

Approved by the Faculty January 23, 2008

Approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost March 30, 2008

EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES CONCERNING FACULTY REVIEW, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

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

The **Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*** specifically states in section 7.12 Departmental Statement:

Each department or equivalent academic unit must have a document that specifies (1) the indices and standards that will be used to determine whether candidates meet the threshold criteria of subsection 7.11 (“General Criteria” for the awarding of indefinite tenure) and (2) the indices and standards that will be used to determine whether candidates meet the threshold criteria of subsection 9.2 (“Criteria for Promotion to Professor”). The document must contain as an appendix the text and footnotes of subsections 7.11 and 9.2, and must be consistent with the criteria given there but may exceed them. Each departmental statement must be approved by a faculty vote (including both tenured and probationary members), the dean, and other appropriate academic administrators, including the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The chair or head of each academic unit must provide each probationary faculty member with a copy of the Departmental Statement at the beginning of the probationary service.

This document is intended to satisfy section 7.12 of the ***Faculty Tenure***. It describes with more specificity the criteria for personnel evaluations and associated procedures and is organized as follows:

- I. Overview**
- II. Awarding of Indefinite Tenure**
- III. Probationary Faculty**
- IV. Promotion to Associate Professor**
- V. Promotion to Professor**
- VI. Annual Review of Tenured Faculty**
- VII. Post-Tenure Review**

I. Overview

Faculty personnel policies and procedures for the Department of Educational Psychology meet the requirements established by the University and the College of Education and Human Development, and are consistent with the College **Values Statement To Guide 7.12 Revisions**. These policies and procedures appear in this document.

A. College of Education and Human Development Mission Statement

“The new College of Education and Human Development is a world leader in discovering, creating, sharing, and applying principles and practices of multiculturalism and multidisciplinary scholarship to advance teaching and learning and to enhance the psychological, physical, and social development of children, youth, and adults across the lifespan in families, organizations, and communities” (Source: College of Education and Human Development website <http://education.umn.edu/newcollege/default.html>).

B. Department of Educational Psychology Mission Statement

“Educational Psychology involves the study of cognitive, emotional, and social learning processes that underlie education and human development across the lifespan. Research in educational psychology advances scientific knowledge of those processes and their application in diverse educational and community settings. The department provides training in the psychological foundations of education, research methods, and the practice and science of counseling psychology, school psychology, and special education. Faculty and students provide leadership and consultation to the state, the nation, and the international community in each area of educational psychology. The department’s scholarship and teaching enhance professional practice in schools and universities, community mental health agencies, business and industrial organizations, early childhood programs, and government agencies” (Source: Department of Educational website <http://education.umn.edu/EdPsych/default.html>).

In fulfilling its mission, faculty of the Department of Educational Psychology serve not only the students majoring in Educational Psychology, but students in programs throughout the College of Education and Human Development and in other Colleges of the University. As a major service function, the Department extends its activities and skills to local, state, regional, and national governmental and professional organizations to help meet its mission. Educational Psychology faculty and other Departmental resources are devoted to a research, teaching, and service program that embodies the following principles:

1. The provision of programs which promote foundational learning as part of the educator-preparation effort at all levels within the College, as well as throughout the University.
2. The preparation of highly qualified professionals throughout the Department.
3. Promotion of the concept that every person, no matter how special his or her needs may be, should receive an appropriate education in an environment which values and supports

multiculturalism and diversity.

4. Assumption of responsibility for broad leadership in strengthening and improvement of educational practices.

To accomplish its mission it is the expectation of the Department that every faculty member shall be engaged in research, teaching, and service. However, the Department will place highest priority on research and teaching activities that deal with major issues in Educational Psychology including those that are multidisciplinary in nature. We recognize that the proportion of time given to particular activities will vary among faculty members.

C. College Values Statement To Guide 7.12 Revisions

“The College affirms the pre-eminent value of excellence in research, teaching, and service—excellence that will help the University achieve the highest level of recognition among public research universities. Unit 7.12 statements must reflect the Unit’s high standards of academic excellence, consistent with the framework of the University 7.11 statement for granting of tenure and the University 9.2 statement for promotion to professor.

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

The College affirms the crucial role played by faculty within the unit to ensure that their decisions about promotion and tenure are decisions that will be validated by judgments at the College and University levels.

