

DEPARTMENT OF ANIMAL SCIENCE
7.12 Statement

**Procedures, Criteria and Guidelines for Faculty Tenure, Promotion,
Annual Review and Post-Tenure Review.**

Approved by the Department of Animal Science Faculty
April 21, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT 3
II.	DEPARTMENTAL MISSION STATEMENT 3
III.	CRITERIA FOR CONFERRAL OF INDEFINITE TENURE 4
	A. Standards and Indices for Tenure	
	B. Teaching: Graduate and Undergraduate Academic Programs	
	C. Teaching: Extension and Non-degree Instruction	
	D. Research/Scholarship	
	E. Service	
	F. Stopping the Tenure Clock	
IV.	ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY 10
	A. Guidelines	
	B. Procedures	
V.	RECOMMENDATION FOR TENURE 13
VI.	RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION 15
	A. Promotion to Associate Professor	
	1. Criteria for teaching	
	2. Criteria for research/scholarship	
	3. Criteria for service	
	4. Procedures	
	B. Promotion to Professor	
	1. Criteria for teaching	
	2. Criteria for research/scholarship	
	3. Criteria for service	
	4. Procedures	
VII.	POST-TENURE REVIEW 16
	Appendix A – 7.11 General Criteria 20
	Appendix B – 9.2 Criteria for Promotion to Professor 21

I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

This document describes, with specificity, the criteria, standards and procedures to be used in the Department of Animal Science as follows:

- A. Criteria for Conferral of Indefinite Tenure.
[In accordance with the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure* University of Minnesota, 2007; hereafter cited as *Faculty Tenure*), Section 7.11. General Criteria – Appendix A]
- B. Guidelines and procedures for annual appraisals of probationary faculty.
- C. Guidelines and procedures for decisions on indefinite tenure
- D. Guidelines and procedures for decisions on promotion to associate professor and professor (Section 9.2 of *Faculty Tenure*).
- E. Guidelines and procedures for annual post-tenure reviews
[According to Section 7a.1 and 7a.2 of the *Faculty Tenure*.]

II. DEPARTMENTAL MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Department of Animal Science is to provide educational opportunities for several populations of learners, to conduct research that generates new knowledge concerning the biology of farm animals and that improves the efficiency of animal production, and to serve livestock producers and livestock-related agribusinesses in Minnesota. The programs in the Department of Animal Science serve the needs of people everywhere, but special emphasis is placed on those in Minnesota and the region. Educational and research programs include an appreciation of and involvement in international issues and activities. Educational opportunities are provided for students who pursue baccalaureate, graduate (M.S. and Ph.D.) and Master of Agriculture degrees and for learners in a variety of off-campus settings. Research in the Department of Animal Science addresses significant issues related to biological functions of economically important food-producing farm animals and improves our knowledge of farm animal production systems.

The goal of the Department of Animal Science is to fulfill its mission with quality and nationally recognized research and education opportunities and programs. To achieve this, the Department strives to provide a work environment for faculty that allows them to flourish and achieve their highest potential.

The goals of faculty to achieve the mission should be:

- Providing the highest quality science-based educational programs and opportunities to undergraduate, masters and doctoral degree students.
- Providing scholarly and relevant extension programs to our stakeholders, animal industries, governmental agencies, national and international organizations, and the public to enhance their knowledge in, and application of, current research addressing animal issues.

- Conducting innovative basic and applied research to broaden our scientific knowledge for solving today's and tomorrow's problems facing animal science.

Individual faculty members should have goals to become full professors and achieve university, national and international recognition in their education and/or research area or discipline specialty.

Faculty are encouraged to demonstrate inquiry, creativity, attention to questions of diversity, and innovation through interdisciplinary and intercultural scholarship and teaching. Collaboration, interaction and education across a wide range of diverse ethnic and cultural perspectives contributes to the breadth and quality of academic work and represents a core value of the University of Minnesota.

