School of Public Health
7.12 Statement
Modified July 12, 2021
Approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost on July 27, 2021

I. Introduction

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

This document describes the policies and procedures that assure that the School 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 primarily concerns the tenure/tenure track faculty, which includes tenured and probationary (tenure track) faculty members. Policies regarding appointment and promotion of contract faculty are specified in the School's *Contract Faculty Appointment & Promotion Policy*. In the present document, policies apply or refer to contract faculty only if that is stated explicitly.

This document also reflects the School's commitment to comply with the requirements of the Board of Regents *Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Equal Opportunity* as well as any pertinent legal requirements and institutional standards of fairness and good faith.

A primary measure of the 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 that a school achieves.

Within the School, 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 members within the unit of the candidate being considered for appointment, promotion, continuation, or indefinite tenure.

Well-defined policies and procedures are essential to provide equity, uniformity, and efficiency in this process. 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. In the sections that follow, a framework is

provided for the systematic evaluation of candidates for appointment, continuation of appointment, granting of indefinite tenure, and promotion. A mechanism for continued review and modification of this document and associated procedures is also outlined.

Faculty members who participate in this process should recognize clearly that they bear an important obligation that transcends the technical details of any promotion policy: specifically, 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 and maintaining productive academic careers.

This document is organized as follows:

I. Introduction
II. Vision, Mission, and Goals 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. Annual and Regular Review of Tenured Faculty and Post-Tenure Review
XI. Evaluation of Faculty with Joint Appointments in Other Schools

II. Vision, Mission, and Goals of the School of Public Health

Vision

A world in which all people thrive throughout their lives with optimum health and well-being.

Mission

The School of Public Health improves the health and well-being of populations and communities around the world through excellence in research and education, and by advancing policies and practices that sustain health equity for all.

Goals

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

Goal 1 Education: Provide students with the knowledge, skills, and experience to become leaders in public health practice and research.

Goal 2 Research: Conduct, translate, and disseminate research to shape public health solutions, policies, and practices that will reduce health inequities.

Goal 3 Community Engagement: Engage and collaborate with partners to advance learning, practice, and scholarship in public health.

Goal 4 Continuing Education: Provide continuing education to professionals and community leaders in evidenced-based practices that improve health and well-being.

Goal 5 Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion: Advance diversity, equity, inclusion, justice and antiracism in our education, research, and community engagement.

III. Appointment

The primary standards for recommendation for appointment are effectiveness in teaching and advising and distinction in scholarly activity. Service contributions to the candidate's University, School or College, department or division, academic programs, professional organizations, and professional service to the community are also considered.

The standards used for tenured/probationary tenure track appointment decisions shall include those established for the recommended rank being considered, as enumerated below. In addition, the criteria shall include the demonstrated capacity of the person being considered to contribute to the central mission of the School and to adapt to its changing needs in research, teaching, and service. This includes, but is not limited to, the capacity to advance the School's goals of diversity, equity, and inclusion in our work, and to advance population health and health equity.

A. Standards

1. Assistant Professor
   Appointment to assistant professor requires that a candidate has demonstrated their potential to develop a program of teaching and scholarship that is innovative and of high quality. An earned Ph.D., Sc.D., M.D., Dr.P.H., or equivalent degree is also required.

2. Associate Professor
   Appointment to the rank of associate professor requires that a candidate has established a program of either teaching or research that is innovative and of high quality, and has demonstrated the potential to achieve a highly effective record in the other area (i.e. teaching or research). If the record is such that appointment at a lower rank is inappropriate, an appointment at the rank of associate professor without tenure is suitable. The length of the probationary tenure track period is part of the appointment and must be included in the documentation submitted to the eligible Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee and the School of Public Health (SPH) faculty for their review and recommendation vote.

   a) Teaching
      The candidate should show evidence of impact and effectiveness as a teacher and advisor or mentor. Teaching may take many forms, including independent

teaching (i.e., sole responsibility for a course), co-teaching, leading independent studies, and instruction in short courses and institutes. Courses may include school-wide, core and elective classes. All forms and types of classes are valued, whether in-person, hybrid, or distance learning in format.

A candidate's record of teaching effectiveness, as a primary or co-instructor, and assessed by student and peer evaluation of the course content and delivery, provides the best evidence for evaluating teaching ability and accomplishments.

In addition to teaching courses, candidates should have demonstrated the ability to successfully advise students. Advising may occur formally through serving on student dissertation and examination committees as a chair, primary thesis/dissertation advisor or co-advisor, or as an academic advisor.

Mentorship, both informally and formally, of students at any level (post-doctoral, assistantships) is highly valued. Colleague peer mentoring is also highly valued.

b) Research

The candidate must show evidence of having mastered their discipline and demonstrate independent research productivity. Distinguishing contributions stimulate the work of others and further develop or translate research knowledge and approaches that address the health and well-being of the public. Thoughtful and impactful scholarly activities by public health faculty are diverse in nature. *Therefore, individuals do not need to pursue all of the following, but may demonstrate research impact through a combination of contributions including, but not limited to, the following:*

(1) Peer-reviewed publications in peer-reviewed journals relevant to the development of the discipline or its application to public health. These provide the best evidence of a candidate's research impact and expertise and are typically required. Given the heterogeneity within 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.

(2) Books, book chapters, and non-peer reviewed publications including legislative or policy briefs, white papers, position papers, and non-peer-reviewed opinion pieces or editorials.

(3) A sustainable research program supported by competitively awarded grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, or other funding sources, usually as principal or co-investigator. These are important indicators of research independence, innovation, and impact.

(4) Presentations at scientific conferences, invited talks, and media interviews to disseminate research and engage the public.

(5) Software development, patents, databases, internet-based or digital resources and digital media that are peer-reviewed and/or show an impact on the field through other means (i.e., utilization, citation, downloads, or other metrics).

(6) Engagement with public officials, healthcare delivery and service organizations, and/or community organizations and stakeholders in a way that meaningfully informs/changes policy or practice. Community based research and community-building activities are highly valued.

(7) Research or creative contributions that engage a diverse racial, ethnic, or multicultural public and/or student population, or that contribute to the knowledge of diversity, equity, and inclusion are valued.

(8) Evidence of directing or facilitating team science (*Collaboration and Team Science: From Theory to Practice* (nih.gov)). This may include provision of technical expertise instrumental to successful execution of interdisciplinary work, developing and supporting research infrastructure (e.g. within centers, programs), or other contributions. This may include evidence-demonstrating diversity of collaboration and/or sustained contribution to advancement of work led by others. Collaborative research among divisions within the School, across academic units within the Health Sciences, the University, and at a national and international level, is highly valued.

(9) Recognition of disciplinary expertise through election or appointment to a leadership position for discipline-relevant professional organizations or journals.

(10) Other scholarly activities as defined in the University of Minnesota regulations regarding *Faculty Tenure* (Subsection 7.11).

c. Service

Service is an important supplementary component of the candidate's activities for appointment to the rank of associate professor, and the significance of the candidate's service should be documented. Institutional service and/or professional service activities related to the candidate's field or discipline, involvement in community partnerships/collaborations aimed at improving public health, and advancing diversity equity and inclusion in research and teaching are all strongly valued.

