

Statement of Departmental Standards for Tenure, Annual Reviews, Post-Tenure Reviews, and Promotion for Probationary and Tenured Faculty (Social Sciences 7.12)

University of Minnesota, Morris (UMN Morris) Division of the Social Sciences

Approved by the Social Sciences Division Faculty on October 28, 2025

Approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost on May 29, 2026

Order of Contents:

I. Introduction

II. Mission Statement

III. Annual Review of Probationary Faculty and Extending the Probationary Period

IV. Conferral of Indefinite Tenure

V. Promotion

VI. Review of Tenured Faculty Performance

I. Introduction

The Division of Social Sciences of the University of Minnesota Morris (UMN Morris) is dedicated to education in the liberal arts tradition that fosters enriched, productive, and satisfying lives and is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression.

The purpose of the Division of Social Sciences is to advance a thoughtful, knowledgeable, and engaged society through its three-fold mission: to educate undergraduate students and prepare them for a productive life of intellectual curiosity, cultural appreciation, and continuous learning; to create new knowledge; and to engage with our community to achieve the land grant promise of a university in service to the community.

Reviews of faculty for promotion and tenure and annual performance appraisals at the UMN Morris are conducted in accordance with all-University policies and procedures contained in the Board of Regents' Policy on *Faculty Tenure* and related documents.

Candidates for indefinite tenure and/or promotion in rank are judged on demonstrated accomplishments and on potential for future development, and on their contributions to UMN Morris programs in the areas of teaching, research, and service. This document describes specifically the indices and standards that are used to evaluate candidates for the following personnel evaluations:

- Annual reviews of probationary faculty (Section 7.2 of the Regent's Policy on *Faculty Tenure*)
- Recommendation for awarding indefinite tenure (Section 7.11 of the Regent's Policy on *Faculty Tenure*)
- Recommendation for promotion to full professor (Section 9.2 of the Regent's Policy on *Faculty Tenure*)
- Annual performance appraisal for post-tenure review (Section 7a. of the Regent's Policy on *Faculty Tenure*)

For a complete perspective, the reader is advised to review Sections 7 and 9 in their entirety. This document is consistent with the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*.

The following appendices of this document contain the text of the Regent's Policy on *Faculty Tenure*: Appendix A contains the text of Section 7.2, Appendix B contains the text of Section 7.11, Appendix C contains the text of Section 9.2, Appendix D contains the text of Section 7a, Appendix E contains the text of Section 7.12, Unit Statement, Appendix F contains the text of Section 5.5, and Appendix G contains the Social Sciences Division Procedures for Promotion and Tenure.

II. Mission

The Division of Social Sciences supports the mission of the UMN Morris by:

- Providing essential aspects of a liberal arts education through understanding humans and other animals in their diversity as expressed in their histories, cultures, ideas, institutions, and behaviors.
- Providing service in cooperation with other offices and programs to the campus and the greater community that contribute to the discovery and dissemination of knowledge to the Social Sciences and related fields.
- Providing our students with core knowledge of their chosen majors and minors and competence in the methodologies, techniques, and skills required in their fields.

The mission of the Division of Social Sciences is to foster a dynamic academic climate and to support faculty and student scholarship. Broadly speaking scholarship includes:

- Contributions to student education, knowledge, diversity, and/or educational rigor through teaching, mentoring, and advising.
- Strengthening the university, field, or intellectual community through independent research and publishing.
- Building a stronger, more sustainable, and/or equitable university, field, or community through service.

The Division supports community-engaged scholarship and encourages its faculty to teach community-engaged courses and pursue community-engaged research and service. All faculty are invited to collaborate with the Office of Public Engagement as part of their conferral of indefinite tenure or promotion evaluation.

The Division includes the disciplines of Anthropology and Sociology, Business and Management, Economics, History, Political Science, and Psychology. The Division offers majors in Anthropology, Business and Management, Economics, History, Political Science, and Psychology and an interdisciplinary major in Human Services. The Division also participates in interdivisional majors such as Environmental Studies, Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies, and Native American & Indigenous Studies. The Division offers minors in Anthropology, Business and Management, Economics, History, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology and interdivision minors such as African & Black American Studies, Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies, Native American & Indigenous Studies, and Social Justice. The Division encourages its faculty to teach interdisciplinary courses and pursue interdisciplinary research.

III. Annual Review of Probationary Faculty and Extending the Probationary Period

A. Annual Review:

Probationary faculty are expected to put forth a portfolio annually containing documented evidence of their contributions to the three primary areas as determined by the University: teaching, research and

service. This portfolio is evaluated by tenured faculty members of the Division. 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 the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, so that the strengths can be further bolstered and the weaknesses remedied. Three elements are essential to this process: information gathering, deliberation, and consultation with the candidate.

There exists substantial research on the value of faculty mentoring, defined in this context as a form of service by which tenured faculty members share experience, expertise, and advice regarding research, teaching, and other professional development issues with less experienced colleagues. Mentoring is often conceptualized as guidance for tenure-track assistant professors, but it can also apply to tenured professors working towards their career development goals and/or promotion. Mentoring is both a personal process and a reciprocal relationship that can serve to promote the development of both new and veteran faculty members. The interests of the Social Sciences Division and UMN Morris are best served when we effectively mentor and review the faculty we hire.

