

CARLSON SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

PROMOTION AND TENURE CODE 7.12

STATEMENT

Approved February 1, 2007
Amended March 3, 2023

CRITERIA AND EVIDENCE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Criteria for promotion and tenure in the Carlson School of Management reflect the general requirements in the University of Minnesota promotion and tenure guidelines (section 7.11 for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure and section 9.2 for promotion to Full Professor).

This statement further defines these criteria within the context of the Carlson School and details the evidence that we use to assess if these criteria are met.

This document provides general statements about the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure and promotion to Full Professor. It then provides finer detail and documents the evidence and processes used to assess these criteria for the dimensions of research, teaching, and service.

The underlying principles that guided the drafting of this document can be found in Exhibit I.

This statement was approved by a vote of the Carlson School faculty on February 1, 2007.

Mission

The mission of the Carlson School of Management is to provide the highest quality education for present and future business and academic leaders, and advance the understanding and practice of management through research and outreach.

General Statement

I. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The promotion to Associate Professor with tenure requires that a candidate have a record of outstanding achievement in scholarly research together with a record of excellence in teaching integrally influenced by scholarship. In the absence of such a record, tenure will not be granted.

This determination will be reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of research, teaching, and service.

Excellence in teaching based in scholarship is a prerequisite for tenure. Moreover, a candidate is expected to show a clear track record of scholarly research and teaching excellence, and hold the further promise of effective contributions toward the work and intellectual life of the individual's department, the Carlson School, the University of Minnesota, and the profession. If these prerequisites are met, outstanding scholarship that is the foundation for a national and/or international reputation is the requirement for tenure.

Due to the nature of a professional business school, outreach, public engagement, and technology transfer accomplishments will generally be evaluated as evidence for teaching or service accomplishments, although exceptions may occur in cases when these activities have a significant scholarly impact akin to research.

II. Promotion to Full Professor

In order to be promoted to Full Professor a candidate is expected to have achieved a national and/or international reputation based on the candidate's scholarship and will have added in a substantive way to an already distinguished record of research accomplishment. The candidate is also expected to exhibit broader or deeper accomplishments in the areas of teaching and service than required for promotion to Associate Professor.

This determination will be reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of research, teaching, and service.

Criteria and Evidence for Research

I. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Awarding indefinite tenure requires the determination that the candidate has demonstrated and will continue to develop an outstanding record of scholarly accomplishment that is the foundation for a national and/or international reputation.

The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure is an inquiry into past accomplishment and future promise.

1. Has the candidate developed an outstanding record of scholarly accomplishment that forms the foundation for a national and/or international reputation?
2. Is the candidate among the strongest in his or her field, in comparison with other individuals in the same field at similar points in their careers, taking into consideration the goals of the department?
3. Is the candidate likely to be promoted to full professor in a reasonable amount of time?

Description of Outstanding Scholarship

Scholarship consists of the production and dissemination of new knowledge, new insights, and new methods. Research achievements will be judged primarily on the basis of the creativity of the work, quality of implementation, validity of results, importance of the findings, and influence on the candidate's field. The Carlson School places considerable importance on the scholarly influence of the ideas developed by a candidate that forms the foundation for a national and/or international reputation.

The written work is examined for evidence of originality and importance, in terms of problem choice, methods used, and results obtained. Normally the research findings will have been disseminated in the form of publication in high quality refereed journals. Publication in books, non-refereed journals, or other outlets may also be relevant in assessing a scholar's impact in cases where such publications have substantial originality and impact.

Research achievements will only secondarily be assessed in terms of the volume of the work; volume will be assessed relative to the publication norms in the candidate's own discipline. A few outstanding publications will typically be accorded more importance than a long string of mediocre publications. Research that opens important new avenues of thinking – as opposed to replication, elaboration, and extension of existing ideas – will also be valued more highly.

Some scholars primarily focus on inter-disciplinary research. In such cases, as in discipline-based scholarship, the primary focus is on the validity, quality, importance, creativity of the work, and its influence. Assessing the appropriate impact and volume of output in such cases will be judged on a case-by-case basis taking into account, but not limited to, the norms of the underlying disciplines.

Evidence that the candidate has demonstrated and will continue to develop a distinguished record of academic accomplishment that is the foundation for a national and/or international reputation is based on an internal and external evaluation of the candidate's research record, published and unpublished scholarly works, presentations, and other supplemental materials following the steps described later in this document.

II. Promotion to Full Professor

In concurrence with section 9.2 of the University of Minnesota Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, the basis for promotion to the rank of professor is the determination that each candidate has (1) demonstrated the intellectual distinction, (2) added substantially to an already distinguished record of academic achievement, and (3) established the national or international reputation ordinarily resulting from such distinction and achievement.

1. Due to the qualitative nature of this assessment, substantial addition to a research record is defined as “additional substantive research output.” It is not defined by a count of output or a ratio of output compared to the pre-tenure period.

Examples of cases where this requirement would *not* be satisfied include, but are not restricted to, the following:

- Cessation of or excessive decline in research activity
- Research activity that is not being recognized by the peer scholarly community, as evidenced by lack of refereed publications or advancement through the review process.
- Research output that essentially ‘recycles’ the candidate’s previous research contributions with no material advancements.

Criteria and Evidence for Teaching

I. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Teaching includes presentation of material to students in the various programs of the School, the planning and preparation of materials for the classroom, the advising of students about their programs of study and the problems they encounter in learning, and the guidance of independent studies. Teaching also includes the advising, examination, supervision and placement of Ph.D. students.

