

**ACADEMIC FACULTY**

# **APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY**

January 2014

---

School of Public Health

University of Minnesota

Modified by the Faculty of the School of Public Health January 9, 2014 (technical amendment)  
Adopted by the Faculty of the School of Public Health 2009

(This School of Public Health policy is the 7.12 statement required in the  
University of Minnesota Faculty Tenure policy)

**Approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost November 20, 2014**

Interpretation to University of Minnesota *Faculty Tenure* policy:

Special note should be taken of Interpretation #3 – Interpretation of Subsection 7.12: Review of Departmental Statements, which was approved June 10, 2011, as it pertains to the School of Public Health’s 7.12 Statement (*Academic Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Policy*).

3. Interpretation of Subsection 7.12: Review of Departmental Statements

The faculty of an academic unit are expected to periodically review their criteria for awarding indefinite tenure and for promotion in rank and reflect any new criteria in a revision of their Subsection 7.12 Statement. The new criteria and Subsection 7.12 Statement must be adopted in accordance with the established procedures of the University, after consultation as required by those procedures. Current probationary faculty in the unit may elect to be evaluated on the criteria for tenure and promotion in the previous Subsection 7.12 Statement or on the new criteria. This option is also available to current tenured faculty in their evaluation for promotion to the next level. Probationary or tenured faculty must make this decision within one year of the date of administrative approval of the new criteria.

For questions regarding the *Faculty Tenure* policy, contact the SPH Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee % SPH Dean’s Office at 624-6669 or [sphapt@umn.edu](mailto:sphapt@umn.edu).

*The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.*

*The Dean shall inform members of the School of their right under Minnesota law (Minnesota Laws, 1975, Chapter 401) to examine or obtain copies of filed data of which they are the subjects and to have the meaning of it explained to them. The Dean will encourage them to review periodically their personnel files and to add materials or observations they think appropriate to complete or correct them.*

# Contents

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| I.   | <u>Introduction</u> .....                                 | 1  |
| II.  | <u>Mission Statement of School of Public Health</u> ..... | 2  |
| III. | <u>Appointment</u> .....                                  | 2  |
|      | A. Standards .....  | 2  |
|      | 1. Instructor .....                                       | 2  |
|      | 2. Assistant Professor .....                              | 3  |
|      | 3. Associate Professor .....                              | 3  |
|      | 4. Professor .....  | 4  |
|      | B. Procedures .....                                       | 4  |
|      | 1. Search Process .....                                   | 4  |
|      | 2. Documentation .....                                    | 4  |
|      | a) Search Committee Summary .....                         | 5  |
|      | b) Candidate's Background and Experience .....            | 5  |
|      | c) Faculty Eligible to Vote .....                         | 5  |
|      | d) Division Faculty Review and Vote .....                 | 6  |
|      | e) Division Head's Review and Report .....                | 6  |
|      | f) APT Review, Vote and Report .....                      | 6  |
|      | g) SPH Faculty Review, Vote and Report .....              | 6  |
|      | h) Dean's Review and Report .....                         | 8  |
|      | i) Rights of the Candidate .....                          | 8  |
| IV.  | <u>Annual Appraisals of Probationary Faculty</u> .....    | 8  |
|      | A. Standards .....  | 9  |
|      | B. Procedures .....                                       | 9  |
|      | 1. Documentation .....                                    | 9  |
|      | a) Title Page .....                                       | 9  |
|      | b) Current Annual Appraisal .....                         | 9  |
|      | c) APT Committee Summary and Recommendation .....         | 9  |
|      | d) SPH APT (7.12) Policy .....                            | 9  |
|      | e) UM Faculty Tenure (7.11) Code .....                    | 9  |
|      | f) Table of Contents .....                                | 9  |
|      | g) Statement of Assurance .....                           | 9  |
|      | h) Collegiate Unit Letters .....                          | 10 |
|      | i) Record of Vote .....                                   | 10 |
|      | j) Annual Appraisals .....                                | 10 |
|      | k) Curriculum Vitae .....                                 | 10 |
|      | l) Summary and Documentation of Scholarly Activity .....  | 10 |
|      | m) Summary and Documentation of Teaching Experience ..... | 11 |
|      | n) Summary and Documentation of Service .....             | 13 |
|      | o) Reprints .....   | 13 |
|      | p) Other Relevant Materials .....                         | 13 |
|      | 2. Faculty Eligible to Vote .....                         | 13 |
|      | 3. Division Faculty Review, Vote and Report .....         | 13 |

|       |   |    |
|-------|---|----|
| 4.    | Division Head Letter . . . . .  | 14 |
| 5.    | APT Review, Vote and Report . . . . .                                       | 14 |
| 6.    | SPH Faculty Review, Vote and Report . . . . .                               | 14 |
| 7.    | Dean’s Review and Recommendation/Decision. . . . .                          | 14 |
| 8.    | Rights of Candidate . . . . .   | 14 |
| V.    | <u>Promotion</u> . . . . .  | 15 |
|       | A. Standards . . . . .  | 15 |
|       | 1. Assistant Professor . . . . .  | 14 |
|       | 2. Associate Professor . . . . .  | 15 |
|       | 3. Professor . . . . .  | 15 |
|       | B. Procedures. . . . .  | 15 |
|       | 1. Documentation . . . . .  | 16 |
|       | 2. Faculty Eligible to Vote . . . . .                                       | 17 |
|       | 3. Division Faculty Review, Vote and Report. . . . .                        | 17 |
|       | 4. Division Head Letter. . . . .  | 17 |
|       | 5. APT Review, Vote and Report . . . . .                                    | 17 |
|       | 6. SPH Faculty Review, Vote and Report . . . . .                            | 18 |
|       | 7. Dean’s Review and Report . . . . .                                       | 18 |
|       | 8. Rights of the Candidate . . . . .  | 18 |
| VI.   | <u>Conferral of Indefinite Tenure</u> . . . . .                             | 18 |
|       | A. Criteria . . . . .   | 18 |
|       | B. Procedures . . . . .   | 19 |
|       | 1. Documentation . . . . .  | 19 |
|       | 2. Faculty Eligible to Vote . . . . .                                       | 19 |
|       | 3. Division Faculty Review, Vote and Report. . . . .                        | 20 |
|       | 4. Division Head Letter. . . . .  | 20 |
|       | 5. APT Review, Vote and Report . . . . .                                    | 20 |
|       | 6. SPH Faculty Review, Vote and Report . . . . .                            | 20 |
|       | 7. Dean’s Review and Report . . . . .                                       | 20 |
|       | 8. Rights of Candidate . . . . .  | 20 |
|       | C. Extending Probationary Period . . . . .                                  | 20 |
| VII.  | General Procedures . . . . .  | 20 |
| VIII. | Membership and Function of the APT Committee . . . . .                      | 21 |
| IX.   | Ad Hoc Review Committee . . . . .   | 22 |
| X.    | Annual & Regular Review of Tenured Faculty and Post-Tenure Review.. . . . . | 22 |
| XI.   | Evaluation of Faculty with Joint Appointments in Other Schools . . . . .    | 23 |

Appendices:

- I. Review Process for Faculty Promotions, Tenure and Continuations
- II. Review Process for New Faculty Appointments
- III. Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*
- IV. Important Websites

**School of Public Health**  
**7.12 Statement**  
**Modified 1/9/14**

**I. Introduction**

This document describes the standards and procedures which will be used to evaluate candidates both for appointment to the faculty of the School of Public Health and also for continuation, promotion and tenure. As such, it describes the indices and standards which will be used to evaluate whether candidates meet the general criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor in Section 7.11 and for promotion to professor in Section 9.2 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*. For a complete perspective, the reader is advised to review this policy in its entirety.