Pursuant to Section 7.2 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, each probationary faculty member's performance will be evaluated annually by the Division's tenured voting faculty with a recommendation of continuation of the probationary period or termination. Social Sciences Division procedures state that an advisory vote will be taken at the beginning of years one, two, three, and five of the probationary period. This vote is strictly for information and cannot be considered as a vote of retention or termination. A retention vote is taken in the beginning of year four of the probationary period. After all votes, a summary of the evaluation will be written by the division chair and given to the candidate. This is followed by a mandatory meeting between the division chair and faculty member to discuss the review and its recommendation. This written summary is provided on President's Form 12 and is signed by the candidate, the chair of the division, and the Vice Chancellor and Dean for Academic Affairs and/or Chancellor. All procedures are outlined in Appendix G.

A tenure decision is required in or before the 6th year of the probationary period. Anyone requesting early determination of indefinite tenure and promotion to associate professor must notify the Division Chair by February 15 of the academic year preceding the year in which the decision is to be made (determination for early tenure made as detailed by the Social Sciences Division's Procedures. See Appendix G).

B. Extending the Probationary Period:

The Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* allows probationary faculty who meet the guidelines to request a one-year extension of their probationary period. See 5.5 of the 7.12 document for circumstances and procedures that apply (Appendix F in this document).

Annual appraisal of faculty is required even if their probationary period is extended. Extension of the probationary period must be noted when appraising probationary faculty. However, when considering the record of probationary faculty who extended the probationary period, criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than the criteria for those who do not have an extension to the tenure clock.

IV. Conferral of Indefinite Tenure

The Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* mandates that all faculty who receive indefinite tenure must satisfy University criteria for contributions to its teaching, research, and service missions and uphold its academic integrity. The conferral of indefinite tenure is primarily determined by effectiveness in teaching and achievement in research; service is an important but secondary consideration in the tenure decision. The relative weight placed on the three categories differs among the various units of the University. The UMN Morris, places relatively greater weight than many other units on quality of teaching but recognizes achievement in research as a second essential commitment.

The UMN Morris expects that candidates for indefinite tenure will be accomplished in both teaching and research. In addition, the pattern of performance should indicate, by its consistency, that the faculty member is likely to contribute to both activities during the remainder of their tenured career at levels no less proficient. The awarding of indefinite tenure suggests that the probationary faculty show strong promise of their achieving promotion to professor.

Judgment of strength in teaching and research is based on a balance of qualitative and quantitative factors, as detailed below. The qualitative and quantitative standards for tenure and promotion must be met by faculty regardless of extensions of the probationary period (according to Section 5.5 of *Faculty Tenure*) or early consideration for promotion.

In case of prior employment candidates, who have previously held regular faculty positions at accredited universities and colleges elsewhere, and for which previous experience has reduced the maximum period of probationary service at the UMN Morris, should provide as much documentation from those previous institutions as possible, including any and all forms of evidence addressed in sections IV.

A. Teaching and Advising:

Candidates for indefinite tenure must be effective teachers and advisors.

“Effective” means that a candidate enables or produces the intended result of student learning, and maintains a clearly articulated teaching philosophy, advising philosophy, and narrative summary of teaching, advising, or related activity and accomplishments. Specifically, candidates should demonstrate course-appropriate content expertise and an ability to transmit such knowledge to students through effective instructional design, delivery, and assessment. Instructional design includes the ability to create, sequence, and present experiences that lead to learning among students with various backgrounds, identities, and dis/ability statuses. Instructional delivery refers to the skills that facilitate learning in a respectful environment. Assessment refers to the use of tools and procedures for evaluating student learning, including appropriate grading practices.

“Teaching” encompasses a broad range of activities and is not limited to classroom instruction. It includes other forms of communicating knowledge (to both registered University students and persons in the extramural community) as well as supervising, mentoring, or advising students whether individually or in groups, informally and formally. Across teaching obligations, faculty members are expected to support and engage in behaviors that promote professional and healthy classroom learning and community spaces. The candidate is expected to abide by university policies governing student-faculty interactions, classroom management, and academic policies.

Effective teaching alone cannot qualify the candidate for indefinite tenure.

Relevant Forms of Evidence or Documentation of Effective Teaching and Advising include:

- A clearly articulated teaching philosophy that addresses student learning inside and outside of the classroom and how this is achieved.
- A clearly articulated advising philosophy that addresses how one supports student success at UMN Morris.

