

Hubert H. Humphrey School of Public Affairs

Standards for Promotion and Tenure Required by Section 7.12, Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*

*Revisions approved by HHH School Faculty on March 22, 2024; Expiration date, May 20, 2030
Approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost, March 29, 2024.*

Table of Contents

I.	Introductory Statement	3
II.	School Mission Statement and Values.....	3
III.	Statement on Societally-Impactful and Publicly Engaged Scholarship.....	4
IV.	Professional Ethics and Respectful Culture.....	4
V.	University Standard – General Criteria for Tenure	5
A.	Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure, Section 7.11, General Criteria	5
B.	Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure, Footnotes to Section 7.11.....	5
VI.	Humphrey School Criteria for Tenure	6
A.	Distinction in Research	6
B.	Effectiveness in Teaching	7
C.	Significant Achievement in Service.....	8
VII.	University Standard – Criteria for Promotion to Professor.....	9
A.	Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure, Section 9.2, Criteria for Promotion to Professor	9
B.	Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure, Footnotes to Section 9.2.....	9
VIII.	Humphrey School Criteria for Promotion to Professor	10
A.	Distinction in Research	10
B.	Effectiveness in Teaching	10
C.	Significant Achievement in Service.....	11
IX.	Joint Appointments.....	11
X.	Goals and Expectations for Faculty Members, Post-Tenure Review.....	11
A.	Research	11
B.	Teaching	11
C.	Service	12
XI.	Processes for Review of Faculty.....	12
A.	Probationary Faculty	12
B.	Procedures for Tenure Review and Promotion to Associate Professor	18
C.	Procedure for Fourth Year Mentoring Discussion for Associate Professors.....	21
D.	Promotion to Full Professor.....	22
E.	Appointment of New Faculty Members with Tenure	23
F.	Post-tenure Review	25
APPENDIX		27
Annual Merit Review Process for All Faculty		27

I. Introductory Statement

This document describes the processes and standards to be used by the Humphrey School of Public Affairs to determine whether candidates meet the University of Minnesota's general criteria for indefinite tenure set out in Section 7.11 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, as well as the processes and standards for promotion to the rank of professor as they are set out in Section 9.2 of the same Regents policy. For a complete perspective, the reader is advised to review Sections 7 and 9 in their entirety as well as the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*.

This document contains processes and standards for the following personnel evaluations:

- Recommendation for awarding indefinite tenure;
- Recommendation for promotion;
- Goals and expectations for faculty, post tenure;
- Processes for review of faculty, including post-tenure review.

II. School Mission Statement and Values

(adopted by the Humphrey School in 2022)

Our Mission: The Humphrey School of Public Affairs educates, engages, and equips leaders and communities to discover solutions that advance the common good in our diverse world.

Our Vision: Building on the legacy of its namesake, the Humphrey School community aspires to co-create innovative solutions to the world's most complex problems through leadership, service, and inclusive engagement locally and globally.

Our Values: These values will guide us in our interactions, practices, and decisions. They set the course for how we deliver on our mission and pursue our vision. They are the parameters that will shape our organizational culture and our engagement with partners.

- **We value student success:** The hands-on experiences learners have while they are engaged with the Humphrey School and their impact in the world.
- **We value inclusion and dialogue across differences:** Nurturing a culture and environment where everyone feels welcome and heard.
- **We value local and global interconnectedness:** Making a positive impact in communities immediately around us and in those well beyond the School's geographic location.
- **We value the sustainability of our diverse world:** Preservation and restoration of our environment, our resources, and all living things.
- **We value communities as partners in our collective work:** Through the mutually beneficial pursuit of innovative solutions.

- **We value equity, access, and social justice:** Where all people have equal opportunities to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.
- **We value evidence-based, research-driven knowledge:** Rigorous and vigorous innovation, built on the foundations of robust scholarship.

III. Statement on Societally-Impactful and Publicly Engaged Scholarship

The Humphrey School values scholarship that produces or has the potential to produce societal impacts that align with the values and mission of the School. Societally-impactful scholarship advances knowledge with a priority on addressing policy or practice questions and can take a variety of forms, including research that crosses and extends beyond traditional disciplinary boundaries and that results in academic and public-facing knowledge products. Societally-impactful scholarship occurs across the research, teaching, and service missions of the School and offers unique opportunities to produce dynamic interplay between these missions.

The Humphrey School also values faculty investments in research, teaching, and service that align with the University's commitments to public engagement. The University of Minnesota defines public engagement as “the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.” The Humphrey School acknowledges that respectful and reciprocal partnerships require time, commitment, and consistency. Investments by faculty and the School in building these relationships adds significant value to the broader School community and enhances the reputation and impact of our institution.

IV. Professional Ethics and Respectful Culture

At the Humphrey School, faculty are required to observe research integrity, professional ethics, and to contribute to a respectful department, college, and university culture. Faculty are asked to refer to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) statement on professional ethics (<https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-professional-ethics>) and the University's Code of Conduct (https://regents.umn.edu/sites/regents.umn.edu/files/2020-01/policy_code_of_conduct.pdf). In addition, all faculty are expected to engage actively in School meetings and other important business of the School and University.

If a candidate has been subject to disciplinary action in this University, the facts and circumstances that led to the disciplinary action will be shared with the tenured faculty of the unit (for probationary faculty), or with the full professors of the department (for associate and full professors), at the time of the action. These facts and circumstances will be considered to the extent to which the facts and circumstances leading to the disciplinary action may adversely affect the faculty member's potential for excellence in teaching, research, and service.

V. University Standard – General Criteria for Tenure

A. Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, Section 7.11, General Criteria

What the University of Minnesota seeks above all in its faculty members is intellectual distinction and academic integrity. The basis for awarding indefinite tenure to the candidates possessing these qualities is the determination that each has established and is likely to continue to develop a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national or international reputation or both [FN2]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [FN3].

The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision [FN4]. Demonstrated scholarly or other creative achievement and teaching effectiveness must be given primary emphasis; service alone cannot qualify the candidate for tenure.

Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, attention to 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.

B. Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, Footnotes to Section 7.11

[FN2] "Academic achievement" includes teaching as well as scholarly research and other creative work. The definition and relative weight of the factors may vary with the mission of the individual campus.

[FN3] The persons responsible and the process for making this determination are described in subsections 7.3 through 7.6.

"Scholarly research" must include significant publications and, as appropriate, the development and dissemination by other means of new knowledge, technology, or scientific procedures resulting in innovative products, practices, and ideas of significance and value to society.

"Other creative work" refers to all forms of creative production across a wide range of disciplines, including, but not limited to, visual and performing arts, design, architecture of structures and environments, writing, media, and other modes of expression.

"Teaching" is not limited to classroom instruction. It includes extension and outreach education, and other forms of communicating knowledge to both registered University students and persons in the extended community, as well as supervising, mentoring, and advising students.

"Service" may be professional or institutional. Professional service, based on one's academic expertise, is that provided to the profession, to the University, or to the local,

state, national, or international community. Institutional service may be administrative, committee, and related contributions to one's department or college, or the University. All faculty members are expected to engage in service activities, but only modest institutional service should be expected of probationary faculty.

[FN3] 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.

