

INSTITUTE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES CONCERNING FACULTY
REVIEW, PROMOTION, AND TENURE
(Required by Section 7.12 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*)

I. Introductory Statement

This document describes with more specificity the standards and procedures that will be used to evaluate whether candidates meet the general criteria in Sections 7.11 for conferral of indefinite tenure and 9.2 for promotion to professor of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*. For a complete perspective, the reader is advised to review Section 7 in its entirety. This document and department practices are consistent with the University Procedures for Evaluating Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty. The document also describes the Institute's procedures for annual reviews of faculty members.

II. Mission Statement

Since it was founded in 1925, the Institute of Child Development has been an integral part of the University of Minnesota devoted to understanding and promoting child development and well-being from infancy into adulthood. Through research, teaching, and outreach activities, the Institute serves the goal of advancing the developmental sciences and their applications to improving the quality of human life.

The mission of the Institute of Child Development includes teaching, research, and discipline-related professional service as defined in Sections 7.11 and 9.2 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*. To be awarded indefinite tenure or promotion, a faculty member will be expected to have demonstrated effectiveness in teaching, productivity in research, and achievement in service to professional organizations, learned societies, state and federal agencies, and to the community. Although accomplishment in all three areas must be demonstrated by each faculty member, scholarly productivity and effective teaching will be considered primary.

The Institute's mission is congruent with The College of Education and Human Development's goals of discovering, creating, sharing, and applying principles and practices to advance teaching and learning and to enhance the physical, psychological, and social development of children, youth, and adults across the lifespan in families, organizations, and communities. Within this context, multidisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, and attention to questions of diversity will be taken into consideration in evaluating the candidate's satisfaction of criteria for promotion and tenure. Multidisciplinary work includes work that integrates different disciplines, or examines a phenomenon through multiple disciplines.

III. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Since promotion to Associate Professor is usually associated with a decision concerning tenure, such a promotion must meet tenure standards of effectiveness in teaching and professional distinction in research. Section 7.11 of *Faculty Tenure* describes the general criteria for the conferral of indefinite tenure:

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.

[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, to the University, or to the local, state, national, or international community. Institutional service 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 requirements. A probationary appointment must be terminated when the appointee fails to satisfy the criteria in the last year of probationary service and may be terminated earlier if the appointee is not making satisfactory progress within that period toward meeting the criteria.

A. Teaching

1. Evaluation of effectiveness of teaching is based on:

- a. Review of courses taught, directed, or developed by the candidate, at both undergraduate and graduate levels;
- b. Review of contributions to curriculum or program development;

- c. Degree candidates advised (or co-advised) at both the MA and Ph.D. levels;
 - d. Students supervised in research or independent study, including the direction of undergraduate honors projects and directed research;
 - e. Evaluations by students;
 - f. Evaluations by peers (e.g. classroom visits; review of syllabi, including text, material covered, assignments, methods of evaluation).
2. Standards for evaluation will be guided by the answers to questions such as:
- a. Planning. How well does the instructional plan identify objectives, utilize appropriate subject matter sequences, incorporate up-to-date information, consider students and their differences, employ current materials and technology?
 - b. Methods. How well do instructor/student interactions facilitate learning? How well do the instructor's methods contribute to the effectiveness of the learning plans? Has the instructor taken advantage of a variety of strategies designed to enhance student learning and participation?
 - c. Outcome. How well did the teaching do what it intended? Methods of assessment will include student evaluations of the course and peer assessments of the likelihood that the planning and methods employed should lead to effective outcomes.

B. Research

- 1. Evaluation of distinction in research is based on:
 - a. A review of the candidate's publications, particularly those in peer reviewed journals. Contributions to prestigious review journals, monographs, etc., that are not peer reviewed will be taken into consideration but cannot be a primary basis for a decision. Evidence will be sought from all publications that the work is scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance;
 - b. Independence and originality of research accomplishments. In multi-authored articles, the contribution of the individual under review will be specifically described and evaluated. That said, all faculty are encouraged to include graduate students and, as appropriate, undergraduate students on their publications. In addition, participation in multidisciplinary research leading to publications is valued and will not, when the independence and originality of the candidate's contributions can be clearly described, be judged less valuable than other publications;
 - c. External research funding from sources outside the University by competition at a national level or international level;