- A narrative summary of teaching, advising, and/or related activity and accomplishments (e.g., professional development, program development, awards) since the date of appointment to the current position.
- Peer review of teaching, which could include class observation by peers or pedagogical experts, and/or a review of syllabi, lecture notes, laboratory exercises, course web sites, material covered, assignments, or examinations.
- Peer review of advising which could include reviewing an advising philosophy statement, Students' Rating of Advising, advising syllabi, documentation of time and activities spent advising, letters from advisees, and/or participation in advising-related events.
- Scores on the Students' Rating of Teaching (SRTs) of each course taught by the candidate. The department office will keep copies of all SRTs of its faculty.
- Use of Early-Term Feedback and Responses as recommended.
- Letters of support obtained from students once they have graduated. Letters from former students (minimum of 5) are solicited from a list provided by the candidate.
- Certificates of completion of pedagogical or advising training and evidence of subsequent implementation of principles learned (e.g., inclusive teaching).
- Contributions made to the curriculum of the Discipline (made individually or resulting from participation in committees or workshops devoted to curriculum development and assessment) including but not limited to: development of courses, course sequences, new areas of instruction, major/minor sequences, or substantive refinements of courses.
- Effective use of new technologies.
- Programmatic innovations.
- Service learning or community-based learning/research.
- Development of instructional or advising materials (made individually or resulting from participation in committees or workshops) including but not limited to: computer software, compilations of readings, workbooks, student workshops, advising templates, and course guides.
- Receipt of teaching or advising awards and other formal recognitions of teaching or advising excellence.
- Participation in research opportunities with students such as Morris Academic Partners, Research Practica, Undergraduate Research Opportunities, or McNair Scholars.
- Receipt of grants for curricular development, educational or advising innovation, or the preparation of instructional units. Grants alone, however, do not suffice; the successful completion of the project shall also be considered.
- Participation in Honors theses, Directed Studies, Internships, Field Opportunities, and other kinds of activities outside the classroom.
- Evidence of scholarly approaches to teaching and advising such as attending teaching and/or advising workshops or conferences, etc.

- Contributions to interdisciplinary learning.
- Public engagement as well as international activities and initiatives related to teaching or advising.
- Evidence of incorporating issues related to diversity, equity, and inclusion into one's teaching and advising.
- Evidence of how the educator considers the various backgrounds, identities, and dis/ability status of their students to ensure that material is accessible and approachable to all students.
- Publications concerning teaching, teaching methods, or other pedagogic subjects.
- Textbook authorship.
- Development of teaching tools, including but not limited to technology-based tools, that are adopted by others.
- Organization of short courses or workshops on teaching or advising that attract a regional or national attendance.
- Invitations to give lectures, participate in symposia, write reviews, etc., on education or advising.
- Extramural letters of recommendation with favorable mention of contributions to education or advising.
- Other relevant materials the candidate may wish to include in their file.

B. Research:

The Division of Social Sciences, in alignment with the mission of the UMN Morris, is committed to the values of inclusiveness, diversity, and equity to ensure that faculty are preparing students to be global citizens that value intellectual growth, civic engagement, intercultural competence, and environmental stewardship. This commitment encompasses ethical research practices which support diverse scholarship among faculty and with undergraduate researchers.

In addition to demonstrating effective teaching, scholarly productivity and a cohesive research program are expected. A wide range of scholarly activities is acceptable within the Social Sciences division, including the production of books, book chapters, and publications in peer-reviewed journals, proceedings and conference presentations, and the creation and dissemination of collaborative and community-engaged project outcomes. The Division values and encourages research and publications with professional colleagues, community partners, and with undergraduate students.

Peer-reviewed publications generally will receive greater weight than publications that are not peer reviewed. Conference presentations, while valued, are not considered equivalent to publications and cannot substitute for them. Work under review or in progress may be considered; however, this category

receives less weight than published or completed work.¹ If a written work is co-authored, the division of labor among the co-authors should be clarified.

All research activities are expected to make an effective contribution either to scholarly inquiry related to the faculty member's research program and/or to the scholarship of teaching and learning. Research is a shared endeavor and not limited to publication of traditional manuscripts, but includes other activities which impact the community or the broader world. Faculty are obligated in their research to maintain collegial, respectful, and inclusive practices as appropriate to their field.

"Effective" research means that candidates become recognized in a field of expertise, have a consistent record of scholarly productivity, have contributions that are assessed positively by internal and external reviewers (e.g., peer review publications), and maintain a clearly articulated research statement. Evaluations of effective research must consider the expectations of a field of study, the type of scholarship and outcomes, and the impact of that scholarship within and outside of the academic community.

Effective research and scholarship alone cannot qualify the candidate for indefinite tenure.

Relevant Forms of Evidence or Documentation of Effective Research and Scholarship include:

- A clearly articulated research statement that addresses the quality and consistency of scholarly work, a clear research agenda, and provides evidence of one's publication and dissemination of research findings and/or project outcomes.
- The nature of the venue in which the scholarship is presented (e.g., refereed disciplinary or interdisciplinary journals, proceedings, books, or book chapter).
- The quality of the journal/publication and the suitability of the venue of the candidate's work to promote and disseminate research outcomes. . The Division recognizes that variability exists between disciplines and subfields.
- Presentation of research results at scientific meetings, conferences, or other research institutions.
- Citation of the candidate's work by other scholars in the field.
- Publicly-engaged scholarship, creating and disseminating resources for public use, and organizing events related to research objectives.
- Clearly articulated evidence of research and creative work in progress that requires time-consuming collaboration or community building. In-process work will be considered and valued a part of a contributorship model of scholarship.
- External evaluation by peers and established scholars in the field of inquiry (as detailed by the Social Sciences Division's Procedures, Appendix G).
- Major contribution to a new or existing body of inquiry in the field.

¹ A written work is considered to be published when it satisfies two standards: it is under contract and in production. The candidate is asked to produce the actual contract or another form of evidence showing the work has been accepted for publication. A book, journal article, or book chapter will be considered in production when a letter from the director or editor is sent and states that the work has met all of the following criteria: a) has gone through all rounds of reviews; b) all corrections/revisions have been completed; c) the fully completed/revised manuscript is in the hands of the press or journal; d) the press or journal has agreed to publish it.

