

Revisions submitted for approval May 28, 2019. Approved by faculty in Educational Psychology May 24, 2019.

Approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost, June 23, 2021.

Prior Version approved by the Faculty January 23, 2008; approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost March 30, 2008. Revisions approved by the Department of Educational Psychology, September 21, 2011 (modifications through current Section IV) and February 20, 2013 (modifications of current Section V). Revisions approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost on March 4, 2013.

EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES CONCERNING FACULTY REVIEW, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

(This document is required by Section 7.12 of the **Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure***)

This document describes the specific criteria and standards used to evaluate whether candidates from the Department of Educational Psychology meet the general criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor in Section 7.11 and for promotion to professor in Section 9.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*. All candidates for promotion and/or tenure are evaluated with the criteria and standards outlined in Sections 7.11 and 7.12, and criteria and standards for full professor are outlined in Section 9 (all sections are appended).

The relevant University documents regarding criteria for tenure and/or promotion and the procedures for implementing these criteria are:

- University of Minnesota Board of Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* (hereafter referred to as Faculty Tenure)
(http://regents.umn.edu/sites/regents.umn.edu/files/policies/FacultyTenure1_0.pdf)
- *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty* (<https://policy.umn.edu/hr/tenure-proc01>)

This document, intended to satisfy section 7.12 of the *Faculty Tenure*, describes the departmental criteria for personnel evaluations and associated procedures. It is organized as follows:

- I. Overview**
- II. Awarding of Indefinite Tenure**
- III. Probationary Faculty**
- IV. Promotion to Associate Professor**
- V. Promotion to Professor**
- VI. Annual Review of Tenured Faculty**
- VII. Post-Tenure Review**

I. Overview

Faculty personnel policies and procedures for the Department of Educational Psychology meet the requirements established by the University and the College of Education and Human Development, and are consistent with the College **Values Statement To Guide 7.12 Revisions**. These policies and procedures appear in this document.

A. College of Education and Human Development Mission Statement

“The new 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” (Source: College of Education and Human Development website <http://education.umn.edu/newcollege/default.html>).

B. Department of Educational Psychology Mission Statement

“Educational Psychology involves the study of cognitive, emotional, and social learning processes that underlie education and human development across the lifespan. Research in educational psychology advances scientific knowledge of those processes and their application in diverse educational and community settings. The department provides training in the psychological foundations of education, research methods, and the practice and science of counseling psychology, school psychology, and special education. Faculty and students provide leadership and consultation to the state, the nation, and the international community in each area of educational psychology. The department’s scholarship and teaching enhance professional practice in schools and universities, community mental health agencies, business and industrial organizations, early childhood programs, and government agencies” (Source: Department of Educational Psychology intranet website <http://sky.cehd.umn.edu/dc/>).

In fulfilling its mission, faculty of the Department of Educational Psychology serve not only the students majoring in Educational Psychology, but students in programs throughout the College of Education and Human Development and in other Colleges of the University. As a major service function, the Department extends its activities and skills to local, state, regional, national, and international governmental and professional organizations to help meet its mission. Educational Psychology faculty and other Departmental resources are devoted to a program of research, teaching, and service that embodies our core values:

1. Conducting Research to Advance Science and Practice;
2. Fostering a Positive Climate for All; and
3. Preparing Students as Leaders and Innovators.

To accomplish its mission it is the expectation of the Department that every faculty member shall be engaged in research, teaching, and service. However, the Department will place highest priority on research and teaching activities that deal with major issues in Educational Psychology, including those that are interdisciplinary in nature. We recognize that the proportion of time given to particular activities will vary among faculty members.

C. College Values Statement To Guide 7.12 Revisions

“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 granting of tenure and the University 9.2 statement for promotion to professor.

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 (see above).

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 models for public engagement and multicultural and multidisciplinary initiatives can be documented so that excellence in these areas is considered in the context of promotion and tenure.” (Source: College of Education and Human Development 7.12 Committee)

Sections 7.11, 7.12, and 9.2 appear respectively as Appendices B, C, and D.

II. Awarding of Indefinite Tenure

A. General Statement

Evaluations related to the awarding of indefinite tenure are based on the general criteria in Section 7.11 of the *Faculty Tenure* (for a complete perspective, the reader is advised to review relevant portions of Section 7 as well as the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*. These *Procedures* are located at: <https://policy.umn.edu/hr/tenure-proc01>).

Faculty members shall document their accomplishments in the three categories of research, teaching, and service. Evaluation of a faculty member's record of accomplishment will be

judged against the expectations of the University and the College, along with the expectations of the Department as described in this document. The basis for awarding indefinite tenure is the determination that the candidate has established and is likely to continue to add to a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national or international reputation or both.

