

Revised January 2020

Revision Approved by Faculty, 2.12.07

Approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost, June 24, 2021

GUIDELINES FOR DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SOCIAL SCIENCE AS REQUIRED BY SECTION 7.12 OF REGENTS POLICY ON FACULTY

TENURE

1. Introductory Material

A. Overview: This document describes the indices and standards that will be used to evaluate whether candidates meet the criteria in Sections 7.11 and 9.2 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*. After introductory material on the College and Department's missions and values, the document contains policies for awarding indefinite tenure, for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor, procedures for annual reviews of probationary faculty, the application process for tenure and promotion, and procedures for post tenure review.

B. College Statements of Mission and Values

College Mission Statement

The mission of the University of Minnesota College of Education and Human Development is to contribute to a just and sustainable future through engagement with the local and global communities to enhance human learning and development at all stages of the life span.

College Values Statement to Guide Unit 7.12 Statements

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.

The College recognizes and values the diversity of missions, disciplines, and faculty expertise represented in the departments of 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 departments 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.

Faculty at our land grant University are expected to contribute to the public good through their work. CEHD promotion criteria as reflected in each departmental 7.12 statement should address how faculty work that involves models for public engagement and multicultural and interdisciplinary initiatives will be documented so that excellence in these areas is considered in the context of promotion and tenure.

C. Family Social Science Statement of Mission, Vision, and Values

Our *mission* is to enhance the well-being of diverse families in a changing world through teaching, research, and outreach.

Our *vision* is to be an international leader in undergraduate, graduate, and extension education; in discovery and application of knowledge; and in innovative engagement with communities.

Our *core values* are collaboration, excellence, diversity, inclusiveness, innovation, and social relevance.

II. Policy on Awarding Indefinite Tenure

This section begins with the Department's new framework for understanding faculty work. The next section contains the evaluation criteria for awarding tenure, beginning with the University's 7.11 statement, followed by the Department's specification of the evaluation criteria in the 7.11 statement and forms of documentation for meeting the evaluation criteria.

A. Framework for Understanding Faculty Work

In this document, we put high quality faculty work that contributes to the public good on par with traditional forms of disciplinary scholarship as the basis for awarding tenure. In the traditional typology of faculty work—teaching, research, and service—*teaching* (see Key Definitions) and *research* (see Key Definitions) are seen as core

faculty contributions that lend themselves to high standards and rigorous evaluation. Service is framed as a worthy volunteer activity that may round out a tenure portfolio but cannot serve as a basis for awarding a lifetime academic position. This document transcends this conceptual bind with a typology that integrates teaching, research, and service into three categories: **disciplinary work**, **outreach work**, and **engagement work**. It also articulates standards of excellence that apply with equal weight across these types of faculty work.

Faculty work can be categorized into disciplinary work, outreach work, and engagement work, each of which involves teaching, research, and service, and each of which can serve as the basis for tenure when meeting the evaluation criteria described in Section II. B. of this document. Disciplinary, outreach, and engagement work with minoritized communities is highly valued.

Disciplinary work is the faculty work of teaching and advising students within the academy, service to the profession and the academic community, theory building, and basic and applied research that contributes to knowledge about families.

Outreach work is research, teaching, and service that involves faculty working with members of the public and with community professionals. Outreach work responds to concerns of stakeholders outside of academia and feeds results back to these stakeholders and other groups, enriching local and broader communities. Outreach teaching responds to the educational needs of families or other stakeholders outside of academia and may occur off-campus in non-credit workshops or other teaching venues such as distance education. Outreach service involves faculty bringing their expertise to families or other stakeholders in forms such as media work, speaking and consulting to community organizations, board leadership positions, and testifying at legislative hearings.

Engagement work combines research, teaching, and service in projects that involve families or other community stakeholders as **co-creators and collaborators**, generally with the goal of developing useful knowledge for innovations in community practices, public policies, or social or economic change. Engagement work may involve a combination of activities included in disciplinary work and outreach work, plus other activities, but adds the dimension of the —cycle of scholarship in which research, teaching, and service complement and mutually inform one another in a planful way.