- Invitations to present lectures, chair sessions at conferences and symposia, write review articles, etc.
- International, national, and local/regional awards and honors and awarding of fellowships for research.
- The candidate's success in attracting significant grants and other external funding (or favorable evaluation of a grant proposal that was not funded due to lack of funding).
- Other relevant materials the candidate may wish to include in their file.

The quality and consistency of contributions to professional scholarly activity are of greater significance than the level of annual activity. In addition, the time required to obtain results in a particular area of inquiry is taken into consideration.

C. Service:

Service contributions play a secondary but significant role in evaluation for tenure within the Social Sciences division. The University considers service to include active and effective contributions to the field of scholarly inquiry, the community, and the University.

- Service to the University is assessed by participation in UMN Morris as an inclusive campus and collegial workplace (e.g., individual, programmatic, or institutional capacity building or participation in retention initiatives) and/or University committees and related structures, advising student organizations, and the undertaking of other leadership opportunities within the University (e.g., serving as a discipline coordinator or on search committees). Quality of the faculty member's participation carries more weight than quantity.
- Service to the field of inquiry is assessed by participation in professional organizations and contributions of professional expertise to the field (e.g., acting as a reviewer of papers, discussant at a national conference, organizer of panels).
- Service to the community is assessed by public engagement activities relating to one's academic expertise.

Service alone cannot qualify the candidate for indefinite tenure.

Relevant Forms of Evidence or Documentation of Effective Service include:

- A clearly articulated service statement that addresses how one provides services to the field of inquiry, community, and University.
- Letters of support from community partners.
- Receipt of service awards or other forms of recognition of service excellence.

V. Promotion

A. Faculty at UMN Morris can be hired as tenure-track faculty at the rank of Instructor even if they have not completed their Ph.D., but will not receive the rank of Assistant Professor until their degree is conferred.

B. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is based upon demonstrated effectiveness in teaching and advising students, on distinction in research, in professional, community, and university related service, and academic integrity consistent with the criteria for tenure. The process for assessing the faculty's

teaching, research, and service is similar to the conferral of indefinite tenure.

C. Promotion to Professor indicates the attainment of distinction within one's field and the highest academic achievement with respect to teaching, research, and service. Any candidate for promotion must be distinguished through the quality, substance, and high standards of their teaching and advising. Moreover they must have attained national or international visibility in relevant scholarly communities based on the high quality of their contributions to a specific area of scholarly work. Significant local visibility with high quality scholarly contributions, including engaged practices, are also valued. Finally, the candidate must exhibit a record of continued effective service to the discipline, campus, University, and/or profession. A greater contribution in the area of institutional service is expected of candidates for the rank of Professor than was expected for the award of tenure. Records of teaching, research, and service excellence that advance the University's goals of inclusion and equity are valued, as are distinguished records of dissemination of scholarship for a broad public audience, community-engaged scholarship, and domestic and international work in the policy realm. The process for assessing the faculty's teaching, research, and service is similar to the conferral of indefinite tenure. Associate professors are encouraged to work toward promotion to the rank of professor, as implied in the last sentence of Section 7.11 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. Associate professors are strongly encouraged to achieve the rank of professor. See Section 9.2 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* in Appendix C.

VI. Review of Tenured Faculty Performance

A. Tenured Faculty Review:

Section 7a of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* refers to review of faculty performance including annual and post-tenure review. The Division of Social Sciences has a set of goals and expectations for tenured faculty. The Division expects its tenured faculty to be effectively engaged in teaching and advising, research, and service. Therefore the process of annual review is seen as necessary for affirming and maintaining faculty member's vitality and to provide an avenue, if necessary, to improve performance.

B. Goals and Expectations.

Social Sciences faculty holding indefinite tenure are expected to contribute significantly and consistently to the mission of the University and to its programs of teaching and advising, research, and service over the course of their careers. However, over the professional lifetime of a given faculty member, the Division recognizes that the balance among the functions of teaching and advising, research, and service may shift. Social Sciences faculty will, on an annual basis, be expected to demonstrate vitality and achievement in all three functions. When circumstances require, as in the case of full-time administrative assignments, faculty members may negotiate with the Division chair, preferably in advance, to adjust their distribution of effort percentages. These agreements will be documented and serve as the basis for subsequent annual reviews.

Teaching and Advising:

Each year faculty will demonstrate that they are effective teachers and advisors. The minimum expectation is that evidence of effective teaching and advising will be documented in the annual report of activities that may include:

- Standard student rating of teaching measures.
- Participating in peer review and observation of teaching.
- Curricular innovation such as development of new courses or materials, or use of significant new teaching strategies, or self-critical examination of existing materials and strategies.

- Periodically updated teaching philosophy statements.
- Evidence of incorporating the Social Sciences' Mission (e.g., equal access; diversity, cultural appreciation, equity, intellectual curiosity, service to the community, and inclusion).
- Documentation of providing effective advising (e.g., advising philosophy, Students' Rating of Advising, advising syllabi, documentation of time and activities spent advising, letters from alumni advisees).

Research:

The Division expects every tenured faculty member to be actively involved in scholarly research, which includes:

- Publication of books, chapters, and papers in peer-reviewed journals and proceedings.
- Active participation in regional, national, or international conferences.
- A periodically updated research program statement.

