

Departmental Standards for Promotion and Tenure

Required by Section 7.12, *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*

University of Minnesota Rochester (UMR)
Center for Learning Innovation (CLI)

Approved by the regular faculty of the Center for Learning Innovation on September 21, 2017.

Approved by the executive vice president and provost on October 11, 2017.

Order of Contents

- I. Introduction
 - II. UMR and the Center for Learning Innovation-Vision, Values, Mission
 - III. Annual Appraisals of Probationary Faculty
 - IV. University Standard-General Criteria for Tenure
 - V. UMR Center for Learning Innovation Departmental Criteria for Tenure
 - VI. University Standard – Criteria for Promotion to Professor
 - VII. UMR Center for Learning Innovation Department - Criteria for Promotion to Professor
 - VIII. Post-Tenure Review
 - IX. Expiration Statement
- Appendices

I. Introduction

Reviews of faculty for promotion and tenure at the University of Minnesota Rochester are conducted in accordance with all-University policies and procedures contained in the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure* and the related document, *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion*.

This document describes with more specificity the standards and processes that will be used to evaluate whether or not candidates meet the general criteria for tenure and promotion for the Center for Learning Innovation at the University of Minnesota Rochester according to the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*. The general criteria for tenure are described in section 7.11 whereas the indices and standards for promotion to professor are given in Section 9.2 of the same Regents policy. For a complete overview, the reader is advised to review sections 7 and 9 in their entirety.

This document contains UMR-specific standards and processes for the following personnel evaluations:

- Annual appraisal of probationary faculty
- Recommendation for awarding indefinite tenure
- Recommendation for promotion
- Post-tenure review

II. UMR and the Center for Learning Innovation-Vision, Values, Mission

UMR is a unique campus in the University of Minnesota System, academically focused on the health-related workforce needs of the region and on learning innovation research and practice. Expectations for faculty performance are aligned with this distinctiveness, as reflected in our Strategic Vision, Grounding Values, and Mission Statements:

A. UMR Strategic Vision

The University of Minnesota Rochester will inspire transformation in higher education through innovations that empower our graduates to solve the grand health challenges of the 21st-century.

B. UMR Grounding Values

- Respect. We value habits of interaction that demonstrate the worth and dignity of each person.
- Human Potential. We value every person's capacity to learn, develop, imagine, create, and contribute.
- Community. We value collective work and a culture of trust that promotes collaboration, problem-solving, and partnerships while creating belonging, accountability, and courageous action.
- Diversity & Inclusiveness. We value the range of human differences and the active pursuit and involvement of varied perspectives.
- Evidence-Based Decision Making. We value strategic collection and careful assessment of data to inform our choices in all matters, including student learning and development.

C. UMR Mission Statement

The University of Minnesota Rochester promotes learning and development through personalized education in a technology-enhanced environment. The University of Minnesota Rochester empowers undergraduate and graduate students to be responsible for their own learning and provides appropriate support to prepare them to succeed in a global and multicultural society.

The University of Minnesota Rochester serves as a conduit and catalyst for leveraging intellectual and economic resources in Rochester and southeastern Minnesota through its signature academic, research, and public engagement programs in collaboration with other campuses of the University of Minnesota, other higher education institutions throughout the state and nation, governmental and non-profit organizations, and private enterprise. (Campus Mission Statement Approved, Board of Regents, June 2009)

D. UMR Center for Learning Innovation (CLI)

Given UMR's commitment to learning innovation, learning research, and collaboration, the University of Minnesota Rochester's interdisciplinary CLI serves as the only academic unit for this campus. This department promotes a learner-centered environment in which ongoing assessment monitors and guides student learning and is the primary basis for faculty scholarship. The CLI faculty lead the development, refinement, and ongoing assessment of the curriculum.

CLI Mission

The mission of the Center for Learning Innovation is to advance learner-centered, assessment-driven, technology-enhanced, and community-integrated education in the health sciences through evidence-based, innovative approaches to teaching and learning.

