

School of Kinesiology

7.12 Statement

Promotion and Tenure: Specific Criteria, Standards, and Procedures

Approved by the Faculty on April 1, 2008

Approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost on April 29, 2008

1. Introductory Material

1.1. College Mission Statement

1.2. Mission Statement of the School of Kinesiology

1.3. General Criteria for Tenure (Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure)

2. Criteria for Awarding Indefinite Tenure in the School of Kinesiology

2.1. Teaching

2.1.1. Defining Effective Teaching

2.1.2. Criteria to evaluate Effective Teaching

2.2. Research

2.2.1. Description of Research Culture in the School of Kinesiology

2.2.2. Expectations on Research Productivity and Impact

2.2.3. Criteria to evaluate Research Productivity and Impact

2.2.4. Value of Interdisciplinary and International Research

2.3. Service

2.3.1. Defining Appropriate Service

2.3.2. Intramural Service

2.3.3. Extramural Service

3. Procedure for Annual Review of Probationary Faculty

4. Guidelines on Stopping the Tenure Clock

5. Voting Process for Granting Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

5.1. Tenure and Promotion Review Meeting

5.3. Voting on Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

5.3.1 Required majority vote

5.3.2 Recommendation on tenure and promotion

6. Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

6.1. University 9.2 Statement on Promotion to Full Professor

6.2. Expectations for Teaching

6.3. Expectations for Research

6.4. Expectations for Service

6.5. Process of Promotion to Full Professor

6.5.1. Promotion Review Meeting

6.5.2. Disqualifications from Voting

6.5.3. Voting on Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

6.5.4. Required majority vote

7. Preparation of Dossier and Process for Inviting External and Internal Reviews

8. Post-tenure Review

8.1. Annual Review of Tenured Faculty

8.2. Review of Faculty not Meeting Minimal Standards of the School

Appendix A. Value statement of the College of Education and Human Development

Appendix B. University Rules and Procedures for Annual and Special Post-tenure Review

This document outlines the policies and procedures of the School of Kinesiology for granting indefinite tenure and promotion in academic rank. The policies and procedures are in compliance with Subsections 7.11 and 9.2 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, and the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty* (2007) adopted by the University. The document also conforms to the guidelines issued by the College of Education and Human Development (Appendix A).

1.1. College Mission Statement

The College of Education and Human Development is a world leader in discovering, creating, sharing, and applying principles and practices of multiculturalism and multidisciplinary scholarship to advance teaching and learning and to enhance the psychological, physical, and social development of children, youth, and adults across the lifespan in families, organizations, and communities.

1.2. Mission Statement of the School of Kinesiology

The mission of the school is to enrich the quality of human life by expanding, applying, and disseminating the body of knowledge germane to physical activity, recreation, sport, and their applied systems. The aspects of physical activity, recreation, and sport that are relevant to this mission include:

- Biological, developmental, psychosocial, and behavioral attributes of persons engaged in physical activity, recreation, and sport.
- Delivery systems of the educational and management enterprises that reflect the professional outgrowth of the scholarly inquiry into physical activity, recreation and sport.
- Applied research in all areas of human performance, physical activity, recreation, and sport.
- Instruction in a variety of sport, exercise, and recreational activities which enhance the quality of the University experience for all students, with an emphasis on making decisions about personal lifetime physical activity, recreational participation, health, and wellness.

1.3 General Criteria for Tenure (Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure)

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.

2. Criteria for Awarding Indefinite Tenure in the School of Kinesiology

A faculty seeking promotion to Associate Professor and indefinite tenure in the School of Kinesiology at the University of Minnesota needs to document excellence in the areas of research, teaching and service. A record of outstanding teaching and service will not suffice as a substitute for a lack of scholarly productivity. The expectations for each of the three areas of faculty work are outlined below. In addition, the candidate's record shall show clear promise of ultimately achieving the rank of Full Professor (see also 1.3., Subsection 7.11 of *Faculty Tenure*).

2.1. Teaching and Advising

Teaching consists of those activities performed with the intent that they would engender learning and be directed toward goals that are usually specified in courses, curricula, and programs. 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. Advising includes consultation with students pursuing degrees and/or specific programs and providing assistance to students relative to research and writing.

This category includes:

- Teaching classes, seminars, or guest lectures.
- Supervising independent studies.
- Supervising student teaching, internships, and practica.
- Serving on graduate examining committees.
- Supervising student research and creative productivity.
- Serving as a reader for masters and doctoral research.
- Advising undergraduate, Master of Education, and graduate students.
- Supervising post-doctoral fellows
- Credit and non-credit teaching

- Unique aspects of teaching: team teaching, multidisciplinary teaching, service learning, publicly engaged teaching, technology transfer, etc.

2.1.2. Defining Effective Teaching and Advising

Effective teaching shall show evidence of thorough and current knowledge of the subject matter, an appropriate instructional plan, the ability to communicate effectively, creating an environment conducive to learning, showing a concern for students as individuals, and academic integrity. Effective advising shall show evidence of the professor's availability for consultation with students, knowledge of institutional programs, policies, and procedures, and skill in guiding student research and writing in a timely manner.