Service/Outreach:

We recognize that service and outreach are not the primary criteria on which promotion decisions rest. However, we expect that faculty holding indefinite tenure will contribute to an inclusive campus and collegial workplace, and will engage in service and outreach activities that both build on and take advantage of the strength of the UMN Morris and its faculty. The minimum expectation is that evidence of service or outreach will be documented in the annual report of activities through:

- Active service in Discipline, Division, Campus, or University governance and/or administration.
- Service to professional organizations.
- Public service or community outreach which takes advantage of the individual's role as a University faculty member.

C. Process of Post-Tenure Review

In the spring, each faculty member must submit a summary of teaching and advising, research, and service related activities during the past year, as well as a general plan for future work, to the Division Chair. The Division Chair meets with each faculty member to discuss performance and plans. Plans for the future may involve a redistribution of effort agreed upon by the Chair and the faculty member. In accordance with Section 7a of the regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* (see Appendix D), only faculty performance deemed "substandard" would then need to be referred to the Faculty Review Committee.

D. Determination of Below Standard Performance

The Division, annually in the fall, will elect a Faculty Review Committee consisting of five members and an alternate. All must be tenured, and at least three members shall hold the rank of professor. The alternate shall hold the rank of professor and serve in case a committee member is the subject of review by the Committee, or is otherwise unable to serve.

If the Division Chair determines that a faculty member's performance is substantially below goals and expectations of the Division, and fails to reflect the expectations agreed upon during the previous year's review, the case is referred in a timely manner for review to the elected Divisional Faculty Review Committee. In the event that the Faculty Review Committee agrees with the Chair's judgment, they must

send a letter or memorandum to the faculty member stating that finding by the end of the academic year. The faculty member may then consult with the Faculty Review Committee concerning the evaluation.

The Faculty Review Committee will then provide an evaluation of the faculty member's performance, including a plan for remedy, to the Division Chair. The letter must then be signed by the chair of the Faculty Review Committee and by the Division Chair and a copy provided to the faculty member.

The faculty member, thus notified, has at least one year from the date of the letter and plan for remedy to show evidence of appropriate steps being taken to resolve the perceived deficiencies. The Faculty Review Committee can aid the faculty member in devising a plan to meet the concerns. If the Division Chair and the Faculty Review Committee find on termination of the one-year period that the faculty member has failed to take appropriate steps, the Division Chair may ask the Academic Dean to initiate a special review according to Section 7a.3 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*.

APPENDIX A

Annual Review of Probationary Faculty

7.2 Annual Review. The tenured faculty [FN6] of each academic unit annually reviews the progress of each probationary faculty member toward satisfaction of the criteria for receiving tenure. The head of the unit prepares a written summary of that review and discusses the candidate's progress with the candidate, giving a copy of the report to the candidate.

[FN 6] As used in this policy, “tenured faculty” means those members of the faculty who hold indefinite tenure.

This and all subsequent footnotes correspond to the 2011 Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure.

Appendix B

Personnel Decisions Concerning Probationary Faculty

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 their achieving promotion to professor.

[FN 2] "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.

[FN 3] 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.

[FN 4] 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.

APPENDIX C

Promotion to Professor

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 [FN 7]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [FN 8]. 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.

[FN 7] "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.

[FN 8] 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 subsection 7.4 for the granting of indefinite tenure, the nondisclosure of grounds for the decision (subsection 7.5), and the review of recommendations (subsection 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 subsection 7.7 for decisions about promotion to associate professor and conferral of indefinite tenure.

See the definitions of "scholarly research," "other creative work," "teaching," and "service" in footnote [3]. A greater contribution in the area of institutional service is expected of candidates for the rank of professor than was expected for the award of tenure.

APPENDIX D

Post-tenure Review

Section 7a. Review Of Faculty Performance

7a.1. Goals And Expectations. The faculty of each academic unit must establish goals and expectations for all faculty members, including goals and expectations regarding teaching, scholarly productivity, and contributions to the service and outreach functions of the unit. The factors to be considered will parallel those used by the unit in the granting of tenure, but will take into account the different stages of professional development of faculty. The goals and expectations will be established in accordance with standards established by the University Senate. They can provide for flexibility, so that some faculty members can contribute more heavily to the accomplishment of one mission of the unit and others to the accomplishment of other missions. The goals and expectations shall not violate the individual faculty member's academic freedom in instruction or in the selection of topics or methods for research. They shall include reasonable indices of acceptable performance in each of the areas (e.g., teaching contributions and evaluations, scholarly productivity, service, governance and outreach activities). The dean reviews the goals and expectations of each unit and may request changes to meet the standards of the University and of the collegiate unit.

7a.2. Annual Review. Each academic unit, through its merit review process (established in accordance with the standards adopted by the senate), annually reviews with each faculty member the performance of that faculty member in light of the goals and expectations of the academic unit established under subsection 7a.1. This review is used for salary adjustment and faculty development. The faculty member will be advised of the evaluation and, if appropriate, of any steps that should be taken to improve performance and will be provided assistance in that effort. If the head of the unit and a peer merit review committee elected for annual merit review within that unit both find a faculty member's performance to be substantially below the goals and expectations adopted by that unit, they shall advise the faculty member in writing, including suggestions for improving performance, and establish a time period (of at least one year) within which improvement should be demonstrated.

