



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development

**Guidelines for
Standards, Policies, and Procedures for
PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW OF FACULTY**

As Required by Section 7.12 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*

Approved by the OLPD Faculty on April 04, 2022

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development

**GUIDELINES FOR STANDARDS, POLICIES, AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND
TENURE REVIEW OF FACULTY**
As Required by Section 7.12 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*

Approved by the OLPD Faculty on April 04, 2022; Approved by the Dean on March 18, 2023;
Approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost on April 24, 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT.....	1
2. MISSION AND CORE VALUES	1
2.1 University of Minnesota	1
2.2 College of Education and Human Development	2
2.3 Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development	3
2.3.1 Commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in all aspects of the work	3
2.3.2 Professional ethics and respectful culture	3
2.3.3 Interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary activities	3
2.3.4 Publicly-engaged research and teaching	3
3. REVIEWS OF FACULTY	4
3.1 Procedures for Review of Ongoing Performance and Progress	4
3.1.1 Annual Performance Review	4
3.1.2 Annual Appraisal of Probationary Faculty for Continuation of Appointment ...	5
3.1.2.1 Probationary Period	5
3.1.2.2 Annual Appraisal of Probationary Faculty (Form 12)	6
3.1.2.3 Annual Special Meeting of Eligible Voting Faculty	7
3.1.2.4 Annual Voting Process for the Continuation of Probationary Appointments	8
3.1.2.5 Synthesis Report of the Faculty Decision	8

3.1.2.6 <i>Communication of the Recommendations</i>	9
3.1.2.7 <i>Recommendation for Awarding of Tenure and Promotion</i>	9
3.1.2.8 <i>Authority/Responsibility</i>	10
3.1.2.9 <i>Termination of Probationary Faculty</i>	10
3.1.3 Performance Review of Tenured Associate Professors	10
3.1.3.1 <i>Determination of Readiness for Promotion to Full Professor</i> <i>(Form 13)</i>	10
3.1.4 Post-Tenure Review for Performance Improvement	11
3.2 Review Procedures for Purposes of Tenure and Promotion	13
3.2.1 Formation of Dossier Review Committee (DRC)	14
3.2.2 Responsibilities of the Dossier Review Committee	14
3.2.3 Preparing the Promotion and/or Tenure Dossier	15
3.2.4 Review Committee Process	16
3.2.5 External Reviews and External Reviewer Qualifications	17
3.2.6 Internal Reviewers	18
3.2.7 Joint Appointments	18
3.2.8 Special Meeting of Eligible Voting Faculty	19
3.2.9 Voting process for the Awarding of Tenure and Promotion	19
3.2.10 Synthesis Report of the Faculty Decision	20
3.2.11 Recording and Communication of the Recommendations	20
4. GOALS AND EXPECTATIONS FOR FACULTY PERFORMANCE	21
5. CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION	22
5.1 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	22
5.1.1 Research	22
5.1.2 Teaching	25
5.1.3 Service	28
5.2 Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor	30

APPENDIX A:	Extension of Maximum Probationary Period for New Parent or Caregiver, or for Personal Medical Reasons. (From Section 5.5 of the University Faculty Tenure Policy.)	31
APPENDIX B:	Section 7.11 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure: General Criteria	32
APPENDIX C:	Types of Faculty Reviews	34
APPENDIX D:	Sample Letter for External and Internal Reviewers	36
APPENDIX E:	Glossary of Terms	38

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development**

**GUIDELINES FOR STANDARDS, POLICIES, AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND
TENURE REVIEW OF FACULTY
As Required by Section 7.12 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure***

Document in Effect: Approved by the OLPD Faculty on [INSERT DATE]; Approved by the Executive
Vice President and Provost on [INSERT DATE]

1. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

This document details the standards, expectations, and procedures (7.12 statement) for promotion and conferral of indefinite tenure for tenure line faculty members in the Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development (OLPD) within the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD). The information contained in this document is guided by the policies for faculty advancement presented in the University of Minnesota [*Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure*](#), which includes the criteria for conferral of indefinite tenure (Section 7.11) and Regents policy on faculty promotion to associate professor or professor (Section 9.2). This document also describes OLPD's procedures for annual reviews of faculty members.

*For a complete perspective, the reader is advised to review Appendix B, which details Section 7.11 in its entirety. Special attention should be paid to Section 9.2 of the document. The University-wide document titled [*Procedures for Evaluating Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty*](#). The reader should also review the [*College of Education and Human Development's Promotion & Tenure Review Guidelines*](#) document.*

A glossary of terms used in this document is available in Appendix F.

2. MISSION AND CORE VALUES

Through their scholarly endeavors, successful tenure-line faculty demonstrate achievement in advancing the missions of the department, the college, and the University. To this end, OLPD's 7.12 statement and core values are framed and guided by the following mission statements:

2.1 University of Minnesota

The University of Minnesota, founded in the belief that all people are enriched by understanding, is dedicated to the advancement of learning and the search for truth; to the sharing of this knowledge through education for a diverse community; and to the application of this knowledge to benefit the people of the state, the nation, and the world. The University's mission, carried out on multiple campuses and throughout the state, is threefold:

Research and Discovery

Generate and preserve knowledge, understanding, and creativity by conducting high-quality research,

scholarship, and artistic activity that benefit students, scholars, and communities across the state, the nation, and the world.

Teaching and Learning

Share that knowledge, understanding, and creativity by providing a broad range of educational programs in a strong and diverse community of learners and teachers, and prepare graduate, professional, and undergraduate students, as well as non-degree-seeking students interested in continuing education and lifelong learning, for active roles in a multiracial and multicultural world.

Outreach and Public Service

Extend, apply, and exchange knowledge between the University and society by applying scholarly expertise to community problems, by helping organizations and individuals respond to their changing environments, and by making the knowledge and resources created and preserved at the University accessible to the citizens of the state, the nation, and the world.

In all of its activities, the University strives to sustain an open exchange of diverse perspectives and ideas in an environment that embodies the values of academic freedom, responsibility, integrity, and cooperation; that provides an atmosphere of mutual respect, free from racism, sexism, and other forms of prejudice and intolerance; that assists individuals, institutions, and communities in responding to a continuously changing world; that is conscious of and responsive to the needs of the many communities it is committed to serving; that creates and supports partnerships within the University, with other educational systems and institutions, and with communities to achieve common goals; and that inspires, sets high expectations for, and empowers individuals within its community."

(www1.umn.edu/twincities/hist.php)

2.2 College of Education and Human Development

The College of Education and Human Development is a world leader in discovering, creating, sharing, and applying principles and practices of multiculturalism and multidisciplinary scholarship to advance teaching and learning and to enhance the psychological, physical, and social development of children, youth, and adults across the lifespan in families, organizations, and communities (www.cehd.umn.edu/about/default.html)

The College of Education and Human Development affirms the pre-eminent value of excellence in research, teaching, and service—excellence that will help the University achieve the highest level of recognition among public research universities. Unit 7.12 statements must reflect the Unit's high standards of academic excellence, consistent with the framework of the *Faculty Tenure* policy, Section 7.11 regarding the conferral of indefinite tenure and Section 9.2 for promotion to professor.

CEHD recognizes and values the diversity of missions, disciplines, and faculty expertise represented within and across its Units. 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.

CEHD 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.

Unit 7.12 statements must recognize multidisciplinary, multiculturalism, and public engagement in faculty research, teaching, and service, and must show how excellence in these areas is reflected in the

standards for evaluating faculty scholars for promotion and tenure. Units are encouraged to weave into their 7.12 statements how faculty work that involves models for multi-disciplinary scholarship is to be considered in the context of promotion and tenure. Not every faculty member is required to be involved in multidisciplinary, multicultural, or publicly-engaged work. However, in light of the University's mission, every faculty member's body of scholarly work should demonstrate advancement of the public good.

2.3 Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy and Development

The Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy and Development is a leader in advancing knowledge about educational and organizational change in local, national, and international contexts. Our research, teaching, and outreach reflect a commitment to interdisciplinary and intercultural engagement with educators, scholars, and policy makers seeking to enhance leadership, policy, and development around the globe."

<https://www.cehd.umn.edu/olpd/about/>

Implicit in OLPD's mission are underlying University-wide and College-wide values that are exercised through both broad and specific principles and tenets, including but not limited to the following:

- 2.3.1 Commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in all aspects of the work.** In OLPD, faculty value the integration and exploration of issues of diversity, inclusion and equity in their research and scholarship. This might take any of several forms including and not limited to cultural understanding and sensitivities related to domestic and international research, issues of gender diversity and equity, decolonizing pedagogies and practices, and aspects of multi-disciplinary and intersectional perspectives (i.e., the intersections of race, class, religion, gender, etc.). Some examples of expression of this value include reflections on contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion in teaching, the inclusion of evidence of curriculum development aimed at improving the learning experience for students of different backgrounds, efforts to expand the diversity of grad students or faculty hiring in programs, and other such demonstration of commitment.
- 2.3.2 Professional ethics and respectful culture:** In OLPD, faculty are required to observe research integrity, professional ethics, and to contribute to a respectful departmental, college, and university culture. Scholars are asked to refer to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) statement on professional ethics and the University's Code of Conduct as well as relevant University/college/department guidelines. Such a statement can iterate the value the Department places on respectful discourse among faculty colleagues and the importance of providing effective and professional mentoring and guidance to students and postdoctoral trainees.
- 2.3.3 Interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary activities:** In OLPD, interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, transdisciplinary, and other cross-disciplinary work that engages colleagues across departments, colleges, and areas of inquiry is valued and encouraged. Faculty who engage in such work should describe how their work across the disciplines enhances their research, teaching, and/or service efforts.
- 2.3.4 Publicly-engaged research and teaching:** Publicly-engaged research and teaching refers to a broad range of scholarly work that scholars conduct for, in, and/or with external communities. Community-engaged teaching, research and other publicly-engaged creative contributions are highly valued and encouraged. Faculty who conduct community-engaged scholarship and/or engage students in field-based learning activities should describe how engagements with external

partners and places further their line(s) of inquiry, understanding of the discipline(s), and/or students' overall educational experience.