2.1.3. Criteria to Evaluate Effective Teaching and Advising

Candidates must document their contributions and effectiveness in the area of teaching and advising. Documentation of contributions related to teaching should include, but is not limited to, the following:

- A listing of regular courses taught, independent studies supervised, guest lectures delivered, and outreach teaching. Load-courses, credits, contact hours, and enrollments should be specified. Course syllabi, examples of exams, assignments and handouts.
- A summary of the candidate's advising responsibilities for undergraduate and graduate students, including the number of advisees and/or post-doctoral fellows supervised. Advising of doctoral students, as primary advisor or as a committee member, as well as any other thesis/research (including post-doctoral fellows) supervised should be specified
- Documentation of the development of new courses and contributions to curriculum planning and development.
- Documentation of unique aspects of teaching such as team teaching or multidisciplinary teaching.
- International teaching or advising activities and initiatives such as study- abroad or international exchange programs.
- Use of instructional technology to enhance student learning inside and outside the classroom.
- Attention to diversity in teaching and advising.

Documentation of effectiveness in teaching and advising should include, but is not limited to, the following:

- A summary of peer assessments which may include written statements from peers, administrators or professional colleagues outside of the School or University if available; classroom visits and reports of such visits by tenured peers; peer analysis of syllabi or curriculum development, exams, quizzes or assignments.
- A summary of student assessments including student evaluation scores, and written comments by students, or letters of reference from graduate or undergraduate students.
- A summary of other indicators of teaching quality such as textbooks, workbooks or curricular materials.

With respect to effective teaching, the School of Kinesiology expects that, at minimum, the following criteria are fulfilled:

- Successful advising of students as evidenced by timely degree completion and production of student scholarship.
- Demonstrated effectiveness of teaching inside and outside the classroom as evidenced by student and peer evaluations.

2.2. Research

2.2.1. Description of Research Culture in the School of Kinesiology

The School of Kinesiology embodies a diverse research culture that ranges from basic to applied research and spans across Life Science, the Social Sciences and Education. These disciplines may differ in how scholarly work is disseminated and how its impact is evaluated. The School of Kinesiology recognizes and values this diversity of research culture. Multidisciplinary collaboration in research within the School, the College and across the University is emphasized by the School of Kinesiology. Further, the establishment of high impact national and international research collaborations is encouraged by the School consistent with the mission of the College and the expectations of the University

2.2.2. Expectations of Research Productivity and Impact

The School of Kinesiology expects that faculty seeking promotion to the level of Associate Professor will clearly document the establishment of national recognition for their scholarly work. Scholarly work includes any activity which expands the body of human knowledge. Examples of scholarly work are but are not limited to the following:

- Publications of empirical research in high impact refereed journals.
- Publications of theory-based research in revered refereed journals.
- Publications of review articles that synthesize and/or apply the existing body of knowledge to advance a new perspective.
- The publication of monographs, chapters, books, and edited textbooks.
- Presentations at professional conferences which focus on expanding or applying the body of knowledge.
- The development and dissemination of tools, techniques, or instruments to be used in applied settings or research.
- Development and procurement of grants/contracts relevant to the candidate's scholarly activities.

2.2.3. Criteria to Evaluate Research Productivity and Impact

With respect to research productivity and impact of the candidate's scholarly work, the School of Kinesiology expects that, at minimum, the following criteria are fulfilled:

- An average of two published manuscripts per year in top-tier refereed journals specific to the field of study. It is recognized that depending on the type of the candidate's scholarly work, probationary faculty in their first years at the University may not meet this goal. In this case the reasons and circumstances for the lack of publications shall be clearly mentioned and explained in the candidate's annual review. In addition and after consultation with the tenured faculty, the Director of the School shall prepare a written statement given to the candidate that explicitly states whether the School considers that the candidate has made appropriate or not appropriate progress toward achieving tenure (see section 3).
- A demonstrated high impact in the discipline or field of scholarly work, which may be evidenced by the impact factor or independent external evaluation of those journals, in which the candidate has published, by a citation record (i.e., a listing how often and by whom the candidate's work has been cited), and by external reviews of the candidate's work.
- A minimum of one presentation of scholarly work per year at a national or international conference germane to the field of study.
- Demonstration that one has sought and/or secured external funding through procurement of grants and contracts from internal and external sources.

- First or senior authorship on the majority of scholarly publications.

2.2.4. Value of Interdisciplinary and International Research

The School recognizes that important research questions concerning the field of kinesiology may cross traditional disciplinary and geographical boundaries. The School therefore encourages interdisciplinary collaboration of researchers at the University, national or international level. The School also recognizes that the establishment of interdisciplinary and international ties requires time and extra effort on part of the faculty. It is understood that faculty holding or seeking the rank of Full Professor have established such ties within the scientific community.

2.3. Service

2.3.1. Defining Appropriate Service

Appropriate service means demonstrating a clear record of intramural and extramural service. Intramural service is defined as service related to the function of University, the College, and the School of Kinesiology. Extramural service is defined as professional work related to service representing the University at the local, national, and international level. Such service includes physical and intellectual contributions to professional organizations and learned societies, state and federal agencies, and to the community.

2.3.2. Intramural Service

Such activities include but are not limited to:

- Service on School, College, and University committees, task forces, or working groups.
- Authorship of major reports produced by such committees.
- Participation in meetings, seminars, and workshops at the School or University level.
- Exhibits leadership towards resolution of departmental issues or problems.
- The administration of the various programs housed within the unit.
- The administration of courses which are taught by teaching assistants or adjunct faculty.
- Volunteer service to university student organizations.