7a.3. Special Peer Review In Cases Of Alleged Substandard Performance By Tenured Faculty. If, at the end of the time period for improvement described in the previous paragraph, a tenured faculty member's performance continues to be substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit and there has not been a sufficient improvement of performance, the head of the academic unit and the elected peer merit review committee may jointly request the dean to initiate a special peer review of that faculty member. Before doing so, the dean shall independently review the file to determine that special peer review is warranted. (in the case of an academic unit that is also a collegiate unit, the request shall be made to and the review conducted by the responsible senior academic administrator.) The special peer review shall be conducted by a panel of five tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank, selected to review that individual. The faculty member under review shall have the option to appoint one member. The remaining members shall be elected by secret ballot by the tenured faculty of the unit. The members of the special review panel need not be members of the academic unit. The special review panel shall provide adequate opportunity for the faculty member to participate in the review process and shall consider alternative measures that would assist the faculty member to improve performance. The tenure subcommittee may adopt rules and procedures regulating the conduct of such reviews. The special review panel shall prepare a report on the teaching, scholarship, service, governance, and (when appropriate) outreach performance of the faculty member. It will also identify any supporting service or accommodation that the University should provide to enable the faculty member to improve performance. Depending on its findings, the panel may recommend:

(a) that the performance is adequate to meet standards and that the review be concluded;

(b) that the allocation of the faculty member's expected effort among the teaching, research, service and governance functions of the unit be altered in light of the faculty member's strengths and interests so as to maximize the faculty member's contribution to the mission of the University;

(c) that the faculty member undertake specified steps to improve performance, subject only to future regular annual reviews as provided in subsection 7a.2;

(d) that the faculty member undertake specified steps to improve performance subject to a subsequent special review under subsection 7a.3, to be conducted at a specified future time;

(e) that the faculty member's performance is so inadequate as to justify limited reductions of salary, as provided in subsection 7a.4;

(f) that the faculty member's performance is so inadequate that the dean should commence formal proceedings for termination or involuntary leave of absence as provided in sections 10 and 14; or

(g) some combination of these measures.

The panel will send its report to the dean, the head of the academic unit, and the faculty member. Within 30 work days of receiving the report, the faculty member may appeal to the Judicial Committee, which shall review the report in a manner analogous to the review of tenure decisions (see subsection 7.7).

7a.4. Salary Reductions. If the special review panel recommends that the faculty member's performance is so inadequate as to justify limited reductions of recurring salary, the head of the academic unit, with the approval of the dean, may reduce the faculty member's recurring pay, subject to the following limitations:

(a) the amount of the decrease will not exceed 10% of the faculty member's recurring salary on the basis of any one special review;

(b) recurring salary may not be reduced by more than 25% from the highest level of recurring pay ever held by the faculty member;

(c) at least six months' notice of the decrease must be given;

(d) any decrease in recurring salary may be restored by the annual review process provided in subsection 7a.2.

Within 30 work days of notice of the decrease, the faculty member may appeal this action to the Judicial Committee, which shall review the action and the recommendation leading to it in a manner analogous to the review of tenure decisions (see subsection 7.7). This review may not reconsider matters already decided by the Judicial Committee under subsection 7a.3. Any decrease in recurring pay beyond the limits specified in this subsection can only be imposed pursuant to sections 4.5, 10, 11, and 14.

7a.5. Peer Review Option. Upon application to it by the dean and faculty (or the elected faculty assembly) of a collegiate unit, the Faculty Senate may adopt a system of peer review of performance of faculty of that unit different from the system set forth in sections 7a.1 through 7a.4 if in the Faculty Senate's judgment so proceeding is in the University's interest.

APPENDIX E

Unit Statement

7.12 Departmental Statement. [FN5] Each department or equivalent academic unit must have a document that specifies (1) the indices and standards that will be used to determine whether candidates meet the threshold criteria of subsection 7.11 ("General Criteria" for the awarding of indefinite tenure); (2) the indices and standards that will be used to determine whether candidates meet the threshold criteria of subsection 9.2 ("Criteria for Promotion to Professor"); and (3) the goals and expectations to be used in evaluating faculty members' performance under subsection 7a ("Review of the Performance of Faculty Members"). The document must contain the text and footnotes of subsections 7.11 and 9.2, and must be consistent with the criteria given there but may exceed them. Each departmental statement must be approved by a faculty vote (including both tenured and probationary members), the dean, and other appropriate academic administrators, including the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost. The chair or head of each academic unit must provide each probationary faculty member with a copy of the Departmental Statement at the beginning of the probationary service.

[FN 5] "Departmental" refers to an academic department or its equivalent, such as division, institute, or unit.

APPENDIX F

Extending the Probationary Period

5.5 Extension Of Maximum Probationary Period For New Parent Or Caregiver, Or For Personal Medical Reasons.

Upon the written request of a probationary faculty member, the maximum period of that faculty member's probationary service will be extended by one year at a time for each request:

(a) On the occasion of the birth of the faculty member's child or placement of an adoptive/foster child with the faculty member. Such a request for extension will be granted automatically if the faculty member notifies the unit head, dean, and Executive Vice President and Provost in writing that the faculty member is eligible for an extension under subsection 5.5 because of the birth or adoption/foster placement; or

(b) If the faculty member is a major caregiver for a family member with an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition and the Executive Vice President and Provost determines that the circumstances have had or are likely to have a substantial negative impact on the faculty member's ability to work over an extended period of time;

(c) If the faculty member has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition, and the Executive Vice President and Provost determines that the circumstances have had or are likely to have a substantial negative impact on the faculty member's ability to work over an extended period of time. If the faculty member's illness, injury, or debilitating condition reduces the faculty member's ability to work to less than two-thirds time during the faculty member's contract year [i.e., the academic year or twelve months], the probationary period is automatically extended by one year in accordance with subsection 5.3.