VI. Humphrey School Criteria for Tenure

The faculty of the School are committed to educate, engage, and equip leaders and communities to discover solutions that advance the common good in our diverse world through research, teaching, and service. While evaluation for tenure is divided among these three categories, and according to university policy research and teaching are valued above service, it is recognized that there may be overlap and linkages across these categories.

A. Distinction in Research

For the granting of tenure, a candidate is required to attain distinction in research, demonstrated through significant published peer-reviewed research of a disciplinary or interdisciplinary nature, and evidence of promise for future publication. Societally-impactful and publicly-engaged research that appears in non-peer-reviewed venues will be considered as additional evidence of research distinction. Non-peer-reviewed outputs alone are not enough for the granting of tenure.

No explicit quantity of publication is specified; the emphasis is on the balance between quantity and quality of the work, including the scholarly and societal impact of the work accomplished. A candidate's research must be judged as high quality both internally, by Humphrey faculty, and by external evaluators.

Criteria used in evaluating a candidate's research record:

- Research that advances knowledge into a disciplinary, interdisciplinary, theoretical, policy, professional, or societal problem;
- Visibility of the candidate's research within the discipline and/or within an academic field;
- Promise of future scholarly accomplishment in public affairs;
- Research that is societally-impactful, meaning research that has resulted in outcomes such as changes in policy, professional practice, or work done by engaged members of civil society. This may or may not be peer-reviewed.

Evidence considered to assess distinction in research can take a number of forms, including, but not limited to:

- Articles in well-regarded refereed journals, refereed books or book chapters with respected presses;
- Success in attracting competitive external and internal research grants and fellowships;
- Non-peer reviewed, societally-impactful scholarship (e.g. research reports, policy briefs, reports to governmental bodies, video, film, new products, services and technologies, etc.) that can be demonstrated to have resulted in policy change, the adoption of innovations or changes in professional practice, or other demonstrable societal impacts;
- Edited collections, published lectures, peer-reviewed technical reports produced for public agencies;
- Translations, reprints, citations, journal or press reputation, media coverage, reviews of a candidate's work, awards, inclusion in course syllabi at other institutions, conference presentations, invited seminars, that establish the visibility and influence of the candidate;
- Research in progress, working papers, and manuscripts under review that establish the promise of future scholarly accomplishment of the candidate;
- Documentation of community-engaged research relationships or significant investments in data collection; producing public goods in the form of new or substantially transformed data that is or will be publicly retrievable; repatriating research to the communities that facilitated or provided data; and other forms of investment in societally-impactful research.

A book or a book chapter is considered published when it is accepted and in production. A journal article is considered published when it is finally accepted by the journal.

B. Effectiveness in Teaching

For the granting of tenure, candidates are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching. Teaching includes School and other University courses, advising graduate students at either the Master's or Ph.D. level, and Extension teaching in case of Extension appointments. 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 consistent with the value placed on investments in societal impact and public engagement.

Criteria used in evaluating a candidate's teaching and advising record:

- Teaching and advising that encourages students' personal and professional growth;
- Integration of best practices in instructional content, design, delivery, engagement, and assessment;
- Advising or supervision of students individually or in groups and the provision of feedback and guidance on professional papers, theses or dissertations, and through professional mentorship.

Evidence considered to assess effectiveness in teaching and advising includes but is not limited to:

- Positive summative peer reviews of teaching as outlined in the annual review processes for probationary faculty and promotion;
- Positive Student Evaluations of Teaching using the qualifiers and metrics noted in the annual review process for probationary faculty (in the case of extension appointments these may include post-workshop or program surveys);
- Course materials that demonstrate best practices in course content, design, delivery, engagement, and assessment (e.g. syllabi, reading lists, student projects, course web sites, study guides, examinations, specific course innovations, textbooks, computer software);
- Substantive contributions to School curriculum such as new courses designed and taught; design of concentrations, minors or certificates; dedication to improving required courses or curriculum;
- Teaching or advising awards, grants, or fellowships;
- Scholarly student mentorship assessed by directing and supervising the work of Ph.D. students and research assistants, co-authorships, the quality or impact of student papers, theses, and dissertations produced under the candidate's guidance; placement of Ph.D. students;
- Notable investments in student advising and mentorship including time devoted to student personal and professional growth and creating opportunities for community building;
- Aiding students in finding internships and jobs, writing letters of recommendation;
- Participation in teaching training or workshops through the School, University, or external units.

C. Significant Achievement in Service

For the granting of tenure, School faculty are expected to engage in a mix of School, University, professional, and public service activities. The specific mix of service will depend on the expertise and rank of the individual. The Humphrey School recognizes that service is required of all regular faculty members, but service expectations are fewer for probationary faculty than for tenured faculty. School service, University service, professional service, and public service contributions should be documented. Service will be evaluated in terms of both effort and impact. Consistent with the mission and vision of the School, we value service that has societal impact and demonstrates investment in public engagement. The School also values and encourages the integration of service goals and activities with faculty scholars' research and/or teaching agendas.

School and University service includes membership on committees and leadership roles therein; initiatives that strengthen the School and/or University mission; and good citizenship in School affairs. University service may include university-wide committees, university-wide centers, interdisciplinary programs, faculty governance, etc. Good citizenship in School affairs may be shown by regular attendance at faculty meetings, committee service, Center and Area participation and leadership, and by engagement in activities such as student and faculty recruitment and mentoring of assistant professors.

Professional service involves leadership roles in professional associations such as service on governance boards, commissions or committees of professional associations; journal editor or editorial board roles; book series editor; service as formal reviewer of journal articles, book manuscripts, and research proposals for foundations; nominations of candidates for honorary titles (e.g. election to National Academies); review of files for promotion and tenure at other universities; and articles in professional newsletters and magazines.

Public Service includes service and outreach to public sector, non-profit, international organizations, and outreach to public audiences that may take any of the following documented forms:

- Holding public office;
- Service as an advisor or consultant – paid or pro bono – to public, non-profit and private sector organizations, including but not limited to serving on boards, advice and help in fashioning strategy, drafting of public reports, providing intellectual frameworks or bodies of evidence in support of policy initiatives (paid consulting activities should be so noted);
- Invited testimony before public bodies or commissions;
- Public speaking engagements;
- Publications in non-peer reviewed outlets such as public interest and community group reports, policy briefs, public-facing blogs, podcasts, newsletters, or similar outlets;
- Success in obtaining service-related grants or contracts;
- Media interviews;
- Opinion and editorial pieces in newspapers or magazines.

VII. University Standard – Criteria for Promotion to Professor

A. Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, Section 9.2, Criteria for Promotion to Professor

The basis for promotion to the rank of professor is the determination that each candidate has (1) demonstrated the intellectual distinction and academic integrity expected of all faculty members, (2) added substantially to an already distinguished record of academic achievement, and (3) established the national or international reputation (or both) ordinarily resulting from such distinction and achievement [FN7]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [FN8]. The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision. Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, attention to questions of diversity, technology transfer, and other special kinds of professional activity by the candidate should be considered when applicable. But the primary emphasis must be on demonstrated scholarly or other creative achievement and on teaching effectiveness, and service alone cannot qualify the candidate for promotion.

B. Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, Footnotes to Section 9.2

[FN7] "Academic achievement" includes teaching as well as scholarly research and other creative work. The definition and relative weight of the factors may vary with the mission of the individual campus. Not being promoted to the rank of professor will not in itself result in special post-tenure review of a tenured associate professor.

[FN8] The persons responsible for this determination are the full professors in the unit who are eligible to vote. The outcome of the vote is either promotion to the rank of professor or continuation in rank as an associate professor. The procedures for voting are identical to those outlined in Section 7.4 for the granting of indefinite tenure, the nondisclosure of grounds for the decision (subsection 7.5), and the review of recommendations (subsection 7.6). In addition, a petition to the Judicial Committee for review of a recommendation of continuation in rank as an associate professor follows the procedures specified in subsection 7.7 for decisions about promotion to associate professor and conferral of indefinite tenure. See the definitions of "scholarly research," "other creative work," "teaching," and "service" in footnote [3]. A greater contribution in the area of institutional service is expected of candidates for the rank of professor than was expected for the award of tenure.

VIII. Humphrey School Criteria for Promotion to Professor

For promotion to professor, in addition to criteria used for associate professor, a candidate must demonstrate the following for each category:

A. Distinction in Research

A significant body of peer-reviewed publications beyond those that supported the granting of tenure is necessary for achieving promotion to full professor. The candidate must also have attained a distinguished national or international scholarly reputation. In addition to peer-reviewed publications, research that is non-peer reviewed and societally-impactful will be considered. Evidence of research impact since tenure, related to research conducted prior to tenure, will be considered.

No explicit quantity of publication is specified; the emphasis is on the balance between quantity and quality of the work, including the scholarly and societal impact of the work accomplished. A candidate's research must be judged as high quality both internally, by Humphrey faculty, and by external evaluators.

B. Effectiveness in Teaching

Evidence of sustained teaching effectiveness as measured by the factors listed under the criteria for awarding indefinite tenure. Among materials provided in the promotion file, evidence should include at least one summative peer review of teaching (after obtaining tenure and before going up for promotion to full professor) and an updated teaching narrative.

C. Significant Achievement in Service

Evidence of continued significant achievement in two or more of the service categories required for tenure: School and University service, professional service, and public service.

IX. Joint Appointments

Joint appointments will be governed by a Memorandum of Understanding between the different parties to the joint appointment defining the tenure home of the faculty member and their allocation of effort across the entities involved in the joint appointment.

X. Goals and Expectations for Faculty Members, Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with Section 7a.1 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, the Humphrey School tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to meet the Goals and Expectations for faculty performance in research, teaching and advising, and service. The Goals and Expectations are evaluated each year through the Annual Review Process, facilitated by the Merit Review Committee, and are considered in faculty merit and salary decisions.

All tenured and tenure-track members of the Humphrey School faculty are expected to engage in research, teaching, and the service necessary for the successful functioning of the School and University, and, consistent with expectations for their academic rank and academic expertise, to engage in professional and public service and outreach. The distribution of effort among these three spheres of professional activity may vary by individual and over time in the course of a faculty member's career. Faculty members are expected to have some level of documented activity that meets minimum standards in at least two of the three categories (teaching, research, and service), each year.

All faculty with full-time appointments in the School are expected to achieve the following:

A. Research

Annually, faculty are expected to demonstrate at least one of the following: one peer-reviewed article or book chapter, multiple technical reports, substantial on-going research (which may include for example creation of new datasets, significant investments in data collection or analysis, development of engaged research partnerships, or progress on a book manuscript), grant awards, or a submission of a proposal for major funding.

B. Teaching

- Teach at least one course per academic year;
- Effectiveness in teaching as evidenced by curriculum development, students' ratings in course evaluations, peer review of teaching, written evaluations or supplemental student evaluations collected by the faculty member, teaching awards, and /or other demonstrations of effective teaching and student learning and development;
- Evidence of effective and active advising of Master's and/or doctoral students.

Appropriate reductions in course loads are made for faculty members with substantial extension appointments and those who undertake major service and/or administrative responsibilities, such as being Associate Dean, Director of Graduate Studies, and other positions. Faculty on approved leave and those using course buy-outs are exempted from teaching requirements.

C. Service

- Active participation in School or university committees consistent with expectations for the academic rank;
- Evidence of service to the profession, consistent with expectations of academic rank;
- Evidence of external contributions to groups, communities, government, or associations external to the university consistent with expectations of academic rank and academic expertise.

XI. Processes for Review of Faculty

A. Probationary Faculty

1. Beginning of Probationary Appointment

Within the first four months of the probationary appointment, the Dean or Associate Dean must review the terms of the appointment with the probationary candidate. This includes:

- a) Making certain that credit for prior service has been granted and properly recorded and clarifying the maximum length of the probationary period.
- b) Providing the candidate a copy of the Humphrey School 7.12 Tenure and Promotion Statement, which lays out the School's Goals and Expectations for Faculty.
- c) Informing the candidate about the procedures used to review teaching, research and service at the School. Review with the candidate the annual review process and the annual report on Appraisals of Probationary Faculty (President's Form 12) that is completed during the probationary phase. Candidates are also informed of their right to inspect their file and the right of access to information.
- d) Appointing and informing the candidate of the mentor(s) appointed to work with the candidate on an ongoing basis (see below). The Dean, in appointing mentors, will consult with the search committee involved in the hiring.
- e) The Dean or Associate Dean must make a written summary of the meeting, including the time and date the meeting took place. The summary is included in the candidate's personnel record.

2. Annually During the Probationary Period

The process of reviewing a candidate's progress is ongoing. The essential elements to this process include information gathering, deliberation, and consultation with the candidate. At a minimum:

- a) Beginning with the first year of the probationary period, the School has the responsibility for gathering data about the candidate's performance on all relevant criteria. The candidate's annual merit review file is used for this purpose.
- b) The Humphrey School's Promotion and Tenure Committee will review the candidate's C.V. and merit file, read the candidate's written work, review the candidate's cumulative record, and prepare a statement reflecting their assessment towards tenure based on the criteria outlined in the 7.12 statement. The P&T Committee will draw up a substantive statement of evaluation and feedback to the candidate. Before bringing the assessment to the tenured faculty for discussion and forwarding to the Dean, the P&T Committee members will meet with the candidate, relay the strengths and weaknesses as articulated in the assessment, and ask the candidate for their views and any additional information. Candidates may draft a response to the assessment or offer corrections or modifications for consideration by the P&T committee. Following the meeting with the candidate, the P&T Committee will present its written assessment to the tenured faculty. Amendments may be suggested by faculty members. The assessment will be voted on for approval and will be forwarded to the Dean and candidate.
- c) Candidates are entitled to three mentors. In addition to the mentor appointed by the Dean in the candidate's first term, the candidate will work with Promotion and Tenure Committee members to identify two additional mentors by the beginning of the second semester of service. The Dean will then request the identified mentors to serve. Ordinarily, the mentors will include at least one School faculty member from a degree program that is not the candidate's main teaching domain. It is also possible to ask for a mentor in another college at the University. Tenured faculty members appointed to serve as the candidate's mentors will help the candidate develop a strategy for achieving superior annual merit reviews and promotion to tenure. The candidate may request one mentor to accompany him/her to meetings with the P&T Committee and the Dean/Associate Dean to ensure that the candidate's rights and best interests are respected in the process and to help the candidate interpret the feedback clearly. At the initiative of either the candidate or the tenured faculty members involved, a mentor may be changed at any time, and new faculty members appointed in her/his place.
- d) Evaluation of teaching during the probationary period includes three key components: student teaching satisfaction scores (STSSs); peer review; and a teaching narrative. In addition, the candidate may orally share details on their teaching at their annual meeting with the P&T committee. Faculty having Extension appointments may include audience evaluations using a standardized evaluation form.