Units are encouraged to prepare 7.12 statements that articulate unit priorities in the context of the College’s mission statement (see above).

Faculty at our land grant University are expected to contribute to the public good through their work. Therefore, Unit 7.12 statements should reflect how faculty work that involves models for public engagement and multicultural and multidisciplinary initiatives can be documented so that excellence in these areas is considered in the context of promotion and tenure.” (Source: College of Education and Human Development 7.12 Committee)

D. Section 7.11, *Faculty 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 [3] This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate’s record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [4]. The relative importance

of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision [5]. 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.

[3] "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.

[4] 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.

[5] 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.

E. Section 9.2, *Faculty Tenure*

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.

II. Awarding of Indefinite Tenure

A. General Statement

Evaluations related to the awarding of indefinite tenure are based on the general criteria in Section 7.11 of the *Faculty Tenure* (for a complete perspective, the reader is advised to review relevant portions of section 7 as well as the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*. These *Procedures* are located at: <http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/faculty/pdf/procedures101207.pdf>).

Faculty members shall document their accomplishments in the three categories of research, teaching, and service. Evaluation of a faculty member's record of accomplishment will be judged against the expectations of the University and the College, along with the expectations of the Department as described in this document. The basis for awarding indefinite tenure is the determination that each candidate has established and is likely to continue to add to a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national or international reputation or both.

Candidates who demonstrate a distinguished record of accomplishment in Educational Psychology that is aligned with the College Values Statement To Guide 7.12 Revisions will also have that work recognized. For example, the evaluation of a candidate whose research, teaching, or service has a multidisciplinary, multicultural, or public engagement character must include assessment by faculty whose expertise allows such work to be fairly and accurately reviewed

(public engagement is defined by the University 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”). Similar guidelines hold for evaluating the accomplishments of faculty holding joint appointments within the College, but in this case the extent to which work linked to each appointment will be weighted in the evaluation should be described. Expectations may vary for different individuals and may change as an individual's career develops. However, in all cases contributions in all three categories (research, teaching, service) are necessary.

A candidate may use the same accomplishment in multiple categories but must provide evidence of the appropriateness and success of this practice. For example, a scholarly paper published in a peer-reviewed journal that focuses on the social development of children and that is subsequently used to engage communities outside the University in an educational partnership could provide evidence of a candidate's accomplishments in research and service. Similarly, a candidate who uses their academic expertise and experience to assist a community organization develop materials for applying for state and federal grants could provide evidence of accomplishments in teaching and service.

B. Research

Distinction in research is based on consideration of:

1. *Originality*. How original are the accomplishments?
2. *Rigor*. How well do accomplishments utilize the canons of inquiry of the discipline that are basic to the inquiries?
3. *Cumulative Effect*. How well do accomplishments build on previous theory and research and reflect a research effort that is coherent and programmatic?
4. *Impact*. How well do accomplishments focus on central questions, issues, or decisions in educational psychology that yield broad, enduring understanding?
5. *Relevance*. What is the prospect that these accomplishments could make a difference in the practice of education or the assumptions on which practice is built?

Evidence of research accomplishment would typically include, but is not limited to:

- a. Publications which would include books, monographs, journal articles, book chapters, etc. In general, peer-reviewed work will be given more weight in the evaluation of a candidate's research accomplishments, but evidence of scholarly publications that are not peer-reviewed will be recognized.
- b. External research funding from sources outside the University by competition.

- c. Participation in prestigious state, national, or international panels, advisory boards, task forces, symposia, presentations, etc. that recognize a candidate's research accomplishments, for example, participation in a national panel whose task is to synthesize available studies in a field for research and policy purposes; invited scholarly lectures; scholarly awards for excellence in the discipline.

In all cases the evaluation of a candidate's research accomplishments should distinguish between work that is done independently and work done as a member of a team of co-investigators or co-authors. In the latter cases the candidate's role as a co-investigator or as a contributor to multi-authored work should be described.

C. Teaching

The evaluation of teaching will typically include graduate or undergraduate classroom teaching in which students register for credit, but could also involve non-credit teaching, for example, assisting a community organization develop materials for applying for state or federal grants in ways consistent with the University, College, and Department's teaching mission. Supervising, mentoring, and advising University students is also considered teaching. Effective teaching that involves public engagement or is multidisciplinary or multicultural in character must be recognized.

