

Approved April 9,1990

**STATEMENT OF STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION IN
THE CURTIS L. CARLSON SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT**

(As Required by Section 7.12 of the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure)

I. Introduction

This Statement is adopted in accordance with the requirements of Subsection 7.12 of Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure (Regulations) and Section I of Procedures for Reviewing the Performance of Probationary Faculty (Procedures) and describes with more specificity the indices and standards which will be used to evaluate whether candidates meet the general criteria of Section 7.11 of the regulations. Faculty members are urged to consult the full text of Regulations and Procedures, with all the revisions and the interpretations that are in force at the time they are reviewed. They are also urged to read Appendix A to this document for procedures used by Curtis L. Carlson School of Management to evaluate candidates for promotion and tenure.

II. Mission Statement

The Curtis L. Carlson School of Management's primary mission is to understand and improve the process of management. It seeks a national and international reputation through the preparation and placement of its graduates and the dissemination of its research. Moreover, the School recognizes a special relationship with and responsibility to the region's business firms, labor unions, governmental units and non-profit agencies in furthering improved management study and practice.

III. Criteria for Decisions

In pursuing its mission, the School relies on teaching, research, and service activities of its faculty. The primary criteria for evaluating a candidate's suitability for promotion or tenure are her or his performance in the areas of teaching and research. Candidates not meeting the minimum standard of teaching and competence are deemed to be deficient for purposes of promotion or tenure regardless of their research record. Service is of secondary importance.

A. Teaching

Teaching includes presentation of material to students in the various programs of the School, the planning and preparation of materials for the classroom, the advising of students about their programs of study and the problems they encounter in learning, and the guidance of independent studies. Teaching also includes the advising, examination, supervision, and placement of Ph.D. students.

A good teacher is able to instill in students a thoughtful, logical approach to management, grounded in the knowledge of the relevant academic fields. A successful teacher of management is familiar with the current practice and literature in her or his field, and, when appropriate, develops new courses and introduces the products of new research into her or his teaching. He or she designs and teaches courses that are appropriate yet challenging for the audience, provides a coherent and logically connected body of knowledge, promotes active participation in learning on the part of students, is organized, and provides timely and meaningful feedback to students. A good teacher shows an interest in, and is sensitive to, the problems students encounter in learning, and is responsive to student and peer evaluations.

Evidence on the scope and quality of teaching is found in the candidate's statement of professional activities, student evaluations of presentations in classes, student and peer evaluations of seminars, special programs, and class materials, including course outlines and reading lists, syllabi, examinations, class notes, textbooks, and other teaching materials, and such evaluations of any other activities that contribute to or detract from favorable learning situations for students. Placement of Ph.D. students in the short run and their own academic achievements in the long run provide additional evidence on the effectiveness of teaching in the Ph.D. program.

B. Research

Research refers to investigation aimed at formulation of new theories, revision of accepted theories in the light of new facts, design and use of innovative methodologies for testing of new and existing theories, and significant application of such new or revised theories. Suitable and successful communication of such discoveries, interpretations, theories, methodologies and tests to the academic community are an integral part of research.

The quality of research is assessed by its originality, importance, validity, effective communication, and impact on the theory and practice of management.

Evidence on the scope and quality of research comes primarily from the work itself and its publication in refereed academic journals, refereed collections of papers, and research monographs.

Other evidence of quality in research comes from editorial and referee services for academic journals, election to prestigious national organizations of scholars, research

awards and honors granted by scholarly societies, external funding of research projects, and other significant acts of public recognition of the research work of the candidate.

Supplementary evidence may also come from participation in academic conferences and academic seminars (especially by invitation), from articles in practitioner journals, and from the unpublished work of the candidate. Supplementary evidence cannot substitute for primary evidence.

Evidence on the scope and quality of research is found in the candidate's research work listed on her or his resume and statement of professional activities, copies of the candidate's published works, its evaluation by peers, and a statement of the candidate's contribution to co-authored research.

C. Service

Service includes contributions to the intellectual activities and faculty self-governance of the department, the relevant academic profession, the School and the University. Service to business, labor unions, government, nonprofit agencies, and the community is also considered when it provides supplementary evidence on effective teaching and distinguished research. Service does not include administrative appointments.