- i. Student Teaching Satisfaction Scores. STSSs provide an important student voice in the teaching evaluation process. However, STSSs contain social biases that research has shown negatively impact for example women faculty, faculty of color, faculty with accents, gay/lesbian faculty and likely have negative impacts on non-binary instructors. STSSs measure student satisfaction with a course, not student learning or teaching effectiveness. In turn, satisfaction is often contextually driven. Some students, for example, may never be satisfied with a course outside their comfort zone. In addition, judgments of satisfaction tend to be made relative to expectations, which can reflect factors such as students' social positioning or the pre-existing reputation of a course. Moreover, issues of low response rates, and the fact that outliers can greatly impact mean scores, suggest that special care must be taken with these quantitative indicators. Given these concerns:
- The P&T Committee will contextualize the use of STSSs, acknowledging issues of bias and the ambiguity of satisfaction measures in its reviews of teaching.
 - The P&T Committee will identify any courses where student response rates fall below 70 percent. STSSs based on response rates between 50 and 69 percent will be used in reviews but noted as less reliable. Results based on response rates below 50 percent will not be reported.
 - The P&T Committee asks the candidate to provide, and will in turn report the median scores, mean, and standard deviation.
 - A staff member will periodically be charged with comparing average STSS scores across the faculty to determine if there are significant gender or racial/ethnic gaps in Humphrey teaching evaluations that the P&T Committee should take into account.
- ii. Peer Review of Teaching. Peer review of instruction is a systematic process of examining and evaluating colleagues' teaching for purposes including professional development, performance appraisal, and/or promotion and tenure. Peer review of teaching is required by the administrative policy - Evaluation of Teaching. Humphrey School peer review of teaching includes both formative and summative reviews. Formative peer review is intended for improvement of the person being reviewed, and the emphasis is on constructive feedback. Summative peer review is intended to be the basis for a personnel decision, such as promotion, tenure, or merit pay, and the emphasis is on making fair judgments. The progression for peer review for probationary faculty is as follows:

Formative Review: Years One, Two, Four

- Review of at least one syllabus and course materials by one or two mentors using the formative rubric.
- Classroom observation, using formative course review rubric. At least one visit over the course of one semester, by one or two mentors.
- Feedback and discussion of the visit and course materials with the candidate. No report for the tenure file at this time. Mentors to report summary of conversation to chair of P&T committee when discussion is complete.
- The candidate is encouraged to request Student Feedback through Consensus from CEI as well: <https://cei.umn.edu/support-services/consultations>.

Summative Review: Years Three and Five

- Classroom observation, using summative review rubric. Two visits arranged by the P&T Committee. Rubrics to be included in the tenure file. Review will also include review of syllabi and course materials (e.g., assignments, assessments) for courses taught for which the candidate has primary continuing responsibility. Review to be included in the tenure file.
- The P&T Committee shall include the results of the summative reviews in its report.

iii. Teaching Narrative in the Third Year, and Tenure A teaching narrative allows for a more holistic assessment of teaching. A teaching narrative is required for the third-year review and in the tenure dossier. The third-year narrative gives the faculty member an opportunity for feedback on their teaching, pedagogical development, and mentoring at an earlier stage in the tenure review process. Teaching narratives should contain a statement of teaching philosophy and can be an opportunity for the faculty member to outline teaching innovations, additional pedagogical training, mentoring, unsolicited letters or comments that students provided to them in the course of their teaching, and/or other details that the faculty wishes to share in order to provide a fuller picture of their teaching. Faculty with Extension appointments should furnish a summary of program activities including titles of presentations and publications, along with a sample or description of materials developed for specific clientele.

e) During the candidate's third year, the Dean/Associate Dean will assign three tenured faculty, including one University faculty member from outside the School, to a Reading Committee covering the cumulative work of the candidate. The members of the Reading Committee will have, to the extent possible, substantive knowledge of the candidate's areas of interest and discipline. The Reading Committee is responsible for reviewing the candidate's publications and ongoing research and providing advice on the content and substance. The Reading Committee will be appointed by the beginning of spring semester, will convene and do their work in conjunction with the annual merit and P&T

Committee reviews, and will add their input to the annual assessment. One member of the Reading Committee will join the annual meeting between the P&T Committee and the candidate. In this year, two members of the P&T Committee will also conduct a more intensive assessment of teaching, including classroom visitation (summative peer review).

- f) The candidate's annual files will be made available to the tenured faculty of the School who must review the progress of each candidate annually as provided to them by the P&T Committee. The annual review does not require a formal ballot or recommendation of the faculty but the School may choose to take a ballot if desired.
- g) The Dean must discuss with the candidate annually his/her progress toward achieving tenure. The Dean will review both the Merit Review committee's assessment and the faculty-approved Promotion and Tenure Committee assessment. The Dean also reports the sense of the meeting of the tenured faculty, and any recommendations made by it, to the candidate. The candidate is given a copy of the annual Appraisal of Probationary Faculty (PF12) report, which parallels the major elements of the conversation, as well as a written summary of additional matters, as appropriate. The summary includes the date and time of the meeting.
- h) The candidate may write a letter responding to the assessment, and the letter would become a part of his or her file.
- i) Fully signed and completed Appraisals of Probationary Faculty (PF12s), along with the probationary candidate's dossier, must be submitted to the Office of Human Resources and the Office of Vice President and Executive Vice Provost, by date set Centrally each year.

3. Formal Consideration for Tenure or Termination of Appointment

A tenure decision may be made in any year of the probationary period. A candidate must be considered in a formal tenure review in the last year of the probationary period; i.e., the sixth year of an ordinary probationary period or a designated time in a shorter probationary period. A formal review must also take place at the times required by a special contract. The candidate may also request an early tenure review, but the School has the authority to decide whether to conduct it.

4. Extension of Maximum Probationary Period for New Parent or Caregiver, or for Personal Medical Reasons.

In accordance with Section 5.5 of the Board of Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure, and upon the written request of a probationary faculty member, the maximum period of that faculty member's probationary service will be extended by one year at a time for each request:

- a) On the occasion of the birth of the faculty member's child or placement of an adoptive/foster child with the faculty member. Such a request for extension will be granted automatically if the faculty member notifies the unit head, dean, and executive vice president and provost in writing that the faculty member is eligible for an extension under subsection 5.5 of the Board of Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure because of the birth or adoption/foster placement; or
- b) If the faculty member is a major caregiver for a family member with an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition and the executive vice president and provost determines that the circumstances have had or are likely to have a substantial negative impact on the faculty member's ability to work over an extended period of time;
- c) If the faculty member has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition, and the executive vice president and provost determines that the circumstances have had or are likely to have a substantial negative impact on the faculty member's ability to work over an extended period of time. If the faculty member's illness, injury, or debilitating condition reduces the faculty member's ability to work to less than two-thirds time during the faculty member's contract year [i.e., the academic year or twelve months], the probationary period is automatically extended by one year in accordance with subsection 5.3 of the Board of Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure.

