

**Faculty Tenure
Section 7.12
School of Nursing**

Approved by School of Nursing: February 22, 2016 (Regular Faculty)

Approved by Executive Vice President and Provost: March 21, 2016

Approved by School of Nursing: May 28, 2019 (Regular Faculty)

Approved by Executive Vice President and Provost: July 26, 2019 (minor revisions)

TABLE OF CONTENTS		
	Section	Page
1.0	Introduction	4
2.0	Mission and Vision	4
3.1	Criteria for Appointment, Tenure and Promotion	4
3.2	Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure	4
3.2.1	General Criteria for Tenure (Section 7.11)	4
3.2.2	Promotion to Professor (Section 9.2)	6
3.3	School of Nursing Criteria	7
4.0	Annual Appraisals of Probationary Faculty	7
5.1	Conferral of Indefinite Tenure	8
5.2	Criteria	8
5.3	Extension of Probationary Period	8
5.4	Tenure at Appointment	8
6.1	Post-tenure Review	9
6.2	Purpose of Post-tenure Review	9
6.3	Minimum Performance Expectations	9
6.3.1	Service	9
6.3.2	Research	9
6.3.3	Teaching	10
6.4	Process	10
7.0	Schedule of Revision	10
APPENDIX: Procedures		

A1.1	Guidance	20
A1.2	Probationary Faculty	20
A1.1.1	Mentoring Policy	20
A1.1.2	Tenure and Promotion Handbook	20
A1.3	Associate Professors	20
A1.3.1.	Expectation for Promotion	20
A1.3.2.	Information Sessions	20
A1.3.3	Periodic Review	20
A1.3.4	Decision to Conduct a Review	21
A2.1	Annual Review of Probationary Faculty	22
A2.2	Basis of Review	22
A2.1.2	Information Sessions	22
A2.3	Materials Reviewed	22
A2.4	Review Process	22
A2.5	U M Form 12	23
A3.1	Promotion and Tenure Reviews	23
A3.2	Promotion and Tenure	23
A3.3	Definitions	24
A3.4	Period under Review	24
A3.5	External Reviewers	24
A3.6	The Dossier	25
A3.6.1	Preparation	25
A3.6.2	Contents	25
A3.7	Review by Tenured Faculty	25
A3.8	Review by Dean	26
A3.9	Candidate Response	26
A3.10	Dossier	26

A3.11	Second Level Review	26
A4.1	Review Sessions	26
A4.2	Confidentiality of Review Materials	26
A4.3	Regular Voting Rules	27
A4.4	Report of Action	27
A5.0	Appointment with Tenure	27
A6.1	Post-tenure Review	27
A6.2	Annual Performance Shortfall	28
A6.3	Substantial Performance Shortfall	29

LIST OF TABLES		
1.	Criteria and Exemplars for Research	11
2.	Criteria and Exemplars for Teaching	15
3.	Criteria and Exemplars for Service	18
A.	Documentation for Annual Review of Probationary Faculty	29

Faculty Tenure
Section 7.12
School of Nursing

1.0. Introduction

This document describes the indices and criteria to be used to evaluate candidates for appointment, continuation, promotion, and tenure for the regular faculty of the School of Nursing, as specified in subsection 7.11 (General Criteria) and subsection 9.2 (Criteria for Promotion to Professor) of the Regents' Policy on *Faculty Tenure*. In accord with Section 7a (Review of Faculty Performance), it also describes post-tenure goals and performance expectations and procedures for annual review. The Appendix lists procedures assuring School of Nursing compliance with the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty* of the Regents' Policy on *Faculty Tenure*. The Regents' Policy on *Faculty Tenure* and the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty* provide a complete overview of the promotion and tenure process at the University of Minnesota.

All tenured faculty members are expected to participate fully in tenure and promotion reviews, including reviews of probationary and clinical faculty. Full participation includes reading dossiers, participating in the review session (unless compelling circumstances prevent participation), and voting.

2.0 Mission and Vision

The mission of the School of Nursing is to generate knowledge and educate leaders to shape the future of nursing and advance healthcare to improve the health and well-being of all.

The School of Nursing vision is to ensure optimal health & wellbeing for all people and the planet.

3.1. Criteria for Appointment, Tenure and Promotion

3.2. Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure

3.2.1. General Criteria for Tenure (Section 7.11). 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 [FN2]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [FN3]. The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision [FN4]. 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.

[FN 2] "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.

[FN 3] 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.

[FN 4] 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.

3.2.2. Promotion to Professor (Section 9.2). 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 [FN 7]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [FN 8].

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.

[FN 7] "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.

[FN 8] 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 subsection 7.4 for the granting of indefinite tenure, the nondisclosure of grounds for the decision (subsection 7.5), and the review of recommendations (subsection 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 subsection 7.7 for decisions about promotion to associate professor and conferral of indefinite tenure.

3.3. School of Nursing Criteria Criteria for appointment, tenure and promotion for each rank in the domains of research, teaching, and service are listed in Tables 1-3, respectively. As per University of Minnesota guidelines, a formal vote of the regular faculty is not required for appointment of a new faculty person to the tenure track. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are expected to fulfill criteria shown for each of the research, teaching, and service domains. Interdisciplinary and/or interprofessional collaboration and public engagement are incorporated into the criteria. In each domain, exemplars for each criterion constitute suggested types of evidence that candidates may use to demonstrate records of accomplishment distinguished by conspicuous excellence in quality, productivity, visibility, and continued promise.