This document describes the procedures which assure that the School of Public Health complies with the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* as provided by Sections 7.4, 7.61 and 16.3 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*.

This document also reflects the School's commitment to comply with the requirements of the University and School of Public Health *Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity Policy for Academic Positions* as well as any pertinent legal requirements and institutional standards of fairness and good faith.

A primary measure of excellence of an educational institution is the quality of its faculty. Therefore, the degree of foresight and wisdom employed in making decisions regarding faculty appointments, promotions, continuations or the granting of indefinite tenure will determine, in large measure, the distinction which a school achieves.

Within the School of Public Health the ultimate responsibility for recommending faculty members for appointment, continuation, promotion, or indefinite tenure rests with the Dean. To discharge this responsibility effectively, the Dean should have the counsel of the Division Heads and the tenured faculty of the School; the Dean should seek especially the advice of the faculty of the unit in which individuals are being recommended for appointment, promotion, continuation, or indefinite tenure.

Well-defined policies and procedures are essential to provide equity, uniformity, and efficiency in this process. Also, School policies must be in accordance with University policies, with particular emphasis on adherence to the affirmative action policies and procedures of the University of Minnesota and the School of Public Health. In the sections that follow, a framework is provided for the systematic evaluation of candidates for appointment, promotion, continuation of appointment, or for granting of indefinite tenure. A mechanism for continued review and modification of this procedure is also outlined.

Faculty members who participate in this process should recognize clearly that they bear an important obligation which transcends the technical details of any promotion policy—to identify and reward teachers and scholars who demonstrate a commitment to the advancement, communication, and utilization of knowledge and who show promise of pursuing productive academic careers.

This document is organized as follows:

- I. Introduction
- II. Mission statement of the School of Public Health
- III. Appointment
- IV. Annual appraisals of probationary faculty
- V. Conferral of indefinite tenure
- VI. Promotion
- VII. General procedures
- VIII. Membership and function of the APT Committee
- IX. Ad Hoc review Committee
- X. Post-Tenure review Committee
- XI. Evaluation of faculty with joint appointments in other Schools

## **II. Mission Statement of the School of Public Health**

### Mission

The University of Minnesota School of Public Health advances human health from scientific discovery to public impact in the prevention of disease and injury and the enhancement of population health through excellence in education, research and engagement with the global community.

### Goals

To achieve its mission, the School has established the following goals related to its major functions of education, research and service:

1. Prepare the next generation of public health professional, academic and scientific leaders.
2. Advance the School's global leadership in public health research and discovery.
3. Advance population health by engaging with communities worldwide.

## **III. Appointment**

The primary standards for recommendation for appointment are effectiveness in teaching and advising and distinction in scholarly activity. Service contributions to academic majors, Divisions, the School of Public Health (SPH), the University, professional organizations, or professionally related services to the community will also be considered, but effectiveness in teaching and distinction in scholarly activity are considered primary.

The standards used for regular (P or N) appointment decisions shall include those established for the recommended rank of the person being considered, as enumerated below. In addition, the criteria shall include the ability of the person being considered to contribute to the central mission of the School and to adapt to its changing needs.

### A. Standards

#### 1. Instructor

Appointment to Instructor requires that a candidate has demonstrated potential in the area of teaching.

2. Assistant Professor  
Appointment to assistant professor requires that a candidate has demonstrated potential in the areas of teaching and scholarly activity. An earned Ph.D., Sc.D., M.D., Dr.P.H., or equivalent degree is also required.
3. Associate Professor  
Appointment to the rank of associate professor generally requires that a candidate that may have a particularly strong record in either teaching or research and has demonstrated potential in the other area, and if the stature is such that a lower rank is inappropriate, an appointment at a rank of associate professor without tenure can be made. The length of the probationary period is part of the appointment and must be included in the documentation submitted to the APT Committee and the eligible SPH faculty for their vote.
  - a. Teaching  
The candidate should be clearly recognized for his/her impact and effectiveness as a teacher and advisor. Teaching may take many forms, including independent teaching (i.e., sole responsibility for a course), co-teaching, distance learning, instruction in short courses and summer institutes. Courses may include school-wide, core and elective classes. All forms and types of classes are valued. However, a candidate's record of teaching substantial courses (as primary instructor) provides the strongest evidence for evaluating teaching ability and accomplishments. In addition to teaching courses, candidates should have demonstrated the ability to successfully advise and train students for scientific inquiry.
  - b. Research  
The candidate should show evidence of having mastered his/her discipline and the ability to carry out independent inquiry. Collaborative research among divisions within the School, across academic units within the Academic Health Center, the University, and beyond is valued. High-quality publications in prestigious peer-reviewed journals relevant to the development of the discipline or its application to public health are the best evidence of a person's research ability. Given the heterogeneity with the SPH, the quality of the journals most relevant to a candidate's area of expertise will be judged by the letters from external reviewers, the Division Head and Division faculty. Additional evidence shall include contributions towards development of a sustainable funded research program including competitively awarded grants, the publication of peer-reviewed books and book chapters and other scholarly activities as defined in the University of Minnesota regulations regarding *Faculty Tenure* (Section 7.11). It should be noted that in reviewing an individual's scholarly activity, there should be evidence of sustained performance.
  - c. Service  
Service is an important supplementary component of the candidate's activities for appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor, and the significance of the candidate's service should be documented. Service aimed at improving public health is particularly valued.

4. Professor

Appointment to the rank of professor generally requires that a candidate has a particularly strong research record and has demonstrated potential for teaching and if the stature is such that a lower rank is inappropriate, an appointment at a rank of professor without tenure can be made. The length of the probationary period is part of the appointment and must be included in the documentation submitted to the APT Committee and the eligible SPH faculty for their vote.

a. Teaching

The candidate should excel in his/her teaching activity, and there should be evidence of an impact on the field by students whom s/he has mentored for careers, professional and academic. Mentoring may occur informally or formally through serving on student dissertation and examination committees as a chair, co-director or as an academic advisor.

b. Research

The scholarly output of the candidate should be consistent and sustained and should have developed a theme or major area of expertise that is recognized nationally and internationally. There should be one or more outstanding publications with the particular stamp of the personality and contribution of the candidate for full professorship. Collaborative research among divisions within the School and across academic units with the Academic Health Center, the University and beyond is also valued. Additional evidence shall include leadership in a sustainable, funded research program including competitively awarded grants, the publication of peer-reviewed books and book chapters, and other scholarly activities as defined in the University of Minnesota regulations regarding *Faculty Tenure* (Section 9.2).

c. Service

Service is an important supplementary component of the candidate's activities. This service should have had a demonstrated impact in his/her field within the framework of professionally related community activities which contribute to major, division, school and university functions, professional organizations, and the local, state, national or international community. Service aimed at improving public health is particularly valued.