A good teacher is able to instill in students a thoughtful, logical approach to management, grounded in the knowledge of the relevant academic fields. A successful teacher of management is familiar with the current practice and literature in the field, and, when appropriate, develops new courses and introduces the products of new research into teaching. Good teachers design and teach courses that are appropriate yet challenging for the audience, provide a coherent and logically connected body of knowledge, promote active participation in learning on the part of students, are organized, and provide timely and meaningful feedback to students. A good teacher shows an interest in, and is sensitive to, the problems students encounter in learning, and is responsive to student and peer evaluations.

Evidence of teaching excellence is based upon an internal evaluation of the candidate's record of credit and non-credit teaching, student advising, teaching philosophy, student evaluation scores, peer review of teaching, and other supplemental materials.

II. Promotion to Full Professor

The requirements of accomplishment in teaching are the continuation of teaching effectiveness as required and assessed in the promotion to associate professor; and *to the extent that such accomplishments have not already been demonstrated and continued*, evidence in at least one of the following dimensions:

- Curriculum development
 - This can be through the design of new courses, new course materials, or degree programs.
 - New course materials are materials that are used beyond the candidate's own teaching. This would include textbooks and teaching cases used in other instructors' classes within the Carlson school or in other institutions.
 - Curriculum development in degree programs can be evidenced by participation in program overview committees or similar bodies.
- Expansion of teaching inventory. This can include:
 - Ph.D. advising.
 - Participation in degree programs in which the individual did not previously teach.
 - Participation in non-degree programs such as executive education.

Criteria and Evidence of Service

I. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Consistent with section 7.11 of the University's tenure code, 'service' may be professional or institutional. Professional service, based on one's academic expertise, is that provided to colleagues, the profession, or 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.

For promotion to Associate Professor the primary criterion is that the individual contributes to the intellectual environment of the department, school and profession by being an engaged colleague. Secondary emphasis can be placed on institutional service. Good performance in service is expected, but cannot substitute for research or teaching deficiencies. Evidence of professional and institutional service may include the following:

a. Professional Service

Formal and informal peer reviewing of journal articles, books, external grants, conference submissions, or working papers

Participation in professional association committees

Participation in department and school research workshops (attending and engaging in the intellectual discourse)

Participation in other department and school activities

Providing professional expertise to the media

b. Institutional Service

Service on departmental committees

Advisor to student groups

Participation in departmental meetings and activities

II. Promotion to Full Professor

For promotion to Full Professor, a continued contribution is expected to the intellectual environment of the department, school and profession. Promotion to Full Professor requires a broader level of service, including both professional and institutional service activities, than the level required for promotion to Associate Professor.

Some individuals may have already achieved this broader level of service prior to promotion to Associate Professor; these individuals are expected to maintain levels of service consistent with promotion to Full Professor, but are not required to increase their service contributions even further.

Associate Professors *ready for promotion to* Full Professor need not demonstrate the level of service expected from *existing* Full Professors.

Examples of service activities most relevant for promotion include.

a. Professional Service

Formal and informal peer reviewing of journal articles, books, external grants, conference submissions, or working papers

Mentoring junior colleagues

Editorial Board memberships and Editorial Assignments

Participation in professional association committees

Participation in department, school, and University research workshops (attending and engaging in the intellectual discourse)

Participation in other department, school, and university activities

Public engagement such as serving community groups or speaking to them in a professional capacity

Providing professional expertise to the media

Legislative testimony of a professional nature

Writing evaluation letters for promotion cases at other schools

b. Institutional Service

Service on University, school or departmental committees

Administrative appointments (e.g., departmental Ph.D. director)

Advisor to student groups

Regular participation in departmental meetings and activities

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Procedures for Review of Probationary Faculty

All participants involved in the review of faculty are expected to treat cases in an ethical manner. Ethical behavior includes a specific obligation to maintain confidentiality of the proceedings, because confidentiality makes honest and open discussion possible.

A. Definitions

The term “academic unit” in the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure (Regulations) and term “department” in the Procedures for Reviewing the Performance of Probationary Faculty (Procedures) are to be interpreted as the Carlson School of Management.

The term “head of the department” in the Procedures is to be interpreted as the Dean of the Carlson School of Management.

The term “tenured faculty” in the Regulations and the Procedures is to be interpreted as the members of the regular faculty of the Carlson School of Management who hold indefinite tenure in the School, without regard to their rank.

The term “department” in this Statement refers to one of the academic departments within the Carlson School of Management.

The “Appointment Committee” is a committee of 3 members and 1 alternate member elected by all tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Carlson School of Management. Members of the Appointment Committee serve staggered three-year terms and must be full professors in the School. No academic department can have more than one member, including the alternate member, on the Appointment Committee. The Appointment Committee is the steward of the tenure and promotion process prior to the Dean’s review and oversees the steps of the process as necessary for all candidates. The activities of the Appointment Committee are described in detail in Section H (below).

A “Review Committee” is a four-person committee of tenured University of Minnesota faculty members senior in rank to the candidate (in some cases a member of the committee may be from outside the Carlson School). At least one member and at most two members of a Review Committee shall be from the candidate’s department. A Review Committee shall not be chaired by a member of the candidate’s department. A unique review committee is appointed for each candidate’s case. The activities of a Review Committee are described in detail in Section H (below).

B. Probationary Period (Tenure Clock)

The probationary period within the Carlson School is 8 years (*i.e.*, the maximum amount of time during which a probationary faculty member must come up for tenure review). The

probationary period begins upon the appointment to a position of faculty rank in a tenure-track position, including instructor. The probationary period runs consecutively. Exceptions are allowed in stopping the tenure clock for parental, caregiver, and medical reasons in accordance with section 5.5 of the University's tenure code. Unpaid personal leaves that would reduce one's appointment below 67% in a given year that would result in stopping the tenure clock will not be granted during the probationary appointment period unless there is a compelling institutional reason for doing so..