2.3.3. Extramural Service

Such activities include but are not limited to:

- Holding of office or engaging in leadership roles of professional work at the local, state, regional, national, or international level.
- Serving in an advisory role to clubs, organizations, and groups which function in activities akin to the faculty member's expertise.
- Serving as a member of a community committee or board.
- Public engagement, community outreach, and research partnerships with the professional community, multicultural groups, and working with underserved or underrepresented groups.
- International activities and initiatives
- Serves on review panels for grants, departmental reviews, and others
- Engages in editorial work and/or reviews manuscripts in professional and scholarly journals.
- Membership or office in professional and scholarly organizations.
- Presenting talks, consulting, or conferring on topics relevant to one's academic discipline.

2.2.3. Criteria to Evaluate Service

Candidates must document their contributions to intra- and extramural service. Minimal expectations by the School on the service of a faculty are:

- Serving on one (1) School committee and one (1) College/University committee per calendar year.
- Serving as a reviewer of the work of others in one (1) or more of the following capacities: ad-hoc reviewer of scholarly manuscripts for professional journals or other scholarly publications, reviewer of University and/or external grants.
- Demonstration that the candidate has actively engaged in service to the public and the community.

3. Procedure for Annual Review of Probationary Faculty

Tenured faculty will review materials submitted by probationary faculty, meet as a group to discuss probationary faculty progress, and vote by anonymous ballot regarding contract renewal. Results of this evaluation will be summarized by the Director and discussed with probationary faculty. The department will file President's Form 12: Appraisals of Probationary Faculty with the Human Resources Director of the College. These annual appraisals are reviewed by the Dean of CEHD and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

At the beginning of a probationary, tenure-track appointment, the Department Head will review the terms of employment with the probationary faculty. This review will include the following items of discussion:

- Ascertain that credit for prior service has been granted and appropriately recorded, and that there is a common understanding about the maximum length of the probationary period.
- Supplying the candidate with copies of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*(2007), and this Departmental document "Promotion and Tenure: Specific Criteria, Standards, and Procedures," as required by section 7.12. Discuss with the candidate the application of the criteria for promotion and tenure.
- Informing the candidate about the School's procedures of annual review. The candidate must be informed about the annual review process and made familiar with the annual report on Appraisals of Probationary Faculty (President's Form 12), which will be completed. The candidate must also be informed about his or her right to inspect the file and right of access to information.
- The tenured faculty will have access to the files of probationary faculty at least three days prior to the annual review meeting. These files will be maintained in the School's main office. All tenured faculty of the School have the duty to review annually the progress of each candidate. An annual meeting of the tenured faculty to review progress will be held in late Fall of each year. The Director will attend and chair this meeting.
- After the annual review meeting, the Director will meet with the candidate to discuss the candidate's progress toward achieving tenure. The Director will review data, discuss the vote of the tenured faculty meeting regarding the candidate, and outline any other information relied upon during the review process. The Department Head will add the completed Annual Appraisal form to the candidate's file, and include a written summary of matters discussed at this meeting.

4. Guidelines for Extending the Probationary Period or Stopping the Tenure Clock

Probationary faculty may stop the tenure clock in accordance with Section 5.5 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*. The request to stop the tenure clock must be made in writing to the Director of the School. Faculty who exercise this right will be evaluated according to the numbers of years actually on the tenure track and will not be penalized by additional expectations beyond those for faculty who did not stop the tenure clock.

5. Voting Process for Granting Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

5.1. Tenure and Promotion Review Meeting

All tenured faculty members at the Associate or Full Professor level are required to attend tenure and promotion meetings for probationary faculty seeking promotion and tenure. If circumstances prevent a faculty member from attending the tenure and promotion review meetings, the absent faculty member is entitled to receive a copy of the synopsis and, whenever practicable, a copy of the file. Absent tenured faculty members may submit their written evaluative statements relative to the three categories. These statements shall be read at the scheduled faculty review meeting. Absent faculty members are also entitled to vote by sealed, absentee ballots. A faculty member should not vote unless he/she is adequately informed. Proxy voting or voting by telephone, e-mail, or fax is not allowed.

5.2. Disqualifications from Voting

Persons who are or were closely related to a candidate, or who have or have had an intimate personal relationship with a candidate, must not attend or participate in the meeting where that candidate is being considered. If the candidate (or another member of the tenured faculty) wishes to challenge the participation of any member of the tenured faculty, that challenge must be made in writing to the challenged faculty member and to the head of the unit at least two weeks before the scheduled tenure meeting, stating the reasons for the challenge and setting forth the relevant evidence. The fact that a member of the tenured faculty has formed a negative view of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, or service during the course of the candidate's career is not a basis for disqualification. In most cases, the unit head will decide whether the challenged faculty member may participate in the decision. In cases where the unit head is the challenged faculty member, the decision will be made by the dean, chancellor, or other administrator to whom the unit head reports. In doubtful cases, the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action should be consulted in reaching a decision about disqualification, pursuant to its responsibilities under the Nepotism and Consensual Relationships Policy of the Board of Regents. The record of the challenge and its resolution will be included in the file forwarded for review. If the challenged faculty member is not permitted to participate in the discussion and vote, that person shall be considered ineligible to vote and therefore shall not count toward the quorum requirement (see *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty (2007)*, section 2(e)).

If the candidate (or another member of the tenured faculty) wishes to challenge the participation of any member of the tenured faculty, that challenge must be made in writing to the challenged faculty member and to the Director of the School at least two weeks before the scheduled tenure meeting, stating the reasons for the challenge and setting forth the relevant evidence. The challenged faculty member will decide whether to participate in the decision. The record of the challenge and its resolution will be included in the file that is forwarded for review.