3. REVIEWS OF FACULTY

There are several types of faculty reviews. One set of reviews focuses on assessing faculty members' meeting of expectations for annual performance, satisfactory progress, and eligibility for salary merit. These reviews include:

- *Annual Performance Review*: Required annual performance review of all faculty for consideration of merit, salary, and ongoing professional development
- *Annual Appraisal of Probationary Faculty*: Required annual review of probationary faculty to determine continuation of appointment
- *Performance Review of Tenured Faculty*: Performance review of Associate Professors conducted at least every four years to assess progress toward promotion to Full Professor
- *Post-Tenure Review*: Establishes a performance improvement plan for Associate Professors or Full Professors whose performance is determined to be substantially below expectations

Another set of reviews focuses specifically on faculty members' meeting of criteria for tenure and/or promotion. These reviews include:

- *Promotion to Associate Professor and granting of Tenure*: Review of probationary faculty for awarding of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor
- *Promotion to Full Professor*: Review of associate professors for promotion to Full Professor

Each review type is governed by established protocols, procedures, and timelines. See Appendix C for a chart describing in more detail each type of review.

3.1 Procedures for Review of Ongoing Performance and Progress

3.1.1 Annual Performance Review

All faculty members—probationary faculty and those with tenure—are expected to be reviewed annually. Typically, this takes place during each spring and is done with consideration of merit salary and faculty development needs.

Each faculty member is reviewed annually to assess the extent to which adequate progress is made in the established Goals and Expectations for Faculty Performance in research and creative work, teaching and advising, and service (See section 4). This annual review coincides with and contributes to merit determinations regarding salary. Such reviews are not focused on awarding of promotion and tenure but on the range of a faculty member's accomplishments during the previous 12 months. The annual review also provides a means

of assisting faculty members who are experiencing difficulties in achieving the expected performance goals and expectations of the Department.

For the annual review, each faculty submits to the Department's Faculty Performance Committee a summary of their annual activity report (i.e., WORKS summary) along with a current copy of their curriculum vitae, as well as other details of accomplishments that might be requested. The Faculty Performance Committee is a committee of four but no fewer than three tenured faculty members elected by the faculty charged with conducting peer-reviews of faculty performance, assessing and rating each faculty member's level of performance based on the established Goals and Expectations for Faculty Performance, and providing recommendations to the Department Chair regarding consideration of faculty members for merit, commendations, salary equity adjustments, and/or performance improvement plans. The Department Chair considers the Committee members' recommendations in completing each faculty member's annual performance report.

In conducting their reviews, the members of the Faculty Performance Committee take into account whether a faculty member's appointment is full-time or at a reduced time due to a sabbatical, personal leave, administrative appointment, joint appointment, phased retirement, or other approved reduction in appointment time in the Department.

3.1.2 Annual Appraisal of Probationary Faculty for Continuation of Appointment

In addition to completing the annual review for merit, all probationary faculty members are required to undergo a formal appraisal of their progress in meeting the Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (See Section 5.1). Adequate annual progress toward tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is expected for continuation of appointment.

3.1.2.1 Probationary Period

The evaluation of probationary faculty members' performance is based on the amount of time they have spent in a probationary period. The maximum period of probationary service of a faculty member is normally six academic years, whether consecutive or not. A faculty member is considered to have served an academic year if the faculty member serves at least two-thirds time during their contract year (either an academic year or twelve months). At the end of this probationary period, a probationary faculty member must either be given a regular appointment with indefinite tenure or a one-year terminal appointment.

Upon hire, probationary tenure-line faculty members are provided a period of time during which they are to complete their probationary period and submit their dossier for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. At the beginning of a probationary appointment, the Department Chair will review the terms of the appointment with the faculty member. This initial review must make certain that years of prior service have been acknowledged and appropriately recorded, and that there is a common understanding about the length of the probationary period. The faculty member is supplied with copies of the Board of Regents Faculty Tenure policy, relevant CEHD personnel documents, OLPD's Guidelines for Standards, Policies, and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review of Faculty (7.12 Guidelines), and other OLPD

departmental policy and procedure documents. The discussion must seek to make as clear as possible the application of the performance criteria and expectations outlined throughout Sections 4 and 5 of this document. The review must inform the faculty member about the procedures used in the Department to review teaching, research, and service, as well as the annual review process including:

- the faculty tenure record appraisal forms (Form 12s) that will be completed annually;
- the faculty member's right to inspect the file; and
- the right of access to information included in the review.

The Department Chair will complete a written summary of this meeting, including its time and date, and place it within the faculty member's personnel record.

In accordance with Board of Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure (Section 5.5, also See Appendix A of this document), probationary faculty members have the right to request an extension of their probationary periods for circumstances including, but not limited to, individual health conditions, addition of biological or adopted family members, or pandemics. Extensions are designed for the health and wellbeing of faculty members, and the Department supports probationary faculty in their requests for extensions.

Under the current University policy, the expectations and criteria for promotion and tenure for probationary faculty members who have extended their probationary period are no different from the criteria for those who have not had an extension.

3.1.2.2 Annual Appraisal of Probationary Faculty (Form 12)

Beginning with the first year of the probationary period, the preparation of a file containing documentation relevant to an eventual tenure decision is launched. This file is part of the faculty member's personnel file. The file is accessible to the faculty member and to all regular faculty in the Department who are senior in rank, while other portions of the faculty candidate's personnel file are accessible only to the faculty candidate and to those who have reason to deal with particular information contained in it.

Each year, the probationary faculty member submits a summary statement of their research, teaching, and service activities during each year, reports on the quantity and quality of teaching (per the university Student Ratings of Teaching [SRTs]), reports from peer reviewers of the teaching, copies of sample scholarly works and review of their merit, and contribution to scholarship, and any other data that offer information regarding the candidate's accomplishments and level of scholarly productivity. By a designated date (usually in early spring), the probationary faculty member submits these materials to a three-member Probationary Faculty Review Committee (PFRC), which reviews the materials and provides a recommendation to the department's tenured faculty regarding whether the probationary faculty member's appointment should continue.

The members of the PFRC are appointed by the OLPD Department Chair. All members of each PFRC are tenured faculty in OLPD, with at least one person from the probationary faculty member's program area(s), and at least one member at the rank of

full professor. Membership on each PFRC may change partially or fully each year, depending on the schedules of the members.

In addition to reviewing the faculty candidate's materials, the PFRC provides mentorship to the probationary faculty scholar by offering recommendations, advice, and feedback regarding the faculty candidate's productivity and progress toward promotion and/or tenure. Each year, this Committee evaluates the faculty member's scholarly work based on the Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (see Section 5.1), pointing out areas of strength and areas for improvement. Such review supports faculty professional development and models the tenure review process.

For the annual appraisal, the members of the PFRC review the full set of materials the probationary faculty member has submitted. All members review the entire dossier, with each member concentrating their evaluation report on one of three primary areas of scholarship: research, teaching, or service. The PFRC members discuss the scholar's performance in each of the respective scholarship areas and prepare an annual report of the Committee that presents the conclusions of their assessment. The PFRC's report, along with the probationary faculty member's dossier, is presented to the tenured faculty in the Department. During a meeting of the tenured faculty (usually in the spring) the faculty review and discuss the probationary faculty member's progress based on the dossier materials submitted and presented. Following a discussion of the faculty member's progress, the tenured faculty in the Department vote to either continue or discontinue the appointment of the probationary faculty member. If the probationary faculty candidate is serving in their "decision year" (usually Year 6), the tenured faculty body must vote to either support a promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure or to discontinue the appointment.

This PFRC's report and the faculty vote is presented to the Department Chair, who discusses the report, including the vote and any recommendations for improvement, with the probationary faculty member. The Department Chair then submits a letter to the CEHD Dean that both summarizes the report of the OLPD tenured faculty and makes a recommendation regarding the probationary faculty member's continuation or discontinuation. Consistent with University and CEHD procedures, that letter is presented to the probationary faculty candidate. The Department Chair documents the key aspects of the review and the final recommendation on the University's standard Faculty Annual Probationary Appraisal form (Form 12). This Form is completed and signed annually by the Chair and the probationary faculty scholar. The Chair's letter, annual review (all completed Form 12s), and faculty member's CV are forwarded to the Dean. All completed Form 12s are placed in the faculty candidate's file and are taken into account if and when the candidate is considered for tenure. The faculty candidate has the obligation to review the file annually and may make written comments or add material to it including written rebuttals to areas where the scholar disagrees or wishes to provide additional context. The Form 12 must be signed by the probationary faculty member.

3.1.2.3 Annual Special Meeting of Eligible Voting Faculty

Each year, the Chair of the Department will call a special meeting of tenured faculty to discuss the annual performance of each probationary faculty member in the Department.

The members of a candidate's Probationary Faculty Review Committee will share their report of the candidate's performance, which includes a recommendation to continue or end the candidate's appointment. After discussing the performance of each faculty candidate under review, the faculty will vote on whether to continue or end a candidate's appointment. If the probationary faculty candidate is in their decision year, (usually Year 6) the tenured faculty body must vote to support promotion to Associate Professor and granting of Tenure, or to discontinue the faculty candidate's appointment. Faculty votes will be taken by electronic vote via the University's official voting system. To be counted, a vote must be cast within 24 hours of the conclusion of the special meeting. In considering the continuation of appointments of probationary assistant professors, only tenured faculty in OLPD are eligible to cast a vote.