For faculty whose job descriptions emphasize engagement or whose scholarly interests and motivations align with this kind of work, this tenure document grants them acknowledgement and rewards consistent with the quality of their

accomplishments. There is no value judgment that any of these areas of faculty work is better than another; each is worthy of consideration for tenure and promotion when meeting evaluation criteria for excellence.

This document does not mandate that any faculty member engage in outreach or engagement work. A faculty member could receive tenure based on teaching, research, and service exclusively in the disciplinary domain.

B. Evaluation Criteria for Tenure

Section 7.11 from the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*

What the University of Minnesota seeks above all in its faculty members is intellectual distinction and academic integrity. The basis for awarding indefinite tenure to the candidates possessing these qualities is the determination that each has established and is likely to continue to develop a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national or international reputation or both. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service. (The persons responsible and the process for making this determination are described in subsections 7.3 through 7.6.) The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision. 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.

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.

Key Definitions

[1] "Academic achievement" includes teaching as well as scholarly research and other creative work.

[2] "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. Scholarship focused on or completed in partnership with a minoritized group is valued as is dissemination in both mainstream and specialized journals and other outlets.

[3] "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.

[4] "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. Consistent with the University's mission, teaching is the sharing of "knowledge, understanding, and creativity by providing a broad range of educational programs in a strong and diverse community of learners and teachers, and prepare graduate, professional, and undergraduate students, as well as non-degree seeking students interested in continuing education and lifelong learning, for active roles in a multiracial and multicultural world."

[5] "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. Service that advances the equity and diversity goals of the university is valued.

All faculty members are expected to engage in service activities, but only modest institutional service should be expected of probationary faculty.

Department Criteria

In keeping with the 7.11 statement and the mission and values of the College and the Department, the Department of Family Social Science above all seeks intellectual distinction and academic integrity in its faculty members. The Department applies the following essential evaluation criteria in tenure decisions. Section II.C of this document specifies ways a candidate can demonstrate the meeting of these criteria based on the values and emphases of the Department and the College. Not

every candidate must show every form of documentation, but the totality of the candidate's performance and portfolio must demonstrate that these five essential criteria have been met. These criteria apply across all three types of faculty work--disciplinary, outreach, and engagement.

- Effectiveness in teaching
- Professional distinction in research
- Record of service
- Strong promise for achieving the rank of full professor
- National recognition for the candidate's work

C. Documentation of Faculty Work

In writing their tenure materials, candidates will specify the kind of work they have conducted and provide the documentation pertinent to that work. The first set of sources of documentation below (Section II.C.1.) applies to all three kinds of scholarly work. The second set (in Section II.C.2) subsumes the first and adds additional documentation for outreach and engagement work. The third set (Section II.C.3.) subsumes the first two and adds documentation specific to engagement work. Outreach work and engagement work as viewed here combine teaching, research and service, and build a systematic body of knowledge while meeting community needs. The Department acknowledges that outreach and engagement work may blur traditional distinctions between research, teaching, and service. Candidates for tenure may provide unique forms of documentation beyond those listed below. (Section VII of this document provides candidates with guidance on the specific materials to be included in their tenure and promotion portfolio.)

1. Documentation For Disciplinary, Outreach and Engagement Work

Given the 7.11 statement and the research missions of the University, the College, and the Department, faculty are expected to have significant publications that involve peer review. The candidate's publication record will be evaluated by internal and external reviewers on the standards of **originality**, **independence**, **coherence**, and **impact**.

These are general evaluative standards applied to all types of candidate work. More specific standards may apply to particular work the faculty member chooses to engage in, such as collaborative, interdisciplinary, or community engaged work.

Originality can refer to a wide range of distinctive contributions and is not restricted in meaning to working in a new area of scholarship. A work could be original because it addresses new issues or old issues in new ways. Originality could be theoretical, empirical, analytic, or methodological. It could involve new syntheses,

applications to new audiences, or something else that creates or contributes new knowledge. **Independence** refers to the demonstrated ability to make one's own significant scholarly contributions. It does not mean solo work or solo publications; interdisciplinary work, team science, and community collaborations are highly valued by the Department. However, independence does imply that one takes the lead in at least some of one's work, and that should be clearly identified in one's materials. For multi-authored publications the faculty member should provide information that outlines their contributions including, but not limited to, describing 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. In addition, the faculty member should use symbols or annotations for post-doc/student/industry/community co-authors. Provide descriptive context and avoid simply indicating a percentage effort. See [APA guidelines for more information on publication practices and responsible authorship](#).