Previous appointments to a position of faculty rank in a tenure-track position, including instructor, count toward the probationary period as defined in the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*. Therefore, each year of prior service (to a maximum of 3) counts toward the probationary period.

C. Explaining the Process to the Candidate

Early in the probationary appointment, the department chair must review the terms of appointment with the probationary candidate. The department chair must refer to Sections B and C of the University's "Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty" to ensure that all relevant issues are addressed. The department chair must make a written summary of this meeting; including the time and date it took place. The summary is to be included in the candidate's personnel record.

D. Annual Reviews

The tenured faculty in each department must review annually the progress of its probationary faculty relative to section 7.11 of the University's tenure code and to this Statement. The annual review is intended to constructively point out to the candidate strengths and weaknesses, so that the strengths can be built upon and the weaknesses remedied. Three elements are essential to this process: information gathering, deliberation, and consultation with the candidate.

1. *Information Gathering.* Beginning with the first year of the probationary period, the department chair has the responsibility for compiling the Review File which includes cumulative data on the candidate's performance in research, teaching, and service. The single most important source of these data is the candidate who has the responsibility for providing the department chair with all relevant materials in a timely fashion. There is no presumption of satisfactory performance; all aspects of such performance must be demonstrated by supporting evidence. The candidate and the department chair must refer to Section C.6 of the University's "Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty" to ensure that all elements of the Review File are collected. If the information in the file appears to be incomplete or uninformative on the due date, the department chair will make a reasonable effort to obtain additional information from the candidate, and after such effort has been made the file will be deemed to be complete and ready for review.

2. *Deliberation.* The tenured faculty in each department must review annually the progress of its probationary faculty according to this 7.12 statement, and must designate a meeting for this purpose. The Review File must be made available to the tenured faculty of the department prior to this meeting. Departments are expected to adopt procedures to allow serious and informed deliberation over the candidate's progress toward promotion and tenure. Key questions to be examined and discussed include:

- Is the candidate engaged in research that is likely to have an impact on the discipline?
- Is the candidate's productivity, in terms of working papers and publications, consistent with the norms of the discipline?
- Is the candidate presenting their work internally and at top-tier institutions and national conferences consistent with the norms of the discipline?
- Is the candidate developing a track record of effective instructional activities?
- Is the candidate contributing to the intellectual environment of the department, school, and profession by being an engaged colleague?

At the meeting of the tenured departmental faculty, a secret ballot must be taken in which each tenured faculty member in the department present has the opportunity to indicate his or her view on the candidate's cumulative progress toward tenure by using 6-point scales ranging from does not meet to exceeds the expectations for cumulative progress toward tenure on four dimensions: research, teaching, service, and overall (see Exhibit IVa). When a tenured departmental faculty member is unable to attend the meeting, he or she can vote on the candidate's progress toward tenure via absentee ballot provided that he or she expresses his or her views to the other tenured departmental faculty members prior to the meeting. This ensures that the absent faculty member's views can enter into the evaluation discussion.

In any year in which the candidate is being reviewed for promotion and tenure under the processes in subsection H below, the departmental annual review is superseded by the preparation of the departmental nominating statement and other departmental activities as described in subsection H.

3. *Consultation with the Candidate.* Subsequent to the annual review meeting, the department chair must discuss with the candidate the candidate's progress toward achieving tenure. The department chair also reports the sense of the meeting of the tenured faculty, any recommendations made by it, and the tabulations of the progress toward tenure scales, to the candidate. It is important that this conversation be candid, and that the candidate be clearly told if there are areas in which performance needs to be improved. The candidate must be given a copy of the annual Appraisal of Probationary Faculty report, which should parallel the major elements of this conversation, as well as a written summary of any additional matters discussed. If there are questions about the application of the criteria or about what the candidate is expected to do, the department chair should amplify upon the criteria. The head of the department places the Appraisal of Probationary Faculty report and a written summary of any additional matters discussed in the candidate's permanent file. The summary indicates the date and time of the meeting.

E. School-wide Evaluative Review Within the Probationary Period (4th Year Review)

All probationary faculty hired with less than two years of prior service shall have a major evaluative review in their 4th year after being hired (hence, “fourth year review” in this Statement). Others will have this major evaluative review depending on their prior years of service.¹ The process for this review is the same as for tenure and promotion (see subsection H below) except that external letters are not solicited. The materials required for this review include all materials generated by the department as described in section H2 below with the exception of those materials under 2.a.ii, 2.d, and 2.e. It also includes all materials generated by the candidate as described in Exhibit II with the exception of the material under A4.

It is expected that this review occur during the Spring semester. The objective of this review is to allow the Carlson School faculty to evaluate the candidate’s progress toward tenure and promotion, and culminates in a faculty vote on whether to retain the candidate in rank or terminate the candidate. The purpose of this review is not to seek to terminate candidates, but candidates who are judged as not having made material progress toward achieving a record of academic distinction may be recommended for termination by a vote of the faculty. The outcome of “retain in rank” should not be interpreted that promotion and tenure at a later date is assured.

The basis of the review is to further examine the questions used in the annual review process:

- Is the candidate engaged in research that is likely to have an impact on the discipline?
- Is the candidate’s productivity, in terms of working papers and publications, consistent with the norms of the discipline?
- Is the candidate presenting their work internally and at top-tier institutions and national conferences consistent with the norms of the discipline?
- Is the candidate developing a track record of effective instructional activities?
- Is the candidate contributing to the intellectual environment of the department, school, and profession by being an engaged colleague?