B. Procedures

Recommendations for regular (P or N) appointments normally are initiated by the Division Head.

1. Search Process

Recommendation for appointment to a regular (P or N) position must be through participation in the search process which is conducted in accordance with affirmative action and equal opportunity policies and procedures.

2. Documentation

It is the responsibility of the Division Head to provide the required documentation for proposed faculty appointments.



a. Search Committee Summary

The Chair of the Search Committee shall provide a brief written summary of the recommendation of the committee regarding the proposed candidate. A copy of the description of the available academic position must be included. At least three letters of recommendation from individuals acquainted with the candidate's teaching and/or scholarly activity shall be included as part of the documentation. For associate and full professor rank, five letters are recommended.

b. Candidate's Background and Experience

A curriculum vitae that includes the following shall be included:

- 1) Formal education
- 2) Professional experience
- 3) Special honors and awards
- 4) Up-to-date bibliography (reprints of any publications—not to exceed three)
- 5) Grant and/or contract awards, if relevant
- 6) List of courses taught; extent of responsibility (e.g., sole instructor, co-instructor, lecturer) and number of credits for each
- 7) Statement on the extent of student advising; number of students for which the candidate had the major advising responsibility
- 8) Documentation of other specific teaching and advising contributions such as:
  - a) Coordination of graduate seminars;
  - b) Invited lecturing in courses taught by others;
  - c) Postdoctoral advising and training;
  - d) Supervising student research;
  - e) Service on graduate student examining committees; and
  - f) Supervising interns.
- 9) Summary of any available evaluative data on teaching such as summaries of student evaluations
- 10) Listing of University, professional and community service activities

c. Faculty Eligible to Vote

For an appointment to a regular faculty position, the tenured faculty at or above the rank being considered are defined to be the faculty eligible to vote.

d. Division Faculty Review, Vote and Report

Each initial proposal for appointment, regardless of rank, must be presented to the Division faculty eligible to vote together with the complete documentation in support of that proposal. The Division faculty eligible to vote must complete a secret ballot.

The Division Head writes the Division Faculty Report. The report must indicate the proposed date of appointment, and, for candidates who have not earned a Ph.D., Sc.D., M.D., Dr.P.H., or equivalent degree, must specify that the appointment will not be made until after such a degree has been obtained. A report of the vote by the Division faculty eligible to vote including any comments submitted as explanation of votes cast. The proposed length of the probationary period and actual beginning probationary year must be stated in the report and, if approved, must be stated in the letter of offer to the candidate.

e. Division Head's Review and Report

The Division Head shall write a brief personal letter of support for the recommendation for appointment, including a description of the position to be filled in terms of teaching and research expectations, and the qualifications of the candidate that justify the appointment.

f. APT Review, Vote and Report

Each initial proposal for regular faculty appointments, regardless of rank, must be reviewed by the APT Committee together with the complete documentation in support of the proposal. The APT committee must complete a secret ballot.

After full evaluation and vote, the APT Committee shall make a recommendation concerning the appointment of the candidate to the SPH faculty eligible to vote. A report of the relevant information shall be prepared by the Chair of the APT Committee.

g. SPH Faculty Review, Vote and Report

Each initial proposal for regular faculty appointments, regardless of rank, must be presented to the SPH faculty eligible to vote together with the complete documentation in support of that proposal. The SPH faculty eligible to vote must complete a secret ballot.

If 10% or more of the faculty eligible to vote request a meeting to discuss the appointment, a meeting shall be conducted so as to afford a reasonable opportunity to discuss the materials presented, to put questions, and to offer further information and judgments. This will give all concerned the opportunity to hear additional information. Written notice of the meeting must be given in advance to all SPH faculty members eligible to vote.

Prior to the meeting, the documentation and reports by the Division Head and the APT Committee must be made available to all SPH faculty members eligible to vote on the recommendation in question, including absent faculty members (including those on semester and sabbatical leave) and another vote will be taken after the faculty meeting.

The recommendation of the faculty should be determined by a tabulation of the ballots. At least 80% of SPH faculty eligible to vote must cast a ballot and a majority (50%+1) of the ballots cast by the SPH faculty eligible to vote is required to effect a valid recommendation to the Dean. For example, if there are 100 faculty eligible to vote, at least 80 must cast a ballot and of those 80 ballots, 41 must be in agreement to forward a recommendation on to the Dean.

Abstentions are not counted in determining whether a majority of those voting cast votes in favor of tenure or promotion, as required to report an affirmative recommendation, but the number of abstentions is reported as part of the vote tally and, in the review process, they will be considered an indication of lack of support for the candidate by those abstaining. Abstentions are strongly discouraged. Tenured faculty members have an obligation to decide whether or not a candidate merits tenure or promotion and to vote for or against tenure or promotion. If tenured faculty members are eligible to vote and do not cast a vote, the number of such non-votes is reported but they are not counted as affirmative or negative votes, or as abstentions.

In all cases, the actual vote is to be reported. The report should indicate the number eligible to vote, the number present at the meeting, the number of affirmative and negative votes and abstentions, and the number of instances of ballots not cast. In the report of the vote, the unit head should explain, if possible, the number of eligible faculty members not voting (e.g., faculty members on leaves or sabbaticals, on phased retirements, or holding administrative positions). The percent affirmative vote equals the number of affirmative votes divided by the number of affirmative plus negative votes (x 100). That is, abstentions are not included in the determination of the percentage of affirmative votes cast.

Following the faculty vote of the SPH faculty eligible to vote, the Chair of the APT Committee shall submit to the Dean a report which includes:

- 1) A statement of the votes cast for each recommendation, including:
  - a) The number of majority votes
  - b) The number of minority votes
  - c) The number of abstaining votes
  - d) The number of those entitled to vote but did not because of absence
- 2) A summary statement of the grounds upon which the majority view and recommendation rest, based on comments on the ballot.
- 3) A summary statement of the grounds upon which the minority view rests, based on comments on the ballot.