Candidates who demonstrate a distinguished record of accomplishment in Educational Psychology that is aligned with the *College Values Statement To Guide 7.12 Revisions* will also have that work recognized. The evaluation of a candidate whose research, teaching, or service has an interdisciplinary, diversity-focused, international, or public engagement character must include assessment by faculty whose expertise allows such work to be fairly and accurately reviewed. As examples, public engagement is defined by the University as “The partnership of University knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.” Public engagement crosses research, teaching, and service. Similarly, for diversity, the University states, “we envision a University where equity and diversity are: 1) Integrated into the work and lives of every student, faculty, and staff member. 2) Recognized as core institutional values, and will inform thinking, policies, and practices throughout the University. 3) Inherently intertwined with academic excellence and the development of leaders for a globally inclusive society.”

To evaluate the accomplishments of faculty holding joint appointments within the College, similar guidelines hold, but in this case the extent to which work linked to each appointment will be weighted in the evaluation should be described. Expectations may vary for different individuals and may change as an individual's career develops. However, in all cases contributions in all three categories (research, teaching, service) are necessary.

A candidate may use the same accomplishment in multiple categories but must provide evidence of the appropriateness and success of this practice. For example, a scholarly paper published in a peer-reviewed journal that focuses on the social development of children and that is subsequently used to engage communities outside the University in an educational partnership could provide evidence of a candidate's accomplishments in research and service. Similarly, a candidate who uses their academic expertise and experience to assist a community organization to develop materials for applying for state and federal grants could provide evidence of accomplishments in teaching and service.

B. Research

Distinction in research is based on consideration of:

1. *Originality*. How original are the accomplishments?
2. *Rigor*. How well do accomplishments utilize the canons of inquiry of the discipline that are basic to the inquiries?

3. *Cumulative Effect.* How well do accomplishments build on previous theory and research and reflect a research effort that is coherent and programmatic?
4. *Impact.* How well do accomplishments focus on central questions, issues, or decisions in educational psychology that yield broad, enduring understanding?
5. *Relevance.* What is the prospect that these accomplishments could make a difference in the practice of education or the assumptions on which practice is built?

Evidence of research accomplishment would typically include, but is not limited to:

1. A review of the candidate's scientific publications, particularly those in national or international peer-reviewed journals. Evidence is sought that the work is scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance, whether basic laboratory, experimental, and/or non-experimental research, applied research improving and informing policy or practice, or conceptual and integrative in focus.
2. Independence of research accomplishments or significant contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative research. Evidence of independence or significant contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative research may include:
 - a. Naming of the candidate as the first or senior author on multi-authored journal articles and/or documentation of major, substantial contributions by the candidate to the collaborative project and publication.
 - b. Statements of peer evaluators on the creativity and significance of the candidate's contributions to a collaborative research project and/or to multi- authored publications.
 - c. Identification of the candidate as the principal investigator or a major collaborator on peer-reviewed, funded research grants or contracts
 - d. Invitations/nominations to serve on study sections, national policy boards, editorial boards, etc.

The candidate should provide CV annotations to document their contribution to multi-authored publications and collaborative endeavors. This could include whether they were the corresponding author, involved in approval of the manuscript before final submission, contributed or analyzed data, were PI/co-PI on funding. It is recommended that candidates use symbols or annotations for post-doc/student/industry/community co-authors. Provide descriptive context and avoid simply indicating a percentage effort.

3. External research funding from federal and other national granting agencies which sponsor programs subject to peer review.
4. Significant original contributions based on techniques which impact the practice of education and/or psychology.

Assessment of competence in research is based upon:

1. Evidence of significant discipline-related publications. including reports of interventions, case studies, and descriptions of new techniques.
2. Participation in invited scientific and practitioner-oriented symposia, meetings and lectures.
3. Letters from authorities in the candidate's discipline assessing their contributions to the discipline.

Other evidence of scholarship can be provided, including evidence of

- (a) public engagement that aligns with University of Minnesota [criteria for engaged scholarship](#)
- (b) other forms of knowledge translation (e.g., curriculum, testing/assessments, trainings, technology transfer, interventions developed and validated through research).

In all cases, the evaluation of a candidate's research accomplishments should distinguish between work that is done independently and work done as a member of a team of co-investigators or co-authors. In the latter cases the candidate's role as a co-investigator or as a contributor to multi-authored work should be described.

C. Teaching

The evaluation of teaching will typically include graduate or undergraduate classroom teaching in which students register for credit, but could also involve non-credit teaching, for example, assisting a community organization to develop materials for applying for state or federal grants specifically targeting graduate or undergraduate preparation in ways consistent with the University, College, and Department's teaching mission. Supervising, mentoring, and advising University students is also considered teaching. Effective teaching that involves public engagement or is interdisciplinary or diversity-focused in character must be recognized.

