

Review Process
Department of Design, Housing, and Apparel (DHA)
2008

The procedures described in this document provide implementation information for DHA consistent with the University of Minnesota "Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty" (dated October 15, 2007).

The annual schedule for DHA review during the probationary period is described in the DHA document, "Tenure and Promotion Timeline." Information about mentor committees is in the DHA document, "Mentor Committees."

Outline

1. Candidate Responsibilities in Preparation for Review by Tenured Faculty
2. Department Administration Responsibilities in Preparation for Candidate Review by Tenured Faculty
3. Responsibilities of the Presenter
4. Tenured Faculty Members' Responsibilities in Preparation for Meeting to Review Candidates
 - a. General Responsibilities
 - b. Preparation Specific to a Candidate
5. Tenured Faculty Meeting to Review Candidates
 - a. Basic Premises
 - b. Chairperson
 - c. Basic Meeting Sequence
 - d. Discussion
 - e. Recording Information during Discussion
6. Voting Process
7. The Faculty Summary Statement
8. Meeting Outcome
9. Process for Tenured Faculty Applying for Promotion to Full Professor
10. Additional Issues to Consider Ensuring a Climate of Cooperation

Roles described in this document:

Presenter (at Tenured Faculty Meeting, see Sections 2 and 3)

Tenured Faculty Meeting (see Section 5)

Chairperson (of Tenured Faculty Meeting, see Section 5.b.)

Recorder (at Tenured Faculty Meeting, see Section 5.e.)

1. Candidate Responsibilities in Preparation for Review by Tenured Faculty

- Arranges a meeting of his/her Mentor Committee to review progress at least once a year
- Prepares a philosophy statement of his/her research, teaching, outreach, and service
- Gathers and submits materials in a timely manner to the Department Head so that they may be available for faculty review
- Responsible for the accuracy and integrity of the materials
- Accomplishments completed during the most recent academic year highlighted in the vitae by the candidate to track progress
- Responsible for and is required to incorporate information to the evaluation materials as requested by the Mentor Committee, the DHA Tenured Faculty Meeting, the Department Head, and relevant college and university committees

2. Department Administration Responsibilities in Preparation for Candidate Review by Tenured Faculty

- Department Head is responsible for ensuring that the applicable departmental and UM regulations are followed
- The Department Head assigns a Presenter for each candidate from among the tenured faculty members who are not on the Mentor Committee and not in the program area of the candidate
- The Department Head, with the assigned Presenter, insures that the candidate has submitted all appropriate materials for the review
- The Department Head shall provide to each tenured faculty member a copy of the candidate's vitae to review before the meeting

3. Responsibilities of the Presenter

- The Presenter is responsible for presenting the candidate's case at the Tenured Faculty Meeting and preparing the draft statement after the discussion and vote
- The Presenter, with the Department Head, insure that the candidate has submitted all appropriate materials for the review
- Each year, the Presenter should revolve among tenured faculty members who are not serving on the candidate's Mentor Committee nor in the candidate's program area

4. Tenured Faculty Members' Responsibilities in Preparation for Meeting to Review Candidates

a. General Responsibilities

- Review UM 7.11 statement, DHA 7.12 criteria, and procedures relevant to annual probationary review, and promotion and/or tenure decision
- Understand performance outcomes that are addressed by the DHA 7.12 criteria and information that is and is not appropriate for consideration
- Be prepared to ask questions for clarification of standards and procedures before discussion of candidates

b. Preparation Specific to a Candidate

- Responsible for thorough review of the candidate's dossier with respect to the DHA 7.12 criteria
- Review actual work—articles, artistic work, syllabi, etc.
- By the 3rd year of the probationary review (of a normal 6 year review period), assess candidate's dossier to determine if candidate is getting up to speed, i.e., is he/she developing a dossier that will eventually meet the expected outcomes of our post-tenure review standards

5. Tenured Faculty Meeting to Review Candidates

a. Basic Premises

- All members of tenured faculty come prepared to discuss candidate's body of work and performance based on DHA 7.12 criteria
- Faculty participate in an open discussion in a non-hostile climate
- Multiple scheduled meetings provide for reflection between the meetings
- If a tenured faculty member misses one or more of the meetings, they must talk with the Chairperson about what transpired at the meeting(s) missed

b. Chairperson of Tenured Faculty Meeting

- Department Head assigns a Chairperson to conduct the fall series of scheduled meetings
- Chairperson of Tenured Faculty Meeting may be different each year

c. Basic Meeting Sequence (additional meetings may be scheduled)

