

University of Minnesota Morris
Division of Education

Criteria and Evaluation Procedures

For Faculty Performance at the University of Minnesota, Morris
Divisional Statement as Required Under the University of Minnesota
Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure, Section 7.12
Approved by the Faculty on February 3, 2011
Approved by the Senior Vice President and Provost February 5, 2011

I. Introduction

Reviews of faculty for promotion and tenure and annual performance appraisals at the University of Minnesota, Morris (UMM) are conducted in accordance with all University policies and procedures contained in the Board of Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* and related documents. Candidates for indefinite tenure and/or promotion in rank are judged on demonstrated accomplishments and on potential for future development and contributions to the UMM program in the areas of teaching, research, and service. This document states the criteria for expected faculty performance at all stages of a faculty member's career in the Division of Education at the University of Minnesota, Morris. The document describes indices and standards for the following personnel evaluations:

- A. Annual performance appraisal during probationary period (Section 7.2 of the Regent's Policy on *Faculty Tenure*)
- B. Recommendations for awarding indefinite tenure according to the Regent's Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, Section 7.11 General Criteria.
- C. Recommendations for promotion to Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor (Section 9.2. Criteria for Promotion to Professor).
- D. Annual performance appraisal for post tenure review according to Section 7a of the Regent's Policy on *Faculty Tenure*.

For a complete perspective, the reader is advised to review Sections 7 and 9 in their entirety. This document is consistent with the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*.

Appendix A to this document contains the text of Section 7.11 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, which specifies the general criteria for indefinite tenure across the University. Appendix B contains the text for the guidelines for a departmental statement with respect to awarding tenure and promotion. Appendix C contains the text of Section 5.5 which specifies the conditions under which a probationary faculty member may extend the probationary period. Appendix D contains the text of Section 9.2, which specifies the criteria for promotion to professor.

II. Mission Statement

The mission of the Division of Education is one of teaching, research, and service commensurate with UMM's role as an undergraduate liberal arts college of the University of Minnesota. The Division of Education at UMM has responsibility for the elementary and secondary education and for sport studies and athletics programs. The Division is committed to preparing qualified and superior teachers in liberal arts disciplines for schools within and beyond Minnesota and to providing quality instruction in sport studies and athletics. The sport studies and athletics faculty is responsible for intercollegiate, intramural, recreational, and community related athletic activities. The primary goal of the Division is to provide a coherent and high-quality

undergraduate program to prepare prospective teachers to enter the profession with the knowledge, skills, dispositions, and leadership abilities necessary to ensure student learning and reflection. The Division's faculty engages in active service to their disciplines, the campus, the University, and to the public.

The Division expects full faculty participation and growth throughout all stages of their career. Faculty members appointed to tenure lines are expected to meet the requirements for promotion to associate professor and tenure. It is the goal of the Division that associate professors will work toward, request, and attain promotion to full professor.

III. Annual Appraisals of Probationary Faculty

Pursuant to Section 7.2 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, each probationary faculty member's performance will be evaluated annually by the Division's tenured voting faculty to determine a recommendation of continuation in rank, promotion, or termination. The Chair of the Division of Education shall assure that there is systematic collection of information about the work of each probationary member of the division faculty. The probationary faculty member will assemble the review file with guidance from the Chair or an appointed deputy. Each faculty member being reviewed or considered for tenure or promotion will attest, in writing, that his/her review file is a complete record for purposes of the review prior to the committee's examination and deliberation.

The review file is made available to the tenured faculty members of the division for their examination at least seven days before the meeting in which the annual review is discussed. Each member of the tenured faculty will be notified of the availability of the files and the date and time of the review meeting. The Division of Education tenured faculty will review annually the progress of each probationary candidate as documented in the review file prepared by the candidate for the annual meeting.

When there are fewer than three tenured faculty members in the Division of Education, the Division of Education Chairperson shall recommend (in consultation with the tenured faculty in the Education Division and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs) up to a five-person committee from within the University system that will include tenured faculty within the Division. The Vice Chancellor will send a request that these additional faculty members participate in the review to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost who will provide written approval to the Chairperson of the Division of Education. Any Division of Education faculty member eligible to vote shall be included on the committee.

After each probationary candidate's progress is evaluated, there will be a formal ballot taken where faculty vote on whether the candidate should be reappointed. The Division chair will meet with the probationary faculty member to discuss the progress toward tenure, describe the general sense of the annual review meeting, and to tell of any areas of improvement needed. The candidate will also receive a written copy of the annual Appraisal of Probationary Document on President's Form 12. The candidate signs the form along with the chair. The form is also signed by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and/or Chancellor. This report and a written summary of any additional matters discussed including the date and time of the meeting is placed in the candidate's permanent file.