Candidates for tenure need to provide evidence for effective teaching. Given the complexity of judging the quality of teaching and learning, it is important that a range of different types of evidence of effective teaching and significant student learning be used to assess instructional effectiveness such as student survey data, peer evaluations, course syllabi, student work, etc. It is important that the different forms of evidence provide a consistent, interrelated pattern of effective teaching and that syllabi reflect CEHD guidelines and expectations. Evidence can be provided through a variety of means representing core teaching activities such as:

1. Review of courses taught, directed, or developed by the candidate, at both undergraduate and graduate levels, including didactic courses and formal supervision of students' degree requirements; as evidenced by teaching statements, course materials (e.g., syllabi, documentation of student learning outcomes), student evaluations of teaching (both quantitative and qualitative data derived), peer evaluations of teaching or teaching materials, or other relevant materials.

2. Review of contributions to curriculum or program development, including development of new courses, major course revisions, and development or modification of programs, including materials developed in these efforts and external evaluations thereof.
3. Review of contributions to graduate and undergraduate advising, as evidenced by students' timely progress towards and completion of degrees, production of student scholarship, or student evaluations or other feedback on advising.

Evidence of core teaching activities may be supplemented by auxiliary evidence such as:

4. Review of contributions to other student research, including committee membership, independent study, undergraduate honors projects and other directed research, as evidenced by student products, or mentoring of postdoctoral scholars;
5. Review of teaching materials and evaluations related to international teaching or other informal teaching that is part of one's university duties. In some instances, it may include workshops, consulting, or professional development offerings in community or school settings (though these activities more likely qualify as service--see #3 under service);
6. Demonstrated progress in developing teaching effectiveness, such as participation in programs to improve teaching, an upward trajectory in measures of teaching effectiveness, evidence of course revision based on peer, student, and self-evaluation;
7. Written or on-line materials such as texts, workbooks, curricular materials, and other publications about one's teaching;
8. Application or development of instructional technology to support student learning;
9. Honors or awards relating to teaching/advising/mentoring.

D. Service

All faculty members are expected to engage in service activities, but only modest institutional service should be expected of probationary faculty. The evaluation of a candidate's service is based on consideration of:

1. Discipline-related service, which includes both service to the profession and outreach to the local, state, national, or international community based on one's academic expertise, in ways that impact organizations, institutions and professional practices. Such service activities include those that enhance professional practice in community schools and mental health agencies, business and industrial organizations, early childhood programs, or government agencies.
2. Institutional service, which includes administrative, committee, and related service to the University, College, and Department.
3. Workshops, technical assistance, or professional development activities done for external groups as part of one's university duties

Service activities that involve public engagement or are interdisciplinary or diversity-focused in character in ways consistent with the University, College, and Department mission must be recognized.

III. Probationary Faculty

- A. Annual Review of Progress of Probationary Faculty.
1. Under the *Faculty Tenure* policy the progress of probationary faculty must be reviewed annually by the tenured faculty of the Department. The basis of the review is an accomplishment file containing evidence of an individual's research, teaching, and service accomplishments for the previous calendar year. The accomplishment file should also include the individual's curriculum vitae together with any additional statements which the individual wishes to make. Individuals whose accomplishments include research, teaching, or service activities involving public engagement or have an interdisciplinary or diversity-focused character are encouraged to include a description of this work (additional information on supporting documentation appears in Sections 5 through 8 of the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*.) Annual reviews of the progress of probationary faculty are initiated in the Fall in the Department and end in the Spring semester of each year.
 2. The accomplishment file is first reviewed by a three-person synopsis committee of tenured faculty within the Department who are appointed by the Department Chair and are senior in rank to those being reviewed. Individuals being reviewed may suggest up to three faculty members for membership on the synopsis committee, but at least one member of the committee will be a faculty member not suggested by the individual. To the extent possible, one faculty member will serve continuously across the probationary years. The synopsis committee shall meet and summarize the individual's strengths and areas in need of improvement as reflected in the accomplishment file, and prepare a detailed synopsis report of that file in order to ensure a complete and accurate portrayal of the individual's work and progress. Members of the synopsis committee shall be guided in their judgments by the standards for accomplishment outlined in sections A, B, C, and D of **Part II** of this document, and by the Department expectations for the individual. The synopsis committee is also charged with actively mentoring the individual through the review process, which typically includes conferring with the individual and recommending modifications in the accomplishment file when appropriate.
 3. The synopsis report and all related documents, including a description of the synopsis committee procedures, shall be brought in writing to the Department Chair. The Department Chair does not approve or edit the committee's final synopsis report, but the Chair may review drafts of the report to ensure adequate coverage of important content related to the individual's work. Individuals being reviewed may examine the synopsis prepared by the synopsis committee and suggest changes of a factual nature.
 4. A meeting of Department faculty to review an individual's accomplishments and the report of the synopsis committee shall be scheduled by the Department Chair. Faculty senior in rank to the candidate will meet to review the synopsis report and general qualifications of the individual and to vote on whatever matter is to be decided. Written notice of the agenda, a roster of faculty eligible to vote, and time and place of the meeting shall be distributed at least three weeks in advance to all Department faculty eligible to