The Chair shall submit the report, with such modifications as s/he may think desirable in the light of the comments, to the Dean in explanation of the faculty's recommendation. A copy shall be retained in the School appointment, promotion and tenure files. The ballots cast shall also be retained for a period of at least one year; in the event of a challenge to the action recommended they may be needed to show the validity of the report submitted.

h. Dean's Review and Recommendation/Decision

The Dean must review and make recommendations or decisions for all initial faculty appointments. After review of the report from the APT Chair and the documentation supporting the request, the Dean shall make the decision for non-tenured faculty appointments.

For tenured faculty appointments, the Dean shall review the report of the APT Chair and the supporting documentation before forwarding his/her recommendation for the faculty appointment on to the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for further review and decision. Following the review of the documentation, including the Dean's approval or disapproval of the recommendation, the Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost presents his/her recommendation to the Board of Regents for its decision whether to approve the tenured faculty appointment. If both the faculty and the Dean disapprove of the faculty appointment, the appointment will not be made.

i. Rights of the Candidate

Together with any rights assured by the University, the School of Public Health will assure that at any time prior to the SPH faculty vote, a candidate may withdraw his/her application. It is also noted that written statements preserved in School files are subject to the candidate's rights under Minnesota law. These rights include the following: the candidate can see the contents of the file, be informed of their meaning, and obtain copies.

#### **IV. Annual Appraisals of Probationary Faculty**

The process of reviewing a candidate's progress is continual. It is intended to be encouraging and nurturing, although it is necessarily evaluative. Especially in the early years of the probationary period, the annual tenure review is intended to point out to the candidate his or her strengths and weaknesses, so that the strengths can be built upon and the weaknesses remedied. Three elements are essential to this process: information gathering, deliberation, and consultation with the candidate.

The effective date of a probationary faculty appointment identifies the first year of the probationary year. An Academic year is defined in the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* (Section 5.3). Probationary faculty hired before November 1, shall begin their probationary service in year 1 of the six-year period. Probationary faculty hired on or after November 1, shall begin their probationary service in year 0 of the six-year period.

All probationary faculty shall be reviewed annually during years 1-6 of the probationary period. The reviews are to determine whether the candidate is making satisfactory progress towards tenure, to write an evaluation of that progress and to vote on continuation of the appointment for another year. The yearly evaluation provides feedback to the candidate and becomes part of the candidate's accumulating record for later decisions concerning promotion and/or tenure. Documentation must be submitted by the candidate each year.

The review in Year 6 is for promotion or discontinuance of faculty appointment.

The Division, APT Committee, and SPH faculty eligible to vote will review the candidate each year. If there is not sufficient evidence of satisfactory progress and it appears unlikely that the candidate will reach the standards for promotion/tenure by the end of the probationary period, the faculty may vote to discontinue the candidate. In the sixth year of probation, the review is for promotion [cf. Section V. (pp. 15-18)] and tenure [cf. Section VI. (pp. 18-20)] or for discontinuation of appointment. Details on the standards and procedures for review of probationary faculty follow.

A. Standards

The primary criteria for the continuation of probationary faculty is the satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards of promotion. All of the criteria and guidelines used by the SPH for annual continuation reviews are contained in this document (SPH 7.12 Statement).

B. Procedures

Faculty must adhere to the *SPH Administrative Procedures for Probationary Faculty Appointments* for processing of documentation.

1. Documentation

It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide the required documentation for continuation. It should be concise and well-organized. Unless otherwise noted, the documentation should cover the candidate's entire academic career, regardless of the site or time at which the work was done. Sections concerning teaching, research and service should be cumulative dated summaries of objective data, as detailed below. Where asterisks (\*) are requested to indicate recent work, they should mark work done since the last review or since the date of appointment to the current position, whichever is more recent. Candidates are encouraged to meet with the APT members in their Division for help in preparing the documentation. The APT committee reserves the right to return documentation for revision if it is excessive. (cf. Section II.E.2. of the *UM Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*.)

The complete annual documentation dossier (*See SPH Administrative Procedures for Probationary Faculty Appointments*) includes:

- a. Title Page
- b. Current Annual Appraisal (UM President's Form 12) with Dean's Recommendation – added by the APT Committee
- c. APT Committee Summary and Recommendation – added by the APT Committee
- d. SPH APT (7.12) Policy, current version according to beginning date of appointment
- e. UM Faculty Tenure (7.11) Code, current version
- f. Table of Contents
- g. Statement of Assurances

A signed statement by the candidate shall accompany the documentation affirming that the candidate has had an opportunity to inspect the contents of the dossier and to add appropriate relevant material or comments to the

dossier. The statement indicates which version (based on the faculty member's effective date of appointment) of the UM Faculty Tenure Code (7.11) and the SPH APT (7.12) Policy will be used for the review of the faculty candidates documentation.

The Collegiate Unit's Statement of Assurance, signed by the Dean is included to indicate that documentation was made available to all eligible to review, including the faculty candidate.

h. Collegiate Unit Letters

Both the report of the division faculty vote with comments, written by the division head, and the division head's personal recommendation letter.

i. Record of Vote

The Division Record of Vote is included here before submission to the APT Committee for further review. The APT Committee staff will add the APT Committee and the SPH Faculty Records of Vote to this section.

j. Annual Appraisals

Include completed copies of all Appraisals of Probationary Faculty (UM President's Form 12), for each previous probationary year(s). The Form 12 is also included for all year(s) of the appointment served on an Extension of Maximum Period of Probationary Service. The completed Form 1764, 1765, or 1766 is also included; redacted of any personal/confidential information.

k. Curriculum Vitae

This section shall be in the form of a complete curriculum vitae [cf. Section III.B.2.b. (p.5)]:

l. Summary and Documentation of Scholarly Activity

This section must include the following items:

- 1) Narrative summary of scholarly activities (including research and accomplishments) (1-2 pages) since the last review or since the date of appointment to the current position, whichever is more recent, highlighting any special accomplishments. This summary should state the focus of independent research inquiry. Include an estimate of the percentage of time spent in research/scholarship effort.
- 2) A complete bibliography of all publications (including articles in press). List in chronological order and in separate sections: 1) all peer-reviewed sole and co-authored articles (for those co-authored articles, list order of names as they appear on the publication); 2) non-peer-reviewed articles; 3) books and chapters in books (indicate whether or not these are peer-reviewed); 4) presentations and abstracts. For co-authored articles there must be a statement indicating the role of the candidate in the publication. Specifically, note participation in conceptualization, grant writing, implementation, analysis, manuscript writing, and advising of student research. Use an asterisk (\*) to identify work done since the last review or since the date of appointment to the current position, whichever is more recent.

Example: Johnson, D.O., Larson, P.Q., and Carlson, A.L.: Evaluating Home Care for the Elderly. American Journal of Public Health 65: 433-42, 1989. (Analyzed data and wrote manuscript.)