Coherence refers to the presence of unifying themes and approaches in the candidate's work; it does not imply a focus on only one scholarly topic or method.

Impact refers to the influence, already realized or with clear potential, of the candidate's scholarly work on the field and the audiences it is intended to reach; it is not restricted to any one kind of measurement. Impact on underserved communities is highly valued.

Interdisciplinary work is valued although not required of faculty, and will be evaluated by the same standards as for all other faculty work. When faculty are engaged in collaborative, interdisciplinary, team science, or community engaged work, it is important for them to identify their role and contribution (see guidelines under independence section). In cases where the faculty member's discipline is not represented in the Family Social Science tenured faculty, or where the faculty member has a joint appointment with another department, special arrangements will be made for insuring that the promotion and tenure committee can fairly evaluate the candidate's work. Faculty with joint appointments or whose work is clearly of an interdisciplinary nature should have an MOU on file documenting how and by which criteria evaluations take place. For more information, see the University's tenure regulations. <https://policy.umn.edu/hr/tenure-proc01#IIB>

Candidates for tenure are expected to engage in a modest level of departmental and collegiate service; other kinds of service are valued but not required for probationary faculty. The following forms of documentation cover all three types of faculty work.

- a. Academic publications and presentations

- Peer-reviewed articles (empirical, conceptual, theoretical, process, etc.). See section titled “Independence” above for additional information on how to note contributions re: multi-authored publications)
 - Academic books and chapters
 - Edited special issues of journals
 - Research and Technical reports
 - Conference presentations
 - Special invited presentations
 - Other forms of academic publications and presentations
- b. Teaching
- Summary of teaching activities
 - Syllabi, curricula, program plans
 - Evaluations from students/learners/stakeholders
 - Peer evaluations
 - Student advising record
 - Evidence of multicultural perspectives in teaching
 - Participation in programs to improve one’s teaching is valued but not required
- c. Service
- Departmental service record
 - Collegiate, Extension, and University service record
 - Record of service to the academic and professional community
 - Record of professional service in local, state, national, or international communities or organizations
- d. Potential for achieving external funding. External funding from sources outside the University is desirable.
- e. National and local recognition
- Associate editor, editor, special issues editor, or editorial board memberships
 - Honors, awards
 - Leadership positions
 - Other forms of local, regional, national, international, and global recognition

2. Additional Documentation for Outreach and Engagement Work

This document distinguishes evaluation criteria (as outlined in the 7.11 document and listed under Department Criteria) from forms of documentation (the products submitted for evaluation). The same evaluation criteria apply with equal force to disciplinary, outreach, and engagement work; in other words, work that involves

community partnerships is held to the same standard as traditional disciplinary activities. This section of the document expands the types of products that faculty can use to document their work.

In addition the documentation described in section II.C, outreach and engagement work may involve additional forms of documentation, each of which will be evaluated on the criteria of originality, independence, coherence, and impact.

- Summary of sustained programs, projects, and partnerships, including details about the process and collaborative relationships involved
- Products such as videos, websites, educational manuals, software, apps or other innovations
- Popular media, with information and analytics on types of media, and consumption
- Summary of public influence such as involvement in policy development, policy changes, new laws, or changes in agency practices
- Multiple, complementary products reflecting a cycle of scholarship integrating teaching, research, and service. Example: a refereed journal article, community education materials, and media stories -- all emerging from one collaborative project.
- Summary of involvement of community stakeholders as collaborators and co-creators of projects

3. Additional Documentation for Engagement Work

Documentation sections 1, 2, and 3 build hierarchically. All three kinds of faculty work would be documented with peer reviewed journal articles. Only outreach and engagement work would be documented with evidence for shifts in organizational practices based on a joint project, or through policy proposals or policy changes. And only engagement work would be documented with project notes and written statements from community stakeholders about the level of co-creation of a project from beginning to end. In all cases, the evaluation criteria for the candidate's whole portfolio are the same. However, determining whether certain products (such as CD-ROMs and online media) meet these evaluation criteria may require efforts by tenured faculty to determine the standards of quality in unfamiliar areas and to locate peer reviewers who can evaluate these products by the best contemporary standards.

