This document describes with more specificity the indices and standards that will be used to evaluate whether or not candidates meet the general criteria for tenure and promotion for the Center of Learning Innovation at the University of Minnesota Rochester according to the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*. The general criteria for tenure are described in section 7.11 shown in Appendix A; the indices and standards for promotion to professor are given in Section 9.2 of the same Regents policy (see Appendix B). For a complete overview, the reader is advised to review sections 7 and 9 in their entirety. In matters of tenure and promotion, the University of Minnesota Rochester follows the “Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or tenure: Tenure Track or Tenured Faculty.”

The document contains indices and standards for the following personnel evaluations:

- annual reviews of probationary faculty
- recommendation for awarding indefinite tenure
- recommendation for promotion
- annual performance appraisal for post tenure review according to Section 7a of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*

**I. Center for Learning Innovation**

Since the University of Minnesota Rochester does not have departments or colleges, the Center for Learning Innovation (CLI) will serve as the academic unit.

The CLI is an administrative structure designed to promote a learner-centered, competency-based learning environment in which ongoing assessment guides and monitors student learning and is the basis for data-driven research on learning. The Center seeks to bring insights from the cognitive sciences to bear on student learning. It leads the development of an integrated curriculum for a baccalaureate degree in the health sciences where the classroom extends beyond the four walls of a lecture hall and will serve as a laboratory for learning.

*The mission of the Center is to advance learner-centered, technology-enhanced, competency-based, assessment-driven, and community-integrated education in the health sciences through cognitive science-based, innovative learning approaches.*
II. Criteria for Tenure

The CLI follows the policies of the University of Minnesota as outlined in the “Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty.” The length of the probationary period for the CLI and UMR is eight years, with a ninth terminal year for those who do not achieve indefinite tenure. The rationale to extend the traditional six year probationary period to eight years is to mitigate any uncertainties associated with the growth of a new campus. With many new faculty as colleagues and emerging new programs, that could hinder the development of success of candidates. A longer probationary period does not preclude a faculty member requesting to be considered for promotion and tenure during an earlier review cycle, nor does it preclude extending the probationary period as described in section 5.5, Exception for a New Parent Or Caregiver, Or for Personal Medical Reasons” in the appendix. However, an earlier review must follow the process and outcomes as described in the “Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure Track or Tenured Faculty.”

The achievement of the CLI mission requires a faculty who are recognized leaders in the area of student learning at the postsecondary level; who develop and implement cognitive models for student learning informed by research; and who disseminate research that is recognized by peers to advance knowledge in the scholarship of learning. Given the necessary interplay between practice and research in the study of student learning, the successful candidate for tenure will demonstrate excellence in both teaching and research. It is also expected that the pattern of accomplishments would suggest that the faculty member would provide leadership to the inquiry of learning during the remainder of the tenured career.

The judgment of excellence in teaching and research is based on both qualitative and quantitative assessments. Examples are provided below. The standards for research are defined by national and international benchmarks, whereas the standards for teaching and student learning will be measured against targets set by the CLI pertaining to learning efficiency and effectiveness resulting from learning modules designed by the faculty member. The list below is meant to provide examples of the evidence that may be used by a candidate, promotion and tenure committees, and central leadership in the evaluation of a case.

The qualitative and quantitative standards for tenure and promotion must be met by faculty regardless of a stoppage of the tenure clock or early consideration for promotion. Extension of the probationary period in accordance with Section 5.5 may not be a factor in the evaluation. For more information, see the appendix section 5.5, “Exception For New Parent Or Caregiver, Or for Personal Medical Reasons.”

A. Teaching and Learning

The evaluation of probationary faculty will include a summary of the candidate’s teaching assignments, evaluation of learning modules and their assessment components, and the candidate’s ability to integrate curricular materials across the curriculum. The Center for
Learning Innovation requires student evaluations of each course by its faculty. Senior faculty will provide regular feedback on teaching, including but not limited to classroom performance.

The learning modules developed by the probationary faculty member will be evaluated. The evaluation may include evidence concerning:

- Student progress toward achievement of both overall learning outcomes and specific learning objectives;
- Effectiveness of the learning modules in supporting student achievement of learning objectives relative to pre-test measures;
- The capacity of the learning modules to accommodate diverse learning styles;
- The integrative learning experiences embedded in the learning modules;
- The appropriate modifications of the learning modules made over time that incorporate student feedback, and better strategies informed by data to improve effectiveness and efficiency of the learning modules in the achievement of learning outcomes and objectives;
- The development and dissemination of innovative strategies that promote student learning; and
- The participation in the achievement and assessment of overall learning outcomes.