- 3) A cumulative and dated list of all grants or contracts submitted under-review or obtained (date of award) since the last review. In the listing include: title, funding agency, one-sentence summary of purpose of support, period of funding, candidate's role (principal or co-investigator, role in obtaining the grant, or other substantial responsibility), and status of award, i.e., submitted/under-review/date of award. Note which grants or contracts are internal or external to the university. Use an asterisk (\*) to identify grants or contracts awarded since the date of appointment to the current position or since the last review, whichever is more recent. Do NOT include scores of grants submitted.
- 4) Listing of persons trained/mentored/advised in sponsored research activities (e.g., post-doctoral fellows, trainees, etc.). Include the current position of these individuals.
- 5) Listing of other evidence of research and scholarship (in preparation or planned) including: 1) research publications, 2) grant proposals, and 3) books/book chapters.

m. Summary and Documentation of Teaching Experience

It is recognized that teaching takes many forms. Among these are independent teaching (sole responsibility for course content); team teaching of courses; teaching of seminars; advising students regarding course work and requirements; and guiding the research of master's and doctoral students and post-doctoral fellows.

This section must include the following items:

- 1) Narrative summary of teaching/advising/mentoring activity (1-2 pages) since the date of appointment to the current position or since the last review of documentation, whichever is more recent, highlighting any special accomplishments. Include an estimate of the percentage of time spent in the teaching/ instructional/educational effort.
- 2) A cumulative and dated list of all teaching activities. Use an asterisk (\*) to identify work done since the date of appointment to the current position or since the last review, whichever is more recent.

(a) Courses Taught

Listing of courses by title, including for each course the quarter/semester in which the course was taught, number of students, and extent of responsibility (i.e., percentage of course taught, sole instructor, co-instructor, lecturer). Also, indicate courses which are to be taught during the current academic year.

(b) Advising

A cumulative and dated list of formal advisees should be presented in chronological order and in tabular form wherein columns are included for the names of the advisees, their degree program, their major, the date of completion of the degree, and the role of the advisor. Advisor roles should be drawn from the list below, listing all that apply:

M.P.H.: Academic advisor  
Master's project advisor  
Examination committee member

M.S.: Academic advisor  
Master's project or thesis advisor  
Examination committee member

Ph.D.: Academic advisor  
Dissertation advisor  
Dissertation reader  
Examination committee member

(c) Other Teaching Activity

List other teaching/instructional/educational activity such as continuing education, outreach, and development of teaching manuals or special instructional formats.

3) A section on teaching effectiveness, including:

(a) Formal Teaching Evaluations

Provide a summary of formal teaching evaluations (student or peer) over time. That is, summarize the teaching evaluations obtained through the University of Minnesota Office of Measurement Services forms using the one or both of the teaching evaluation tables found in the *SPH Administrative Procedures*. For faculty appointments at or above Assistant Professor, teaching evaluations from other institutions must be included using a comparable table or other formal measurement tools for evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Do not add raw data.

(b) Informal Teaching Evaluations

Provide a summary of any informal teaching evaluations such as peer assessment/letters and student or advisee letters. Indicate whether letters were solicited or unsolicited, or are an established component of the process of evaluating teaching effectiveness. Include actual letters.

(c) Honors and Awards

List any honors or awards received for teaching effectiveness.



n. Summary and Documentation of Service

This section must include the following items:

- 1) Narrative summary of discipline-related, professional, and University service (1-2 pages) since the last review or since the date of appointment to the current position, whichever is more recent, highlighting any special accomplishments. Include an estimate of the percentage of time spent in the service effort.
- 2) A cumulative and dated list of important service. Use an asterisk (\*) to identify work done since the last review or since the date of appointment to the current position, whichever is more recent.

Service activities can include:

- (a) Professional service, including roles in professional organizations, editorial boards, advisory board roles, and service in governmental organizations;
- (b) University of Minnesota committees and other University of Minnesota administrative service;
- (c) Other professional community service, including presentations to community groups, activities in committee work, and other things done for non-professional outside organizations.

o. Reprints

Reprints of any publications (not to exceed three) since the last review or since the date of appointment to the current position, whichever is more recent. The candidate must be the first or senior author, and the papers selected should reflect significant contributions of the candidate. In the case of multiple authorships, the contribution of the candidate to the project must be clearly established and reported.

p. Other Relevant Material

Other relevant material may be included, but must be brief.

2. Faculty Eligible to Vote

Tenured faculty vote on the recommendations for continuation of a probationary (N) faculty member.

3. Division Faculty Review, Vote and Report

Each proposal for continuation of an appointment in a probationary track, regardless of rank, must be presented to the Division faculty eligible to vote together with the complete documentation in support of that proposal. The Division faculty eligible to vote must complete a secret ballot. The Division Head writes the Division Faculty Report. A report of the vote by the Division faculty eligible to vote including any comments submitted as explanation of votes cast.

4. Division Head Letter

The Division Head shall write a letter stating his/her personal evaluation of the candidate's progress toward promotion and/or tenure, justifying continuation with components of the APT Policy. This report shall include a statement on the quality of the candidate's scholarly activity, including their publications, the quality of their teaching and service.

5. APT Review, Vote and Report

After full evaluation, the APT Committee shall make a recommendation concerning the continuation or discontinuation of the candidates in years 1-6 to the SPH faculty eligible to vote. The Division Head is responsible for making the recommendation for candidates in year 0. A report of the relevant information will be prepared, including the vote of the APT Committee.

6. SPH Faculty Review, Vote and Report

The APT report and supporting documentation shall be made available to the SPH faculty eligible to vote which must meet and vote for or against continuation for another year. The procedures and requirements for the SPH faculty review, vote and report on the continuation of probationary faculty shall be the same as for regular faculty appointments, presented in [cf. Section III.B.2.g. (pp. 6-7)], with the following modifications:

- a. A draft of the report prepared by the APT chair summarizing the SPH faculty vote will be made available to faculty eligible to vote for comment and suggested changes before it is forwarded to the Dean. The final draft will be sent to the affected faculty member, the faculty member's Division Head, and the Dean, and will be open to the faculty eligible to vote.
- b. A mandatory quorum of meeting attendees is required to discuss any faculty appointments. The quorum is 50%+1 of faculty eligible to review and vote. Attendees may participate by phone or other electronic connection.

7. Dean's Review and Recommendation/Decision

The decision to continue a tenure-track faculty appointment lies with the Dean. The Dean shall add his/her recommendation and comments to the Appraisals of Probationary Faculty (President's Form 12) and forward it to the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for confirmation signature on the Form 12 of the continuation of the appointment.

8. Rights of the Candidate

In addition to the rights assured in [cf. Section III.B.2.i. (p. 8)], several other rights are assured for candidates for continuation. At each step in the review process the candidate shall receive a copy of the reports prepared by the reviewing individuals or groups (Division Head, APT Committee, SPH Faculty, Dean) and may add additional material. The Dean shall promptly notify the candidate of the action taken after the meeting of the SPH faculty eligible to vote, and inform the candidate of the reasons for the action and of the candidate's procedural rights in this situation.

- C. Refer to section 5.5 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* re: extending the probationary period.