3.1.2.4 Annual Voting Process for the Continuation of Probationary Appointments

All tenured faculty members, including those on leave, must be informed of all probationary faculty members whose appointments are being considered for promotion and/or tenure and the date and place of the special meeting during which the faculty discussion and vote will take place. Faculty on leave will be given the opportunity to review the final dossier and encouraged to vote.

Voting members' reviews should be limited to the information contained in the submitted dossiers. Should a voting member have concerns, questions, or comments regarding aspects of a dossier, they should forward their comments or questions to the chair of the candidate's Dossier Review Committee during this review period and within a reasonable period prior to the scheduled discussion and vote. This is to allow sufficient time for responses and any required further documentation to be secured and shared with the full voting faculty before the voting faculty meet to discuss the case and a final vote is taken.

Faculty eligible to vote on promotion and tenure decisions must vote by electronic secret ballot. The Department Chair will make available a copy of the file to every faculty member eligible to vote who will be absent from the meeting but wishes to cast a ballot. Such faculty members will be given an opportunity to vote by electronic secret ballot through the University's official electronic voting system. The ballots cast are maintained in official Department electronic files along with all other related documents.

3.1.2.5 Synthesis Report of the Faculty Decision

The faculty shall elect a representative (i.e., an eligible voting faculty) within the Department to serve as the recorder for the faculty during the faculty meeting at which matters of continuation of appointment for a probationary faculty member are deliberated. It shall be the duty of the faculty representative to record and synthesize the faculty discussion regarding each candidate without attribution.

Once all eligible votes have been tabulated within the electronic system following the meeting, the faculty representative records the vote on the synthesis report and submits the report to all eligible voting faculty so that any corrections or appropriate revisions may be made. The final synthesis of the faculty discussion, including all majority and minority views, and the record of the faculty vote as prepared by the faculty

representative will be recorded in this synthesis report and shall constitute the faculty's decision. In the reports, comments or views noted during the voting meeting are not to be attributed to any individual. The completed report is then presented to the Department Chair, who summarizes the key points, faculty vote, and recommendation on Form 12. The Department Chair will include on the form a statement of concurrence or disagreement with the faculty recommendation.

The Department Chair will transmit Form 12 to the Dean of the College of Education and Human Development. This communication will include a composite statement of reasons for the action of the faculty, any substantive minority position, the record of the vote taken, the voting faculty's recommendation, and the Department Chair's conclusions and recommendation.

3.1.2.6 Communication of the Recommendations

The probationary faculty member will be informed by the Department Chair of the outcome of the Annual Appraisal for the Continuation of Appointment. The candidate will be given an opportunity to review and respond in writing to all the documents sent forward to the College and to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The Department Chair will notify the faculty candidate of the due date by which the candidate must submit any comments or responses.

3.1.2.7 Recommendation for Awarding of Tenure and Promotion

At any point during the probationary period, the Department Chair in consultation with the Probationary Faculty Review Committee may recommend to OLPD's tenured faculty that a candidate be considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Normally, this recommendation occurs in the later stages of the probationary period. Evaluations related to the awarding of indefinite tenure are based on the general criteria in Section 7.11 of the Board of Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. The general criteria state:

“What the University of Minnesota seeks above all in its faculty members is intellectual distinction and academic integrity. The basis for awarding indefinite tenure to the candidates possessing these qualities is the determination that each has established and is likely to continue to develop a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national or international reputation or both. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service.” [Section 7.11, Board of Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure]

Given that the awarding of tenure is almost always associated with a decision concerning promotion to Associate Professor or Professor, such a promotion must meet University tenure standards (Faculty Tenure, section 6.3) as well as the departmental goals, expectations, and standards for the rank of Associate Professor or Professor.

A faculty candidate without tenure may at any time during their probationary period

request that a promotion review take place, but the tenured faculty members in the department or the Department Chair determine whether to conduct it. The Department Chair considers feedback from the tenured faculty body and, in consultation with the Probationary Faculty Review Committee, makes a final determination as to whether to proceed with a formal promotion review. The decision to support promotion and the granting of Tenure must be made by the tenured faculty no later than the faculty candidate's decision year.

3.1.2.8 Authority/Responsibility

University policy requires that the Chair of the Department preside at an annual meeting wherein recommendations for a faculty member's promotion and tenure are established. The Department Chair carries forward to the Dean of the College the resulting recommendations from that meeting. The Department Chair will ensure that all procedures and recommendations are in conformance with the policies, guidelines, rules, and regulations of the Department, College, and University on those matters related to personnel.

3.1.2.9 Termination of Probationary Faculty

A probationary appointment must be terminated when the appointee fails to satisfy by the last year of the established probationary term of service the Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor described in Section 5.1 of this document. The probationary faculty member may be terminated earlier if the tenured faculty of OLPD and/or the OLPD Department Chair determine through documentation via Annual Appraisals (Form 12) that the faculty member is not making satisfactory progress toward meeting the criteria within the probationary period.

A probationary appointment may be terminated at the end of any academic year by giving the faculty member notice of termination no later than May 15 of the preceding academic year. The notice must inform the faculty member of the right to request a hearing before the University's Senate Judicial Committee and must advise the faculty member of the applicable time limit for making such a request. Following notice of appointment termination, the scholar is given a nine-month terminal appointment for the following academic year.

3.1.3 Performance Review of Tenured Associate Professors

In addition to having their performance reviewed annually for the purposes of merit and salary, all associate professors with tenure undergo a formal appraisal of their progress in meeting the Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Professor. Each associate professor's progress to the rank of Professor is conducted no less than every four years via the completion and submission of Form 13 (Promotional Review of Tenured Associate Professors).

There is no established time period for when an associate professor with tenure may be considered for promotion to Full Professor. Each case is judged based on the faculty member's achievement of the Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor (see Section 5.2).

3.1.3.1 Determination of Readiness for Promotion to Full Professor (Form 13)

Consideration for promotion from Associate Professor to the rank of Professor is initiated by the Department Chair or by the faculty in the unit at the rank of Professor with the concurrence of the candidate. Such consideration may occur at any time after appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. An associate professor may at any time request that they be considered for promotion by submitting a written request to the Department Chair. The full professors in the unit will decide via a special meeting whether to conduct the review. For further details on policies and procedures regarding consideration for promotion to full professor, see the University-wide [*Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty, Section IIIA.*](#)

The progress review of associate professors, facilitated through Form 13, is conducted by a three-member Full Professor Promotion Committee composed of OLPD faculty at the rank of Professor. This committee provides feedback about the faculty member's level of achievement in meeting the Criteria for Promotion to Professor (see Section 5.2), and documents this feedback on Form 13. When possible, at least one member of the committee is a faculty member within the candidate's program area. One member of the committee must be from outside the candidate's program area but within OLPD.

For this review, the candidate submits a dossier that includes an up-to-date curriculum vitae and statements regarding accomplishments in research, teaching, and service since their promotion to Associate Professor. The Full Professor Promotion Committee may request that publications, syllabi, and other scholarly materials be submitted.

The members of the Full Professor Promotion Committee review the dossier and, as a committee, deliberate and submit a written report to the Department Chair that recommends either the candidate move ahead and prepare a promotion dossier for review by the department's full professors, or the candidate defer consideration for another time and continue to build the case for promotion in order to address areas that require additional growth and development. In either case, the report should identify areas of strengths and suggestions for further work that will strengthen the candidate's case for advancement to the rank of Professor. The report should include a statement as to whether or not the Full Professor Promotion Committee's final recommendation was unanimous. The recommendation of the Committee is recorded on Form 13 and the form is retained in the candidate's personnel file.

The Department Chair considers the Committee's assessment of the candidate's readiness for promotion, including areas that need attention and/or improvement, and makes a determination on the candidate's readiness for a full departmental review for promotion. 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 CEHD Dean, or the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

For cases in which an associate professor's performance, either through the Annual Performance Review (see Section 3.1.1 of this document) or other formal review (i.e., Form 13), is deemed unsatisfactory, a Post-Tenure Review of the candidate may be recommended. (See Section 3.1.4).

3.1.4 Post-Tenure Review for Performance Improvement

If, during the Annual Performance Review, the tenured members of the Faculty Performance Committee or Department Chair finds a tenured faculty member's performance to be substantially below the Goals and Expectations for Faculty Performance (see Section 4), the faculty member must be informed of this judgment. When such judgements are made, the case must be reviewed by the tenured members of the Performance Review Committee to determine if the faculty member falls substantially below the established goals and expectations.

If the Department Chair and the tenured faculty of the Faculty Performance Committee agree that the faculty member in question has fallen substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit, they must put this judgment in writing for the faculty member. The letter must include suggestions for improvement to meet the goals and expectations and establish a time period for improvement of at least one year from the date of letter. The time period for improvement cannot end at the next annual review if that review is less than one year from the date of the letter. The letter from the unit head and the elected committee must identify the ending date for the period of performance improvement and must request that the faculty member provide a report at that time describing the faculty member's progress towards meeting the goals and expectations of the unit.

The Department Chair and the Faculty Performance Committee members should make reasonable efforts to meet with the faculty member to discuss the plan for meeting the Goals and Expectations for Faculty Performance. The faculty member may request modification of the plan from the Department Chair and the Committee but may not at this stage file a complaint with the Senate Judicial Committee.

At the end of the time period specified for performance improvement, the faculty member under review must provide a report describing progress toward meeting the goals and expectations. The Department Chair and Faculty Performance Committee's tenured members will then review the progress that the faculty member has made regarding the recommendations as specified in the report from the faculty member.

The Department Chair will provide the Faculty Performance Committee with information related to the faculty member's performance during the previous two-year time period, including but not limited to annual review letters, faculty activity reports (i.e., WORKS), and curriculum vitae. The Faculty Performance Committee may request that the scholar provide examples of the faculty member's scholarship (i.e., syllabi, publications, grant proposals, etc.) as well as other information relevant to the faculty member's research, teaching and advising, and service. The Committee will conduct the review in accordance with the University's Faculty Tenure policy, accompanying procedures, and established Goals and Expectations for Faculty Performance.