5.3. Voting on Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

When the formal vote for granting tenure and promotion is taken at any time before the final probationary year, either (or both) of the following questions shall be put forward:

- Shall the candidate be recommended for tenure?

- Shall the candidate be given notice of termination of appointment?

If there is no majority for either motion, the appointment will be continued. In the last year of the probationary period, the question must be "Shall (the candidate) be recommended for tenure?" If there is no majority for that motion, the recommendation is automatically for termination of the appointment. All votes will cast in secret ballot.

5.3.1 Required majority vote

Except as indicated elsewhere in this document, the action of the School is based on the majority of those voting on the question. If there is a tie vote, the recommendation will be negative. The actual vote is to be reported. The report should indicate the number of faculty qualified to vote, the number of affirmative and negative votes, the number of faculty present at the meeting who abstained, the number of faculty who were absent and not voting. It should also indicate how many absentee ballots were cast. If there are reconsiderations after an initial vote, both the original and the reconsidered vote should be fully reported.

A full record of the vote, including affirmative, negative, abstentions, and absences shall be forwarded with the recommendation of the faculty.

The Director may encourage those who voted to give written rationale for their vote—particularly those who have submitted absentee ballots. All written rationales shall be maintained in the School files and will be available for review in judicial procedures both within and outside the University.

5.3.2 Recommendation on tenure and promotion

Within ten (10) working days following the meeting, a draft of the statement of the voting faculty's recommendation to grant indefinite tenure for each faculty member in review shall be prepared by the Director of the School. The statements shall include the number vote of the eligible faculty, the collective rationale for the recommendation by the majority of voting faculty, and the rationale for the dissenting and/or abstaining position(s) of the minority. The Director also shall prepare a separate statement indicating agreement or disagreement with the recommendation of the voting faculty.

The drafts of recommendations of the voting faculty shall be available for at least five (5) working days during which time those faculty members who participated in the review process shall have the opportunity to read the recommendation documents and to suggest revisions for the language in each document. Based upon the suggested revisions, the writer of the original draft of the recommendation document shall edit the document as appropriate. Every reasonable attempt shall be made to afford the reviewing faculty an opportunity to read the final drafts before they are distributed to the faculty member on review.

Within fifteen (15) working days following completion of the School recommendation documents, the Director shall confer with each person on review to discuss the recommendation. A copy of the recommendation document of the voting faculty for each faculty member on review (including the outcome of the vote) and a copy of the corresponding Director's statement shall be made available to the particular faculty member on review at least five (5) working days prior to the conference with the Director. All materials shall be retained in the Director's office for at least five (5) working days following the meeting involving the candidate and Director.

During that time, each faculty member on review may submit to the Director a written response relative to comments in either the voting faculty recommendation document or Director's statement. After the five-day period, the (a) voting faculty recommendation statement, (b) the Director's statement, (c) the appended responses and/or statements (if any), and (d) the candidate's dossier with all supplementary materials (e) complete dossier for each candidate being recommended for a change in status shall be forwarded by the Director to the Dean of the College.

Reconsideration of recommendations shall follow the policies and procedures outlined in the College of Education and Human Development Academic Personnel Policy and Procedures and as governed by the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* and the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*.

College and University policies concerning the disposition of all material gathered in the reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure review process shall be followed. A copy of the dossier, the voting faculty recommendation document, the Director's statement, and any written responses by the candidate shall be placed in his/her personnel file in the Director's office.

6. Promotion to Full Professor

To be considered for promotion to Full Professor a candidate needs to document a consistent and outstanding record of teaching, research and service that exceeds the expectations specified for promotion to Associate Professor (section 2 of this document) and that are in accordance to the University's 9.2. statement on promotion to Full Professor. A record of outstanding teaching and service cannot substitute for a lack of scholarly productivity.

6.1.

Subsection 9.2 of Faculty Tenure - Promotion to Full 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.

6.2. Expectations for Teaching

It is expected that the candidate has maintained a consistent record of teaching and successful advising fulfilling the criteria outlined in sections 2.1.2. and 2.1.3.

6.3. Expectations for Research

It is expected that the candidate documents a strong record of scholarly productivity according to the criteria outlined in section 2.2.2. With respect to the University's aim of being a world class research institution, it is expected that a candidate, who seeks promotion to Full Professor has not only achieved national, but international recognition. Such international recognition should be documented by a record of publishing in high-impact publications with an international readership, by a record of pursuing research funds from national and international funding agencies, and by highlighting the impact of the candidate's work through independent external reviews and agencies measuring scientific impact.

6.4. Expectations for Service

It is expected that the candidate has a consistent record of university and professional service as outlined in sections 2.3.2. and 2.3.3. With respect to university service, it is expected that the candidate has provided leadership at the departmental, college or university level by having served as chair of committees or task forces. \

6.5. Process of Promotion to Full Professor

6.5.1. Promotion Review Meeting

All tenured faculty members at the rank of Full Professor are required to attend promotion meetings for faculty seeking promotion to Full Professor. If circumstances prevent a faculty member from attending the promotion review meetings, the absent faculty member is entitled to receive a copy of the synopsis and, whenever practicable, a copy of the file. Absent tenured professors may submit their written evaluative statements relative to the three categories. These statements shall be read at the scheduled faculty review meeting. Absent tenured professors are also entitled to vote by sealed, absentee ballots. A faculty member should not vote unless he/she is adequately informed. Proxy voting or telephone voting is not allowed.

6.5.2. Disqualifications from Voting

All regulations listed in section 5.2. apply.