III. Annual Appraisals of Probationary Faculty

A. Annual Process

Probationary faculty are reviewed annually. The unit head specifies and communicates a due date for annual review files at the outset of each academic year. The materials are compiled by the faculty member and an electronic file is provided to the unit head to be placed on a secure site for review by the CLI Tenure and Promotion Committee, comprised of the tenured faculty at UMR. The CLI Tenure and Promotion Committee works with the unit head to conduct an annual review of each probationary faculty member's progress toward satisfaction of the criteria for receiving tenure as provided by the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure* and in accordance with the *University's Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*. At a meeting called by the unit head, members of the CLI Tenure and Promotion Committee discuss the merits of the research, teaching, and service activities as documented in the probationary faculty member's file. The unit head prepares a written report summarizing the committee's discussion and records that report on the Appraisal of Probationary Faculty (Form 12). The unit head then meets with the faculty member to review the committee's annual report. Throughout, the committee will ascribe to details in *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenure Faculty*.

B. Process in Tenure Candidacy Year

Using the timeline provided annually by the Provost's Office, CLI's unit head specifies and communicates a due date for each step of the tenure review process including external reviews. The CLI Tenure and Promotion Committee works with the unit head to conduct the tenure review using the criteria for receiving tenure as provided by the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure* and in accordance with the *University's Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*. At a meeting called by the unit head, members of the CLI Tenure and Promotion Committee together with the unit head, discuss and vote upon the merits of the research, teaching, and service activities as documented in the tenure candidate's file and vote, in accordance with the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-*

Track and Tenure Faculty. The unit head prepares a written report summarizing the committee's discussion and records that report and results of the committee's vote on the Appraisal of Probationary Faculty (Form 12). The unit head then meets with the faculty member to review the committee's annual report. Throughout, the committee will follow the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenure Faculty*. A document from the vice provost for faculty and academic affairs outlines the required independent levels of review for UMR CLI.

C. Documentation for annual reviews

The annual review files of probationary UMR faculty members should include the following materials to document progress toward tenure in research, teaching, and service as defined by Footnote 3 of the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*:

- Curriculum Vitae (CV), structured using the UMN System faculty CV template.
- Annual Activity Report and Critical Reflection: An essay summarizing and critically reviewing teaching and research activities of the prior year and plans for the upcoming year.
- Teaching and Learning Activities for the review period, with documentation to include:
 - Summary of teaching assignments, including teaching team members and roles.
 - Links to course syllabi from the year under review
 - Table summarizing quantitative student evaluation information by course name and semester, including an overall student evaluation mean for each course.
 - A teaching observation from a tenured faculty member of the UMR CLI or the unit head.
 - A listing of courses that were developed or modified significantly in the previous year indicating if the new or modified courses were a collaborative effort based on team teaching assignments and/or curricular integration.
 - An example of assessment of student learning from the previous year (e.g. a completed rubric providing feedback on a student's learning artifact).
 - Supplementary teaching materials. This sub-section is optional and its contents are at the probationary faculty member's discretion. Examples of supplementary teaching materials include but are not limited to professional development related to teaching and learning; peer evaluations of teaching; student learning artifacts; alumni letters; and/or a list of guest presentations in UMR courses.
- Primary and Secondary Research Activities
 - A list of publications in a consistent, accepted citation format from the year under review, organized by the following categories: published, in press, submitted and advised to revise and resubmit, submitted, and manuscripts in preparation. Documentation is needed regarding the status of publications in press or under review (e.g. copy of an email from a journal editor). For collaborative work, an explanation of the role the probationary faculty is expected.
 - For faculty with distinctly different primary and secondary research agendas, publications may be organized by "primary" and "secondary" categories.

Publications should include an annotation that indicates whether a contribution belongs to a “primary” or “secondary” research activity. Multi-authored publications should include an annotation explaining the individual’s contribution to the publication.