The nature of the faculty-to-faculty, faculty-to-staff, and faculty-to-student interactions will be evaluated for the probationary faculty member. This evaluation may include evidence concerning:

- The development and oversight of community-based learning activities for students;
- The timeliness and the structure of the feedback provided to group-based student projects;
- The advisement, mentorship, and supervision associated with student capstone experiences;
- Letters from former students who have participated in the group learning activities; and
- The capacity to work as a team member and interact effectively with the teaching specialists, affiliated faculty, and post-doctoral fellows.

If appropriate, the advisement and mentorship of postdoctoral fellows who have worked with the probationary faculty member in the design and implementation of the learning modules will be evaluated. Hence, the evaluation may include letters from former postdoctoral fellows.

**B. Research**

The primary research of the probationary faculty member should make significant contributions to advance the field of inquiry of student learning, especially as it pertains to the understanding of principles and concepts in the life, physical, social, and quantitative sciences and the humanities. The secondary research area must be associated with the faculty member’s disciplinary/content area. The purpose of the participation by the probationary faculty member in a secondary research area is to assure currency in a disciplinary field and content area.
The primary research program of the probationary faculty member may be evaluated by:

- The publication of scholarly works in refereed, disciplinary or interdisciplinary journals;
- The significant participation in extramurally funded, peer-reviewed research;
- The highly favorable evaluations of grant proposals that were either funded or not funded because of lack of funding by the grant agency;
- The presentations of research results at scientific meetings; and
- Strong extramural letters of recommendation from prominent peer researchers who attest to the high quality of research contributions and the impact and the leadership of the probationary faculty member in the field of student learning.

The standards for research productivity for all probationary faculty will be uniform. The frequency of research publication will be evaluated within the context of the quality of each publication, by its comprehensiveness, by the importance of its contribution to fundamental questions surrounding student learning, and by the time required to obtain results.

Faculty should seek venues to communicate their research results that will lead to a national or international reputation. This may be accomplished by publishing some research findings in journals with a broader readership or high visibility, or by presenting at conferences that attract participants from the broader community.

Collaborative work is encouraged, and it is recognized that senior authorship will be less frequent in multi-authored studies than for more independent research. Faculty involved in collaborative work must explain their role in multi-authored publications and are encouraged to take a leadership role in some of the multi-authored publications.

Also, in recognition of the collaborative nature of research in student learning, lead-PI status by a probationary faculty member on collaborative grants is not required. However, if all grants of the probationary faculty are collaborative, the faculty member should have played a major role in some of the collaborative grants.

The secondary research program of the probationary faculty member may be evaluated by:

- Attendance at disciplinary-based conferences;
- Participation in multi-investigator research projects; and
- Participation in disciplinary-based workshops.

The probationary faculty member must provide evidence that he or she has been actively engaged with their content area of expertise in ways that assure an understanding of the current trends and practices in the disciplinary area.
C. Service

The probationary faculty will be asked to provide service to the campus and the CLI, such as membership on committees whose charge is within the expertise of the faculty member and serve the mission of the CLI or the campus. Nonetheless, such service, even though necessary to the campus and CLI to function, is not a sufficient condition to award tenure.

Service activities for groups external to the University that is related to the educational and research mission of the CLI is not a prerequisite for awarding of tenure, but outstanding external service related to the mission of the CLI will be a positive consideration in a decision to award tenure.

III. Promotion

A. To Associate Professor

Promotion to this rank is concomitant with a decision to award tenure. Standards for tenure are set forth in Section II above. The decision in the promotion to Associate Professor and the awarding of tenure is based on evidence that a faculty member is on track to eventually meet the standards for promotion to Professor.

B. To Professor

The general criteria for promotion to professor are shown in the appendix section 9.2, “Criteria for Promotion to Professor.” In the Center for Learning Innovation, the promotion to the rank of Professor requires that the faculty member establish a national, and if appropriate, an international scholarly reputation in the field of student learning. The evidence sought for consideration for promotion to Professor includes:

- Leadership in the scholarship of learning, as evidenced by letters from authorities assessing the candidate’s scholarly contributions;
- Establishment of training programs for pre- and postdoctoral trainees that has resulted in placing trainees in academic or other positions in their fields;
- Development of an international reputation through invitations to symposia, election to prestigious societies, or holding offices in prominent international societies, if such opportunities avail themselves in the area of student learning; and
- Significant service contribution to the mission of the CLI, the campus, and the University of Minnesota.