In addition, the documentation described in section II.C.1 and 2, engagement work may involve additional forms of documentation, each of which will be evaluated on the criteria of **originality**, **independence**, **coherence**, and **impact**.

III. Extending the Probationary Period

Probationary faculty have the right to extend the probationary period (i.e., stop the tenure clock) in accord with Section 5.5 of —Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*. Faculty who exercise this right will be evaluated according to the numbers of years actually on the tenure track and will not be penalized by additional expectations beyond those for faculty who did not stop the tenure clock.

IV. Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to Associate Professor is usually associated with a decision concerning tenure. Promotion to this rank follows the same process as for tenure and candidates must meet the same criteria.

V. Promotion to Professor

Achieving the rank of professor is an expectation of faculty recruited by the Department of Family Social Science. The performance expectations exceed those for promotion to associate professor.

In keeping with the University's 9.2 statement of criteria for promotion to professor, faculty candidates for professor must meet these criteria:

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. "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.

This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service. The persons responsible for this determination are the full professors in the unit who are eligible to vote. The outcome of the vote is either promotion to the rank of professor or continuation in rank as an associate professor. The procedures for voting are identical to those outlined in Section 7.4 for the granting of indefinite tenure, the nondisclosure of grounds for the decision (Section 7.5), and the review of recommendations (Section 7.6). In addition, a petition to the Judicial Committee for review of a recommendation of continuation in rank as an associate professor follows the procedures specified in Section 7.7 for decisions about promotion to associate professor and conferral of indefinite tenure.

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 equity, and inclusion, 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. Service alone cannot qualify the candidate for promotion.

The candidate's reputation will be established through the same procedures for internal and external evaluations as described in Section VII of this document.

In addition, the department expects the following accomplishments:

- Evidence of seeking, and success in securing, external funding for the candidate's disciplinary, outreach, or engagement work. External funding is considered a demonstration of the faculty member's ability to financially sustain their scholarship. Peer reviewed and/or competitive funding is highly valued because of its indication of scholarship excellence.
- Continued effectiveness in teaching (see Section II criteria for tenure), including a successful record of advising graduate students to the completion of their programs
- A strong record of service to the Department and College. Service to the University and to local, state, national, and international communities is also valued by the Department.
- Demonstrated leadership in the academic community, for example, leadership positions in professional organizations and journal editorial board membership.

In writing their promotion materials, candidates will specify the kind of work they have conducted (disciplinary, outreach, engagement) and provide the documentation pertinent to that work. As described in Section II of this document, the evaluation criteria are the same across all three types of faculty work, although the documentation materials may differ. The same evaluation principles and processes for interdisciplinary work also apply to promotion to professor.

VI. Annual Review of Probationary Faculty

In keeping with university policies and procedures, the Department of Family Social Science probationary faculty will be reviewed annually. Tenured faculty will review materials submitted by probationary faculty, meet as a group to discuss probationary faculty progress, and vote by anonymous ballot regarding contract

renewal. Results of this evaluation will be summarized by the department head and discussed with probationary faculty. The department will file President's Form 12: Appraisals of Probationary Faculty with CEHD's Human Resources Director, who forwards it to the Dean and the Provost.

1. At the beginning of a probationary, tenure-track appointment, the Department Head will review the terms of employment with the probationary faculty. This review will include the following items of discussion:
 - Making certain that credit for prior service has been granted and appropriately recorded, and that there is a common understanding about the maximum length of the probationary period.
 - Supplying the candidate with copies of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure and this Departmental document "Promotion and Tenure: Specific Criteria, Standards, and Procedures," as required by section 7.12. If the candidate is unsure about the application of the criteria, the discussion should seek to make that as clear as possible.
 - Informing the candidate about the procedures used in the department to review teaching, research and service. The candidate must be informed about the annual review process and made familiar with the annual report on Appraisals of Probationary Faculty (President's Form 12), which will be completed. The candidate must also be informed about his or her right to inspect the file and right of access to information.
 - It shall be the responsibility of the Department Head, working with the faculty member, the administrator for international programs and other appropriate administrative leaders (e.g., Extension Assistant, Principal Investigator, Team Leader), to ensure that documentation requirements for evaluation are being met for faculty members on international assignments.