3. Professor

Appointment to the rank of professor generally requires that the candidate has established a highly impactful program of research, has established a scholarly reputation at the national or international level, and has shown evidence of impact and effectiveness as a teacher and advisor. Formal and informal advising and mentoring of students, junior colleagues, and faculty peers inside or outside their institution are highly valued.

a) Teaching

The candidate should have evidence of impact and effectiveness in teaching and advising activities, which may take many forms as itemized in Section III.A.2.a. There should be evidence, including student and peer evaluations, of their impact and effectiveness in the classroom. Evidence of effectiveness in public educational settings is also valued. Impact on the next generation of professionals in the field, as attested by the number of students mentored for professional and/or academic careers and placement of PhD students in professional or academic careers, is also highly valued. Advising and mentoring may occur informally or formally through serving on student dissertation and examination committees or as an academic advisor, as a supervisor of student research, and as a mentor to post-doctoral fellows and junior colleagues, for example.

b) Research

In addition to the criteria specified for appointment at the rank of associate professor, evidence of research impact includes consistent, sustained scholarly productivity. The research output should show development of a theme or major area of expertise that is recognized nationally and/or internationally. Distinguishing contributions have stimulated the work of others and have further developed or translated research knowledge and approaches that address the health and well-being of the public. Interdisciplinary research, publicly-engaged research, international research initiatives, technology transfer, and other special kinds of professional activity by the candidate should be considered when applicable.

As in the case of appointment at the rank of associate professor, impactful scholarly activities by public health faculty are diverse in nature. Individuals may demonstrate their impact through a combination of contributions, including those listed in Section III.A.3.b. These should be considered together with the University of Minnesota regulations regarding *Faculty Tenure* (Section 9.2).

c) Service

Service is an important element of the candidate's record for appointment to the rank of professor, and the significance of the candidate's service should be documented. Professional service activities demonstrating leadership in the candidate's unit/school/institution, leadership in their field or disciplinary organizations, development of community partnerships/collaborations aimed at improving public health, and/or leadership service in the advancement of diversity, equity, and inclusion are all highly valued.

B. Procedures

Recommendations for tenure/probationary tenure track appointments normally are initiated by the Division Head.

1. Search Process
   Recommendation for appointment to a tenure/probationary tenure track position must be the result of a search process conducted in accordance with affirmative action and equal opportunity policies and procedures. Guidance found in the University Administrative Policy: *Hiring Faculty and Staff*.

2. Documentation
   It is the responsibility of the Division Head to provide the required documentation for proposed faculty appointments to the SPH Office of Faculty Affairs.

   a) The Chair of the Search Committee shall provide a brief written summary of the recommendation of the committee regarding the proposed candidate to the Division Head.

   b) Position Description of the available academic position.

   c) 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 professor and professor rank, five letters recommended.

   d) Reprints or list of digital object identifiers (doi) of significant publications or scholarly works. Preferred selections should reflect significant contributions and the candidate is the first or senior author. In the case of multiple authorships, the contribution of the candidate must be clearly established and stated. For appointment to assistant professor rank, 1-3 (up to three) publications or scholarly works recommended. For associate professor rank, three publications (no more than three) or scholarly works recommended and professor rank, no more than five publications or scholarly works recommended.

   e) Curriculum Vitae including candidate's background and experience:

      (1) Formal education
      (2) Professional experience
      (3) Special honors and awards
      (4) Up-to-date bibliography
      (5) Grant and/or contract awards, if relevant
      (6) Description of all courses taught, including role/responsibility (e.g., course development, sole instructor, co-instructor), and number of credits for each
      (7) Statement on student advising role/s; number of students for which the candidate had the major advising responsibility
      (8) Statement on mentoring role/s; number of students/trainees/junior colleagues mentored

(9) Documentation of other specific teaching and advising contributions such as but not limited to:
   (a) Coordination of graduate seminars;
   (b) Invited lecturing in courses taught by others;
   (c) Postdoctoral advising and training;
   (d) Supervising student research or interns, mentoring of community partners/collaborators;
   (e) Service on graduate student examining committees

(10) Summary of any available evaluative data on teaching such as summaries of student and peer evaluations

(11) Listing of University, professional and community service activities

(12) Documentation of activities that advance the goals of diversity, equity, and inclusion in the areas of research, teaching, or service is encouraged.

3. Faculty Eligible to Vote and Vote Report

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

In all cases, the actual vote results are to be reported. The report should indicate the number eligible to vote, the number present at the meeting (if required), the number of affirmative and negative votes and abstentions, and the number of instances of ballots not cast. In the report of the vote, the unit head should explain, if possible, the number of eligible faculty members not voting (e.g., faculty members on leaves or sabbaticals, on phased retirements, or holding administrative positions). The percent affirmative vote equals the number of affirmative votes divided by the number of affirmative plus negative votes (x100). At least 80% of those eligible to vote must cast a ballot and a majority of the ballots (50%+1 ballot) cast is required to effect a valid recommendation to the Dean. For example, if there are 100 faculty eligible to vote, at least 80 must cast a ballot and of those 80 ballots, 41 must be in agreement to forward a recommendation on to the Dean.

Abstentions are not included in the determination of the number of affirmative votes cast. Abstentions are not counted in determining whether or not a majority of those voting cast votes in favor of appointment, 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 except in rare cases (e.g., involving a conflict of interest).

Tenured faculty members have an obligation to decide whether or not a candidate merits the appointment and to vote for or against hiring. 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.

4. Division Faculty Review, Recommendation Vote and Report
   Each initial proposal for appointment, regardless of rank, must be presented to the Division faculty eligible to vote together with complete documentation (Section III.B.2.) for review and recommendation vote. At least 80% of the division faculty eligible to vote must complete a secret ballot, a majority of ballots (50%+1 ballot) of the votes (approve or do not approve) cast determines the recommendation of appointment.

   The Division Head completes and submits the Division Faculty Vote Report for inclusion with the appointment documentation to the SPH Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA). The report states the proposed appointment rank and type, effective date of appointment, beginning probationary tenure track year, length of the probationary period and decision year for promotion and/or tenure, as needed. The tally of the eligible division faculty votes (approve, do not approve, abstain, not cast/absent) includes any comments submitted and the recommendation of the eligible division faculty for appointment according to the vote results.

5. Division Head's Recommendation of Appointment
   The Division Head shall submit a brief personal letter of recommendation for appointment to OFA for inclusion with the appointment documentation. The letter includes a description of the position to be filled, the teaching and research expectations, and the qualifications of the candidate that justify the appointment.

6. APT Committee Review, Recommendation Vote and Report
   The APT Committee must review each initial proposal for tenure/probationary tenure track faculty appointments together with the complete documentation in support of the proposal, regardless of rank. At least 80% of the APT committee must complete a secret ballot, a majority of ballots (50%+1 ballot) of the votes (approve or do not approve) cast determines the recommendation of appointment.

   The Chair of the APT Committee completes and submits the APT Committee Vote Report for inclusion with the candidate's appointment documentation to the SPH OFA. The report states the proposed appointment rank and type, effective date of appointment, beginning probationary tenure track year, length of the probationary period and decision year for promotion and/or tenure, as needed. The tally of the eligible committee members votes (approve, do not approve, abstain, not cast/absent) includes any comments submitted and the recommendation of the eligible committee members for appointment according to the vote results.

