

Department of Biomedical Engineering

7.12 Criteria for promotion and tenure

I. Introduction

This document describes with more specificity the indices and standards that will be used to evaluate whether candidates meet the general criteria in Sections 7.11 and 9.2 of the Regents Policy on Faculty *Tenure* for the following personnel evaluations:

- A. Annual performance appraisal of progress toward achieving tenure.
- B. Recommendation for awarding indefinite tenure according to the Regents Policy on Faculty *Tenure* (University of Minnesota, 2007; hereafter cited as *Faculty Tenure*), Section 7.11. General Criteria.
- C. Recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor and Full Professor according to Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, Section 9.2 Criteria for Promotion to Professor.
- D. Annual performance appraisal for post tenure review according to Section 7a.1 and 7a.2 of the *Faculty Tenure*.”

In addition, this document is consistent with the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* (2007), hereafter referred to as the *Procedures*.

II. Department of Biomedical Engineering Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of Biomedical Engineering is to deliver innovative educational programs of the highest quality at all degree levels, conduct pioneering high-impact research spanning from basic science to clinical and technological application, and serve the local biomedical engineering community around the University, in the local biomedical device community, and beyond, via these pursuits.

III. Annual Appraisals of Probationary Faculty

Probationary faculty will be reviewed annually and progress will be evaluated according to Section 7.11 in the *Faculty Tenure*, the *Procedures*, and the criteria described here (Section IV).

Mentoring is an important component in the promotion and tenure process. The department head will assign a tenured faculty member from the department to serve as adviser for each probationary faculty member. The adviser's responsibility is to serve as mentor and to provide guidance and advice on teaching, research directions and funding, advising of students, and professional service. The adviser will also be responsible for soliciting an annual report from the probationary faculty member on his/her teaching, research, and service activities plus any additional information deemed necessary for the review according to this 7.12 statement and according to the *Procedures*, Sections 5 through 8. The adviser will prepare a written report to the department head. It will be the responsibility of the department head to review the adviser's report with the probationary faculty member. This report and review is the basis for the annual Form 12 for the review of probationary faculty.

Tenure decisions may be made in any year of the probationary period, as described in Section 5.2 of the *Faculty Tenure* and Section 9 of the *Procedures*. A candidate must be considered in a formal tenure review in the last year of the probationary period.

In accordance with Section 5.5 of the *Faculty Tenure* the probationary period may be extended by one year at a time at the request of the faculty member for childbirth/adoption, caregiver responsibilities, or medical reasons. The criteria for evaluation of faculty who have had their probationary period extended are no different than the criteria for faculty who do not have an extension of the probationary period. Extension of the probationary period in accordance with Section 5.5 will not be a factor in the evaluation.

The department may recommend termination of a candidate's appointment at any time in accordance with Section 10 of the *Procedures*.

IV. Conferral of Indefinite Tenure

Section 7.11 of the *Faculty Tenure* specifies the criteria for tenure:

7.11 General Criteria What the University of Minnesota seeks above all in its faculty members is intellectual distinction and academic integrity. The basis for awarding indefinite tenure to the candidates possessing these qualities is the determination that each has established and is likely to continue to develop a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national or international reputation or both [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.

To be awarded indefinite tenure in the Department of Biomedical Engineering a faculty member must demonstrate effectiveness in teaching and must establish a record of excellence and creativity in scholarly research and its dissemination. These are the primary criteria, and the fulfillment of both is a minimum requirement for the awarding of indefinite tenure. Extraordinary distinction in teaching alone, or in research alone, is not sufficient for the granting of indefinite tenure.

A faculty member may choose to participate in service to the profession and in other governance and service activities. These contributions, however, are secondary to the

teaching and research components in evaluations leading to decisions regarding the granting of tenure. An outstanding record in the service component alone is not, by itself, sufficient to form the basis for a recommendation of indefinite tenure.

When considering the record of probationary faculty who have stopped the tenure clock (Section 5.5 of the *Faculty Tenure*), the criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than the criteria for faculty who do not have an extension of the probationary period. Extension of the probationary period in accordance with Section 5.5 may not be a factor in the tenure decision. That is, a record of six years post-hiring with a one-year stopping of the clock must be considered the same way that one considers five years post-hiring with no stopping of the tenure clock.

A. Teaching

Effectiveness in teaching is assessed from the candidate's contributions to the overall teaching mission of the university including, where appropriate, classroom, laboratory and individualized instruction at both undergraduate and graduate levels, the supervising of graduate students, and the advising of postdoctoral personnel.