vote, and shall include notice of the location of the individual's accomplishment file to be reviewed by voting faculty prior to the meeting. In order to vote, faculty must sign off that they have reviewed the accomplishment file prior to the meeting. After reviewing the individual's accomplishments and the synopsis committee report, eligible faculty will vote on the continuation of a faculty member's probationary status. The faculty vote on the continuation of an individual's probationary status is advisory to the faculty and Chair, and will be used to guide the Department's recommendation for an individual's probationary status.

5. All eligible faculty are expected to attend the review and voting session of the Department unless they have submitted a written request justifying their absence. Faculty members eligible to vote, including those on leaves or on phased retirement, who are absent from campus shall receive notice of the meeting and are expected to participate and vote by absentee ballot, for they will have electronic access to full information on the individual. Absentee ballots should be submitted to the Department Chair in a sealed envelope prior to the Department meeting at which the vote will be taken or done electronically during the time of the voting. Absentee ballots received after the Departmental vote shall not be valid. Proxy votes or telephone votes are not permitted. Absentee faculty who wish to comment about their votes shall put their comments in writing and may request that these comments be read following the synopsis committee report at the Department meeting. Valid absentee ballots shall be combined with ballots of those present at the meeting. When using the electronic voting system, vote.umn.edu, the system will be available for voting towards the end of the meeting so a vote can be called during the meeting. The voting system will be left open for 12-24 hours after the meeting to accommodate those who were excused from attending. The Chair shall retain information about all ballots cast (either physical documents or electronic summaries of who voted and aggregate vote tallies), together with any written statements from faculty and shall make the vote and statements available for examination by the individual being reviewed, or any voting member of the faculty upon written request.
 6. In accordance with the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*, the Department Chair will prepare the appraisal section of the President's Form 12 and submit this form to the Dean. The Department Chair will also schedule a meeting with each probationary faculty member before the end of the Spring semester to discuss the appraisal.
- B. Annual Merit Review of Probationary Faculty

Annual merit reviews for probationary faculty will be based on the following process:

1. Probationary faculty will submit a completed accomplishment form (e.g., WORKS; works.umn.edu), detailing their activities for the previous year.
2. An individual's accomplishment form and the synopsis committee's report will be reviewed by the Department Chair and a Departmental Faculty and P&A Development & Recognition Committee (Faculty and P&A Development & Recognition Committee),

which will consist of tenured faculty recommended by faculty in each program area. However, membership on Faculty and P&A Development & Recognition Committee is contingent on approval by the Chair. The Chair is also a member of Faculty and P&A Development & Recognition Committee.

3. The Faculty and P&A Development & Recognition Committee will recommend to the Department Chair a rating of each faculty member based on accomplishments in research, teaching, and service for the year under review. The Faculty and P&A Development & Recognition Committee ratings will be used by the Chair to make salary recommendations to the Dean.
4. The Chair will provide opportunities for probationary faculty who wish to meet to discuss the salary recommendations.

C. Extending the Probationary Period

Section 5 of *Faculty Tenure* states that the maximum period of probationary service is six academic years. However, probationary faculty have the right to request the tenure clock be stopped in certain circumstances (e.g., childbirth/adoption, caregiver responsibilities, and personal injury or illness). When considering the work of probationary faculty who have stopped the tenure clock, criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than the criteria for those who do not have an extension to the tenure clock. Specifically, “time in position” and “time since degree” should be considered as *not* including time when the tenure clock has been stopped. Readers should consult section 5.5 of *Faculty Tenure* for details (See Appendix A).

D. Probationary Faculty Seeking Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The Department affirms that probationary faculty may initiate review for tenure and promotion to associate professor prior to the end of the probationary period for themselves (i.e., a candidate may ask for an early review for tenure and promotion), based solely on performance and accomplishments as detailed in this document. The Department Chair will inform probationary faculty members of their options for full review in the Spring of each year. Individuals interested in initiating full review will submit a brief written request and updated curriculum vitae to all tenured faculty for consideration. A simple majority of tenured faculty voting is needed to initiate this full review.