At the meeting of the tenured School faculty, a secret ballot must be taken in which each tenured faculty member present has the opportunity to indicate his or her view on the candidate’s cumulative progress toward tenure by using a 6-point scale ranging from “does not meet” to “exceeds” the expectations for cumulative progress toward tenure on four dimensions: research, teaching, service, and overall (See Exhibit IVa). Additionally, each present member will have the opportunity to vote to recommend to continue or terminate the probationary appointment. When a tenured School faculty member is unable to attend the meeting, he or she is encouraged to express his or her views to other tenured School faculty members prior to the meeting, but because an absent member is not able to hear the views expressed at the meeting, he or she is not allowed to vote.

¹ The school-wide review timetable for probationary faculty is as follows: zero years of prior service—fourth year in the Carlson School (fourth year in probationary period); one year of prior service—fourth year in the Carlson School (fifth year in probationary period); two years: third year (fifth year in probationary period); three or more years: third year (sixth year in probationary period). Exhibit VI presents this timetable.

This evaluation of a candidate's progress toward tenure and promotion has a number of important benefits. Most importantly, the candidate can see how the school's faculty view his or her progress toward tenure. The review committee report provides important feedback on the quality of the candidate's research while the tabulations of the faculty assessments of research, teaching, service, and overall progress provide important feedback on the candidate's record in these critical dimensions. Although the review is evaluative in nature, there are important development benefits. Candidates with favorable tabulations can be counseled to build on their accomplishments; candidates with weaker tabulations of faculty votes can be counseled to significantly improve their performance along the relevant dimension(s) in order to be a strong candidate for tenure and promotion, and in some cases, be counseled to explore other employment opportunities, or be terminated. This school-level review also provides important oversight to ensure that individual departments are providing accurate assessments to junior faculty through the annual review process.

F. A Decision To Terminate Appointment May Be Made At Any Time

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

When determined necessary, the School faculty may recommend to the Dean termination of a candidate's appointment at any time during the probationary period. A recommendation to terminate an appointment is taken by a secret ballot at a meeting of the School's tenured faculty following the same tenure and promotion review steps described in subsection H below, except that external letters are not required. This process may be initiated by a request from the candidate's department to the Appointment Committee, or by a request from the Dean to the Appointment Committee.

- This process can be satisfied by the School-wide Evaluative Review Within the Probationary Period (4th Year Review as in Section E) or by the tenure review. Namely, a separate review does not have to occur if the evaluation for termination comes from either of these reviews.

G. Tenure Decision May Be Made At Any Time

A decision on tenure may be made in any year of the probationary period. It is not necessary to wait until the end of the probationary period to recommend tenure. It is expected that candidates will be nominated for tenure when the department believes there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the candidate has fulfilled the requirements for tenure and promotion. A recommendation to promote and grant tenure is taken by a secret ballot at a meeting of the School's tenured faculty following the tenure and promotion review steps described in subsection H below.

A candidate must be considered in a formal tenure review in the last year of the probationary period, i.e., at the beginning of the eighth year of an ordinary probationary period or the designated time in a shorter probationary period. In consultation with the department, the candidate may request a tenure review at the beginning of any review cycle.

H. Promotion and Tenure Review

This section presents the promotion and tenure review process in chronological order.

1. Assembly of the Review File

The promotion and tenure review process begins with the candidate's assembly of the review file as described in Exhibit II (or Exhibit III for Promotion to Full Professor).

2. Departmental Nomination Statement

The department will use the candidate's review file to prepare a nominating statement.

The department will have a meeting (or meetings) of department members senior in rank to the candidate in order to consider the candidacy. The senior colleagues in the department will add to the materials submitted by the candidate, as follows:

- a. A written assessment of the candidate's research. The department's report must not be a regurgitation of the candidate's statement and vita. It should not contain a paper by paper evaluation of the candidate's work. It is intended to provide perspective on the likely academic reputation and influence of the candidate and the impact of the candidate's research on the discipline. The department's report must contain:
 - i. An assessment of the importance and originality of the issues studied by the candidate relative to the candidate's discipline, innovations in methodology relative to the state of the art in the discipline, and likely impact and influence on the discipline. The department must identify what the candidate is known for.
 - ii. A comparison of the candidate's performance relative to recently promoted individuals at top business schools or related departments in the candidate's field of research.
 - iii. The quality and significance of the journals or other venues of distribution in which the candidate's work has appeared must be appraised. If they are not the best representatives in the field, the best must be named, and the absence of work in them must be explained.
 - iv. The manner in which the candidate's area of special expertise relates to the discipline as a whole must be discussed.
 - v. The report will indicate what part of the research record is based on the candidate's dissertation, and what ideas and advances are subsequent to the dissertation.

- vi. In some fields external funding is important. In such cases, the candidate's success at securing grants must be evaluated in relation to reasonable expectations for scholars in the same field and at the same stage of professional development. The assessment must list and appraise the relative competitiveness of grants and fellowships received by the candidate.
 - vii. This document will be signed by the participating senior colleagues.
- b. A written assessment of the candidate's teaching performance from a substantive perspective. This is *not* a regurgitation of the student teaching evaluations. It is a discussion of the substance of the candidate's teaching as appropriate, which will include.
- i. Analysis of the candidate's mastery of teaching effectiveness using material from the candidate's teaching portfolio. In particular, the analysis should include an assessment of the design and content of the course along with the appropriateness of the methods for teaching the content areas involved and an assessment of the innovativeness, as appropriate, and effectiveness of the methods. This analysis will commonly include classroom visits by department colleagues or teaching professionals according to the Senate Policy on the Evaluation of Teaching.
 - ii. A statement regarding the candidate's advising and non-credit teaching effectiveness, when appropriate.
 - iii. A summary of student evaluations of teaching, which provide information about student satisfaction with the class experience. The following information should be provided:
 - 1. Student evaluation of teaching scores (collected through standard procedures as specific by university and school rules in place at the time the courses were taught) for all classes taught during the probationary period. The information should include the class title, class size, level of instruction, and selected scores addressing the following dimensions:
 - What is the student's evaluation of the instructor's overall teaching ability?
 - How did the student's rate the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter?
 - How much did the student's feel they learned in the course?
 - Did the instructor clearly present the material?
 - Did the students receive helpful feedback and grading of performance?
 - 2. An analysis of trends (positive or negative) in a summary or overall quality question in the student evaluation of teaching instrument, and other student evaluation of teaching scores as deemed informative.

