

7.12 STATEMENT OF CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES REGARDING PROMOTION AND TENURE OF FACULTY

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost April 24, 2023

Approved by the Dean March 18, 2023

Revised and Approved by Department Faculty February 6, 2023

Revised and Approved by Department Faculty October 2, 2021

Revised and Approved by Department Faculty May 7, 2018

Updated February 2017
Revised February 2008

Revised April 2020
Approved by Department Faculty March 3, 2008

Approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost
April 15, 2008

Table of Contents

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION	4
1.A. OVERVIEW OF DOCUMENT	4
1.B. COLLEGE MISSION STATEMENT	5
1.C. DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT	5
1.D. COLLEGE VALUES STATEMENT	6
1.E. SECTION 7.11 OF THE <i>REGENTS POLICY ON FACULTY TENURE</i> (STATEMENT ON TENURE)	7
1.F. SECTION 9.2 OF THE <i>REGENTS POLICY ON FACULTY TENURE</i> (STATEMENT ON PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR)	8
SECTION 2: CRITERIA FOR RECOMMENDING INDEFINITE TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	9
2.A. CRITERIA FOR TEACHING AND ADVISING	9
2.B. CRITERIA FOR SCHOLARLY INQUIRY	12
2.C. SERVICE	14
SECTION 3: EXTENDING THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD	14
SECTION 4: CRITERIA FOR RECOMMENDING PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR	14
4.A. FACULTY TENURE, SECTION 9.2.	14
4.B. DEPARTMENT STATEMENT	15
4.C. EXPECTATIONS FOR TEACHING AND ADVISING	14
4.D. EXPECTATIONS FOR SCHOLARLY INQUIRY	15
4.E. EXPECTATIONS FOR SERVICE	15
SECTION 5: DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING ANNUAL REVIEWS OF PRETENURED FACULTY AND DEVELOPING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GRANTING INDEFINITE TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION IN RANK	16
5.A. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (PC)	16
5.B. APPOINTMENT OF MENTORS	16
5.C. DOSSIER COMMITTEE (DC)	16
5.D. CHANGE IN MENTOR ASSIGNMENTS	17
5.E. INFORMING PRETENURED FACULTY ABOUT DEPARTMENTAL, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.	17
5.F. PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW OF PRETENURED FACULTY	18
5.G. PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF FACULTY FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR DOSSIER CONTENTS	21
5.H. PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE TO FULL PROFESSOR	32

SECTION 6: POST-TENURE REVIEW	37
6.A. ANNUAL REVIEW	35
6.B. ANNUAL MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT CHAIR	35
6.C. MEETING RECORD	35
6.D. PERFORMANCE ISSUES	35
APPENDIX A - CURRICULUM VITAE OUTLINE	39
APPENDIX B – EXTERNAL REVIEW LETTERS	47
APPENDIX C - SAMPLE PROMOTION & TENURE PROCESS SCHEDULE LETTER TO FACULTY	54
APPENDIX D – ANNUAL MERIT REVIEW DOCUMENTS	55
APPENDIX E – <i>REGENTS POLICY ON FACULTY TENURE</i> EXTENDING THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD PROVISION	67
APPENDIX F – <i>REGENTS POLICY ON FACULTY TENURE</i> DEPARTMENTAL STATEMENT SECTION	68

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

7.12 Statement

(Approved by Curriculum and Instruction Tenured and Tenure-track faculty March 3, 2008;
approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost April 15, 2008)

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.A. Overview of Document

The policies and guidelines indicated in this 7.12 statement of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction (from hereon referred to as “the department”) have been developed in accordance with the current *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure* and “*Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty.*” The contents of this departmental 7.12 statement will be reviewed every ten years, or more frequently if circumstances warrant more frequent review. Any changes made to the department’s 7.12 statement will be adopted in accordance with the established procedures of the university, after consultation as required by those procedures. When changes are made in the statement, current pretenured faculty in the department may elect to be evaluated on the criteria in the previous departmental 7.12 statement or on the revised 7.12 statement. This option is also available to current tenured faculty in their evaluation for promotion to the next level. Pretenured and tenured faculty must notify the department chair in writing of their decision within one year of the date of administrative approval of the new criteria.

This document describes criteria, processes, and procedures for the following personnel processes and actions:

- Annual performance appraisal of progress toward achieving tenure.
- Recommendation for awarding indefinite tenure according to the current *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*, section 7.11, General Criteria.
- Recommendation for promotion to associate professor parallel to that for awarding indefinite tenure.
- Annual performance appraisal for post tenure review according to section 7a.1 and 7a.2 of *Faculty Tenure*.
- Recommendation for promotion to full professor according to section 9.2 of *Faculty Tenure*.

This document also has been developed to reflect the priorities indicated in the mission and values statements of the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD).

Changes in these policies and materials. Policies outlined in the introduction and in sections 2 through 7 may be changed as follows. An individual or group (including the Personnel Committee or the department chair) may propose changes in writing to the department chair or the Personnel Committee (PC). All proposed changes will be reviewed by the PC, who will consult with the department chair. If the PC's conclusion is that the proposed change is of value and is not disallowed by college and university policy, the PC will notify the proposer and the department chair in writing of this conclusion and the rationale for it, and bring the proposed change to the tenured and tenure track faculty for a vote. A simple majority vote in favor of the change is needed for approval. If the change is approved by the department faculty, then it will be forwarded to the college and the Executive Vice President and Provost for approval. If the PC does not concur with the proposed change, the committee will notify the proposer and the department chair in writing of this conclusion and the reasons for it.

Changes in all other sections of the document can be proposed using the procedures noted above. Please, note that with respect to Appendix A CEHD Guidelines require use of the standardized University of Minnesota CV template generated in [Works](#) or the [Master Curriculum Vitae for Promotion and Tenure](#). Changes in Appendix D must be forwarded to the college but do not require the approval of the Executive Vice President and Provost. Materials in Appendix B and C are simply examples. They are intended as guides to the department chair and Personnel Committee in carrying out their responsibilities and are not policies that require approval by the faculty, college, or Executive Vice President and Provost to modify them as needed and appropriate. Appendix E and F are excerpts from *Faculty Tenure* (sections 5.5 and 7.12) and will be updated as needed to reflect any changes made at the university level in these sections of *Faculty Tenure*.

1.B. 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.

1. C. Department Mission and Values Statements

Mission Statement

We are committed to fostering educational practices that lead to a more democratic and just society by:

- Researching and engaging effective ways to teach and learn,
- preparing our students to become leaders and collaborators who understand the social, cultural, linguistic, political, and technological factors that influence teaching, learning, and research,
- partnering with schools and communities to support the engagement and preparedness of all learners.

Values Statement

The Department of Curriculum and Instruction is committed to promoting social justice and dismantling racial, socioeconomic, gender and language injustices in education. We actively work to eliminate barriers and obstacles created by institutional discrimination. We are committed to developing future teachers, practitioners, technologists and researchers who are equipped to identify and challenge systems and structures of racism and oppression in their fields, locally, and globally.

1. D. College Values Statement

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

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

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

The College affirms the crucial role played by faculty within the unit to ensure that their decisions about promotion and tenure are decisions that will be validated by judgments at the College and University levels. Units are encouraged to prepare 7.12 statements that articulate unit priorities in the context of the College's mission statement: "*The 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.*"

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 public engagement and multicultural and multidisciplinary initiative can be documented so that excellence in these areas is considered in the context of promotion and tenure.

1.E. Section 7.11 of the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure* (Statement on Tenure)

General Criteria. What the University of Minnesota seeks above all in its faculty members is intellectual distinction and academic integrity. The basis for awarding indefinite tenure to the candidates possessing these qualities is the determination that each 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 issues 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.

[FN2] "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.

[FN3] 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.

[FN4] 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.

1.F. Section 9.2 of the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure* (Statement on Promotion to Professor)

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 [FN7]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [FN8]. 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.

[FN7] "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.

[FN8] 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. See the definitions of "scholarly research," "other creative work," "teaching," and "service" in footnote [3] in the previous section. A greater contribution in the area of institutional service is expected of candidates for the rank of professor than was expected for the award of tenure.

SECTION 2: CRITERIA FOR RECOMMENDING INDEFINITE TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The following criteria shall be used in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction to facilitate collegial review of faculty accomplishments leading to the development of recommendations concerning the granting of indefinite tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (see *Faculty Tenure*, section 6.3). The criteria herein detailed for the department are consistent with and

complementary to existing policies of the University of Minnesota as described in section 7.11 of the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*. In formulating these guidelines, the commitment of the University of Minnesota to the central importance of research and teaching in organizing and evaluating faculty productivity is recognized. Also recognized is the value and importance of external service and outreach to the fulfillment of the university's land-grant mission, the college mission, and the department mission.

The granting of tenure requires faculty members to make significant contributions in the areas of Teaching and Advising, Scholarly Inquiry, and Service with attention to issues of diversity (including challenging racial, socioeconomic, gender, and language injustices in education). The overarching expectation is that the faculty member is making a significant contribution to their field(s) and is on the way to developing a national and/or international reputation. The criteria for performance in each of the required areas are described below.

2.A. Criteria for Teaching and Advising

2.A.1 Definition. From Section 7.11 of the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*, “‘Teaching’” is not limited to classroom instruction. It includes other forms of communicating knowledge to both registered University students and persons in the extended community as well as supervising, mentoring, and advising students.”

2.A.2. Department statement on teaching. As faculty members in a Department of Curriculum and Instruction, we value teaching as essential in providing students with opportunities to learn and in modeling the instructional practices we are promoting, whether undergraduate or graduate, credit or noncredit teaching. Teaching may also take the form of team teaching, interdisciplinary teaching, multicultural teaching, publicly engaged teaching, or service learning. Interdisciplinary teaching may involve developing and/or teaching interdisciplinary courses and programs that facilitate students' learning in areas that cannot be adequately understood from a single disciplinary perspective. Interdisciplinary teaching may involve, for example, team-taught courses or other instructional configurations that support students' understanding of how a given subject may appear differently when examined by different disciplines, focus on the theory of interdisciplinarity itself, engage students in critique of epistemological assumptions and structures associated with institutionalized disciplines, expose students to multiple disciplines in order to deepen and broaden students' understanding of a problem or area, develop their appreciation of differing perspectives and approaches, or develop interdisciplinarity as a habit of mind.

2.A.3. Criteria and evidence for teaching. The department perceives effective teaching in terms of:

- Student learning.
- Deep knowledge and understanding of the faculty member regarding his or her area(s) of expertise.

- Respect for diversity so that university students of varied backgrounds and abilities are well served and student diversity is viewed as a resource and benefit to all members of the group.
- Commitment to diversity within P-16 schools, other institutions, and the greater community as reflected in the CEHD and departmental mission and values statements.
- Ability to clearly present material in an engaging manner, facilitate discussions in which students can express their opinions and ideas, and employ teaching approaches that involve students in active learning either in class or online.
- Degree to which significant historical and current research and theoretical frameworks are incorporated into the course content.
- Ability to organize courses, formulate goals, devise syllabi, design assignments relevant to goals and student ability level, and provide meaningful feedback, and, when appropriate, doing so in conjunction with students.
- Ability to reflect on and study one's own teaching to determine whether one is achieving one's instructional goals and contributing to the departmental mission.

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 such as:

- Student evaluations that meet departmental expectations as noted in the annual merit review rubric found in Appendix D. Evidence of strong teaching based on student ratings of teaching will be determined by the mean and mode for student responses to the required questions provided by the Faculty Senate. The candidate has an opportunity to build an argument for the significance of student responses to other questions as related to his or her particular teaching assignment, statement, and goals. Candidate teaching statements may include specific ways that they have addressed areas in need of improvement.
- Written peer evaluations that specifically address the above descriptors of excellence in teaching. These may include reports of classroom observation, analyses of syllabi, curriculum materials developed by the candidate, informal interviews with students, and other relevant material.
- The most recent course syllabi for all courses taught and other teaching materials that support points made in the candidate's teaching statement (e.g., assignments, projects, field experiences, information about guest speakers)

- Evidence of innovative teaching approaches and practices such as online teaching, using technology in creative ways, teaching courses embedded in schools, co-teaching or teaching in learning communities, and teaching and providing feedback in writing intensive courses.
- Teaching materials and evaluations related to workshops, consulting, or professional development offerings in community or school settings.
- Demonstrated progress in developing teaching effectiveness, such as participation in programs to improve teaching, implementing various ways for facilitating student feedback, an upward trajectory in measures of teaching effectiveness, evidence of course revision based on peer, student, and self-evaluation.
- Written or online materials such as texts, workbooks, curricular materials, and other publications about one's teaching.
- Research on one's own teaching.
- Honors or awards

2.A.4. Criteria and evidence for advising, mentoring, and supervising. One important component of teaching is advising, mentoring, and supervising students. The quality of candidates' advising is evident in the extent to which they are available to advisees; their knowledge of requirements and student services; their awareness and sensitivity to advisees' needs, progress, and goals; their ability to provide students with relevant information in a clear and consistent manner; and their ability to provide students working on theses and dissertations with timely, constructive feedback. The successful completion of theses, dissertations, and degrees at all levels is viewed as an important indicator of successful advising.