The tenured faculty will have access to the files of probationary faculty at least three days prior to the annual review meeting. These files will be accessible through a secure folder on the departmental shared drive. Tenured faculty have a duty to review annually the progress of each candidate. An annual meeting of the tenured faculty to review progress will be held in mid-October each year. The Department Head will attend this meeting and will designate a faculty member to conduct it.

After the annual review meeting, the Department Head will meet with the candidate to discuss the candidate's progress toward achieving tenure. The Department Head will review data, discuss the sense and/or vote of the tenured

faculty meeting regarding the candidate, and outline any other information relied upon during the review process. The Department Head will add the completed Annual Appraisal form to the candidate's file, and include a written summary of matters discussed at this meeting. The candidate signs the UM Form 12.

VII. Procedures for Applying for Tenure and Promotion

The tenure and promotion process of this Department complies with the Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty as provided in Sections 16.3, 7.4, and 7.61 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. Questions not answerable by reference to these departmental procedures will be resolved by application of the rules and guidelines listed above.

A tenure decision can be made at any time after the first year, but must be made before the end of the probation period. A candidate does not have a right to an early tenure review and decision. The candidate may request such a review, but the Department will decide whether or not to conduct it. A formal review, however, can be initiated by the Department Head or by vote of the tenured faculty. Where such a decision is made to conduct a tenure review, the process must conform to the regular annual schedule for such reviews.

The Department will conform to the schedule for formal action on tenure decisions as set forth by the Academic Affairs office and the Dean.

1. Candidate's Portfolio

Depending on the kind of faculty work (See Section II) the candidate has done, review materials should include:

- a) Copies of a current curriculum vitae, annual activity reports, and Appraisal of Probationary Faculty forms for the current and previous years.
- b) Personal Statement
 - Three professional narratives, or three sections of one overall narrative, indicative of research, teaching, and service. These narratives should provide an overview of the faculty member's work at the University, including the terms of the original faculty appointment and any changes to that appointment, the type of faculty work done and its history, development, coherence, and contributions. These narratives should include a philosophy of faculty work, and a statement of plans for systematic scholarly work. In addition, faculty are strongly encouraged to include in these narratives how their work intersects

with and advances equity, inclusion, and diversity, as well as how community engagement is integrated into any aspect of their work.

c) Review Materials for Disciplinary Work

- Peer-reviewed articles – documented within curriculum vitae and copies delivered with portfolio
- Academic books and chapters – documented within curriculum vitae and copies delivered with portfolio
- Edited special issues of journals – documented within curriculum vitae and copies delivered with portfolio
- Research and Technical reports – documented within curriculum vitae and copies delivered with portfolio
- Conference presentations – documented within curriculum vitae
- Special invited presentations – documented within curriculum vitae
- Other forms of academic publications and presentations – documented within curriculum vitae
- Grants record – documented within curriculum vitae and provided as a summary of grant-related activities (project title, role on project, source and amount of funding requested, status, and copy of proposal)
- Journal editorial board memberships – documented within curriculum vitae
- Summary of teaching activities – constructed and provided within portfolio
 - Resident faculty should prepare a chart that includes titles of courses taught, class evaluations for each course taught, numbers of students taught for each course, when each course was taught, and teaching venues (face-to-face, distance learning, etc.)
 - Extension faculty should prepare a chart that includes organization of teaching by programmatic areas, types of audiences / students taught, total numbers of people taught, number of contacts with the same people / groups, multiple effect estimates, and teaching venues (face-to-face, distance learning, etc.)
- Syllabi, curricula, program plans – included within portfolio
- Documentation for how multicultural perspectives are included in teaching
- Evaluations from students/learners/stakeholders – included within portfolio
 - Peer evaluations of teaching – included within portfolio
 - In the context of classroom teaching, *peer* is defined as a University of Minnesota faculty member from within the