- iv. This document will be signed by the relevant senior colleagues.
- c. A written assessment of the candidate's service contributions. This document will be signed by the relevant senior colleagues.
- d. Copy of candidate's Fourth Year Review (if applicable).
- e. A list of at least 8 outside evaluators (in addition to those submitted by the candidate as specified in Exhibit II), together with their scholarly credentials and an explanation for why they were chosen. These must not be scholars with whom the candidate is closely associated, such as co-authors, thesis supervisors, or other close associates. These also must not be the same individuals proposed by the candidate.
- f. The department also may attach any further evidence that is deemed relevant to an appropriate consideration of the case.

The departmental nominating statement is forwarded to the Appointment Committee. In consultation with the candidate's department chair, the Appointment Committee appoints a Review Committee for the candidate and solicits external letters. The procedure for identifying and soliciting external letters is described in Section I (below). If a full member of the Appointment Committee is from the same department as the candidate, that member is replaced by the alternate member for all matters concerning this candidate.

3. Departmental Final Report

After receipt of at least six external letters, the department is allowed to attach an addendum to its nominating statement consisting of the tabulations of the departmental tenured faculty members' indications of the candidate's cumulative progress toward tenure by using 5-point scales ranging from "does not meet" to "exceeds" the standards for tenure on four dimensions: research, teaching, service, and overall (see Exhibit IVb). The department does not see the Review Committee report until after the department's final report is submitted to the Appointment Committee. Tenured members of the department have the right to submit minority statements if they choose.

4. Review Committee

It is the responsibility of the Review Committee to thoroughly assess the candidate's research accomplishments. The Review Committee is expected to derive its views from its knowledge of the field, a reading of as much of the candidate's published work and work in progress as necessary to develop a full sense of the candidate's accomplishments, and external review letters. The Review Committee will not have access to the departmental nominating statement or final report. The Review Committee is expected to derive its views as independently as possible from those of the department.

The Review Committee conducts a substantive, evaluative review of the candidate's three most important research works (as designated by the candidate) and prepares a written report for the School faculty; the Review Committee will normally review additional works, as necessary, to develop a full picture of the candidate's research. The report should contain a candid discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the research, including an evaluation of the innovation and methodological quality of the research. The three most important works should be evaluated in depth. Members of the review committee have the right to submit minority reports if they choose.

The Review Committee's report to the School faculty should also include the tabulations of the committee members' anonymous views on the candidate's fulfillment of the research criterion for promotion and tenure by using a 5-point scale (see Exhibit IVb) ranging from "does not meet" to "exceeds" the research standard (fulfillment of the research standard is replaced by cumulative progress toward promotion and tenure in the 4th year review process).

5. School Faculty Deliberation and Vote

The Appointment Committee receives the external letters, and the reports from the Review Committee and the candidate's department. If in the judgment of the Appointment Committee the reports are incomplete, the reports will be returned to the Review Committee or Department for completion. Once the Appointment Committee deems the reports complete, these materials will be provided to the tenured faculty of the School prior to a meeting to review the candidates for promotion and tenure. At least two weeks prior to this meeting, the Appointment Committee must send an e-mail message to all tenured faculty and this message must contain a link to the candidate's three most important research works that the candidate designates (these are the same as reviewed by the Review Committee). Each tenured faculty member recognizes the importance of thoroughly reviewing these materials so that they are well-informed about each candidate's strengths and weaknesses.

At the meeting of the tenured School faculty, a secret ballot must be taken in which each tenured faculty member present has the opportunity to indicate his or her view on the candidate's fulfillment of the standards for promotion and tenure by using a 5-point scale ranging from "does not meet" to "exceeds" the standards on four dimensions: research, teaching, service, and overall (See Exhibit IVb). Additionally, each present member will vote to recommend "promote and grant tenure", "terminate the probationary period", or, when a candidate is considered prior to the final year of the probationary period, "continue the probationary period". When a tenured School faculty member is unable to attend the meeting, he or she is encouraged to express his or her views to other tenured School faculty members prior to the meeting, but because an absent member is not able to hear the views expressed at the meeting, he or she is not allowed to vote.²

² Meeting presence can be satisfied by electronic means provided that it: (a) is done in real-time (i.e., not recorded), (b) allows for two-way transmission, (c) is without substantial interruption, and (d) satisfies the security and confidentiality requirements of electronic participation as detailed by Carlson School of Management policy.