- Copies of scholarly, peer-reviewed publications during the annual review period.
- A list of citations for presentations at professional academic meetings during the review period (lectures or other invited talks in non-academic settings may be listed as service).
- A list of grants during the review period, organized by the following categories: grants secured, grant proposals under review, and grants submitted and rejected. Each entry should include the grant proposal title, abstract, name of granting agency or foundation, award amount, and a description of the role the probationary faculty played in the grant proposal.
- Service Activities
 - A list or brief written summary of service activities accomplished during the review period, including CLI (department), campus, UMN System (institutional), professional academic associations, and external organization/endeavor (outreach) service.
- Any other material considered by the committee or unit head as relevant for the evaluation.

D. Length of Probationary Period

- The length of the probationary period for the CLI and UMR is seven years, with an eighth terminal year for those who do not achieve indefinite tenure. The rationale to extend the traditional six-year probationary period to seven years is to mitigate service demands associated with the growth of a new campus; a distinctive primary research focus for all faculty; and interdisciplinary collaboration necessary for implementing an integrated curriculum.
- A longer probationary period does not preclude a faculty member from requesting to be considered for promotion and tenure during an earlier review cycle, nor does it preclude extending the probationary period as described in section 5.5, *Exception for a New Parent Or Caregiver, Or for Personal Medical Reasons*; however, an earlier review must follow the process and outcomes as described in the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure Track or Tenured Faculty*. The qualitative and quantitative standards for tenure and promotion must be met by faculty regardless of an extension of the probationary period or early consideration for promotion. Extension of the probationary period in accordance with Section 5.5 *Exception for a New Parent or Caregiver, or for Personal Medical Reasons* may not be a factor in the evaluation.

E. Mid-tenure Review

During the third year of the probationary period a more substantive review concerning the progress of the candidate toward tenure and promotion is conducted. The candidate compiles a comprehensive file of research, teaching, and service activities. These materials are similar in format and content to those provided for each of the annual reviews except that the compilation will encompass achievements from the entire probationary period to date. That third-year dossier includes a comprehensive critical reflection on teaching and research contributions to date as well as a research agenda for the next three years. As with the annual review, at a meeting called by the unit head, members of the CLI Tenure and Promotion Committee discuss the merits of the research, teaching, and service activities as documented in the probationary faculty member's file. The unit head prepares a written report summarizing the committee's discussion and records that report on the Appraisal of Probationary Faculty (Form 12). The unit head then meets with the faculty member to review the committee's annual report. Throughout, the committee will follow the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*.

IV. University Standard-General Criteria for Tenure

The CLI follows the policies of the University of Minnesota as outlined in the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty. Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*, Section 7.11, General Criteria:

What the University of Minnesota seeks above all in its faculty members is intellectual distinction and academic integrity. The basis for awarding indefinite tenure to the candidates possessing these qualities is the determination that each has established and is likely to continue to develop a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national or international reputation or both [3]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [4]. The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision [5]. Demonstrated scholarly or other creative achievement and teaching effectiveness must be given primary emphasis: service alone cannot qualify the candidate for tenure. Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, attention to questions of diversity, technology transfer, and other special kinds of professional activity by the candidate should be considered when applicable. The awarding of indefinite tenure presupposes that the candidate's record shows strong promise of his or her achieving promotion to professor.

Regents Policy of *Faculty Tenure*, Footnotes to Section 7.11

[3] "Academic achievement" includes teaching as well as scholarly research and other creative work. The definition and relative weight of the factors may vary with the mission of the individual campus.

[4] The persons responsible and the process for making this determination are described in subsections 7.3 through 7.6.

“Scholarly research” must include significant publications and, as appropriate, the development and dissemination by other means of new knowledge, technology, or scientific procedures resulting in innovative products, practices, and ideas of significance and value to society.

“Other creative work” refers to all forms of creative production across a wide range of disciplines, including, but not limited to, visual and performing arts, design, architecture of structures and environments, writing, media, and other modes of expression.

“Teaching” is not limited to classroom instruction. It includes extension and outreach education, and other forms of communicating knowledge to both registered University students and persons in the extended community, as well as supervising, mentoring, and advising students.

“Service” may be professional or institutional. Professional service, based on one’s academic expertise, is that provided to the profession, the University, or to the local, state, national, or international community. Institutional services may be administrative, committee, and related contributions to one’s department or college, or the University. All faculty members are expected to engage in service activities, but only modest institutional service should be expected of probationary faculty.