7. SPH Faculty Review, Recommendation Vote and Report
   Each initial proposal for tenure/probationary tenure track faculty appointments, regardless of rank, must be presented to the SPH faculty eligible to vote together with the complete documentation in support of that proposal for review and recommendation vote. At least 80% of the SPH faculty eligible to vote must review the documentation and complete a secret ballot, a majority of ballots (50%+1 ballot) of the votes (approve or do not approve) cast determines the recommendation of appointment to forward on to the Dean.

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

Prior to the requested meeting, the documentation and recommendations of appointment by the Division Faculty, Division Head and the APT Committee must be made available to all School faculty members eligible to cast a recommendation vote on the reconsideration of the appointment in question, including absent faculty members (including those on semester and sabbatical leave). A second recommendation for appointment vote by secret ballot is distributed to faculty eligible to vote following the meeting.

The recommendation of the faculty should be determined by a tabulation of the ballots. At least 80% of School faculty eligible to vote must cast a ballot and a majority of ballots (50%+1 ballot) cast by the School faculty eligible to vote is required to effect a valid recommendation to the Dean of the reconsideration of appointment. Faculty eligible to vote include faculty on leave (sabbatical, semester, etc.).

The APT Committee Chair shall submit the faculty vote report, with such modifications as they 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 SPH Office of Faculty Affairs. 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.

8. Dean's Review and Recommendation/Decision

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

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

9. 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 School's faculty vote, a candidate may withdraw their application. It is also noted that written statements preserved in the SPH Office of Faculty Affairs 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 probationary tenure track review is intended to point out to the candidates strengths and weaknesses, so that the strengths can be built upon and the weaknesses remedied. Three elements are essential to this process: information gathering, deliberation, and consultation with the candidate.

The effective date of a probationary faculty appointment identifies the first year of the probationary year. Probationary faculty hired before November 1 shall begin their probationary service in year 1 of the six-year period. Probationary faculty hired on or after November 1 shall begin their probationary service in year 0 of the six-year period.

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

The review in Year 6 of the probationary period is for promotion (Section V.) and/or tenure (Section VI.) or discontinuance of faculty appointment.

The Division tenured faculty, APT Committee, and SPH tenured faculty eligible to vote will review and cast a vote for recommendation to continue the appointment for 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 and/or tenure by the end of the probationary period, the faculty may vote to discontinue the candidate.

A. Standards
   The primary criteria for the continuation of probationary tenure track faculty is the satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards of promotion and/or tenure. All of the criteria and guidelines used by the SPH for annual continuation reviews are contained in this document (SPH APT Policy, 7.12 Statement).

B. Procedures

The Dean has the responsibility to ensure that the School gathers data annually about the candidate's performance on all relevant criteria, working together with the candidate to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the assembled file (Section II.E.2.) of the *UM Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*.)

1. Documentation

It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide the required documentation for continuation of probationary tenure track appointment. 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. Asterisks (*) are requested to indicate recent work, they should mark work done since the last review or since the effective date of appointment to the current position, whichever is more recent.

The complete annual continuation of probationary tenure track appointment documentation dossier includes:

a) Statement of Assurances

A signed statement by the candidate shall accompany the documentation affirming that the candidate has had an opportunity to inspect the contents of the dossier submitted for review and may submit written comments or appropriate relevant materials. Based on the effective date of appointment, the statement indicates the version of the UM Faculty Tenure Code (7.11 Statement) and the SPH APT (7.12 Statement) Policy to be used for the review of the faculty candidates documentation.

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

b) Collegiate Unit Recommendations

The recommendations for continuation of appointment by the division head, APT Committee Chair and SPH faculty written by the Dean are included in the documentation following each independent level of review. Include all recommendations (division, APT committee and SPH Faculty) completed for each previous probationary year(s) of the appointment.

c) Record of Vote

The records of vote for the Division faculty, APT Committee and SPH Faculty including relevant comments are included in the documentation following each independent level of review and vote completed for the year.

d) Annual Appraisals
Include completed copies of all Appraisals of Probationary Faculty (UM Form 12), for each previous probationary year(s). The Form 12 is also included for all year(s) of the appointment served on an Extension of Maximum Period of Probationary Service.

e) Curriculum Vitae
Complete curriculum vitae created using the UM Works *(see Works handbook)*.

f) Summary and Documentation of Research/Scholarly Activity
This section must include the following items, not included in the CV:

(1) A narrative summary of scholarly development, activities, and accomplishments (2 pages max. with 1 inch margins). This summary should state the focus of independent research inquiry. Accomplishments since the last review or since the date of appointment to the current position can be highlighted. Note any significant contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion as they relate to research. Include an estimate of the percentage of effort spent annually in research-related activities at the end of the summary. Note: all three activities (research, teaching and service) must equal 100% effort.

(2) A complete bibliography of all publications (including articles in press, under review with decision pending, and under revision/in preparation) and reports. List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) and in separate sections: 1) all peer-reviewed sole and co-authored articles and reports (for those co-authored articles, list order of names as they appear on the publication); 2) non-peer-reviewed articles and reports; 3) books and chapters in books (indicate whether or not these are peer-reviewed); 4) presentations and abstracts. For co-authored articles and reports there must be a statement indicating the role of the candidate. Specifically, note participation in conceptualization, obtaining funding, implementation, analysis, manuscript writing, and supervision of research completed by students and trainees. Identify the candidate's name in boldface. Identify any student/trainee listed with underlining of their name. Use an asterisk (*) to identify work done since the last review or since the date of appointment to the current position, whichever is more recent.

Example: Johnson, D.O., **Larson, P.Q.**, and Carlson, A.L.: Evaluating Home Care for the Elderly. *American Journal of Public Health* 65: 433-42 (2021). doi:10.0000/000000000.
Role: Analyzed data and wrote manuscript.

(3) A cumulative and dated list of all grants, cooperative agreements, contracts, or other funding source applications (internal and external to the University) categorized as currently funded, funded previously and

concluded, submitted and/or under review for decision, resubmissions for review, and submitted and not funded. For each entry indicate: candidate's role (principal or co-investigator), name and institution of PI (if needed), funding agency, title of proposal, dates of funding, and short summary of purpose of support). Use an asterisk (*) to identify grants or contracts, etc. listed since the date of appointment to the current position or since the last review, whichever is more recent.

(4) A cumulative and dated list of any community-based participatory research activities (list brief project description, the communities engaged, faculty member role, and dissemination activities). Use an asterisk (*) to identify activities since the date of appointment to the current position or since the last review, whichever is more recent.

(5) A cumulative list of any persons trained/mentored/advised in research activities (e.g., masters' students, pre-doctoral trainees, post-doctoral fellows, etc.). Include the current position of these individuals, if known.

(6) A description of any activities and contributions that advance diversity, equity, and inclusion in the area of research. Examples include, but are not limited to, research that addresses health inequities, research that achieves diverse representation on study teams or among study participants, leadership or support of research groups that address equity and inclusion (e.g. journal clubs, work groups), and use of tools/strategies such as community based participatory research practices.