If the Department Chair and Faculty Performance Committee's tenured members agree that the faculty member now meets the Goals and Expectations for Faculty Performance, the faculty member returns to the usual process for annual review. If the Department Chair and Faculty Performance Committee's tenured members do not agree, the faculty member returns to the usual process for annual review. If the Department Chair and Faculty Performance Committee's tenured members agree that the faculty member still falls substantially below the goals and expectations after the time period specified for performance improvement, then the faculty member may be referred for Special Peer Review in accordance with Board of Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure, Section 7a.3 or may proceed with an additional remediation period as specified in the following paragraph.

If the Department Chair and the Faculty Performance Committee concur that the faculty scholar has performed at a level that is substantially below the Goals and Expectations for Faculty Performance, the Department Chair will inform the faculty member by letter (signed by both the Department Chair and a representative of the Faculty Performance Committee), identifying the deficiencies, specifying steps the faculty member should take to address the deficiencies, and establishing a time period (per University policy, not less than one year from the date of the letter) during which the faculty member should address the identified problems.

If, at the end of the specified time period, both the Department Chair and the Faculty Performance Committee again find the faculty member's performance to still be substantially below the goals and expectations of OLPD, the Department Chair and members of the Faculty Performance Committee may contact the CEHD Dean to recommend an additional assessment through the University's Special Peer Review process. (See Board of Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure, Section 7a.3).

3.2 Review Procedures for Purposes of Tenure and/or Promotion

The Department's policies and procedures in consideration of faculty members' promotion and/or the awarding of tenure are governed by established University-wide policies, procedures, and timelines (See Board of Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure). What the University of Minnesota seeks above all in its faculty members is intellectual distinction and academic integrity. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching and advising, and service, based on the Department's established criteria for Tenure and Promotion (see Section 5).

When under consideration for tenure and/or promotion, faculty members in the Department shall document their accomplishments in the three categories of research, teaching, and service. Evaluation of a faculty member's record of accomplishment will be judged against the expectations of the University and the College, along with the Department's Goals and Expectations for Faculty Performance as described in Section 4 of this document. The basis for awarding indefinite tenure is the determination that the candidate has established and is likely to continue to add to a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national or international reputation or both. Expectations may vary for different individuals and may change as a faculty member's career develops. However, in all cases, excellence in all three categories (teaching, research, and service) is necessary to

be awarded tenure and/or promotion. Faculty in the Department are expected to contribute to the public good through their teaching, research, and/or service, such as through public engagement, equity and diversity, and multidisciplinary initiatives; excellence in these areas is considered in the context of promotion and tenure.

Within the first two months of each academic year, the Department Chair will advise all faculty members who will be under consideration for promotion and/or tenure based on the results of and recommendations from the completed faculty review processes. To be considered for promotion to Associate Professor or Full Professor in a given year, these faculty members must notify the Department Chair of their intent on or before March 1 of the year before the promotion and/or tenure review is to take place. The Department Chair will provide these faculty members with College and University guidelines for the preparation of their promotion materials and will appoint a Dossier Review Committee.

All policies and procedures herein described are congruent with the [*Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure*](#), The University-wide document titled [*Procedures for Evaluating Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty*](#), and with CEHD's [*Promotion & Tenure Review Guidelines*](#). In addition, the [*Faculty Tenure*](#) policy indicates actions both required and optional that are not reiterated in this document.

3.2.1 Formation of Dossier Review Committee (DRC)

In the academic year prior to when the OLPD department faculty will consider and vote on a faculty member's request for promotion and tenure, a three-person review committee (DRC) is formed to conduct a comprehensive review of the faculty candidate's promotion dossier and complete a Recommendation Report that describes the extent to which the candidate has met the standards and expectations for tenure and advancement to Associate Professor, or advancement to Full Professor.

The Dossier Review Committee is composed of three faculty members appointed by OLPD's Department Chair. The Department Chair will assign one of the DRC members to chair the committee. The members of the DRC must be senior in rank to the candidate under review. When possible, at least one member of the review committee should be from the candidate's program area and at least one committee member should be from another program area in the Department.

3.2.2 Responsibilities of the Dossier Review Committee

The committee guides the faculty candidate in securing the statements, supporting documents, and other materials required for the formal review of the promotion dossier. According to the Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty, the dossier file must contain relevant information on the candidate's teaching and advising, scholarly research and other creative work, and service, and on other factors relevant to the decision.

The appointed Chair of the DRC is responsible for ensuring a full, fair, and equitable review and adherence to University procedures regarding the review of candidates' dossiers for promotion and/or tenure consideration.

DRC members will meet with the faculty candidate to review the faculty member's materials and statements and guide the candidate in compiling the full dossier (see Section 3.2.3) for contents to include in the dossier). A candidate may request the Department Chair or other faculty in the Department to review portions of the dossier for recommendations and suggestions for improvement.

The DRC serves as a representative body of the tenured faculty of the Department in conducting a full review of a faculty candidate's dossier in consideration of the awarding of indefinite tenure (for probationary faculty) and promotion. To this end, it reviews the faculty candidate's dossier according to the respective Criteria for Promotion and Tenure (see Sections 5.1 and 5.2 of this document) and presents to the faculty who are eligible to vote on the case a report that discusses the findings of its review and a recommendation (recommend to promote, not recommend to promote).

A special meeting of eligible voting faculty in the Department is scheduled to discuss each faculty member's candidacy for advancement, and following the discussion, to conduct a vote for promotion and/or (if the faculty member is probationary) tenure within the designated period of time (typically within 24 hours) using the University-wide electronic voting system. Prior to the special meeting, the dossier package of each faculty candidate under consideration for tenure and/or promotion will be made available for a time period of not less than two weeks for review by each faculty member eligible to vote.

3.2.3 Preparing the Tenure and/or Promotion Dossier

The University has identified specific items and materials that faculty candidates must include in their tenure and/or promotion dossier. The tenure and/or promotion dossier should include the following:

1. The faculty candidate's current curriculum vitae (See Master Promotion and Tenure CV Template for required format of curriculum vitae).
2. The faculty candidate's presentation and reflection of accomplishments, contributions, and achievement of standards as follows:
 - a. A research statement that describes the focus and content of the faculty candidate's area(s) of inquiry and provides examples that demonstrate that the candidate's body of research has met standards of rigor, significance, originality, and impact (see Section 5.1.1);
 - b. A teaching statement that describes the quantity, quality and impact of the faculty candidate's teaching and advising. The statement should include summaries of the candidate's teaching assignments, student advising roles, and student and peer evaluations. (see Section 5.1.2)

- c. A service statement that describes quantity, quality and impact of the faculty candidate's service to the University, service to the profession, and service to the community. (for the definition of service, [see Section 5.1.3 as well as Faculty Tenure (2022), footnote 3; if the probationary faculty member is governed by subsection 7.11 of Faculty Tenure (2001), then see footnote 8 of that policy]);
3. Electronic copies of publications (typically five) that demonstrate the rigor, significance, originality and impact of the candidate's research or other scholarly contributions (for the definition of scholarly research and other creative work, see Faculty Tenure (2011), footnote 3; if the probationary faculty member is governed by subsection 7.11 of Faculty Tenure (2001), then see footnote 7 of that policy);
4. Other relevant material that a faculty candidate deems appropriate for their case (i.e., evaluations of the candidate's scholarly research or other creative work by persons inside and outside the University.
5. For probationary faculty, copies of all completed Form 12s and accompanying documentation are required.

3.2.4 Review Committee Process

The Dossier Review Committee considers and assesses the entirety of a faculty candidate's scholarship, with specific attention given to the scholarly work in research, teaching, and service conducted at the University of Minnesota after receiving a terminal degree. For faculty under consideration for promotion to the rank of Professor, the Dossier Review Committee should highlight the candidate's accomplishments achieved at the University of Minnesota while serving at the rank of Associate Professor. The DRC should consider the faculty member's level of productivity (see Section 4), the extent to which the faculty member has met the Criteria for Promotion and Tenure (see Section 5), reviews from external letters and other sources, and for probationary faculty seeking promotion to Associate Professor and tenure, the potential for achieving the rank of Professor. Given the broad range of disciplines and areas of study that comprise the core academic knowledge in OLPD, consideration should be given to both the particular scholarship expectations and norms within the candidate's defined subject area(s) of study and inquiry, and the individual's impact, influence and reputation within that subject area(s). Attention should also be given to different areas of scholarly work (research, teaching and service) as they pertain to contributions that incorporate issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion, interdisciplinary activities, and/or public engagement and community-engaged scholarship.

Diversity, equity, and inclusion: The University encourages faculty to explicitly integrate and explore issues of diversity, inclusion, and equity in or across their work. This might take any of several forms including and not limited to justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion efforts related to local, national, and international research; issues of access, equality, and equity; and interdisciplinary perspectives. Examples of evidence of contributions may include but are not limited to diversity, inclusion, and equity efforts related to student access; faculty diversity, curriculum development; course technologies; collaborative and community-engaged research that contributes to knowledge and improved practice of diversity, equity, and inclusion; community partnerships that promote departmental, college,

and university goals around diversity, equity, and inclusion; and other creative contributions that engage diverse public and student populations.