Evidence of effective advising/mentoring/supervising includes but is not limited to:

- Record of current advising load: Number of advisees, degree type (undergraduate, MEd, MA, doctoral)
- Record of current and completed M. A. and Ph.D. student committees; committees chaired by the candidate
- Record of completed undergraduate, MEd, M.A., and Ph.D. advisees.
- M. A. theses and doctoral dissertations advised to completion.
- Documentation of supervising and mentoring responsibilities.
- Written comments from students
- Record of supporting students' professional development through sponsorship of student organizations, development of mentoring structures (e.g., Teacher Scholars of

Color), encouraging and guiding publications, conference presentations, nominating students for awards, writing letters of recommendation, etc.

2.B. Criteria for Scholarly Inquiry

2.B.1. Definition. “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. (From *Faculty Tenure*, subsection 7.11)

2.B.2. Department statement on scholarly inquiry. The department is part of the University of Minnesota, a research university with very high research activity (RU/VH) where faculty are given a significant amount of time in which to advance knowledge in the field by conducting and publishing outstanding scholarly inquiry. This scholarship may be centered in one or more relevant disciplines. Interdisciplinary work may involve the use of knowledge and methodology from two or more disciplines, the integration of two or more academic disciplines, and use of two or more academic disciplines in understanding or addressing complex problems and issues. It may involve the joint work of scholars from different disciplines or the work of one individual who combines two or more disciplines within his or her own work. Likewise, scholarly inquiry may also focus on multicultural issues, and the scholarship of both teaching and public engagement.

2.B.3. Overall criteria for scholarly inquiry. The expectations for scholarly inquiry are as follows:

- Sustained and regular publication activity.
- Showing evidence of dissemination of scholarship through papers for presentations at major scholarly conferences—and other outlets appropriate to stakeholders.
- Seeking external funding for research through grants, contracts, or awards, in keeping with the norms of the researcher’s particular area of scholarship.

In addition:

- The record should show a sustained line of inquiry on one or more topics during the period leading up to promotion.
- The record should provide clear evidence that the faculty member has advanced knowledge about that topic or those topics and 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.
- Scholarly inquiry should result in a significant number of quality research publications.

- Publications should be in high quality national and international outlets, the majority of which are peer reviewed. These include but are not limited to: (1) major discipline-specific (education or other pertinent disciplines) research journals, (2) major journals which are not discipline specific, (3) major practitioner-oriented journals, (4) scholarly books published by highly regarded publishers, (5) chapters in major books, and (6) other outlets.
- New technologies, software, textbooks, curriculum materials, and other procedures and innovative products are valued.
- The record should indicate that the faculty member has demonstrated significant independence and scholarly responsibility. One way of demonstrating this is through sole or first authorship. However, since interdisciplinary as well as disciplinary work is valued, evidence of leadership in joint scholarly inquiry projects can also demonstrate independence and responsibility.

2.B.4. Criteria for Community-Engaged Scholarship (CES)

The department values Community-Engaged Scholarship (also referred to as Publicly Engaged Scholarship) and believes that while CES meets the overall criteria for scholarly inquiry (2.B.3), it also has unique features and criteria for quality. The department sees CES 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.

Engaged scholarship has several attributes that may distinguish it from traditional scholarship:

- 1) Products are often published in both traditional disciplinary outlets and non-traditional venues.
- 2) The work is often multi-disciplinary.
- 3) Scholarly products often include multiple co-authors, including community partners who contribute to the work in significant ways.
- 4) The work often integrates research, teaching, and service in a way that makes it difficult to compartmentalize into a single category (e.g., teaching, research, service).
- 5) The work requires significant relationship-building with external partners to maximize its quality and impact.

Faculty members who feel their scholarship is best described, and evaluated, as CES should consult with the Office for Public Engagement regarding the resources and supports that the office provides for faculty members--especially those resources and supports directly related to [Promotion and Tenure](#).

If faculty members believe it will help their case, they may request an engaged scholar review by the [Review Committee on Community-Engaged Scholarship](#).

The engaged scholar review involves the following and includes a [MOU](#):

- The purpose of the engaged scholar review is to provide an internal review of the scholarly portfolio of community-engaged scholars who are submitting their dossiers for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. These reviews are meant to provide an analysis of the quality and impact of scholarship, either holistically or in specific areas of research or teaching.
- The review committee is composed of University of Minnesota-Twin Cities tenured faculty members from diverse disciplines and professional fields. Each is a leading community-engaged scholar who has a distinguished record of scholarship produced through community-engaged research, teaching, and/or outreach. Three members from this committee will be selected to serve as the review panel for a case, including at least one member with a discipline or field of study in an area related to the candidate's.
- The engaged scholar review will take into consideration engagement criteria as they relate to criteria outlined in the unit's 7.12 statement. The criteria for high-quality engaged scholarship include the candidate's demonstration of:
 - 1) Clear Academic & Community Change Goals
 - 2) Adequate Preparation in Content Area and Grounding in the Community
 - 3) Appropriate Methods: Rigor and Community Engagement
 - 4) Significant Results: Impact on the Discipline/Field and the Community
 - 5) Effective Presentation and Communication to Academic and Community Audiences
 - 6) Reflective Critique: Lessons Learned to Improve the Scholarship and Community Engagement
 - 7) Collaborative Leadership and Personal Contribution
 - 8) Socially and Ethically Responsible Conduct of Research and Teaching

Once completed, the Review Committee's report will be added to the candidate's dossier and will be included with the materials that are submitted for the candidate's department, college, and provostial reviews.

2.C. Service

2.C.1. Definition. According to subsection 7.11 of *Faculty Tenure*, "service" takes the form 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; and (2) institutional service, which includes administrative, committee, and related service 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.

2.C.2. Department statement on service. The Department of Curriculum and Instruction, in keeping with the regulations of the University of Minnesota, identifies service as an important part of a faculty member's responsibilities. Whenever possible, service should be integrated with research, publication, and teaching activities. However, an outstanding record of service alone will not be sufficient for promotion and tenure.

Service that supports a faculty member's reputation as a scholar and leader in the field is valued. This service may take the form of disciplinary, interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, multicultural, and publicly engaged service activities. Interdisciplinary service, outreach, and public engagement may involve collaborating with others in and beyond the university in bringing knowledge from multiple disciplines to bear on decisions and actions that affect the public good and are in the public interest. Public engagement is 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.

Institutional service, as defined in 2.C.1., is expected of all faculty members, but only modest institutional service by pretenured faculty is expected.

2.C.3. Criteria and evidence for service. A candidate for indefinite tenure should demonstrate a commitment to service at the national or international level as well as state or local level. This commitment may be demonstrated by evidence that supports participation in activities such as:

- Reviewing for national and international journals
- Reviewing paper presentation submissions for professional meetings
- Planning local, state, regional, national and international professional meetings
- Holding office or committee membership in professional organizations
- Service on external review panels and teams (for grants, accreditation, graduate program reviews, etc.)
- Legislative testimony
- Board membership of appropriate organizations
- Discipline-related and interdisciplinary work with local community groups

SECTION 3: EXTENDING THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD

Consistent with subsection 5.5 of the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure* - (see Appendix E) and Section IV of the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*, when considering the record of pretenured faculty who have received an extension of the probationary period, criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than the criteria for those who do not have an extension of the probationary period. That

is, a record of six years post-hiring with a one-year extension of the probationary period must be considered the same way that a record of five years post-hiring with extension is considered. As stated in *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*: “A decision to recommend termination may not be made during the continuation year if the candidate has extended the probationary period according to subsection 5.5 of *Faculty Tenure*, but termination may occur as otherwise specified by *Faculty Tenure* (e.g. disciplinary action or fiscal emergency).”

SECTION 4: CRITERIA FOR RECOMMENDING PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

4.A. Faculty Tenure, Section 9.2.

This section of *Faculty Tenure*, which concerns promotion from associate professor to professor, is contained in section 1F of this 7.12 document.

4.B. Department Statement

In the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, it is the expectation that all faculty members will achieve the rank of full professor. The performance expectations for doing so exceed those achieved for promotion to associate professor.

4.C. Expectations for Teaching and Advising

In the department, we consider good teaching essential to our mission. It is expected that candidates for promotion to the rank of Full Professor have demonstrated excellence in teaching and advising. This excellence can be documented through publications regarding teaching, high student ratings of teaching, excellent peer evaluations, syllabi and other evidence of course development, honors and awards for teaching, active involvement in course/program development, documentation of the completion of PhD and MA students in a timely manner, demonstrated evidence of collaborative work with PhD and MA students, and excellent placements of PhD advisees and mentee.

4.D. Expectations for Scholarly Inquiry

The department values research and research-based publications; the standards for scholarly inquiry are high. The record of scholarly inquiry should demonstrate the ongoing development of a scholar pursuing significant questions as part of a cohesive body of work. The record should indicate a *demonstrated* mastery of this topic or topics, and a *demonstrated* national or international reputation for leadership regarding the topic(s). This can be demonstrated by a significant number of publications in highly-regarded, peer-reviewed research journals, as well as other publications aimed at an array of audiences; major books, chapters in books, or edited books; and funded research, as defined in the departmental annual merit review rubric. Publications should reflect the leadership of the candidate through sole or first-authorship, as well as collaborative work that demonstrates an influence on other scholars. Presentations

including major addresses and keynotes at national and international conferences are further evidence of a national/international reputation.

4.E. Expectations for Service

Service is an important part of a senior faculty member's responsibilities. It is expected that candidates for promotion to the rank of Full Professor have demonstrated leadership in a substantial record of service to the profession, the public, and the university. In addition to membership on committees within the department, college, and university, candidates are expected to take on leadership roles in one or more service areas. These may include leadership positions in professional organizations, service on editorial or review boards for national and international professional journals, reviewing external grants and external candidates for tenure, organizing and chairing national and international meetings, service as a professional in local/state/national school endeavors, leading outreach and community efforts, chairing of committees, and accepting administrative roles. A greater contribution in the area of institutional service is expected of candidates for the rank of professor than was expected for the award of tenure.

SECTION 5: DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING ANNUAL REVIEWS OF PRETENURED FACULTY AND DEVELOPING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GRANTING INDEFINITE TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION IN RANK

The following procedures shall be used in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction to facilitate collegial review of faculty accomplishments leading to the development of recommendations concerning continuation of pretenured faculty appointments and the granting of indefinite tenure and/or promotion in rank. The policies and procedures detailed herein are consistent with and complementary to existing policies of the University of Minnesota as described in the current *"Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty"* and sections 5, 6, 7, and 9 of *Faculty Tenure*.

5.A. Personnel Committee (PC)

A Personnel Committee (PC) consisting of five tenured faculty members at the rank of professor or associate professor shall be elected by the tenured and pretenured faculty in the department and shall oversee procedures related to establishing a mentoring system for all assistant and associate professors, for conducting annual reviews of pretenured faculty, and for developing recommendations for the granting of indefinite tenure and/or promotion in rank. No more than two associate professors shall serve on the committee at any one time. Elected members shall serve for two years and terms will be staggered so that two or three new members are elected in March of each year for terms beginning the following academic year. From among those full professors elected to the PC each year, the department chair shall appoint an associate PC chair who will become the committee chair in the second year of their membership on the committee. The current and future PC chair will meet during April with the department chair to establish a recommended schedule for the review procedures culminating in the fall semester faculty meeting at which voting on recommendations for continuation of appointments for pretenured

faculty and on tenure and/or promotion recommendations takes place. This schedule must allow deadlines set by the university and the college to be met.

5.B. Appointment of Mentors

Upon entering the department, pretenured faculty will be assigned a tenured faculty mentor by the department chair. Criteria that will be considered in assigning a mentor will be the field of expertise of the pretenured faculty member and potential mentors, the availability and loads of potential mentors, preferences expressed by the pretenured faculty member (if any), and tenured faculty members' volunteering for mentor assignments. The responsibility of the mentor is to guide the mentee toward tenure and promotion to associate professor and, subsequently, to full professor. This includes meeting regularly with the mentee and providing specific feedback regarding her or his progress. The mentor will also chair the mentee's Dossier Committee (DC). The mentor will remain in his or her role across the pretenured faculty member's advancement to full professor barring exceptions noted in section 5.D.