III. CRITERIA FOR CONFERRAL OF INDEFINITE TENURE

The award of indefinite tenure will be based on achievements that demonstrate the effectiveness of the individual for continued significant contributions to the mission of the Department, College and University (See Appendix A. Section 7.11 of *Faculty Tenure*). The primary criteria are demonstrated effectiveness in teaching (which includes extension) and professional distinction and demonstrated production in research/scholarship. Throughout this document, teaching is inclusive of all instructional and educational efforts to registered University students and to individuals and groups in the community seeking educational opportunities outside of degree granting programs. Criteria specific to teaching types are defined below. Effectiveness in teaching will be evaluated in accordance to the appointment and the responsibilities defined in the probationary faculty member's position description. Outstanding service to the Department, the College and/or the University, will be taken into consideration, but is not in itself a basis for awarding tenure. Faculty are encouraged to demonstrate inquiry, creativity, attention to questions of diversity, and innovation through interdisciplinary and intercultural scholarship and teaching. Collaboration, interaction and education across a wide range of diverse ethnic and cultural perspectives contributes to the breadth and quality of academic work and represents a core value of the University of Minnesota.

A. CRITERIA FOR TENURE

1. Development of clearly defined **research** and **teaching** focuses.
2. Demonstrated effectiveness in **teaching**.
3. Demonstrated evidence of outstanding **research**/scholarly achievement.
4. Successful **advising or co-advising** of M.S. or PhD students.
5. Demonstrated **professional leadership**.
6. Evidence of continuing **professional** and **interpersonal growth**.

**B. TEACHING:
GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC PROGRAMS**

Demonstrated effectiveness in graduate and undergraduate teaching involves coordinating and taking responsibility for the development of educational programs and conducting learning experiences for students enrolled in credit-granting courses.

Specific Criteria and Standard Levels of Performance

1. Course development
 - a. Goals and objectives of courses are consistent with student learning outcomes.
 - b. Information is important, durable, correct, current and professionally credible.
 - c. Appropriate for audience.
 - d. Information presented is consistent with stated goals and objectives
2. Use of effective teaching methods, materials and course construction
 - a. Provides challenges appropriate for the level of the course and the students.
 - b. Promotes depth of understanding
 - c. Provides coherent and logically connected body of knowledge.
3. Learning activities (reading, writing, listening, viewing, interviewing, discussing, case studies)
 - a. Activities are designed to facilitate learning.
 - b. Student participation is fostered.
 - c. Technical material is discussed in the context of its use.
 - d. Timely and meaningful feedback is provided on student questions and assignments.
 - e. Enables students to be proficient in the subject upon course completion.
 - f. Assessment of student learning.
4. Advising graduate and/or undergraduate students.
 - a. Available to students.
 - b. Knowledgeable about their own and students' responsibilities.
 - c. Concerned about individual student's progress and willing to help.
5. Professional competence
 - a. Demonstrates mastery of the subject matter
 - b. Creatively packages and uses existing educational materials
 - c. Develops timely, relevant and professionally accepted subject matter.

6. Teaching Evaluation

- a. Documented effectiveness in teaching through student and peer evaluation. Letters will be invited from experts to assess the quality of teaching.
- b. Responsive to student and peer evaluations. Re-evaluates course content, goals and teaching methods to revise appropriately.
- c. Periodically participates in seminar or structured programs designed to foster teaching excellence.

C. TEACHING: EXTENSION AND NON-DEGREE INSTRUCTION

This teaching involves developing educational programs and conducting learning experiences for people who are not enrolled for credit toward a degree. Included in these teaching programs are a variety of activities such as group and individual teaching, and information dissemination through publications, audio-visual materials and computer programs.

Specific Criteria and Standard Levels of Performance

1. Program Development

- a. Goals, objectives and content of program are consistent with learning outcomes
- b. Information is important, durable, correct, current and professionally credible.
- c. Appropriate for identified audience.
- d. Information presented is consistent with stated goals and objectives

2. Program Presentation - teaching activities to support educational program

- a. Serves as a resource person in informal and formal meetings and workshops with individuals and groups seeking information.
- b. Serves as a resource person in print and on electronic media programs.
- c. Effectively communicates information and knowledge.
- d. Demonstrates sensitivity to needs of learners.
- e. Imaginative use of program delivery mechanisms

3. Use of effective teaching materials

- a. Develops appropriate educational materials for the learner and the setting
- b. Promotes depth of understanding
- c. Provides coherent and logically connected body of knowledge

4. Learning activities (reading, writing, listening, viewing, interviewing, discussing, case studies)
 - a. Activities are designed to facilitate learning.
 - b. Learner participation is fostered.
 - c. Technical material is discussed in the context of its use.
 - d. Timely and meaningful feedback is provided on learner questions.
 - e. Enables the learners to meet educational objectives in the subject by the time the extension program is finished.
 - f. Assessment of student learning.