Tenure and promotion to associate professor decisions will adhere to the following process as well as to those described in Section 9 of the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*:

1. Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor must develop an accomplishment file whose structure and contents should be guided by their synopsis committee and the Department Chair. Relevant information to be considered in tenure and promotion to associate professor decisions should include, but is not limited to, the following:

- a. Evidence of a candidate's research accomplishments.
 - b. Evaluations of the candidate's research by persons inside and outside of the University.
 - c. Evaluations of the candidate's teaching accomplishments.
 - d. Evaluations of the candidate's service accomplishments.
 - e. Copies of the candidate's synopsis report for all previous years.
 - f. The candidate's curriculum vitae.
 - g. Material supplied by the candidate in elaboration of their performance, which shall be identified as such, for example, sample publications focused on their work since coming to the University. Candidates whose accomplishments include research, teaching, or service that involves public engagement or has an interdisciplinary or diversity-focused character should include a description of this work in a statement in their accomplishment file.
2. Candidates seeking tenure and promotion to associate professor must, as described in ***Faculty Tenure***, have their accomplishments evaluated by appropriate colleagues outside the University. Specific practices for identifying appropriate external reviewers are as follows: A total of 5-10 potential external reviewers will be identified by members of the synopsis committee in consultation with the candidate and other faculty within the Department senior in rank to the candidate. The Chair then will contact potential reviewers to identify ones willing to review the candidate within the timeline. External reviewers will be asked to review a candidate's work using guidelines developed by the Department Chair. A minimum of five external reviews of a candidate's work is needed. Additional letters from colleagues within the University are not required but may be sought by the candidate or the synopsis committee. The relationship, if any, between a candidate and internal or external reviewers should be described in any correspondence involving the reviews. See the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*, Section 12 for Requirements about the relationship between the candidate and the external reviewers.
 3. A meeting of Department faculty to review a candidate's accomplishments and the report of the synopsis committee shall be scheduled by the Department Chair. Tenured faculty senior in rank to the candidate will meet to review the synopsis report and general qualifications of the candidate and to vote on whatever matter is to be decided. Written notice of the agenda, a roster of faculty eligible to vote, and time and place of the meeting shall be distributed at least three weeks in advance to all Department faculty eligible to vote, and shall include notice of the location of the candidate's accomplishment file to be reviewed by voting faculty prior to the meeting. At the meeting, the candidate's accomplishments and the synopsis committee report will be reviewed, followed by eligible faculty voting on the awarding of tenure and promotion to associate professor.

4. All eligible faculty are expected to attend the review and voting session of the Department unless they have submitted a written statement justifying their absence. Faculty members eligible to vote who are absent from campus shall receive notice of the meeting and are expected to vote insofar as the files are available electronically for viewing. Faculty who will be absent from the meeting shall submit a written absentee ballot, which should be sent to the Department Chair in a sealed envelope prior to the meeting at which the vote will be taken, or they can vote electronically during the time the polling is available. Proxy votes or telephone votes are not permitted. Absentee faculty who wish to comment about their votes shall put their comments in writing and may request that these comments be read following the synopsis committee report at the Department meeting. Absentee ballots received after the Departmental vote closes shall not be valid. The Chair shall retain all ballots cast, either written ballots or electronic summaries of those voting and vote totals, together with any written statements from faculty, and shall make the vote and statements available for examination by the candidate, or any voting member of the faculty upon written request.
5. All votes will be by secret ballot. Two faculty members designated by but not including the Chair shall work with staff monitoring the electronic voting to determine when all ballots have been cast. All faculty members voting in a particular case will be requested, immediately after voting, to write statements that may be used in interpreting the decision to the individual involved. Individual faculty members may also file signed statements concerning their votes about the probationary faculty member within a period of not less than three (3) days following any particular vote in which they were a participant. These statements shall be made available, upon request, to the candidate under review. Once the vote closes, the results will be shared with voting members present at the meeting. They must not share the results of the vote with the candidate until after the Chair has the opportunity to share the results of the vote with the candidate. Abstentions are highly discouraged, for as the process goes to college and Central review, they may be viewed as representing “No” votes by faculty unwilling to make difficult choices about their colleagues.
6. For decisions on tenure and promotion to associate professor a 2/3 majority of those voting constitutes a faculty recommendation.
7. The Chair of the Department shall submit to the Dean, or other appropriate academic officer a letter which shall include: (a) a statement of the votes cast for each recommendation, including the number of positive votes, the number present who abstained and the number of those entitled to vote who did not because of absence; (b) a Departmental recommendation based upon a 2/3 majority among those who voted for tenure; (c) a statement of grounds upon which the majority view and recommendation rest; (d) a statement of any minority view that has substantial support, with the grounds upon which it rests; and (e) a statement whether the Chair agrees with the majority position and, if not, why not. Faculty who voted may review the Chair’s letter upon request.