The Division of Education may recommend termination of a candidate's appointment if performance is so clearly short of required standards that the decision is appropriate. Outside reviews are not necessary for this course of action.

If a probationary faculty member is an interdisciplinary scholar, annual reviews and external reviews during the tenure decision year will include assessment from persons who have expertise in the disciplines involved. If a candidate has a joint appointment in the Division of Education and another discipline, the divisions will work collaboratively to develop expectations and criteria for success proportional to the appointment.

A faculty member may extend the probationary period ("stop the tenure clock") due to new parent, caregiver, or personal medical reasons according to section 5.5 of the Tenure Policy (See Appendix C). An annual appraisal is required even if the clock is stopped, and faculty reviewers and the division chair must adjust expectations appropriately in their discussion and in the written report. When considering the record of probationary faculty members who have stopped the tenure clock, criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than the criteria for those who do not have an extension to the tenure clock. An extension of the probationary period cannot be a negative factor in a tenure case.

IV. Conferral of Indefinite Tenure

The University of Minnesota general criteria for the conferral of indefinite tenure are contained in Section 7.11 which is provided in Appendix A.

A tenure decision is required in or before the sixth year of review. A faculty member wishing to be considered for early determination of indefinite tenure and promotion must notify the Division Chair, in writing, by March 15 of the academic year preceding the one in which the decision is to be made. A faculty member can also be recommended by a colleague. In such an instance, the Division Chair asks that faculty member if he or she does indeed wish to be considered for promotion. Procedures for tenure decisions follow those for promotion (See section V.B. below).

Candidates for indefinite tenure are judged on demonstrated accomplishments and on potential for future development and contributions to the University of Minnesota in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The relative weight placed on the three criteria varies among the various units of the University; the University of Minnesota, Morris expects that candidates for indefinite tenure will be strong to excellent in both teaching and research. In the Division of Education, positive tenure decisions are based upon professional distinction in research, on demonstrated effectiveness in teaching and advising, and on service to the discipline, campus, University, community, and profession.

Judgment of strength in teaching and research is based on assessment of qualitative and quantitative factors, as detailed below. The elements below are not meant to be a checklist for a successful tenure decision, but instead are examples of evidence that can be used to evaluate performance. The qualitative and quantitative standards for tenure and promotion must be met by faculty regardless of extensions of the probationary period according to Section 5.5 of *Faculty Tenure* (Appendix C) or early consideration for promotion. See also the "General Criteria for Promotion," section 7.11 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* (Appendix A).

A. Teaching and Advising

Effectiveness in teaching, including the academic advising of individual students, is essential at UMM. Those under review are expected to have a substantial and ongoing record of achievement. Teaching effectiveness is assessed using such indicators as student evaluations; peer reviews of teaching by colleagues, including curricular proposals, appropriate course syllabi and reading lists, directed studies, classroom observations; innovative teaching assignments, successful grant projects related to teaching, evidence of meaningful contributions to advising, and any other pertinent evidence the candidate may present.

The following criteria will be used by tenured faculty to determine the quality of a candidate's teaching.

Material that must be considered:

- The candidate's statement of teaching and advising philosophy. Satisfactory statements indicate an understanding of principles of effective teaching; recognition of personal teaching strengths and growth areas; and evidence of successful effort to address goals. Outstanding statements will also include careful reflection, description, and focus on student learning.
- Teaching effectiveness as evidenced by peer review. Peer review includes evaluation of teaching materials (including but not limited to syllabi, course websites, assignments, and examinations) as well as direct observation of classroom instruction by tenured faculty both within and outside of instructor's discipline. To meet minimum standards of effectiveness, peer reviews will indicate successful planning and implementation of instruction and a respectful classroom environment. Outstanding peer reviews will also document evidence of a high degree of student engagement and learning.
- Student Evaluations of each course taught by the candidate, including both written remarks and quantitative data. For acceptable performance leading to a positive tenure decision, at least 75% of students must indicate "somewhat agree" or higher on all questions. A majority of the written remarks should indicate adequate preparation and respect for students.
- In addition, a minimum of five evaluation letters from former students will be sought by the Division Chair from a list of names provided by the candidate; these letters will be included as part of the candidate's file.