Faculty members can help create a productive research and teaching atmosphere by providing mutual intellectual support and stimulation. They benefit from each other's teaching and research skills through participation and presentations in workshops and seminars, informal dialogue, and formal research collaboration. Such contributions may extend to similar activities in the School and in the University. All such intellectual contributions may be considered as supporting evidence under teaching or research criterion as appropriate. Contribution to the intellectual activity of the

department is assessed by the extent and quality of the participation in the above activities.

Service contributions to faculty self-governance refer to the work undertaken to help govern the department, the School and the University in one's capacity **as a member of the faculty**. Such work includes committees, meetings, ad hoc tasks and other activities directed at resolution of academic problems and issues. Administrative appointments are not included.

Service to the academic profession refers to participation and presentations in academic meetings and invited academic seminars, editorial and referee services for academic journals, and services to academic professional associations. Where selection of an editor is based on the recognition of the individual's scholarly achievements, editorial services may be also considered as supporting evidence under the research criterion.

Evidence of participation in the intellectual activity of the department, and of service to the academic profession is found in the candidate's resume, statement of professional activities, and peer evaluations.

Service to business, labor unions, and governments and nonprofit agencies refers to the provision of professional services to these organizations including field application of new ideas and techniques, the participation and presentations in professional nonacademic meetings and invited nonacademic seminars, publication of professional nonacademic papers, editorial and referee service for professional nonacademic journals, and service to professional nonacademic organizations. The scope and quality of service to business, labor unions, and government and nonprofit agencies is determined by the extent and quality of the participation in the above activities.

Service to the community refers to the provision of professional services to community agencies not listed above.

Evidence of service to business, labor unions, nonprofit and government agencies, and the community is found in: The candidate's resume, statement of professional activities, and letters of evaluation from organizations and individuals served.

IV. Promotion

Requirements for promotion to each rank are listed below. The term "an appropriate field" refers to a field that is appropriate to the department with which the candidate is affiliated, and that fits the professional needs of the department and the School. The general requirement for indefinite tenure, as articulated in Subsection 7.11 of Regulations, is a demonstrated potential to contribute significantly to the mission of the University and the School in teaching, research and service over the course of the candidate's academic career.

A. Assistant Professor

Promotion to the rank of assistant professor requires (1) completed Ph.D. or professional doctorate in an appropriate field, (2) evidence of promise to become a quality teacher, (3) evidence of promise to make quality contribution to scholarly research in an appropriate field, and to attain national reputation as a researcher in that field, and (4) evidence of ability and willingness to participate in the service activities of the department and the School.

B. Associate Professor (with tenure)

Promotion to associate professor with tenure is based on (1) demonstrated effectiveness in teaching which may include the supervision of Ph.D. students, and evidence that such

teaching will continue at the same or higher level of effectiveness, (2) significant demonstrated achievements in making quality contribution to scholarly research in an appropriate field, and in attaining national distinction as a researcher in that field, with evidence of continued productivity and professional growth, and (3) a demonstrated contribution to the service activities of the department and the School, and evidence that such contributions will continue.

C. Professor

Promotion to Professor is based on (1) demonstrated effectiveness in teaching of non-doctoral students, and teaching and supervision of Ph.D. students, and strong evidence that such activities will continue at the same or higher level of effectiveness, (2) conclusive evidence of a high level of achievement in making quality contribution to scholarly research in an appropriate field, and of the attainment of national distinction as a researcher in that field, with evidence of continued productivity and professional growth, and (3) demonstrated professional and collegial leadership in the service activities of the department, the School, and University, and evidence that such leadership will continue.

V. Procedures

The Carlson School of Management complies with Procedures for Reviewing the Performance of Probationary Faculty as provided by Sections 16.3, 7.4, and 7.61 of the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure and distributed annually by the Vice President for

Academic Affairs. Appendix A describes the procedures used by the Carlson School to evaluate candidates for promotion and tenure. Appendix B describes the standards used to make new appointments of regular faculty.

Appendix A

PROCEDURES FOR THE REVIEW OF THE PERFORMANCE OF FACULTY IN THE CARLSON SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

A. Definitions

The term "academic unit" in the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure (Regulations) and term "department" in the Procedures for Reviewing the Performance of Probationary Faculty (Procedures), are to be interpreted as the Carlson School of Management.

The term "head of the department" in the Procedures, is to be interpreted as the dean of the Carlson School of Management.

The term "tenured faculty" in the Regulations and the Procedures is to be interpreted as the members of the regular faculty of the Carlson School of Management who hold indefinite tenure in the School, without regard to their rank.

The term "department" in this Statement refers to one of the academic departments within the Carlson School of Management.