department or from another department within the University. For outreach, engagement, or Extension teaching in particular, *peer* can be a faculty member at the University of Minnesota, an Extension Specialist at another institution, an Extension Educator, or a fellow community engaged scholar. *Peer evaluation* can include a range of things, for example, observation of in class teaching or of a presentation, review of a course or program website, syllabus review, curriculum or educational material review, etc. This is not a comprehensive list. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor requires five peer evaluations. When teaching is outside the classroom in the community or part of Extension teaching, this should also be peer reviewed.

- Student advising record – listing of advisees, students' status in program, years students completed degrees, undergraduate UROPs and capstones, and post docs
- Honors, awards – documented within curriculum vitae
- Leadership positions – documented within curriculum vitae
- Other forms of local, regional, national, international, and global recognition – documented within curriculum vitae
- Departmental, Collegiate, Extension, and University citizenship record – documented within curriculum vitae
- Record of service to the academic and professional community – documented within curriculum vitae
- Record of professional service in local, state, national, or international communities or organizations – documented within curriculum vitae

d) Additional Review Materials for Outreach and Engagement Work

- Summary of sustained programs, projects, and partnerships – include within portfolio
- Products such as videos, websites, CDROMs, educational manuals, trade books may be included – include within portfolio
- Summary of local and national popular media, with information on types of media, populations reached, circulation, influence, citations – include within portfolio
- Summary of public influence, such as involvement in policy development, policy changes, new laws, or changes in agency practices – include within portfolio

e) Additional Review Materials for Engagement Work

- Summary of multiple, complementary products that demonstrate a cycle of scholarship integrating teaching, research, and service – include within portfolio
 - Summary of involvement of community stakeholders as collaborators and co-creators of projects. Evidence should include letters of support from co-creators and collaborators – include within portfolio
- f) External Reviews
- The file must include evaluations of the candidate's teaching, research, or other scholarly contributions by five leaders in the field outside the University. The department head chooses the final slate of reviewers in consultation with the candidate and the tenured faculty. External reviews must be obtained from individuals with no direct professional or personal interest in the advancement of the candidate's career.

2. Review Procedures for Tenure

- In the Spring before a candidate is to put forward their portfolio for review, the Department Head will meet with him/her to outline the process, provide guidance about the development of specific parts of the portfolio, and reiterate that the candidate should provide input regarding external reviewers.
- By late spring or early summer, the candidate should have prepared and organized materials to be forwarded to external reviewers.
- During this same time, the Department Head will consult with faculty regarding the finalization of outside reviewers and contact them to determine their willingness to complete the review in a timely manner.
- The Department Head will forward the candidate's materials to external reviewers with a cover letter outlining the University of Minnesota's tenure and promotion process.

In the fall, the file of each candidate will be made accessible to the tenured faculty and the candidate for his/her review. Eligible faculty (as defined in University Regulations, Faculty Tenure, Preamble) may submit signed statements regarding the candidate to be incorporated in the file. The candidate may supplement his/her file and/or respond or comment on anything contained in it.

- A meeting of the tenured faculty will be held. All tenured faculty are expected to participate in the meeting to be eligible to vote. Voting without participation in the meeting must be discussed with the Head in advance. Each candidate will be reviewed in the following manner:

- A discussion of the candidate will be conducted in which comments will not be identified by the contributor, but will be noted and summarized by a senior faculty member.
- Faculty will vote via a confidential online voting system. The system will open for voting during the second half of the meeting and remain open for 24 hours after the meeting. The ballot will set forth the questions to be decided, and the candidate's name.
- Each candidate will be considered and voted on separately, assuring that only eligible voting faculty (as defined in *Faculty Tenure*, Preamble and the new *Procedures* document).
- After the meeting, the vote will be tabulated by two of the voting faculty. The tally will include all previously approved absentee ballots received from eligible faculty unable to attend the meeting. Recommendations for promotion or tenure are based on simple majority of those voting on the question. The faculty will prepare a department report that captures the recommendation of the voting faculty and any dissent/concerns, if applicable.
- The Department Head will prepare a letter outlining their recommendation and will meet with the candidate to inform the candidate of both the Department's recommendation and the recommendation of the Department Head. The candidate put forward will be given the opportunity to review his/her file prior to it being forwarded to the Dean. The candidate may add a letter commenting on the department recommendation. However, materials that may require faculty evaluation and could change the faculty vote are not timely.
- The Department Head will forward the file to the Dean. The file will contain the following information: the Departmental Report, the Department Head's letter and recommendation, external evaluation letters, and statements or summarized data presented to the file by faculty or the candidate.

