

ACADEMIC FACULTY

APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY

June 2010

School of Public Health

University of Minnesota

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 June 28, 2010

Amendments to University of Minnesota *Faculty Tenure* policy:

Special note should be taken of Interpretation #6 – Interpretation of Subsection 7.11: Consideration of Factors Other than Primary Tenure Criteria, which was approved June 9, 2000, as it pertains to the School of Public Health’s 7.12 Statement (*Academic Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Policy*).

6. Interpretation of Subsection 7.11: Consideration of Factors Other than Primary Tenure Criteria

The use of any factor other than teaching, research, and service in making the decision about a probationary faculty member must be specifically stated and justified at the time of the decision. This rule applies both when that factor is a criterion for judging the candidate’s progress and when it is an element in establishing or modifying the standard which the faculty member should achieve.

The faculty of an academic unit are expected to periodically review their criteria for awarding indefinite tenure 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 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.

Contact the SPH Dean’s Office, 624-6669, with questions regarding the *Faculty Tenure* policy.

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	3
	1. Instructor	3
	2. Assistant Professor	3
	3. Associate Professor	3
	4. Professor	3
	B. Procedures	3
	1. Search Process	3
	2. Documentation	3
	a) Search Committee Summary	3
	b) Candidate's Background and Experience	3
	c) Faculty Eligible to Vote	4
	d) Division Faculty Review and Vote	4
	e) Division Head's Review and Report	4
	f) APT Review, Vote and Report	5
	g) SPH Faculty Review, Vote and Report	5
	h) Dean's Review and Report	6
	i) Rights of the Candidate	6
IV.	<u>Annual Appraisals of Probationary Faculty</u>	6
	A. Standards	7
	B. Procedures	7
	1. Documentation	7
	a) Table of Contents	7
	b) Statement of Assurance	7
	c) Collegiate Unit Letters	8
	d) Record of Vote	8
	e) Annual Appraisals	8
	f) Curriculum Vitae	8
	g) Summary and Documentation of Scholarly Activity	8
	h) Summary and Documentation of Teaching Experience	9
	i) Summary and Documentation of Service	10
	j) Reprints	11
	k) Other Relevant Materials	11
	2. Faculty Eligible to Vote	11
	3. Division Faculty Review and Vote	11
	4. Division Head Letter and Division Report	11
	5. APT Review, Vote and Report	11
	6. SPH Faculty Review, Vote and Report	11
	7. Dean's Review and Report	12
	8. Rights of Candidate	12

V.	<u>Conferral of Indefinite Tenure</u>	12
	A. Criteria	12
	B. Procedures	13
	1. Documentation	13
	2. Faculty Eligible to Vote	13
	3. Division Faculty Review and Vote	13
	4. Division Head Letter and Division Report	14
	5. APT Review, Vote and Report	14
	6. SPH Faculty Review, Vote and Report	14
	7. Dean's Review and Report	14
	8. Rights of Candidate	14
	C. Extending Probationary Period	14
VI.	<u>Promotion</u>	14
	A. Standards	14
	1. Assistant Professor	14
	2. Associate Professor	15
	a) Teaching	15
	b) Research	15
	c) Service	15
	3. Professor	15
	a) Teaching	15
	b) Research	16
	c) Service	16
	B. Procedures	16
	1. Documentation	16
	2. Faculty Eligible to Vote	17
	3. Division Faculty Review and Vote	17
	4. Division Head Letter and Division Report	17
	5. APT Review, Vote and Report	18
	6. SPH Faculty Review, Vote and Report	18
	7. Dean's Review and Report	18
	8. Rights of the Candidate	18
VII.	General Procedures	18
VIII.	Membership and Function of the APT Committee	19
IX.	Ad Hoc Review Committee	19
X.	Annual & Regular Review of Tenured Faculty and Post-Tenure Review	19
XI.	Evaluation of Faculty with Joint Appointments in Other Schools	21

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

Revised 12/17/09

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 also 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, 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.

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
An initial appointment to the rank of associate professor generally requires the same accomplishments in teaching, research and service as the criteria for promotion within the School [cf. Section IV.A.2. (pp.16-17)]. If a candidate has 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 faculty for their vote.
4. Professor
An initial appointment to the rank of professor generally requires the same accomplishments in teaching, research and service as the criteria for promotion within the School [cf. Section VI.A.3. (pp. 17-18)]. If 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 faculty for their vote.