[5] Indefinite tenure may be granted at any time the candidate has satisfied the requirement. A probationary appointment must be terminated when the appointee fails to satisfy the criteria in the last year of probationary services and may be terminated earlier if the appointee is not making satisfactory progress within that period toward meeting the criteria.

V. UMR Center for Learning Innovation Departmental Criteria for Tenure

Achieving the CLI and UMR missions requires faculty who are recognized leaders in the area of student learning at the undergraduate level; who develop and implement curricula and pedagogy informed by educational research; and who disseminate research that is recognized by peers to advance knowledge in the scholarship of teaching and learning, disciplinary education (e.g. Chemistry education), or other established higher education or learning innovation contexts. Given the interconnection of praxis and scholarship in the study of student learning, the successful tenure candidate at UMR will have demonstrated excellence in both teaching and research. It is expected that the record of teaching and research accomplishments during the probationary period demonstrate that the faculty member is poised to continue to make substantive contributions to the body of knowledge being generated through teaching and learning scholarship, post-tenure. The judgment of excellence in teaching and research is based on both qualitative and quantitative assessments. The standards for research are defined by national and international benchmarks, whereas the standards for teaching and student learning are determined by contributions to the achievement of student outcomes and the

advancement of the CLI Mission and the UMR Vision. UMR Center for Learning Innovation faculty are also required to engage in service. *Service* means that faculty as UMR citizens actively participate in advancing the interests of the UMR Center for Learning Innovation, the campus, the institution, the profession, and the community.

V-1: Evidence of Primary and Secondary Research Achievement

Primary Research

The primary research of the probationary faculty member should show evidence of significant contributions to advance scholarly inquiry of student learning. The secondary research area is expected to be associated with the faculty member's disciplinary/content area. In some cases, disciplinary scholarship and learning scholarship may be connected into one primary research focus (e.g. Biology Education).

Candidates are expected to provide a concise summary and critical reflection of their scholarly activities in teaching and learning, with supplemental documentation to include published materials. Candidates must give evidence of quality, productivity, visibility, and promise.

Excellence in the primary research area will be demonstrated with the following evidence:

- A record of publication of scholarly works in refereed journals or rigorously peer-reviewed books
- The presentation of research results at academic conferences or colloquia requiring peer review, or invited presentations at academic institutions
- Strong external evaluation letters from peer researchers (defined in section II.F.4 of the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion*), who attest to the high quality of research contributions as well as the impact and leadership of the probationary faculty member in established academic contexts related to learning innovation in higher education

A candidate's tenure case for excellence in the primary research area can be further strengthened by:

- Successful grant proposals for teaching and learning research
- Supervision of undergraduate research experiences that leads to peer-reviewed publication or presentation in a venue external to UMR
- Institutional assessment of UMR student outcomes that leads to peer-reviewed publication or presentation in a venue external to UMR

Scholarly Research. Scholarly research can take many forms including original articles and books, book chapters, edited collections and anthologies, critical editions, encyclopedia articles, translations, reviews, integrative textbooks that advance learning innovation, and published lectures.

Quantity and Quality of Publication. The expected frequency of research publication will be evaluated within the context of the quality of each publication and by the importance of its contribution to

fundamental and innovative questions related to student learning and development. While quality is more important than quantity, the candidate must present a sustained and substantial body of achievement.

Peer-Review. Peer-reviewed publications will receive greater weight than publications that were not peer reviewed. Publications by eminent presses and those appearing in journals, series, or volumes with stringent review and major significance generally receive the most weight. For articles published as book chapters, the peer-review process should be explained.

Collaborative Scholarship. Collaborative student learning research is valued and encouraged at UMR. As a result, senior authorship and lead PI status expectations are mitigated as follows:

- Faculty involved in collaborative work must explain their role in multi-authored publications and are expected to have taken a leadership role in some of their multi-authored publications.
- Lead PI status by a probationary faculty member on collaborative grants is not necessary for a funded grant to serve as evidence of excellence in the primary research area; however, if the faculty member is involved in multiple, collaborative grants, a leadership role in one or more is expected.
- Continued participation and leadership on department-level research activities, including activities like engaging in institutional research.
- Contribution to department-level IRB research protocols necessary to sustain the curriculum-wide research endeavors in the CLI, especially as evidenced by appointment as the PI on the research protocols.