The evaluation of the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching is based on consideration of

1. *Planning.* How well does the instructional plan identify objectives, utilize appropriate subject matter sequences, consider the students and their differences and employ materials and media that contribute to student learning?
2. *Conduct.* How well does the encounter with students set the desired climate and employ methods appropriate to the plan?
3. *Evaluation.* How well did the teaching do what it intended as reflected by appraisal of student competencies and utilization of appraisals in revision of the plan for instruction?

Evidence of effective teaching would typically include, but is not limited to:

- a. Curricular materials for courses or teaching-oriented activities taught, directed, or developed by the candidate, which could include syllabi, exams, quizzes, assignments, textbooks, workbooks, on-line materials; materials linked to community activities such as offering professional workshops to educators; independent studies with University students.
- b. Written evaluations by students including student comments and summaries of all student numerical ratings; letters from community organizations evaluating a candidate's teaching-related work or from students characterizing the quality of advising or mentoring (whether the letters were solicited or unsolicited should be described); teaching awards.

- c. Peer evaluations of teaching which would typically consist of classroom visits by faculty senior in rank to the candidate, and an accompanying letter summarizing the faculty member's impressions of the candidate's teaching and their assessment of the curricular materials.
- d. Evidence of the trajectory of a candidate's teaching indicating whether the candidate's teaching has improved over time or remain unchanged at a high level of competence, and what the candidate has done to improve his or her teaching, (e.g., participation in University programs designed to improve teaching effectiveness such as the Early Career Teaching Program, Mid Career Teaching Program, or the Multicultural Teaching and Learning Fellowship Program); student evaluations of the same course evaluated over time; multiple peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching conducted over time.

D. Service

All faculty members are expected to engage in service activities, but only modest institutional service should be expected of probationary faculty. The evaluation of a candidate's service is based on consideration of:

1. Discipline-related service, which includes both service to the profession and outreach to the local, state, national, or international community based on one's academic expertise in ways that impact organizations, institutions and professional practices. For example, service activities that enhance professional practice in community schools and mental health agencies, business and industrial organizations, early childhood programs, or government agencies.
2. Institutional service, which includes administrative, committee, and related service to the University, College, and Department.

Service activities that involve public engagement or are multidisciplinary or multicultural in character in ways consistent with the University, College, and Department mission must be recognized.

III. Probationary Faculty

A. Annual Review of Progress of Probationary Faculty.

1. Under the *Faculty Tenure* policy the progress of probationary faculty must be reviewed annually by the tenured faculty of the Department. The basis of the review is an accomplishment file containing evidence of an individual's research, teaching, and service accomplishments for the previous year. The accomplishment file should also include the individual's curriculum vitae together with any additional statements which the individual wishes to make. Individual's whose accomplishments include research, teaching, or service activities involving public engagement or had a multidisciplinary or

multicultural character are encouraged to include a description of this work (additional information on supporting documentation appears in Sections 5 through 8 of the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*). Annual reviews of the progress of probationary faculty will occur in the spring semester of each year.

2. The accomplishment file is first reviewed by a three-person synopsis committee of tenured faculty within the Department who are appointed by the Department Chair and are senior in rank to those being reviewed. Individuals being reviewed may suggest up to three faculty members for membership on the synopsis committee, but at least one member of the committee will be a faculty member not suggested by the individual. The synopsis committee shall meet and summarize the individual's strengths and areas in need of improvement as reflected in the accomplishment file, and prepare a detailed synopsis report of that file in order to ensure a complete and accurate portrayal of the individual's work and progress. Members of the synopsis committee shall be guided in their judgments by the standards for accomplishment outlined in sections A, B, C, and D of **part II** of this document, and by the Department expectations for the individual. The synopsis committee is also charged with actively mentoring the individual through the review process. This would typically include conferring with the individual and recommending modifications in the accomplishment file when that seems appropriate.
3. The synopsis report and all related documents, including a description of the synopsis committee procedures, shall be brought in writing to the Department Chair. The Department Chair does not approve or edit the committee's final synopsis report, but the Chair may review drafts of the report to insure adequate coverage of important content related to the individual's work. Individual's being reviewed may examine the synopsis prepared by the synopsis committee and suggest changes of a factual nature.
4. A meeting of Department faculty to review an individual's accomplishments and the report of the synopsis committee shall be scheduled by the Department Chair. Faculty senior in rank to the candidate will meet to review the synopsis report and general qualifications of the individual and to vote on whatever matter is to be decided. Written notice of the agenda, a roster of faculty eligible to vote, and time and place of the meeting shall be distributed at least three weeks in advance to all Department faculty eligible to vote, and shall include notice of the location of the individual's accomplishment file to be reviewed by voting faculty prior to the meeting. After reviewing the individual's accomplishments and the synopsis committee report eligible faculty will vote on the continuation of a faculty member's probationary status. The faculty vote on the continuation of an individual's probationary status is advisory to the faculty and Chair and will be used to guide the Department's recommendation for an individual's probationary status.
5. All eligible faculty are expected to attend the review and voting session of the Department unless they have submitted a written statement justifying their absence. Faculty members eligible to vote who are absent from campus shall receive notice of the meeting and are expected to vote by absentee ballot provided they have full information