5.C. Dossier Committee (DC)

The DC will include two members, the mentor and one other tenured faculty member senior in rank to the mentee. When possible, either the mentor or the second member of the DC should be knowledgeable regarding the mentee's area of expertise. The DC should be considered an advocacy group, charged with helping the mentee advance toward tenure and promotion to associate professor and, subsequently, to full professor. A major responsibility of the DC is to help the mentee prepare an appropriate, accurate, and complete vitae and dossier for annual reviews during the probationary period, for reviews for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor and, subsequently, for reviews for promotion to full professor. This responsibility includes being sure that the mentee's vitae and dossier follow the format and content specified by in the [CEHD Promotion and Tenure Review Guidelines](#) and that the candidate uses the standardized University of Minnesota CV template generated in [Works](#) or the [Master Curriculum Vitae for Promotion and Tenure](#).

5.D. Change in Mentor Assignments

Mentors may be changed permanently or temporarily when necessary due to such circumstances as retirement, changes in load and responsibilities, mentor no longer senior in rank to the mentee, a sabbatical or other leave, or if it becomes apparent that the mentor-mentee relationship is not functioning as noted in section 5.B. The department chair is responsible for making short and long-term changes in mentor assignments in accordance with the criteria identified in section 5.B. The PC is responsible for overseeing the performance of DC members and for recommending change in mentor and DC assignments if it determines such changes are necessary. During March of each year, the PC shall contact all assistant and associate professors to ensure that all mentors and DCs are functioning properly. A mentee may also request a change in mentor and DC composition by notifying the PC chair at any time. The PC will gather

pertinent information regarding mentor and DC performance issues it becomes aware of through these or other avenues and the PC chair will inform the department chair of the PC's recommendation and the reasons for the recommendation.

5.E Informing Pretenured Faculty About Departmental, College, and University Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures.

Early in the probationary appointment, the department chair must review the terms of appointment with the pretenured faculty member. This includes:

- 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. (See *Faculty Tenure*, section 5.4).
- Supplying the candidate with copies of the university's current [Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure](#) and [Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty](#), the [CEHD Promotion and Tenure Review Guidelines](#), and the department 7.12 statement. The pretenured faculty member should be informed about the procedures used in the department to review teaching, research, and service, and about the annual review process, and should be made familiar with the annual *Appraisal of Probationary Faculty* ([UM Form 12](#)) report that is completed each year during the probationary period. The candidate must also be informed about his or her right to inspect the file and right of access to information contained in it as well as results of faculty meeting discussions and votes. Candidates may withdraw their candidacy for tenure, either prior to or after a vote on a motion to recommend tenure, by making a written request to the unit head, the dean, and to the executive vice president and provost. The candidate must also submit a letter of resignation, effective at the end of the candidate's next contract year (i.e., academic year or twelve months). Upon receipt of such a request, the file will not be further reviewed (see UM ***Procedures*** for information regarding withdrawal, Section II.C.6). Pretenured faculty members should have an opportunity to seek clarification regarding any uncertainty they may have about the application of the criteria or procedures, and the discussion should seek to make the information as clear as possible.

The department chair must make a written summary of this meeting, including the time and date it took place, and include it in the candidate's personnel file. The probationary faculty member must sign and date this summary. The department chair must forward a copy of this signed summary to the Dean and to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

5.F. Procedures for Annual Review of Pretenured Faculty

The process of reviewing a pretenured faculty member's progress is a continuous one. The tenured faculty in the department must review the progress of each pretenured faculty member annually, regardless of whether or not the pretenured faculty member wishes to be considered for tenure and promotion. The annual review is intended to have an encouraging and nurturing

function, although it is by necessity evaluative. Especially in the early years of the probationary period, the annual review is intended to point out to the candidate strengths and weaknesses, so that the strengths can be built upon and the weaknesses remedied.

5.F.1. Dossier preparation. Assisted by their DC, pretenured faculty shall prepare vitae and dossier in accordance with [CEHD guidelines](#) (see section 5.G.3 Preparation of the dossier, and Appendix A, Department Vitae Outline) and university guidelines noted in [Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty](#).

5.F.2. DC report and submission of the pretenured faculty member's dossier to the PC. The DC will generate a report that specifies the years of service the faculty member has completed and summarizes in outline form the faculty member's achievements in the areas of scholarly inquiry, instruction and advising, and service. The DC Report should also specifically state that the faculty member's vitae and dossier follow the [College Guidelines](#). The DC report will be considered by the PC in formation of its report and recommendation letter to the faculty eligible to vote.

The DC will submit its report and the faculty member's dossier to the PC by late January.

5.F.3. Personnel Committee (PC) letter. The PC shall critically review the vitae and dossier submitted by each pretenured faculty member and the candidate's DC to determine whether or not these documents are complete and in the correct format. The PC may request additional information or further work on the documents from a pretenured faculty member or the DC. The PC will also critically review the DC report.

Based on its review of these materials, the PC shall prepare a formal review letter addressed to the tenured faculty in the department that includes each of the following elements for each pretenured faculty member:

- a. A summary and evaluation of professional accomplishments in the areas of scholarly inquiry, instruction and advising, and service.
- b. Information concerning how the pretenured faculty is moving in a systematic direction that meets the needs and mission of the program, the department, and the college, and that is consistent with the job description under which s/he was hired.
- c. A report (without attribution) of a preliminary vote by the PC, which indicates the number of no and yes votes to the question, "Shall the faculty member be given notice of termination of appointment?" and which contains a recommendation for or against continuing the appointment.

The PC shall place the letter in the pretenured faculty member's dossier (see section 5.G.3) and provide a copy to the department chair. This shall be done by early February. Also by early February, the PC chair is responsible for the delivery of the faculty member's dossier containing the PC letter to the department chair.

5.F.4. Review of the dossier by the tenured faculty in the department. The complete dossier for each pretenured faculty member containing the PC's letter is made available to the tenured faculty for review beginning in mid to late February *at least* two weeks prior to the faculty meeting where promotion and/or tenure decisions will be made. To ensure a thorough department level review, eligible voting faculty must review the entire file, even though comprehensive summary materials are contained in it.

5.F.5. Notification of meeting of the tenured faculty to take formal action. By mid to late March, approximately two weeks after the dossiers have been available for review, the tenured faculty in the department meet to vote on recommendations of candidates for tenure and promotion. Preferably near the beginning of the academic year, but in any case well in advance of the meeting date, faculty are to receive notification of the date and time of this meeting, which should be set to allow compliance with schedules set by the college for receiving recommendations from departments (see section 5.A).

This meeting shall be scheduled so that ample time to discuss the progress of each pretenured faculty member is available in order to assist the department chair in providing feedback to each of them as mandated by university policy in *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty* (see sample promotion and tenure process schedule letter to faculty in Appendix C).

5.F.6. Eligibility to participate in the decision. See section 5.G.8.

5.F.7. Absentee ballots. See section 5.G.9

5.F.8. Taking formal action at the meeting of the tenured faculty in the department.

The department chair shall send out an agenda for the meeting between one and two weeks prior to the meeting. The PC shall organize the meeting. A PC member shall provide an introduction to the case of each pretenured faculty member by distributing and reviewing the PC's letter for that faculty member, thus providing a brief overview of the accomplishments of the faculty member. The PC member shall also note the recommendations of the PC contained in the letter. Following this introduction of each faculty member, the tenured faculty will commence the discussion. When discussion has been completed, action will be taken by a simple majority vote by using electronic ballots through a secure, password-protected voting site. The question to be voted on will be as follows: "Shall the pretenured faculty member be given notice of termination?" Response options on the ballot will be yes, no, and abstain, and will contain the phrase, "if abstain, provide reasons in writing here:" and space for writing these reasons. The ballots will be immediately counted (including any absentee ballots received by the deadline for absentee ballots and any abstentions) by members present who are appointed to this task by the department chair. The vote will be immediately orally reported: the number of yes and no votes and the number of abstentions. As part of the annual review process, abstentions will not be counted in determining whether a majority of those voting cast no or yes votes, but the number of abstentions is reported as part of the vote tally. It should be noted that abstentions are strongly discouraged. If tenured faculty members are eligible to vote and do not cast a vote (whether present at the meeting or not), the number of such non-votes is reported but they are not counted

as affirmative or negative votes, or as abstentions. The department chair and the department administrator will be the recorders for the meeting, recording the discussion and the vote.

If the “no” votes are in the majority, or if there is no majority (i.e., a tie vote), an appointment will automatically be renewed. If there is a majority for termination of the appointment (i.e., a majority of “yes” votes), the department must make a report and forward the report and the candidate's file to the dean for review by the deadline indicated by the college for receipt of such reports (see reporting procedures in section 5.G.11).

An appointment will automatically be renewed annually until the maximum probationary period is reached, unless there is a recommendation for formal action, granting tenure or terminating the appointment, at some earlier time.

5.F.9. Report of action in annual conference with the candidate. Following the meeting in which action by the tenured faculty allows continuation of the pretenured faculty member's appointment, the department chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the faculty member's progress toward achieving tenure. The department chair also reports the vote of the tenured faculty, the sense of the meeting, and any recommendations made to the pretenured faculty member by the tenured faculty. It is important that this conversation be candid, and that the pretenured faculty member be clearly told if there are areas in which performance needs to be improved. If the pretenured faculty member has questions about the application of criteria or about what they are expected to do, the department chair should respond to these. The pretenured faculty member is given a copy of the annual Appraisal of Probationary Faculty report, which should report the vote (including the reasons for any abstentions) and parallel the major elements of this conversation, including any concerns of the tenured faculty regarding the candidate's progress toward tenure and must provide guidance for addressing any weaknesses that have been noted, as well as include a written summary of any additional matters discussed, and the date and time of the meeting of the tenured faculty in which the discussion took place and the date of the meeting with the candidate. If the candidate has been granted an extension year according to section 5.5 of *Faculty Tenure*, the annual report must clearly report that fact. The department chair returns the dossier, which includes the PC letter, to the faculty member.

The pretenured faculty member may prepare a written response to the PC's report and/or the Appraisal of Probationary Faculty report they desire. Any such response shall be provided to the department chair. The department chair will attach any response from the faculty member to the annual Appraisal of Probationary Faculty report (UM Form 12), sign the form as well as obtain the signature of the candidate, and forward these to the college by the deadline for receipt of these reports and also place a copy in the pretenured faculty member's permanent file.

The review of the probationary faculty member by the tenured faculty, the conference with the probationary faculty member, and the final written report must reflect the criteria and the indices of performance in the department's 7.12 statement.

5.G. Procedures for Review of Faculty for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The decision to grant tenure is based on demonstrated ability to continue to contribute significantly to the mission of the university, college, and department, and to research, programs or teaching, and discipline-related or interdisciplinary service. Promotion to the rank of associate professor is based upon professional distinction in research and demonstrated effectiveness in teaching and advising students, and discipline-related or interdisciplinary service.

The dean will establish a yearly deadline for the submission of materials regarding candidates for tenure or promotion. This deadline shall be the Friday of the first full week in November. The deadline will be announced to department chairs during Spring Semester each year.

5.G.1. Initiation of review of pretenured faculty for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Pretenured faculty will be reviewed for tenure and promotion in the fall of their sixth year of service in keeping with the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure and Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*. Pretenured faculty may, however, request review for tenure and/or promotion at any time during the probationary period. The department will decide whether to conduct the review. A formal review for tenure and promotion may also be initiated at any earlier time by the department chair or by vote of the tenured faculty of the department, with the pretenured faculty member's agreement. Candidates must be told that the outcome of an early tenure evaluation may be a recommendation for (1) promotion and tenure; (2) continuation of the probationary appointment without tenure and promotion at this time; or (3) termination. A recommendation for termination would be based on overall performance that is so clearly below the standards indicated in this 7.12 statement that such a course of action is deemed necessary, or performance on any of the primary criteria is so deficient that positive evaluation of the other criteria would not warrant continuation of appointment. If this action should be taken, the reasons for it must be clearly documented in a written evaluation.