“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 of the Board of Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure.

The notification of birth or adoption/foster placement for provision (a) and the request for extension for provisions (b) and (c) in this subsection must be made in writing within one year of the events giving rise to the claim and no later than June 30 preceding the year a final decision would otherwise be made on an appointment with indefinite tenure for that faculty member.

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

B. Procedures for Tenure Review and Promotion to Associate Professor

The university-level procedures for reviewing tenure-track and tenured candidates for tenure and/or promotion are detailed in <https://policy.umn.edu/hr/tenure-proc01>

In addition to complying with university wide procedures, The Humphrey School's procedures are the following:

1. Contents of the file:

The file for granting of tenure should encompass the entire probationary period and a candidate for indefinite tenure must show evidence of excellence in all three areas of research, teaching, and service as specified in Section VII of this document. The file should consist of four sections: introduction, research, teaching, and service.

Section 1: Introduction

The introductory section should contain sections prepared by the Dean's Office:

- Humphrey School Tenure Statement (7.12);
- Copies of all the probationary period reviews (Form 12);
- P&T Committee, Faculty, and Dean's Report;
- External reviewers' letters.

and sections prepared by the candidate:

- A description of the candidate's appointment (date hired, any leaves, etc.);
- The candidate's up-to-date C.V.

Section 2: Research

The research section should include the following information:

- A statement on the candidate's research record and intellectual agenda, generally three to twelve pages. This statement is a narrative summary of research and scholarly activity and accomplishments. It should describe the evolution and development of the candidate's research agenda over time. It should also include current projects and plans for the next three to five years. It may include details on the research process, such as investment into relationship-building for engaged research, investments in developing new forms of public data, additional training that was required, etc.;
- A detailed list of research outputs – categories could include, for example:
 - books;
 - refereed journal articles;
 - other articles, book chapters;
 - policy briefs, reports to governments or non-profits;

- video, film, new products, services and technologies, other creative media;
- documentation of community engaged research relationships;
- novel or substantially transformed data;
- evidence of repatriation of research;
- manuscripts under review;
- research in progress.

For all multi-authored or collaborative works, the file must specifically describe the candidate's contribution.

- A list of grants obtained (with a brief description of grant amount/source and the candidate's role);
- Copies of all publications since the granting of the candidate's Ph.D., papers and manuscripts under review, professional reports, etc.;
- Letters from co-authors, explaining the candidate's role in producing jointly authored research outputs (optional).

Section 3: Teaching

The teaching section should include the following information:

- A narrative summary of teaching activity and teaching philosophy (typically two to four pages). The summary should describe the candidate's philosophy, approach to teaching and advising (such as a description of course design and the kinds of materials employed), and achievements relative to teaching and advising during the probationary period;
- A detailed list of teaching activities and accomplishments that includes:
 - courses taught;
 - new courses developed;
 - teaching awards/honors received;
 - student advising responsibilities (to include academic advising, paper advising, membership on committees, etc. For undergrad advising, list departments students are in);
 - a list of persons trained/mentored/advised in research activities (e.g., Ph.D. students, research assistants, post-doctoral fellows);
 - a list of other instructional activity including continuing education, professional development instruction, technical trainings conducted;
 - a summary of formal teaching evaluations over time. This should include, the course number, the term taught, enrollment, and STSS scores. STSS reporting should include response rates for the course section and the mean, median, and standard deviation of scores for the following metrics: "instructor's overall teaching ability," "instructor's knowledge of subject matter," "instructor's respect/concern for students," and "amount learned in this course";
 - In the case of extension teaching, post workshop evaluations or other metrics of satisfaction are encouraged;

- Copies of University and Humphrey School course evaluation qualitative comments from students, for each course taught;
- Summative peer reviews of teaching;
- Examples of teaching materials used in courses (optional).

Section 4: Service

The service section should include the following information:

- A narrative statement of discipline-related professional service during the probationary period (typically one to three pages);
- A detailed list of service-related activities, including sections such as:
 - service to the School;
 - service to the University;
 - service to the profession;
 - service to the public;
 - consulting;
 - supporting documents as appropriate.

2. External Reviewers

The candidate will be asked to provide the names, contact information, and a brief biography for eight potential outside reviewers.

Seven outside reviewers will be chosen and confirmed by the Dean. The list of outside reviewers should contain at least two names from the list provided by the candidate, and at least two names not taken from the candidate's list. The candidate will have an opportunity to indicate if any conflicts exist with the proposed reviewers which might preclude a fair evaluation. The Dean has the final authority on the composition of the list. In some circumstances and consistent with university policy, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, with the concurrence of the Dean, may choose to accept fewer than seven external reviews.

Reviewers typically represent senior scholars (associate or full professors) or equivalent rank in non-academic institutions. Reviewers are selected based on their reputation as leading scholars in their respective fields who can speak to the broader academic and societal impact of the candidate's research. For candidates with a tenure case built largely or in-part on societal impact, one or more reviewers may be selected based on their ability to comment on the societal impact of the candidate's scholarship. All reviewers must be "arms length", meaning not close friends, past graduate school colleagues, past university colleagues, co-authors, co-PIs, former advisors or supervisors, or otherwise unable to provide an impartial review. It is acceptable to ask someone to evaluate a file if the person is the editor or serves on the editorial board of a journal in which the candidates published, has sat on the same conference panel, has served on professional committees or review committees together, or has met the candidate at conferences or under similar circumstances.

Optionally, the University provides a review process for engaged scholars through the Review Committee on Community Engaged Scholarship that candidates may utilize. Candidate files will receive rigorous evaluation by campus scholars with experience in community-engaged scholarship. The Committee's evaluation then becomes part of the candidate's tenure file.

The outside reviewers will be sent the following materials:

- A letter requesting the reviewer to evaluate the candidate's research record;
- The candidate's C.V.;
- The entire research section of the candidate's file, including summary statement, list of research outputs and grants received, and copies of all articles and manuscripts;
- The summary statements from the teaching section and the service section of the candidate's file. This is provided to give the reviewers a better understanding of the candidate's workload distribution, as this may have some bearing on their assessment of the quantity of research output. The reviewers will not be asked to evaluate the teaching and service record of the candidate.

The reviewers will be asked to read five articles/manuscripts chosen by the Dean/Associate Dean in consultation with the candidate. The rest of the candidate's refereed articles will be provided for the reviewers' optional perusal, to allow them to understand the breadth of the candidate's research, and to allow them access to the candidate's research that best matches their own expertise. Non-refereed articles/manuscripts for optional perusal may also be chosen by the Dean/Associate Dean in consultation with the candidate.

C. Procedure for Fourth Year Mentoring Discussion for Associate Professors

No less frequently than every four years, the tenured faculty at the rank of professor shall examine the progress toward promotion of each associate professor with tenure. This discussion will provide the associate professor with an opportunity to reflect on his or her progress towards meeting the criteria in subsection VIII of this document.