on the individual. Absentee ballots should be submitted to the Department Chair in a sealed envelope prior to the Department meeting at which the vote will be taken. Absentee ballots received after the Departmental vote shall not be valid. Proxy votes or telephone votes are not permitted. Absentee faculty who wish to comment about their votes shall put their comments in writing and may request that these comments be read following the synopsis committee report at the Department meeting. Valid absentee ballots shall be combined with ballots of those present at the meeting. The Chair shall retain all ballots cast, together with any written statements from faculty and shall make the vote and statements available for examination by the individual being reviewed, or any voting member of the faculty upon written request.

6. In accordance with the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*, the Department Chair will prepare the appraisal section of the President's Form 12 and submit this form to the Dean. The Department Chair will also schedule a meeting with each probationary faculty member before the end of the Spring semester to discuss the appraisal.

B. Annual Merit Review of Probationary Faculty

Annual merit reviews for probationary faculty will be based on the following process:

1. Probationary faculty will submit a completed Faculty Activity Report (<http://intranet.cehd.umn.edu/services/far/>), detailing their activities for the previous year.
2. An individual's Faculty Accomplishment Form, accomplishment file, and the synopsis committee's report will be reviewed by the Department Chair and a Departmental Annual Faculty Review Committee (AFRC), which will consist of tenured faculty recommended by faculty in each program area. However, membership on AFRC is contingent on approval by the Chair. The Chair is also a member of AFRC.
3. The AFRC will recommend to the Department Chair a rating of each faculty member based on accomplishments in research, teaching, and service for the year under review. The AFRC ratings will be used by the Chair to make salary recommendations to the Dean.
4. The Chair will provide opportunities for probationary faculty who wish to meet to discuss the salary recommendations.

C. Extending the Probationary Period

Section 5 of *Faculty Tenure* states that the maximum period of probationary service is six academic years. However, probationary faculty have the right to request the tenure clock be stopped in certain circumstances (e.g. childbirth/adoption, caregiver responsibilities, and personal injury or illness). When considering the work of probationary faculty who have stopped the tenure clock, criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than the criteria for those who do not have an extension to the tenure clock. Specifically, “time in position” and “time since degree” should be considered as *not* including time when the tenure clock has been stopped. Readers should consult section 5.5 of *Faculty Tenure* for details (See Appendix A).

D. Probationary Faculty Seeking Tenure

The Department affirms that probationary faculty may initiate review for tenure prior to the end of the probationary period for themselves, based solely on performance and accomplishments as detailed in this document. The Department Chair will inform probationary faculty of his or her option for full review in the Spring of each year. Individuals interested in initiating full review will submit a brief written request and updated curriculum vitae to all tenured faculty for consideration. A simple majority of tenured faculty voting is needed to initiate this full review.

Tenure promotion decisions will adhere to the following process as well as to those described in Section 9 of the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*:

1. Candidates for tenure must develop an accomplishment file whose structure and contents should be guided by their synopsis committee and the Department Chair. Relevant information to be considered in tenure decisions should include, but is not limited to, the following:
 - a. Evidence of a candidate’s research accomplishments.
 - b. Evaluations of the candidate's research by persons inside and outside of the University.
 - c. Evaluations of the candidate's teaching accomplishments.
 - d. Evaluations of the candidate's service accomplishments.
 - e. Copies of the candidate’s synopsis report for all previous years.
 - f. The candidate's curriculum vitae.
 - g. Material supplied by the candidate in elaboration of their performance, which shall be identified as such, for example, documentation of external funding from sources outside the University by competition. Candidates whose accomplishments include research, teaching, or service that involves public

engagement or has a multidisciplinary or multicultural character should include a description of this work in a statement in their accomplishment file.