In the early spring semester of the year prior to the fall in which they wish to be reviewed, pretenured faculty members considering a plan to seek tenure review prior to their sixth year of service should consult with their DC regarding their plan. The department chair shall poll pretenured faculty in March of each year to determine whether any of them plan to seek formal review for promotion and/or tenure during the following fall semester. Pretenured faculty who wish to seek tenure review prior to their sixth year of service shall announce their intention by April 15 by notifying the department chair in writing of their intent and attaching their up-to-date vitae. The department chair will share this information with the chair and associate chair of the PC, who will consult with the candidate's DC, if deemed appropriate. They will forward their written recommendation regarding the advisability of conducting the tenure review to the chair, who will also share his or her recommendation with the PC chair and associate chair. If there is unanimous agreement among the PC chair and associate chair and the department chair, the department chair will communicate the decision to pretenured faculty member. If there is not agreement, the department chair shall call a meeting with the PC chair and associate chair to reach consensus on a joint decision. The pretenured faculty member might also be asked to

attend a portion of this meeting. The department chair will communicate the decision to pretenured faculty member.

Pretenured faculty members who will be in their sixth year of service in the following fall as well as those who the department has approved to move forward with review for tenure and promotion prior to their sixth year of service as noted above will be referred to as candidates in the following sections.

5.G.2. Procedures and criteria for obtaining external and internal reviews. In late April or early May, the department chair shall request from all candidates, and from tenured faculty in the candidates' area(s) of expertise, names of appropriate professionals in the field qualified to provide external and internal review of each candidate's materials. The department chair, PC associate chair, and the candidate shall meet to review the suggested names, to suggest additional names, if appropriate, and to jointly identify in priority order those names from whom external and internal reviews will be requested. Reviews will be requested to equal a total of at least five external review letters received, three of these from reviewers selected by persons other than the candidate and who are knowledgeable about the candidate's field(s). At least half, and no fewer than four of the external review letters must be received from individuals with no direct professional or personal interest in the advancement of the candidate's career (e.g., they should not be former advisors, mentors, co-authors, or co-investigators on previous work). The file must clearly specify the relationship of each external reviewer to the candidate and a description of each reviewer and his or her credentials. All external reviewers must be active, well-regarded scholars in the relevant field(s), and located in departments that are of high quality and that will be recognized as peers. For candidates whose work spans more than one discipline or field, letters from individuals knowledgeable about each discipline or field should be obtained. For any candidate, more than five external review letters may be requested. Candidates may not independently solicit comments or evaluations or discuss their promotion and tenure candidacy with external reviewers and should instead recommend to the department individuals from whom letters might be obtained. It is also advisable to solicit additional letters of support from peers/colleagues both within and outside of the university, as well as letters from students. No more than five such letters should be included in any individual dossier. These individuals should be jointly determined by the candidate, the PC associate chair, and the department chair, and should be persons who could speak knowledgeably about such areas as the candidate's teaching and advising, service, outreach, public engagement, and impact of the candidate's work. For candidates whose work spans more than one discipline or field, letters may be requested from scholars from relevant disciplines familiar with publications in interdisciplinary fields, or scholars within the candidate's field who do similar interdisciplinary work.

In May, the department chair shall send a brief request for agreement to provide review letters to the highest priority external and internal reviewers selected to equal the number of letters required and desired. Based on the responses, the department chair will send further requests to additional individuals in order of their listed priority as noted above. By late May or early June, the department chair will send an official request letter, along with the candidate's up-to-date vitae and other materials selected by the candidate in consultation with the DC, the PC Associate chair, and the department chair, to individuals who have agreed to provide reviews. The chair's

letter will ask that the evaluation be signed and written on letterhead and mailed to be received by the chair no later than September 1, and that reviewers include their vitae and a brief (one paragraph) biographical sketch. This letter will also note if the candidate has extended the probationary period and for how long, but should not indicate the reasons for any extension. External reviewers should be advised that the candidate is expected to meet the same standard as though the probationary period had not been extended. The five or more external reviewers should be asked to provide an assessment of the selected scholarly works provided for review and to address the following:

1. Specific commentary on the scholarly quality of the candidate's work, including its conceptualization, methodology, etc.
2. Impact of the candidate's work in the field
3. The candidate's reputation among scholars in the field(s) (as defined by the candidate's research statement).

Referees must be informed that their evaluations will not be held confidential, since state law may permit the candidate to inspect them. A sample request for agreement to conduct an external review and a sample request letter containing all of the guidelines for the review are provided in Appendix B.

Writers of the additional letters should be asked to speak to the quality and impact of specific areas of the candidate's work with which they are known to be familiar.

5.G.3. Preparation and submission of the dossier. Assisted by their DC, candidates shall prepare their dossier in accordance with departmental guidelines contained in this document and [CEHD Promotion and Tenure Review Guidelines](#). The dossier shall contain the following sections and contents, which shall be cumulative across the probationary period. Where appropriate, APA format should be used.

Dossier Contents

A. Department Faculty Review & Recommendation

1. The department recommendation that reports the faculty vote and summarizes the discussion regarding the candidate.
2. The department chair's individual recommendation.
3. The department's internal review documents (such as, the report of the department dossier committee or personnel committee) if such formal documentation is required by the department procedures or 7.12 statement.
4. Any separate statements by members of the tenured faculty who disagree with the department recommendation.
5. Any supplementary statement provided by the candidate. If present, it must be dated and clearly indicate that it was submitted by the candidate. [Note: Supplementary statements must be provided to the chair who will distribute to the faculty.

B. Curriculum Vita for Promotion and Tenure

1. The candidate's current Curriculum Vitae and summary of the candidate's accomplishments during the probationary period

C. Teaching and Advising

1. Candidate's personal statement regarding teaching and advising accomplishments that should also include their philosophy and goals in this area.
2. Summary of teaching assignments (list of courses taught with enrollments) and a list of students advised to completion and relevant other advisement activities.
3. A statement regarding teaching load and how the candidate's activities meet departmental needs and expectations, and all-college workload expectations. [Note: This could also be included in the department report.]
4. Student evaluation summary information should also be included in this section. Probationary faculty develop summary reports that track student evaluations throughout the probationary period.
5. Peer reviews of teaching.
6. Most recent syllabi for all courses taught and other teaching material that supports points made in the candidate's teaching statement (e.g., assignments, projects, field experiences, information about guest speakers) [Note: Items in C.6. are for the department only, and are not forwarded for College or University review.]
7. Any additional evidence in support of the candidate's teaching statement (e.g., research on one's own teaching; teaching materials and evaluations related to workshops, consulting, or professional development offerings in community or school settings; students' signed [no anonymous] written comments outside of course evaluations) [Note: Items in C.7. are for the department only, and are not forwarded for College or University review.]

D. Research/Scholarly Contributions

1. Candidate's personal statement that describes the program of research and scholarly contributions and describes plans for future work. This statement might also include their philosophy and goals in this area.
2. List of externally-funded projects, grants, or contracts that includes dollar amounts and the names of granting agencies be included in this section.
3. Information about the quality and impact of the various journals in which the candidate has published.

E. Professional Service and Outreach Activities

1. Candidate's personal statement regarding professional service and outreach activities that could include their philosophy and goals in this area.
2. Summary materials that support the breadth and depth of engaged activities.

F. External Review Letters – (no fewer than five)

1. A list of the external reviewers that provides the following descriptive information: name, rank and institutional affiliation, why each person was selected, and what relationship the reviewer has to the candidate, if any.
2. A copy of each of the candidate's articles or scholarly products that were provided to the reviewers.
3. A copy of the letter sent to each individual reviewer

4. Letters from reviewers
5. Reviewers' CVs

G. OPTIONAL: Letters of Support – limited to 5

1. Letters from students
2. Letters from colleagues/peers within and outside the University

H. Publications

1. At least three exemplary scholarly publications. [Note: May be the same as those provided in F.2]
2. Other publications (not included in H.1.) [Materials in H.2. are for departmental purposes and are not forwarded to the College or University for review.] Omit category if it doesn't apply.
 - a. Books or monographs
 - b. Refereed journal articles
 - c. Non-refereed journal articles, essays, or book chapters
 - d. Proceedings of conferences
 - e. Catalogs
 - f. Interviews
 - g. Review of performances/exhibitions
 - h. Software development
 - i. Invited Presentations
 - j. Papers presented at professional meetings
 - k. Abstracts

I. Departmental 7.12 Statement

A copy of the applicable department promotion and tenure standards and indices.

J. Annual Appraisals of Probationary Faculty (UM Form 12)

For probationary faculty members seeking tenure, the file must include copies of the *Appraisal of Probationary Faculty* report (UM Form 12) for each year the individual has been on the tenure-track, including continuation years.

In addition to the sections and contents listed above, the candidate has the right to add any material they consider relevant, including unsolicited signed comments, but anonymous statements (with the exception of student comment data on university course evaluation forms that may be included at the candidate's discretion) must not be included in the file and cannot be considered.

Dossiers must be received by the DC on the date specified in the departmental timeline (usually early to mid-September).

5.G.4. DC report for candidates and submission of the candidate's dossier to the PC. The DC will generate a report and submit it and the faculty member's dossier according to the guidelines in section 5.F.1 to the PC on the date specified in the departmental timeline (usually mid- to late September). **The DC does not make a recommendation to the PC on tenure or**

promotion. The DC report will be considered by the PC in formation of the PC's report and recommendation letter to the faculty, but it will not be included in the dossier of a candidate recommended for tenure and/or promotion when it is forwarded to the college.

5.G.5. PC letter. The PC shall critically review the vitae and dossier submitted by each candidate and the candidate's DC to determine whether or not these documents are complete and in the correct format according to section 5.G.3 and Appendix A. The PC may request additional information or further work on the documents from the candidate or the candidate's DC. The PC will also critically review the DC report and the external and internal review letters that have been received for a candidate (by mid- to late September, the department chair shall provide to the PC copies of these letters as well as the vitae of the external reviewers).

Based on its review of these materials, the PC shall prepare a formal review letter addressed to the department tenured faculty that includes each of the following elements for each candidate:

- a. A summary and evaluation of the candidate's professional accomplishments in the areas of scholarly inquiry, teaching and advising, and service,
- b. Information concerning how the candidate's work is moving in a systematic direction and meets the needs and mission of the program, the department, and the college,
- c. A report (without attribution) of a preliminary vote by the PC, which indicates the number of no and yes votes to the question, "Shall the candidate be recommended for tenure?" and which contains a recommendation for or against tenure and promotion.

The PC shall place the letter in the candidate's dossier (see section 5.G.3) and provide a copy to the department chair. This shall be done by the date specified in the departmental timeline (usually early October). Also on the date specified in the departmental timeline (usually early October), the PC chair is responsible for the delivery of the faculty member's dossier containing the PC letter to the department chair.

5.G.6. Review of candidate's dossier by the tenured faculty in the department. The complete dossier for each candidate containing the PC's letter and the review letters is made available to the tenured faculty for review at least two weeks prior to the promotion and tenure meeting of the tenured faculty. The department chair sends out a notice to all tenured faculty in the department eligible to participate in the decisions that the dossiers are available for review. Relevant information must not be excluded from the file, but the weight to be given to the views of any particular external reviewer is a matter to be considered by the tenured faculty. To ensure a thorough department level review, eligible voting faculty must review the entire file, even though comprehensive summary materials are contained in it.

5.G.7. Notification of meeting of the tenured faculty to take formal action. Approximately two weeks after the dossiers have been available for review, the tenured faculty in the department meet to vote on recommendations of candidates for tenure and promotion. Preferably near the beginning of the academic year, but in any case well in advance of the meeting date, faculty are

to receive notification of the date and time of this meeting, which should be set at a time to allow compliance with schedules set by the college for receiving recommendations from departments. This meeting shall be scheduled so that ample time to discuss the professional accomplishments of each candidate is available. See a sample promotion and tenure process schedule letter to faculty in Appendix C.

5.G.8. Eligibility to participate in the decision. All tenured faculty in the department senior in rank to a faculty member being considered are eligible to participate in the discussion and voting excepting those noted as follows. Consistent with the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*, if the department chair is a member of the tenured faculty, he or she may participate and vote, but has no additional tie-breaking vote. Persons who are or were closely related to a candidate by blood or marriage, or who have or have had an intimate personal relationship with a candidate which would prejudice their judgment, must not attend or participate in the meeting where the candidate is being considered. Such persons will notify the department chair well in advance of the meeting of their present or past relationship to the faculty member being considered and leave the room during the time that discussion and voting is occurring regarding that faculty member. If the candidate or another member of the tenured faculty wishes to challenge the participation of any member of the tenured faculty, university policies provided in the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*, will be followed.