Materials that may also be considered:

- Contributions made to the curriculum of the Discipline, including but not limited to
 - Development of courses, course sequences, new areas of instruction, and study abroad opportunities.
 - Use of technologies to enhance student learning
 - Service learning or community-based learning/research
- Grants received and successfully implemented for curricular development or the preparation of instructional units.
- Teaching awards received and other formal recognitions of teaching excellence, such as invitations to present on pedagogical practices.
- Evidence of effective pedagogical tools and techniques.
- Student evaluations of supervision for student teaching.

- The quality of and contribution to undergraduate advising, such as evidence from advising evaluations, participation in advising-related events, advising awards, as well as participation in such activities as Honors these, MAPs, UROPs, and Multi-Ethnic Mentorships.

B. Research

Good teaching must be accompanied by a consistent record of scholarly productivity. A wide diversity of scholarly or artistic activities is acceptable at UMM and within the division of education, including publications and scholarly papers; presentations; and products, techniques, and pedagogical tools. In addition, the following activities that relate to a faculty member's expertise should be considered as part of scholarly activities: interdisciplinary work, public engagement, presentations at conferences, international activities and initiatives, attention to questions of diversity when applicable. The scholarship of teaching is appropriate and accepted in the Division of Education. Collaborative research and research related to the teacher education conceptual framework are of highest value. Tenure decisions are based on the quality, quantity, annual evidence of engagement within the candidate's field, and future potential for scholarly contribution.

The following criteria will be used by tenured faculty to determine the quality of a candidate's research or scholarship:

Material that must be considered, as appropriate to candidate's field:

- The candidate's research statement. Satisfactory statements clearly communicate a research agenda, describe strengths and growth areas, and provide evidence of efforts to address goals. Excellent statements will also clearly and thoroughly discuss contributions to the field.
- The record of scholarly productivity, including, as appropriate to the candidates field:
 - Publication (including books, book chapters, journal articles, reviews, or reports). The division values single-authored work and also encourages collaborative research with professional colleagues and with undergraduate students. Publications concerning teaching methods and other pedagogical subjects are valued. Peer-reviewed publications in prestigious journals are of highest value. The quality and regularity of professional contributions are of greater significance than a high level of annual activity.
 - Presentations of research at conferences. Presentations selected through a rigorous peer review process or invited presentations to present are of greater importance those without peer-review; participation at events with national or international stature or reputation generally receive more with than those at venues with regional or local stature.
- Internal evaluation by members of the tenure committee (See Section III above).
- External evaluation by established scholars in the field (See Section V.B.3. below).

Materials that may also be considered:

- Recognition by national or international societies, organizations, or other institutions of learning that may include awards, invitations to present, invitation to review others' work, and reference to the candidate's work by other scholars in the field.
- The ability to gain grants, fellowships, commissions, and other funding, and to effectively use that funding to demonstrably advance the scholarly agenda.

C. Service

At UMM, contributions of professional expertise and service are expected. Service contributions to the campus and wider community play a secondary but significant role in evaluation. Service to the field of inquiry is assessed by participation in professional organizations and sharing of professional expertise (e.g. presenting workshops, reviewing papers, and serving as a discussant at a national conference). Service to the University includes participation in UMM and/or University committees, advising student organization, and undertaking other leadership roles (e.g. organizing new initiatives, overseeing external reviews, or assuming administrative support duties) The quality of the faculty member's participation carries more weight than the quantity of activities alone. Service alone cannot qualify the candidate for indefinite tenure.

V. Promotion

The University of Minnesota general criteria for promotion to the rank of professor are contained in Section 9.2 which is provided in Appendix D.

A. Criteria

1. Promotion to Assistant Professor is dependent upon completion of the terminal degree appropriate to one's field.
2. Promotion to Associate Professor is based upon professional distinction in research and on demonstrated effectiveness in teaching and advising students in professional, university, and service consistent with criteria for tenure. Service to the institution and the field are valued but alone are not sufficient. See Tenure Section above.
3. In awarding promotion to professor, the Division acts in accordance with Section 9.2 of the Tenure Policy: 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, (3) established the national or international reputation ordinarily resulting from such distinction and achievement, and (4) provided service to the profession, the University, and leadership within the faculty of the Morris campus.

For promotion to the rank of Professor, the primary emphasis must be on demonstrated scholarly distinction and teaching excellence. Service alone cannot qualify the candidate for promotion.

A greater contribution in the area of institutional service is expected of candidates for the rank of Professor than is expected for the award of tenure.