"Family member" means a faculty member's spouse or domestic partner, child, or other relative.

"Child" includes a biological child, an adopted or foster child, and the child of a spouse or domestic partner.

The probationary period may be extended for no more than three years total, except that the extension may be for no more than one year total for (1) an instructor with a probationary appointment under subsection 6.22 or (2) an associate professor or professor with a three-year probationary appointment under subsection 6.21.

The notification of birth or adoption/foster placement for provision (a) and the request for extension for provisions (b) and (c) in this subsection must be made in writing within one year of the events giving rise to the claim and no later than June 30 preceding the year a final decision would otherwise be made on an appointment with indefinite tenure for that faculty member.

A request for an extension under provision (b) or (c) will not be denied without first providing the faculty member making the request with an opportunity to discuss the request in a meeting with an administrator designated by the Executive Vice President and Provost. A claim that a request for an extension under provision (b) or (c) was improperly denied may be considered in any subsequent review by the Senate Judicial Committee of a termination under subsection 7.7.

Appendix G

University of Minnesota, Morris Division of the Social Sciences

Approved October 28, 2025

PROCEDURES

for Promotion and Tenure Reviews of Regular Faculty

The Division of Social Sciences complies with the Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty as provided by Section 7.4, 7.61 and 16.3 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. The process of reviewing a candidate's progress is continuous. It is intended to be encouraging and nurturing, although it is necessarily evaluative. Especially in the early years of the probationary period, the annual tenure review is intended to point out to the candidate their 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. Copies of these procedures will be available at the division website and faculty will be reminded annually to review them. New tenure track faculty will receive a copy of the procedures, and voting options will be defined at each voting meeting.

In these procedures, the "appropriate decision making group" includes all tenured faculty above the current rank of the candidate under consideration.

A tenure decision is required during or before the 6th year of review. Anyone requesting promotion or early determination of indefinite tenure must notify the Division Chair by February 15th of the academic year preceding the one in which the decision is made. Promotion consideration is given to all who ask for it. A colleague can also recommend a faculty member. In such an instance the Division Chair would then ask that faculty member if they do indeed wish to be considered for promotion. During the probationary period, a recommendation regarding continued appointment or of tenure can be made.

The Chair of the Division of Social Sciences shall ensure that there is systematic annual collection of information about the work of each member of the Division faculty. For promotion/annual review and tenure considerations, this is carried out by the faculty member with the cooperation and assistance of the Chair and with the help and advice of at least one senior faculty member from the Division. For the purpose of advice and clarification, Division colleagues' current curriculum vitae are available for review by their Divisional colleagues. The probationary faculty member has not only the right but the responsibility to inspect the annual-review file annually. They have a right also to submit written comments and to add relevant materials to the file. The review file thus assembled is then made available to the appropriate faculty members for their inspection at least two weeks before the first Promotion and Tenure meeting. Appropriate faculty members of the Division who are part of the decision-making group will be notified of the availability of the files and the date and time of the review meeting.

The Division will hold its regular tenure and promotion review meetings, which are chaired by the Division Chair. Only the relevant decision-making group may participate in these meetings. In case when the Division Chair has a lower rank than required to be part of the "decision-making group", they may attend the meeting and even write the report but will not be considered a voting member of the committee. Discussions at these meetings will center on the areas spelled out in the Division's 7.12 statement (teaching, research and service) as evidenced by the candidate's review file.

Depending on the number of years in which a candidate has been on probationary status, one of three types of reviews will occur after the first full year of service:

Review with advisory vote (following the start of the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 5th probationary years)—This review

will serve the purpose of informing the candidate about colleagues' evaluations about progress toward meeting the Division's expectations regarding tenure and promotion. Upon completion of the discussion, using the University of Minnesota's online voting system, appropriate decision-making faculty will vote (i.e., yes, no, abstain) on the following prompts:

- Dr. X is making adequate progress towards satisfying the criteria for teaching and advising as outlined in the Division of Social Sciences 7.12 document.
- Dr. X is making adequate progress towards satisfying the criteria for research as outlined in the Division of Social Sciences 7.12 document.
- Dr. X is making adequate progress towards satisfying the criteria for service as outlined in the Division of Social Sciences 7.12 document.

A retention vote may be requested during the discussion meeting of a probationary faculty member not currently being considered for retention or tenure as spelled out in these procedures by any of the appropriate decision-making faculty members of the Division. If after discussion, a two-thirds majority of those present agree, a vote regarding retention/termination will occur as outlined above following the discussion meeting.

Review with retention vote (following the start of the 4th probationary year)—A discussion meeting during which careful review of the candidate's evidence of teaching, scholarship, and service will take place at least one week prior to a scheduled vote in order to evaluate progress toward tenure. Using the University of Minnesota's online voting system appropriate decision-making faculty will vote (i.e., yes, no, abstain) on the following prompts:

- Dr. X is making adequate progress towards satisfying the criteria for teaching and advising as outlined in the Division of Social Sciences 7.12 document.
- Dr. X is making adequate progress towards satisfying the criteria for research as outlined in the Division of Social Sciences 7.12 document.
- Dr. X is making adequate progress towards satisfying the criteria for service as outlined in the Division of Social Sciences 7.12 document.
- Dr. X should be given notice of termination.