4.0. Annual Review of Probationary Faculty

Probationary faculty members are reviewed every academic year by the tenured faculty as a whole, using the criteria shown in Tables 1-3. These annual reviews are informed by feedback and recommendations candidates received from prior years that have been documented on UM Form 12. (An academic year is defined on UM Form 12 as the fiscal year.) The review is based on the General Criteria for Tenure (Section 7.11), the School of Nursing criteria listed in Tables 1-3 in accord with Section 7.12 (Departmental Statement), and documentation submitted by the faculty member under review. Materials reviewed include annual summary statements of accomplishments in research, teaching, and service and a statement that synthesizes work across the missions; effort allotted to each mission; goals, including response to the prior year's evaluation; lists of specific accomplishments in each area; and current curriculum vitae (CV). In accord with School of Nursing Bylaws, the annual review process for probationary faculty is coordinated by the Faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Evaluation Committee and approved by the tenured faculty as a whole.

Following the annual review of probationary faculty members by the tenured faculty, FAPTEC will finalize a written summary report to be reviewed and approved by the tenured faculty. This report will state any concerns of the tenured faculty regarding the

candidates' progress toward tenure and will provide guidance for addressing any weaknesses that have been noted. The cooperative unit chair, as delegated by the dean, will discuss with each candidate their progress toward achieving tenure based on the annual review by tenured faculty. The cooperative unit chair will also report to the candidate the sense of the meeting of the tenured faculty, including any recommendations and areas in which performance needs to be improved. The candidate will be given a copy of the Annual Review of Probationary Faculty report (UM form 12), which includes the written summary of the tenured faculty.

The Form 12, including the written summary, is signed by the candidate, the cooperative unit chair, and the Dean of the School of Nursing, who forwards it to the University Executive Vice President and Provost. Procedures for annual review of probationary faculty and formats for submitting documentation and evidence are outlined and detailed in the Appendix.

5.1. Conferral of Indefinite Tenure

5.2. Criteria Faculty members are expected to demonstrate integration of the three missions: research, education and service, which may include practice. The criteria for tenure for these three areas are the same as those for promotion to associate professor, presented in Tables 1-3.

5.3. Extension of Probationary Period Under conditions described in Section 5.5 of the Regents' Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, the maximum period of probationary service may be extended by one year at the notification or request of a probationary faculty member. These conditions include the birth of that faculty member's child or adoptive/foster placement of a child with that faculty member (requires notification only); or when the faculty member is a major caregiver for a family member who has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition; or when the faculty member has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition (requires approval of request).

5.4. Tenure at Appointment The Dean must have the vote of tenured faculty prior to offering a prospective faculty member an appointment with tenure. The applicant must provide the following documents to the search committee, who must make them available to the tenured faculty as the basis for their evaluation: (a) five letters of recommendation, comparable to external reviews obtained for internal candidates for tenure, that include an evaluation of the applicant's accomplishments with respect to General Criteria (Section 7.11) and School of Nursing criteria (Tables 1-3) for tenure; (b) evidence of teaching ability (e.g., peer or student evaluations); (c) CV that includes documentation of research/scholarship, teaching including advisement and

mentorship, and service; (d) a synthesizing statement linking research, teaching, and service; and (e) a statement of the prospective faculty member's vision for nursing and how their work will contribute to it. For items (d) and (e), the applicant's cover letter will suffice if the items are adequately addressed. The regular faculty meet to discuss the case and vote as follows: (a) the entire regular faculty first vote on the motion to hire; (b) the entire tenured faculty then vote on the motion for tenure at appointment; and (c) lastly, the full professors vote on the motion for appointment at full professor rank. Results of the votes and a summary of the discussions are forwarded to the Dean. The vote and summary are to be appended to the appointment document. Specific procedures for tenured hires are provided in the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*.

6.1. Post-tenure Review

6.2. Purpose of Post-Tenure Review A lively climate of engaged scholarship is essential to advance the scholarly interests and the tripartite mission of the School of Nursing and the University. Tenured faculty are leaders in these efforts by virtue of authority delegated to them within the University and arising from their accomplishments and experience as seasoned academicians. The purpose of Post-Tenure Review is to affirm each tenured faculty member's continued engagement; or, when performance falls substantially short of minimal expectation, to create and implement a performance improvement plan.

6.3. Minimum Performance Expectations School of Nursing post-tenure performance expectations reflect criteria for promotion to ranks of Associate or Full Professor (Tables 1-3). During the post-tenure period, the relative emphasis on the three missions of research, teaching, and service may vary from person to person and year to year. All tenured faculty members are expected to contribute to the service mission of the School of Nursing and the University. The minimum performance expectations are evaluated and include individual goals that a tenured faculty member may establish as a personal work plan. Additional accomplishments in any given year may reflect active research and/or teaching, as described below. Failure to submit annual review documents by the published deadline is a general failure to meet minimum performance expectations because no data relevant to the assessment are available.

6.3.1. Service. Participation in governance and service is expected.

6.3.2. Research. Active researchers contribute to the knowledge of the discipline of nursing. Active researchers are those who articulate the nature of their research and who show evidence of accomplishment over the course of a 3-year period that

includes *at least one* of the Exemplars for research at rank shown in Table 1.

6.3.3. Teaching. Effective teachers disseminate knowledge to students and are respected mentors who guide advisees to advancement in their educational and professional careers. Adequate performance of educational responsibilities includes teaching assigned courses and receiving satisfactory evaluations, and demonstration of efforts to facilitate academic progression of students and advisees.