3. Review Procedures for Promotion to Associate Professor

The procedures for promotion to Associate Professor parallel those for consideration for tenure. Candidates must request consideration for promotion, but the Department will decide whether the promotion consideration process should be initiated. The Department Head or the tenured faculty may initiate the process.

4. Review Procedures for Promotion to Professor

The procedures for promotion to Professor parallel those for consideration for tenure. Candidates must request consideration for promotion, but the Department will decide whether the promotion consideration process should be initiated. The Department Head or current full professors may initiate the process.

VIII. Review of Tenured Faculty

The review of tenured faculty will occur annually. A special post tenure review can be invoked under circumstances when a faculty member's performance is substantially below the expectations of the Department according to Section 7a of *Faculty Tenure*.

A. Annual Review of Tenured Faculty

The Department of Family Social Science conducts an annual review (based on the calendar year) of all faculty, including tenure/tenure track and Professional and Administrative faculty. Family Social Science considers the annual review process as the important first step in post-tenure review. The review coincides with and contributes to merit evaluation and provides a full disclosure of scholarship in the previous year.

During the spring semester, faculty members receive information from the department head concerning the annual review process, the review timeline and schedule for individual meetings with the department head to discuss progress, the departmental annual review handbook outlining minimum standards and any specific items that should be highlighted (e.g., contributions to special departmental initiatives). For minimum standards, see Section VIII.C in this document. Faculty members develop materials for annual review and submit these materials with current vita to the department head. Once faculty materials are forwarded, the department head reviews materials and meets individually with each faculty member to discuss progress and future plans. After all reviews are complete, the department head prepares a written response to each faculty member summarizing his/her evaluation and suggestions for future plans. In a separate letter, the department head provides information regarding merit raises and compression, if appropriate.

Once the department head has completed the review process, s/he meets with the dean to present and discuss his/her merit/compression decisions. Final approval for merit/compression decisions rests with the dean.

B. Special Post Tenure Review

The department is required to have a special peer review in cases of alleged substandard performance by tenure faculty. The policy and procedures included here were approved by the faculty on February 12, 2008.

Spirit of the Departmental Policy

The special provisions in this policy are intended for outlier cases in which a tenured faculty member is clearly functioning far below what the department needs and expects from its faculty. Except in that extraordinary situation, the present annual faculty review system should continue with no change, with the department head's review based on each faculty member's position description, assignments, interests, and career trajectory.

Goals and Expectations Policy

Post-Tenure, faculty are expected to continue to meet expectations in all three areas of faculty life: teaching, research, and service. Section II. of this document describes the department's goals and expectations for tenured associate professors for the post-tenure review process, and Section V describes the goals and expectations for professors. See Section VIII.C. for information on minimal performance expectations for faculty.

Procedures for Reviews

1. The tenured faculty elects a committee composed of 3 full professors, with staggered terms. The initial three committee members will serve 3, 2, and 1 year terms respectively, with the terms of each member decided by lot. In subsequent elections, all terms will be for three years.
2. The department head will conduct annual post tenure reviews with each faculty member (see Section VII. A. of this document).
3. In the event that the department head believes that a faculty member's performance is substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit (as outlined below), the department head requests a review by the peer faculty review committee. If a member of the committee has been identified as performing substantially below expectations, then the other two members of the committee will conduct the case review.