6.5.3. Voting on Promotion to Professor

When the formal vote for granting promotion to Full Professor is taken the following question shall be put forward: Shall the candidate be recommended for promotion to Full Professor? The vote shall be cast in secret ballot.

6.5.4. Required majority vote

If the simple majority (more than half the eligible faculty) of School of vote in favor of promotion to the rank of Full Professor, the School will recommend the candidate's request for promotion. If there is a tie vote, the recommendation will be negative. The actual vote is to be reported. The report should indicate the number of faculty qualified to vote, the number of affirmative and negative votes, the number of faculty who abstained, the number of faculty who were absent and not voting. It should also indicate how many absentee ballots were cast. If there are reconsiderations after an initial vote, both the original and the reconsidered vote should be fully reported.

7. Preparation of Dossier and Review Process

The following procedures have been developed to facilitate the peer review of faculty accomplishments leading to the recommendations relative to reappointment, promotion in academic rank, and/or the granting of indefinite tenure. The policies and procedures outlined in this document are in compliance with the related sections in the College of Education and Human Development values statement, the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, in particular Subsection 9.2, Academic Personnel Policy of the College, and the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or*

Tenured Faculty, and any attendant procedures adopted by The University. The step-by-step procedures are summarized below.

1. A faculty member who seeks promotion in rank and/or the granting of indefinite tenure formally indicates his/her intent in a letter addressed to the Director of the School.
2. The Director of the School will then notify the office of the Dean about the candidate's intent.
3. The candidate will then prepare the dossier and supplementary materials.
4. Experts external to the University will be invited by the Director to evaluate the credentials of the faculty member under review. The potential reviewers will be selected by the Director. The candidate may recommend experts who are familiar with the candidate's work to the Director. Each individual contacted to serve as an external reviewer shall hold a professional appointment preferably at a major doctoral-granting institution and should be senior in rank to the faculty member on review.
5. Upon receipt of the external reviews the appropriate tenured faculty will review the candidate's dossier, supplementary materials and the external reviews. Tenured faculty with the rank of Associate or Full Professor shall then vote on the request of probationary faculty seeking tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Only faculty with the rank of Full Professor shall vote on requests seeking promotion to Full Professor.
6. After the faculty vote, the Director will prepare a separate written statement that contains the recommendation.
7. This recommendation plus the complete dossier of the candidate will be forwarded to the office of the Dean for consideration of the promotion and tenure committee of the College.

8. Post-tenure Review

8.1. Annual Review of Tenured Faculty

Each faculty member will be annually reviewed in April of the academic year to determine performance and possible merit salary increases. In the Fall of 1999 the faculty of the School of Kinesiology delegated the review process on faculty performance, as well as recommendations for salary adjustments, to the Director of the School.

Every year, each faculty member submits an annual achievement document that contains the yearly accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research, and service that represent the faculty effort for the previous academic year. This includes a summary statement of accomplishments in each of the three areas and an updated CV. Along with this documentation, the Director will also have access to the faculty member's class syllabi and student evaluations. The Director meets individually with each faculty member to review and discuss the accomplishment report with each individual faculty member. This meeting focuses on both past accomplishments and expectations for the coming year. Such individual reviews usually take place before their final salary recommendations are submitted and thus typically occur within the month following the submission of the accomplishment report (April/May of the academic year).

The Director provides a written summary of each review. A copy of that summary is added to the personnel file of the respective faculty and is available to the faculty member for review.

8.2. Review of Tenured Faculty not Meeting Minimal Standards of the School

If as part of the annual review, the Director concludes that a tenured faculty member is repeatedly failing to meet School's guidelines regarding the expectations relative to teaching, research, and service (7.12 statement) within a time period of 3-5 years, the Director will bring this to the attention of the School tenured faculty in a special meeting. In this meeting, all tenured faculty members will be informed about the alleged substandard performance of a faculty member. The faculty will then constitute a post-tenure review committee that consists of all tenured faculty members besides the faculty whose performance is

under consideration. The committee will elect a tenured faculty other than the Director to chair the committee.

The post-tenure review committee will be required to review the performance of the faculty member, identified by the director during the annual performance review. If the committee by simple majority vote concurs with the Director's assessment of substandard performance, committee members will participate in constructing plans to assist in the improvement of the faculty member's performance in the three areas of teaching, research and service, or in any particular area where there is evidence of weakness. Upon recommendation of the faculty the committee chair joins the Director in writing a letter to the faculty member specifying the deficiencies and setting a time period (usually by the next annual review) during which the faculty member should address the identified problems. Both committee chair and the Director will sign the letter. Documentation of the post-tenure review will be added to the faculty member's personnel file. If the post-tenure review committee does not concur with the director's conclusion, no further action is warranted regarding the faculty member's performance at that juncture.

If in the subsequent year the faculty member's review continues to be substantially below the goals and expectations agreed upon in the previous year's review, referral will be made again to a post-tenure review committee by the Director. If the review committee again concurs with the Director, the Director will request that the Dean of the College of Education and Human Development conduct a special review. To do so, the committee and the Director should send a letter or memorandum to the Dean and to the faculty member, setting out their findings with a copy of the documents they have reviewed.

Final Version: April 1, 2008

Appendix A

VALUES STATEMENT TO GUIDE 7.12 REVISIONS

This statement of College values is intended to guide the revision of Unit 7.12 statements for promotion and tenure.