6.4. Process The post-tenure review is conducted as part of the annual merit review process. The merit assessment documents completed by tenured faculty are submitted from the Dean's Office to the Faculty Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee (FAPTEC). The FAPTEC conducts the annual assessment of tenured faculty activity with respect to School of Nursing goals and expectations listed in sections 6.3.1, 6.3.2, and 6.3.3, above, using the procedure outlined in the Appendix.

7.0. Schedule of Revision The Faculty Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee (FAPTEC) shall conduct a systematic review of the 7.12 statement at least every three years. Requests for additional reviews of the 7.12 statement may be sent to the FAPTEC by faculty members with regular appointments or by the Dean. The FAPTEC will propose any necessary revisions. These revisions will then be made available to the regular faculty, which will conduct a vote on the acceptability of the changes. If no changes are required, that fact will be reported to the regular faculty. Revisions approved by the regular faculty are then forwarded to the Dean and the Executive Vice President and Provost for their consideration. The dates of approvals of changes shall become part of the School of Nursing 7.12 Statement.

Table 1
Criteria and Exemplars for Research

Assistant Professor	Associate Professor and Tenure	Professor
<p>Criterion: <i>Shows evidence of competence in research</i></p>	<p>Criterion: <i>Pursues a focused program of research</i></p>	<p>Criterion: <i>Increases depth and/or breadth of focused, sustained and creative program of research</i></p>
<p>Exemplars</p>	<p>Exemplars</p>	<p>Exemplars</p>
<p>Clearly articulated area of research and scholarship.</p> <p>Beginning establishment of trajectory of research productivity</p> <p>Substantive unique contribution to a research grant.</p> <p>Post-doctoral fellowship</p> <p>Interdisciplinary or collaborative research or other scholarly initiatives</p>	<p>PI on an internally or an externally funded research grant award</p> <p>Co-I on an internally or externally funded research grant award</p> <p>Co-I or consultant on SoN and/or UofM collaborative, interdisciplinary community based research/scholarship project</p>	<p>Sustained record of extramural grants awards as PI, Co-PI, or Co-I of increasing depth and breadth</p> <p>PI or Co-PI on an NIH R01 award or similar extramural grant award demonstrating independence as a researcher</p> <p>Sustained Creativity And Sophistication in focused area of scholarship</p> <p>Leadership in interdisciplinary and collaborative research or scholarly activities in AHC or university</p> <p>Sustained record of grants from a variety of funding sources (e.g., federal, foundation, corporate)</p>

<p>Criterion: <i>Defines an area of scholarship</i></p>	<p>Criterion: <i>Merits regional and national recognition as a scholar</i></p>	<p>Criterion: <i>Has national and/or international recognition as a scholar</i></p>
<p>Exemplars</p>	<p>Exemplars</p>	<p>Exemplars</p>
<p>Clearly articulates direction of research program and how it is significant to nursing knowledge development and practice</p> <p>A defined plan for research and funding</p>	<p>Positive external evaluations of program of scholarship</p> <p>Increasing competence, creativity, and sophistication in focused area of scholarship</p> <p>Local/regional or national research consultation</p> <p>Local, state, or regional award for research or scholarship</p> <p>Invitations to speak in area of expertise at regional or national programs</p>	<p>Positive external evaluations of research program and scholarship</p> <p>Member of editorial board or national scientific review panel</p> <p>Member of national /international scientific advisory committee, consensus group or expert panel</p> <p>Member/fellow prestigious professional society</p> <p>National/inter-national research consultant</p> <p>International award for research or scholarship</p>
<p>Criterion: <i>Publishes scholarly products</i></p>	<p>Criterion: <i>Established record of scholarly publications</i></p>	<p>Criterion: <i>Sustained, substantive record of scholarly publications</i></p>
<p>Exemplars</p>	<p>Exemplars</p>	<p>Exemplars</p>
<p>Papers published/in press in peer-reviewed journals reviewed journals</p> <p>Data-based papers published/ in press in peer-reviewed journals</p> <p>Published dissertation findings</p>	<p>Publication record includes in prestigious, peer-reviewed journals that are recognized as authoritative, scientifically rigorous and influence health care and/or the discipline of nursing.</p> <p>Expanded record of publications with a preponderance of data-</p>	<p>A substantial publication record that includes articles in prestigious, peer-reviewed journals that are recognized as authoritative, scientifically rigorous and influence health care and/or the discipline of nursing.</p> <p>Publication record includes a</p>

	<p>based, peer- reviewed papers.</p> <p>A substantial number of peer-reviewed articles must be first and/or solo authored</p> <p>Publication record includes books, book chapters, review papers monographs</p>	<p>majority of data-based, peer-reviewed publications</p> <p>Sustained record of students co-authored publications</p> <p>Publications include editorials and other influential scholarly commentary</p> <p>Serves as editor or guest editor for prestigious, peer-reviewed research journals or textbooks that are recognized as exerting a major influence on health care and/or the discipline of nursing.</p> <p>Serves as guest reviewer of international grants and scholarship</p> <p>Serves as expert guest reviewer of article in prestigious journal when not on editorial board</p>
<p>Criterion: <i>Successfully disseminates research and/or scholarly knowledge</i></p>	<p>Criterion: <i>Established record of successful dissemination of research and Scholarly knowledge</i></p>	<p>Criterion: <i>Sustained record of disseminating research and scholarly knowledge</i></p>
<p>Exemplars</p>	<p>Exemplars</p>	<p>Exemplars</p>
<p>Local, regional and/or national presentations</p> <p>Provides peer review of faculty grants and publications</p>	<p>Competes successfully to present scholarly work at national and/or international conferences</p> <p>Presents research at regional research conferences</p> <p>Invited or keynote speaker at regional research conferences</p> <p>Provides peer review of faculty grants and publications</p>	<p>Sustained record of competing successfully to present scholarly work at national and/or international conferences</p> <p>Competes successfully to present research at international conferences</p> <p>Multi-Media presentations (e.g., video, web –based)</p>