Published Work. The candidate is asked to produce the publication contract or another form of evidence showing the work has been accepted for publication. A book, journal article, or book chapter will be considered in production when a letter from the director or editor is sent and states that the work 1) has gone through all rounds of reviews; 2) all corrections/revisions have been completed; 3) the fully complete/revised manuscript is in the hands of the press or journal; 4) the press or journal has put it on a production schedule.

Work under Review. Work under review may be considered but is not sufficient as evidence of excellence in the primary research area. If manuscripts are under review at the time of the submission of the tenure dossier, documentation is needed regarding the status of publications in press or under review. A copy of an email from a journal editor will suffice as evidence.

Submitted but Unsuccessful Grants. Grants submitted may be considered but are not sufficient as evidence of excellence in the primary research area.

Secondary Research

All tenure candidates must provide evidence that they have been actively engaged with their content area of expertise in ways that ensure an understanding of the current trends and practices in the

disciplinary area. For tenure candidates with a secondary research area distinct from their teaching and learning research, excellence in the secondary research area may be demonstrated with the following evidence:

- Attendance at disciplinary-based conferences
- Participation in disciplinary-based workshops
- A record of publication of scholarly work in refereed, disciplinary journals, validated as contributing to the discipline by an external evaluator
- Presentation at disciplinary conferences or colloquia requiring peer review

Scholarly publication in a candidate's secondary (disciplinary, content area) research is neither required for promotion or tenure, nor sufficient for promotion or tenure. The probationary faculty member must provide evidence that he or she has been actively engaged with their content area of expertise in ways that assure an understanding of the current trends and practices in the disciplinary area.

V-2: Relevant Forms of Evidence - Teaching

The teaching section of the dossier of tenure candidates should include the following materials to document excellence in teaching as expected for tenure and as defined by Footnote 3 of the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*:

An essay of no more than six pages summarizing and reviewing teaching activities during the probationary period including the development of course content, pedagogy, and assessment methods; contributions to the collaborative development and implementation of an evidence-based, innovative, interdisciplinary, integrated curricula; and student learning.

Teaching and Learning Activities Documentation. List of teaching assignments with embedded links to syllabi, including teaching team members and roles, directed study, and supervision associated with student capstone experiences and/or undergraduate research experiences.

Student Evaluations. Table summarizing quantitative student evaluation information by course name and semester.

Faculty Peer Review. At least three teaching observations from a) three different academic years; b) at least two different courses; and c) tenured faculty in the CLI and the unit head.

Assessment. At least two examples of exemplary assessment methods (e.g. a lab or oral presentation rubric; a formative assessment tool, etc.).

Additional Evidence for the evaluation of teaching excellence at the time of tenure may include but is not limited to the following:

- Leadership of collaborative endeavors to initiate, organize, implement, and assess the integrated UMR curriculum and/or innovative pedagogical strategies that enhance student learning
- Leadership of professional development endeavors in teaching and learning
- Leadership in the implementation of inclusive pedagogical strategies
- Leadership in the collective assessment and achievement of institutional learning and development outcomes
- Teaching-related letters from alumni
- Development of instructional materials, including but not limited to computer software, compilations of readings, course guides for Directed Study courses, and publication of textbooks or instructor manuals
- Teaching awards and other formal recognitions of teaching excellence
- Grants for curricular development and/or preparation of instructional materials

V-3: Relevant Forms of Evidence - Service

A strong commitment to service by probationary faculty continues to be essential to campus functioning at this new, small university. Those expectations routinely include leadership of CLI committees and often include leadership of campus-level committees and participation in institutional-level endeavors. At UMR, campus and department level service are major contributors to the overall strength of the tenure candidacy with service or public engagement with groups external to the University also highly valued.