For this process, the Dean/Associate Dean, in consultation with the P&T Committee, will assign three full professors to a Mentoring and Reading Committee. The Mentoring and Reading Committee will consist of two full professors from Humphrey and one University faculty member from outside the School. The members of the Mentoring and Reading Committee will have substantive knowledge of the candidate's areas of interest and discipline.

Each member of the Mentoring and Reading Committee is responsible for writing a letter assessing the Associate Professor's curriculum vitae and three sample publications based on their scholarly and societal impact, taking into account the full period of the individual's service as Associate Professor at the Humphrey School. These letters will be delivered to the Associate Professor, with copies to the P&T committee, the other Mentoring and Reading Committee members, and the Dean's office.

Following the submission of letters, the Mentoring and Reading Committee shall meet with the Associate Professor to discuss progress toward promotion to full professor. The P&T committee will consult with members of the Mentoring and Reading Committee regarding the discussion with the Associate Professor. The Associate Professor will then meet with the P&T committee in an advisory manner regarding Mentoring and Reading Committee feedback and plans going forward. The P&T committee will then provide a written report describing these consultations to the full faculty.

D. Promotion to Full Professor

The process for promotion to full professor must parallel that for considering candidates for tenure, from the unit review through the central review. The criteria for promotion to Full Professor are laid out in Sections VII and VIII of this document.

1. Contents of the File

The candidate's dossier should encompass the entire period following the granting of tenure. The dossier for promotion to full professor has similar contents to the dossier for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. It shall include all outputs not included in the tenure dossier.

2. External Reviewers

The candidate will be asked to provide the names, contact information, and a brief biography for eight potential outside reviewers.

Seven outside reviewers will be chosen and confirmed by the Dean. The list of outside reviewers should contain at least two names from the list provided by the candidate, and at least two names not taken from the candidate's list. The candidate will have an opportunity to indicate if any conflicts exist with the proposed reviewers which might preclude a fair evaluation. The Dean has the final authority on the composition of the list. In some circumstances and consistent with university policy, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, with the concurrence of the Dean, may choose to accept fewer than seven external reviews.

Reviewers typically represent senior scholars (full professors) or equivalent rank in non-academic institutions. Reviewers are selected based on their reputation as leading scholars in their respective fields who can speak to the broader academic and societal impact of the candidate's research. For candidates with a tenure case built largely or in part on societal impact, one or more reviewers may be selected based on their ability to comment on the societal impact of the candidate's scholarship. All reviewers must be "arms length", meaning not close friends, past graduate school colleagues, past university colleagues, co-authors, co-PIs, former advisors or supervisors, or otherwise unable to provide an impartial review. It is acceptable to ask someone to evaluate a file if the person is the editor or serves on the editorial board of a journal in which the candidates published, has sat on the same conference panel, has served on professional

committees or review committees together, or has met the candidate at conferences or under similar circumstances.

The outside reviewers will be sent the following materials:

- A letter requesting the reviewer to evaluate the candidate's research record;
- The candidate's C.V.;
- The entire research section of the candidate's file, including summary statement, list of research outputs and grants received, and copies of all articles and manuscripts;
- The summary statements from the teaching section and the service section of the candidate's file. This is provided to give the reviewers a better understanding of the candidate's workload distribution, as this may have some bearing on their assessment of the quantity of research output. The reviewers will not be asked to evaluate the teaching and service record of the candidate.

The reviewers will be asked to read five articles/manuscripts chosen by the candidate. The rest of the candidate's scholarly research output since tenure will be provided for the reviewers' optional perusal, to allow them to understand the breadth of the candidate's research, and to allow them access to the candidate's research that best matches their own expertise.

E. Appointment of New Faculty Members with Tenure

Faculty hired from outside the University (external hires) may be appointed with tenure at the ranks of associate professor or professor. External hires of faculty with tenure often require that units be able to make offers quickly outside of the regular timelines for tenure and/or promotion reviews. The unit conducts the initial review of the outside hire based on a dossier that its head assembles. This dossier contains at minimum: 1) a current and complete curriculum vitae; 2) a letter or statement by the potential faculty member about research, teaching, and service; 3) copies of some or all of the scholarly or creative works of the potential faculty member; 4) a minimum of three letters from external reviewers that address the faculty member's academic credentials if the faculty member has tenure at another academic institution; a minimum of four letters from external reviewers are required if the potential faculty member has not yet received tenure at another academic institution. Teaching evaluations from another academic institution should be included if available as well as any other supporting documents. These dossiers may be abbreviated in length in comparison to the typical dossier of a faculty member who is considered for tenure and/or promotion through internal processes.

The unit takes (1) a vote to recommend tenure, in which all tenured members of the faculty are eligible to vote, and (2) a vote to recommend rank of associate professor (tenured associate professors and professors may vote) or professor (tenured professors may vote). Following the unit votes, the unit head or designated faculty member writes a report of the votes and the recommendation for tenure and rank. The unit head writes a separate recommendation.

The dossier, unit votes and report is forwarded to the dean. The dean may request an advisory review from the collegiate or campus promotion and tenure committee; this is not required because of time constraints in these hires and because this review may take place outside of the regular academic year. The dean writes a separate recommendation to the executive vice president and provost. (The external-hire dossier and unit reports from Twin Cities colleges not divided into departments do not receive a second-level review but are sent directly to the executive vice president and provost.)

The files of all external hires of faculty with tenure must be reviewed by the executive vice president and provost, who will make the final recommendation for tenure and rank to the Board of Regents. The college or campus must send at least the following information to the executive vice president and provost for consideration:

- 1) A cover letter from the dean or chancellor expressing support for the candidate;
- 2) A report from the hiring unit that details the vote of the tenured faculty for tenure consideration as well as a vote of associate professors and/or professors for the appropriate rank;
- 3) A recommendation from the unit head;
- 4) The dossier described above. It is preferable to also have records of teaching evaluations. Any other supporting documents may be included.

The college or campus writes an offer letter that specifies the rank of the position and the hiring details. The following suggested language should be used regarding tenure:

“You will have an appointment as [a(n) associate professor/professor] in the (unit). The conferral of tenure is contingent on the approval and recommendation of the executive vice president and provost and final decision by the Board of Regents.”

If a college or campus hires a faculty member who has a current academic appointment at another university or institution, whether as a tenured or untenured faculty member or in a research/administrative appointment, it is a condition of the tenured appointment at the University of Minnesota that the hiring dean or chancellor receive a copy of the candidate’s letter of resignation from that university or institution, effective prior to the effective date of the tenured appointment at the University of Minnesota. This precondition of a resignation letter must be stated in the appointment letter to the potential faculty member. The dean or chancellor must approve the appointment letter before it is finalized and effective. These conditions do not apply to junior faculty candidates who are coming to the University of Minnesota from graduate programs or postdoctoral programs at another institution.