(7) Any other evidence of research and scholarship not itemized above

(8) Honors and awards received for excellence in scholarship

(9) Student/Trainee First Author Bibliography
List of all student first author publications, presentations, posters, etc. that the faculty member assisted with, advised on, and/or prompted to completion. Formal student advising relationship is not required for inclusion. Copy of list is included in both teaching and research activity sections of documentation.

g) Summary and Documentation of Teaching Activity
It is recognized that teaching takes many forms. Among these are independent classroom teaching and curriculum development (sole or shared responsibility for new course content, substantial revision of course content, and development of original new programs and curricula); team teaching of courses; pedagogical innovation; teaching of seminars; advising students regarding course work and requirements; guiding the research of master's and doctoral students and post-doctoral fellows and trainees; and formal or informal mentoring of students, trainees, and junior colleagues.

This section must include the following items, not included in the CV:

(1) A narrative summary of teaching-related activity and accomplishments (2 pages max. with 1 inch margins) since the date of appointment to the current position or since the last review of documentation, highlighting any special accomplishments. Note any significant contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the area of teaching and pedagogy. Include an estimate of the percentage of effort spent annually in teaching-related activities at the end of the summary. Note: all three activities (research, teaching and service) must equal 100% effort.

(2) A cumulative and dated list of all teaching-related activities. Use an asterisk (*) to identify work done since the date of appointment to the current position or since the last review, whichever is more recent.

(a) Curriculum Development and/or Course Instruction
Listing of courses developed, current and past instruction and scheduled instruction for upcoming academic year/term. Include for each: course title, short course description, quarter/semester in which the course was developed and/or taught, number of students and credits, and role/responsibility for the course (i.e., sole instructor, co-instructor, guest lecturer).

Description of activities related to development of new programs (majors, minors), new program curricula, revision of existing curricula, and other substantial curricular development work. Include role/responsibility and dates of work.

(b) Advising
A cumulative and dated list of formal advisees' names, their degree program, their major, the date of completion of the degree, and the role of the advisor drawn from the list below, listing all that apply:

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

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

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

(c) Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Activities in Teaching
List any activities that advance diversity, equity, and inclusion in the area of teaching. Examples may include inclusion of guest speakers of diverse backgrounds/populations for course teaching, the pursuit of pedagogical training in and adoption of inclusive teaching practices, selection of course readings representing various diverse perspectives and interests, ensuring accessibility of teaching materials and modes of course delivery, mentoring underrepresented students, developing new curricula that address health inequities, arranging community placement activities for students/trainees, and educating university or professional groups about diversity, equity, and inclusion (e.g. through invited speaking engagements).

(d) Other Teaching Activity
List any other teaching activities not itemized above, such as continuing education, outreach, and development of teaching manuals or special instructional formats and other mentoring not listed above.

(3) A section on teaching effectiveness, including:

(a) Formal Teaching Evaluations
Provide a summary of formal teaching evaluations (including evaluations by both students and peers) over time. For student evaluations, summarize the teaching evaluations obtained through the University of Minnesota Office of Measurement Services reports using SPH teaching evaluation table. For each item where scores are presented, include total number (N) of students who responded, mean, median, and standard deviation of responses.

For faculty appointments at or above Assistant Professor, teaching evaluations from other institutions must be included using a comparable table or other formal measurement tools for evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Do not add raw data.

Candidates may include a paragraph in this section or in their teaching narrative to contextualize their teaching evaluation scores or explain special circumstances.

(b) Informal Teaching Evaluations
Provide a summary or excerpts of any informal teaching evaluations such as student or advisee letters. Indicate which course or item evaluated, whether the letters were solicited or unsolicited, or are an established component of the process of evaluating teaching effectiveness.

(c) Honors and Awards
List any honors or awards received for teaching.

(d) Student First Author Bibliography
List of all student first author publications, presentations, posters, etc. that the faculty member assisted with, advised on, and/or prompted to completion. Formal student advising relationship is not required for inclusion. Copy of list is included in both teaching and research activity sections of documentation.

h) Summary and Documentation of Service
This section must include the following items:

(1) A narrative summary of professional and institutional service (2 pages max, with 1 inch margins). This summary should state the focus of disciplinary based service activities. Include accomplishments since the last review or since the date of appointment to the current position, highlighting any special accomplishments. Include any significant contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the area of service. Include an estimate of the percentage of effort spent annually in service related activities at the end of the summary. Note: all three activities (research, teaching and service) must equal 100% effort.

(2) A cumulative and dated list of all professional and institutional service activities. Use an asterisk (*) to identify work done since the last review or since the date of appointment to the current position, whichever is more recent.

Service activities may include:

(a) Activities contributing to the School mission including, but not limited to, community partnerships/collaborations that advance population health;

(b) Professional service, including roles in professional organizations, editorial boards, advisory boards, service/technical assistance to governmental organizations, including tribal governments, and to non-profit organizations;

(c) Institutional service: University of Minnesota committees and other University of Minnesota administrative service and leadership at the University, School, and Division levels;

(d) Any contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion in relation to service. These activities may include board membership or other advisory roles for groups (on or off campus) engaged in the work of

equity, participation in academic programs that create pathways for underrepresented groups to pursue higher education, and other activities.

(e) Other professional service activities, including but not limited to engagement of communities through public speaking and media interviews.

i) Reprints
A listing of the digital object identifier (doi) links or .pdfs of any significant publications or scholarly works since the last review or since the date of appointment to the current position, whichever is more recent. The candidate must be the first or senior author on at least two of the included publications, 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 stated. For assistant professor rank, one to three publications or scholarly works recommended. For associate professor rank, no more than three publications or scholarly works recommended.

j). Other Relevant Material
Other relevant material may be included, but must be brief (less than two pages).

2. Faculty Eligible to Vote and Recommendation Vote Report
Tenured faculty are defined as the faculty eligible to vote on the recommendation for continuation of a probationary tenure track faculty members appointment.

In all cases, the actual vote results are to be reported. The report should indicate the number eligible to vote, the number present at the meeting (if required), the number of affirmative and negative votes and abstentions, and the number of instances of ballots not cast. At least 80% of those eligible to vote must cast a ballot and a majority of ballots (50%+1 ballot) cast is required to effect a valid recommendation to the Dean.

3. Division Faculty Review, Recommendation Vote and Report
Each proposal for continuation of a probationary tenure track appointment, is presented and discussed at the review meeting of the Division faculty eligible to vote together with the complete documentation (Section IV.B.1.) in support of that proposal. A mandatory quorum of meeting attendees is required to discuss all faculty continuations. The quorum of attendees is 50%+1 of faculty eligible to review and vote. Attendees may participate by phone or other electronic connection.

Following the discussion, at least 80% of the Division faculty eligible to vote must complete a secret ballot, a majority of ballots (50%+1 ballot) of the votes (approve or do not approve) cast determines the recommendation of continuation of appointment.

The Division Head completes the Division Faculty Vote Report and submits to the SPH OFA for inclusion in the continuation review documentation. The report must indicate the probationary year of the tenure track, the tally of the eligible division faculty votes (approve, do not approve, abstain, not cast/absent) includes any comments submitted and the recommendation of the eligible division faculty for continuation of appointment according to the vote results.

4. Division Head Recommendation of Continuation of Appointment
   The Division Head shall write a letter stating their personal evaluation of the candidate's progress toward promotion and/or tenure, justifying continuation with components of the APT Policy. This letter shall include a statement on the quality of the candidate's scholarly activity, including their research quality and impact, the quality of their teaching, and their professional and institutional service. The letter is submitted to the SPH OFA for inclusion with the continuation documentation.