Examples of service to the institution include but are not limited to:

- Participation in the faculty governance of the campus and the University
- Participation in department, campus, and University committees and working groups
- Active participation in Center for Learning Innovation departmental activities.
- Sponsorship of student organizations
- Active participation in UMR recruitment and scholarship endeavors

Examples of service to the profession include but are not limited to:

- Holding committee appointments and elected offices in a local, regional, state, national, or international professional societies
- Organizing, hosting, and/or sponsoring meetings and panels of local, regional, national or international professional societies
- Serving as a consultant or referee for books, journal articles, and other professional publications
- Refereeing conference submissions, or organizing a conference session or roundtable at an academic conference
- Reviewing grant applications
- Serving as an outside reviewer for tenure and promotion cases at other institutions of higher education
- Serving as an outside reviewer of academic programs at other educational institutions

- Providing consulting services to professional organizations

Examples of service to the community include but are not limited to:

- Outreach to K-12 schools.
- Consulting services to community organizations.
- Sponsoring, organizing, presenting at, and/or hosting educational conferences, seminars, symposia, panels, and workshops with community groups.
- Holding offices on the boards of non-profit organizations.
- Publication of essays and articles in newspapers, magazines, and other educational venues.

VI. University Standard – Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure, Section 9.2, Criteria for Promotion to Professor

The basis for promotion to the rank of professor is the determination that each candidate has 1) demonstrated the intellectual distinction and academic integrity expected of all faculty members, 2) added substantially to an already distinguished record of academic achievement, and 3) established the national or international reputation (or both) ordinarily resulting from such distinction and achievement [8]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate’s record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [9]. The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision. Interdisciplinary work, public engagement international activities and initiatives, attention to questions of diversity, technology transfer, and other special kinds of professional activity by the candidate should be considered when applicable. But the primary emphasis must be on demonstrated scholarly or other creative achievement and on teaching effectiveness, and service alone cannot qualify the candidate for promotion.

Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure, Footnotes to Section 9.2

[8] “Academic achievement” includes teaching as well as scholarly research and other creative work. The definition and relative weight of the factors may vary with the mission of the individual campus. Not being promoted to the rank of professor will not in itself result in special post-tenure review of a tenured associate professor.

[9] The persons responsible for this determination are the full professors in the unit who are eligible to vote. The outcome of the vote is either promotion to the rank of professor or continuation in rank as an associate professor. The procedures for voting are identical to those outlined in Section 7.4 for the granting of indefinite tenure, the nondisclosure of grounds for the decision (Section 7.5), and the review of a recommendation of continuation in rank as an associate professor follows the procedures specified in Section 7.7 for decisions about promotion to associate professor and conferral of indefinite tenure.

VII. UMR Center for Learning Innovation Department - Criteria for Promotion to Professor

The rank of professor is the mark of eminence in an academic career. All associate professors are strongly encouraged to work toward promotion to the rank of professor (see Section 7.11 of the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*). The general criteria for promotion to professor are shown in section 9.2, “Criteria for Promotion to Professor.” Note that the training for doctoral students is not an expectation at UMR, given our focus on undergraduate education. In the CLI, promotion to the rank of Professor requires that the faculty member establish a national and/or international scholarly reputation in a recognized arena of inquiry related to learning innovation (disciplinary education, scholarship of teaching and learning, general student learning, higher education research, higher education innovation, or another context relevant to UMR’s Vision and Mission). Disciplinary research is neither sufficient nor necessary for promotion to full professor, but can be considered as contributing to the faculty member’s national and/or international scholarly reputation.