Public and community engagement: The University encourages faculty to consider research, teaching, and service that is publicly and/or community engaged, and encourages them to present evidence of public and/or community engagement in or across their work. The relevance of community engagement activities to the missions of the Department and the College of Education and a scholar's line of inquiry should be assessed. The Department recognizes that research agendas may be based on the candidate's commitments to reciprocity with research communities, and that the establishment of such research requires time and efforts beyond researcher-initiated projects. For faculty members with substantial effort in this area, those contributions can be considered in relation to other areas (teaching, service, and other kinds of research) to account for the relative proportion of time spent in each area. Evidence of the strength and quality of these community engagement activities should be provided by the individual faculty scholar and should be evaluated by qualified peers or colleagues with experience related to such activities as a part of the promotion and tenure process. Publicly and community-engaged activities (distinct from service activities) should only be included in the overall evaluation towards promotion and/or tenure when such activities are integrated with and result in the production of rigorous scholarship. Such scholarship may be produced not only through research, but also through scholarly work delivered through teaching, advising, outreach, and service. Distinction in public or community engagement for the granting of tenure must include scholarly or other creative products of engagement, including but not limited to publications, innovative forms of dissemination, demonstrated broad impact on or with the public or community, that might include local, national, or international community-based, public, or peer recognition. To be clear, public or community engagement work may involve additional forms of documentation on impact, which can be evaluated for originality, independence, coherence, impact, and collaborative skills.

3.2.5 External Reviews and External Reviewer Qualifications

Outside evaluations of the candidate's contributions to scholarly research and other creative work should be sought both by recognized scholars in the field and persons suggested by the candidate. Generally, 5-7 external reviews are expected. At least half, and no fewer than four, of the external reviews must be obtained from individuals with no direct professional or personal interest in the advancement of the candidate's career (for example, they should not be former advisors, mentors, co-authors, or co-investigators on previous work). The file must specify clearly the relationship of each external reviewer to the candidate and should contain a description of external reviewers and their credentials to enable collegiate/campus review committees and collegiate and central administrators to interpret reviews more fully. [For more information visit <https://policy.umn.edu/hr/tenure-proc01#IE>].

Dossier Review Committee members identify between five and seven external peer reviewers. Former advisors, dissertation committee members, or other formal mentors of the candidate must not be included. The file must specify clearly the relationship of each external reviewer to the faculty candidate and should contain a description of each external reviewer and their credentials to enable collegiate/campus review committees and collegiate and central administrators to interpret reviews more fully. The faculty member under review

may recommend to the Dossier Review Committee experts who are familiar with the candidate's work. The Review Committee submits the list of external reviewers to the Department Chair who makes a final decision on which external reviewers to contact. Typically, the Department Chair invites external reviewers to submit letters. The Department Chair may delegate the facilitation of inviting external reviewers to the Chair of the Dossier Review Committee.

Individuals contacted to serve as external reviewers should hold a professional academic appointment preferably at a peer institution, should be senior in rank to the faculty member under review, should conduct work in the faculty member's area of scholarship or related field, and should be leading scholars in the subject area(s) under review. In some cases (i.e., scholars whose research is conducted in partnership with non-academic knowledge holders), reviews from qualified experts and peers who work outside of academia may be appropriate and included. External reviewers, regardless of position, should be able to speak to the rigor, significance, impact, originality, and quality of the faculty member's scholarly work. In all cases, external reviews must be obtained from individuals with no direct professional or personal interest in the advancement of the candidate's career.

External reviewers who agree to conduct a review will be sent a copy of the faculty member's curriculum vitae and a set of publications. When appropriate, a faculty member may request that specific publications be sent to particular reviewers based on the reviewers' areas of expertise. External reviewers are required to submit a copy of their curriculum vitae along with their review of the candidate.

External reviewers must be informed that their evaluations will not be held confidential given that the Minnesota state law permits candidates to inspect them. External reviewers must be informed if and when a faculty candidate has extended the probationary period and for how long. Reviewers are not told the reason the probationary period was extended, but should be advised to allow for reduced productivity during the time the probationary period was extended.

All letters received from solicited external reviewers must be included in the faculty member's dossier. The curriculum vitae of all outside reviewers must also be part of the file along with a description of the position and qualifications of each external reviewer.

3.2.6 Internal Reviewers

Letters from internal reviewers (e.g., those who work or study at the University of Minnesota) may also be considered in the review process. If internal reviews are sought, such reviews must be solicited from either the Chair of the Dossier Review Committee or the Department Chair, not the candidate themselves. Solicitation for internal letters should follow the protocol that the Department has created for external letters (See Appendix D). The expectation is that solicited letters from internal reviewers (including former students) should speak to and focus on the performance criteria in research, teaching, and service presented in Sections 5.1 and 5.2, as well as other specific aspects of the candidate's scholarly work with which the reviewer may be familiar, such as the scholar's engaged scholarship, school-related consultation, innovations in teaching, or other focal points central to the faculty member's area of expertise.

Once a solicited letter is submitted, and if it was appropriately solicited, it must be included in the file. Unsolicited letters or other forms of documentation that are received should not be included in the file.

3.2.7 Joint Appointments

For faculty members holding joint appointments, the primary department will initiate the review process and appoint the review committee. The review committee will include individuals from each of the departments involved, and special care will be taken in soliciting reviews from representatives of the appropriate subject areas. In cases where the departments are both in the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD), the Department Chair submits a written request to the Dean of CEHD requesting approval of the joint committee's membership. The Dean of CEHD submits in writing their decision to approve the committee membership or have the Department Chair identify different members. The review committee can begin its work only after the Dean's written approval of the committee membership is obtained. In cases where any of the appointments are held by a unit outside CEHD, the Department Chair will submit a written request to both the Dean(s) and/or departments concerned requesting approval of the joint committee's membership. The request will identify the faculty candidate under consideration and include the name(s) and tenure homes of those faculty members who will be asked to vote on the candidate and the reasons for including them. The review committee can begin its work only after all of the aforementioned parties have approved, in writing, the membership of the committee.

3.2.8 Special Meeting of Eligible Voting Faculty

The Chair of the Department will call a special meeting of faculty eligible to vote for the purpose of conducting annual reviews and evaluating all faculty members under consideration for promotion and tenure. The members of the Dossier Review Committee will share their report of the extent to which the candidate has met the Criteria for Tenure and Promotion and state whether they recommend or do not recommend promotion. After discussing each faculty candidate under review, the faculty will vote on promotion and/or tenure in accordance with the policies and procedures of the College and University. Faculty votes will be taken by electronic vote via the University's official voting system. To be counted, a vote must be cast within 24 hours of the conclusion of the special meeting.

In cases regarding consideration of associate professors' promotion to the rank of Professor, only Full Professors in OLPD are eligible to cast a vote. In cases regarding consideration of probationary assistant professors' awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, all tenured faculty in OLPD are eligible to cast a vote.

3.2.9 Voting process for the Awarding of Tenure and Promotion

All faculty members eligible to vote on individual cases, including those on leave, must be informed of all faculty members being considered for promotion and/or tenure and the date

and place of the special meeting during which the faculty discussion will take place, and following the discussion, be informed how and by when (usually within 24 hours) to cast a vote for promotion and/or (if the faculty member is probationary) using the University-wide electronic voting system. Faculty on leave will be given the opportunity to review the final dossier and encouraged to vote.

Voting members' reviews should be limited to the information contained in the submitted dossiers. Should a voting member have concerns, questions, or comments regarding aspects of a dossier, they should forward their comments or questions to the chair of the candidate's Dossier Review Committee during this review period and within a reasonable period prior to the scheduled discussion and vote. This is to allow sufficient time for responses and any required further documentation to be secured and shared with the full voting faculty before the voting faculty meet to discuss the case and a final vote is taken.

Faculty eligible to vote on promotion and tenure decisions must vote by electronic or written secret ballot. The Department Chair will make available a copy of the file to every faculty member eligible to vote who will be absent from the meeting but wishes to cast a ballot. Such faculty members will be given an opportunity to vote by written absentee ballot through the University's official electronic voting system. The ballots cast are maintained in official Department electronic files along with all other related documents.

3.2.10 Synthesis Report of the Faculty Decision

The faculty shall elect a representative (i.e., an eligible voting faculty member) within the Department to serve as the recorder for the faculty during the faculty meeting at which matters of promotion or tenure for an individual faculty member are deliberated. It shall be the duty of the faculty representative to record and synthesize the faculty discussion regarding each candidate without attribution.

Once all eligible votes have been tabulated within the electronic system following the meeting, the faculty representative records the vote on the synthesis report and submits the report to all eligible voting faculty so that any corrections or appropriate revisions may be made. The final synthesis of the faculty discussion, including all majority and minority views, and the record of the faculty vote as prepared by the faculty representative will be recorded in this synthesis report and shall constitute the faculty's decision. In the reports, comments or views noted during the voting meeting are not to be attributed to any individual. The completed report is then presented to the Department Chair for transmittal to the Dean.

3.2.11 Recording and Communication of the Recommendations

The Department Chair will transmit the results of the vote on promotion and tenure to the Dean of the College of Education and Human Development as the recommendation of the faculty. This communication will include a composite statement of reasons for the action of the faculty, any substantive minority position, the record of the vote taken, and the faculty

recommendation.

The Department Chair will prepare and transmit to the College their separate statement of concurrence or disagreement with the faculty recommendation.

A faculty candidate under review for promotion or tenure will be informed by the Department Chair of the recommendation of the faculty and Department Chair. The candidate will be given an opportunity to review and respond in writing to all of the documents sent forward to the College and to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The Department Chair will notify the faculty candidate of the due date by which the candidate must submit any comments or responses.

If desired, a faculty member may withdraw their consideration for tenure or promotion by making a request in writing to the Department Chair, the Dean of CEHD, and the Executive Vice President and Provost at any time during the review process before a decision is made by the Executive Vice President and Provost. A faculty member in their mandatory decision year must also submit a letter of resignation, effective at the end of the faculty member's next academic year (i.e., academic year or twelve months). A faculty member being considered for early tenure and promotion is not required to submit a letter of resignation if they withdraw their file from consideration. Upon receipt of such a request, the file will not be further reviewed.