Examples of factors which may be used in the evaluation of effectiveness in teaching at the undergraduate level include, but are not limited to, the following:

- written evaluations by students; where quantitative course evaluations are used, performance is expected to be minimally in the satisfactory range. Teaching in the Department of Biomedical Engineering includes a variety of courses, including large undergraduate core courses and smaller graduate courses. Student evaluations from these different types of classes can show considerable variation. Therefore, historical department norms for these classes will also be used for comparison, when possible;
- written evaluations by peers based on classroom visits and review of course materials; interdisciplinary classes may also be evaluated by representatives from the other fields;
- development of new courses and/or laboratories;
- supervision of undergraduate research projects;
- local and national awards for teaching.

At the graduate level, the primary consideration in establishing teaching effectiveness is expertise in the teaching of advanced courses, in the conducting of graduate seminars, and in the supervising of graduate students at the masters and doctoral levels, including peer evaluation of the progress of the candidate's advisees. Other factors that may be taken into consideration at the graduate level are:

- written evaluations by students;
- written evaluations by peers based upon classroom and/or seminar visits;
- development of new courses and/or laboratories;
- supervision of postdoctoral personnel

B. Research

The quality of a candidate's original research and the impact of the work within the candidate's research area are the primary criteria by which professional distinction in research is established. Examples of factors upon which an analysis of the research accomplishments of the candidate may be based include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Written evaluations of the candidate's research activities and of the candidate's publications in peer-reviewed research journals and research monographs. These evaluations are requested from persons who are generally recognized as leaders in the candidate's research area. Effort shall be made to obtain at least 8 letters of evaluation from persons outside the University, some of whom should be of international stature. At least 6 of the reviewers must not have any professional or personal interest in the advancement of the candidate's career (for example, former advisers, mentors, co-authors, and co-investigators). The candidate will be asked to suggest the names of reviewers to the department head who will then consult with the chair of the candidate's promotion and tenure committee. Letters will be requested as set forth in the *Procedures*. Interdisciplinary research is intrinsic to biomedical engineering, and will be evaluated by experts from both biomedical engineering and the other disciplines most relevant to the candidate's research activities. Collaborative research will be evaluated by obtaining information from the candidate on his/her relative contribution to the work and from senior members of the research group and/or senior authors on the publication. About half of the suggested reviewers should originate from the candidate and half from the department.
- Peer-reviewed external research funding, insofar as such funding indicates the attainment of a meritorious level of research accomplishment. Research funding is necessary to develop and sustain a competitive research program and is expected to a degree depending on the candidate's particular research area and associated funding climate. Each probationary faculty member is expected to demonstrate a concerted effort to obtain external funding by the submission of competitive research proposals and may be asked to share research proposals and/or proposal reviews with his or her adviser.

In evaluating the candidate's research contributions through the various avenues of publication and presentation, the objectives are to establish that the work is of high quality, that it is a scholarly and creative contribution that substantially advances understanding or practice, and that it is a measure of the candidate's potential to make continuing contributions in biomedical engineering.

Other accomplishments that may be used to establish the candidate's research ability include, but are not limited to, the following examples:

- election to prestigious national organizations that recognize excellence in a discipline.
- research awards and honors granted by professional societies, government agencies, and industry.
- patents, inventions, technology transfer, and other such developments of a significant scientific or engineering nature.
- publication of scholarly review articles and research monographs.

C. Service

In some units, service to the profession is an integral component of a faculty member's professional obligations. It enhances the faculty member's professional reputation, and it brings recognition to the department and the University. While service to the profession is expected, it is not a sufficient basis for the granting of tenure in the Department of Biomedical Engineering.

Examples of service contributions to the profession include, but are not limited to:

- editor or associate editor of a refereed scientific or technical journal.
- officer in a national or international scientific or technical society.
- member of a national or international scientific or technical committee.
- member of a governmental or private advisory committee.
- organizer or member of the organizing committee for a national or international symposium or conference.
- review of technical and scientific papers for peer-reviewed journals and conference presentations.
- review of proposals for funding agencies.
- participation in public outreach and education.
- advising of undergraduate and professional student organizations;

Participation in the governance of the institution and other services to the University and the Department of Biomedical Engineering is expected for Biomedical Engineering faculty and may be included as additional support for a tenure recommendation. Examples of such services include, but are not limited to, active participation in departmental, collegiate, and University committees.

V. Promotion

The following paragraphs describe the criteria for promotion to tenured ranks from within the Institute of Technology. The same criteria and standards are applied for appointments from outside.

|

A. To associate professor (with tenure) from assistant professor (probationary)

Promotion to the rank of associate professor from the rank of probationary assistant professor in the Department of Biomedical Engineering is always accompanied by the granting of permanent tenure. Thus a candidate for promotion to associate professor must have established a professional record that meets the requirements for effectiveness in teaching and professional distinction in research as set forth in Section IV. Service contributions are also included in the evaluation of the candidate, but cannot be used in place of either the teaching or the research criteria.