5.G.9. Absentee ballots. Absentee voting shall be made available to those faculty members eligible to vote who had the opportunity to review the dossiers. Approximately two weeks before the scheduled meeting is to take place, the department chair notifies all persons eligible to participate in the meeting to invite submission of absentee ballots if their participation in the meeting will not be possible. The department administrator provides a deadline no later than two days before the meeting for faculty to request absentee voting. The method for voting absentee should be identical to the method for in-person voting, both being electronic. The vote is taken by electronic, unsigned secret ballot. Faculty needing to vote absentee will complete voting no later than one hour before the start of the meeting.

5.G.10. Taking formal action at the meeting of the tenured faculty in the department. The department chair shall send out an agenda for the meeting between one and two weeks prior to the meeting. The PC shall organize the meeting. A quorum, defined as more than 50% of the tenured faculty members in the department, must be present for discussion and vote on promotion and tenure. Participating through electronic video chat counts as being present.

A PC member shall provide an introduction to the case of each candidate by distributing and reviewing the PC's letter for that candidate, thus providing a brief overview of the accomplishments of the faculty member. The PC member shall also note the recommendations of the PC contained in the letter. Following this introduction of a candidate, the tenured faculty will commence the discussion. Consistent with section 5.5 of *Faculty Tenure*, when considering the record of pretenured faculty who have an extension year to the maximum probationary period, criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than the criteria for those who do not have an extension year to maximum probationary period. That is, a record of six years post-hiring with a

one-year extension must be considered the same way that a record of five years post-hiring with no extension year is considered. (See section 3 of this document). When the discussion is completed, action will be taken by a simple majority vote using electronic ballots through a secure, password-protected voting site. The department chair will be the recorder for the meeting, recording the discussion and the vote.

The question to be voted on for those pretenured faculty who are in their sixth or an earlier year of service will be that noted in the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*: “Shall (the candidate) be recommended for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor?” Response options on the ballot will be yes, no, and abstain, and the ballot will contain the phrase, “if abstain, provide reasons in writing here: ” and space for writing these reasons. A deadline date must be established for final casting of votes. The vote totals must remain secret until all ballots are counted.

The ballots will be immediately counted (including any absentee ballots received by the deadline for absentee ballots and any abstentions) by members present who are appointed to this task by the department chair. The vote will be immediately orally reported: the number of yes and no votes and the number of abstentions. Abstentions will not be counted in determining whether a majority of those voting cast no or yes votes, but the number of abstentions is reported as part of the vote tally. It should be noted that abstentions are strongly discouraged and will be considered an indication of lack of support for the candidate by those abstaining. If tenured faculty members are eligible to vote and do not cast a vote (whether present at the meeting or not), the number of such non-votes is reported but they are not counted as affirmative or negative votes, or as abstentions.

If there is no majority (i.e., a tie vote), or if there is a simple majority of no votes on the tenure question, and the candidate is in their sixth year of service, the appointment will automatically be recommended for termination, consistent with *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*.

If there is no majority (i.e., a tie vote), or if there is a simple majority of no votes on the tenure and promotion question, and the candidate is not in their sixth year of service, a second vote will be taken. The question on this vote shall be: “Shall the candidate be given notice of termination of appointment?” If there is a simple majority of no votes on this question among all of the votes cast, or if there is no majority (i.e., a tie vote), the appointment will automatically continue. A simple majority of yes votes on this question will result in termination of the appointment.

5.G.11. Reporting of action taken. If the department recommends tenure, or recommends termination of an appointment, the department must make a report and forward the report and the candidate's file to the dean for review by the deadline noted by the college for receipt of such reports. The report should indicate the faculty's recommendation, the number who are qualified to vote, the number of affirmative and negative votes for each question, the number of persons present at the meeting who abstained and the reasons for their abstaining, and the number who were absent and not voting. It should also indicate how many absentee ballots were cast. If there

is a "reconsideration" after an initial vote (if, for example, new information comes to light after the faculty meeting and vote has occurred and this information warrants revisiting the recommendation), both the original and the reconsidered vote should be fully reported. The report should summarize the candidate's file and indicate the reasons for the action taken at the meeting of the tenured faculty. The statement of reasons expressed must be a summary of both majority and minority views which had substantial support and were expressed in the course of formal consideration of the action. All statements reflecting the discussion must be made without personal attribution.

The department chair also prepares an additional statement of personal agreement or disagreement with the department's recommendation, including the reasons for any disagreement.

A preliminary draft of the report, including the departmental information noted above as well as the department chair's statement, is made available to members of the faculty eligible to vote so they may comment and suggest changes. The final draft is open to the faculty eligible to vote. Faculty members may file separate, signed reports if they believe that their views are not adequately reflected in the departmental report. Copies of such separate reports must be given to the department chair and to the candidate. The submission of such reports is the only way that university policy provides for faculty members to present their separate views to the dean, collegiate, and university review bodies.

The department chair places the final report, along with any separate reports from faculty, in the candidate's dossier. The department chair informs the candidate of the department's recommendation and of the department chair's own recommendation and gives the candidate a copy of the report containing both.

The candidate has a right to inspect individual evaluations contained in the file that will be forwarded to the dean. The candidate also has a right to add material to the file and to submit a supplementary statement to the dean and college review committee. Copies of the statement must be given to the department chair and distributed to the tenured faculty.

The department chair forwards the candidate's dossier (including the departmental report containing the departmental recommendation and the department chair's recommendation, any separate statements by members of the tenured faculty, and any supplementary statement by the candidate) to the Dean's Office for College Review.

5.H Procedures for Review of Candidates for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor

Promotion in rank from Associate to Full Professor is based on achievement in teaching, research, and discipline-related and interdisciplinary service, including distinction in these pursuits that reflects the establishment of a national and/or international reputation for scholarly work in a field or discipline, or for scholarly work that spans two or more disciplines or fields. Review for this promotion is conducted by the tenured faculty in the department senior in rank to the candidate (i.e., by those at the rank of professor).

5.H.1. Initiation of review of associate professors for promotion to professor. In the early spring semester of the year prior to the fall in which they wish to be reviewed, associate professors considering a plan to seek promotion to full professor should consult with their DC regarding their plan. The department chair shall poll associate professors in March of each year to determine whether or not any of them plan to seek formal review for promotion during the following fall semester. Associate professors who wish to seek review for promotion shall announce their intention by April 15 by notifying the department chair in writing of their intent and attaching their up-to-date vitae. The department chair will share this information with the chair and associate chair of the PC, who will consult with the candidate's DC, if deemed appropriate. The PC chair and associate chair will forward their written recommendation regarding the advisability of conducting the review to the department chair, who will also share his or her recommendation with the PC chair and associate chair. If there is unanimous agreement among the PC chair and associate chair and the department chair that the review should be conducted, the department chair will communicate the recommendation to the associate professor requesting review and the review will proceed. If there is not agreement, or if the recommendation agreed upon by the PC and the department chair is against conducting the review, the department chair shall call a meeting with the PC chair and associate chair, and the associate professor requesting review to discuss the perspectives of each. If a consensus among the PC, department chair, and the associate professor is not able to be reached on the question of whether to conduct the review, the associate professor's vitae will be shared with the tenured full professors in the department who, after meeting with the associate professor, will vote by either secret written ballot or by using electronic ballots through a secure, password-protected voting site whether or not to conduct the review. The question on the ballot shall be: "Shall a review of professor x for promotion to full professor be conducted? Response options will be: yes, no, and abstain. A simple majority of yes votes is needed, counting all of those voting, to render a decision to move the requested review forward. If an associate professor believes that a decision not to conduct a promotion review was made unfairly, they may raise their concerns with the department chair, the dean, or the Executive Vice President and Provost.

Associate professors who decide to move forward with review for promotion will be referred to as candidates in the following sections.

5.H.2. Procedures and criteria for obtaining external and internal reviews. See section 5.G.2. External review letters should document the national or international reputation in the candidate's field or fields of study.

5.H.3. Preparation and submission of the dossier. See Section 5.G.3. The dossier should be cumulative across the candidate's career. Indicate accomplishments since last promotion with a hashtag sign. Of the items listed in the dossier contents, copies of annual probationary faculty reviews should not be included. In the PC letters section of the dossier, only the letter regarding promotion to Professor should be included.

5.H.4. DC report for candidates and submission of the candidate's dossier to the PC. See section 5.G.4.

5.H.5. Personnel Subcommittee (PS) letter. The full professor members of the PC will comprise a subcommittee of the PC (hereafter referred to as the PS). This PS shall critically review the vitae and dossier submitted by the candidate to determine whether or not these documents are complete and in the correct format according to section 5.G.3 and Appendix A. The PS may request additional information or further work on the documents from the candidate or the candidate's DC. The PS will also critically review the DC report and the external and internal review letters that have been received for a candidate (by mid- to late September, the department chair shall provide to the PC copies of these letters).

Based on its review of these materials, the PS shall prepare a formal review letter addressed to the tenured full professors in the department that includes each of the following elements:

- a. A summary and evaluation of the candidate's professional accomplishments in the areas of scholarly inquiry, teaching and advising, and service,
- b. Information concerning how the candidate's work has moved in a systematic direction, met the needs and mission of the program, the department, and the college,
- c. A report (without attribution) of a preliminary vote by the PS, which indicates the number of no and yes votes to the question, "Shall the candidate be recommended for promotion to the rank of Professor?" and which contains a recommendation for or against promotion.

The PS shall place the letter in the candidate's dossier (see section 5.G.3) and provide a copy to the department chair. This shall be done by the date specified in the departmental timeline (usually early October). Also by the date specified in the departmental timeline (usually early October), the PS is responsible for the delivery of the faculty member's dossier containing the PS letter to the department chair.

5.H.6. Review of candidate's dossier by the tenured full professors in the department. The complete dossier for the candidate containing the PS letter and the review letters is made available to the full professors in the department for review at least two weeks prior to the vote of the tenured full professors. The department chair sends out a notice to all tenured full professors in the department eligible to participate in the decision that the dossier is available for review. Relevant information must not be excluded from the file, but the weight to be given to the views of any particular external reviewer is a matter to be considered by the tenured full professors. To ensure a thorough department level review, eligible voting faculty must review the entire file, even though comprehensive summary materials are contained in it.

5.H.7. Notification of meeting of the tenured full professors to take formal action. Approximately two weeks after the dossiers have been available for review (usually mid- to late October), the full professors in the department meet to vote on recommendations of candidates for promotion. Preferably near the beginning of the academic year, but in any case well in advance of the date, faculty are to receive notification of the date and time of this meeting, which should be set to allow compliance with schedules set by the college for receiving recommendations from departments. This meeting shall be scheduled so that ample time to

discuss the professional accomplishments of each candidate is available (see a sample promotion and tenure process schedule letter to faculty in Appendix C).

5.H.8. Eligibility to participate in the decision. All tenured full professors in the department are eligible to participate in the discussion and voting except those noted as follows. If the department chair is a member of the tenured faculty and a full professor, they may participate and vote, but has no additional tie-breaking vote. Persons who are or were closely related to a candidate by blood or marriage, or who have or have had an intimate personal relationship with a candidate which would prejudice their judgment, must not attend or participate in the meeting with respect to that candidate. Such persons will notify the department chair well in advance of the meeting of their present or past relationship to the faculty member being considered and leave the room during the time that discussion and voting is occurring regarding that faculty member. If the candidate or another member of the tenured faculty wishes to challenge the participation of any member of the tenured faculty, University policies provided in *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty* will be followed.

5.H.9. Absentee ballots. See section 5.G.9.

5.H.10. Taking formal action at the meeting of the tenured full professors in the department. The department chair shall send out an agenda for the meeting between one and two weeks prior to the meeting. The PS shall organize the meeting. A PS member shall provide an introduction to the case of each candidate by distributing and reviewing the PS's letter for that candidate, thus providing a brief overview of the accomplishments of the faculty member. The PS member shall also note the recommendations of the PS contained in the letter. Following this introduction of the candidate, the tenured faculty will commence the discussion. When the discussion is completed, action will be taken by a simple majority vote using unsigned electronic ballots through a secure, password-protected voting site. The question to be voted on is: "Shall the candidate be recommended for promotion to the rank of professor?" Response options on the ballot will be yes, no, and abstain, and will contain the phrase, "if abstain, provide reasons in writing here:" and space for writing these reasons. The ballots will be immediately counted (including any absentee ballots received by the deadline for absentee ballots and any abstentions) by members present who are appointed to this task by the department chair. The vote will be immediately orally reported: the number of yes and no votes and the number of abstentions. Abstentions will not be counted in determining whether a majority of those voting cast no or yes votes, but the number of abstentions is reported as part of the vote tally. It should be noted that abstentions are strongly discouraged. Abstentions are not counted in determining whether a majority of those voting cast votes in favor of tenure or promotion, as required to report an affirmative recommendation, and in the review process at other levels, will be considered an indication of lack of support for the candidate by those abstaining. If tenured faculty members are eligible to vote and do not cast a vote (whether present at the meeting or not), the number of such non-votes is reported but they are not counted as affirmative or negative votes, or as abstentions. The department chair will be the recorder for the meeting, recording the discussion and the vote.