IV. Promotion to Professor

Evaluations related to promotion to Professor are based on section 9.2 of *Faculty Tenure (Appendix D)*.

1. Achieving the rank of Professor is an expectation of faculty. In addition to criteria used for an Associate Professor appointment, promotion to Professor requires that the candidate has added substantially to an already distinguished record of academic achievement and established the national or international reputation ordinarily resulting from such distinction and achievement. It is also expected that the candidate will have distinguished themselves in their teaching and service to the University, College, and the Department. Research, teaching, and service activities that involve public engagement or are interdisciplinary or diversity-focused in character in ways consistent with the University, College, and Department mission will be recognized.
2. Decisions concerning promotion to Professor will adhere to the same general process described in **Part III** numbers 1-5. Evidence supporting promotion to Professor would typically include, but not be limited to:
 - a. Scholarly work with important implications for the discipline.
 - b. Participation on, or leadership of, prestigious state, national, or international panels, advisory boards, task forces, symposia, presentations, etc.; invited scholarly lectures; scholarly awards for excellence in the discipline, editorship of a prestigious journal.
 - c. Documentation of teaching excellence, for example, student course evaluations, student letters, letters documenting peer evaluations of a candidate's teaching; teaching awards; student advising.
 - d. Significant record of institutional service which includes administrative, committee, and related service to the University, College, and Department, or disciplinary service as described above.
3. For decisions on promotion to Professor a vote of support from a simple majority of faculty eligible to vote will constitute a faculty recommendation.
4. As part of the process of moving toward promotion to full professor, each associate professor will be reviewed during their 4th year in rank and every 4th year thereafter until promoted to full professor. These reviews are intended to be primarily formative, helping associate professors know where they are with respect to promotion, and what they will need to do to be considered for full professor. Although these reviews do not have any direct negative impacts, they may point to shortcomings that need to be addressed to keep the associate professor on track toward success.

V. Annual Review of Tenured Faculty

V.1 Goals and Expectations

Tenured faculty members in the Department of Educational Psychology are expected to continue to be recognized and remain prominent within their domain of research and continue to produce a body of research that is scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance. Satisfactory scholarship is understood as involvement in a programmatic line of research, regular publication of peer-reviewed works, and presentations at scholarly conferences.

Tenured faculty members are also expected to remain effective teachers and to be actively engaged in the communication of knowledge and the supervision, mentoring, and advising of students. Tenured faculty are expected to meet CEHD workload expectations and will offer well-constructed and clearly presented courses based on current scholarship. They will be accessible to students and will advise students on a regular basis.

Tenured faculty members are also expected to participate in advancing the interests of the Department, the College of Education and Human Development, and the University of Minnesota for the benefit of the institution, the profession, and the community. Tenured faculty are expected to engage regularly in professional service at a regional, national, or international level through activities such as editorial service for professional journals, grant reviewing, and service in professional associations. They are expected to attend and participate in regular and special department faculty meetings and especially those dealing with annual review of assistant professors, 4th year review of associate professors, post-tenure review, promotion and tenure, and decisions on tenure/tenure track faculty positions, and to serve effectively on various committees as elected or appointed.

During the annual review process, tenured faculty are evaluated on whether they meet the following minimum performance standards. They must:

- Engage in professional behaviors consistent with the University [Code of Conduct](#),
- Have at least 1 peer review publication and 1 peer reviewed presentation per year averaged over 3 years
- Teach at least 1 course per year unless on approved leaves/appointments. For courses taught, consistently attends and leads assigned courses consistent with course/program guidelines and department averages if SRTs are available,
- Actively advise and mentor MA or PhD students as appropriate in program,
- Participate on at least 1 department committee or represent the department on a college committee, and
- Participate in annual review and P&T processes.

V.2 Annual Review Procedures

The Department complies with **Section 7a.2 of Faculty Tenure** (See Appendix E) which requires that the performance of tenured faculty be evaluated annually. The evaluation of tenured faculty is also used by the Department Chair to make salary recommendations to the Dean. The following procedure will govern these annual reviews:

- a. Annual reviews of tenured faculty will occur in the spring semester of each year.