- First meeting
 - Presenter presents material regarding candidate
 - Faculty discuss candidate
- Second meeting
 - Continue discussion
 - Vote (see Section 7)
- Third meeting
 - Review statement (see Section 8)
 - Reach consensus

d. Discussion during the Tenured Faculty Meeting

- Chairperson convenes the meeting
- The Presenter presents the candidate's information (this could be a list but not in paragraph text format)
 - Description of position
 - Rank and years in position, 9 vs. 12 month,
 - Scholarship focus/foci and accomplishments
 - Typical teaching load (in classroom and/or in community)
 - Course numbers, titles, and evaluations of courses taught
 - Service activities
 - Terminology and headings need to be clear (e.g., books, monographs, refereed, national or international)
- Faculty discuss the candidate's accomplishments focusing on the vitae and record of accomplishments, not on ideas or works in progress
- Discuss strengths and concerns of research/creative production, teaching, and service
- Discussion includes the assessment of the quantity, quality, value, and impact of accomplishments each year based on DHA 7.12 criteria
- Mentor Committee may be called on to clarify, but not to defend the work of the candidate

e. Recording Information during Discussion at the Tenured Faculty Meeting

- The Assistant to the Head of the Department is designated by the Department Head as the Recorder to take written notes of the discussion
- Accurate notes must be taken including both positive and negative comments
- Comments should not be attributed to individuals by name
- All comments must be respected and noted
- When asked for opinions, it is fundamental that faculty be frank and open; willing to be honest, direct, and professional, focusing on assessment not accusation
- After the end of discussion, the faculty Presenter will take the Recorder's notes and compile a draft statement to be presented to faculty after vote is taken (see Sections 6 and 7)

6. Voting Process

- After final discussion, but before a statement is drafted, the official vote is taken by written unsigned secret ballot
- The statement is then prepared by the Presenter according to Section 7, below.

7. The Faculty Summary Statement

- After the discussion and vote, the Presenter of the candidate's accomplishments prepares a statement based on the written comments recorded by the Recorder. An outline of the content that needs to be in the statement should be developed and then the statement written based on the Recorder's notes
- The statement is circulated, revised, and approved by consensus of the faculty indicating that it accurately reflects the discussion of the candidate's record and the vote of the faculty
- Statement must reflect the candidate's accomplishments relative to the DHA 7.12 criteria and, for probationary faculty, response to previous year's recommendations
- Statement should include:
 - Description of position
 - Rank and years in position, 9 vs. 12 month, typical teaching load (in classroom/in community)
 - Scholarship focus/foci
 - Objective list of accomplishments for the previous year or for all years considered in the tenure decision year
 - Three sections consistent with DHA 7.12 criteria to include: creative production and research, teaching, outreach/engagement, and service
 - Quantify performance when applicable, e.g., three refereed journal publications, mean ratings of student evaluation of teaching, number of committees served
 - Objective explanation or description of accomplishments based on criteria in DHA 7.12

8. Meeting Outcome

- Annual review results are discussed with the candidate, including the vote results and the statement.
- Mentor Committee and Department Head report back to candidate to give the nuance of conversations

9. Process for Tenured Faculty Applying for Promotion to Full Professor

- Faculty members who are associate professors should develop a plan mid-point in the time period of being an associate professor about going up for promotion to full professor
- In consultation with the Department Head, the associate professor should identify faculty members who could serve as mentors—it is likely that two faculty mentors would be sufficient
- The role of the Mentor Committee for this promotional purpose is one of advocacy

- The Tenured Faculty Meeting includes only the tenured full professors, but follows the same procedures for conducting the meeting as outlined in this document.

10. Additional Issues to Consider Ensuring a Climate of Cooperation

- Issues of safety—i.e., need to be able to contradict each other without defensiveness or creation of a negative environment
- Issues of culture—i.e., difference versus diversity; of ideology versus personality
- Issues of confidentiality—i.e., comments and opinions not shared or discussed outside of meeting
- Issues of objectivity—i.e., review annual accomplishments for content rather than for rationale for a predetermined opinion
- Issues of disciplinary standards—i.e., understand conventions in various fields