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 and Vote
Each 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 APT Committee members from the Division shall notify the Division Head in writing of any issues which might be of concern to the APT Committee as a whole.
- e. Division Head's Review and Report
The Division Head shall write a brief 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. The Division Head's letter must also indicate the proposed date of appointment, and, for candidates who do not have an earned 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 must be attached to the letter. The proposed length of the probationary period must be stated in the report and, if approved, must be stated in the letter of offer to the candidate.

f. APT Review, Vote and Report

The APT Committee must review and vote on all initial regular faculty appointments proposed for tenure or at the rank of associate professor and above.

After full evaluation, 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

The SPH faculty eligible to vote must review and vote on all regular faculty appointments.

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 at least one month 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 vote of the faculty shall be taken by individual written, unsigned ballots. The recommendation of the faculty should be determined by a tabulation of the ballots. A quorum is defined as 50% + 1 of the faculty eligible to vote. In order to effect a valid recommendation to the Dean, at least 80% of SPH faculty eligible to vote must vote. The vote of a majority of the SPH faculty who cast votes is required to effect a valid recommendation 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, the number of absentee ballots cast, 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 present but abstaining
 - 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 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 Report

The Dean must review and make recommendations for all faculty appointments. After review of the report from the APT Chair and the documentation supporting it, the Dean shall forward the faculty recommendation to the Office of the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences, Academic Health Center, with all the documentation received, together with the Dean's approval or disapproval of the recommendation. If both the faculty and the Dean disapprove, 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.

All probationary faculty shall be reviewed annually during years 1-6 of the probationary period (an Academic year is defined in the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* (Section 5.3). The review in Year 6 is for promotion or discontinuance. The purposes of this review 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 Division 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 VI. (pp. 16-20)] and tenure [cf. Section V. (pp. 13-16)] or for discontinuation. The APT Committee will review the candidate in years 2-6. 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

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 June 1 of the previous year 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. (See Sections 5 and 6 of the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*.)

- a. Table of Contents
- b. Statement of Assurance
The candidate shall be given the opportunity to examine the documentation to be submitted for review. 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.
- c. Collegiate Unit Letters
Include the division head letter and the report of the division faculty vote here. The School of Public Health Dean's Office will add the Collegiate Unit's Statement of Assurance, the APT Committee report, and the letter from the Dean to the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences to this section.
- d. Record of Vote
Include the Division Record of Vote here. The School of Public Health Dean's Office will add the School of Public Health Faculty Record of Vote to this section.
- e. Annual Appraisals
Copies of the completed Appraisals of Probationary Faculty (President's Form 12) for each of the probationary years. Include the Form 12 for "stop-the-clock" years when applicable.
- f. Curriculum Vitae
This section shall be in the form of a complete curriculum vitae [cf. Section III.B.2.b. (p.4)]:
- g. 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 June 1 of the previous year 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 June 1 of the

previous year 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. AJP 65: 433-42, 1989. (Analyzed data and wrote manuscript.)

- 3) A cumulative and dated list of all grants or contracts obtained, including 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).. Note which grants or contracts are internal or external to the university. Use an asterisk (*) to identify grants or contracts awarded since June 1 of the previous year or since the date of appointment to the current position, whichever is more recent.
- 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.

h. 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 June 1 of the previous year 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 teaching/ instructional/educational effort.
- 2) A cumulative and dated list of all teaching activities. Use an asterisk (*) to identify work done since June 1 of the previous year or since the date of appointment to the current position, 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 or other formal measurement tools for evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

(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.

i. 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 June 1 of the previous year 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 June 1 of the previous year 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;
 - (c) Other professional community service, including presentations to community groups, activities in committee work, and other things done for non-professional outside organizations.
- j. Reprints
Reprints of any publications (not to exceed three) since June 1 of the previous year 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.
- k. 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 and Vote

Each proposal for continuation 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.

4. Division Head Letter and Division Report

The Division Head shall write a letter stating his/her personal evaluation of the candidate's progress toward promotion and/or tenure, and a separate report of the Division faculty discussion and vote, 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. The Division head will use the President's Form 12 as the official annual feedback form for the review.

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 2-6 to the SPH faculty eligible to vote. The Division Head is responsible for making the recommendation for candidates in year 1. 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 Section III.B.2.g. (pp. 5-7), with one modification:

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.

7. Dean's Review and Report

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 Health Sciences, Academic Health Center.