Colleges and campuses must use the following language in their appointment letters regarding the receipt of a resignation letter from the home university or institution:

“If you hold an academic, research, or administrative position at another university or institution, your tenured appointment at the University of Minnesota is subject to receipt by the University of a copy of your resignation letter to your home institution. The effective

date of your resignation from your home university or institution must be prior to the first date of employment at the University of Minnesota. The receipt of this resignation letter is a precondition of tenured appointment at the University of Minnesota.”

In the rare instances when the faculty member being offered a position at the University of Minnesota has requested a leave of absence from the individual’s home university or institution rather than resigning, a letter must be on file that sets forth all the terms of the leave, approved by the provosts or senior administrators at both universities or institutions. The faculty member who is being hired with the expectation of tenure will be reviewed for tenure and a decision made prior to the appointment as described above, but tenure at the University of Minnesota will not be conferred until the faculty member resigns the position at the previous university or institution. While the tenured faculty member is on leave from the prior university or institution, the faculty member will have a visiting appointment at the University of Minnesota at the rank specified in the offer letter.

Pursuant to the policy Outside Consulting and Other Commitments and the Guidelines for Reviewing Outside Consulting and Commitment Requests, faculty members at the University of Minnesota may not hold two tenured positions at the same time. Consequently, before a faculty member begins a tenured position at the University of Minnesota, the faculty member must resign a tenured position held at another academic institution. Conversely, a tenured faculty member on leave from the University of Minnesota may not retain the tenured position at the University of Minnesota after accepting a tenured position at another academic institution.

F. Post-tenure Review

The Promotion and Tenure Committee serves as the Post-tenure Review Committee. If in the event the Post-tenure Review Committee is convened and it is determined that a member cannot serve because they are of a rank lower than the faculty member in review or because of a conflict of interest, the faculty shall elect a replacement to serve for this purpose.

If, in the course of the annual merit review, the Dean and the Merit Review Committee conclude that a faculty member has performed at a level that is substantially below the goals and expectations of the Humphrey School, the Dean must refer the matter to the Post-tenure Review Committee for review in accordance with the University's post-tenure review policy. The Merit Review Committee shall consider rankings of 1 on a 4-point scale (1 being the lowest ranking) for two of the three categories (teaching, research, service) to be substantially below expectations of performance and, absent an explicit finding of mitigating circumstances for the substandard performance, a trigger for recommending to the Dean a post-tenure review.

The Dean will provide the Post-tenure Review Committee with such information as may be necessary to complete the review. The Post-tenure Review Committee will conduct the review in accordance with the University's *Faculty Tenure* policy and accompanying *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Probation: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* and the Humphrey School’s 7.12 Statement. If the Dean concurs with the

committee that the faculty member has performed at a level that is substantially below the goals and expectations of the Humphrey School, the Dean will inform the faculty member by letter (signed by both the Dean and elected Post-tenure Review Committee chair), identifying 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 Dean and the Post-tenure Review Committee again find performance substantially below goals and expectations, special review will be initiated in accordance with the University's *Faculty Tenure* policy and accompanying procedures. The case is referred to the Executive Vice President and Provost (EVPP) who will undertake an initial review of the case to determine if a special peer review is warranted. This provostal review is required in the case of colleges that are single units such as the Humphrey School. If the EVPP concurs with the review of the Dean and the Post-tenure Review Committee, then the processes described below begin.

A special review panel is designated for each case separately consisting of five tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank than the individual being reviewed. They need not be members of the academic unit conducting the review. The faculty member under review may designate one member of the panel, from anywhere in the University. The remaining members are elected by secret ballot of faculty members at or above the rank of the faculty member in review.

The special review panel conducts a review of the individual faculty member. The panel collects information, including information and documentation from the faculty member and the Dean that reflects on the faculty member's performance. The panel may review the scholarly work of the faculty member, teaching evaluations, and other evidence of performance such as negotiated goals, tasks and accomplishments. The panel may also seek internal and external reviews.

The special panel may recommend a number of actions including: (1) terminate review, (2) alter allocation of effort, (3) suggest improvements, (4) continued special review, (5) salary reduction, or (5) dismissal, or a combination of these actions. The Dean need not implement all of the recommendations from the panel but may not impose additional or more severe measures without following proper procedures.

APPENDIX

TO BE REVISED BY THE MERIT REVIEW COMMITTEE IN FALL 2024 TO REFLECT THE NEW 7.12 STATEMENT

Annual Merit Review Process for All Faculty

Annual performance reviews of faculty are required by the University of Minnesota:

“Each academic unit, through its merit review process (established in accordance with the standards adopted by the senate), annually reviews with each faculty member the performance of that faculty member in light of the goals and expectations of the academic unit...” -- Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure. Version approved 3-31-16.

1. Objective

The objective of the Merit Review Committee process is – in addition to meeting the University requirement – to help identify the faculty members who truly had exceptional years and to identify those few faculty, if any, who have failed to document their contributions pursuant to University requirements, have had sub-standard performance, or warrant post-tenure review. The two purposes of the MRC’s reviews are:

- a) To be one of multiple inputs to the process used by the Dean to make decisions about annual salary adjustments.
- b) To comply with policies and inform the processes for post-tenure review. Merit review scores are not a required part of the School’s processes related to the granting of tenure or promotion through ranks. The substantive reviews that inform tenure and promotion decisions are organized and conducted by the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

2. Process

- a) No later than December of each year, the Dean or Associate Dean will notify the faculty of the timeline for completion of annual activity reporting via the Works online system and provide the Merit Review Committee with the list of faculty to be reviewed. It is not the responsibility of the Merit Review Committee to remind or encourage faculty members to complete annual activity reporting; it is each individual member’s responsibility to do so.
- b) The first step in the merit review process is for faculty members to complete annual activity reporting via the Works online system. The Works system is the means by which faculty communicate to the Merit Review Committee about the work they have done in the previous calendar year. Works allows for both quantitative and qualitative data input. The Works system auto populates some information from other UMN systems, such as information

about sponsored projects and advising. Faculty are responsible for reviewing this information to ensure that it is accurate and complete.

In addition to providing responses for relevant sections of the Works system, each faculty member should upload a current CV to the Narrative, Goals, and Supplementary Material section of the Works.

It is the responsibility of faculty members to provide specific information in the Narrative, Goals, and Supplementary Material section of the Works system about the terms of their employment that affect the level of effort devoted to teaching, research, and service (e.g., course releases, administrative appointments). This information should be provided for each semester that is being reviewed.

Examples of terms include:

- Contractual agreements that differ from standard terms of faculty appointments (e.g., fewer than 12 credits per year for a tenured faculty member);
- Sabbaticals, administrative or research leaves, family or other leaves, course releases for administrative appointments;
- Buyouts of teaching responsibilities for research or other purposes;
- Teaching in other units that may not be reflected in Works databases;
- Class cancellations due to low enrollments;
- Shifting of teaching responsibilities across semesters or calendar years that may affect annual course or credit hour totals;
- Voluntary or paid overload teaching assignments; extraordinary external factors (e.g., federal government shutdown) that affect ongoing research projects.

Faculty members may experience special or mitigating factors that affect productivity (e.g., health or family illness) for which no specific, formal accommodations have been provided. Absent formal accommodation, the Merit Review Committee will apply standard rubrics for assessment. However, faculty members may and are encouraged to report these factors to the Dean and/or Associate Dean privately for consideration in annual assessment.