## V. Promotion

### A. Standards

The primary criteria for recommendation for promotion are effectiveness in teaching and advising and distinction in scholarly activity. Service contributions to academic majors, Divisions, the School of Public Health, the University, or to professional organizations, or professionally related services to the community will also be considered, but effectiveness in teaching and distinction in scholarly activity are considered primary.

#### 1. Assistant Professor

Promotion to assistant professor requires that a candidate has demonstrated potential in the areas of teaching and scholarly activity. A Ph.D., Sc.D., M.D., Dr.P.H., or equivalent degree is required. A promotion to Assistant Professor does not affect the faculty member's tenure status.

#### 2. Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of associate professor requires clear and demonstrable evidence that the candidate has developed a program of teaching and scholarly activity which is innovative and of high quality. Promotion to the rank of associate professor generally requires the same accomplishments in teaching, research, and service as the criteria for appointment within the school [cf.Section III.A.3. (pg.3)].

The promotion of a probationary appointee to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor must be accompanied with an appointment with indefinite tenure.

#### 3. Professor

Promotion to the rank of professor implies advanced academic maturity and requires clear and demonstrable evidence that the candidate has achieved recognition as a national and international authority in his/her discipline through the development of an innovative program of teaching and scholarly activity (See Section 9.2 Criteria for Promotion to Professor from the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* in Appendix III). Promotion to the rank of professor generally requires the same accomplishments in teaching, research and service as the criteria for appointment within the school [cf.Section III.A.4. (pg.4)].

### B. Procedures

Recommendations for promotion normally are initiated by the Division Head. A promotion recommendation to the APT Committee may be initiated by any member of the School faculty for himself/herself or for other members of the School faculty. Also, any faculty member may request the Committee to remove his/her name from consideration. It is strongly recommended that a faculty member who believes s/he should be considered for promotion discuss these possibilities with the Division Head and obtain, if at all possible, the support of the Division Head.

A Division Head may recommend him/herself for promotion, or the recommendation may be initiated by a tenured faculty member, preferably of full professor rank, in the Division.

1. Documentation

The documentation to be submitted in support of a recommendation for promotion should be of the same type and format as that submitted in support of a recommendation for continuation, with five additions:

a. External Review

After the APT Committee has deemed the documentation appropriate for consideration, the APT Committee shall select outside reviewers to assess the quality and significance of the candidate's scholarly activities and to comment on the candidate's national or international reputation. Letters that are requested from faculty at other academic institutions should indicate whether the candidate would be eligible for promotion at their institution (or one comparable to the University of Minnesota). Each reviewer will be provided with the APT Policy and the candidate's submitted documentation, with the Statement of Assurance, Collegiate Unit Letters, Record of Vote, Annual Appraisals, and External Review and Evaluation sections redacted.

- 1) The names of a minimum of fifteen (15) possible external reviewers identified in preferred contact order, along with their contact information, short paragraph biography, and statement of their relationship with the candidate, shall be included with the documentation. The list of names shall be developed with the guidance of the candidate's APT division representative and with input from the senior faculty from the division. The first 6 potential external reviewers listed are the first group contacted to conduct the review. The remaining potential reviewers are contacted as needed to ensure receipt of at least four evaluations. The following criteria should be taken into consideration when identifying potential reviewers:
  - a) Distinguished faculty or, occasionally, highly regarded non-academics.
  - b) If faculty, rank should be above that of the candidate. Otherwise they should be of a status or position considered to be at least equal to the rank for which the candidate is being considered.
  - c) Ability to provide an impartial and evaluative review of the candidate's qualifications and accomplishments.
  - d) Contributing to providing an overall balanced view of the candidate and to providing a range of perspectives.

*NOTE: To ensure impartiality, it is important to avoid a situation where reviewers have direct professional or personal interest in the advancement of the candidate. These relationships include: former advisor, mentor, co-author, or co-investigator. (See Section II.F.4. of the Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty for specific criteria for the selection of external reviewers).*

- e) When circumstances arise that an evaluation is needed from a reviewer with a personal relationship to the candidate (e.g., former trainees, mentors, or students), the Dean must address this in the letter to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

- 2) Where asterisks are requested to indicate recent work, those asterisks should reflect work or events new since the date of appointment or promotion to the current rank.
  - 3) The one- to two-page summaries for teaching, research and service should reflect work or events new since the date of appointment or promotion to the current rank.
  - 4) The requirements for reprints and evaluations of teaching should reflect the period since the date of appointment or promotion to the current rank.
  - 5) Candidates may present additional concise (two pages) evidence to support promotion.
2. Faculty Eligible to Vote  
For the promotion of a regular faculty member, the tenured faculty at or above the rank being considered are defined to be the faculty eligible to vote.
  3. Division Faculty Review, Vote and Report  
Each proposal for promotion, regardless of rank, must be presented to the Division faculty eligible to vote together with the complete documentation in support of that proposal. The Division faculty eligible to vote must complete a secret ballot. The Division Head writes a separate report of the Division faculty discussion and vote (including comments), justifying promotion with components of the APT Policy. This report shall include a statement on the quality of the candidate's scholarly activity, including their publications, the quality of their teaching and service.
  4. Division Head Letter  
The Division Head shall write a letter stating his/her personal evaluation of the candidate's progress toward promotion and/or tenure.
  5. APT Review, Vote and Report  
Each proposal for promotion, regardless of rank, must be reviewed by the APT Committee together with the complete documentation in support of that proposal. For promotion to Associate Professor, the full APT Committee shall review the proposal. For promotion to Professor, a subset of the APT Committee, comprised of all of the members who hold the rank of Professor, shall review the proposal.

A copy of the letter from the APT Committee requesting the evaluation, along with the short paragraph biography on each reviewer and the statement of his/her relationship with the candidate, shall be included with the external reviews when the documentation is forwarded to the Sr. Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost. In order to effect a valid recommendation to the Dean, at least four letters must be received from external reviewers.

After full evaluation, the APT Committee shall make a recommendation concerning the promotion of the candidate to the SPH faculty eligible to vote. A report of the relevant information will be prepared, including the APT Committee vote, which is taken by secret ballot.

6. SPH Faculty Review, Vote and Report  
The APT report and supporting documentation shall be made available to the SPH faculty eligible to vote which must meet and vote for or against the proposed promotion. The procedures and requirements for the SPH faculty review, vote and report on the promotion of regular faculty shall be the same as for regular faculty appointments, presented in Section III.B.2.g. (pp. 6-7).
7. Dean's Review and Report  
The procedures and requirements for the Dean's review, and report on the promotion of regular faculty shall be the same as for regular faculty appointments, presented in Section III.B.2.h. (pg.8).
8. Rights of the Candidate  
The rights of candidates for promotion shall be the same as for candidates for continuation, presented in Section III.B.2.i. (p. 8).