- b. Faculty will submit a report (e.g., via WORKS; <http://academic.umn.edu/provost/works> or other CEHD-required reporting system), detailing their activities for the previous year.
- c. Accomplishments will be reviewed by the Department Chair and a Departmental Annual Faculty Review Committee (Faculty and P&A Development & Recognition Committee), which will consist of tenured faculty recommended by faculty in each program area. However, membership on Faculty and P&A Development & Recognition Committee is contingent on approval by the Chair. The Chair is also a member of Faculty and P&A Development & Recognition Committee.
- d. The Faculty and P&A Development & Recognition Committee will recommend to the Department Chair a rating of faculty based on faculty accomplishments in research, teaching, and service for the year under review. The Faculty and P&A Development & Recognition Committee ratings will be used by the Chair to make salary recommendations to the Dean.
- e. The Chair will provide opportunities for faculty who wish to meet to discuss the review of the faculty member's accomplishments and salary recommendation.

V. 3 Post-tenure Review

If during the annual review of the tenured faculty by the Faculty and P&A Development & Recognition Committee, the Department Chair (also referred to below as unit head) finds a “faculty member’s performance falls substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit” (Procedures¹) in any aspect of their performance, she or he will inform the faculty member of his or her judgment and refer the case to the Post Tenure Review Committee (also referred to below as the elected committee and as the PTRC). It is expected that the Chair will consult with the faculty member’s Program Coordinator when making this judgment. See Section 7a.3 of the Regents (Appendix F).

- a. “If the unit head and the elected PTRC *independently* agree that the faculty member has fallen substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit, they must put this judgment in writing for the faculty member. The letter must include suggestions for improvement to meet the goals and expectations and establish a time period for improvement of at least one year from the date of the letter. The time period for improvement cannot end at the next annual review if that review is less than one year from the date of the letter. The letter from the unit head and the elected committee must identify the ending date for the period of performance improvement and must request that the faculty member provide a report at that time describing their progress towards meeting the goals and expectations of the unit. The unit head and the committee chair should make reasonable efforts to meet with the faculty member to discuss the plan for meeting the goals and expectations of the unit. The faculty member may request modification of the plan from the unit head and the committee....” (Procedures).
- b. “At the end of the time period specified for performance improvement, the faculty member under review must provide a report describing his or her progress toward meeting the goals and expectations of the unit. The unit head and the elected committee of tenured faculty will then independently review the progress that the faculty member has made regarding the recommendations as specified in the report from the faculty member. If the unit head and elected committee of tenured faculty agree that the faculty member now meets the goals and expectations of the unit, the faculty member returns to the usual process for annual review. If the unit head and the elected committee of tenured faculty agree that the faculty member still falls substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit after the time period specified for performance improvement” (Procedures), “the unit head and the elected committee of tenured faculty {will} jointly request the dean...to initiate a special peer review of that faculty member pursuant to subsection 7a.3 of *Faculty Tenure*.” (Procedures). “If the unit head and the elected committee do not agree, the faculty member returns to the usual process for annual review.” (Procedures).

1

Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty (<https://policy.umn.edu/hr/tenure-proc01>).

Appendix A: Section 5.5 Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure

5.5 Extension Of Maximum Probationary Period For New Parent Or Caregiver, Or For Personal Medical Reasons. Upon the written request of a probationary faculty member, the maximum period of that faculty member's probationary service will be extended by one year at a time for each request:

(a) On the occasion of the birth of the faculty member's child or placement of an adoptive/foster child with the faculty member. Such a request for extension will be granted automatically if the faculty member notifies the unit head, dean, and executive vice president and provost in writing that the faculty member is eligible for an extension under subsection 5.5 because of the birth or adoption/foster placement; or

(b) If the faculty member is a major caregiver for a family member with an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition and the executive vice president and provost determines that the circumstances have had or are likely to have a substantial negative impact on the faculty member's ability to work over an extended period of time;

(c) If the faculty member has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition, and the executive vice president and provost determines that the circumstances have had or are likely to have a substantial negative impact on the faculty member's ability to work over an extended period of time. If the faculty member's illness, injury, or debilitating condition reduces the faculty member's ability to work to less than two-thirds time during the faculty member's contract year [i.e., the academic year or twelve months], the probationary period is automatically extended by one year in accordance with subsection 5.3.

"Family member" means a faculty member's spouse or domestic partner, child, or other relative. "Child" includes a biological child, an adopted or foster child, and the child of a spouse or domestic partner.

The probationary period may be extended for no more than three years total, except that the extension may be for no more than one year total for (1) an instructor with a probationary appointment under subsection 6.22 or (2) an associate professor or professor with a three-year probationary appointment under subsection 6.21.

The notification of birth or adoption/foster placement for provision (a) and the request for extension for provisions (b) and (c) in this subsection 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./

A request for an extension under provision (b) or (c) will not be denied without first providing the faculty member making the request with an opportunity to discuss the request in a meeting with an administrator designated by the executive vice president and provost. A claim that a request for an extension under provision (b) or (c) was improperly denied may be considered in any subsequent review by the Senate Judicial Committee of a termination under subsection 7.7.