8. Rights of the Candidate

In addition to the rights assured in Section III.B.2.i. (p. 7), 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. 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 [1]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [2]. The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision [3]. 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>

[1] "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.

[2] 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.

[3] 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. Separate votes for promotion and tenure must be taken.

3. Division Faculty Review and Vote

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.

4. Division Head Letter and Division Report

The Division Head shall write a letter stating his/her personal evaluation of the candidate's progress toward tenure and a separate report of the Division faculty discussion and vote, justifying tenure with components of the APT Policy.

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 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.5 (p. 13), 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. 5-7).

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. (p.7).

8. Rights of the Candidate

The rights of candidates for tenure shall be the same as for candidates for continuation, presented in Section IV.B.8. (p. 13).

- C. Extending the Probationary Period. Refer to section 5.5 of the Tenure Code

VI. 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.

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.

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).

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 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. The names of at least fifteen (15) possible external reviewers, 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 following criteria should be taken into consideration when identifying potential reviewers:

- 1) Distinguished faculty or, occasionally, highly regarded non-academics.
- 2) 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.
- 3) Ability to provide an impartial and evaluative review of the candidate's qualifications and accomplishments.
- 4) 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: advisor, mentor, co-author, collaborator, or past co-worker. (See Section 12 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.)

5) 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 Health Sciences.

b. 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.

- c. 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.
 - d. The requirements for reprints and evaluations of teaching should reflect the period since the date of appointment or promotion to the current rank.
 - e. 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 and Vote
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.
 4. Division Head Letter and Division Report
The Division Head shall write a letter stating his/her personal evaluation of the candidate's progress toward promotion and/or tenure and a separate report of the Division faculty discussion and vote, 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.
 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.

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. 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 Academic Health Center. 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.

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. 5-7).
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 II.B.2.h. (p.7).
8. Rights of the Candidate
The rights of candidates for promotion shall be the same as for candidates for continuation, presented in Section IV.B.8. (p. 13).

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).

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 at meetings 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 Health Sciences 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 committee (APT) is the elected faculty body of the SPH responsible for post tenure reviews by the faculty.

In the School of Public Health, post tenure review occurs under two circumstances:

(1) 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 VI. A. 2-3. 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: on an annual basis, the Division Heads will provide the Dean with a formal report of all annual reviews of faculty and describe faculty members who may not be achieving School-defined expectations. After 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. 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 (APT) Committee which will initiate an APT review.

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.

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. 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 Health Sciences to initiate a special review as described in the Section 7a of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*.

(2) Five-Year Review of Tenured Faculty. Every five years, each tenured faculty member will submit to the School's APT Committee the standard documentation, minus all letters of reference or recommendation, used by the APT Committee for appointment, continuation, promotion, and tenure recommendations. A copy of the annual reviews by the Division Head over the preceding five years should be included as part of the faculty member's documentation. The Five Year APT Review is independent of the Division Head's review, but builds on the faculty member's progress in teaching, research, and service. The same procedures described for the Annual Review at the Unit level apply in the Five Year Review following the APT review.

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

APPENDIX I

Review Process for Faculty Promotions, Tenure, and Continuations

Regular Faculty Positions (P or N)		
<i>Promotion to:</i>	<i>APT review?</i>	<i>SPH faculty eligible to vote</i>
Professor P or N	Yes (only full professors)	Professor Ps
Associate Professor P or N	Yes	Associate and Full Professor Ps
<i>Tenure granted:</i>	<i>APT review?</i>	<i>SPH faculty eligible to vote</i>
Professor	Yes (only full professors)	Professor Ps
Associate Professor	Yes	Associate and Full Professor Ps
<i>Continuation as:</i>	<i>APT review?</i>	<i>SPH faculty eligible to vote</i>
Associate or Assistant Professor N	Yes (years 2-6 of tenure-track)	Associate and Full Professor Ps

Note: In instances involving promotion AND tenure, separate votes on promotion and tenure must be taken.

APPENDIX II

Review Process for New Faculty Appointments

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

Note: In instances involving tenure, separate votes on rank 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

Faculty Tenure:

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

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>

Administrative Policy on Academic Appointments:

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

Companion Document to Administrative Policy on Academic Appointments:

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

Academic Health Center promotion and tenure guidelines:

<http://www.ahceducation.umn.edu/OofE/Faculty/PandT.html>

School of Public Health faculty directory:

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