- d. Recognition of the impact of one's scholarship through participation in invited scientific symposia, meetings, and lectures; election to prestigious national organizations or scholarly awards from professional societies that recognize excellence in the discipline; or participation in prestigious national or international research networks, advisory boards, and task forces that recognize outstanding achievements in disciplined inquiry.
2. Standards for evaluation of research by Institute faculty and external reviewers will be guided by answers to questions such as:
 - a. Rigor. How well does the research meet the standards of methodological rigor in the developmental sciences?
 - b. Cumulative Effect. To what extent is the individual's research program coherent and programmatic? For work that is multidisciplinary the question of cumulative effect should be evaluated within the context of the various disciplines for which the work has import.
 - c. Significance. How well does the work focus on central questions, issues, or theories? In what ways might it lead to additional work in the area? For work that is multidisciplinary the question of significance should be evaluated within the context of the significance of the questions that motivate the multidisciplinary inquiry.
 - d. Impact. What is the prospect that this work will make a difference in the understanding of human development and developmental processes? To what degree is it viewed as an original and valuable contribution by leading scholars in the area?
 - e. Dissemination. To what extent have findings-or conceptualizations been communicated effectively through publication? Has the candidate succeeded in publishing in outlets with high visibility and impact?
 - f. Funding. To what extent has the individual attracted external funding when it is available and necessary for progress in their particular research program?

For faculty doing multidisciplinary work, the same guidelines will apply. For faculty with joint appointments, a committee consisting of faculty in the individual's departments will be formed to evaluate the application of these guidelines. The composition and operation of this committee will be determined by an administrator who is superordinate to the departmental units involved.

C. Service.

1. Service to professional organizations, learned societies, state and federal agencies, and to the community will be considered when it is within the faculty member's academic expertise and consistent with the mission of the Institute, College, and University. Probationary faculty are not expected to take on the same degree of service obligations as are tenured faculty in our department.

2. Evaluation of organizational and professional service contributions will be guided by the answers to questions such as: What did the individual contribute to the Institute, the University, the State, National or International communities or the professions of developmental science by way of:
 - a. developing and establishing policies or influencing deliberations?
 - b. developing or achieving more effective programs that benefit child development or the quality of human life?
 - c. anticipating and solving operational problems so that policies are made workable?
 - d. service to professional organizations, editorial or advisory boards, governmental agencies?
 - e. communication of scientific information to the public?
 - f. contributing to Institute, College or University governance?

IV. Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor.

Section 9.2 of *Faculty Tenure* describes the criteria for promotion to professor:

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.

[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 recommendations (Section 7.6). In addition, a petition to the Judicial Committee for 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.

For promotion to Full Professor, in addition to criteria used for Associate Professor, evidence is sought for a truly international reputation. Evaluation will be based on:

- A. Letters from authorities in the candidate's field assessing the candidate's scientific contributions, particularly to determine whether or not the candidate is among the leaders in his or her field;
- B. Contributions to predoctoral and postdoctoral training that have resulted in preparation and placements of trainees in positions in their field. This can include contributions to program development at the predoctoral and doctoral level that have resulted in improved training and placement of students they have supervised. This might include evidence of the success of the candidate's predoctoral students in gaining access to graduate and advanced professional training opportunities, and evidence of the success of the candidate's graduate students in obtaining jobs after graduation that utilize their professional training.

V. Procedures for Reviews

The Institute of Child Development complies with the Procedures for Evaluating Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty as provided by Sections 16.3, 7.4, and 7.61 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. In accordance with these policies, all faculty will be reviewed annually.

- A. Probationary faculty will be reviewed annually. The annual review will be conducted by the Director and discussed in a meeting with each faculty member. The essence of the review will be communicated to the faculty member, and they will acknowledge they have received the information by signing President's Form 12. There will be a major review after three years. During this review, the cumulative record of the faculty member will be evaluated, and may include information from relevant faculty and graduate students, as well as the annual review information. Probationary faculty will be reviewed for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor at the end of their fifth year with a decision made in the sixth probationary year. This review will be carried out in accordance with the University of Minnesota's *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty*.
- B. For the Annual Review, probationary faculty will provide:
 - 1. an up-to-date curriculum vitae;
 - 2. copies of recent publications;
 - 3. Other documentation which should include (but need not be limited to) records of teaching assignments, student evaluations, advising records (program, dissertation, student committee assignments), past and proposed research activities, research grant support, a record and copies of research reports, theoretical articles and other scholarly writing, both published and in press, a record of papers presented at colloquia or professional meetings, departmental committee assignments, service to the College of Education and Human Development and

other units of the University, organizational, advisory, and editorial responsibilities for professional bodies, community contributions.