The term "activity report" in this Statement refers to a written report of work accomplished in teaching, research and service during the preceding 12 months.

The term "vote" in this statement refers to a written, unsigned, secret ballot.

The term "nomination" in this statement refers to the deliberations and, if appropriate, vote taken by the department and the FAPC in making its recommendations to the tenured faculty of the School.

The phrase "senior in rank" in this statement refers to the following hierarchy: non-tenured (NT) instructor, NT assistant professor or NT associate professor, tenured associate professor, (full) professor.

The term "probationary" in this statement refers to all faculty—instructor, assistant professors, and non-tenured associate professors - who have not been granted indefinite tenure.

B. Delegation of Functions

The dean of the Carlson School of Management has delegated certain functions under the Procedures to the chairs of the academic departments in the School as follows:

Explaining the promotion and tenure process to the candidate, as described in Section 3 of the procedures; collecting information on the candidate's performance, as described in Sections 5 and 11 of the Procedures (except for the collection of outside letters of evaluation when the candidate is considered for tenure or promotion); and the annual conference with the candidate, as described in Section 7 of the Procedures.

In addition, the dean has delegated the function of collecting outside letters of evaluation when the candidate is considered for tenure or promotion to the Faculty Appointments and Promotions Committee (FAPC), as described in section G below.

C. Explaining the Process to the Candidate

Early in the probationary appointment, the department chair must review the terms of the appointment with the probationary candidate, supply the candidate with copies of the

University's Regulations, Procedures, and a copy of this Statement, and perform the functions required by Section 3 of the Procedures.

D. Collecting Information on the Candidate's Performance

This Subsection makes the requirement of Sections 5 and 11 of the Procedures specific to the School.

Beginning with the first year of the probationary period, the department chair has the responsibility for compiling the Review File, which includes cumulative evidence on the candidate's performance in teaching, research, and service. The single most important source of this data is the candidate, who has the responsibility for providing the department chair with all the relevant materials in her or his possession in a timely fashion. There is no presumption of satisfactory performance; all aspects of such performance must be demonstrated by supporting evidence.

The Review File should include:

- i. The candidate's current resume, and annual activity reports.
- ii. Evidence on the scope and quality of teaching as described in Subsection III.A of this Statement.
- iii. Evidence on the scope and quality of research as described in Subsection III.B of this Statement.
- iv. Evidence on the scope and quality of service, as described in Subsection III.C of this Statement.
- v. Copies of Appraisal of Probationary Faculty forms for the prior years.

- vi. Any other relevant material relating to the satisfaction by the candidate of the requirements for promotion and tenure, or the satisfactory progress toward meeting such requirements.
- vii. If the candidate is nominated for promotion or tenure, written evaluations of the candidate's performance in teaching, research, and service by persons inside and outside the University.

Each year, the Faculty Appointments and Promotions Committee and the departments will set a calendar for nomination and review meetings.

The due date for the completion of the Review File (except item vii listed above) will be four weeks prior to the scheduled nomination meeting by the department. The candidate has the obligation to inspect the Review File annually and to assist in assembling it. If the information in the file appears to be incomplete or uninformative on the due date, the department chair will make a reasonable effort to obtain additional information from the candidate, and after such effort has been made the file will be deemed to be complete and ready for review.

Materials added by the candidate after this time must be identified as such. The departments or the School have no obligation to repeat or revise those steps in the nomination and review process that have been started before submission of additional materials. Materials not reviewed by the department or the FAPC should be identified as such.

E. Nomination of Candidates

Nomination is made by the candidate's academic department in the School. The tenured faculty in each department must review annually the progress of its probationary

candidates, and must designate a meeting for this purpose. The Review File must be made available to the tenured faculty of the department prior to this meeting.

During the annual nomination process, the tenured faculty in the department shall be assisted by two or three readers, appointed by the department chair from among the tenured faculty in the department. The task of the readers is to present to the tenured faculty in the department the research work of the candidate and to lead the discussion on the candidate's research performance during the nomination meeting. In appointing the readers, the department chair will strive for balanced representation of expertise in the general academic field of the candidate.

In the years prior to the final year of probationary appointment, the department faculty can vote to nominate the candidate for one of the following four: Continuation of probationary appointment, tenure without promotion (where applicable), tenure and promotion (where applicable), or termination of probationary appointment. In the final probationary year, the tenured faculty in the department must vote to nominate the candidate for one of the following three: Tenure without promotion (where applicable), tenure and promotion (where applicable), or termination of probationary appointment.