I. External Reviewers

Consideration of a candidate's case for promotion and tenure requires at least six informative letters from outside evaluators. At the start of the review cycle for promotion and tenure, the candidate submits the names of four possible external reviewers to the Appointment Committee; the Appointment Committee must contact at least two of these individuals to try to obtain a review letter. The Appointment Committee is responsible for contacting a sufficient number of additional evaluators so as to obtain at least six review letters. The candidate's department submits 8 names (in addition to those submitted by the candidate) as suggestions to the Appointment Committee. The Appointment Committee can add to or subtract from this list. External reviewers are chosen on the basis of the stature of the individual and their expertise in the academic field of the candidate. The candidate's and department's lists of suggested reviews must contain brief explanations as to why each reviewer is qualified to serve as an external reviewer for this particular promotion and tenure case. No more than one letter can come from an individual who has worked closely with the candidate; this includes the candidate's doctoral adviser and any co-authors.

The primary purpose of the external letters is to provide information on the candidate's research reputation and contributions. To provide relevant and consistent information, the request for external reviews should be based on the standard letter suggested in Exhibit V. The weight given to the views of any particular referee is left to the judgment of each faculty member participating in the review process.

Faculty members (including the candidate) are expected to honor and maintain the integrity and independence of the external review process and must guard against inappropriate contact with external reviewers.

Procedures for Review of Tenured Associate Professors

The procedures for reviewing tenured associate professors parallel the procedures for review of probationary faculty with the following provisos:

- a. The departmental and School faculty that participate in the review of associate professors are limited to those senior in rank to the faculty member under review.
- b. A major evaluative review is required in the fourth year after receiving tenure (or no more than 4 years after joining the faculty for individuals hired as associate professors with tenure). It is expected that associate professors will be ready for promotion to professor at this time; for these individuals the procedures follow those outlined above in subsection H except that “terminate the probationary period” is removed from the ballot at the School faculty meeting, and all of the scales-based ballots are changed to reflect fulfillment of the standards for promotion to full professor.
 - Candidates who are not granted promotion at this review can be considered for promotion in any subsequent review cycle.
- c. At the start of this 4th year process, candidates can choose not to be considered for promotion to professor. In such cases, a major evaluative review is still undertaken, and it is analogous to the 4th year review for probationary faculty. External letters are not solicited and the faculty vote on the cumulative progress toward rather than fulfillment of the criteria for promotion to full professor.
- d. For associate professors not promoted to full professors within four years of promotion to associate professor the following apply. In any year subsequent to the major evaluative review in the 4th year after tenure, when a department believes that an associate professor has satisfied the criteria for promotion to professor, a nomination statement must be submitted to the Appointment Committee and the process for School-wide review outlined earlier in this Statement will be initiated. In consultation with the department, the candidate may request a full professor review at the beginning of any review cycle. Departments are expected to conduct periodic reviews subsequent to the 4th year review to help the candidate make progress toward promotion to professor with the goal of being able to nominate the candidate for a School-wide review of his or her candidacy for promotion to professor in due course.

Procedures for Post-Tenure Review

At the Carlson School, a faculty member who is performing “substantially below the goals and expectations of the School” will have his or her case referred for Post-Tenure Review.

The post-tenure review policy applies to all tenured faculty, except faculty whose position is principally or solely administrative. Faculty whose position is principally or solely administrative (75% time or more administrative appointment) and whose administrative appointment exceeds two years will be subject to the post-tenure review policy after they have completed two full academic years, following the completion of their administrative position.

A faculty member will be deemed to be performing substantially below the goals and expectations of the School if, for two consecutive years, a faculty member is rated substantially below the goals and expectations of the School on any two of the three dimensions of teaching, research and service.

For post-tenure review, a faculty member will be deemed to be performing substantially below the goals and expectations of the School in a given year if, on the annual performance review done by the department chair or department review committee, his or her teaching is evaluated to be a “1” on a 5 point scale. The scales are attached to the FAR.

For post-tenure review, a faculty member will be deemed to be performing substantially below the goals and expectations of the School in a given year if, on the annual performance review done by the department chair or department review committee, his or her research is evaluated to be “1” on a 5 point scale. The scales are attached to the FAR.

For post-tenure review, a faculty member will be deemed to be performing substantially below the goals and expectations of the School in a given year if, on the annual performance review done by the department chair or department review committee, his or her service is evaluated to be “1” on a 5 point scale. The scales are attached to the FAR.

The University’s Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, (in section 7a.1), indicates that the statement of goals and expectations of performance should “provide for flexible standards, recognizing changing career patterns.” The post-tenure review statement may provide for “trade-offs” between aspects of the expectations. For example, it could allow for “increased service in return for reduced teaching or scholarly expectations,” or a shift in emphasis between teaching and scholarly elements of the expectations, although over time there must be some balance of both elements to maintain academic competence. It could allow for strengths under one criterion to balance weaknesses under another, but balance does not mean that a sufficiently high rating on one dimension can completely offset ratings that are substantially below goals and expectations on the other two dimensions.

The following is the Carlson School's procedure for carrying out Post-Tenure Reviews.

Currently an annual review is conducted by the Department Chair of each faculty member's department in conjunction with the merit review process. If during this process the Department Chair, in conjunction with the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research and the ADC (Academic Department Chairs), determines that a faculty member is performing substantially below the goals and expectations of the School, the case will be referred to the Appointment Committee. If a full member of the Appointment Committee is from the same department as the review case, that member is replaced by the alternate member for all matters concerning this case.