B. Procedures

1. The faculty member wishing to be considered for promotion must notify the Division Chair, in writing, by March 15 of the academic year preceding the one in which the decision is to be made. A faculty member can also be recommended by a colleague. In such an instance, the Division Chair asks that faculty member if he or she does indeed wish to be considered for promotion.
2. The Chairperson of the Division of Education shall assure that there is systematic collection of information about the work of each member of the division faculty. Each faculty member being reviewed or considered for tenure or promotion will attest, in writing, that his/her review file is a complete record for purposes of the review prior to the committee's study and deliberation.
3. The candidate and division chair work together to determine the list of possible external reviewers of research for promotion and/or tenure decisions. At least four external reviews will be sought in accordance with the procedures outlined in section 12 of the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion*. At least half and no fewer than four of the external reviews must be obtained from individuals with no direct professional or personal interest in the advancement of the candidate's career (for example they should not be former advisors, mentors, co-authors, investigators, or collaborators). The candidate and division chair work together to determine the list of possible external reviewers of research for promotion and/or tenure decisions. The potential reviewers must be established experts in the candidate's research area/s, usually full professors. The reviewers should represent a variety of institution types. Potential reviewers are contacted by the division chair to solicit their participation. Reviewers receive a letter of instruction and a file containing the candidate's curriculum vitae, statement of research, and selected samples of scholarship. Reviewers submit their curriculum vitae and a written assessment of the candidate's scholarship.
4. When there are fewer than three tenured or senior-in-rank faculty members in the Division of Education to serve on the review committee, the Division of Education Chairperson shall select (in consultation with the person being reviewed and with approval of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs) up to a five-person committee from within the University system. The Vice Chancellor must then make a formal request to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for approval. Any Division of Education faculty member eligible to vote shall be included on the committee.
5. Two meetings of the tenured faculty are held each year, consistent with review deadlines, to consider all candidates up for review for tenure or requesting promotion consideration. Only those faculty senior in rank to the candidate will review, discuss, and vote. A vote, by written secret ballot, is taken on all candidates whether being reviewed annually or considered for tenure or for promotion.

- a. At the first meeting, eligible faculty members discuss the full credentials of each candidate and vote. A vote is taken for tenure and promotion.
- b. After this meeting, the Division Chair prepares a summary of each discussion. The decision-making group then meets a second time to review the summaries, offer amendments if deemed necessary, and to endorse with their signatures each summary as an accurate account of each discussion.

VI. Review of Tenured Faculty Performance

A. Introductory Statement

Section VI of this document, Review of Tenured Faculty Performance, is an implementation of the University of Minnesota Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* (Section 7a), 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 reviewed by the Tenure Subcommittee March 5, 1998

B. Goals and Expectations

In accordance with Section 7a of the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure Annual Review*, the Division has established a procedure for annual reviews with each faculty member to assess performance of goals and expectations of the Division established in 7a1. 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. Faculty will on an annual basis demonstrate achievement in all three areas of responsibility: teaching, scholarship, and service. The balance among these functions may shift over the professional career span of an individual faculty member. Faculty members may negotiate with the Division chair, in advance, to adjust their distribution of effort percentages. Any such agreement will be documented (and signed by both faculty member and division chair) and will serve as the basis for subsequent annual reviews until further revision.

The goal of the post-tenure review process is to support and improve faculty performance faculty have the right and responsibility to explain and/or comment upon their annual activity.

Teaching and Advising

The Division expects every faculty member to teach effectively as measured by positive peer reviews and at least satisfactory scores on student ratings of teaching. Teaching activities must include a variety of teaching strategies such as: demonstration, inquiry, discussion, lecture, and cooperative learning. Supervision of field placements is also an integral part of the responsibility of teacher education faculty. The Division expects every faculty member to engage in academic advising. In addition to general advising of students in classes and education programs, advising responsibilities may include mentoring and guiding independent study and research projects. The Division expects every faculty member to collaborate on curriculum development and grant projects related to the instructional program. Faculty members will submit annual statements in which they provide summaries and goal statements for their teaching and advising. Statements must be updated every three years. These will be reviewed annually by the division chair. Evidence that minimum expectations of effectiveness have been met includes:

- Satisfactory scores on the standard student ratings of teaching including both written remarks and quantitative data. In a three year period, at least 75% of students must indicate “somewhat agree” or higher on all questions. Within the same three year period, a majority of written remarks should indicate adequate preparedness, communication, respect, and other positive responses.
- Positive evaluation by peer review of course materials (including syllabi, assessments, assignments and other artifacts) and of direct observation of classroom instruction.
- Academic advising of students annually

Evidence may also include:

- Collaborative teaching
- Curricular innovation such as development of new courses/materials, use of new teaching strategies, or grants received to effect such changes.