C. Promotion and Tenure of Probationary Faculty

1. Candidates for promotion and tenure will be evaluated by a minimum of four external leading authorities who have no professional or personal interest in the candidate's career. Two of the authorities will be selected by the Director in consultation with senior faculty from a list suggested by the candidate. The Director and professorial faculty senior in rank to the candidate will select two additional referees. Copies of the vitae and publications will be sent to the referees who will be asked to review the candidate's credentials with respect to promotion and/or tenure.
2. Evaluation of teaching for candidates for promotion and/or tenure will be solicited through comments from all currently enrolled graduate students and graduates from relevant previous years. Input from undergraduate students will also be solicited. The department will routinely request, collect, and file standardized student evaluations for undergraduate courses as part of the required teaching dossier maintained for each faculty member. Evaluations for the candidate's time in rank will be summarized with the assistance of the candidate for consideration by the evaluating faculty.
3. The Director will meet with the candidate seeking promotion and/or tenure to review the materials and statements prepared by the candidate and will provide him or her with recommendations for improvement of the dossier.
4. The final package of documents and supporting materials of the candidate seeking promotion and tenure will be made available to the faculty for a reasonable time period (not less than two weeks) for review.
5. A special meeting of faculty senior to the candidate seeking promotion and tenure will be held for open discussion of the candidate.
6. The faculty will vote by secret ballot on promotion and/or tenure, the results of the vote to be the recommendation of the Institute to the College. In all voting, the Director of the Institute will cast his or her vote as a professor. A two-thirds majority rule of all eligible voting faculty shall determine the outcome of all promotion and tenure recommendations in the Institute. The Director will submit an appropriate description of the outcome and his or her own recommendation to the Dean of the College.
7. All faculty, including those on leave, will be informed of candidates being considered for promotion and tenure. Documents and supporting materials will be made available to those on leave; they will be given the opportunity to vote and will be encouraged to do so.
8. Faculty members under review for promotion and tenure shall be informed by the Director of the recommendation of the faculty and Director, and shall be given an opportunity to review and respond in writing to all of the documents sent forward to the College.

9. The recommendation of the faculty and Director with any response of the candidate for promotion and tenure will be forwarded to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and to the Dean for his or her review.
10. Stopping the tenure clock is the right of probationary faculty as long as it is consistent with the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* (*Appendix B contains Section 5.5 which describes the policy*). When considering the record of probationary faculty who have stopped the clock, criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than for those who do not stop the clock.

D. Tenured Faculty

1. Annual Reviews of Tenured Faculty, Post-tenure reviews will be conducted annually for all tenured faculty (except those undergoing review for promotion to full professor) according to Section 7a of *Faculty Tenure*. The goals and expectations for tenured faculty members will parallel those used in the granting of tenure, but will take into account the different stages of professional development of faculty, providing for flexibility. The post-tenure review will be conducted by the Director and discussed in a meeting with each faculty member. If a faculty member is falling below the *Minimum Performance Standards for Tenured Faculty* listed below, a plan to reach minimum standards will be discussed with the director. If standards are not met in the following year, the faculty member may request completion of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). A MOU requires the agreement of the faculty member, the director, the dean, and the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost. The MOU must specify the goals and expectations of the unit for teaching, research, and service; how the faculty member's workload expectations will depart from the unit goals and expectations; and the time period over which the MOU extends. If the MOU is not approved at any level of the approval process or when cases of alleged substandard performance arise, an elected peer merit review committee will follow the steps outlined in 7a.3 of the Procedures regarding *Faculty Tenure*. For annual reviews faculty will be asked to provide:
 - a. an up-to-date curriculum vitae;
 - b. copies of recent publications;
 - c. Other documentation which should include (but need not be limited to) records of teaching assignments, student evaluations, advising records (program, dissertation, student committee assignments), past and proposed research activities, research grant support, a record and copies of research reports, theoretical articles and other scholarly writing, both published and in press, a record of papers presented at colloquia or professional meetings, departmental committee assignments, service to the College of Education and Human Development and other units of the University, organizational, advisory, and editorial responsibilities for professional bodies, community contributions.
2. The following *Minimum Performance Standards for Tenured Faculty* will be used during the annual review to evaluate for merit increases when available, planning of future contributions, and to establish that the faculty is meeting minimum standards in three areas of responsibilities (teaching, research, and service). These standards describe the barest minimum of performance, below which the faculty member would be judged to be "not

meeting standards” unless there is a prior arrangement with the director. More than minimum standards are required for merit increases in salary; simply meeting the minimum standards do not warrant a merit increase.