   The Division Head is responsible for making the recommendation for continuation for candidates in year 0 of the probationary period; no subsequent review or vote are required.

5. APT Committee Review, Recommendation Vote and Report
   After full evaluation of the continuation documentation, the APT Committee drafts recommendation summaries concerning continuation or discontinuation of the candidates in years 1-6 of the probationary period to discuss.

   Following the review meeting, where a mandatory quorum of 50%+1 of committee members attend to discuss the faculty continuations, at least 80% of the APT committee must complete a secret ballot, a majority of ballots (50%+1 ballot) of the votes (approve or do not approve) cast determines the recommendation of appointment.

   The Chair of the APT Committee completes and submits the APT Committee Vote Report and recommendation for continuation of appointment to the SPH OFA. The report states the proposed appointment rank and type, effective date of appointment, beginning probationary tenure track year, length of the probationary period and decision year for promotion and/or tenure, as needed. The tally of the eligible committee members votes (approve, do not approve, abstain, not cast/absent) includes any comments submitted and the recommendation of the eligible committee members for continuation according to the vote results.

6. SPH Faculty Review, Recommendation Vote and Report
   All tenured faculty reviews each proposal for continuation of probationary appointment documentation before the meeting to discuss each candidate. All tenured faculty eligible to vote are expected to participate in the discussion and vote on all continuations, as a mandatory quorum of meeting attendees is required to discuss all faculty continuations. The attendee quorum is 50%+1 of faculty eligible to review and vote. Attendees may participate by phone or other electronic connection. Faculty who are unable to attend the meeting must have a compelling reason not to attend and vote.

Following the meeting, at least 80% of the SPH faculty eligible to vote must review the documentation and complete a secret ballot, a majority of ballots (50%+1 ballot) of the votes (approve or do not approve) cast determines the recommendation of appointment to forward on to the Dean. Faculty eligible to vote include faculty on leave (sabbatical, semester, etc.).

A draft of the report prepared by the APT chair summarizing the SPH faculty vote will be 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 candidate, the candidate's Division Head, and the Dean, and will be open to the faculty eligible to vote.

7. Dean's Review and Recommendation/Decision
   The decision to continue a probationary tenure track faculty appointment lies with the Dean. This decision includes the recommendation of the tenured faculty and comments to the Appraisals of Probationary Faculty (Form 12) form and forward it to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost for confirmation signature on the Form 12.

   A majority vote to terminate a probationary appointment automatically results in a recommendation to terminate appointment that must be forwarded on to the Executive Vice President & Provost for review and action. The dean can disagree, but not override a majority vote to terminate appointment.

8. Rights of the Candidate
   In addition to the rights assured in by the University, the School of Public Health will assure that at any time prior to the SPH faculty vote, a candidate may withdraw application for continuation of appointment. At each step in the review process, the candidate shall receive a copy of the various recommendations and vote reports prepared by the reviewing individuals or groups (Division Head, APT Committee, School Faculty, Dean) and may add additional material. The Dean shall promptly notify the candidate of the action taken after the meeting of the School faculty eligible to vote, and inform the candidate of the reasons for the action and of the candidate's procedural rights in this situation.

   It is also noted that written statements preserved in the SPH OFA 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.

C. Extension of Probationary Period
   (Section 5.5 Extension of Maximum Probationary Period for New Parent or Caregiver, or for Personal Medical Reasons of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure)*

   Upon the written request of a probationary faculty member (Form UM 1910), the maximum period of that faculty members probationary service will be extended by one year at a time for each request: birth or placement of faculty member's child or

placement of an adoptive/foster child with the faculty member; major caregiver duties for a family member; or if the faculty member has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition.

The probationary period may be extended for no more than three years total under this rule; additional extensions may be possible, as allowed by the Provost, if University-wide extenuating circumstances exist (e.g., COVID pandemic).

V. Promotion

A. Standards

The primary criteria for recommendation for promotion are effectiveness in teaching and advising and distinction in scholarly activity. Professional and institutional service contributions will also be considered.

Criteria for recommending promotion of contract faculty members are discussed in detail in the School of Public Health's *Contract Faculty Appointment & Promotion Policy*. The key distinguishing feature of criteria for contract faculty is that a contract faculty member is evaluated with respect to the terms of their contract, which may differ considerably from the terms generally applied to tenure/probationary tenure track faculty members.

Criteria for recommending promotion of tenure/probationary tenure track faculty members are described in the following subsections.

1. Assistant Professor

   Promotion to assistant professor requires that a candidate has demonstrated their potential to develop a program of teaching and scholarship that is innovative and of high quality. 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 that is innovative and of high quality. Promotion to the rank of associate professor generally requires demonstration of the same accomplishments in teaching, research, and service as the criteria for appointment within the school (Section III.A.2.). 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 not only established a program of teaching and scholarly activity that is innovative and of high quality but has

achieved recognition as a national and/or international authority in their discipline, with a body of work that demonstrates a major area of recognized expertise (Section 9.2 Criteria for Promotion to Professor from the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* in Appendix III). Promotion to the rank of professor generally requires the same accomplishments in teaching, research, and service as the criteria for appointment at this rank within the School (Section III.A.3.).

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 themselves or for other members of the School faculty. Also, any faculty member may request the Committee to remove their name from consideration. It is strongly recommended that a faculty member who believes they should be considered for promotion discuss this possibility with the Division Head and obtain, if at all possible, the support of the Division Head.

A Division Head may recommend themselves 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 (Section IV.B.2.), with the following additions:

a) External Review

The APT Committee shall select outside reviewers to assess the quality and significance of the candidate's scholarly, teaching, and service activities, accomplishments, and contributions as they relate to the 7.12 statement, and to comment on the candidate's professional reputation or stature at any levels including: local, state, national, or international levels. Each reviewer will be provided with the candidate's submitted promotion and/or tenure documentation, including the Statement of Assurances, CV, Research, Teaching and Service sections, articles or scholarly works, and the SPH APT policy (7.12 statement). The documentation distributed for the external review does not include: Collegiate Unit Letters, Records of Vote, Prior Annual Appraisals, Impact Statements or other such sections.

If a tenure track faculty member received an extension of probationary service, the reviewer is informed of the amount of time spent on any extensions of probationary service. No details are provided on the reason for the additional time on the tenure track. For example: “7 years total on the 6-year tenure track due to 1 year extension of probationary service”.

The names of a minimum of fifteen (15) and no more than twenty (20) possible external reviewers identified in preferred contact order, along with their contact

information, short paragraph biography, and clear 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, Division Head, faculty mentors, and other senior faculty from their division. The APT Committee will review list and confirm potential reviewers to contact (excluding any that are deemed inappropriate). The first eight (8) potential external reviewers listed are contacted and receive request to conduct a review of the candidate. The remaining potential reviewers are contacted as needed to ensure receipt of at least four evaluations from distinguished faculty members in the candidate's field or related field in public health. The following criteria should be taken into consideration when identifying potential reviewers:

(1) The list should consist primarily of distinguished faculty members in public health and closely related fields, and secondarily of highly regarded non-academic public health scientists or researchers, with the background and expertise needed to evaluate the dossier. Typically, a majority of the evaluations received should come from public health academics.