B. To associate professor (with tenure) from associate professor (probationary)

The granting of indefinite tenure to an associate professor on a probationary appointment requires that the candidate meet all the requirements for effectiveness in teaching and professional distinction in research as set forth in Section IV.

C. To professor from associate professor

Section 9.2 of the *Faculty Tenure* specifies the criteria for promotion to full 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 [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.

In the Department of Biomedical Engineering, it is expected that associate professors strive toward promotion to full professor. Candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to have a record of accomplishment that substantially exceeds that achieved for promotion to associate professor. It is the responsibility of the department head to advise the associate professors on their progress as part of the annual departmental performance review process.

A candidate for promotion to the rank of professor must have achieved a high level of professional distinction through research contributions to the candidate's discipline(s) that are distinguished by substance, quality and creativity, and through consistently high standards in teaching. Service to the profession, participation in the governance of the institution, and other services to the department, college, and University are expected for candidates for promotion to professor, but they are not in themselves bases for promotion to the rank of professor. Promotion to the rank of professor will not be granted solely on the basis of length of service to the academic unit.

For promotion to professor, the candidate is expected to satisfy the criteria specified in Section IV, with emphasis on:

- high quality research that indicates that the candidate is among the leaders in biomedical engineering and the other disciplines most relevant to the candidate's research field, as documented by letters from acknowledged national and international leaders and contributors to the knowledge base in the field.
- demonstrated high quality teaching.

Examples of other factors that may be used to establish a candidate's professional reputation include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a record of continuous external research funding.
- a record of effective advising of masters and doctoral degree candidates.
- the effective advising of post-doctoral personnel.
- invitations to national and international symposia and conferences.
- membership and the holding of office in professional societies.
- general professional contributions such as editorships, expository writing, and other activities that enhance the professional stature of the candidate.

The methods of assessment of the performance of a candidate being considered for promotion to the rank of professor are the same as those employed in the granting of tenure.

VI. Post Tenure Review of Faculty Performance

The goals and expectations for tenured faculty will parallel those used in granting tenure taking into account the different stages of professional development. Tenured faculty in the Department of Biomedical Engineering are expected to maintain an active research program, teach courses as required by the department, advise students, and serve the goals of the department and the college, all with the distinction that merited their promotion.

According to Section 7a of the *Faculty Tenure* all faculty are reviewed annually as part of the annual merit review process in accordance with Senate policy. The Department of Biomedical Engineering has a Post Tenure Review Committee of three full professors appointed by the department head. If, during the course of the annual review process, both the department head and the Post Tenure Review Committee find a faculty member's performance to be substantially below the goals and expectations of the department, they must send a letter or memorandum to the faculty member stating that finding. The letter must be signed both by the department head and by all members of the Committee and must specify the deficiencies. If such findings occur over three consecutive years, the letter must also set a time period of at least one year, during which the faculty member should address the identified problems. Both the department head and the Committee should work with the faculty member to improve performance during that time. Efforts must be made at this point in the process to assist the faculty member in remedying perceived deficiencies.

If the faculty member's performance continues to be below expectations then the procedures described in 7a.3 of the *Faculty Tenure* will be followed.

VII. Procedures

The departments of the Institute of Technology comply with the procedures as provided by Sections 7.4, 7.61 and 16.3 of the *Faculty Tenure*.

During, if not before, the decision year for a probationary faculty member, the department head assigns a three (or more) member committee to oversee the promotion process, which normally includes the person serving as the candidate's adviser. This committee, in consultation with the department head, is responsible for soliciting the letters of recommendation for promotion and tenure. The candidate, working with his or her committee, will be responsible for assembling the dossier in accordance with the guidelines provided by the Institute of Technology and the *Procedures*. Based on their review of the dossier and the letters of recommendation, the candidate's committee will make its recommendations for tenure decisions to a meeting of the tenured faculty in the Department of Biomedical Engineering. All of the tenured faculty are expected to have reviewed the candidate's file prior to the meeting and participate in the vote. After discussion the faculty will vote by secret ballot. [Tenured faculty who are absent from the university for an extended period, such as a sabbatical or other leave of absence, will be given the option of voting in absentia]. A two-thirds majority of the faculty eligible to

vote is required for a positive decision. The same procedures and voting standard will apply to decisions for promotion to full professor where all of the full professors are expected to review the file and to participate in the vote.

Approved by the faculty: December 17, 2007

Approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost: March 24, 2008