4. If the peer faculty review committee, after reviewing all relevant documents and following the guidelines and procedures laid out in Section 7a of *Faculty Tenure*, concurs that the faculty member's performance is substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit, the committee joins the department head in writing a letter to the faculty member specifying the deficiencies and setting a time period (usually by the next annual review) during which the faculty member should address the identified problems. Both the department head and the committee chair sign the letter. Both the [department] head and the elected committee should work with the faculty member to improve performance during that time.

At the end of the specified time, both the department head and the elected faculty review committee should again review the performance of the faculty member. If they again find that performance is substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit, they can ask the dean to initiate special review. To do so, they should send a letter or memorandum to the dean and to the faculty member, setting out their findings, with a copy of the documents they have reviewed. Both the department head and the committee chair sign the letter.

C. Guidelines for Minimal Performance Expectations

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

1. Minimum standards for **Research** are met when a faculty member:

- has two publications per year averaged over three years, one of which is a peer-reviewed manuscript, including those currently in press.
- submits at least one external grant application every two years that the faculty member does not have a grant. If the faculty member has an external grant (as PI, Co-PI, or Co-I), this meets the minimum standards.

2. Minimum standards for **Teaching** are met when a faculty member:

- advises or co-advises at least one graduate student over a three-year period and serves on the committees of other graduate students within the program area
- teaches at an appropriate level / amount commensurate with his/her appointment and the college workload policy across a three year period.

- maintains an adequate quality of teaching which will be determined by a combination of student- and peer- evaluations and other approved forms of documentation.

3. Minimum standards for **Extension** are met when a faculty member:

- has ongoing participation averaged across three years in at least one Extension initiative within Minnesota and/or one initiative that extends beyond Minnesota (national in scope).
- has at least one Extension based publication per year averaged across three years.

4. Minimum standards for **Service** are met when a tenured faculty member (unless on leave or sabbatical):

- attends departmental faculty meetings and retreats, as well as those of relevant program faculty (e.g. undergraduate, graduate, professional) meetings unless excused
- attends meetings of departmental committees assigned
- serves on at least one collegiate or University committee within a three-year period
- participates in admissions, hiring, and promotion meetings as appropriate to rank

D. Process for annual post tenure review:

1. Tenured faculty will meet with the Department Head annually.
2. If faculty member is falling below the minimum standards, a plan to reach minimum standards will be discussed and documented in a work plan with the Department Head.
3. If the standards are not met in the following year, the Head or faculty member may request completion of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). A MOU requires the agreement of the faculty member, the Head of the unit, the Dean, and the Executive Vice President and Provost. The MOU must specify the goals and expectations of the unit for teaching, research, and service; how the faculty member's workload expectations will meet the unit goals and expectations or provide a justification for how and why they will deviate from unit goals and expectations; and the time period over which the MOU extends.
4. If the MOU is not approved, and this could happen at any level of its approval process, this will trigger an extended post tenure review as written in the Department's 7.12 policy, Section VIIIB.

APPENDIX A

7.12 Departmental Statement. [6] Each department or equivalent academic unit must have a document that specifies (1) the indices and standards that will be used to determine whether candidates meet the threshold criteria of subsection 7.11 (—General Criteria for the awarding of indefinite tenure) and (2) the indices and standards that will be used to determine whether candidates meet the threshold criteria of subsection 9.2 (—Criteria for Promotion to Professor). The document must contain as an appendix the text and footnotes of subsections 7.11 and 9.2, and must be consistent with the criteria given there but may exceed them. Each departmental statement must be approved by a faculty vote (including both tenured and probationary members), the dean, and other appropriate academic administrators, including the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The chair or head of each academic unit must provide each probationary faculty member with a copy of the Departmental Statement at the beginning of the probationary service.

Appendix B

5.5 Exception for New Parent Or Caregiver, Or for Personal Medical Reasons.

The maximum period of probationary service will be extended by one year at the request of a probationary faculty member:

1. On the occasion of the birth of that faculty member's child or adoptive/foster placement of a child with that faculty member; or
2. When the faculty member is a major caregiver for a family member [2] who has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition. A faculty member may use this provision no more than two times; or
3. When the faculty member has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition.

The request for extension must be made in writing within one year of the events giving rise to the claim and no later than June 30 preceding the year a final decision would otherwise be made on an appointment with indefinite tenure for that faculty member.