## **VI. Conferral of Indefinite Tenure**

### **A. Criteria**

Appointments with indefinite tenure (P) will be granted only to probationary (N) faculty or to faculty who have been recruited for a specific tenured (P) position in accordance with University and School affirmative action and equal opportunity policies and procedures, and in accordance with the policies and procedures which comprise this document.

Section 7.11 of the University of Minnesota regulations regarding *Faculty Tenure* specifies the criteria for tenure:

*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.*

For the full version of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, please go to:  
<http://www1.umn.edu/regents/policies/humanresources/FacultyTenure.pdf>

---

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

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

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

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

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

*“Service” may be professional or institutional. Professional service, based on one’s academic expertise, is that provided to the profession, to the University, or to the local, state, national, or international community. Institutional service may be administrative, committee, and related contributions to one’s department or college, or the University. All faculty members are expected to engage in service activities, but only modest institutional service should be expected of probationary faculty.*

[FN4] *Indefinite tenure may be granted at any time the candidate has satisfied the requirements. A probationary appointment must be terminated when the appointee fails to satisfy the criteria in the last year of probationary service and may be terminated earlier if the appointee is not making satisfactory progress within that period toward meeting the criteria.*

## B. Procedures

Recommendations for tenure normally are initiated by the Division Head. A tenure recommendation to the APT Committee may be initiated by any member of the School faculty for himself/herself or for other members of the School faculty. Also, any faculty member may request the Committee to remove his/her name from consideration. It is strongly recommended that a faculty member who believes s/he should be considered for tenure discuss these possibilities with the Division Head and obtain, if at all possible, the support of the Division Head.

### 1. Documentation

The documentation to be submitted in support of a recommendation for tenure should be of the same type and format as that submitted in support of a recommendation for promotion.

### 2. Faculty Eligible to Vote

Tenured faculty vote on the recommendations for tenure, for faculty requesting both promotion and tenure, one vote is taken for both requests, i.e., ‘promotion and tenure’.

3. Division Faculty Review, Vote and Report  
Each proposal for tenure, regardless of rank, must be presented to the Division faculty eligible to vote together with the complete documentation in support of that proposal. The Division faculty eligible to vote must complete a secret ballot. The Division Head shall write a report of the Division faculty discussion and vote (including comments), justifying tenure with components of the APT policy.
4. Division Head Letter  
The Division Head shall write a letter stating his/her personal evaluation of the candidate's progress toward tenure.
5. APT Review, Vote and Report  
Each proposal for tenure, regardless of rank, must be reviewed by the APT Committee together with the complete documentation in support of that proposal. The APT Committee members must complete a secret ballot.

The procedures and requirements for the APT Committee's review, vote and report on proposals for tenure shall be the same as for promotions, presented in Section IV.B.6. (p. 17), except that external reviewers shall be asked to indicate whether the candidate would be eligible for tenure rather than promotion at their institution (or one comparable to the University of Minnesota).

6. SPH Faculty Review, Vote and Report  
The APT report and supporting documentation shall be made available to the SPH faculty eligible to vote which must meet and vote for or against the proposal for tenure. The procedures and requirements for the SPH faculty review, vote and report on tenure decisions shall be the same as for regular faculty appointments, presented in Section III.B.2.g. (pp. 6-7).
7. Dean's Review and Report  
The procedures and requirements for the Dean's review, and report on all tenure decisions shall be the same as for regular faculty appointments, presented in Section III.B.2.h. (pg.8).
8. Rights of the Candidate  
The rights of candidates for tenure shall be the same as for candidates for continuation, presented in Section III.B.2.I. (pg. 8).

- C. Extending the Probationary Period. Refer to section 5.5 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*

## **VII. General Procedures**

The Chair of the APT Committee shall confer annually with the Dean to establish dates for consideration of individuals recommended for promotion and/or tenure, and of individuals recommended for continuation or non-continuation as probationary faculty. The Chair of the APT may convene the committee at any time over the course of the year to consider new appointments as required by this policy.



The Dean may request the APT Committee to review an application for promotion and/or tenure at a time other than the designated annual review period set by the University and the School. Such a review shall be initiated only upon written request, including justification, from the Dean.

### **VIII. Membership and Function of the APT Committee**

The faculty of the School, at the rank of assistant professor and above, shall elect an APT Committee from among the tenured faculty. The committee shall be composed of eight members. The APT Committee shall annually elect the Chair from among the committee members holding the rank of full professor. Any associate professor member who becomes a candidate for promotion in a given year shall be replaced on the committee by means of a special election.

The committee shall be comprised of two faculty members from each Division, of which at least one is a full professor, elected by eligible members of that Division.

Elections of the committee and Chair shall be held during spring semester. Members of the committee will begin their terms the following fall semester.

Members shall serve for two years. Division Heads shall not be eligible to serve on the APT Committee. Committee membership is limited to two consecutive terms (four years).

To maintain separation of the various levels of review for faculty candidates within the School, members of the APT Committee do not participate in the review or vote as an SPH Faculty member. They have one vote as a member of the APT Committee.

The committee's function shall be to:

- A. Establish a timetable for review of requests for promotion, continuation of appointments, or tenure.
- B. Receive and review the documentation supporting such requests.
- C. Make recommendations to the faculty eligible to vote as described and required by this policy.
- D. Review recommendations for all promotions and for appointments to assistant professor and above as outlined in this policy.
- E. Make recommendations to the faculty regarding revisions deemed necessary in the School of Public Health Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Policy.
- F. Perform other tasks as requested by the Dean and/or School faculty, such as review of semester leave and sabbatical furlough applications.

## **IX. Ad Hoc Review Committee**

The APT Policy normally shall be reviewed in even academic years (every two years) by an Ad Hoc Committee. The Ad Hoc Review Committee shall be chaired by the APT Committee Chair and composed of one representative from each division on the APT Committee and an equal number of non-tenured faculty, one from each Division, elected by the non-tenured faculty of that Division.

## **X. Annual and Regular Review of Tenured Faculty and Post-Tenure Review**

The School of Public Health (SPH) will use the following system for Annual, Regular, and Post-Tenure Review which complies with Section 7a of the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*.

As stated in the 1997-98 *Rules and Procedures for Annual and Special Post-Tenure Review*, (<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/fsen/guidelines.html>) post-tenure review takes place in the tenure [appointment] home of the faculty member. In the SPH, the appointment home is the School. Specifically, SPH is the administrative unit, the Dean is the academic unit head, and the faculty of the unit are all SPH faculty, regardless of division affiliation. In this respect, the Dean is in the role of a 'Department Head' and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost is in the role of a 'Dean.' For purposes of post-tenure review, the Dean has designated the Head of each Division to conduct the annual review on his behalf. The Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee is the elected faculty body of the SPH responsible for post-tenure reviews by the faculty.