		<p>Provides peer review of faculty grants and publications</p> <p>Research Dissemination awards</p> <p>Invited or keynote speaker at national and international research conferences</p>
	<p>Criterion: <i>Contributes to the research climate of the SoN</i></p>	<p>Criterion: <i>Research mentorship of students and assistant/associate professors</i></p>
<p>Exemplars</p>	<p>Exemplars</p>	<p>Exemplars</p>
	<p>Record of advising and participating on graduate student committees</p> <p>Involves students in program of research or scholarship</p> <p>Has student co-authors or co-presenters at regional or national research conferences</p> <p>Successfully mentors students in research</p>	<p>Sustained record of :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -advising graduate students and participating serving on DNP and PhD committees -research mentorship of students and postdoctoral fellows - involving students, graduates, and/or postdoctoral fellows in research -student co-authors -students presenting or co-presenting research at local, regional, national, or international conferences. -research mentorship of junior faculty colleagues <p>Students and postdoctoral fellows receive research awards, grants, fellowships, or publication awards</p>

Table 2
Criteria and Exemplars for Teaching

Assistant Professor	Associate Professor and Tenure	Professor
Criterion: <i>Demonstrates an in-depth knowledge of defined content area or specialty practice area</i>	Criterion: <i>Recognition in defined content area of specialty practice area</i>	Criterion: <i>National or international recognition in defined content area or specialty practice area</i>
Exemplars	Exemplars	Exemplars
<p>Experience in teaching or presenting at local, regional or national venues in content/ specialty area</p> <p>Practice experience in content/ specialty area</p> <p>Certification in content/ specialty area</p>	<p>Teaches courses, classes, and/or provides teaching consultations related to defined content area or specialty practice area</p> <p>Certification in content/ specialty area</p> <p>Publishes education focused manuscripts, textbooks, book chapters, case studies or other learning aides</p>	<p>Publishes in education/teaching or practice related journals that are refereed and in journals of distinction.</p> <p>Provides invited presentations or consultations</p>
Criterion: <i>Experience and skill as a teacher</i>	Criterion: <i>Expertise as a teacher</i>	Criterion: <i>Recognized as a master teacher</i>
Exemplars	Exemplars	Exemplars
<p>Provides evidence of positive evaluations from teaching/presentations</p> <p>Provides letters of reference regarding teaching ability</p> <p>Provides examples of teaching materials</p> <p>Teaches as a guest lecturer at college level</p>	<p>Demonstrates a pattern of positive student relationships and evaluations</p> <p>Demonstrates a pattern of positive peer evaluations</p> <p>Integrates own research and that of the field into their teaching</p> <p>Receives a SON or local teaching award</p>	<p>Pattern of innovative and creative teaching strategies</p> <p>Receives a university or external teaching award</p> <p>Demonstrates that own teaching models/ perspectives are adopted at regional or national levels</p>

	Demonstrates innovative teaching strategies Effectively teaches students in more than one program	
Criterion: <i>Demonstrates a clear philosophical vision of nursing education</i>	Criterion: <i>Demonstrates leadership in the education mission of the School of Nursing</i>	Criterion: <i>Demonstrates broad educational leadership</i>
Exemplars	Exemplars	Exemplars
Articulates a philosophy of teaching	Organizes, teaches, and evaluates one or more courses. Effectively contributes toward the revision, development, implementation, and evaluation of a course and/or curriculum Actively participates in deliberations and implementation of the education mission of the SON. Successfully develops or significantly revised, implements, and evaluates a course Effectively coordinates an undergraduate or graduate course Effectively coordinates an area of study Serves as PI or Co-I of an intramural or extramural education (training) grant Advanced Interdisciplinary Education In the SON	Mentors faculty at assistant or associate level Assumes a leadership role in advancing the education mission for the SON Integrates scholarship/research into teaching Assumes a leadership role related to education on professional and/or university groups Advances interdisciplinary education in the AHC or university Serves as PI, Co-I or investigator of an intramural or extramural education or training grant

<p>Criterion: <i>Shows advising potential</i></p>	<p>Criterion: <i>Demonstrates advising effectiveness</i></p>	<p>Criterion: <i>Demonstrates leadership in advising & mentoring</i></p>
<p>Exemplars</p>	<p>Exemplars</p>	<p>Exemplars</p>
<p>Experience advising students Experience mentoring nurses</p>	<p>Advises UROPs or capstone projects Teaches research practicum Serves as academic advisor Serves as advisor to student organizations Advises or co-advises PhD dissertation research</p>	<p>Advises PhD dissertation research Serves as academic advisor for PhD students or post-doctoral fellows Submits letters from advisees/mentees documenting positive influence Serves as advisor/sponsor for pre-doctoral or postdoctoral training awards Serves as project director or collaborator for pre or post doctoral training award</p>