The College affirms the pre-eminent value of excellence in research, teaching, and service—excellence that will help the University achieve the highest level of recognition among public research universities. Unit 7.12 statements must reflect the Unit’s high standards of academic excellence, consistent with the framework of the University 7.11 statement for promotion and tenure.

The College recognizes and values the diversity of missions, disciplines, and faculty expertise represented in the units in the College. Although excellence must be the foundation upon which the work of a faculty member is evaluated in the context of promotion and tenure, how that excellence is manifested may vary across time and across units within the College.

The College affirms the crucial role played by faculty within the unit to ensure that their decisions about promotion and tenure are decisions that will be validated by judgments at the College and University levels. Units are encouraged to prepare 7.12 statements that articulate unit priorities in the context of the College’s mission statement: “The College of Education and Human Development is a world leader in discovering, creating, sharing, and applying principles and practices of multiculturalism and multidisciplinary scholarship 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.”

Faculty at our land grant University are expected to contribute to the public good through their work. Therefore, Unit 7.12 statements should reflect how faculty work that involves model for public engagement and multicultural and multidisciplinary initiative can be documented so that excellence in these areas is considered in the context of promotion and tenure.

Final version from 10 January 2007

Appendix B

RULES AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL AND SPECIAL POST-TENURE REVIEW

Approved by the Tenure Subcommittee January 5, 1998
Revised by the Tenure Subcommittee March 5, 1998

These Rules and Procedures are promulgated by the Tenure Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs pursuant to Section 7a.3 of the Tenure Code adopted by the Board of Regents in June 1997. They provide guidance to implement the requirements of Section 7a-- Review of Faculty Performance, which mandates a system of annual review and "special peer review in cases of alleged substandard performance by tenured faculty." "Post-tenure review" as used in these Rules and Procedures refers to the annual and special reviews contemplated by Section 7a.

What is the purpose of Post-Tenure Review?

The purpose of Post-Tenure Review as defined in Section 7a.2 is to give faculty members an opportunity for review in order to maintain and improve their performance in teaching, research, and service. It may also provide a means of assisting faculty members who are experiencing difficulties in achieving their expectations. Annual review of faculty members already takes place pursuant to the Faculty Compensation Policy in order to determine annual salary increases and to offer suggestions for enhancing productivity, where appropriate. Section 7a.2 contemplates a similar process of annual review for "salary adjustment and faculty development" and to form the basis for possible special review in cases of alleged substandard performance. Annual review pursuant to Section 7a.2 should be standard in each academic unit; only in cases of "alleged substandard performance" will an additional step of special review take place. Annual reviews under both the Compensation Policy and the Tenure Code may be accomplished in a single review process, as long as the process satisfies the requirements of both kinds of review. The review processes and standards described here are separate from the processes and standards used for purposes of promotion.

At what level does Post-Tenure Review take place?

Post tenure review takes place in the tenure home of the faculty member. As defined in the Tenure Code, the tenure home is usually an "Academic Unit", which is a department or similar unit. A school or college that is not further subdivided is also an academic unit. The Academic Unit for Post-Tenure Review is usually the same as the unit in which tenure decisions are made. In very small Academic Units in which faculty from other Academic Units participate in the tenure decisions, they should be added for Post-Tenure review purposes as well. Academic Units formally organized into divisions may designate those divisions as the units within which the annual review will take place. While review of individual faculty members takes place in departments or similar units, deans and collegiate governance bodies should ensure that such units adopt the documents necessary to establish standards and procedures for post-tenure review (see below) and that post-tenure review is taking place on an annual basis.

What needs to be done initially to implement Section 7a?

The faculty of each academic unit should adopt two policy statements. One is a

statement of goals and expectations for all faculty members in that unit (Section 7a.1). The other is a statement of procedures for annual and special reviews (Sections 7a.2, 7a.3). Many Academic Units already have these (or similar) policies in place for compensation review purposes. If so, the faculty need only make any modifications it feels necessary and identify them as the policies applicable to post-tenure review pursuant to Section 7a.

The two policy statements must be adopted by vote of the faculty of the unit. If existing policies are being designated for this purpose, there should be a vote of the faculty designating them as such. The documents must be submitted for review to the dean, who is responsible for ensuring that every Academic Unit has adopted a policy that meets the standards of the University and of the collegiate unit. The dean may approve the policy statements or return them to the faculty with requests for change.

(1) Goals and expectations. Section 7a.1 indicates that 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 Academic Unit may already have goals and expectations in place as part of the Compensation Policy. If so, they should be reviewed to see if they are appropriate for the purpose of post-tenure review. If they are appropriate, the faculty of the unit (including both tenured and tenure-track faculty) should formally adopt them. If there are not already goals and expectations in place, the faculty should develop them. The Academic Unit's statement for granting of tenure, adopted under section 7.12 of the Tenure Regulations, may serve as a point of departure for this exercise.

As indicated in Section 7a.1, the statement should provide for flexible standards, recognizing changing career patterns. It need not provide a detailed catalogue. The post-tenure review statement may provide for flexibility in the annual review process to permit an Academic Unit head and faculty member to agree to "trade-offs" between aspects of the expectations. Thus it could allow the head and a faculty member to agree that the faculty member would increase commitment to institutional service (e.g., by becoming a director of graduate studies in a large program) in return for reduced School of Kinesiology 7.12 Statement 20

teaching or scholarly expectations. Or the policy could permit the Academic Unit head and a faculty member to agree to shift the emphasis between the teaching and scholarly elements of the expectations, although over time there must be some balance of both elements to maintain academic competence. It could allow for strengths under one criterion to balance weaknesses under another.