The evidence sought for consideration for promotion to Professor includes:

- Continued excellence in teaching, including leadership and the modeling of teaching innovation with all teaching colleagues in the department
- Leadership in the scholarship of teaching and learning or other academic contexts recognized for evidence-based education, as demonstrated by letters from scholarly experts assessing the candidate’s record of scholarly contributions
- Development of a national and/or international reputation as demonstrated through invitations to symposia, election to prestigious societies, or election to offices in prominent national or international societies
- Significant internal and external service contributions (internal to include the CLI, the UMR campus, and the University of Minnesota System; external to include substantive service to 1) at least one external organization or endeavor well-aligned with the candidate’s professional expertise or 2) at least one Rochester area community outreach endeavor or organization well-aligned with the public, land-grant mission of this community-integrated campus

The procedures for promotion to full professor are as follows:

The candidate, the unit head, or the departmental promotion review committee [comprised of the department’s faculty who hold the rank of professor] may recommend a formal review process for promotion to the rank of professor. When a faculty member is considered for promotion to the rank of professor, the following steps will be taken: 1) the candidate will submit the dossier and supporting material to the department for review and discussion by the tenured faculty who hold the rank of professor; 2) the formal discussion will be followed by a vote cast by a written unsigned secret ballot with action taken by a majority decision; 3) a report of the vote and a summary of faculty views both for and against promotion will be written; 4) after the discussion and vote of the faculty, the unit head will write a separate statement for or against promotion; 5) the candidate may then inspect the entire file and provide a written response if he or she so chooses; and 6) the file, the department’s faculty vote and written summary, the unit head’s statement, and the response of the faculty member, if any, are then forwarded for subsequent levels of independent review.

VIII. Post-Tenure Review

This section is an implementation of the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure* (Section 7.a.), as described in detail in the Rules and Procedures for Annual and Special Post-Tenure Review approved by the Tenure Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs January 5, 1998; and revised by the Tenure Subcommittee March 5, 1998. The *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure* section 7.a.1 states:

“The faculty of each academic unit must establish goals and expectations for all faculty members, including goals and expectations regarding teaching, scholarly productivity, and contributions to the service and outreach functions of the unit. The factors to be considered will parallel those used by the unit in the granting of tenure, but will take into account the different stages of professional development of faculty. The goals and expectations will be established in accordance with standards established by the University Senate. They can provide for flexibility, so that some faculty members can contribute more heavily to the accomplishment of one mission of the unit and others to the accomplishment of other missions.”

Given the unique and innovative environment at UMR, we recognize the importance of flexibility in considering how faculty members meet each of the three goals of research, teaching, and service.

Goals and Expectations for Tenured Faculty in the UMR Center for Learning Innovation Department

Expectations Regarding Research and Publication. Research and publication are vital components of the responsibilities of tenured faculty. It is expected that tenured faculty will become and remain leading and influential scholars in learning innovation. While the extent and nature of research activity may vary over time, within any given period of two years tenured faculty should be able to report a total of at least two substantial accomplishments within one or more of the following categories:

- Publication of a scholarly book, article, book chapter, encyclopedia article, review, bibliography, translation, etc.
- Publication of an edited scholarly volume, encyclopedia, or reference work.
- Refereed or invited scholarly presentation at a major conference or academic institution.
- Organization of a scholarly conference, symposium, workshop, or panel.
- Active engagement in one or more research projects alone or in collaboration with fellow scholars or communities.
- Receipt of an internal or external grant, or fellowship for research.
- Leadership in coordinating research for internal and/or accreditation purposes.

Expectations Regarding Teaching Excellence. Tenured faculty will teach courses at workload levels established by the UMR Campus, modeling teaching excellence as well as teaching and learning innovation; in addition, tenured faculty will participate in ongoing collaborative teaching endeavors related to disciplinary teaching teams and/or curricular integration. Faculty members will also be accessible to students in their courses for consultation at regularly scheduled office or Just Ask hours. Documentation of excellence in teaching will be based on the criteria stated above under criteria for tenure, but can also be supplemented by evidence of leadership in faculty development/mentoring, either on the UMR campus or across the University’s campuses.

Expectations Regarding Service. Tenured faculty will remain actively involved in service. These expectations may include participating in scholarly meetings and engaging in such activities as editorial service for professional journals, conference planning, and service in professional associations. Professional service may also include the evaluation of manuscripts submitted to scholarly journals and presses; assessment of applications to national grants agencies; and being involved in the evaluation of scholarship and standing of individuals for tenure and promotion considerations at other institutions.