In recognition of the different roles and levels of experience individuals have at different career stages, service expected for promotion to Associate Professor is different from promotion to Professor. Roles for faculty who are being considered for promotion to Professor are expected to include service to the broader university and scientific communities.
IV. Procedures

The CLI complies with the “Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure Track or Tenured Faculty.”

A. Mentoring Committee

Each probationary faculty member will be assigned a mentoring committee. It is the intent that the mentoring committee be comprised of three tenured faculty members, and it is likely that some members may be from another campus of the University of Minnesota. The committee members will be assigned by the Director of the CLI within the first year of appointment. However, since initially there will be few tenured faculty at the University of Minnesota Rochester who can serve as members of the mentoring committee, some of the duties of mentorship will necessarily be performed by the Director of the CLI. It is also the intent for the membership on the mentoring committee to remain constant during the probationary period in order to establish continuity and a better understanding by the committee members of the evolving portfolio of work by the probationary faculty member. However, the Director of the CLI may elect to change the membership (add, remove or replace members) for appropriate reasons during the probationary period.

The role of the mentoring committee is to:

- Provide advice and feedback on the teaching and research activities by the faculty members throughout the probationary period;
- Conduct on an annual basis a report on the progress of the probationary faculty member toward tenure and promotion, and provide the report to the Director of the CLI (see B below);
- Conduct a substantive fourth year review, and provide the mid-period report to the Director of the CLI (see C below); and
- Assist the Director of the CLI to prepare the dossier for consideration of tenure and promotion to associate professor (see D below).

The CLI will provide mentoring opportunities for Associate Professors as so requested by and individualized for the faculty member.

B. Annual Review

Probationary faculty will be reviewed annually. The Director of the CLI will request the following materials in order to conduct the annual review. The materials should be gathered by the faculty member and copies provided to the mentoring committee and the Director of the CLI.
The annual report should contain the following materials. Additional materials may be submitted by the probationary faculty member.

- **Biographical Data**
  - Education
  - Positions held
  - Honors and fellowships

- **Essay summarizing research, educational, and other scholarly activities of the prior year and plans for the upcoming year (1-3 pages).** If appropriate, the essay should describe the connection between the development and implementation of the learning modules and the candidate’s research on student learning.

- **Teaching and Learning Activities:**
  - A listing of the learning modules that were developed or modified in the previous year.
  - Any data collected on the assessment of the learning modules.
  - A list of postdoctoral advisees and a description of mentoring activities.

- **Primary and Secondary Research Activities**
  - A list of past (accepted and declined), current, and pending grant proposals, including duration, foundation name, title of proposal, and award amounts, including a description of the role the probationary faculty played in the grant and authorship.
  - A list of publications (published, in press, and submitted publications, manuscripts in preparation) with an explanation of the role the probationary faculty played.
  - A list of contributed talks and posters at scientific meetings, invited seminars, invited symposia and workshops, public lectures, including those declined.

- **A list of service activities, including those declined (center, campus, or University of Minnesota committees), external committees, service on national panels, manuscript and proposal reviews.**

- **Any other material relevant for the evaluation**

The mentoring committee will review the materials and submit a report to the Director on the progress on the faculty member toward promotion and tenure. The Director of the CLI will share the report with any other tenured faculty members in the CLI who are not part of the mentoring committee. The Director of the CLI shares the report with the probationary faculty, and the report is the basis of the report on the President’s Form 12, which is placed in the candidate’s file. If a probationary faculty has an appointment in another department, and if the CLI at UMR is the primary academic appointment home, the CLI is responsible for conducting the annual review. Its director will seek input from the other units and share the report with the appropriate leader of the other unit(s). If CLI is not the tenure home, CLI will provide an annual evaluation, but the materials requested may differ from the ones required in CLI to be consistent with the criteria in the tenure home of the probationary faculty.
If the probationary faculty member wishes to stop the tenure clock for reasons related to being a new parent or caregiver, or for personal reasons, the faculty member should refer to Section 5.5 in the Appendix.

C. Fourth Year Review

At the end of the fourth year of the probationary period, the Director of the CLI will ask the mentoring committee to work with the probationary faculty member to compile a list of accomplishments and materials that cover the previous four years similar in format and content to that provided for the annual reviews (see B above). The faculty member will also write an essay, as during the annual reviews, but for the fourth year review cover the teaching and research accomplishments during the prior four year period. In the essay, the probationary faculty member should articulate the distinctiveness of their emerging teaching and research programs, summarize the contributions of each to actual student learning and our understanding about the processes that undergird student learning, and discuss specific plans over the next five years to further develop their research and teaching programs in ways to further advance the knowledge in the field.