(2) Procedures. The faculty of each Academic Unit must also adopt procedures for conduct of the annual reviews. Under the Compensation Policy some Academic Units have chosen to entrust the evaluation of individual faculty performance to the full faculty, to a committee, or to the Academic Unit head. Under Section 7a, Academic Units are also free to choose the format they prefer, so long as they provide for an elected faculty committee to review cases in which it appears that the faculty member's performance is "substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit." What needs to be done annually?

Under both the Compensation Policy and Tenure Code Section 7A.2, each Academic Unit is required to review annually the performance of each faculty member who holds an appointment in that Academic Unit. Under both policies, the annual review process must give the faculty members an opportunity to provide relevant information and must provide them feedback about their performance. The Compensation Policy further requires that the department chair or unit leader meet at least annually with each individual faculty member in that unit to convey the substance of the reviews. Annual reviews under both the Compensation Policy and the Tenure Code may be accomplished in a single review process, as long as the process satisfies the requirements of both kinds of review.

Under Section 7a.2, the faculty of the Academic Unit must also elect a peer faculty review committee every year (unless Academic Unit procedures call for the full faculty to review performance, in which case all review functions described here for the elected committee would be conducted by the full faculty). The Academic Unit may choose to involve the elected review committee in both compensation and post-tenure review decisions or to involve the elected review committee only in the annual post-tenure review but not in compensation reviews. Although the head of the Academic Unit must review each faculty member annually, the Academic Unit may choose to involve the elected committee in all or only some of those annual reviews. Thus, the role of the elected committee in the annual post-tenure review may involve reviewing each faculty member annually, or reviewing a portion of the faculty annually on a rotating basis, or reviewing only those cases that the Academic Unit head refers to them. The elected committee must review cases in which the Academic Unit head believes that performance is "substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit," but its role may be limited to this aspect. The Procedures statement adopted by the faculty of the Academic Unit should specify the role of the elected faculty review committee.

Terms for members of the elected faculty review committee may be staggered, multiyear terms, if the Academic Unit so chooses. The Academic Unit may designate an existing elected committee for this purpose. As indicated above, if the Academic Unit procedures call for the full faculty, sitting as a Committee of the Whole, to review performance, no election is necessary. The Procedures should specify the election process or indicate that the full faculty will perform the specified review role.

If, during the annual review, both the Academic Unit head and the elected faculty review committee find a faculty member's performance to be "substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit," they must send a letter or memorandum to the faculty member, stating that finding. The letter must be signed both by the Academic Unit head and by the chair of the committee, must specify the deficiencies, and must set a time period (usually by the next annual review) during which the faculty member should address the identified problems. Both the Academic Unit head and the elected committee should work with the faculty member to improve performance during that time. If the post-tenure review process is to achieve its purposes, efforts must be made at this point in the process to assist the faculty member in remedying perceived deficiencies.

At the end of the specified time, both the Academic Unit head and the elected faculty review committee should again review the performance. If they again find that performance is "substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit," they can

ask the dean to initiate special review. To do so, they should send a letter or memorandum to the dean and to the faculty member, setting out their findings with a copy of the documents they have reviewed. (If the Academic Unit is also a collegiate unit, the notice and request for review should be sent to the responsible senior academic administrator for the collegiate unit. Each mention of the "dean" below should be understood to refer to the responsible senior academic administrator for that unit in such a case.)

When does annual review take place?

The rules do not specify a time, but annual review will normally take place in the spring, in the context of the annual compensation review.

What is "special review"?

Special review is an intensive review of an individual faculty member. It can be initiated only after the steps above have been taken, and only after the dean has independently reviewed the file and determined that special review is appropriate.

Special review is not a judicial or quasi-judicial proceeding; it is not an accusatory process. It is a further academic inquiry by colleagues to review performance.

How is the special review panel selected?

The special review panel is designated for each case separately. Section 7a.3 specifies that the review panel consist of five tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank than the individual being reviewed; they need not be members of the Academic Unit conducting the review. The dean will ask the faculty member being reviewed to designate one member of the panel within a specified time (e.g., one week). The faculty member may choose any faculty member in the University (other than himself/herself). If the faculty member does not designate anyone within the specified time, the faculty member waives the right to appoint a member. The remaining members (four, or all five, if the faculty member has not chosen one) are elected by secret ballot of the tenured faculty of the Academic Unit in a meeting convened by the Academic Unit head at the request of the dean. The tenured faculty may choose for the panel faculty members from other units who have the necessary expertise.

How does the special review panel conduct its review?

The faculty member should be invited to supply a resume and any other relevant information at the beginning of the process and to suggest the names of persons who could comment on performance. The faculty member should be given a reasonable time (e.g., two weeks) to submit this information. The dean and Academic Unit head also should provide the panel with information they have that reflects on the faculty member's performance. The panel may review the scholarly work of the faculty member, teaching evaluations, and other evidence of performance. It may seek internal and external reviews. Any documents received should be placed in the file; a memorandum should be made of any oral comments received and should also be placed in the file.

When all of the information has been assembled, the faculty member must be given a

reasonable time (e.g., two weeks) to review it and an opportunity to make a statement to the review panel. The statement can be oral or written, as the faculty member chooses. After reviewing the collected information and any statement the faculty member has chosen to make, the panel will then prepare its report and recommendations.