Appendix B: Section 7.11 of Regents' Policy on Faculty Tenure

7.11 General Criteria. (Personnel Decisions Concerning Probationary Faculty)

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.

Appendix C: Section 7.12 from Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure

7.12 Departmental Statement 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); (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"); and (3) the goals and expectations to be used in evaluating faculty members' performance under subsection 7a ("Review of the Performance of Faculty Members"). The document must contain 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 executive vice president 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.

Interpretation of Section 7.12 in Regents Policy

Review of Departmental Statements.

The faculty of an academic unit are expected to periodically review their criteria for awarding indefinite tenure and for promotion in rank and reflect any new criteria in a revision of their subsection 7.12 Statement. The new criteria and subsection 7.12 Statement must be adopted in accordance the established procedures of the University, after consultation as required by those procedures. Current probationary faculty in the unit may elect to be evaluated on the criteria for tenure and promotion in the previous subsection 7.12 Statement or on the new criteria. This option is also available to current tenured faculty in their evaluation for promotion to the next level. Probationary or tenured faculty must make this decision within one year of the date of administrative approval of the new criteria.

Appendix D: Section 9.2 from Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure

9.2 Criteria for Promotion to Professor. The basis for promotion to the rank of professor is the determination that each candidate has (1) demonstrated the intellectual distinction and academic integrity expected of all faculty members, (2) added substantially to an already distinguished record of academic achievement, and (3) established the national or international reputation (or both) ordinarily resulting from such distinction and achievement [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.

Appendix E: Section 7a.2 from Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure

7a.2. Annual Review [of Tenured Faculty]. Each academic unit, through its merit review process (established in accordance with the standards adopted by the senate), annually reviews with each faculty member the performance of that faculty member in light of the goals and expectations of the academic unit established under subsection 7a.1. This review is used for salary adjustment and faculty development. The faculty member will be advised of the evaluation and, if appropriate, of any steps that should be taken to improve performance and will be provided assistance in that effort. If the head of the unit and a peer merit review committee elected for annual merit review within that unit both find a faculty member's performance to be substantially below the goals and expectations adopted by that unit, they shall advise the faculty member in writing, including suggestions for improving performance, and establish a time period (of at least one year) within which improvement should be demonstrated.

Appendix F: Section 7a.3 from Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure

7a.3. Special Peer Review In Cases Of Alleged Substandard Performance By Tenured Faculty.

If, at the end of the time period for improvement described in the previous paragraph, a tenured faculty member's performance continues to be substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit and there has not been a sufficient improvement of performance, the head of the academic unit and the elected peer merit review committee may jointly request the dean to initiate a special peer review of that faculty member. Before doing so, the dean shall independently review the file to determine that special peer review is warranted. (in the case of an academic unit that is also a collegiate unit, the request shall be made to and the review conducted by the responsible senior academic administrator.) The special peer review shall be conducted by a panel of five tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank, selected to review that individual. The faculty member under review shall have the option to appoint one member. The remaining members shall be elected by secret ballot by the tenured faculty of the unit. The members of the special review panel need not be members of the academic unit. The special review panel shall provide adequate opportunity for the faculty member to participate in the review process and shall consider alternative measures that would assist the faculty member to improve performance. The tenure subcommittee may adopt rules and procedures regulating the conduct of such reviews. The special review panel shall prepare a report on the teaching, scholarship, service, governance, and (when appropriate) outreach performance of the faculty member. It will also identify any supporting service or accommodation that the University should provide to enable the faculty member to improve performance. Depending on its findings, the panel may recommend:

- (a) that the performance is adequate to meet standards and that the review be concluded;
- (b) that the allocation of the faculty member's expected effort among the teaching, research, service and governance functions of the unit be altered in light of the faculty member's strengths and interests so as to maximize the faculty member's contribution to the mission of the University;
- (c) that the faculty member undertake specified steps to improve performance, subject only to future regular annual reviews as provided in subsection 7a.2;
- (d) that the faculty member undertake specified steps to improve performance subject to a subsequent special review under subsection 7a.3, to be conducted at a specified future time;
- (e) that the faculty member's performance is so inadequate as to justify limited reductions of salary, as provided in subsection 7a.4;
- (f) that the faculty member's performance is so inadequate that the dean should commence formal proceedings for termination or involuntary leave of absence as provided in sections 10 and 14; or
- (g) some combination of these measures.

The panel will send its report to the dean, the head of the academic unit, and the faculty member. Within 30 work days of receiving the report, the faculty member may appeal to the Judicial Committee, which shall review the report in a manner analogous to the review of tenure decisions (see subsection 7.7).