5. Professional competence
 - a. Demonstrates mastery of the subject matter
 - b. Creatively packages and uses existing educational materials
 - c. Develops timely, relevant and professionally accepted subject matter.

6. Teaching Evaluation.
 - a. Documented effectiveness in teaching through clientele and peer evaluation. Letters will be invited from peers to assess the quality of teaching.
 - b. Responsive to evaluations. Re-evaluates course content, goals and teaching methods to revise appropriately.
 - c. Periodically participates in seminar or structured programs designed to foster teaching excellence.

D. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

Professional distinction and demonstrated production in research and other scholarly activities are necessary for achieving tenure. All faculty, regardless of appointment, are expected to conduct research and publish results in peer reviewed journals. In addition to scientific research, scholarship includes activities that bring distinction to individuals, their department and the University of Minnesota, such as novel dissemination of existing knowledge and methodologies used in extending this information. It is recognized that for knowledge to be useful, it must be communicated to the appropriate audience. Therefore, it is expected that results be made available through publication and through other appropriate means.

Evaluation of scholarship is both qualitative and quantitative.

a. Qualitative Standard Levels of Performance

1. Significance – The research/scholarship generates new approaches, hypotheses and theories, contributes to understanding of an important principle or has wide-ranging implications in other areas. The research/scholarship results in advances in our knowledge and understanding of animal biology and management.
2. Soundness – The research is based on use of appropriate experimental designs, use of proper controls, sufficient sample size, and appropriate statistical analysis. Other scholarship is to be of high scientific merit
3. Pertinence – The research/scholarship activities focus on state, national and international needs and advance the mission of the Department, College and University. The research promotes the use of research findings by industry, government, educators and other scholars.
4. Solicited Disciplinary Expert Evaluation – Letters will be invited from experts (identified by the candidate and the Department Head) to assess the quality of research/scholarship.

b. Specific Quantitative Criteria

1. Publications
 - a. Must publish refereed articles in appropriate professional journals.
 - b. Examples of other publication areas include (but are not limited to): books, chapters in books, and papers of comparable quality to professional journals or other science-oriented publications (preferably peer-reviewed); and other forms for the profession or the general public including software (with accompanying documentation)
2. Research Funding
 - a. Must obtain external research funding to support and maintain a research program.
3. Graduate Student Advising
 - a. Demonstrates the ability to supervise graduate student research.
 - b. Facilitates students' reasonable progress towards completion of degree programs.
4. Professional activities
 - a. Examples of professional activities include (but are not limited to): presentations at professional meetings and invited seminars, receiving special professional honors, recognition and achievements.

E. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Service to the profession is expected of all faculty and will be taken into consideration for the granting of tenure, but is not in itself a basis for awarding tenure. Professional service enhances the faculty member's professional reputation and brings recognition to the Department and University.

1. Service to the Department, College and/or University
 - a. Serves on committees or task forces
 - b. Attends and participates in departmental meetings, seminars and workshops.
 - c. Responds to requests for voluntary tasks.
 - d. Exhibits leadership towards resolution of departmental issues or problems.
 - e. Provides professional service to student organizations.
2. Service to the Profession
 - a. Attends and participates in professional meetings.
 - b. Serves on committees or boards or as an officer.
 - c. Engages in editorial work and/or reviews manuscripts in professional journals.
3. Service to the community, state or federal agencies
 - a. Provides professional service to community, state or federal agencies.

F. STOP THE CLOCK

Stopping the tenure clock is the right of probationary faculty according to Section 5.5 of *Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure*. When considering the record of probationary faculty who have stopped the tenure clock, criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than the criteria for those who do not have an extension to the tenure clock.

IV. ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

A. GUIDELINES

Probationary faculty in the Department of Animal Science will be reviewed annually by the Promotion, Tenure and Salary Adjustment Committee* (Committee) and tenured faculty to determine their performance and progress** towards tenure. Appraisal will be based on the current year's activity report. Each year's performance data are to be accumulated and assembled into a probationary file*** that provides a complete and objective synopsis of the individual's accomplishments and activities across all years of probation.