Table 3

Criteria and Exemplars for Service

Assistant Professor	Associate Professor and Tenure	Professor
<i>Criterion: Participates in professional service</i>	<i>Criterion: Effective service in School of Nursing and professional societies</i>	<i>Criterion: Effective service leadership in national and international societies</i>
Exemplars	Exemplars	Exemplars
<p>Participates in local or regional professional organization(s)</p> <p>Articulates relationship of scholarly expertise to profession and community service</p>	<p>Participates in scholarly societies (e.g. specialty organization, regional or national research organization, etc.)</p> <p>Integrates service with research and/or education mission activities</p> <p>Serves as abstract reviewer</p> <p>Committee member or officer in local, state, or regional professional organizations</p> <p>Participates in scholarly and policy advisory groups</p> <p>Provides Practice Consultation</p> <p>Testifies before government and regulatory bodies</p>	<p>Serves on Academic Health Center committees and/or task forces</p> <p>Serves on university-wide committees and/or task forces</p> <p>Serves in a leadership position in national or international professional organization</p> <p>Provides Leadership in scholarly societies, scholarly and/or policy advisory groups</p>
<i>Criterion: Participates in Community Service</i>	<i>Criterion: Provides community service activities</i>	<i>Criterion: Leadership in community service activities</i>
Exemplars	Exemplars	Exemplars
	Provides community with knowledge and skills related to scholarly expertise	Holds leadership positions in local, state, regional, or national community and official advisory

	<p>Engages in faculty practice</p> <p>Develops practice models</p> <p>Participates in advisory groups</p> <p>Works with Minnesota Extension Service, AHEC or other outreach groups</p>	<p>groups</p>
--	--	---------------

APPENDIX: Procedures for Review and Evaluation of Regular Faculty

A.1.1. Guidance

A.1.2. Probationary Faculty

A1.1.1. Mentoring Policy. A mentoring policy is in place to support a proactive approach for assisting probationary faculty to be successful in progressing toward tenure. The faculty member is responsible for preparing a career development plan within 6 months of employment. The career development plan includes a 5-year Research/Scholarship Plan and a Teaching /Service Plan. The Service Plan may include nursing practice. The goal of the plan is to ensure alignment of the career goals of the faculty member with promotion and tenure criteria and the mission of the School of Nursing in the context of the University. These plans will be reviewed and revised as needed in consultation with a mentoring team at least once a year. A complete copy of the policy is included in the Tenure and Promotion Handbook.

A.1.1.2. Tenure and Promotion Handbook. The Dean with consultation of the Faculty Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee will prepare a Tenure and Promotion Handbook including: (a) timelines and deadlines for all aspects of the tenure and promotion process; (b) copies of each 7.12 version in use during the year, with versions clearly labeled; and (c) specified CV format. The Handbook is updated annually and includes information about specific documentation required for Tenure and Promotion.

A.1.3. Associate Professors

A.1.3.1. Expectation for Promotion. The long-range goal is that associate professors will achieve the rank of full professor in a timely manner.

A.1.3.2. Information Sessions. Members of the School of Nursing Faculty Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee (FAPTEC) who are full professors conduct annual information sessions about criteria and process for promotion of tenured associate professors to full professor rank.

A.1.3.3. Periodic Review. The progress of all associate professors toward promotion to Professor shall be formally reviewed every four years, initiated by FAPTEC. Associate professors provide the following documents/information to the chair of the FAPTEC (deadline April 1):

- a. Current CV; b. One-page Quadrennial Statement with a projected timeline and plan of activities for achieving promotion; c. Name of one full professor to serve on their quadrennial review committee; d. Name of a desired FAPTEC professor to serve on quadrennial review committee.

A Quadrennial Committee (including the associate professor who is being reviewed, the full professor named by the associate professor, and a full professor who is also a member of FAPTEC) meets to review progress/discuss recommendations (deadline April 15th). The one-page Quadrennial Statement (amended if needed) is signed by all members of the Quadrennial Committee and returned to the chair of the FAPTEC (deadline April 19th).

The full professors meet annually to review the progress of all reviewed associate professors toward promotion (April meeting). After progress is reviewed by the full professors, the Quadrennial Statement and the unit appraisal summary form (UM 13: Promotional Review of Tenured Associate Professors) are forwarded to the cooperative unit chair, who discusses the Statement and review with the associate professor being reviewed (deadline May 15). In instances when the cooperative unit chair has not participated in the full professors' review session, the FAPTEC chair will meet with the associate professor following the full professors' meeting to discuss the review with the individual being reviewed. The Quadrennial Statement and the unit appraisal summary form (UM 13: Promotional Review of Tenured Associate Professors) are signed and dated by the cooperative chair and the associate professor to document the review. Copies of the completed forms are provided to the faculty member and filed in the faculty member's file in the cooperative office; the original forms are sent to the Dean's Office. The date of the review is entered into the Faculty Data Base to create a retrievable record of individual and School-wide compliance with the procedure

Two important notes regarding the Quadrennial Review: (a) this review is oriented toward supportive guidance and counseling about promotion; and (b) there is no penalty for failing to move toward or achieve promotion according to the projected timeline; in particular, not being promoted to the rank of professor will not in itself result in special post-tenure review of a tenured associate professor (Tenure Code, Section 9.2 [FN7]).

A.1.3.4. Decision to Conduct a Review. Associate professors may request meeting with full professors to discuss promotion readiness in the spring semester of the academic year. When an associate professor desires to seek promotion to full professor rank (self-nominates) or is nominated for promotion, the FAPTEC Chair and members at full professor rank are notified and the FAPTEC Chair is provided with (a) a current CV, (b) a formal synthesizing statement from the potential candidate summarizing accomplishments as related to achievement of criteria for the rank of full professor and linking her/his accomplishments in the areas of research, teaching and service, and (c) a nominator's statement (if relevant). Consistent with University of Minnesota *Procedures*, a quorum of full professors meets in closed session to determine whether the review will be held, using regular voting rules as provided in Section A4.2, below. The FAPTEC

Chair informs the Dean of the decision and rationale, and the Dean informs the potential candidate of the decision to conduct the review. The decision may be appealed to the Dean or Provost if the nominee perceives the process was unjust.