In the final year of the probationary appointment, the department chair shall appoint a reading committee (instead of two readers) to evaluate and report on the research accomplishments of the candidate. Such a committee shall also be appointed after the departmental vote in any year in which a simple majority of the department faculty, senior in rank to the candidate, votes to nominate her or him for tenure or promotion. This committee will normally consist of three tenured members of the

University faculty, whose rank is senior to the candidate's. At least one member of the committee shall be from outside the department of the candidate. The Composition of this Committee must be approved by the FAPC before it commences its work.

In appointing the committee, the department chair and the FAPC will strive for a balanced representation of expertise in the general academic field of the candidate. The task of the committee is to examine the candidate's research accomplishments with a view to assist the department and the School faculty's in making their own informed judgments. It is not to make a recommendation on promotion or tenure.

The department faculty shall meet to consider the reading committee report and to vote on the candidate's nomination. Except for candidates in the final year of their probationary appointment, this will occur at the second meeting of the department faculty to consider the nomination of the candidate. Reading committee's report shall be made a part of the Nomination Report.

A summary of the deliberations and, if appropriate, the vote taken at the nomination meeting is to be reported to the Faculty Appointments and Promotions Committee (FAPC). This Nomination Report will include a summary of the evidence on performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service, and the departmental appraisal of this evidence. The Nomination Report must include the motions made, the result of the vote on each motion, and a summary of the minority views that had substantial support. The Nomination Report is added to the Review File sent to the FAPC and a copy made available to the candidate.

The FAPC is advisory to the tenured faculty of the School. It will examine the evidence including the departmental Nomination Report. If the FAPC's assessment

differs significantly from the departments, or if a simple majority of the departmental faculty has voted to promote or grant tenure to the candidate, the FAPC must write its own Appraisal of Performance similar in form to the departmental Nomination Report. In other cases, the FAPC may write its own Appraisal of Performance or may indicate its concurrence with the departmental Nomination Report.

When a candidate is considered for promotion or tenure, the FAPC must consider the information in the outside letters or evaluation. The weight attached to these letters is left to the judgment of the FAPC. The Appraisal of Performance by the FAPC is placed in the Review File and in a Summary File. The Summary File contains the candidate's current resume, the Nomination Report, FAPC's Appraisal of Performance and the outside letters of reference, and is distributed to the School's tenured faculty senior in rank to the candidate.

Prior to the final probationary year, the nomination does not require a vote by the FAPC unless less than a simple majority of the department has voted in favor of continuation of probationary appointment. If there is a vote, it must be one of four: Continuation of probationary appointment, tenure without promotion (where applicable), tenure and promotion (where applicable), or termination of appointment.

In the final probationary year, the FAPC must vote one of two nominations: Indefinite tenure, or termination of the appointment.

The voting rules for the FAPC are the same as the voting rules for the department.

The candidate has the right to see a copy of the departmental Nomination Report and the FAPC's Appraisal of Performance when they become available to the School's faculty senior in rank to the candidate.

F. Annual Review by Tenured Faculty

In accordance with Section 6 of the Procedures, the Review File must be made available to the School's tenured faculty senior in rank to the candidate. Those faculty must collectively review the progress of each probationary candidate annually, and must designate a meeting for this purpose to be chaired by the chair of the FAPC.

In years prior to the final probationary year, the annual review does not require a vote of recommendation by the tenured faculty. If there is no vote, the probationary appointment is continued. If there is a vote, each voting member of tenured faculty must vote for one of four - continuation of probationary appointment, tenure without promotion (where applicable), tenure and promotion (where applicable), or termination of probationary appointment.

In the final probationary year, each voting member of the tenured faculty in the School may vote for one of three recommendations: Tenure Without promotion (where applicable), tenure and promotion (where applicable), or termination of probationary appointment.

The FAPC shall prepare a Faculty Review Report, following the form of the departmental Nomination Report, giving reasons for the action at the meeting of the tenured faculty and including minority views, which have substantial support. A copy of the Faculty Review Report is placed in the Review File, and a copy is sent to the department chair and to each member of the tenured faculty senior in rank to the candidate. The Review File is sent to the dean.

The Faculty Review Report is required whether or not there is a vote on the candidate.