A simple majority of yes votes among all votes cast results in the forwarding of a recommendation by the faculty to the college for promotion. A negative vote or no majority (i.e., a tie vote) for the question results in continuation of the associate professor rank. The department will forward to the college a report of the faculty meeting, including the discussion, the vote, and the recommendation by the faculty that the associate professor rank be continued, as noted in the next section.

5.H.11. Reporting of action taken. The department chair writes a report and forwards the report and the candidate's file to the dean for review by the deadline noted by the college for receipt of reports regarding promotions. If there is a negative vote for promotion at the department level, the candidate may withdraw his or her file from further consideration. The report should indicate the faculty's recommendation, the number who are qualified to vote, the number of affirmative and negative votes for the promotion and question, the number of persons present at the meeting who abstained and the reasons for abstaining, and the number who were absent and not voting. Participating through electronic video chat counts as being present. It should also indicate how many absentee ballots were cast. If there is a "reconsideration" after an initial vote (if, for example, new information comes to light after the faculty meeting and vote has occurred and this information warrants revisiting the recommendation), both the original and the reconsidered vote should be fully reported. The report should summarize the candidate's file and indicate the reasons for the action expressed at the meeting of the tenured full professors. The statement of reasons expressed must be a summary of both majority and minority views that had substantial support expressed in the course of formal consideration of the action. All statements reflecting the discussion must be made without personal attribution.

The department chair also prepares an additional statement of personal agreement or disagreement with the department's recommendation, including the reasons for any disagreement.

A preliminary draft of the report, including the departmental information noted above as well as the department chair's statement, is made available to members of the faculty eligible to vote so they may comment and suggest changes. The final draft is open to the faculty eligible to vote. Faculty members may file separate, signed reports if they believe that their views are not adequately reflected in the departmental report. Copies of such separate reports must be given to the department chair and to the candidate. The submission of such reports is the only way that university policy provides for faculty members to present their separate views to the dean, collegiate, and university review bodies.

The department chair places the final report, along with any separate reports from faculty, in the candidate's dossier. The department chair informs the candidate of the department's recommendation and of the department chair's own recommendation and gives the candidate a copy of the report containing both.

The candidate has a right to inspect individual evaluations contained in the file that will be forwarded to the dean. The candidate has a right to add material to the file and to submit a

supplementary statement to the dean and college review committee. Copies of the statement must be given to the department chair and distributed to the tenured faculty.

The department chair forwards the candidate's dossier (including the departmental report containing the departmental recommendation and the department chair's recommendation, any separate statements by tenured full professors, and any supplementary statement by the candidate) to the Dean's Office for College Review.

SECTION 6: POST-TENURE REVIEW

Procedures for conducting annual post-tenure review in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction include the following steps (steps adopted from the CEHD's Committee on Post-Tenure Review's recommendations). The procedures outlined below are also consistent with the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* (Section VI., Annual Review of Tenured Faculty) and the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure* (Section 7.a Review of Faculty Performance).

The purpose of conducting a post-tenure review, in addition to the fact that it is mandated by the university, is to provide support for tenured faculty in helping them define their goals and meet departmental goals and expectations related to scholarly inquiry, teaching and advising, and service, and to assist them in achieving those goals in terms of their contributions to the overall mission of the department. The intent of this process is therefore not to impose punitive sanctions, but to provide a supportive environment that insures long-term, ongoing professional growth. While the goals and expectations for tenured faculty members parallel those used in the granting of tenure, they also reflect different stages of professional development of faculty, providing for flexibility.

6.A. Annual Review

An annual review of each faculty member will take place by April 15 by the chair to address both merit reviews for salary increases and for post-tenure review. Evaluation for merit review and post-tenure review will be based on the department's identified criteria, formulated by a sub-committee of the PC and approved by the tenure track faculty and on file in the college, set out in the "merit rubric" (see Appendix D for current version of this document). This annual review will serve as both a post-tenure review and merit review for compensation purposes. Faculty who do not submit accomplishment forms and vitae as part of this review will be required to participate in a post-tenure review and will not be eligible for a salary increase. In order to provide faculty with some sense of the evaluative norms operating in the department, information regarding faculty performance will be periodically provided to the faculty (e.g., an annual departmental report that includes accomplishments of departmental faculty).

6.B. Annual Meeting With Department Chair

The department chair will meet with each faculty member annually by June 1 after the written documentation has been examined. Discussion will address both past accomplishments and

future workload and expectations for the coming year. Faculty may also identify areas for development in teaching and advising, scholarly inquiry, and/or service, and seek assistance from the chair and/or PC.

6.C. Meeting Record

By June 1, the department chair will provide for the departmental files a brief written summary of conclusions from the reviews and interviews. It is expected that, in most cases, this brief record of the decisions made during each post-tenure annual review will not exceed one or two paragraphs. A copy of this brief record will also be given to the faculty member under review. These brief records will be maintained in the personnel files of the department for each faculty member.

6.D. Performance Issues

If in two consecutive years an associate professor's annual accomplishment report indicates that she or he is substantially below expectations for associate professors as outlined in sections 2a, b, and c, or if a full professor's annual accomplishment report indicates that she or he is substantially below expectations for professors as outlined in sections 4c, d, and e, the department chair and the PC will work with the faculty member to establish written goals and expectations for the faculty member's work in the area or areas for a defined period of at least one year. If the faculty member's annual accomplishment report at the end of the defined period indicates that he or she remains substantially below expectations in the same area or areas, and the department chair judges them to be substantially below the expectations noted above, the chair will then forward copies of the faculty member's annual accomplishment reports judged by the chair to indicate sustained substandard performance to the PC. The PC will then review the possible substandard performance of the faculty member, and concur or not concur with the chair's evaluation, stating their conclusion and reasons for it in a written report to the department chair. If the PC does not concur with the department chair's evaluation, no further action is taken regarding the faculty member's performance. If the PC concurs with the department chair's evaluation that the faculty member's performance is "substantially below expectations" and that he or she has not made substantial progress towards meeting the written goals and expectations agreed upon by the faculty member, the department chair, and the PC after the defined period is over, the chair will forward a request to the dean for a special review (see section 7a.3 of *Faculty Tenure*).

APPENDICES

These appendices contain documents related to the policies and procedures outlined in the department 7.12 statement. These items are not a formal part of the 7.12 statement. They are operational documents that reflect and are used in carrying out the policies and procedures noted in the 7.12 statement. See section 1.A regarding making changes in the appendices.

APPENDIX A: Curriculum Vitae Outline

APPENDIX B: External Review Letters

APPENDIX C: Sample Promotion and Tenure Process Schedule Letter to Faculty

APPENDIX D: Annual Merit Review Documents

APPENDIX E: *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure* Extending the Probationary Period Provision

APPENDIX F: *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure* Departmental Statement Section

APPENDIX A - Curriculum Vitae Outline

CEHD Promotion and Tenure Guidelines require use of the standardized University of Minnesota CV template generated in [Works](#) or the [Master Curriculum Vitae for Promotion and Tenure](#). This curriculum vitae outline is to be used by CI faculty and academic staff in all reporting, including annual pretenured faculty review, review for tenure and/or promotion in rank, and annual merit review. List scholarly inquiry, teaching/advising, and service, in reverse chronological order--from most to least recent. If you have no contributions in a particular category, do not include the heading for that category.

CURRICULUM VITAE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE¹

NAME _____

IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

Academic Rank

Assistant/Associate/Professor in Department or Unit
Graduate Faculty Appointment in Programs

Education

Degree	Institution	Date Degree Granted
B.S./B.A.	University Area	Year
M.A./M.S.	University Area	Year
Ph.D./J.D.	University Area/Department	Year
M.D.		
[Advisor for Ph.D.]		

[These degrees are placeholders for whatever degrees that the candidate holds. We recognize that a wide range of degrees have been received by faculty that are not listed here.]

Licenses, certifications, certificates, etc. that may be relevant.

Positions/Employment

University of Minnesota, Campus [Twin Cities, Morris, Crookston, Rochester] (year began – present year)

Current rank (assistant, associate professor) _____ dates _____

Previous rank dates

Previous employment (name of university or institution) _____ dates _____

Previous rank (assistant, associate professor)	dates
--	-------

Postdoctoral appointments	dates
1997-1998	1997-1998
1998-1999	1998-1999
1999-2000	1999-2000
2000-2001	2000-2001
2001-2002	2001-2002
2002-2003	2002-2003
2003-2004	2003-2004
2004-2005	2004-2005
2005-2006	2005-2006
2006-2007	2006-2007
2007-2008	2007-2008
2008-2009	2008-2009
2009-2010	2009-2010
2010-2011	2010-2011
2011-2012	2011-2012
2012-2013	2012-2013
2013-2014	2013-2014
2014-2015	2014-2015
2015-2016	2015-2016
2016-2017	2016-2017
2017-2018	2017-2018
2018-2019	2018-2019
2019-2020	2019-2020
2020-2021	2020-2021
2021-2022	2021-2022
2022-2023	2022-2023
2023-2024	2023-2024
2024-2025	2024-2025
2025-2026	2025-2026
2026-2027	2026-2027
2027-2028	2027-2028
2028-2029	2028-2029
2029-2030	2029-2030
2030-2031	2030-2031
2031-2032	2031-2032
2032-2033	2032-2033
2033-2034	2033-2034
2034-2035	2034-2035
2035-2036	2035-2036
2036-2037	2036-2037
2037-2038	2037-2038
2038-2039	2038-2039
2039-2040	2039-2040
2040-2041	2040-2041
2041-2042	2041-2042
2042-2043	2042-2043
2043-2044	2043-2044
2044-2045	2044-2045
2045-2046	2045-2046
2046-2047	2046-2047
2047-2048	2047-2048
2048-2049	2048-2049
2049-2050	2049-2050
2050-2051	2050-2051
2051-2052	2051-2052
2052-2053	2052-2053
2053-2054	2053-2054
2054-2055	2054-2055
2055-2056	2055-2056
2056-2057	2056-2057
2057-2058	2057-2058
2058-2059	2058-2059
2059-2060	2059-2060
2060-2061	2060-2061
2061-2062	2061-2062
2062-2063	2062-2063
2063-2064	2063-2064
2064-2065	2064-2065
2065-2066	2065-2066
2066-2067	2066-2067
2067-2068	2067-2068
2068-2069	2068-2069
2069-2070	2069-2070
2070-2071	2070-2071
2071-2072	2071-2072
2072-2073	2072-2073
2073-2074	2073-2074
2074-2075	2074-2075
2075-2076	2075-2076
2076-2077	2076-2077
2077-2078	2077-2078
2078-2079	2078-2079
2079-2080	2079-2080
2080-2081	2080-2081
2081-2082	2081-2082
2082-2083	2082-2083
2083-2084	2083-2084
2084-2085	2084-2085
2085-2086	2085-2086
2086-2087	2086-2087
2087-2088	2087-2088
2088-2089	2088-2089
2089-2090	2089-2090
2090-2091	2090-2091
2091-2092	2091-2092
2092-2093	2092-2093
2093-2094	2093-2094
2094-2095	2094-2095
2095-2096	2095-2096
2096-2097	2096-2097
2097-2098	2097-2098
2098-2099	2098-2099
2099-2100	2099-2100
2100-2101	2100-2101
2101-2102	2101-2102
2102-2103	2102-2103
2103-2104	2103-2104
2104-2105	2104-2105
2105-2106	2105-2106
2106-2107	210

Graduate appointments	dates
-----------------------	-------

Other professional employment dates

Current Membership in Professional Organizations

¹ Please make sure that all the items relevant to your scholarship/creative work, teaching, service/outreach work find a place on this c.v. If you do not find a category that fits an item, please create an appropriate heading for that item. Similarly, if a category does not pertain to your case, then eliminate it from the list.

HONORS AND AWARDS FOR RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK, TEACHING, PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT, AND SERVICE

University of Minnesota

McKnight Land-Grant Professorship; McKnight Presidential Fellowship
Morse Undergraduate Teaching Award; Graduate/Professional Teaching Award
Collegiate Teaching and Advising Awards
Tate Advising Award
President's Outstanding Service Award
Other research, teaching, public engagement, and service awards

External Sources

Fellowships
Prestigious grants (e.g. NSF CAREER)
Awards from professional associations or journals
Elections to societies
Any award that is germane in the candidate's field
Artistic residencies
National research, teaching, public engagement, service awards
State or local research, teaching, public engagement, service awards

Visiting Professorships or Visiting Scholar Positions

Name of university/college/institute; department; dates; focus

Visiting Artist Engagements

Name of university/college/institute or venue; dates; focus

RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE WORK

Grants and Contracts

[These grants and contracts can be for research or creative work, teaching and learning, curriculum development, public engagement, international work, etc.]