Timely and thorough completion of the annual activity report prior to the deadline is essential, as the Merit Review Committee has only a few weeks to complete its review. The Committee does not ask for clarifications. Activities reported in annual activity reports should be described in language that will make them understandable to a colleague from a different discipline/area. Relevant details, such as the time frame of service activities (e.g., monthly meetings), should be provided.

- c) The Merit Review Committee conducts its review on the basis of information provided by faculty in the annual activity report in the Works system.
- d) The Merit Review Committee reviews activities in the previous calendar year only in accordance with the Humphrey School's workload policy. The Dean may additionally review three-year average teaching load when considering merit scores related to teaching. Note: Humphrey policy also requires that salary decisions reflect a rolling three-year average for research evaluations, but this, too, is done by the Dean as described in point 7 below.
- e) The Merit Review notes that faculty members who received an assessment of 1 in any area of performance may be subject to post-tenure review if the prior year assessments in the same area(s) also were 1.
- f) The committee's rankings are then transmitted to the Dean, along with a short paragraph summarizing the accomplishments and performance of each tenured and tenure-track faculty member. These comments are high level overviews and do not summarize or re-state details of the activity report.
- g) The Dean's office then transmits a summary of the rankings and individualized information to each member of the faculty.
- h) Faculty members who wish to respond to the merit review rankings may submit comments to the Dean.
- i) The Dean combines the merit review and faculty responses with historical data required by Humphrey policies, including the three-year rolling average teaching load and performance assessment for research.
- j) The Dean, after reviewing scores for the previous year and other information, examines the previous year's evaluations to determine whether the threshold for post-tenure review (scores of "1" in at least two areas – research, teaching or service – for two consecutive years) has been met for any individual faculty member.
- k) The Dean then meets with each individual faculty member to discuss performance, including the faculty member's response to and perspective on the merit review ranking.
- l) The Dean makes annual merit raise decisions after the meetings, thus incorporating information obtained in the discussion with the faculty member.

3. Performance Standards

The presumption of the Merit Review Committee is that all faculty meet or exceed the high expectations of the Humphrey School in each area of evaluation – teaching, research, and service – each year. The scoring system used, therefore, is designed to highlight exceptions to those expectations. Faculty will be scored in each area – teaching, research, and service – on a scale of 1 to 4. The top score of 4 acknowledges an exceptional year of performance, well beyond the annual expectations of the School. A score of 3 acknowledges good performance (i.e., the high expectations of the School have been met or exceeded). A score of 2 is meant to indicate that expectations of the School have not been met and that improved performance is necessary. Finally, a score of 1 indicates failure to document meaningful activity in an area of review.

To summarize:

4 = greatly exceeds expectations (an exceptional year)

3 = meets or exceeds expectations (a good year)

2 = does not meet expectations (performance can be strengthened; consult Associate Dean regarding strategies)

1 = failed to document meaningful contributions (performance is substandard; consult Associate Dean on strategies; successive substandard assessments in two areas may trigger post-tenure or other review)

4. Measures and Indicators

The Works system provides a structure for annual reporting on activities that relate to the general categories of Research, Service, and Teaching. All activities reported in Works are used to determine scores. Some activities, however, and therefore some measures, are more important than others. Thus, in the research category, for example, refereed publications are more important than non-refereed publications and therefore play a larger role in determining one's score. In some cases, indicators are numerical, as in number of publications or number of advisees, student credit hours taught, etc. Numerical standards are not strictly applicable in all cases, however, because of the incommensurate nature of many of the activities performed by faculty members in the course of their work. Faculty members are responsible for describing their activities so members of the Committee can assess them and assign credit. It is the responsibility of faculty members to complete sections of the Works system and to supplement technical information with descriptions that enable colleagues outside one's discipline to understand the significance of the activity. For grants, faculty members must provide information about the date of submission, award status, and project beginning and end dates. In space provided for elaboration of activities, faculty members also shall specify whether grants are related to research, service, or teaching.

5. Scoring Rubric

a) Research

Performance in research is primarily determined by the publication of peer-reviewed research. Publications are counted once, in the year they appear in print or online. Other aspects of research activity also are important. The Merit Review Committee will use the following scores and criteria in assessing research productivity:

4 = achieved exceptional research productivity (e.g., one or more books, multiple peer-reviewed publications, major grant awards; substantial external recognition of scholarly or creative work, multiple invited research presentations)

3 = met or exceeded expectations for research productivity (e.g., at least one peer reviewed article or book chapter, multiple technical reports, substantial evidence of ongoing research activity, grant awards, submission of a proposal for major funding; presentation of research at conferences)

2 = did not meet expectations for research productivity (e.g., no publications, little evidence of research-related activity such as professional publications, presentations, or grants; advised to consult Associate Dean for strategies to strengthen performance)

1 = failed to document meaningful research activity (performance is substandard and may warrant referral to for post-tenure or other review).

b) Teaching

The Merit Review Committee evaluates teaching with reference to several categories of indicators: quantity of teaching, quality of teaching, advising load, curriculum development and innovation in teaching.

4 = demonstrated exceptional teaching (e.g., substantially exceeded expected teaching loads), received high student ratings, demonstrated substantial, effective advising, provided leadership in curricular development or teaching innovation)

3 = met or exceeded expectations for teaching quantity, quality, advising, and development of curriculum

2 = did not meet expectations for teaching quantity, quality, or advising (advised to consult Associate Dean for strategies to strengthen performance)

1 = failed to document meaningful contributions in the area of teaching (performance is substandard and may warrant referral for post-tenure or other review)

Teaching quality is mainly measured through student evaluation scores. HHH expectations are that median scores be at or above 5.0, using all six questions on the “University of Minnesota Student Rating of Teaching” instrument.

Other measures of teaching quality can include written evaluations or supplemental student evaluations collected by the faculty member, teaching awards, etc.

Advising is assessed by looking at the number of HHH and other advisees, HHH Professional Paper / Plan B / Plan A committee participation, and service on undergraduate, Masters and Ph.D. committees (at HHH or for other units).

c) Service

Performance in service occurs in three areas: the profession, the community, and the institution. These dimensions of service are in Section XX of this document and space for reporting on them is provided in the Works system.

4 = demonstrated exceptional leadership and achievement in service to the profession, community, or institution (e.g., elected to national boards, multiple invited presentations to legislative bodies or agencies, leadership on key professional or institutional committees that result in significant impact)

3 = met or exceeded expectations in levels of service to the profession, community, or institution

2 = did not meet expectations for service to the profession, community, or institution (advised to consult Associate Dean for strategies to strengthen performance)

1 = failed to document meaningful service to the profession, community, or institution (performance is substandard and may warrant referral for post-tenure or other review)

d) Overall Assessment

Based on historical precedent, the Merit Review Committee aggregates ratings for each of the three areas (i.e., research, teaching, and service) using the following weighting scheme:

Research = 40%;

Teaching = 30%;

Service = 30%.

The Committee then provides to the Dean a spreadsheet that lists all individuals on the faculty, their individual scores in each area of review, and their overall weighted score. These weighted scores are used to rank faculty. The Committee makes no recommendations about allocation of compensation based on their assessment and rankings.