Sections 5 through 8 of the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty* describe the annual review of probationary faculty.

2. Candidates seeking tenure must, as described in *Faculty Tenure*, have their accomplishments evaluated by appropriate colleagues outside the University. Specific practices for identifying appropriate external reviewers are as follows: A total of 5-10 external reviewers will be identified by members of the synopsis committee in consultation with other faculty within the Department senior in rank to the candidate. External reviewers will be asked to review a candidate's work using guidelines developed by the Department Chair. A minimum of five external reviews of a candidate's work is needed. Additional letters from colleagues within the University are not required but may be sought by the candidate or the synopsis committee. The relationship, if any, between a candidate and internal or external reviewers should be described in any correspondence involving the reviews. See the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*, Section 12 for Requirements about the relationship between the candidate and the external reviewers.
3. A meeting of Department faculty to review a candidate's accomplishments and the report of the synopsis committee shall be scheduled by the Department Chair. Tenured faculty senior in rank to the candidate will meet to review the synopsis report and general qualifications of the candidate and to vote on whatever matter is to be decided. Written notice of the agenda, a roster of faculty eligible to vote, and time and place of the meeting shall be distributed at least three weeks in advance to all Department faculty eligible to vote, and shall include notice of the location of the candidate's accomplishment file to be reviewed by voting faculty prior to the meeting. At the meeting the candidate's accomplishments and the synopsis committee report will be reviewed, followed by eligible faculty voting on the awarding of tenure.
4. All eligible faculty are expected to attend the review and voting session of the Department unless they have submitted a written statement justifying their absence. Faculty members eligible to vote who are absent from campus shall receive notice of the meeting and are expected to vote provided they have full information on the candidate. Faculty who will be absent from the meeting but who wish to participate in the vote can submit a written absentee ballot, which should be sent to the Department Chair in a sealed envelope prior to the meeting at which the vote will be taken. Proxy votes or telephone votes are not permitted. Absentee faculty who wish to comment about their votes shall put their comments in writing and may request that these comments be read following the synopsis committee report at the Department meeting. Absentee ballots received after the Departmental vote shall not be valid. The Chair shall retain all ballots cast, together with any written statements from faculty and shall make the vote and statements available for examination by the candidate, or any voting member of the faculty upon written request.

5. All votes will be in writing by secret ballot. Two faculty members designated by but not including the Chair shall tally all votes. All faculty members voting in a particular case will be requested, immediately after voting, to write statements which may be used in interpreting the decision to the individual involved. Individual faculty members may also file signed statements concerning their votes within a period of not less than three (3) days following any particular vote in which they were a participant. These statements shall be made available, upon request, to the candidate under review.
6. For decisions on tenure a 2/3 majority of those voting constitutes a faculty recommendation.
7. The Chair of the Department shall submit to the Dean, or other appropriate academic officer a letter which shall include: (a) a statement of the votes cast for each recommendation, including the number of positive votes, the number present who abstained and the number of those entitled to vote who did not because of absence; (b) a Departmental recommendation based upon a 2/3 majority among those who voted for tenure; (c) a statement of grounds upon which the majority view and recommendation rest; (d) a statement of any minority view that has substantial support, with the grounds upon which it rests; and (e) a statement whether the Chair agrees with the majority position and, if not, why not. Faculty who voted may review the Chair's letter upon request.

IV. Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to Associate Professor is predicated on a candidate satisfying tenure standards in research, teaching, and service. A candidate who satisfies tenure standards is ordinarily promoted to Associate Professor. Promotion to Associate Professor requires the support of a simple majority of the faculty eligible to vote.

V. Promotion to Professor

Evaluations related to promotion to Professor are based on section 9.2 of *Faculty Tenure*.