(2) For external reviewers with an academic position, 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) Ability to contribute to a balanced view of the candidate and to provide a range of perspectives.

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

(6) When circumstances arise such 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 Executive Vice President and Provost.

b) <u>Recent Work Identified (*)</u>
Asterisks indicate recent accomplishments. Those asterisks should reflect work or events new since the date of appointment or promotion to the current rank.

c) Narrative Summaries
The narrative summaries for teaching, research, and service should reflect work or events new since the date of appointment or promotion to the current rank.

d) Reprints and Evaluations
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 (up to two pages) evidence to support promotion.

f) Candidates engaged in Community-Engaged scholarship may request and include letter from the "Review Committee on Community Engaged Scholarship" (initiated through the *Office for Public Engagement (OPE)* and the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs) that offers an "evaluation of the quality and impact of the candidate's engaged scholarship."

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

2. Faculty Eligible to Vote
For the promotion of a tenured/probationary tenure track 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, Recommendation Vote and Report
Each initial proposal for promotion of appointment, regardless of rank, must be presented and discussed at the review meeting of the Division faculty eligible to vote together with the complete documentation (Section IV.B.2.) in support of that proposal. A mandatory quorum of meeting attendees is required to discuss all faculty promotions, The quorum is 50%+1 of faculty eligible to review and vote. Attendees may participate by phone or other electronic connection.

Following the discussion, at least 80% of the Division faculty eligible to vote must complete a secret ballot, a majority of ballots (50%+1 ballot) of the votes (approve or do not approve) cast determines the recommendation of promotion of appointment.

The Division Head completes the Division Faculty Vote Report and submits to the SPH OFA for inclusion in the continuation review documentation. The report must indicate the faculty candidates current rank, type and probationary year of the tenure track (if applicable), the tally of the eligible division faculty votes (approve, do not approve, abstain, not cast/absent) including any comments submitted and the

recommendation of the eligible division faculty for promotion of appointment according to the vote results.

4. Division Head Recommendation Letter
   The Division Head shall write a letter stating their personal evaluation of the candidate's progress toward promotion and/or tenure, justifying promotion with components of the APT Policy. This letter shall include a statement on the quality of the candidate's scholarly activity, including their research quality and impact, the quality of their teaching, and their professional and institutional service. The letter is submitted to the SPH OFA for inclusion with the continuation documentation.

5. APT Committee Review, Recommendation Vote and Report
   Each proposal for promotion, regardless of rank, must be reviewed by the APT Committee together with the complete supportive documentation. 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 full evaluation of the promotion documentation, the APT Committee drafts recommendation summaries concerning promotion of the candidates to discuss at the review meeting. A mandatory quorum of 50%+1 of committee members attend to discuss the faculty continuations, at least 80% of the APT committee must complete a secret ballot, a majority of ballots (50%+1 ballot) of the votes (approve or do not approve) cast determines the recommendation of appointment.

   The Chair of the APT Committee completes and submits the APT Committee Vote Report and recommendation for continuation of appointment to the SPH OFA. The report states the proposed promoted appointment rank and type, effective date of appointment, beginning probationary tenure track year, length of the probationary period and decision year for promotion and/or tenure, as needed. The tally of the eligible committee members votes (approve, do not approve, abstain, not cast/absent) includes any comments submitted and the recommendation of the eligible committee members for promotion according to the vote results.

6. SPH Faculty Review, Recommendation Vote and Report
   All tenured faculty reviews each proposal for promotion of appointment documentation before the meeting to discuss each candidate. All tenured faculty eligible to vote are expected to participate in the discussion and vote on all proposals, as a mandatory quorum of meeting attendees is required to discuss all faculty promotions. The quorum is 50%+1 of faculty eligible to review and vote. Attendees may participate by phone or other electronic connection. Faculty who are unable to attend the meeting must have a compelling reason not to attend and vote.

   Following the meeting, at least 80% of the SPH faculty eligible to vote must review the documentation and complete a secret ballot, a majority of ballots (50%+1 ballot) of the votes (approve or do not approve) cast determines the recommendation of

promotion to forward on to the Dean. Faculty eligible to vote include faculty on leave (sabbatical, semester, etc.).

A draft of the report prepared by the APT chair summarizing the SPH faculty vote will be 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 candidate, the candidate's Division Head, and the Dean, and will be open to the faculty eligible to vote.

7. Dean's Review and Recommendation of Promotion
   The procedures and requirements for the Dean's review, faculty report and recommendation on the promotion of tenure/probationary tenure track faculty includes a statement on the quality of the candidate's scholarly activity, including their research quality and impact, the quality of their teaching, and their professional service and justifying tenure with components of the APT policy.

   The recommendation of the tenured faculty and comments added to the Appraisals of Probationary Faculty (Form 12) form are added to the documentation and forwarded on to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost for the remaining promotion review process and decision of the Board of Regents.

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.2.8.

VI. Conferral of Indefinite Tenure

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

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

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

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

Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, attention to questions of diversity, technology transfer, and other special kinds of professional activity by the candidate should be considered when applicable. The awarding of indefinite tenure presupposes that the candidate's record shows strong promise of his or her achieving promotion to professor.

For the full version of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, please go to: https://policy.umn.edu/policy-regents/faculty-tenure.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B. Procedures

Recommendations for tenure normally are initiated by the Division Head. A tenure recommendation to the APT Committee may be initiated by any member of the School faculty for themselves or for other members of the School faculty. Also, any faculty member may request the Committee to remove their name from consideration. It is strongly recommended that a faculty member who believes they 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 (Section VI.B.1.).

2. Faculty Eligible to Vote

   Tenured faculty vote on the recommendations for the granting of indefinite tenure. For faculty requesting both promotion and tenure, one vote is taken for both requests, i.e., 'promotion and tenure'. The tenured faculty at or above the rank being considered are defined to be the faculty eligible to vote.

3. Division Faculty Review, Vote and Report

   Each proposal for tenure, regardless of rank, must be presented and discussed at the review meeting of the Division faculty eligible to vote together with the complete documentation (Section IV.B.2.).in support of that proposal.

   A mandatory quorum of meeting attendees is required to discuss all faculty tenure requests, The quorum is 50%+1 of faculty eligible to review and vote. Attendees may participate by phone or other electronic connection.

   Following the discussion, at least 80% of the Division faculty eligible to vote must complete a secret ballot, a majority of ballots (50%+1 ballot) of the votes (approve or do not approve) cast to forward a recommendation of awarding the candidate tenure.

   The Division Head completes the Division Faculty Vote Report and submits to the SPH OFA for inclusion in the tenure request documentation. The report must indicate the faculty candidates current rank, type and probationary year of the tenure track (if applicable), the tally of the eligible division faculty votes (approve, do not approve, abstain, not cast/absent) including any comments submitted and the recommendation of the eligible division faculty for the granting of tenure according to the vote results.

4. Division Head Letter

   The Division Head shall write a letter stating their personal evaluation of the justification for awarding the candidate tenure justifying with the components of the APT policy. This letter shall include a statement on the quality of the candidate's scholarly activity, including their research quality and impact, the quality of their teaching, their professional and institutional service. The letter is submitted to the SPH OFA for inclusion with the tenure request documentation.