A.2.1. Annual Review of Probationary Faculty

A.2.2. Basis of Review The criteria set forth in the Tables 1-3 are used by the tenured faculty and administrators in evaluating the annual progress of a candidate and are consistent with the Regents' Policy on Faculty *Tenure* and the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*.

A.2.1.2. Information Sessions. Members of the School of Nursing FAPTEC who are associate and/or full professors conduct annual information sessions about criteria and process for promotion and tenure of probationary faculty.

A.2.3. Materials Reviewed In each annual review in years 1-5, probationary faculty submit a dossier that includes (a) an overall synthesizing statement; (b) additional synthesizing statements in the areas of research, teaching, and service; (c) evidence of teaching ability (e.g., summary of student evaluations); (d) and explanation of effort in the year being reviewed; (e) a current curriculum vitae, and (f) goals for the next year. These materials shall be submitted for each annual continuation review for the immediate past calendar year and a cumulative review of the full probationary period for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

A.2.4. Review Process Beginning with the first year of the probationary period, the Dean's Office will compile the candidate's file on a yearly basis . The probationary year is defined as the fiscal year (UM Form 12). Probationary faculty submit materials reflecting their achievements over the most recent calendar year, and for the full probationary period in the final year.

Each year the Dean's Office will inform the candidate of the schedule for annual review. The candidate will submit the items described in the procedures for annual probationary review documenting activities and progress towards tenure and promotion during the year under review. The Dean/designee will assemble the file and make it available for tenured faculty to review.

A meeting is set for review of probationary faculty by tenured faculty. Typically, votes for continuation are taken beginning in the third probationary year. Secure electronic ballots are used. In the decision year, votes are taken using secure electronic ballots on a recommendation for tenure and for promotion. Probationary faculty members are reviewed each year, even during the first and second probationary years.

For the faculty review session (annual and decision year), one Faculty Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee member prepares and presents a written preliminary summary of the faculty member's file to the Tenured Faculty for discussion. Following the discussion, the Faculty Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee revises the faculty member's summary including recommendations of the tenured faculty. The updated summary is made available for review by tenured faculty, revised if necessary, and approved by the Faculty Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee.

A.2.5. U M Form 12 The annual review summary of probationary faculty will be attached to UM Form 12 and reflects the faculty member's performance relative to the 7.12 statement. If a faculty member has been approved to extend his or her probationary period, consistent with Section 5.5 of the Regents' Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, this must be noted on the Form 12. The Cooperative unit chair will meet annually with each probationary faculty member to review the review summary and sign the completed UM Form 12. The form is forwarded to the Dean for review, comment, and signoff. The Form 12 is forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost for review, comment, and sign off. The signed UM Form 12 will be kept in the probationary faculty member's tenure file and becomes a part of the dossier.

A.3.1. Promotion and Tenure Reviews

Procedural information in this section applies to reviews for (a) promotion from assistant professor to associate professor with tenure; (b) tenure with or without promotion to professor, for associate professors appointed without tenure; and (c) promotion from associate professor with tenure to professor.

A.3.2. Promotion and Tenure Promotion to the rank of associate professor is based upon professional distinction in research and demonstrated effectiveness in teaching and advising students, and, where relevant, in discipline- related service. The criteria for tenure are those for promotion to associate professor. Promotion to the rank of professor requires, in addition, a national or international scholarly reputation in the individual's field of study.

The candidate for promotion to a higher level must meet all the criteria of that level and of those at lower ranks.

A.3.3. Definitions Candidates include: (1) probationary faculty members eligible for indefinite tenure and promotion to the next rank; (2) probationary faculty members eligible to receive tenure in rank; and (3) faculty members with tenure eligible for promotion in rank. In these Procedures, "unit" means the academic unit that makes the

initial recommendation on tenure and promotion. In the School of Nursing the unit is the School. The unit head is the Dean.

A.3.4. Period under Review The review period is the time since appointment to the University of Minnesota or the time since last review (either for promotion and tenure; or for tenure, if tenure review was separate from appointment as associate professor) at the University of Minnesota.

A.3.5. External Reviewers Letters are solicited from external reviewers who are distinguished faculty at or above the rank sought. Occasionally, highly regarded non-academics may serve as reviewers. These persons are expected to provide an impartial evaluation of the candidate's qualifications and accomplishments, using criteria set forth in the 7.12 statement. Typically, letters from six to eight external reviewers are included in the file.

During spring semester prior to the review year, faculty members who are seeking tenure and/or promotion submit to the Faculty Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee a roster of about 10-12 potential external reviewers from peer institutions (names, credentials and contact information). The probationary faculty should not contact the potential external reviewers in advance; the contact and request is made by the Dean's Office. Materials to be sent to the external reviews include (a) letter from the Dean requesting the review; (b) copy of the criteria for ranks from the SoN 7.12 Statement; (c) 1-2-page synthesizing statement from the candidate describing the focus of research/scholarship and written in the first person; (d) current CV; and (e) maximum of five journal articles and/or submitted manuscripts. The candidate shall prepare a cover sheet and table of contents for the packet. Referees must be informed that their evaluations will not be held confidential, since state law permits the candidate to inspect them.