A "tie" vote will lead to a termination of the appointment. ["Abstentions" will be recorded but will not be included in the vote count.]

Review with promotion and tenure votes (in or before the 6th year of the probationary period)—After careful review of the candidate's evidence of teaching, scholarship (including an external review of scholarship), and service, a vote will be taken among appropriate decision-making faculty at least one week after the official discussion with the choices of yes, no, or abstain on the following prompts:

- Dr. X is making adequate progress towards satisfying the criteria for teaching and advising as outlined in the Division of Social Sciences 7.12 document.
- Dr. X is making adequate progress towards satisfying the criteria for research as outlined in the Division of Social Sciences 7.12 document.
- Dr. X is making adequate progress towards satisfying the criteria for service as outlined in the Division of Social Sciences 7.12 document.
- Dr. X should be recommended for tenure?

More “yes” votes than “no” votes on the last prompt “Dr. X should be recommended for tenure” would need to be received for a recommendation of tenure or promotion. [“Abstentions” will be recorded but will not be included in the vote count.] A second vote will be taken, if appropriate, for promotion to the next rank.

In the case of retention or promotion/tenure votes, the Chair shall provide a verbal summary of the discussion (without attribution) to the candidate within 48 hours of the meeting’s conclusion. Following that, the candidate may also solicit feedback from other members of the division’s tenured voting faculty. However, under no circumstances shall the tenured and senior in rank voting faculty member provide attribution to any comment made during the official discussion.

If the candidate wishes to rebut or otherwise clarify issues raised during the discussion, they need to provide such information to the Chair in writing no later than 48 hours prior to the voting meeting for distribution to voting faculty. If information was not provided in the file and not discussed during the review meeting, it is not appropriate to introduce it at this time.

Tenured voting faculty members are reminded that sharing any information about the official discussion with anyone other than the relevant candidate is strictly prohibited unless required by University policy. If there is discussion of any points of the candidate’s case, it needs to be contained within the material from the candidate’s written response to the official discussion.

External review of scholarship: When a candidate will be considered for tenure and/or promotion in rank, the Division Chair, following consultation with the candidate and senior members of the discipline, will appoint a research review committee. If feasible, the committee should include at least one member of the candidate’s discipline. The committee must be appointed by March 31 of the year preceding the tenure or promotion year and will consist of a chair and at least two other members, all of whom must be tenured and hold a rank higher than that of the candidate. The committee will be charged with soliciting external reviews, providing a summary reflecting the candidate’s complete record of scholarship, the context of UMN Morris and the Division’s 7.12 statement, and providing a recommendation based on the evaluations regarding the candidate’s scholarship. The committee will seek appraisals both from persons suggested by the candidate and from other recognized scholars in the field. The candidate will have an opportunity to comment for the record on the list of potential reviewers before solicitations are sent. At least four of the external reviews must be obtained from individuals with no direct professional or personal interest in the advancement of the candidate’s career (e.g., former advisors, mentors, co-authors, or co-investigators on previous work). The candidate in consultation with the Division Chair and the research review committee determines what sample of their scholarly or creative work is to be sent to external evaluators. The file must specify clearly the relationship of each external reviewer to the candidate and should contain a description of each external reviewer and their credentials. External reviewers’ letters and academic vitae, the committee’s report and recommendation will be included in the candidate’s file for review and discussion and the candidate may provide any clarifying information or response.

Voting procedures: Attendance and participation at tenure and promotion meetings are essential obligations of the members of the tenured faculty. The voting meeting(s) will be scheduled as outlined above. All faculty members eligible to vote are expected to review the candidate’s file prior to the meeting and to attend the discussion and voting meetings unless unable to do so for compelling reasons. Absentee votes are allowed with prior approval by the Chair for compelling reasons and if the faculty member can avail themselves to the appropriate materials in order to review the candidate. As the discussion meeting is a vital part of the evaluative process, those missing the discussion for other than approved reasons and/or those who cannot avail the requisite information should not participate in the voting meeting. 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. Abstentions are not counted in determining whether a majority of those voting cast votes in favor of tenure or promotion. However, 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.

Votes are taken via the University of Minnesota's online voting system. The result of the vote is sent to the Division Chair. The Division Chair shares the result with the faculty members in attendance at the meeting and places the result of the vote in the candidate's personnel files. The outcome of the vote is reported to the candidate only by the Division Chair and as soon as practicable. Following the review and vote, the meeting chair prepares a summary of the discussion which is then submitted to the faculty members in attendance at the meeting for their review. The summary is revised if necessary and forwarded to the Division Chair. The Chair informs the candidate of the Division's recommendation and of their own recommendation and will give the candidate a copy of the written report. The candidate has the right to submit a supplementary statement on the unit review for inclusion in the file. Copies of the statement must be given to the Chair and distributed to the tenured faculty.

The Chair then forwards their recommendation and any supplemental statements to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Dean. A reconsideration of the vote may be proposed during the voting meeting by any of the deciding faculty present. However, a two-thirds majority must approve a reconsideration vote before it happens. If there is a reconsideration after an initial vote, both the original and the reconsidered vote must be reported.

All procedures are taken from the 2007 *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*, or subsequent statements of procedures of the University.