The Department Chair will provide the Appointment Committee with the faculty member's faculty activity reports (FARs) for the past 5 years, a curriculum vitae, and a statement regarding their performance over the past 5 years. The Appointment Committee will conduct this review in accordance with the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, which govern the post tenure review processes. Refer to the following website

<http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/policies/documents/FacultyTenure2007.pdf>

If both the Department Chair and the Appointment Committee determine the faculty member's performance to be substantially below the goals and expectations of the School, they will send a letter to the faculty member, stating the deficiencies, resources available to the faculty member to address the problem, and a timeframe during which the faculty member should address the identified problems. At the end of the specified time period (typically one year), both the Department Chair and the Appointment Committee will again review the faculty member's performance. If performance is again determined to be substantially below the goals and expectations of the School, the Appointment Committee will recommend that the Dean initiate a special review in accordance with with the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, which govern the post tenure review processes. Refer to the following websites:

<http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/policies/documents/FacultyTenure2007.pdf>

EXHIBIT I: Principles Guiding 7.12 Document

The following reflect the principles that guided the drafting of this document. These principles were formulated by the committee that revised this document and formed the basis of discussion at the faculty meeting on the 7.12 Statement on December 8, 2006.

Tenure Clock and Tenure Decision

Goal: To be able to recruit and retain high quality faculty

- > Probationary period should provide a fair opportunity for all junior faculty to develop as scholars worthy of tenure
- > Transparency of clock
 - > As free from ‘manipulation’ as possible
- > Clock sets the ‘upper-bound’ of time to provide evidence of tenure
 - > Decisions can come before end of probationary period
 - > Cannot extend it except within the provisions of Section 5.5 Stopping the Tenure Clock of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*
- > Accomplishments determine decision, not time
- > “Richer” evidence can reduce type I and type II errors

Review Procedures

- > The school faculty are key decision makers
- > *Qualitative* evaluation of candidate's achievement and expected trajectory
 - > Language in 7.11 statement
- > Review procedure should be transparent
- > Multiple steps in the review should be:
 - > Efficient
 - > As independent as possible
 - > Provide new information

Evidence

- > This is a *qualitative* assessment
- > Because we are a professional school, “technology transfer” is more likely to reflect teaching evidence, but in rare cases could reflect research evidence
 - > We do not consider it a separate category for promotion evidence
- > Important that there be “internal consistency” of what constitutes evidence across reviews. For research:
 - > Full Professor: national/international reputation with a distinguished record of academic achievement

- > Tenure Decision: has established and is likely to continue to add to a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national/international reputation
- > 4th year review: material progress toward establishing the foundation of an national/international reputation
- > Post-tenure review: *sustained* achievement
- > Impact and volume of output should be judged on a case-by-case basis taking into account the norms of the underlying disciplines.

Promotion to Professor

- > Research
 - > Demonstrated intellectual distinction and establishment of a national/international reputation
- > We can expect different types of contributions once tenure is granted
 - > Service
 - > “Technology transfer”
 - > Nature of teaching contributions
- > Promotion should be based on accomplishments, not time
 - > This *should not* be a prolonged period of time if we make appropriate tenure decisions.

Post Tenure Review

- > Key for tenured faculty to continue to contribute
 - > Nature of contribution can vary by stage of career and nature of appointment
- > Two phase approach is efficient and fair
 - > Phase One is based on yearly merit review or a periodic review document
 - > Phase Two is implemented if “minimum standards” are not met in Phase One
- > Goal of initial Phase Two review is to be constructive
 - > Systematic review at the school level might be able to break a “cycle” of performance/feedback/effort within a department
- > There becomes a point where difficult decisions for the collective good have to be made

EXHIBIT II: Materials Submitted by the Candidate For Promotion and Tenure Review

A. Research

1. Current curriculum vitae.
2. A personal statement not exceeding 6 single-spaced pages presenting an integrated picture of the candidate's work and explaining the development of the candidate's career. It must describe the relationships among the projects completed, in progress, and anticipated.
 - The personal statement may also contain an optional Appendix which includes individual paper summaries, stressing the main ideas in each paper, their originality and significance, any methodological innovations, and the candidate's contribution to the paper. This Appendix does not count against the page limit for the statement.
3. Copies of the candidate's scholarly work. While all scholarly work will be considered, the candidate will indicate 3 articles or working papers as "starred" articles for particular attention in the assessment of the candidate's case.
4. A list of 4 outside evaluators, together with their scholarly credentials and an explanation for why they were chosen.
 - Three of these evaluators must be scholars with whom the candidate *is not* closely associated. Close associations include thesis supervisors, co-authors, and ex-colleagues from institutions where the candidate has held a faculty or professional position.
5. List of research presentations at institutions and national conferences consistent with the norms of the discipline.
6. Supplemental Evidence
 - The candidate may submit additional materials that they consider informative and useful for the assessment of the case, under a section of the docket titled "Supplemental Materials."

B. Teaching

1. Teaching Portfolio

The teaching portfolio will provide the candidate's assessment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness. It brings together in one place information about a faculty member's most significant teaching accomplishments. The portfolio is to teaching what lists of publications, grants, and honors are to research and scholarship. The portfolio should contain:

- a. Teaching Inventory
 - i. List of classes taught, description, class size, level (undergraduate, graduate, executive, international), and representative syllabi during the probationary period
 - ii. List of non-credit teaching during the probationary period, which may include:
 - 1. supervision of independent studies, research projects and assistantships for undergraduate, masters, and doctoral students
 - 2. teaching non-credit courses for the Executive Development Center or other non-credit teaching
 - iii. List of graduate advising and committees
 - 1. Ph.D. student committee membership and advising
 - 2. Masters committee membership and advising
- b. Teaching Philosophy
 - i. Statement of teaching philosophy
 - ii. Examples of how this philosophy has influenced the development and delivery of credit and non-credit teaching experiences. This will typically include:
 - 1. A statement of course design and content covered including how the faculty member's expertise and scholarship is incorporated into their classes.
 - 2. A statement of different pedagogical methods employed such as lecture, case method, small group learning and learning outside the classroom.
 - 3. A statement of different learning assessment methods employed in their classes, such as exams, written cases, class discussion, and group projects.