The primary criteria for the annual appraisal will be effectiveness in teaching, whether conducted on campus or in extension/outreach program activities, and professional distinction in research. Outstanding discipline-related service contributions will be taken into account but shall not, in themselves, be a basis for awarding tenure. The criteria will be consistent with and follow the 7.11 (Appendix A) and 7.12 statements for teaching, research and service.

** Promotion, Tenure and Salary Adjustment Committee consists of 6 tenured faculty (2 from each discipline/area of specialization on staggered terms), elected for 2-year terms (no consecutive terms) as specified in the Departmental guidelines. The Head of the Department shall be a non-voting member of the Committee.*

*** This probationary file is updated yearly and is only part of the probationary faculty member's personnel file in the department. It contains only those matters which are relevant to an eventual tenure decision and is accessible to the individual and to all tenured faculty in the department. The Tenure, Promotion and Salary Adjustment Committee has access to this file when making recommendations relative to the performance of the individual faculty. Other portions of the individual's personnel file are accessible only to the individual and authorized individuals.*

**** In addition to the annual appraisal, decisions to recommend consideration of early tenure or promotion originate from the Committee.*

- 1. Faculty are identified by the Committee (by majority vote- vote includes Department Head's vote in this case) as having potential for early tenure and/or promotion.*
- 2. The Department Head contacts these faculty, discusses their options and determines if they wish to have their file prepared for consideration the following fall.*
- 3. If a faculty member decides to have his/her file considered, they will work with the Department Head to have a complete file (including letters of support) ready for consideration by the following August.*

B. PROCEDURES

Beginning with the first year of the probationary period, the probationary faculty member has the responsibility for gathering performance data relevant to the criteria for tenure for the probationary file. The final tenure/promotion file will be inclusive of data from these probationary files.

The department head will help guide the development of the probationary file and appoint a tenured faculty member or committee to be a mentor to the probationary faculty member. The department will assist in accumulating data and performance indices over the probationary period and the final development and assembling of the tenure/promotion file for submission in the probationary faculty member's decision year.

The probationary file should include:

1. Current position description
2. Current curriculum vitae
3. Annual activity reports
4. Summaries of teaching effectiveness include: syllabus for credit courses, student and peer evaluations for credit courses, description of extension programs and activities, extension teaching evaluations.
5. Summaries, citation listings or copies of research or other scholarly contributions such as journal publications, conference proceedings, extension publications, books or book chapters.
6. Record of research and other grant submissions and awards
7. Summaries of discipline-related service activities
8. Summaries of supplementary criteria such as participation in the governance of the University or department.
9. Appraisal of Probationary Faculty (PF-12) forms (current and previous).
10. Any other material relating to the satisfaction of the tenure criteria.
11. Where relevant, evaluations of discipline-related service activities.
12. The file may also include evaluations by persons, inside and outside of the University, of teaching, research or scholarly contributions

The probationary faculty member has the right and the responsibility to inspect the probationary file. He/She has a right to inspect individual evaluations contained in it and a right to add material to the file or to make written comments. Material provided by the probationary faculty should be identified as such.

Timeline:

November

1. Probationary faculty submit their probationary file to the Committee.
2. Committee meets to discuss probationary performance on the basis of criteria specified in the 7.12.
3. Committee prepares a summary for the PF-12 form and to provide to the voting (tenured) faculty.

December

4. Voting faculty are given access to the probationary file for review.
5. Voting faculty meet as a whole. The Department Head and members of the Committee present information relative to the probationary faculty member's performance. Open discussion occurs followed by voting.
6. Voting is by secret, written ballot with yes, no or abstain choices in each of the following categories: 1) continuation of the appointment, 2) the individual is ready for consideration of tenure, 3) the individual is ready for consideration of promotion.
7. Votes are recorded on the PF12
8. Probationary faculty member meets with the Department Head to review and sign the PF12

Late December/early January

9. Department Head presents the PF12s to the college deans.

C. STOPPING THE TENURE CLOCK

See Section 5.5 of the *Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure* – stopping the tenure clock for either childbirth/adoption or caregiver responsibilities, or significant faculty illness or injury. A record of six years post-hiring, with a one-year stopping of the clock, must be considered the same way that one considers a record of five years post-hiring, with no stopping of the clock. When considering the record of probationary faculty who have stopped the tenure clock, criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than the criteria for those who do not have an extension to the tenure clock.