Research and Scholarly Activity

The Division expects every faculty member to continue to be engaged in research and scholarly activity and to disseminate research findings in a manner appropriate to the discipline. A report of activities and statement of research goals for the next year will be reviewed annually. The minimum expectation is that one or more of the following will be accomplished within any three year period:

- Publication or evidence of significant progress toward publication including books, book chapters, journal articles, or reviews, particularly in peer-reviewed venues
- Presentation of research activities at local, state, regional, national and/or international conferences, especially in peer-reviewed venues
- Invited publications or presentations at notable venues
- Awards or grants that support research activity
- Professional recognition
- Evidence of the development of new avenues of research or agenda

Service

The Division expects every faculty member including those holding indefinite tenure to participate in the activities of appropriate professional societies and contribute professional expertise to the community. The Division expects every faculty member to share the responsibility for discipline, Divisional, campus, and all-University committee work. The Division expects every faculty member to share the responsibility for coordination with external licensing and accreditation agencies. The minimum expectation is that one or more of the following will be documented annually:

- Active participation in discipline, division, campus, and/or university governance, including service on at least one campus or University committee or a substitution approved by the division chair.
- Coordination of accreditation or program assessments
- Service to professional organizations
- Collaboration with local school districts on grants, curriculum, or other programs
- Other public service or community outreach which draws on the faculty member’s professional expertise

C. Process for Annual Review

Performance reviews will be based on: Division of Education goals and expectations, individual's position description, annual goals statement, and annual Faculty Curriculum Vitae. During spring semester, each faculty member submits both a summary of activities in teaching, research, and service during the past year, and goals for future work, to the Division Chair (See VI.B above). Each faculty member is invited but not required to meet with the Division Chair to discuss performance and goals. Plans for the future may involve redistribution of effort agreed upon by the chair and the faculty member. The agreement must be summarized in writing and signed by both the faculty member and the Division Chair. The document will be kept on file in the Division office.

D. Below-Standard Performance

If the chair determines that a faculty member's performance is substantially below the goals and expectations of the Division, the case is referred for review to the Divisional Faculty Review Committee. The Faculty Review Committee consists of three tenured faculty members elected each fall by the tenured faculty of the Division. An alternate will be chosen to serve if a committee member is the subject of a review. When there are fewer than three tenured faculty members in the Division of Education, the Division of Education Chairperson shall select (in consultation with the tenured faculty in the Education Division and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs) up to a five-person committee from within the University system that will include tenured faculty within the Division.

If, during the annual review, both the Division Chair and the faculty review committee find a faculty member's performance to be "substantially below the goals and expectations of the Division of Education" a letter will be sent to the faculty member, stating that finding. The letter, signed by both the Division Chair and chair of the committee, will specify the deficiencies and will state that by a period no less than one year from the date of the letter, the faculty member must address the identified problems. Both the Division Chair and members of the review committee will work with the faculty member to improve performance during that time.

At the end of the specified time, both the Division Chair and the review committee will again review the performance. If they again find that performance is "substantially below the goals and expectations of the Division of Education" they will submit a letter to the dean, along with a copy of the documents they have reviewed, that sets out the findings and requesting the dean to initiate a special review. A copy of the request will be sent to the faculty member.

The dean will independently review the file and determine whether a special review is appropriate. If deemed necessary, the dean will designate members for the review panel and conduct the review in line with guidelines in Section 7a.3.

Appendix A

General Criteria for Promotion

Subsection 7.11 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* (2007)

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 candidate 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, other special kinds of professional activity, and extraordinary abilities and contributions 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 technology or scientific procedures resulting in innovative products, practices, and ideas of significance and value to society.

"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 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

Appendix B

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 of its probationary faculty members with a copy of the Departmental Statement at the beginning of the probationary service.

[6] "Departmental" refers to an academic department or its equivalent, such as division, institute, or unit.

Appendix C

Extending the Probationary Period

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 a time 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 preceding the year a final decision would otherwise be made on an appointment with indefinite tenure for that faculty member.

[2] The term "family member" is meant to include a relative, a marital partner, a domestic partner, or an adoptive/foster child.

Appendix D

Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

Subsection 9.2 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*:

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 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, and technology transfer will be taken into consideration in evaluating the candidate's satisfaction of criteria; such contributions can involve scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and discipline-related service.(fn Y) 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 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 granting of indefinite tenure, the nondisclosure 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 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.

See the definitions of "scholarly research," "teaching," and "service" in footnote [4] (Appendix A). A greater contribution in the area of institutional service is expected of candidates for the rank of professor than was expected for the award of tenure.