External Sources (federal {NIH, NSF, DEO, etc.} or state grants, foundation awards, etc.)

[List current grants first, followed by grants that have been completed. Some units may ask for a listing of grants applied for but not obtained as well.]]

Received at the University of Minnesota:

Investigator status (Principal investigator, Co-PI, Co-investigator)
Name of PI (if not the candidate)
External Agency
Project title and Dates
Direct costs

Received at the University of Minnesota – Student Grants

Student Name, Principal Investigator (Candidate, Research Sponsor).
Grant title and external or internal agency
Dates

Received at another institution:

Investigator status (Principal investigator, Co-PI, Co-investigator)
Name of PI (if not the candidate)
External Agency
Project title and Dates
Direct costs

University Sources (examples below – include the titles, dates, and amount of the awards)

Grant-in-Aid
Other awards from the Office of the Vice President for Research or the Graduate School
President's Multicultural Research Awards
Awards from other University Sources (Office of International Programs, CURA, Office of
Public Engagement, etc.)
Curricular development awards (e.g. Academy of Distinguished Teachers,
Technology Enhanced Learning, etc.)
Awards from colleges

Publications [Note if these are published electronically with a URL if appropriate]

Books or Monographs (eliminate if not necessary)

Author(s), Title, Year of Publication or Publication Status, Publisher
(Indicate if the book is edited, Indicate the candidate's role in multi-author papers)
[Use the order of most recent book to first book.]
Where book reviewed
If co-authored, explain your contribution

Refereed Journal Articles (use any standard format that the candidate's field uses)

Author(s), article title, journal title, volume, year, page numbers (e.g., 225-243)
(Indicate the candidate's role in multi-author papers – this is required in many 7.12 statements;
as well as student authors. This can be done in many ways such as an annotation under each
article or a coded system that is explained in the header of this section.)
[Use the order of most recent article to first article.]

Non-refereed Journal Articles, Essays, or Book Chapters (use any standard format that the candidate's field uses)

Author(s), article title, journal title, volume, year, page numbers (e.g., 225-243)
(Indicate the candidate's role in multi-author papers – this is required in many 7.12 statements;
as well as student authors. This can be done in many ways such as an annotation under each
article or a coded system that is explained in the header of this section.)

[Use the order of most recent article to first article.]

Proceedings of Conferences [indicate whether these are refereed]

Author(s), title, venue, year, page numbers (e.g., 225-243)

Catalogs

Author(s), title, venue, year, pages

Interviews

Author, title, journal/publication, volume, year, page numbers (e.g., 225-243)

Review of performances/exhibitions

Author, title, journal/publication, volume, year, pages

Software Development

Presentations, Posters, and Exhibits

Invited Presentations at Professional Meetings, Conferences, etc. (use any standard format that the candidate's field uses)

Author(s), presentation title, conference or meeting title, date, place of presentation

[Indicate keynote presentations, panels, symposia, etc.]

Contributed Papers Presented at Professional Meetings, Conferences, etc. (use any standard format that the candidate's field uses)

Author(s), presentation title, conference or meeting title, date, place of presentation

[Indicate any student co-authors.]

Include artist talks, panels, gallery presentations, symposia, etc. if applicable

Abstracts (published in electronic or paper format that are archived or searchable)

Author(s), presentation title, conference or meeting title, date, place of presentation

[Indicate any student co-authors.]

Posters or Exhibitions (use any standard format that the candidate's field uses)

Author(s), presentation title, conference or meeting title, date, place of presentation

[Indicate any student co-authors.]

Professional Artistic and Creative Experience

Solo Exhibitions/Tours (indicate venues – local, national, international)

Solo Public Art or Architectural Commissions/Project

Solo Private Art or Architectural Commissions

Collaborative Exhibitions, Projects, and Performances

Curatorial Projects

Video screenings

LPs, CDs, Films

Repertory activities

Choreography

Other production experience (e.g. projects in art and culture; reconstruction and rehearsal direction; editing, etc.)

Architectural projects and designs
Restorations

Websites

Note level of development and participation

Other Key Activities and Accomplishments

TEACHING AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

University of Minnesota (repeat for other university or academic positions)

Courses, seminars, and instructional units taught (just a listing here – put in details of number of students and dates taught in the teaching section of the dossier)

Curriculum Development

(courses, seminars, laboratories, curriculum guides, assessment activities for student learning, service learning materials, rubrics, etc.)

Collaborative Efforts and Activities

(co-teaching, interdisciplinary teaching, curricular planning, assessment, etc.)

Faculty Development Activities regarding teaching

(workshops or programs with the Center for Teaching and Learning, including the Early Career or Mid Career Teaching Programs; workshops with the Center for Writing, Digital Media Center, etc.)

ADVISING AND MENTORING

Undergraduate Student Activities

Undergraduate research projects (UOPS, directed research, lab participation, etc.)

Student names

Undergraduate summa theses or honors projects directed

Student names

Undergraduate advising

Student names

Graduate Student Activities

Master's Theses Directed

Student name, title of thesis, date

Master's Student Advisees

Student names

Doctoral Dissertations Directed

Student name, title of dissertation, date

Doctoral Students Advised (Academic advising for all or part of graduate student's program)

Student Names

Doctoral Committees Served on

Student Names

Professional Student Activities

Professional students supervised

Names, dates

Post-doctoral fellows supervised

Name, dates

Residents Supervised

Names, dates

Visiting Scholars Hosted

Names, dates

Other Mentoring Activities [including serving as a mentor or member of a mentoring committee for a faculty member, etc.]

[Repeat all of the above for other institutions.]

SERVICE AND PUBLIC OUTREACH

Service To The Discipline/Profession/Interdisciplinary Area(s)

Editorships/Journal Reviewer Experience

Associate/Section Editor or Editor, Journal, Dates

Reviewer experience, Journal, Dates

Committee memberships [indicate if the candidate served as chair]

[include task forces, boards, etc. for professional organizations]

Review panels for external funding agencies, foundations, etc.

[include agencies, review panel names, dates, etc.]

Program review experience

[include reviews for universities, professional organizations, funding agencies, etc. with dates, places, focus, etc.]

Jurors for artistic/creative works

[include venues, dates, etc.]

Organization of conferences, workshops, panels, symposia [indicate if served as chair or co-chair, member of the organizing committee, etc.]

[include dates, organization/society if applicable, nature of work, etc.]

Service To The University/College/Department

University of Minnesota [indicate dates of service activities]

University-wide service

[University or Faculty Senate; Senate Committees; Task Forces; Special Panels; etc.]

Collegiate Service and Intercollegiate Service

[Collegiate assembly; collegiate committees, task forces, panels, etc.]

Department/Unit Service

[director of undergraduate studies; director of graduate studies; chair; associate chair; Search committees (chair); curriculum committees; other department committees]

Repeat for other universities or institutions

Public And Other Service

Community, state, national, or international service activities

Any other service in which the candidate engages with the public

APPENDIX B – External Review Letters

Sample Brief Request for Agreement to Provide External Review Letter (E-Mail or Letter)

Re: Request to serve as an external reviewer for tenure and promotion

Date

Dear Professor _____ :

I am writing to request your help in reviewing the dossier of Dr. _____, Assistant Professor, who is being considered for promotion to associate professor with tenure in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education and Human Development, University of Minnesota. In the early fall of year, tenured full and associate professors will vote on whether Dr. _____'s contributions in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and outreach and service warrant their being recommended for promotion and tenure. Dr. _____'s scholarship is in the area of _____ and it is our understanding that you are an acknowledged leader in this field.

As a matter of departmental, college, and university policy, we are seeking external reviews of Dr. _____'s contributions in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and outreach and service. While we realize that you may not be able to comment as specifically on Dr. _____'s teaching, unless you have worked with them in workshops or other instructional situations, we hope that you can review their scholarship, outreach and service to the profession, as well as evidence of teaching using the materials we forward to you, including their vitae.

Specifically, we ask you to provide by **September 1, 20XX** an assessment of the following:

The impact of Dr. _____'s research upon the field of _____ ;

The focus and scholarly quality of their research and writing, including specific commentary on its conceptualization, methodology, etc.; please also include comments on the quality and impact of the journals and other outlets in which their work appears;

The quality of their teaching efforts based on the documentation provided;

The impact and quality of outreach and service accomplishments as noted in their vitae or scholarly endeavors;

Please email me to let me know if you are willing to write a letter for Dr. _____'s review for promotion and tenure or if you are unable to do so. If you respond Yes (which I hope you will) I will send a packet of materials to you. Thank you for considering my request.

Chair name, e-mail address, and phone number

Sample Official External Review Request Letter

Date:

inside address

Dear _____ :

Thank you for agreeing to review the dossier of Dr. _____, Assistant Professor, who is being considered for promotion and tenure in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education and Human Development, University of Minnesota. In the early fall of year, tenured full and associate professors will vote on whether Dr. _____'s contributions in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and outreach and service warrant being recommended for promotion and tenure. Dr. _____'s research focuses on _____ and it is our understanding that you are an acknowledged leader in this field.

As a matter of departmental, college, and university policy, we are seeking external reviews of Dr. _____'s contributions in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and outreach and service. While we realize that you may not be able to comment as specifically on Dr. _____'s teaching, unless you have worked with them in workshops or other instructional situations, we hope that you can review their scholarship, outreach and service to the profession, as well as evidence of teaching using the enclosed materials, which include their vitae and syllabus example(s).

Specifically, we ask you to provide an assessment of the following (1-6) by September X, XXXX:

1. The overall impact of Dr. _____'s research upon the field noted above;
2. The focus and scholarly quality of their research and writing, including specific commentary on its conceptualization, methodology, etc.; please also include comments on the quality and impact of the journals and other outlets in which their work appears;
3. The quality of their teaching efforts based on the documentation provided;
4. The impact and quality of their outreach and service accomplishments as noted in their vitae or scholarly endeavors;
5. Whether or not Dr. _____'s work thus far has met reasonable expectations in accordance with their 7.12 criteria for promotion (included) for a tenured associate professor;
6. Dr. _____'s reputation in the field.

For review of promotion to full professor only: As is noted in the University of Minnesota *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*, Section 9.2: The basis for promotion to the rank of Professor is the determination that each candidate has (1) demonstrated the intellectual distinction and academic integrity expected of all faculty members, (2) added substantially to an already distinguished record of academic achievement, and (3) established the national or international reputation (or both) ordinarily resulting from such distinction and achievement. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service. 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. (See this complete statement, including definitions in Section 1F of the enclosed department statement of criteria regarding promotion and tenure of faculty).

I have enclosed Dr. _____'s vitae; statement of research, teaching, and service; copies of three of publications; a syllabus for a course they have developed and taught, and the department's criteria for promotion. We will need to have your letter for Dr. _____ by September X, 20XX, in order to prepare for the departmental review process in mid-September. When submitting your letter, please enclose a copy of your vitae and a brief biographical sketch (one paragraph) as these are also required by the university as part of the dossier.

Please know that your letter must be signed and on institutional letterhead. Email your letter for Dr. _____, your vitae, and your biographical sketch to [chair email](#). You can also send documents to: Dr. _____, Chair

Curriculum and Instruction Department
145 Peik Hall
University of Minnesota
159 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0208

You should also be aware that, at the conclusion of the review process, all materials we collect will be made available to the candidate as legally mandated in the State of Minnesota. We are most grateful for your assistance in this important matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to email me at _____ or call me at _____

Sincerely,

_____, Chair
Curriculum and Instruction Department

Enclosures:
name of candidate vitae
name of candidate teaching, research, and service statement
5 articles
course syllabus

***Special Language to be Used in Request Letters to External Reviewers if the Candidate has extended their probationary period:

Professor XXX has received an approved extension of the probationary period for XXX years according to provisions of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. We ask that you evaluate their record in the same way as other candidates who do not have an extension of their probationary period. That is, we request that you consider the record without weighing the extension as a factor in your letter of evaluation.