Tenured faculty are also expected to contribute regularly to the governance of the department, campus, and University. All faculty are expected to attend and participate in regular and special department faculty meetings and especially those dealing with tenure, promotion, and the appointment and retention of faculty; serve effectively on various committees as elected or appointed; and accept leadership assignments. In all of these endeavors the quality of involvement is paramount.

Annual Review

Pursuant to Sections 7a.2 and 7a.3 of the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*, each tenured faculty member's performance will be evaluated annually by the unit head and the department's tenured voting faculty to award merit and enhance productivity in the areas of scholarly/research/creative accomplishments, teaching excellence, and service contributions. A summary of the evaluation will be written by the unit head and given to the candidate. This written summary will be followed by a mandatory meeting between the unit head and the faculty member to discuss the review and its recommendations.

Post-Tenure Review in Cases of Alleged Substandard Performance by Tenured Faculty

The UMR Center for Learning Innovation department expects that its tenured faculty will be regularly active in all three domains of research, teaching, and service. Either the unit head or a merit committee if one is appointed will review each faculty member's performance annually. Should a tenured faculty member's performance over a three year period be judged substandard according to the standards outlined in Section VII by both the unit head and the tenured faculty, a process will be initiated at which time 1) a good-faith effort will be made to assemble all materials relevant to the alleged deficiencies, to which the faculty member has the right to add any information s/he considers relevant; 2) an advisory committee of three peers of equal or higher rank from within and outside the department will be appointed to review the materials and make recommendations to enhance the faculty member's performance; 3) a memorandum will be sent to the faculty member from the unit head and the peer committee that specifies the deficiencies, summarizes the recommendations for improvement, and establishes a timetable within which the faculty member must address the problems within at least one year of the date of letter to the faculty member; and 4) in consultation with the unit head, the faculty member will be asked to submit in writing a time-specific plan that defines how s/he intends to remedy the deficiencies before the review at the end of the specific time period (in the letter from the chair and peer committee). At the review, the unit head will initiate another formal evaluation of the faculty member's performance in concurrence with the committee of peers. If both the unit head and the committee of peers agree that the faculty member's performance remains substantially below the goals

and expectations of the department, further actions may be taken as outlined under Section 7a.3 of the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*.

Special Post-Tenure Peer Review Process

The special peer review of a tenured faculty member follows the process outlined in section 7a.3, with the UMR Chancellor serving as the next level of review.

IX. Expiration Statement

The UMR Center for Learning Innovation 7.12 Statement will expire 7 years from the date of its approval. A committee of tenured faculty will review and, if necessary, update the 7.12 document in accordance with the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members will be eligible to vote to approve the 7.12 document.

Appendix A – Section 5.5 of the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*

5.5 Exception for a New Parent or Caregiver, or for Personal Medical Reasons. The maximum period of probationary service will be extended by one year at the request of a probationary faculty member:

1. On the occasion of the birth of that faculty member's child or adoptive/foster placement of a child with that faculty member; or
2. When the faculty member is a major caregiver for a family member [2] who has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition. A faculty member may use this provision no more than two times; or
3. When the faculty member has an extended illness, injury, or debilitating condition.

The request for extension must be made in writing within one year of the events giving rise to the claim and no later than June 30 preceding the year a final decision would otherwise be made on an appointment with indefinite tenure for that faculty member.

Appendix B – Section 7.12 of the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*

7.12 Departmental Statement. [6] Each department or equivalent academic unit must have a document that specifies 1) the indices and standards that will be used to determine whether candidates meet the threshold criteria for subsection 7.11 ("General Criteria" for the awarding of indefinite tenure) and 2) the indices and standards that will be used to determine whether candidates meet the threshold criteria of subsection 9.2 ("Criteria for Promotion to Professor"). The document must contain as an appendix the text and footnotes of subsections 7.11 and 9.2, and must be consistent with the criteria given there but may exceed them. Each departmental statement must be approved by a faculty vote (including both tenure and probationary members), the dean, and other appropriate academic administrators, including the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The chair or head of each academic unit must provide each probationary faculty member with a copy of the Departmental Statement at the beginning of probationary service.