The mentoring committee will review the information provided by the probationary faculty member, and make a recommendation to the Director of the CLI whether or not the probationary faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion. Although a decision to pursue the termination of an appointment may occur any time during the probationary period, the fourth year review constitutes a more substantive review concerning the progress of the candidate toward tenure and promotion. As a result, the fourth year review will include letters from external reviewers commenting on the pace and quality of the research and teaching efforts of the probationary faculty member.

D. Process for Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion

The Director of the CLI, working with the mentoring committee, is responsible for the timely completion of the dossier. The mentoring committee may function as the CLI Promotion and Tenure Committee. The recommendation based on the vote of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the recommendation based on the vote by the eligible CLI faculty will be reported to the Director of the CLI. The votes and report of action will be according to “Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure Track or Tenured Faculty.”

The recommendation by the Director of the CLI and other recommendations will be reported to the All-University Promotion & Tenure Committee. Since UMR does not have colleges or schools, the All-University Promotion & Tenure Committee will perform the alternative second level review. In turn, the recommendation of the All-University Promotion & Tenure Committee will be reviewed by the Chancellor. The Chancellor will in turn consult with the Vice
Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor will make a recommendation to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

In accordance with the academic unit defined as the CLI and with the second level review assigned to the All-University Promotion & Tenure Committee, the review process will follow the procedures outlined in the “Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure Track or Tenured Faculty.”

V. Goals and Expectations for Post-Tenure Review

The purpose of Post-tenure Review is to both recognize outstanding contributions and to support all tenured faculty in the CLI to meet unit expectations for teaching, research and service. The goals and expectations for tenured faculty members parallel those used in the granting of tenure and promotion. At a minimum, faculty must continue to contribute to all three areas: teaching and learning, research, and service and outreach, and meet standards for tenure and promotion in at least one of the three areas. However, it is recognized that the relative distribution of activity across teaching, research, and service may vary during the career of a tenured faculty member and need not be uniform among faculty members. Accordingly, the Post-tenure review process is designed to evaluate for each faculty member the entire portfolio of work and its contribution to the CLI and UMR.

Post-tenure review by elected committee will occur at least every three years for Associate Professors and at least every five years for Professors, with the exception of years in which a faculty member is considered for promotion to Professor, when that review will also serve as a Post-tenure Review.

The Post-tenure Review Committee will consist of four tenured faculty members elected by departmental vote of tenured faculty for two-year terms. All tenured faculty members are eligible to serve on this committee except the Director of the Center for Learning Innovation and faculty members being scheduled for Post-tenure Review. If the number of the tenured faculty in the CLI is not sufficient to form the committee, University of Minnesota faculty from outside the CLI may be elected.

Tenured faculty who are due for Post-tenure Review are required to submit a portfolio containing an updated curriculum vitae and a statement of accomplishments and goals for research, teaching, and service, and, if desired, explanations of circumstances. The CLI will provide statements of annual reviews and teaching evaluations for the previous five years, which will be included in the portfolio.

The responsibility of the Post-tenure Committee during standard Post-tenure Review is to (1) provide a brief written evaluation to the individual faculty member and the Director of the CLI based on the submitted portfolio and input from academic units where the faculty member has faculty responsibilities; and (2) identify cases of sub-standard performance. In addition, if during the annual review the performance of a faculty member is judged by the Director of the CLI
below standards, the Director consults with the elected faculty Post-tenure Review Committee. If the Director of the CLI and the Post-tenure committee agree with the determination of substandard performance, the director of the CLI and the faculty committee should communicate this in writing to the faculty member. Together, the Director of the CLI and the chair of the committee should develop a plan with the assistance of the faculty member to ameliorate any shortcomings in performance. The Director of the CLI, the Post-Tenure Review committee, and the tenured faculty member should reach an agreement about the performance assessment or plan to remediate deficiencies. If an agreement cannot be reached, the matter should be referred to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for additional discussion. The faculty member should have a minimum of one year from the date of the letter to address the plan for improving performance. If at the end of the year, performance is still below the goals and expectations of the CLI, the faculty member should be referred to the Chancellor for consideration of a special review as described in Section 7a.3 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure.
Appendix

Sections from the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*

Extending the Probationary Period

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 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.

Tenure Criteria

Section 7.11 General Criteria. What the University of Minnesota seeks above all in its faculty members is intellectual distinction and academic integrity. The basis for awarding indefinite tenure to the candidates possessing these qualities is the determination that each has established and is likely to continue to develop a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national or international reputation or both [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.
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.

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.

**Promotion Criteria for Full Professor**

**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.
"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.

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.