V. RECOMMENDATION FOR TENURE

A. PROCEDURES

The tenure and promotion process in the Department of Animal Science is intended to comply with the Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty as provided in Sections 7.9, 7.61 and 16.3 of the *Faculty Tenure* policy.

Probationary faculty in their decision year, and/or those who decide (based on consultation with the Committee and Department Head) to have their files considered early, proceed using the following timeline:

1. Submit complete (except for evaluation letters) files to the Committee by August.
2. Individual Committee members review all of the files.
3. Committee meets to discuss the evaluation of these individuals for tenure and/or promotion.
- ❖ For **decision year** tenure and/or promotion cases, the Committee makes recommendations for improving the content and presentation of the file.
- ❖ For **non-decision** year tenure and/or promotional consideration, after a thorough evaluation of the performance relative to the tenure/promotion criteria, a motion is requested of the Committee relative to extending indefinite tenure and/or promotion. The Committee either approves (simple majority required) or disapproves the motion.
4. The Department Head obtains letters of evaluation by the first of October for decision year, and approved non-decision year, tenure and/or promotion files.
5. The complete file is made available to the Committee in October. The current year PF12 summary is written. This summary is included in the file.
6. The files are made available to the voting faculty. Eligible voters for tenure decisions are tenured members of the departmental faculty. Eligible voters for promotion decisions are faculty who are senior in rank to the probationary faculty member.
7. A meeting of the voting faculty is called. The Department Head presents the Committee's summary to the voting faculty. After a thorough discussion of the performance of the faculty member in question, a motion is requested of the voting faculty relative to extending indefinite tenure and/or promotion.
8. Voting is conducted according to the following:
 - a. Voting shall be by individual, written, unsigned ballots.
 - b. Ballots include the options of Yes, No and Abstain in each of the categories of tenure, promotion (if applicable) and continuation.

- c. A 66% in favor vote of the total number of votes must be attained in order for the individual to be recommended for tenure and/or promotion. Abstentions are not counted in determining whether a majority of those voting cast votes in favor of tenure or promotion, as required to report an affirmative recommendation, but the number of abstentions is reported as part of the vote tally and, in the review process, they will be considered an indication of lack of support for the candidate by those abstaining. Abstentions are strongly discouraged.
 - d. Absentee ballots must be requested in advance of the meeting at which the voting occurs and will be accepted only under the condition that the voter has reviewed the complete file.
9. The Department Head prepares a letter to the Dean to describe the recommendations and vote of the tenured faculty concerning the individual for tenure and/or promotion. The Head will also include his/her recommendations. The recommendation of the Head may or may not be consistent with the recommendation of the faculty.

Timeline:

August

Submit complete file (except for evaluation letters) to the Committee
Committee reviews file and makes suggestions for improvement of content and presentation
Probationary faculty has opportunity to improve file

September

Evaluators are identified and contacted by the Department Head to confirm willingness to write evaluation letters.
File is sent to evaluators requesting letters be returned by first of October

October

Committee reviews file with evaluation letters included. Prepares for faculty discussions and provides input to Department Head for use in his/her letter.
Committee writes PF12 summary for that year

Late October/early November

Files are available for voting faculty to review
Meeting of voting faculty is held, with discussion of the probationary faculty member's performance
Voting occurs.
Complete dossier is sent to college.

VI. RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION

A. Promotion to Associate Professor

Standards and Indices for Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to Associate Professor is usually associated with a decision concerning tenure. Promotion to this rank must meet the tenure criteria and standards identified in III above. The Procedures follow those identified in V. above.

B. Promotion to Professor

It is expected that all faculty have the goal of ultimately achieving the rank of professor.

General criteria for promotion to professor are those given in Section 9.2 (Appendix B) of *Faculty Tenure*. Further specific criteria are identified below. Contributions must have continued in all areas. In all cases, achievement is expected to be at a level exceeding that required for promotion to associate professor; service contributions particularly should substantively exceed the level expected for promotion to associate professor.