4. GOALS AND EXPECTATIONS FOR FACULTY PERFORMANCE

During each year of appointment, all faculty in OLPD, especially tenured faculty, are expected to meet the Goals and Expectations for faculty performance in research, teaching and advising, and service. These Goals and Expectations are evaluated each year through the Annual Review Process, facilitated by the Faculty Performance Committee and the Department Chair and are considered in faculty merit and salary decisions.

At a minimum, all faculty with full-time appointments in the Department are expected to produce and achieve the following:

Research

- At least one peer-reviewed publication per year averaged over 3 years
- One peer-reviewed presentation per year averaged over 3 years

Teaching and Advising

- Teach at least one course per year
- Consistently attend and lead assigned courses in alignment with course or program guidelines
- Effectiveness in teaching as evidenced by curriculum development, students' ratings in course evaluations (SRT), student outcomes, and /or other demonstrations of effective teaching and student learning and development

- Evidence of active advising and mentoring of masters and doctoral students

Service

- Active participation on at least one internal (Department, College, or University) committee
- Evidence of external contributions (i.e., contributions to groups, communities, associations external to the University)
- Participation in annual reviews and promotion and tenure processes

In addition, all faculty are expected to engage actively in Department meetings and other important business of the Department, College, and University. All faculty are also required to observe research integrity, professional ethics, and to contribute to a respectful departmental, college, and university culture.

These goals and expectations establish a minimum performance threshold of productivity at which all full-time faculty, especially tenured faculty members, are expected to perform. Achievement of these minimum goals and expectations alone does not qualify faculty members for promotion and/or tenure. Tenure and promotion are granted based on a broader range of factors that demonstrate a faculty member's professional distinction in research, effectiveness in teaching, and service to the University, the profession, and the community. (See Criteria for Tenure and Promotion, Section 5 of this document).

Full-time faculty who perform below this threshold over an extended period of time are considered to be underperforming, and may be subject to a post-tenure review (tenured faculty) or discontinuation of appointment (probationary faculty), depending on circumstances (i.e., a faculty member is on reduced time or workload in the Department due to a sabbatical, personal leave, administrative appointment, joint appointment, phase retirement, or other approved situation). A performance improvement plan will be contemplated when a faculty member consistently fails to reach the minimum performance threshold over a rolling 2-3 year window.

5. CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

While the Goals and Expectations for Faculty Performance (see Section 4) focus on faculty members' level of productivity during a given time frames, the Criteria for Tenure and Promotion focus on demonstrating faculty members' overall contributions, quality, significance, rigor, effectiveness, and impact of their research, teaching, and service. To be considered for advancement in rank or be awarded tenure, faculty members are expected to demonstrate distinction in their field(s) of study through peer-assessments of both individual aspects and the full body of their scholarly and academic work.

5.1 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

In OLPD, promotion to Associate Professor encompasses a faculty member's demonstration of disciplinary expertise and advancement of disciplinary knowledge through the scholar's body of work across their research, teaching, and service activities. To this end, scholarship is not only about the work produced through research, but also includes scholarly work delivered through teaching, advising, outreach, and service.

As defined below, promotion to Associate Professor with the awarding of tenure within OLPD

is based on:

- professional distinction in research;
- effectiveness in teaching; and
- appropriate service to the University, relevant professional audiences, and to communities at the local, state, national and international levels.

5.1.1 Research

As stated in the University of Minnesota's *Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure*,

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 (*Faculty Tenure*, Section 7.11, footnote 3).

The Department's assessment of a faculty scholar's research will be based on evidence of rigor, significance, originality, and impact.

Examples of evidence include, but are not limited to:

- work that has furthered or advanced research methods or approaches to an area of study;
- products resulting from original research (i.e., publications, presentations, grants);
- peer reviews and other assessments of research;
- demonstrations of changes in practice, knowledge, understanding, policy, or theory that have resulted from research; and
- research or creative contributions that engage a diverse public and student population or that contribute to the equity, inclusion, and diversity of knowing and knowledge.

In all cases, the rigor, significance, originality, and impact of the faculty member's body of research should be described.

Rigor. Rigor refers to adherence to the principles, standards, and practices that are basic to disciplined, responsible, and systematic inquiry. A faculty scholar's body of research and research accomplishments will be assessed by the degree to which the scholar utilizes and adheres to these principles, standards, and practices. Primary consideration will be given to scholarly research that has been reviewed by qualified experts in the field or content area.

Significance. Significance refers to the identifiable contributions that a faculty scholar and the faculty scholar's body of research have made in addressing important issues and/or compelling problems found within the faculty scholar's area(s) of study. The faculty scholar's body of research and research accomplishments will be assessed by the extent to which peers, funders, journal publishers, beneficiaries of the research (i.e., practitioners, community members, policy makers, etc.), and others working within the scholar's area(s) of inquiry consider the scholar's body of research to be important, valuable, impactful, and relevant.

Originality. Originality refers to the degree to which the scholar's line(s) of inquiry breaks new ground and produces new understandings. Research accomplishments will be assessed by the degree to which the scholar's research reflects originality in intellectual contribution, conceptualizations, methodologies, and /or resulting products. Ways of demonstrating originality may be the presentation of notable and recognizable discoveries or breakthroughs, peers' adoption or replication of the scholar's discoveries, through peer assessments of the originality of the scholar's work, and through community members' or other external beneficiaries' assessments or unique application of the scholar's work.

Impact. Impact refers to the scholar's influence in shaping research, practice, and/or policy issues in the scholar's field(s) of inquiry. Research accomplishments should reflect a research effort that is coherent and programmatic and advances understanding. Research accomplishments will be assessed by the degree to which the scholar's body of research has defined new areas or methods of inquiry or has redefined, refined, or shaped existing areas or methods of inquiry. When appropriate, the accomplishments will be assessed in terms of their impact on professional practice or educational policy, locally, nationally and internationally.

In consideration of tenure, the Department's assessment of the faculty scholar's research will place primary weight on the following scholarly outputs and accomplishments:

- published or in-press works (including but not limited to refereed journal articles, funding from both internal and external sources, books, book chapters, refereed proceedings, monographs, technical reports);
- research, presentations at professional and scholarly meetings;
- award recognitions; and
- other scholarly products that demonstrate evidence of rigor, significance, originality, and impact in the scholar's area(s) of inquiry.

To the extent possible, Dossier Review Committee members should highlight a scholar's accomplishments and outputs across these dimensions.

Faculty scholars are also encouraged to explicitly integrate and explore issues of diversity, inclusion and equity in their research. This should include awareness of and openness to different cultural, methodological, and/or epistemological perspectives, such as those found in international research, community-situated research and scholarship, interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary research and scholarship.

While scholars are expected to maintain an ongoing, productive research agenda, excellence in research's rigor, significance, originality, an impact is more important than the number or length of publications or the amount of grant funding. Support from grants is only one measure, and not the only indicator of scholarly productivity. Scholarly productivity may also include a scholar's work in accessing publicly available data and developing long-term relationships with communities and organizations that support and advance the research without funds.

For multi-authored publications or multi-investigator research studies, the contribution of

the individual scholar under review must be specifically described and evaluated. For each publication or research study, the faculty scholar must describe their percentage of effort and detail their role and specific contribution. For example, the description should include whether the faculty scholar was the lead author or principal investigator, was involved in approval of the manuscript before final submission, and/or contributed or analyzed data. The contributions of co-authors should also be explained. The criteria described in Elsevier's CRediT taxonomy is just one form in which these descriptions can be presented (See [Sample CRediT author statement](#)). Other criteria and forms that may be more aligned with the nature and focus of a scholar's areas of scholarship should be valued.

When appropriate, faculty scholars are encouraged to include graduate students, community partners and undergraduate students in their publications. As with all multi-authored articles, the specific contribution of the individual scholar and the contribution of the student(s) should be described. In addition, participation in multidisciplinary research leading to publication is valued and will not, when the independence and originality of the candidate's contribution can be clearly described, be judged less valuable than other publications.

The quality of the faculty scholar's research will be assessed by experts both internal and external to the Department and University, including, when appropriate, experts situated in non-academic settings. Judgments will be based on the rigor, significance, originality, and impact of the scholar's overall body of research.

For guidance regarding the use of journal impact factors and other such measures to evaluate faculty performance, reviewers should refer to the College of Education and Human Development [Journal Impact Factor Guidance](#).

5.1.2 Teaching

As is stated in the University of Minnesota's *Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure*,

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 (*Faculty Tenure*, Section 7.11, footnote 3).

As faculty members of a unit within the College of Education and Human Development, teaching is a core and valued component of faculty scholarship. Faculty scholars under consideration for tenure and/or promotion need to demonstrate and provide evidence of effective and high-quality teaching.

High quality teaching is not limited to credit-producing classroom-based instruction. It can include instruction situated in community-based, field-based, and non-academic contexts. It can also involve education and the communication of knowledge both to registered University students and persons in the external community. It also includes supervising, mentoring, and advising students and professional peers.

The Department encourages innovative instruction using the latest technologies. It also values a faculty scholar's development, experimentation, and use of innovative pedagogies and the incorporation of various epistemologies and instructional methods designed to optimize student learning. The Department also values and encourages the integration of teaching with research and/or public service.

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 considered to assess the quality of a faculty member's teaching. In demonstrating accomplishments and efficacy in teaching, a faculty member will show evidence of knowledge of the subject matter, development of an appropriate instructional plan, the ability to communicate effectively, creation of an environment conducive to learning, and an appropriate evaluation plan. The faculty member must also demonstrate and show evidence of skill in providing effective advisement and guidance in student research and writing, knowledge of institutional programs and procedures, and commitment to student educational success through their constructive feedback, availability, and responsiveness.