5. APT Review, Vote and Report
   Each proposal for tenure, regardless of rank, must be reviewed by the APT Committee together with the complete documentation in support of that proposal. The APT Committee members must complete a secret ballot.

6. APT Committee Review, Recommendation 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. For an Assistant Professor requesting tenure, the full APT Committee shall review the proposal. For an Associate Professor requesting tenure, a subset of the APT Committee, comprised of all of the members who hold the rank of Professor, shall review the 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 V.B.

   After full evaluation of the tenure request documentation, the APT Committee drafts recommendation summaries concerning the granting of tenure of the candidate to discuss at the review meeting, where a mandatory quorum of 50%+1 of committee members attend to discuss the faculty continuations. Following the meeting, at least 80% of the APT committee must complete a secret ballot, a majority ballots (50%+1 ballot) of the votes (approve or do not approve) cast determines the recommendation to grant indefinite tenure.

   The Chair of the APT Committee completes and submits the APT Committee Vote Report and recommendation for granting tenure to the SPH OFA. The report states the proposed change of appointment, current appointment rank and type, length of the probationary period, if needed. The tally of the eligible committee members votes (approve, do not approve, abstain, not cast/absent) includes any comments submitted and the recommendation of the eligible committee members for the granting of tenure according to the vote results.

7. SPH Faculty Review, Recommendation Vote and Report
   All eligible tenured faculty reviews each proposal for the granting of tenure documentation before the meeting to discuss each candidate. Tenured faculty eligible to vote are expected to participate in the discussion and vote on all proposals, as a mandatory quorum of meeting attendees is required to discuss all faculty requests for the granting of tenure. The quorum is 50%+1 of faculty eligible to review and vote. Attendees may participate by phone or other electronic connection. Faculty who are unable to attend the meeting must have a compelling reason not to attend and vote.

   Following the meeting, at least 80% of the SPH faculty eligible to vote must review the documentation and complete a secret ballot, a majority of ballots (50%+1 ballot) of the votes (approve or do not approve) cast determines the recommendation of the granting of tenure to forward on to the Dean. Faculty eligible to vote include faculty on leave (sabbatical, semester, etc.).

A draft of the report prepared by the APT chair summarizing the SPH faculty vote will be 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 candidate, the candidate's Division Head, and the Dean, and will be open to the faculty eligible to vote.

8. Dean's Review and Recommendation of Promotion
   The procedures and requirements for the Dean's review, faculty report and recommendation on the granting of tenure includes a statement on the quality of the candidate's scholarly activity, including their research quality and impact, the quality of their teaching, and their professional service and justifying tenure with components of the APT policy.

   The recommendation of the tenured faculty and comments added to the Appraisals of Probationary Faculty (Form 12) form is included with the documentation and forwarded on to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost for the remaining review process and decision of the Board of Regents.

9. Rights of the Candidate
   The rights of candidates for the granting of indefinite tenure shall be the same as for candidates for continuation, presented in Section IV.B.2.8.

VII. General Procedures

The Chair of the APT Committee shall confer annually with the Dean and/or Office of Faculty Affairs 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 and contract faculty. The committee shall be composed of twelve standing members. The standing members shall include two tenured faculty members from each Division, of which at least one is a full professor, elected by the tenure track and tenured faculty members of that Division. In addition, four contract faculty members from across the School (including at least one contract full professor among the four contract associate/full professor members) shall be elected by the contract faculty from across the School to discuss and vote on contract faculty appointments and promotions.

Contract faculty members will not vote on appointment, continuation, promotion or tenure of the tenured/probationary tenure track faculty.

The APT Committee shall annually elect the Chair from among the tenured committee members holding the rank of full professor. Any tenured 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.

Elections of the committee members shall be held during the spring semester, with the Chair being elected by the beginning of the fall semester**.** Members of the committee will begin their terms on July 1 and end on June 30. Members shall serve for three years. Division Heads, Associate Deans, and the Dean shall not be eligible to serve on the APT Committee. Committee membership is limited to two consecutive terms (six years). A former committee member may be re-elected after at least a one year gap.

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

The committee's function shall be to:

A. Establish a timetable for review of requests for new faculty appointments, promotions, continuation of appointments, or tenure.

B. Receive and review the documentation supporting such requests.

C. Make recommendations to the faculty eligible to vote as described and required by this policy.

D. Review recommendations for all promotions and for appointments to assistant professor and above as outlined in this policy.

E Make recommendations to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs regarding revisions that should be considered for 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 applications.

IX. Ad Hoc Review Committee

The APT Policy (7.12 Statement) shall be reviewed periodically as needed, and at least once every six years, by an Ad Hoc Review Committee. The Ad Hoc Review Committee shall be chaired by the APT Committee Chair or by any of the other APT Committee

members holding the rank of tenured full professor. The Ad Hoc Review Committee will be composed as follows:

- four tenured faculty representatives from the APT Committee (one from each Division),
- four probationary tenure track faculty representatives (one from each Division and elected by the probationary faculty of that Division),
- and two contract faculty members elected by the contract faculty across the school (one at the rank of full or associate professor and one at any rank).

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.*

Post-tenure review refers both to the annual reviews of tenured faculty and to special reviews outlined in Section 7a. of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*. 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 Executive Vice President and Provost is in the role of a 'Dean.' For purposes of post-tenure review, the Dean has designated the Head of each Division to conduct the annual review on his behalf. The Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee is the elected faculty body of the SPH responsible for post-tenure reviews by the faculty.

A. Annual Review of Tenured Faculty and the Post-Tenure Review. The annual review with merit raise recommendations will be conducted by the Division Head for the faculty of that Division. Each of the Divisions has a set of goals, expectations, and procedures for merit review which have been voted on and approved by the faculty in that Division. However, for purposes of the Post-Tenure Review, the criteria approved by all SPH faculty will be used for tenured faculty at the Associate Professor and Professor ranks as described in Section V.A.2-3 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.

   Minimum Criteria: 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 their review and expectations as discussed in their meeting. Minimum expectations are detailed in Section B.

B. Expectations for Tenured Faculty. It is expected that all faculty members continue to regularly contribute to the mission of the school as evidenced by their productivity in research, teaching, and service. The effort devoted to research, teaching, or service may vary significantly from faculty member to faculty member, and the distribution of effort may change over time for an individual faculty member. For example, a tenured

member of the faculty may sometimes assume administrative or committee duties that have the potential of diminishing the time available for research and teaching. Performance evaluation for each faculty member is made relative to their individual assignments and responsibilities as agreed upon during their annual reviews. The divisions and SPH should nurture the special strengths brought by each individual faculty member while not losing sight of the overall responsibilities and obligations that tenure confers upon faculty. Minimum expectations in research, teaching, and service should be routinely met or exceeded for any contiguous three year period.

Minimum Research and Scholarship Expectations:

Tenured faculty are typically expected to pursue an active agenda of research and scholarship in their area or areas of academic specialization. Faculty should have documented evidence of impactful research and scholarship through a combination of recent contributions including, but not limited to, the items listed as standards for promotion to Associate Professor (Section III.A.3).