Standards and Indices for Promotion to Full Professor

1. Demonstrated scholarship in research and effectiveness in teaching.
2. Demonstrated high quality teaching
3. National and/or international professional recognition and/or leadership.
The candidate should have established a national and/or international reputation in their disciplinary field. Examples of this include election to prestigious scientific organizations, significant awards from national/international scientific organizations, election to offices in important societies, appointment to an editorial office for a scientific journal, or invitations to disciplinary symposia to make keynote presentations. This evidence must be substantiated by strong letters of support from known discipline subject-matter authorities from outside the University.
4. Successful advising or co-advising of M.S. or Ph.D. student(s) or Post-doc(s).
5. Demonstrated participation and leadership roles in service to the department, university and/or their profession.

Procedures follow those identified in 1-9 (excluding 6) of V above.

VII. POST TENURE REVIEW

PROCEDURES

The faculty post-tenure review process is intended to be constructive and to enable continued improvements in faculty performance.

Each March, faculty member performance will be reviewed by the Tenure, Promotion and Salary Adjustment Committee (TPSA) and by the Department Head and appropriate Research and Outreach Center (ROC) Head [hereafter identified as Head(s)] for Departmental faculty located at ROCs. The TPSA Committee consists of six tenured faculty members elected by the entire faculty, two from each of the following disciplines: Nutrition, Physiology and Growth Biology, and Production Systems. One of the six shall be a ROC faculty member. To ensure this, one ROC faculty member must be elected from the discipline that contains the largest number of ROC faculty. Each faculty member will vote for two representatives in the discipline that is most closely aligned with her/his major responsibility in the Department. Each faculty member may vote in only one discipline. The Department Head shall be an ex-officio non-voting member of the Committee. Members shall be elected for a two-year term and cannot serve consecutive terms. The terms for members from the same discipline will be staggered so that one new member from each discipline is elected each year. This review will cover the faculty member's performance during the previous three years relative to the applicable job description(s).

Results of the annual review of faculty member performance will be categorized as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. A satisfactory performance means the faculty member successfully met the expectations of the job description. An overall performance judged to be substantially below the expectations of the job description would be categorized as unsatisfactory. Examples of unsatisfactory performance include: lack of documented accomplishments relative to the job description and refusing reasonable assignments by the Head(s).

Regardless of the results, each faculty member will receive a written, signed summary of his or her review from the Head(s). The Head(s) will meet with each faculty member each April to discuss the review comments. Faculty members are encouraged to file a written response to the review, especially if there is disagreement. All review correspondence will be kept in the faculty member's personnel file.

ACTION PLAN

Satisfactory Performance. It is assumed that the annual review of faculty will result in at least a satisfactory assessment of each faculty member's performance. The review may identify areas that require attention to ensure continued satisfactory performance but this would not be considered abnormal or indicative of a less than satisfactory performance.

Unsatisfactory Performance. If both the Head(s) and the TPSA committee find the faculty member's overall performance to be substantially below the expectations of the job description, the performance will be categorized as unsatisfactory. The Head(s) and the TPSA committee will send a signed memorandum to the faculty member that

clearly defines the deficiencies. The memorandum will state the specific deficiencies and indicate that the faculty member will have two annual review years to address these deficiencies.

The TPSA Committee and the Head(s) will work with the faculty member to improve the performance during that year. The Department will provide reasonable support (financial or otherwise) for training and/or other resources deemed appropriate to assist the faculty member's efforts to improve their performance.

If both the Head(s) and the TPSA committee find the faculty member's performance to be substantially below the expectations of the job description after the subsequent two years (see Time-line) of this effort, the Head(s) will bring the issue to a vote of the tenured faculty in the department. The tenured faculty will have two weeks to review the faculty member's documents that had been previously reviewed by the Head(s) and TPSA committee. A simple majority vote will determine whether the Dean is requested to initiate a special review of the faculty member.

TIME-LINE

If a faculty member's performance is assessed to be substantially below the expectations of the job description, the following time-line will be initiated. The time-line can be terminated at any point when the faculty member achieves a satisfactory appraisal for the previous three years of performance.