A special review panel should be thorough in its work, but need not extend the process unduly. It should normally be possible to reach a conclusion within two to three months after the panel is selected. This would allow approximately two weeks for the faculty member and administrators to submit the initial information, another month for the committee to gather and complete a file, another two weeks for the faculty member to review that information and to make a presentation, and a period for deliberation and preparation of the report.

The faculty member may have the assistance of a faculty adviser or advocate throughout the review process. Indeed, the faculty member should be encouraged to have the counsel of a trusted colleague to put the issues into perspective. Since this is a School of Kinesiology 7.12 Statement 23

performance review process, and not an accusatory judicial proceeding, a faculty colleague may be the most effective adviser. The adviser need not be a faculty member at the University.

If the faculty member chooses not to participate in the special review process, the panel may reach a conclusion based on the information otherwise obtained. The failure to participate may be taken into account in reaching its conclusions.

The members of the review panel and all others concerned should be reminded that information collected in this process is primarily "private data" under the Minnesota Data Practices Act. It should be made freely available to the faculty member under review, but may not be revealed to others (even to other members of the Academic Unit) except as required for the conduct of official business.

The report must be written and signed by the panel. The panel should send it to the faculty member, to the Academic Unit head, and to the dean.

What actions may the panel recommend?

The actions that the panel may recommend are listed in section 7a.3 of the Tenure Regulations. They include:

- terminate this is appropriate if the panel finds that the faculty member's performance review meets the goals and expectations of the unit
- alter allocation if the panel determines that the faculty member's strengths are not being fully of effort utilized, it might suggest that the allocation of effort between teaching, research, and service be altered so as to maximize the faculty member's contributions to the University
- suggested if the faculty member's performance is likely to be improved by specific steps, improvements and that process can adequately be monitored by further regular annual reviews, the panel can suggest that those steps be taken and remit the case to the annual review process
- continued if specific steps might improve the faculty member's performance, but active

special review monitoring of that progress is needed, the panel can suggest that those steps be taken and that another special review panel be convened at a later date (usually one year later)
--salary if the faculty member's performance has declined in such a way as no longer reduction to warrant the base salary that is attached to the position, the panel can recommend a reduction in base salary of up to 10% (see details below).
--dismissal if the faculty member's performance has fallen below the standard of Section 10.21(a), "sustained refusal or failure to perform reasonably assigned duties adequately," it can recommend the commencement of proceedings for termination of appointment or involuntary leave of absence (see details below).

The panel may also recommend a combination of these measures.

Who implements the decision?

In general, the Academic Unit head has the primary responsibility for implementing the decision, but should consult with the dean before doing so. (The cases of pay reductions or termination of appointment are discussed separately below.) The Academic Unit head need not implement all of the recommendations, but may not impose additional or more severe measures without following proper procedures. The Academic Unit head may implement alternative measures, if the faculty member agrees. For example, a panel might recommend a shift in allocation of effort from teaching to research, but the Academic Unit head and the faculty member might agree on a shift from teaching to departmental service.

How are pay reductions implemented?

One possible action is reduction of pay. The Academic Unit head may reduce pay only if the special review panel recommends this action and the dean concurs in this recommendation. Section 7a.4 limits pay reductions to 10% on the basis of any one special review (and a 25% overall maximum). Six months' notice of the reduction must be given. If the performance is restored to appropriate levels, the head of the Academic Unit may restore the pay to the original level.

Can a faculty member be fired or suspended?

Post-tenure review pursuant to Section 7a and these Rules cannot itself result in dismissal or suspension. The review committee may, however, recommend that the dean begin proceedings under Sections 10 and 14 of the Tenure Regulations for dismissal or suspension (or for involuntary leave of absence). The most probable reason would be "sustained refusal or failure to perform reasonably assigned duties adequately." (Section 10.21(a).) The dean would need to follow the entire process mandated by section 14, including presentation of the case to the tenured faculty of the Academic Unit.

Post-tenure review is not a prerequisite to initiating proceedings under sections 10 and

14. The dean may initiate a proceeding to dismiss a faculty member (or to seek involuntary leave of absence) whenever a faculty member engages in "sustained refusal or failure to perform reasonably assigned duties adequately" or in other conduct forbidden by section 10.21 without using this post-tenure review process.
May the faculty member appeal the decision of the special review panel?

The faculty member may appeal the recommendations of the special review panel to the Judicial Committee by filing an appeal with the Committee within 30 days after the report. The Judicial Committee will hear the case in a manner analogous to the hearing of a tenure denial appeal. It will not substitute its judgment for that of the special review panel, but will examine whether due process was provided and required procedures were followed.

The faculty member may also appeal a pay cut to the Judicial Committee by filing an appeal within 30 days after being given notice of the pay cut by the dean or Academic Unit head. The Judicial Committee will not, however, hear the same issues twice; issues decided in a previous Judicial Committee hearing will not be decided again.

If a dean initiates proceedings for termination or suspension of appointment (or for involuntary leave of absence), the faculty member may appeal to the Judicial Committee, as provided in sections 10 and 14.

What is the "Peer Review Option"?

Section 7a.5 of the Tenure Code permits the dean and faculty of a college to ask the Faculty Senate to approve a different post-tenure review procedure for that college. It leaves the design of that review process up to the dean and faculty of the college. The only limitations are (a) the proposal must include an effective system for post-tenure review, (b) the proposal must be approved by a vote of the faculty of the college (or by a vote of the elected faculty assembly of the college), and (c) the proposal must be approved by the dean. The Faculty Senate will consider the proposal and take appropriate action on it.

Appendix C

Subsection 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 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 D

Subsection 5.5 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*

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