When the review by the tenured faculty of the School is complete, the department chair should offer the candidate and opportunity to discuss the departmental Nomination Report, the FAPC's Appraisal of Performance, and the Faculty Review Report, as required by Section 7 of the Procedures. The department chair is to place a copy of the Appraisal of Probationary Faculty report and a written summary of any additional matters discussed in the candidate's Review File.

The candidate has the right to submit a supplementary statement to the dean. Copies of the statement must be distributed to the faculty senior in rank to the candidate.

The dean is to send her or his recommendation to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. The dean is to inform, in writing, the candidate and the chair of the candidate's department and the School faculty senior in rank to the candidate, of the dean's recommendation and reasons for the recommendation. The candidate should be aware that favorable recommendations at any or all levels in this process do not insure a favorable recommendation or decision at the subsequent levels.

The Carlson School of Management does not have a College Review Committee in the sense of Section 20 of Procedures.

G. Outside Letters of Evaluation

Whenever a candidate is considered for tenure or promotion, the Review File before the FAPC should include letters of evaluation from persons outside the university of Minnesota. The primary purpose of the outside letters is to provide evaluation of the candidate. When appropriate, these letters may also provide evaluation of teaching and service of the candidate. The requests for outside letters of evaluation of teaching and service of the candidate. The requests for outside letters of evaluation are made by the

chair of the FAPC based on a standard letter suggested in Exhibit A-1. If it is considered necessary to request letters of evaluation from the University of Minnesota faculty, such requests, too, shall be made by the chair of the FAPC using the similar standard letter. The list of persons to whom such requests are made is proposed by the department chair, after a consultation with the candidate, and is subject to approval by the FAPC. If the department chair does not submit an acceptable list in a timely fashion, the FAPC may assemble its own list of outside referees for the candidate.

The outside referees are selected on the basis of stature and broad representation in the academic field of the candidate. The qualifications of the referees—what makes each referee a qualified and objective authority to evaluate the candidate's performance—and what makes the proposed list a good combination of referees, should be clearly spelled out in the proposal presented by the department chair.

Five informative letters from outside the University should be in the candidate's file by the time the departmental nomination is reviewed by the FAPC. Sufficient requests should be made to meet this expectation.

In accordance with Section 11 of the Procedures, the weight given to the views of any particular referee is left to the judgment of the FAPC and the tenured faculty of the School.

EXHIBIT A-1

REQUEST FOR AN OUTSIDE LETTER OF EVALUATION

Dear _____:

I am writing to ask for your assistance in the review of _____ who is an assistant (associate *) professor in the Department of _____ has begun her/his year at the University of Minnesota, and the purpose of this review is to make one of the following decisions:

Promote to associate professor with tenure,

Promote to full professor (implies tenure),

Terminate appointment.

I am enclosing ____'s current resume and copies of three papers that s/he selected for the purpose of this review. If you would like to see any of the other papers on the resume, please call me collect at, and I shall send them to you immediately.

We seek to apply high standards to the quality of research work. Because you are a leading research in the area of, it is very important for us to receive your evaluation. We are particularly interested in answers to the following questions:

How well do you know the candidate's work?

How do you evaluate her/his research for its originality, importance and validity? Please be as specific as possible.

How do you compare her/his professional standing with others of similar time in rank?

I know that you are very busy, and that this request is a burden. We will, though, be extremely obliged for any help that you can offer. For your letter to be effective, we must receive it by (insert date).

While seeking your frank opinion, must inform you that Minnesota State law requires that the candidate be given access to their files. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Chair, Faculty Appointments and Promotions Committee

* choose one or more as appropriate.

Appendix B

I. Appointments of New Faculty

Requirements for appointment as instructor are (1) an active pursuit of a Ph.D. or professional doctorate in an appropriate field, with all the requirements but the thesis completed, (2) strong evidence that the candidate will complete her or his thesis within one year of initial appointment, (3) evidence of promise to become a quality teacher, (4) evidence of promise to make quality contribution to research in an appropriate field, and to attain national reputation as a researcher in that field, and (5) evidence of ability and willingness to participate in the service activities of the department and the School.

Requirements for appointment as associate professor without tenure are (1) a Ph.D. or equivalent degree in an appropriate field, (2) demonstrated quality teaching, and evidence that teaching will continue at the same or higher level of quality, and (3) a significant demonstrated achievement in making quality contribution to research in an appropriate field, and evidence of promise to attain national reputation as a researcher in that field.

Requirements for appointment as assistant professor, associate professor with tenure, and professor are the same as for promotion to these ranks as stated in Section IV of the Statement.