Annual Review

Performance review of the previous three years is judged to be unsatisfactory by the Head(s) and the TPSA Committee. Specific written documentation of the problem and the plan to address the problem will be recorded, signed by the Head(s), given to the faculty member, and a copy placed in the faculty member's personnel file. The faculty member is encouraged to provide a written response to the Head(s) and TPSA Committee as soon as practical (generally within four weeks). The two year time-line to correct these deficiencies is initiated at the time the annual review documents were due to be collected (generally in February).

Year 1

Performance review of the previous year is evaluated during the normal review process. If performance has improved and is satisfactory, the two-year time-line is terminated. If performance remains unsatisfactory, the steps identified above in the Annual Review section are repeated for a second year.

Year 2

Performance review of the previous year is evaluated during the normal review process. If the Head(s) and the TPSA Committee deemed the performance remains substandard, the tenured faculty in the department will review the faculty member's CV and record of effort and vote (simple majority) to determine if the Dean should be asked to initiate a special review of the faculty member.

SPECIAL REVIEW

The special review panel is designated for each case separately. The review panel consists of five tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank than the individual being reviewed; they need not be members of the Academic Unit conducting the review. The dean will ask the faculty member being reviewed to designate one member of the panel within a specified time (e.g., one week). The faculty member may choose any faculty member in the University (other than himself/herself). If the faculty member does not designate anyone within the specified time, the faculty member waives the right to appoint a member. The remaining members (four, or all five, if the faculty member has not chosen one) are elected by secret ballot of the tenured faculty of the Academic Unit in a meeting convened by the Academic Unit head at the request of the dean. The tenured faculty may choose, for the panel, faculty members from other units who have the necessary expertise.

The faculty member should be invited to supply a resume and any other relevant information at the beginning of the process and to suggest the names of persons who could comment on performance. The faculty member should be given a reasonable time (e.g., two weeks) to submit this information. The dean and Academic Unit head also should provide the panel with information they have that reflects on the faculty member's performance. The panel may review the scholarly work of the faculty member, teaching evaluations, and other evidence of performance. It may seek internal and external reviews. Any documents received should be placed in the file; a memorandum should be made of any oral comments received and should also be placed in the file.

When all of the information has been assembled, the faculty member must be given a reasonable time (e.g., two weeks) to review it and an opportunity to make a statement to the review panel. The statement can be oral or written, as the faculty member chooses. After reviewing the collected information and any statement the faculty member has chosen to make, the panel will then prepare its report and recommendations.

A special review panel should be thorough in its work, but need not extend the process unduly. It should normally be possible to reach a conclusion within two to three months after the panel is selected. This would allow approximately two weeks for the faculty member and administrators to submit the initial information, another month for the committee to gather and complete a file, another two weeks for the faculty member to review that information and to make a presentation, and a period for deliberation and preparation of the report.

The faculty member may have the assistance of a faculty adviser or advocate throughout the review process. Indeed, the faculty member should be encouraged to have the counsel of a trusted colleague to put the issues into perspective. Since this is a performance review process, and not an accusatory judicial proceeding, a faculty colleague may be the most effective adviser. The adviser need not be a faculty member at the University.

If the faculty member chooses not to participate in the special review process, the panel may reach a conclusion based on the information otherwise obtained. The failure to participate may be taken into account in reaching its conclusions.

The members of the review panel and all others concerned should be reminded that information collected in this process is primarily "private data" under the Minnesota Data Practices Act. It should be made freely available to the faculty member under review, but may not be revealed to others (even to other members of the Academic Unit) except as required for the conduct of official business.

The report must be written and signed by the panel. The panel should send it to the faculty member, to the Academic Unit head, and to the dean.

Appendix A
University of Minnesota
Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*

7.11 General Criteria. What the University of Minnesota seeks above all in its faculty members is intellectual distinction and academic integrity. The basis for awarding indefinite tenure to the candidates possessing these qualities is the determination that each has established and is likely to continue to develop a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national or international reputation or both [3]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [4]. The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision [5]. Demonstrated scholarly or other creative achievement and teaching effectiveness must be given primary emphasis; service alone cannot qualify the candidate for tenure. Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, attention to questions of diversity, technology transfer, and other special kinds of professional activity by the candidate should be considered when applicable. The awarding of indefinite tenure presupposes that the candidate's record shows strong promise of his or her achieving promotion to professor.

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

[4] 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.

[5] 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 B
University of Minnesota
Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*

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

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

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