In addition, the Department values faculty member's explicit commitment to equity, diversity, and inclusion in all aspects of teaching, advising, and mentoring. Some ways that a faculty member can demonstrate this commitment includes the following:

- demonstrated efforts to expand the diversity of graduate students;
- curriculum development aimed at improving the learning experience for students of different backgrounds;
- development of courses that contribute to the study of aspects of equity, diversity, and inclusion;
- incorporation of community partnerships and community-based learning into the curriculum in ways that contribute to promoting unit goals around diversity, equity, and inclusion.

The Department's assessment of a faculty member's teaching and advising will be based on evidence of quantity, quality and impact.

Quantity. A faculty member should detail the expected or contracted teaching assignment for each year. A teaching record should be provided describing courses taught, instructional development (including newly developed or significantly revised classroom and/or online courses), incorporation of new curricula or instructional methods. Course information should include number of times taught, semester(s) taught, and number of students. When applicable, a faculty member should also provide a record of teaching provided through lectures, visiting professorships, workshops, and other educational forums.

In regard to student advising/mentoring/supervising, the faculty member should provide a record of current advising load (number of advisees, degree type: undergraduate, M.Ed., MA, doctoral) and completed M.A., Ed.D., and Ph.D. and other post-baccalaureate student committees where they served as member, reader, or chair.

Quality. A number of qualitative indicators may be examined in evaluating quality teaching

and advising. Among these are student comments on advising, peer assessments of instruction and advising, any formal evaluation program that might be available in the Department, follow-ups of former graduates (positions obtained, awards earned, etc.), recognitions and awards for teaching, character and comprehensiveness of syllabi and other course materials in use (based on University expectations), as well as examinations and other assessment procedures employed in courses. Examples of a faculty scholar's development and incorporation of new methods of teaching or new curricula designed to enhance student learning and development are also evidence of teaching quality. Other quality indicators may be considered, such as academic or professional positions students or advisees take, and scholarly and/or professional contributions students or advisees make after graduation.

Evidence of the trajectory of a faculty member's teaching should determine if improvement over time has occurred or if teaching has remained unchanged at a high level of competence. A faculty scholar should describe any accomplishments dedicated to the improvement of their teaching and/or advising. For example, such professional development might include participation in University programs designed to improve teaching effectiveness such as the Early Career Teaching Program, Mid-Career Teaching Program, Multicultural Teaching and Learning Fellowship Program from the Center for Educational Innovation, or other faculty development programs sponsored by units within the University or by external professional associations or other entities.

Further evidence of the trajectory of the faculty scholar's teaching quality could include student evaluations of the same course evaluated over time or multiple peer evaluations of the scholar's teaching conducted over time. Recognitions and awards for teaching and the criteria for these recognitions and awards are also applicable.

Evidence of the quality of teaching may include but is not limited to:

- summary of courses taught, directed, or developed by the faculty member, at both undergraduate and/or graduate levels;
- number of degree candidates advised and graduated in undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs;
- evaluations by students, including both quantitative ratings and qualitative comments on University-required end of course evaluation form (i.e., Student Ratings of Teaching or SRT);
- evaluation by peers, especially of new courses and curricula as well as course revisions (to include review of syllabi text, material covered, assignments, and examinations);
- progress in teaching, as indicated by measures faculty members have taken to respond to feedback and improve their teaching;
- teaching and advising awards obtained; and

- examples of development and incorporation of new methods of teaching or new curricula.

Evidence of quality advising/mentoring/supervising may include but is not limited to:

- documentation of supervising and mentoring responsibilities related to advising;
- titles of completed theses/dissertations supervised;
- places of employment for past graduate advisees/co-advisees;
- written comments from students;
- record of supporting students' professional development through publications, conference presentations, nominations for awards; and
- evidence of collaborative work with students.

Impact. When available, evidence of the impact of teaching on student learning, development, and educational success should be provided. A faculty member is also encouraged to include available evidence including the impact of teaching on external partners, both domestic and international, through advancements or improvements in the partners' educational or organizational policies, practices, and conditions.

Evidence of teaching impact may include:

- examples of how students have used their learning in their research or practice;
- illustrative samples of student work;
- report of data on student learning outcomes, when available;
- written comments from students;
- changes in educational policies or other practices among external partners; and
- written comments from external partners.

5.1.3 Service

As stated in the University of Minnesota's *Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure*,

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 ([*Faculty Tenure, Section 7.11, footnote 3*](#)).

In alignment with the University's mission to advance the public good through our research, teaching, and service, the Department values the application of faculty members' expertise to the advancement of institutional policies, disciplinary and interdisciplinary knowledge, and important societal issues. The Department also values and encourages the integration of service goals and activities with faculty scholars' research and/or teaching agendas.

Faculty members are expected to demonstrate excellence in service in three categories: service to the University; service to the discipline and profession; and service to the community.

Regardless of area of service, activities might include but are not limited to:

- developing and influencing policies;
- integrating human and other resources into effective programs;
- anticipating and solving operational problems that make policies workable;
- offering professional expertise and skills to enhance organizational functions;
- having an impact on local, state, national, and international institutions and organizations; and
- influencing professional practices.

Faculty members are encouraged to explicitly integrate and explore issues of diversity, inclusion and equity across their service activities. This should include awareness of and intentional engagement with different cultural, methodological, and/or epistemological perspectives that offer scholars new insights and opportunities to learn and grow.

Service to the University

Active service on department-wide, college-wide, and University-wide committees, task forces, and other organized groups to further the institutional agenda is expected, especially when the service activity aligns with the scholar's area(s) of expertise. Examples of service will be evaluated based on type and extent of contributions to institutional committees and initiatives. Particular value is given to institutional service that is integral to one's area of scholarly inquiry.

Service to the Profession

Active contribution to advancing the work through discipline-based and other academic and professional associations is expected. Examples of service will be evaluated based on multiple types of contributions to institutions, agencies, associations or professional practices at local, state, national, and international levels. Particular value is given to service that is integral to one's area of scholarly inquiry.

Service to the Community

Faculty members in OLPD are expected to demonstrate contributions to the betterment of society through direct service and/or direct application of their scholarly work. Examples of service will be evaluated based on multiple types of contributions to societies and communities at the local, state, national, and international levels.

NOTE: If community-based and other publicly-engaged scholarly work is integrated with research and or teaching activities (i.e., courses), and is advancing a faculty member's research and teaching agendas, then that work should also be included and described in the research and/or teaching section of the scholar's portfolio.

The Department's assessment of a faculty member's service will be based on evidence of quantity, quality and impact.

Quality. Qualitative assessments of service will be obtained from peers and from relevant organizations, as well as other sources. Judgments by users of expertise-related service are appropriate. Evidence might include letters of affirmation, repeated requests for expertise-related service within and outside the University, notation that the faculty member was invited or sought after for consultation, materials developed through service activities, and the extent to which the services provided were delivered as expected. Evidence should address the extent of knowledge, thoroughness, follow-through, duration of involvement, and initiative, as appropriate.

Quantity. Quantitative indicators of service will be derived from records of participation in professional, scholarly and field-based organizations, leadership as a member or officer in such associations, awards received, and work as a consultant in appropriate areas. A list of services provided should be listed. Description should include recipient of service, its duration, and a description of responsibilities. Leadership responsibilities should be described for service to professional organizations.

Impact. Judgments should consider the extent of influence of the service provided. The faculty member's relationship to the discipline, professional organization, Department, College, and University mission should be described. In describing the impact of the service, the development of working relationships with persons, agencies, institutions, and organizations important to the individual's field should be presented. A description of how expertise-related service has improved effectiveness in other University activities, improved one's community or profession, added to the prestige of the University, and/or impacted external agencies, organizations or communities should be included.

5.2 Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

In addition to sustained progress of the criteria used for Associate Professor appointments, promotion to professor in Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development requires attention to the Criteria for Promotion to Professor as defined in [*Section 9.2 of the Board of Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*](#), and includes evidence demonstrating:

- a. achievement of a national or international reputation, as shown, for instance, by invitations

to national or international symposia, election to prestigious scholarly or professional organizations, and holding of offices and leadership roles in national or international societies;

- b. the scholar's standing in the field, based on letters from authorities in the scholar's field that assess the faculty member's scholarly and professional contributions, particularly in regard to whether the scholar is among the leaders in his/her field;
- c. continuing excellence in teaching and advising;
- d. continuing excellence through service to the University, profession, and the community;
- e. continuing commitment to broader impacts of research and the advancement of the public good through the linking of research and teaching with relevant community and societal issues; and
- f. continuing excellence through commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts

While the entirety of a scholar's body of work should be considered, a faculty member should demonstrate substantial scholarly progress and notable scholarly achievements (as defined in Section 4.3) since their appointment as Associate Professor in OLPD.

APPENDIX A

Extension of Maximum Probationary Period for New Parent or Caregiver, or for Personal Medical Reasons. (From Section 5.5 of the University Faculty Tenure Policy.)

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 senior vice president for academic affairs 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 senior vice president for academic affairs and provost determines that the circumstances have had or are likely to have a substantial negative impact on the faculty member's ability to work over an extended period of time;
- (c) If the faculty member has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition, and the senior vice president for academic affairs 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 senior vice president for academic affairs and provost. A claim that a request for an extension under provision (b) or (c) was improperly denied may be considered in any subsequent review by the Senate Judicial Committee of a termination under subsection 7.7.

APPENDIX B

Section 7.11 of the Regents Policy on Faculty 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 [FN 2]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [FN 3]. The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision [FN 4]. Demonstrated scholarly or other creative achievement and teaching effectiveness must be given primary emphasis; service alone cannot qualify the candidate for tenure. Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, attention to questions of diversity, technology transfer, and other special kinds of professional activity by the candidate should be considered when applicable. The awarding of indefinite tenure presupposes that the candidate's record shows strong promise of his or her achieving promotion to professor."