A.3.6. The Dossier

A.3.6.1. Preparation. The Dean has the responsibility for seeing that a dossier is prepared for each candidate, containing relevant information on teaching, research, and service, and on other factors relevant to the decision, including outside evaluations of the candidate's contributions to scholarship. For tenure and promotion decisions, the Dean shall seek appraisals from persons suggested by the candidate that have been reviewed and approved by the FAPTEC, and also request from other recognized scholars in the field or related fields. Form 12s must be included for probationary faculty.

A.3.6.2. Contents. Candidates are responsible for providing information about

their accomplishments as detailed in the following paragraphs.

Promotion of Probationary Faculty. Information submitted by probationary faculty for a promotion and/or tenure review are similar to those submitted for annual probationary reviews. Differences are as follows: (a) the synthesizing statement (1-2 pages) should be comprehensive in succinctly addressing key points of the entire probationary period and not just the review year; (b) the summaries of research, teaching and service should address key points of the entire probationary period and not just the review year; (c) a cumulative explanation of effort is not needed; and (d) the dossier should include external letters as described in Appendix Section A.3.4.

In addition to letters from external reviewers, letters from University of Minnesota faculty colleagues whose appointments are outside of the School of Nursing may be included in the dossier.

Promotion to Full Professor. Candidates seeking promotion to full professor submit: (a) CV that includes documentation of research, advisement/mentorship and peer-reviewed articles; (b) a 3-5 page summary of accomplishments (as related to criteria for full professor) in a synthesizing statement linking research, teaching, and service; (c) evidence of teaching ability (e.g., summary of student evaluations); (d) external review letters as described in Appendix Section A.3.4. In addition to letters from external reviewers, letters from University of Minnesota faculty colleagues whose appointments are outside of the School of Nursing may be included in the dossier.

A.3.7. Review by Tenured Faculty Tenured faculty members review the files of candidates and then meet in closed session for discussion and votes by electronic system on motions for tenure and/or promotion. All tenured faculty vote on motions for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor. Only professors discuss and vote on motions for promotion to full professor.

A.3.8. Review by Dean, The Dean (unit head) prepares a statement of agreement or disagreement with the recommendation of the tenured faculty, including the reasons for any disagreement. The Dean reviews both the Tenured Faculty discussion summary and vote. The Dean may also consult with other persons before making decisions but each such consultation or review shall be recorded in the candidate's file.

The Dean informs the candidate of the tenured faculty's recommendation and of the Dean's own recommendation. The Dean also gives the candidate a copy of the final report if the candidate requests it. The Dean will inform FAPTEC of recommendations. The FAPTEC Chair will convey the recommendations to the tenured faculty.

A.3.9. Candidate Response The candidate has the right to submit a supplementary statement. Copies of the statement must be distributed to the tenured faculty.

A.3.10. Dossier The candidate's final file is compiled according to guidelines and procedures from the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for second level review by the All-University Tenure and Promotion Committee.

A.3.11. Second Level Review The dossier is forwarded to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Provost for handling during the second level review process, including peer review at the All-University Tenure and Promotion Committee.

A.4.1. Review Sessions

A.4.2. Confidentiality of Review Materials At the beginning of meetings to review candidates for continuation, tenure, or promotion to any rank, the following statement will be read:

“The proceedings of this review are confidential. Tenured faculty may discuss the review with other tenured faculty members in the School, but may not disclose the review session content and/or sources of the content (i.e., attributing content of the discussion to specific persons) to anyone who was not a tenured faculty in the School of Nursing at the time of the review session. Candidates may discuss the review with members of the School of Nursing Tenured Faculty after they receive a written summary of the review.

Under the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, any written materials from the annual review of probationary faculty meeting(s) regarding a specific individual may be requested by that individual. In order to encourage open discussion during the probationary review session(s) and remain consistent with Section 7 of the Tenure Code, any notes taken by the recorder will be without personal attribution.”

A.4.3. Regular Voting Rules A tenure vote may be taken in any year of the probationary period, but must be taken in the last year of the probationary period. Votes are recorded by the Dean's office for votes for tenure and/or promotion to any rank. The voting process is described in detail in University *Procedures*.

A.4.4. Report of Action The Faculty Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee prepares a draft summary report which summarizes the candidate's file, and summarizes the tenured faculty appraisal of the file (including any minority views expressed at the meeting which had substantial support). The revised draft summary report is made available to the tenured faculty, who may comment and suggest changes.

Voting by the tenured faculty by electronic system follows the faculty discussion and finalizing of the summary report. The Faculty Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee provides the following material to the Dean for review: the Faculty Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee summary report as amended by discussion of the tenured faculty, and any separate statements made by members of the tenured faculty. Faculty members may file separate reports if they believe that their views are not adequately reflected in the departmental report. Copies of such separate reports must be added to the file which is available to department head (Co-operative Unit Chair), Dean, tenured faculty and to the candidate. The submission of such reports is the only appropriate way for faculty members to present their separate views to the Dean or to the collegiate or University review bodies.

A.5.0. Appointment with Tenure Required documentation and coordination of activities by the search committee and tenured faculty were described in Section 5.3.