1. Achieving the rank of Professor is an expectation of faculty. In addition to criteria used for an Associate Professor appointment, promotion to Professor requires that the candidate has added substantially to an already distinguished record of academic achievement and established the national or international reputation ordinarily resulting from such distinction and achievement. It is also expected that the candidate will have distinguished themselves in their teaching and service to the University, College, and the Department. Research, teaching, and service activities that involve public engagement or are multidisciplinary or multicultural in character in ways consistent with the University, College, and Department mission will also have that work recognized.
2. Decisions concerning promotion to Professor will adhere to the same general process described in **part III** numbers 1-5. Evidence supporting promotion to Professor would

typically include, but not be limited to:

- a. Scholarly work with important implications for the discipline.
 - b. Participation on, or leadership of, prestigious state, national, or international panels, advisory boards, task forces, symposia, presentations, etc.; invited scholarly lectures; scholarly awards for excellence in the discipline, editorship of a prestigious journal.
 - c. Documentation of teaching excellence, for example, student course evaluations, student letters, letters documenting peer evaluations of a candidate's teaching; teaching awards; student advising.
 - d. Significant record of institutional service which includes administrative, committee, and related service to the University, College, and Department, or disciplinary service as described above.
3. For decisions on promotion to Professor a vote of support from a simple majority of faculty eligible to vote will constitute a faculty recommendation.

VI. Annual Review of Tenured Faculty

The Department complies with **Section 7a of *Faculty Tenure*** which requires that the performance of tenured faculty be evaluated annually. The evaluation of tenured faculty is also used by the Department Chair to make salary recommendations to the Dean. The following procedure will govern these annual reviews:

- a. Annual reviews of tenured faculty will occur in the spring semester of each year.
- b. Faculty will submit a completed Faculty Activity Report (<http://intranet.cehd.umn.edu/services/far/>), detailing their activities for the previous year.
- c. Accomplishments will be reviewed by the Department Chair and a Departmental Annual Faculty Review Committee (AFRC), which will consist of tenured faculty recommended by faculty in each program area. However, membership on AFRC is contingent on approval by the Chair. The Chair is also a member of AFRC.
- d. The AFRC will recommend to the Department Chair a rating of faculty based on faculty accomplishments in research, teaching, and service for the year under review. The AFRC ratings will be used by the Chair to make salary recommendations to the Dean.
- e. The Chair will provide opportunities for faculty who wish to meet to discuss the review of the faculty member's accomplishments and salary recommendation.

VII. Post-Tenure Review

As part of the due-process system for faculty review, the Department of Educational Psychology has adopted a two-phase procedure for post-tenure review that is consistent with the Section 7a of *Faculty Tenure*.

One phase involves annual reviews of tenured faculty (described elsewhere in this document). The second phase involves the following procedure:

1. A departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC) will be elected by the tenured faculty. The department PTRC will be comprised of 3 tenured faculty members at the rank of Professor. One alternate, at the same rank, will also be elected to serve on the PTRC in instances where a member of the committee is being reviewed. Members of the committee, including the alternate, will be elected to the PTRC by majority vote of the tenured faculty and will serve three-year terms.
2. If during the annual review of the faculty, the Department Chair or the AFRC, in consultation with the faculty member's Program Coordinator, find a faculty member's performance to be substantially below the goals and expectations of the Department in any aspect of their performance, the Chair will meet with the faculty member about his or her performance.
3. Written documentation of the Chair's assessment will be entered into the faculty member's file. A copy of this documentation will be provided to the faculty member, who will have the opportunity to respond and have the response maintained in his or her file along with the Chair's assessment.
 - a. **1st Year:** A faculty member so identified in VII2 above may, for the first year, meet with the departmental PTRC for the purpose of reviewing the Chair's assessment or to obtain assistance in planning steps for improvement.
 - b. **2nd Year:** A faculty member so identified in VII2 above for a second year in a row must meet with the PTRC to review the faculty member's performance and for assistance in planning steps for improvement.
 - c. **3rd Year:** A faculty member so identified in VII2 above for a third year in a row must meet with the PTRC Committee, and the Chair will ask the Dean to conduct a special review of the faculty member.

Adopted by the Department of Educational Psychology, January 23, 2008.

Approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost March 30, 2008

Appendix A

5.5 Exception For New Parent Or Caregiver, Or for Personal Medical Reasons. The maximum period of probationary service will be extended by one year at the request of a probationary faculty member:

1. On the occasion of the birth of that faculty member's child or adoptive/foster placement of a child with that faculty member; or
2. When the faculty member is a major caregiver for a family member[2] who has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition. A faculty member may use this provision no more than two times; or
3. When the faculty member has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition.

The request for extension 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.