The Institute of Child Development has established the following minimum standards for tenured faculty. Any deviations to the minimum standards should be pre-arranged with the director. When applicable, deviations may be based on performance levels used when tenure was approved; for example, if the faculty member was publishing one article a year at the time tenure was received, this could be taken into consideration.

- a. Minimum standards for **PUBLICATION** are met when a tenured faculty member:
 - publishes a minimum of two publications a year averaged over three years; one of which is a peer- reviewed manuscript. Publications “in press” are acceptable. A minimum of one authored book (not edited book), or monograph, over three years would also meet this requirement.
- b. Minimum standards for **MENTORING** are met when a tenured faculty member:
 - does not go more than three years without mentoring (or co-mentoring) a graduate student. It is acceptable to mentor a student in a department outside of ICD. Mentoring a post-doc student is acceptable. Mentoring and co-mentoring is based on the official record of advisers and co-advisers recorded with the University.
- c. Minimum standards for **GRANTS** are met when a tenured faculty member:
 - submits at least one external grant application every two years that the faculty member does not have a grant. If the faculty member has an external grant (as PI, Co-PI, or Co-I) this meets the minimum standards.
- d. Minimum standards for **TEACHING** are met when a tenured faculty member:
 - is present in class for the courses to which one is assigned for at least 80% of the classes, not counting exam days. Extenuating circumstances must be discussed with director.
 - teaches the content appropriate for the course as indicated by the guidelines established for the course or by review of the appropriate instruction committee (graduate or undergraduate).
 - maintains an adequate quality of teaching which will be determined by a combination of student and peer evaluation.
- e. Minimum standards for **SERVICE TO THE DEPARTMENT** are met when a tenured faculty member (unless on leave or sabbatical):
 - attends at least half of the faculty meetings each semester, unless teaching or excused by director

- attends faculty retreats, unless excused by the director
 - participates in admissions (reviewing files, discussing candidates and voting)
 - participates in hiring and promotion as appropriate for rank
 - attends at least half of the meetings of the committees to which he/she has been assigned, unless excused by the director
 - completes the CAR and provide the director with all annual merit review materials requested (this must be completed even if on leave or sabbatical)
 - Meet with the director for the annual review
- f. Minimum standards for **SERVICE TO THE COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY** are met when a tenured faculty member:
- is willing to serve on collegiate or university governance committees/entities. Refusal to serve or to be considered for service will be counted as falling below minimum standards unless the individual has served on one such committee/entity within the past 5 years. Note that service on governance groups associated with centers or programs does not fulfill this service minimum standard.
3. Promotion to Full Professor. A review of tenured associate professors with respect to promotion from associate professor to the rank of professor will occur every four years (unless the faculty member is seeking promotion to the rank of full professor that year). Form UM 13 must be completed and forwarded for each tenured associate professor every four years. The document, *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* (2012), section III.A., indicates that:

No less frequently than every four years, the unit's tenured faculty at the rank of professor shall review the progress toward promotion of each associate professor with tenure. This review will provide the associate professor with feedback about his or her progress towards meeting the criteria in subsection 9.2 of Faculty Tenure and in the unit 7.12 statement. The four-year review of tenured associate professors must be reported in writing by the unit head. The associate professor meets with the unit head to discuss the review and signs the report of the review to acknowledge that the review took place. The report is forwarded to the dean or chancellor and to the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost.

Every four years, occurring during the same time as the regular annual review process, a committee of two department faculty at the rank of full professor will evaluate the associate professor's curriculum vitae and annual review materials (CEHD Activity Report – CAR, teaching evaluations, etc.) using the requirements for promotion to full professor taken from 9.2 of *Faculty Tenure* and section IV above. The committee will provide the director with

written feedback from the review with respect to the associate professor's progress towards seeking promotion to full professor. The director will communicate the findings during the associate professor's annual review and complete Form UM 13.

VI. This statement was last revised in May of 2013, approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and these guidelines should be reviewed and revised as appropriate, but not less often than every 10 years.

Approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, January 13, 2014.

Appendix A

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 of 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 tenured 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 the probationary service.

Appendix B

5.5 Exception for 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 serious 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 proceeding the year a final decision would otherwise be made on an appointment with indefinite tenure for that faculty member.