APPENDIX C - Sample Promotion & Tenure Process Schedule Letter to Faculty

August 25, 2XXX

TO: C&I Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

FROM: _____, Personnel Committee Chair and _____, Department Chair

RE: Dates and Materials for 2XXX-2XXX P&T Process

The promotion and tenure process will follow the procedures outlined in the C&I 7.12 statement approved xxx. These procedures are consistent with the university's revised *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* dated xxx. This procedures document, the Board of Regents *Faculty Tenure* policy, and the department's 7.12 statement are attached.

In the timeline below, you are referred to procedures sections in the new department 7.12 statement that apply to each aspect of the timeline. These 7.12 sections referenced in the timeline apply to faculty as follows:

Section 5.F: applies to assistant professors who will be reviewed for continuation.

Section 5.G: applies to assistant professors seeking promotion and tenure; several of the procedures in this section also apply to assistant professors seeking continuation and to associate professors seeking promotion.

Section 5.H: applies to associate professors seeking promotion.

The following dates have been set for this year's activities related to annual review of pretenured faculty and tenure and promotion processes as delineated in the attached 7.12 departmental policy statement.

1. Late August-early September — Faculty members preparing for review meet and work with their mentor (see Section 5B) and second Dossier Committee (DC) member (see Section 5C). The mentor takes the lead in assembling this group. The DC and the faculty member go over the attached promotion and tenure documents. Faculty members' vitae (see Appendix A) and dossier (see Sections 5.F.1, 5.G.3 and 5.H.3) are updated and put into the correct format.

2. September 2 — External letters for faculty who are to be considered for tenure and/or promotion are due (see Section 5.G.2 and 5.H.2).

3. September 15 — Faculty members' vitae and dossier are due to their DC. The DC reviews the dossier and prepares a report (see Sections 5.F.2 and 5.G.4) for the Personnel Committee (PC) (see Section 5A), due to the chair of the PC on September 29.

4. September 29 — The following items are due to the chair of the PC and should be delivered to Room 145: (a) The DC report in the form of an outline (submit hard copy and electronic copy); (b) Pretenured faculty members and tenured faculty members seeking promotion in rank submit their dossier and a hard copy of their vitae, which incorporates the DC's suggestions; (c) The department chair provides copies of the external review letters for those individuals being reviewed for tenure

and/or promotion. The PC reviews the materials they receive and writes a letter regarding each dossier (see Sections 5.F.3, 5.G.5 and 5.H.5).

5. October 13 — The complete dossier for each faculty member, which contains the PC's letter for the faculty member is made available to the tenured faculty for review. The department chair inserts copies of external review letters in dossiers of those individuals being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion (materials located in 145) (see Sections 5.F.4, 5.G.6, and 5.H.6).

6. October XX, 8:00 a.m.-12 noon, Room 40 Peik — Tenured faculty meet to vote on any faculty members seeking tenure and/or promotion and on the continuation of appointments of the pretenured faculty (see Sections 5.F.5, 5.F.8, 5.G.7 - 5.G.10, and 5.H.7-5.H.10) (we vote on _____ for tenure and promotion, and on continuation for _____).

7. November 5-6 – The dossier including the chair's letter reflecting faculty vote and discussion for each individual being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion is available to the candidates for review and, if desired, comment (see Sections 5.F.9, 5.G.11, and 5.H.11).

8. November 7 — The department chair submits dossier, including original external and internal review letters, chair's letter reflecting faculty vote and discussion, and candidates response (if any) to the dean (see Sections 5.F.9, 5.G.11, and 5.H.11).

9. December and January — Department chair writes reports of reviews for each pretenured faculty for whom continuation is recommended and meets with each person (see Section 5.F.9).

10. February — Deadline for the department chair to submit the pretenured faculty reviews to the dean (see Section 5.F.9).

11. Spring Semester

-DCs meet with pretenured faculty to address data from the annual review and make recommendations and plans for the remainder of spring semester, summer, and the academic year ahead. In March, the chair sends out a notice requesting that assistant and associate professors declare their intent to the department chair regarding a plan to seek formal review for promotion and/or tenure during the following fall semester (see Sections 5.G.1 and 5.H.1).

-April 15 – Deadline for assistant and associate professors declarations of intent.

-Late April-June - The chair and PC work on matters related to pretenured assistant professors recommended during the fall process for formal review for tenure and promotion in the next academic year and other faculty indicating their intent to seek promotion in the coming fall (see Sections 5.G.1, 5.H.1, and 5.H.2). The department chair and PC chair and associate chair work with each candidate and other faculty to seek names of qualified professors at comparable universities to write external review letters for tenure and/or promotion cases (see Section 5.G.2 and 5.H.2). In early May, the chair secures (via e-mail) external reviewers' agreement to write letters and then in May or early June sends a packet of materials and a letter outlining what the letter needs to address (see Appendix B). Letters are due from external reviewers by September 1st.

Enclosures: C&I 7.12 Statement approved April 15, 2008
Board of Regents policy on *Faculty Tenure*, approved June 2007
Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or
Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty dated October 15, 2007
DC assignments

APPENDIX D – Annual Merit Review Documents

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF ANNUAL REVIEW ACCOMPLISHMENTS
FOR TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

(Approved by C&I Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty 12/12/16)

Name _____

Please use this document to categorize your accomplishments using the Department rubric, as well as provide information regarding your teaching, advising, and service activities for the reporting period, including information regarding course buy-outs.

If you have a work scope other than 40-40-20 (that is approved by the Chair), enter the percentages here:

Research: ____% Teaching/Advising: ____% Service: ____%

Share additional details here related to percentages below. For example, “Due to research obligations, I did not teach a class during the 201x academic year. So, my work scope is 50% research, 30% teaching; 20% service.”

SCHOLARLY INQUIRY

Your self-assessment for the SCHOLARLY INQUIRY category (check one):

_____ **Level 3: Exceeds Expectations:** A minimum of 4 accomplishments, including at least 1 level three accomplishment; 2 level two or higher accomplishments, 1 of which must be a publication; and 1 other accomplishment at any level.

_____ **Level 2: Meets Expectations:** A minimum of 3 accomplishments, including 2 level two accomplishments, 1 of which must be a level two publication; and at least 1 other accomplishment.

_____ **Level 1: Below Expectations:** Does not meet requirements for “Meets Expectations.”

Use the CI Annual Review Criteria-Tenured, Tenure-Track Faculty document to make your own judgment of your scholarly activities. For example, *Type of accomplishment* could be “peer reviewed journal article,” “book chapter,” “grant,” “curriculum materials,” etc. In the *Description* column please provide one or two sentences (maximum) to help the committee understand its level of accomplishment. Add additional lines to the table as necessary.

LEVEL 3

Type of accomplishment	Description

LEVEL 2

Type of accomplishment	Description

Multi-Year Projects: In 150 words or less, explain the 3-year project (e.g., book) you wish to be counted as an accomplishment each year for up to three years, including the expected date of completion. Also include the number of times (up to three) that you are reporting this accomplishment.

Optional: In 150 words or less, you may highlight aspects of your SCHOLARLY INQUIRY to which you would like to draw the committee's attention.

TEACHING (includes advising)

Your self-assessment for the TEACHING category (check one):

 Level 3: Exceeds Expectations. Course evaluation average of 5.0 or higher on responses to items 1-6 on the standard course evaluation form, and an additional 4 accomplishments, for a total of 5 teaching accomplishments.

 Level 2: Meets Expectations. A minimum of 3 accomplishments.

 Level 1: Below Expectations. Does not meet requirements for “Meets Expectations.”

List the credit course sections and directed studies you taught/directed during each 2016 term. If you had release time, please indicate what supported it under the appropriate time frame. Add additional lines as necessary.

Spring XXXX

<u>Course Designator & Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>

Summer XXXX

<u>Course Designator & Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>

Fall XXXX

<u>Course Designator & Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>

Release time and its support:

Term	Number of Credits	Source of support

List of current/active advisees:

Student name/Track/Department	Degree	Milestones 2016

List of current/active committees (non-advisees):

Student name/Track/Department	Degree	Milestones XXXX (YEAR)

Teaching Accomplishments

In the table below, put an X in the leftmost column of any row that applies to you. In the “#” column, enter the number of courses/students/etc. to which that row applies.

X	#	Item
		Awards for teaching
		Participation in a course co-teaching partnership or learning community (e.g., CEHD First Year Learning Community)
		Engagement with students on independent study courses
		Teaching an online or distance learning course
		Teaching a designated writing intensive (WI) course
		Teaching a doctoral level writing intensive course
		Supervision/mentorship of students in teaching that is not part of a course load
		Development of innovative materials or practices
		Program development
		“Anchor” program area by teaching required course(s)
		Teach Initial Licensure Program courses
		Teach courses embedded in schools
		Active program recruitment of students
		Implementing technology in new and creative ways
		Rating of “excellent” on a teaching peer review or other qualitative evaluations
		Course evaluation average of 5.0 or higher on responses to items 1-6 on the standard course evaluation form

		Teaching large numbers of students (150 or more per year)
		Participation in college or university teaching improvement initiatives (e.g., Center for Educational Innovation (CEI) workshops attended, CEI evaluators observing classes, Writing Center workshops, CEHD TREKs)
		Significant feedback given to large numbers of students (e.g., alerts, progress reports, meetings with students)
		Development of a new course
		Significantly revise an existing course
		Unsolicited student comments regarding one's effectiveness as an adviser
		Self-evaluation of one's approach to advising
		Supplemental information such as advisee awards
		Exceptional placements of graduate students
		At least three (3) theses/dissertations advised to completion
		Serving in an unofficial role as advisor as a member of a student committee
		Supporting student presentations at national or international conferences (e.g., organizing, co-presenting)
		Co-authoring journal article or book chapter with students
		University Research Opportunity program(UROP) supervisor
		Other accomplishment (specify)

Optional: In 150 words or less, you may highlight aspects of your TEACHING (includes advising) to which you would like to draw the committee's attention.

SERVICE

Your self-assessment for the SERVICE category (check one):

 Level 3: Exceeds Expectations. Service in all three areas: The Profession, the Community, and the University, College or Department, including leadership in at least one of the three areas.

 Level 2: Meets Expectations. Service in at least two of three areas: The Profession, the Community, and the University, College, or Department.

 Level 1: Below Expectations. Does not meet requirements for “Meets Expectations.”

In the tables below, put an X in the leftmost column of any row that applies to you. In the “#” column, enter the number of committees/organizations/etc. to which that row applies.

Service to the University

X	#	Item
		Officer of a University committee outside of CEHD (e.g., Chair of SCEP)
		Membership on a University committee or task force outside of CEHD
		Ad hoc service to the University or another department outside of CEHD
		Membership on a University Task Force
		Membership on a University search committee
		Other accomplishment (specify):

Service to CEHD (or other college)

X	#	Item
		Officer of CEHD committee outside of C&I (e.g., Chair, Governing Council)
		Membership on CEHD committee or task force outside of C&I
		Ad hoc service to CEHD or another department outside of C&I
		Membership on a CEHD Task force
		Membership on a CEHD search committee
		Other accomplishment (specify):

Service to C&I

X	#	Item
---	---	------

		Officer of C&I committee (e.g., Chair of Research Committee)
		Membership on C&I committee or task force (e.g., Merit Review Committee, Graduate Admissions Committee, search committee)
		Ad hoc service to C&I
		UROP supervisor
		Faculty Mentorship (e.g., member of a P&T committee)
		Meaningful participation in discussions and voting on hiring decisions, tenure recommendations, and cases of promotion
		Other accomplishment (specify):

Service to the Profession

X	#	Item
		Officer of a professional group (e.g., president of AERA)
		Reviewer for professional journal (name journal):
		Editor/Associate Editor for a professional (name journal):
		Member of editorial review board of a professional journal (name journal):
		Membership on a non-U of M Search Committee
		Membership on a non-U of M Award Selection Committee
		Grant Reviewer (name grant):
		Member of committee for professional organization (e.g., conference program committee, standing committee)
		Faculty Mentorship (e.g., external evaluator for P&T)
		Other (specify):

Service to the community that relates to your professional expertise.

X	#	Item
		Leadership/significant involvement in the local, state or national community to promote equity in educational practices, policies and research
		Participation on advisory boards of community or governmental organizations.
		Leading significant in-service sessions or workshops

		Working with community partners to significantly shape educational policy and practice
		Working in a professional capacity on an educational project or initiative
		Other (specify):

Optional: In 150 words or less, you may highlight aspects of your SERVICE to which you would like to draw the committee's attention.

APPENDIX E – *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure* Extending the Probationary Period Provision

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; or

(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 F – *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure* Departmental Statement Section

Section 7.12

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) 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 Executive Vice President and Provost. The chair or head of each academic unit must provide each of its probationary faculty members with a copy of the Departmental Statement at the beginning of the probationary service.