A.6.1. Post-tenure Review

Faculty performance is evaluated annually through the School of Nursing Merit Review Process. The Merit review committee is a subcommittee of the FAPTEC. Faculty are required to submit an annual evaluation detailing goals and accomplishments for the calendar year. This annual evaluation includes input from three sources: self, cooperative unit chair and Merit Review sub-committee. For those faculty holding administrative positions a fourth source of evaluation is by the Dean of the School. The School of Nursing has developed performance criteria consistent with the mission of the School and University in the areas of teaching, research and service. The merit document outlines performance expectations for exceeding, meeting and failing to meet expected performance in each of the three areas. Failure to meet expectations is determined if no evidence is submitted that supports performance expectations in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

The dimensions for evaluating a faculty member's contributions in each of the three missions are consistent with the Promotion and Tenure Criteria as outlined in the School of Nursing's 7.12 Statement. A faculty member's academic rank is taken into consideration when evaluating merit. Exemplars are provided as examples for evaluating the faculty member's level of contribution. However, not all exemplars need to be demonstrated to judge that the contribution level has been met.

When no merit review documents are received, or a faculty member is determined to be below performance expectations in teaching, research, and/or service through the merit

process, an annual performance shortfall process is initiated, in accordance with the 7.12 document stating that “Failure to submit annual review documents by the published deadline is a general failure to meet minimum performance expectations because no data relevant to the assessment are available”. Exceptions to this are with faculty who are employed at less than 0.5FTE, and faculty who have been on leave during the year under review. Faculty who are in a phased retirement period must still meet performance expectations even as those are adjusted or negotiated with the Cooperative Unit Chair.

A.6.2. Annual Performance Shortfall. In the case of a faculty member who fails to meet minimum performance expectations, the Faculty Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee (FAPTEC) Merit Review subcommittee activates and recommends review to determine whether (a) performance is satisfactory (all three criteria are met), or (b) there is an annual performance shortfall (one or more criteria are not met). The determination for each tenured faculty member is forwarded to the Dean, who shall maintain a cumulative record of such determinations. A determination of performance shortfall must be transmitted in writing by the Dean to the tenured faculty member as part of the annual review process. The letter shall include stipulations that must be met within the next review period to correct the performance shortfall. Faculty with an annual performance shortfall may seek the guidance of their co-operative unit chair and selected peers about ways to improve their performance.

A.6.3. Substantial Performance Shortfall. Following two consecutive years with shortfall, the Dean and FAPTEC independently assess information submitted for the annual review to determine whether *substantial shortfall* has occurred. If the FAPTEC determines that minimum performance criteria have been met during the third year, the current accumulation of consecutive shortfalls is stopped. If the Dean and FAPTEC agree that three consecutive years of shortfall have occurred, performance is deemed a substantial shortfall and the case is referred to the Executive Vice President and Provost for special peer review according to subsection 7a.3 of the Faculty Tenure policy.

Table A

Documentation for Annual Review of Probationary Faculty

1.	Statements		
	A.	Synthesizing	A narrative statement (1-2 pages only) that synthesizes and describes the integration or link of the candidate’s research, teaching, and service. For each

			mission, include both disciplinary and interdisciplinary work. The statement should be dated and current. The synthesizing statement should be updated annually.
	B.	Research	A narrative summary (1-2 pages only) of research and scholarly activity during the review period. Include a brief explanation of significant research activities and accomplishments.
	C.	Teaching	A narrative summary (1-2 pages only) of teaching activity during the review period, and a summary of student teaching evaluations and peer teaching evaluations.
	D.	Service	A narrative summary (1-2 pages only) of service activity during the review period
2.	Effort		Specify percent and nature of effort on external funded grants/projects and time committed to another department. Specify the percent of effort for research, teaching, and service that is negotiated with administration for the year under review
3.	Goals		The statement lists goals for research, teaching, and service for the next year. Response to previous recommendations related to research, teaching, and service should be included in the statement of goals.
4.	Accomplishments during the Year Under Review (to be highlighted in candidate's CV)		
	A.	Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● data-based scholarly/research-related publications ● research grants submitted, awarded, or being implemented ● research/scholarly presentations ● participation on U of M or extramural grant review committees. ● research/scholarly awards received, including sponsor ● research awards received by student advisees, including sponsor ● appointments as associate editor or editor of journal ● election to prestigious societies (e.g., American Academy of Nursing) ● research consultations ● participation on University, state or national or consensus expert panels during evaluation year; indicate if multi-disciplinary.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●research mentorship of faculty during evaluation year; include department of faculty mentee ●any other research/scholarly progress
	B.	Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●all courses taught (number, name, title semester/year) ●peer evaluation of teaching ●student evaluation of teaching; evaluations should be completed for every course taught during the review period. Standard University and School forms and procedures should be used to obtain the evaluations. Information should be summarized in a table that includes: Term, Course Number and Title, Credits, Enrollment, and the average and range or standard deviation for item on the standard form. ●significant teaching or course coordination innovations or ●intramural or extramural teaching grants submitted, awarded, or implemented
	C.	Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Institutional <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --SoN, AHC, or U of M Governance Committees --SoN, AHC, or U of M Task Forces --Other institutional service given during review period --SoN, AHC, or U of M center director responsibilities; --SoN, AHC, or U of M service awards ● Grant, Manuscript, Presentation/Poster Reviews ●Conference Planning ●Editor or associate editor: educational or practice journal ●Association Activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --participation in professional associations --participation on consensus or expert panels --testimony provided to state or national groups --professional service awards received during review period --nomination and/or election to prestigious university, national, or professional organization positions or awards --clinical practice, including clinical supervision of students and/or research, other practice activities related to maintaining or achieving practice certification; clinical consultations provided to outside groups; clinical practice awards or recognitions ●Community Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --community service activities that do not fall in other categories. ●School of Nursing Administration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note: This category applies only to faculty members who have official administrative responsibilities for which they are compensated in terms of payment and/or effort. --administration activities and responsibilities
5.	Current CV: Prepared Using Format Described in SoN Tenure and Promotion Handbook		