A. Annual Review of Tenured Faculty and the Post-Tenure Review. The annual review with merit raise recommendations will be conducted by the Division Head for the faculty of that Division. Each of the Divisions has a set of goals, expectations, and procedures for merit review which have been voted on and approved by the faculty in that Division. For purposes of the Post-Tenure Review, however, the criteria approved by all SPH faculty will be used for tenured faculty at the Associate Professor and Professor ranks as described in Section V.A.2-3 (pg. 15) in this document. With increasing time in rank, faculty are expected to demonstrate progress in these criteria, and this progress is what the Division Head, APT, and the Dean will use in the post-tenure review of tenured faculty.

Thus, the Post-Tenure Review process builds upon annual reviews in sustaining and enhancing faculty performance in teaching, research and service. It is also intended to assist those members who are experiencing difficulties in achieving established expectations. Following the annual review, the Division Head will send a letter to each faculty member describing the results of his/her review and expectations as discussed in their meeting.

The procedures for the Annual Review at the Unit level are the following:

1. The Division Heads will provide the Dean with a formal report of all completed annual reviews of faculty within their division. Forwarding the complete dossier of any faculty member(s) who may not be achieving the School-defined expectations of Teaching, Research and Service.

2. Following the Dean's review of the dossiers of the identified faculty, the Dean will meet with each of these individuals. The results of this review will be summarized in a letter to the individual from the Dean with a copy to the Division Head.
3. If the level of underperformance is substantial in the opinion of the Dean, he/she will send a copy of the letter to the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee which will initiate an APT review.
4. Following the APT review, if the Dean and the APT agree that the faculty member's performance shows "substantial substandard performance," then a letter will be sent by the Chair of the APT Committee and the Dean to the faculty member identifying the deficiencies and establishing a time period (usually by the next annual review but no less than one year from the date of the letter notifying the faculty member of his or her substandard performance) during which the faculty member should address the identified problems.
5. A Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) will be written by the Division Head in collaboration with the faculty member and the Dean to address these deficiencies. The PIP should describe performance improvement that is developmental and realistic.
6. If the faculty member's performance continues to be substandard in the opinions of both the Dean and the APT Chair, then the APT Committee and the Dean can ask the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost to initiate a special review as described in the Section 7a of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*.

It is also noted that written statements preserved in School files are subject to the candidate's rights under Minnesota law. These rights include the following: the candidate can see the contents of the file, be informed of their meaning, and obtain copies. At each step in the review process the candidate shall receive a copy of the reports prepared by the reviewing individuals or groups (Division Head, APT Committee, Dean).

## **XI. Evaluation of Faculty with Joint Appointments in Other Schools**

The criteria for evaluating faculty with joint appointments whose primary appointment is in other Schools and Departments within the University are the same as those for evaluating faculty whose primary appointment is in the SPH (for appointments, annual appraisals, conferral of indefinite tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review). However, the SPH will evaluate such faculty with joint appointments for appointment, tenure, and promotion only after such a decision has been made for the primary appointment. The documentation required for appointment, annual appraisals of probationary faculty, conferral of indefinite tenure, and post-tenure review can be in the format required by the School or Department in which the faculty holds his/her primary appointment. However, the candidate should ensure that the documentation contain all the elements that are relevant to scholarly activities, teaching, and service in the area of public health. The APT Committee may require additional materials such as additional letters from external reviewers to facilitate adequate review of the candidate's scholarly work in the area of public health. In order to evaluate materials that are the output of interdisciplinary and/or interprofessional work and that may be different from those described in this 7.12 document (e.g., peer-reviewed publications), the candidate should provide a statement describing the relevance of the materials to public health.

---

*Modified by SPH Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee per University Guidelines: May 1, 2000*  
*Modified by APT Committee, Approved by Faculty Eligible to Vote per AHC Guidelines: October 4, 2007*  
*Modified by APT Committee, Approved by Faculty Eligible to Vote per AHC Guidelines: October 3, 2008*  
*S:SPH\Deans Office\Post Tenure Review Plan.doc (Nov 2008)*  
*Modified by APT Committee, Approved by Faculty Eligible to Vote per University Guidelines: December 17, 2009*  
*Modified by SPH Ad Hoc Committee, Approved by SPH Faculty Eligible to Vote per University Guidelines: January 9, 2014*

## **APPENDIX I**

### **Review Process for New Faculty Appointments**

| <b>Regular Faculty Positions (P or N)</b> |                            |  |
|---|----------------------------|--|
| <b><i>Appointment to:</i></b>             | <b><i>APT review?</i></b>  | <b><i>SPH faculty eligible to vote</i></b> |
| <b>Professor P</b>                        | Yes (only full professors) | Professor P                                |
| <b>Associate Professor P or N</b>         | Yes                        | Associate and full professor P             |
| <b>Assistant Professor N</b>              | Yes                        | Associate and full professor P             |
|   |                            |  |
| <b><i>Tenure as:</i></b>                  | <b><i>APT review?</i></b>  | <b><i>SPH faculty eligible to vote</i></b> |
| <b>Professor P</b>                        | Yes (only full professors) | Professor P                                |
| <b>Associate Professor P</b>              | Yes                        | Associate and full professor P             |

*Note: In instances involving tenure, one vote of the appointment rank and tenure must be taken.*

## **APPENDIX II**

### **Review Process for Faculty Promotions, Tenure, and Continuations**

| <b>Regular Faculty Positions (P or N)</b> |                                 |                                     |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <i>Promotion to:</i>                      | <i>APT review?</i>              | <i>SPH faculty eligible to vote</i> |
| <b>Professor P or N</b>                   | Yes (only full professors)      | Professor P                         |
| <b>Associate Professor P or N</b>         | Yes                             | Associate and Full Professor P      |
|   |                                 |                                     |
| <i>Tenure granted:</i>                    | <i>APT review?</i>              | <i>SPH faculty eligible to vote</i> |
| <b>Professor</b>                          | Yes (only full professors)      | Professor P                         |
| <b>Associate Professor</b>                | Yes                             | Associate and Full Professor P      |
|   |                                 |                                     |
| <i>Continuation as:</i>                   | <i>APT review?</i>              | <i>SPH faculty eligible to vote</i> |
| <b>Associate or Assistant Professor N</b> | Yes (years 1-6 of tenure-track) | Associate and Full Professor P      |

Note: In instances involving promotion AND tenure, one vote of “promotion and tenure” must be taken.

### **Appendix III. Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure**

#### 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 [8]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [9]. 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.

[8] "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.

[9] 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 IV. Important Websites**

University of Minnesota Faculty Tenure (7.11) Code:

<http://www1.umn.edu/regents/policies/humanresources/FacultyTenure.pdf>

University of Minnesota

Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty:

<http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/faculty/tenure/pdf/Procedures101207.pdf>

University of Minnesota Administrative Policy on Academic Appointments:

<http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/ohrpolicy/Hiring/Academic/>

University of Minnesota

Companion Document to Administrative Policy on Academic Appointments:

<http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/ohrpolicy/Hiring/Academic/companion.pdf>

School of Public Health Faculty Directory:

<http://www.sph.umn.edu/faculty>