[FN 2] "Academic achievement' includes teaching as well as scholarly research and other creative work. The definition and relative weight of the factors may vary with the mission of the individual campus."

[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."

Section 9.2 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure: Criteria for Promotion to Professor

"The basis for promotion to the rank of professor is the determination that each candidate has (1) demonstrated the intellectual distinction and academic integrity expected of all faculty members, (2) added substantially to an already distinguished record of academic achievement, and (3) established the national or international reputation (or both) ordinarily resulting from such distinction and achievement [FN 7]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [FN 8]. The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision. Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, attention to questions of diversity, technology transfer, and other special kinds of professional activity by the candidate should be considered when applicable. But the primary emphasis must be on demonstrated scholarly or other creative achievement and on teaching effectiveness, and service alone cannot qualify the candidate for promotion."

[FN 7] "'Academic achievement' includes teaching as well as scholarly research and other creative work. The definition and relative weight of the factors may vary with the mission of the individual campus. Not being promoted to the rank of professor will not in itself result in special post-tenure review of a tenured associate professor."

[FN 8] "The persons responsible for this determination are the full professors in the unit who are eligible to vote. The outcome of the vote is either promotion to the rank of professor or continuation in rank as an associate professor. The procedures for voting are identical to those outlined in Section 7.4 for the granting of indefinite tenure, the nondisclosure of grounds for the decision (Section 7.5), and the review of recommendations (Section 7.6). In addition, a petition to the Judicial Committee for review of a recommendation of continuation in rank as an associate professor follows the procedures specified in Section 7.7 for decisions about promotion to associate professor and conferral of indefinite tenure."

APPENDIX C
Types of Faculty Performance Reviews

Who	Purpose	Expectations, Standards, & Criteria	Lead Review Body	Timeframe for Submission of Review Materials	Timeframe for Completion of Review	Forms or Items to be Submitted, Completed, or Filed
Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors	Required annual review of faculty performance for consideration of merit and salary	See Section 3.1.1	3-member Faculty Performance Committee elected by the faculty	Annually, Spring Semester (January/February)	Annually, Spring Semester (March/April)	WORKS annual summary report, Curriculum Vitae, Other materials as requested Performance Report from Department Chair
Probationary Assistant Professors	Required annual appraisal of probationary faculty to determine continuation of appointment	See Section 3.1.2	3-person Probationary Faculty Review Committee (PFRC); appointed by Dept. Chair	Early Spring Semester	End of Spring Semester	Curriculum Vitae, Samples of work, as requested Review report from PFRC; Faculty Vote Form 12 (Faculty Annual Probationary Appraisal)
Probationary Assistant Professors in Decision Year for Promotion	Consideration of probationary faculty for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor	See Sections 3.2 and 5.1	3-person Dossier Review Committee (DRC), composed of tenured faculty; appointed by Dept. Chair	Spring Semester	Fall Semester (OLPD & CEHD) Following Spring Semester (Central)	Promotion and Tenure Dossier Review report from DRC; Vote of Tenured Faculty Department Chair Review Letter

Associate Professors with Tenure	Performance review to assess progress toward promotion to Full Professor; conducted at least every four years from time of tenure.	See Section 3.1.3	3-member Full Professor Promotion Committee (FPPC); composed of Full Professors; appointed by Dept. Chair	Spring Semester	Spring Semester	FPPC Report and recommendation to Department Chair _____ <i>Form 13</i>
Associate or Full Professors with Tenure whose performance is determined to be substantially below expectations	Post-Tenure Review to establish a performance improvement plan	See Section 3.1.4	3-member Faculty Performance Committee elected by the faculty	Determined by each individual case	Based on performance improvement period; improvement period must be one year or more.	Joint letter from Dept. Chair and Faculty Performance Committee stating areas for improvement and performance improvement time frame.
Associate Professors	Consideration of Promotion from Associate Professors to Full Professor	See Sections 3.2 and 5.2	3-member Dossier Review Committee (DRC), composed of Full Professors; appointed by Dept. Chair	Spring Semester	Fall Semester (OLPD & CEHD) and following Spring Semester (Central)	Promotion and Tenure Dossier _____ Review report from DRC; Vote of Tenured Faculty _____ Department Chair Review Letter

APPENDIX D
SAMPLE LETTER FOR EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL REVIEWERS

[Letterhead]

Dear X:

Thank you for agreeing to provide an [external/internal] assessment of the scholarly work of [NAME OF FACULTY MEMBER] as part of their review for consideration for [tenure and] promotion to the rank of [Associate Professor/Professor] in the Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy and Development in the College of Education and Human Development at the University of Minnesota.

Attached are the following documents to facilitate your review:

1. The Promotion and Tenure Guidelines that will govern [NAME OF FACULTY MEMBER's] review. These guidelines present the standards and criteria for scholarship expectations regarding promotion to associate professor with tenure in [NAME OF FACULTY MEMBER's] department and college.
2. Curriculum Vitae
3. Personal statements, in which [NAME OF FACULTY MEMBER] has highlighted their research, teaching and service activities.....

If promotion is to Associate Professor:

since arriving at the University of Minnesota in [SEMESTER OF ARRIVAL].

If promotion is to Professor:

since promotion to Associate Professor.

4. Five representative publications

Letters from [external/internal] reviewers are extremely important for faculty personnel cases, as they are used to help establish the quality and impact of the candidate's scholarly contributions and the extent to which the candidate holds promise for further advancement.

In writing your review, we ask you to consider the following questions:

1. How might you describe the *rigor, significance, originality, and impact* of [NAME OF FACULTY MEMBER's] work? Please provide examples of scholarly and professional contributions that the [NAME OF FACULTY MEMBER] has made to their field of inquiry?
2. In considering the scholar's record of research, teaching, advising, and service, to what extent has the quality and quantity of their work to date met the department's expectations for the level of [associate professor with tenure/full professor]? [See Section 4 of Department

Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure]

3. How might you characterize [NAME OF FACULTY MEMBER's] national and international reputation within their field(s) of inquiry and scholarship.
4. What is the nature of your association with [NAME OF FACULTY MEMBER]?

We also ask that you please include a copy of your curriculum vitae with your review.

Please note that your review and accompanying correspondence will be placed in a file that is accessible to voting faculty and administrators who are involved in the promotion and tenure decisions. Under the provision of the Government Data Practices Act of the State of Minnesota, candidates are permitted to access the file, although the norms of our department encourage them to wait until the department review process and our committee report are complete.

To ensure we meet the established department timeline for [NAME OF FACULTY MEMBER's] review, we would greatly appreciate receiving your report by **[DATE DUE]**.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to email me at [EMAIL ADDRESS] or call me at [PHONE NUMBER].

We realize that serving as an [external/internal] reviewer is a substantial responsibility. Your time and contributions to this process are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

[NAME]

[TITLE]

Promotion Committee Chair

For additional information regarding external letters, refer to pp. 14-15 of CEHD's [*Promotion & Tenure Review Guidelines*](#).

APPENDIX E

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Candidate

A faculty member under consideration for promotion and/or tenure

CEHD

College of Education and Human Development

Decision year

Refers to the final year of probationary service of an assistant professor. Usually, the 6th year of service.

Department Chair

The individual faculty member who is the chief administrative officer for OLPD

Dossier

The full suite of materials that a faculty candidate submits to the department, college, and/or external reviewers during the annual review, promotion review, and/or tenure review process

Dossier Review Committee (DRC)

Three-person committee assigned by Department Chair to oversee dossier preparation of a faculty scholar preparing for promotion review

Faculty Member(s)

Tenure track or tenured faculty member(s) (*See also "Tenure-line faculty"*)

Faculty Performance Review Committee

Three- or four-member advisory committee of faculty members elected by and from among the eligible OLPD faculty each year to review/rate the productivity of the entire pool of regular faculty in OLPD and present its recommendations of individual faculty member's merit to the Department Chair.

Form 12 (Faculty Annual Probationary Appraisal Record)

Form that is completed annually for each probationary faculty and contains the recommendation of the faculty, Department Chair, and CEHD Dean regarding the continuation of the faculty scholar's position and/or the promotion to a higher rank

Form 13

Form that is completed and submitted to CEHD Dean following an assessment of an associate professor's progress to full professor (conducted no less than every four years)

Full Professor Promotion Committee

Three-person committee of full professors who provide feedback to scholars at the associate professor rank regarding readiness for promotion to full professor, based on scholars' achievement of criteria for promotion. Committee's assessment is documented on Form 13

Post-Tenure Review

Invoked at the discretion of the Department Chair, this review gives tenured faculty members, typically

those at the rank of the associate professor, an opportunity for review in order to maintain and improve their performance in teaching, research, and service. It may also provide a means of assisting faculty members who are experiencing difficulties in achieving established expectations

Post-Tenure Review Committee

An elected departmental committee of tenured faculty members that reviews performance of any tenured faculty who has not achieved a satisfactory level of performance in the past two years, according to OLPD faculty

Probationary faculty member (or scholar)

A regular faculty member who has not yet achieved tenure (*See also "tenure track faculty member"*)

Probationary Faculty Review Committee (PFRC)

A three-person committee formed to provide mentorship to the probationary faculty scholar regarding the scholar's productivity and progress toward promotion and/or tenure

Program coordinator

Faculty member appointed by Department Chair to manage an academic program area within OLPD.

Regular faculty member

A faculty member who holds a tenure track or tenured appointment

Special Peer Review

Occurs in cases of alleged substandard performance by tenured faculty and is governed by subsection 7a.3 of *Faculty Tenure*.

Tenure track faculty member

A regular faculty member who has not yet achieved tenure (*Also see "probationary faculty member"*)

Tenure-line faculty

Tenure track or tenured faculty member (*See also "Faculty scholar"*)

WORKS system

University-wide electronic system into which faculty enter their annual achievements and scholarly productivity in research, teaching, and service