C. Service

Candidate will prepare a Statement of Service. The statement will describe how the candidate contributes to the intellectual environment of the department, school and profession. It can also list example of professional and institutional service.

EXHIBIT III: Materials Submitted by the Candidate For Promotion to Full Professor**A. Research**

Same as for promotion and tenure review (see Exhibit I), with the following addition:

- The personal statement will highlight the substantive research efforts post-tenure.
- The candidate will document added influence since tenure, of the research done prior to tenure.

B. Teaching

1. Teaching Portfolio:

Same as for promotion and tenure review (see Exhibit I), with the following addition:

Under Teaching Inventory—

iv. Statement of Development of Teaching Portfolio

- The candidate should describe the ways in which their portfolio of for-credit classes have expanded since promotion to associate with tenure. This can include new classes and new levels of teaching (e.g., MBA, Ph.D., Executive, International).
- The candidate should describe the ways in which their portfolio of non-credit teaching has expanded since promotion to associate with tenure. This can include student advising, public engagement, and technology transfer.

To the extent that such accomplishments were demonstrated prior to the promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, the statement should discuss how such activities have continued post-tenure.

C. Service

Candidate will prepare a Statement of Service. The statement will describe how the candidate contributes to the intellectual environment of the department, school and profession. It will also include a statement of their broader contributions to professional and institutional service and list examples of professional and institutional service.

EXHIBIT IVa:
Scales Used for Faculty Balloting on Progress Toward Promotion and Tenure
(Annual Reviews and 4th Year Review)

The following scales are used to gauge the extent to which the candidate is on track toward promotion and tenure relative to the expectations for someone with the same number of years of service. Considering the candidate's cumulative performance, assess the extent to which the candidate meets the expectations for cumulative progress toward promotion and tenure:

	Does Not Meet	Probably Does Not Meet	Borderline	Probably Meets	Meets	Exceeds	Abstain
Teaching	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Research	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Service	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Overall	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

EXHIBIT IVb: Scales Used for Faculty Balloting on Fulfillment of Standards for
Promotion and Tenure
(Tenure Review Year)

Considering the candidate's performance, assess the extent to which the candidate meets the standards for promotion and tenure:

	Does Not Meet	Probably Does Not Meet	Probably Meets	Meets	Exceeds	Abstain
Teaching	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Research	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Service	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Overall	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Note: Similar scales would be used for Associate Professors to assess progress toward and fulfillment of the standards for promotion to Full Professor.

EXHIBIT V**REQUEST FOR AN OUTSIDE LETTER OF EVALUATION***

Dear _____:

Professor _____, who is currently an Assistant Professor in the Department of _____ of the Carlson School of Management at the University of Minnesota, is being considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure. As an expert in the candidate's field, we value your opinion to help us evaluate the candidate's scholarly achievements.

The University expects that those promoted to the rank of Associate Professor possess a distinguished record of academic accomplishment that is the foundation of a national and/or international reputation in the candidate's field of study. [The University expects that those promoted to the rank of Full Professor possess a distinguished record of academic achievement that provides an established national and/or international reputation in the candidate's field of study]. At the Carlson School of Management, research achievements are judged primarily on the basis of the creativity of the work, quality of implementation, validity of results, importance of the finding, and influence on the candidate's field. The published volume of work is of secondary importance. Therefore, we would appreciate your assessment of the significance of the candidate's accomplishments to date, considering the totality of the contribution to the candidate's field and sub-field. In making your evaluation of the candidate's research, it would be helpful if you would:

1. Indicate how well you know the candidate.
2. Evaluate the scope and significance of the candidate's scholarly achievements and their importance within the general discipline—has the candidate made original or otherwise significant contributions to the discipline?
3. Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's scholarship
4. Comment upon the degree of recognition achieved in the candidate's discipline, noting the most distinctive achievement.
5. Comment on the candidate's progress toward establishing a national or international reputation in the candidate's area of research—is there a theory, research topic, or methodology the candidate is known for?

For your convenience, we enclose a copy of Professor _____'s curriculum vitae, three publications, and statement on research objectives and achievements. If you would like any of the other research materials for your review, please contact me.

The Minnesota Data Practices Act requires that public employees have access to all materials in their official employment files. Thus, we are required to make external letters available to a candidate who requests to read them.

We would appreciate receiving your evaluation by _____ in order to process the candidate's materials in a timely manner.

We are grateful for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

*For candidates who have opted to stop their tenure clocks according to Section 5.5 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, the following paragraph should also be added in the first paragraph of the external review letter request:

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

Exhibit VI – Timeline of probationary period and reviews for probationary faculty

The maximum probationary period is 8 years. The probationary period begins upon the appointment to a position of faculty rank in a tenure-track position, including instructor, and runs consecutively. The only allowable exceptions are for reasons elaborated in section 5.5 of the University regulations (i.e., parental, caregiver, and medical reasons).

The shaded boxes indicate the maximum number of years that can be served at the Carlson School as a probationary faculty member. For example, rookie hires have a maximum of 8 years at the Carlson School, whereas faculty members hired with 2 years of prior service elsewhere have a maximum of 6 years at the Carlson School.

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 Must have tenure review by end of year	9 Tenured or terminal appointment (if tenure review in year 8)
No Prior Service				School-Wide Evaluative Review					
1 Year Prior Service	Prior Service				School-Wide Evaluative Review				
2 Years Prior Service	Prior Service	Prior Service			School-Wide Evaluative Review				
3 Years or More Prior Service	Prior Service	Prior Service	Prior Service			School-Wide Evaluative Review			