Minimum Teaching Expectations:

Tenured faculty are to be actively engaged in communicating knowledge and in supervising, mentoring, or advising students. Faculty are typically expected to teach graduate and/or undergraduate courses in line with the faculty member's expertise. Faculty should also typically provide advising to graduate and/or undergraduate students in their academic programs. Faculty should have documented evidence of teaching and advising through a combination of recent contributions including, but not limited to, the items listed as standards for promotion to Associate Professor (Section III.A.3).

Minimum Service Expectations:

Tenured faculty are typically expected to provide meaningful service to the university community, to their discipline, and/or to our communities. Faculty should have documented evidence of service through a combination of recent contributions including, but not limited to, the items listed as standards for promotion to Associate Professor (Section III.A.3).

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

1. The Division Heads will provide the Dean with a formal report of all completed annual reviews of faculty within their division. In addition, they will forward the complete dossier of any faculty member(s) who is not achieving the School-defined minimum expectations for teaching, research and service.
2. The Dean will review the dossiers of the faculty identified by Division Heads who may not be achieving the School-defined expectations and then will meet with each of these individuals. The results of this review will be summarized in a letter to the individual from the Dean with a copy to the Division Head.
3. If the level of underperformance is substantial in the opinion of the Dean, they will send a copy of the letter to the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, which will initiate an APT post-tenure review.

4. Following the APT post-tenure 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 their substandard performance) during which the faculty member should address the identified problems.
5. A Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) will be written by the Division Head in collaboration with the faculty member and the Dean to address these deficiencies. The PIP should describe performance improvement that is developmental and realistic.
6. If the faculty member's performance continues to be substandard in the opinions of both the Dean and the APT Chair, then the APT Committee and the Dean can ask the Executive Vice President and Provost to initiate a special review as described in the Section 7a of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*.

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

XI. Evaluation of Faculty with Joint Appointments in Other Schools

The criteria for evaluating faculty with joint appointments whose primary appointment is in other Schools and Departments within the University are the same as those for evaluating faculty whose primary appointment is in the SPH (for appointments, annual appraisals, conferral of indefinite tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review). However, the SPH will evaluate such faculty with joint appointments for appointment, tenure, and promotion only after such a decision has been made for the primary appointment. The documentation required for appointment, annual appraisals of probationary faculty, conferral of indefinite tenure, and post-tenure review can be in the format required by the School or Department in which the faculty holds their primary appointment. However, the candidate should ensure that the documentation contains 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 Statement (e.g., peer-reviewed publications), the candidate should provide a statement describing the relevance of the materials to public health.

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

Modified by SPH Ad Hoc Committee, Approved by SPH Faculty Eligible to Vote per University Guidelines: January 9, 2014
Modified by SPH Ad Hoc Committee, Approved by SPH Faculty Eligible to Vote per University Guidelines: July 12, 2021

APPENDIX I.

Review Process for Hiring <u>New</u> Faculty Appointments

	Faculty Eligible to Review and Vote	
Appointment to	***APT Committee members***	***SPH Faculty***
Professor (Tenured)	Professor (Tenured)	Professor (Tenured)
Professor (Contract)	Professor (Tenured and Contract)	Professor (Tenured and Contract)
Associate Professor (Tenured or Probationary Tenure Track)	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenured)	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenured)
Associate Professor (Contract)	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenured and Contract)	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenure Track, Tenured, and Contract)
Assistant Professor (Probationary Tenure Track)	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenured)	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenured)
Assistant Professor (Contract)	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenured and Contract)	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenure Track, Tenured, and Contract)
Conferral of Tenure	***APT Committee members***	***SPH Faculty***
Professor	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenured)	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenured)
Associate Professor	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenured)	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenured)

FINAL APPENDIX I-II Table Revisions 2024
Updated 12/2024

For an appointment to a tenured/probationary tenure track faculty position, the tenured faculty at or above the rank being considered are defined as eligible to vote. *SPH APT Policy, 2021, Section III.B.3.*
For new hire requests including tenure, two votes must be taken: "hiring as" appointment to rank and "conferral of tenure". *UMN Procedures*

APPENDIX II.

Review Process for Faculty Promotions, Tenure, and Continuations

	Faculty Eligible to Review and Vote	
Promotion to	***APT Committee members***	***SPH Faculty***
Professor (Tenured)	Professor (Tenured)	Professor (Tenured)
Professor (Contract)	Professor (Tenured and Contract)	Professor (Tenured and Contract)
Associate Professor (Tenured)	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenured)	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenured)
Associate Professor (Contract)	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenured and Contract)	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenure Track, Tenured, and Contract)
Conferral of Tenure to	***APT Committee***	***SPH Faculty***
Professor	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenured)	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenured)
Associate Professor	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenured)	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenured)
Continuation of	***APT Committee***	***SPH faculty eligible to vote***
Associate or Assistant Professor (Probationary Tenure Track, years 1-6)	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenured)	Associate Professor and Professor (Tenured)

FINAL APPENDIX II Table Revisions 2024
Updated 12/2024

Tenured faculty are defined as the faculty eligible to review and vote on the recommendation for continuation of a probationary tenure track faculty members appointment. *SPH APT Policy, 2021, Section IV.B.2.*
All instances involving promotion AND tenure, one vote of "promotion and tenure" must be taken. *UMN Procedures*

Appendix III. Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure

Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*

Section 9.2 Criteria for Promotion to Professor. The basis for promotion to the rank of professor is the determination that each candidate has (1) demonstrated the intellectual distinction and academic integrity expected of all faculty members, (2) added substantially to an already distinguished record of academic achievement, and (3) established the national or international reputation (or both) ordinarily resulting from such distinction and achievement [8]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [9]. The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision. Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, attention to questions of diversity, technology transfer, and other special kinds of professional activity by the candidate should be considered when applicable. But the primary emphasis must be on demonstrated scholarly or other creative achievement and on teaching effectiveness, and service alone cannot qualify the candidate for promotion.

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

[9] The persons responsible for this determination are the full professors in the unit who are eligible to vote. The outcome of the vote is either promotion to the rank of professor or continuation in rank as an associate professor. The procedures for voting are identical to those outlined in Section 7.4 for the granting of indefinite tenure, the nondisclosure of grounds for the decision (Section 7.5), and the review of recommendations (Section 7.6). In addition, a petition to the Judicial Committee for review of a recommendation of continuation in rank as an associate professor follows the procedures specified in Section 7.7 for decisions about promotion to associate professor and conferral of indefinite tenure.

Appendix IV. Important Websites

University of Minnesota Faculty Tenure (Section 7.11):
https://regents.umn.edu/sites/regents.umn.edu/files/2020-08/policy_faculty_tenure.pdf

University of Minnesota Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty:
http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/faculty/tenure/pdf/Procedures101207.pdf

University of Minnesota Administrative Policy on Academic Appointments:
http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/ohrpolicy/Hiring/Academic/

University of Minnesota Mission Statement
https://twin-cities.umn.edu/about-us

U of M Community-Based Scholarship
https://faculty.umn.edu/promotion-tenure/community-engaged-scholarship

Office of Public Engagement. Review Committee on Community-Engaged Scholarship
https://engagement.umn.edu/about-ope/councils-committees/review-committee-community-engaged-scholarship

University of Minnesota Board of Regents: *Equity, Diversity, Equal Opportunity, and Affirmative Action*
https://regents.umn.edu/sites/regents.umn.edu/files/2019-09/policy_equity_diversity_equal_opportunity_and_affirmative_action.pdf