

7.12 Statement
Department of Bioproducts and Biosystems Engineering
Approved by the Faculty on July 20, 2009
Approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
Date July 22, 2009

I. Introduction

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

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

For a complete perspective, the reader is advised to review Sections 7 and 9 in their entirety (available at <http://www1.umn.edu/regents/policies/humanresources/FacultyTenure.pdf>).

The Department of Bioproducts and Biosystems Engineering (BBE) 7.12 statement is intended to support a climate that is conducive and supportive to helping assistant and associate professors advance in rank, achieve tenure, and be successful. The department will hire only the highest quality individuals with full expectation that they have the potential to achieve tenure and advance in rank to professor. The department’s promotion and tenure system is built upon a mentoring system to assist every individual in reaching their full potential in all areas including teaching (classroom and Extension), research, and service.

II. Departmental Mission and Vision

The mission of the Department of Bioproducts and Biosystems Engineering is to integrate engineering, science, technology and management for sustainable use of renewable resources and enhancement of the environment. The department envisions itself to be a global leader in the discovery, development and application of renewable resources and sustainable technologies to meet society's needs while enhancing the environment in Minnesota and beyond.

III. Standards for Tenure

To be awarded indefinite tenure, a faculty member in the Department of Bioproducts and Biosystems Engineering must meet the following general standards. The candidate has:

- Demonstrated evidence of teaching effectiveness.
- Established and will continue to add to a distinguished record of excellence in research and academic or creative achievement that is the foundation for professional distinction and a national or international reputation.
- Demonstrated evidence of engagement in disciplinary and institutional service.

Teaching Standards

Effectiveness in teaching is assessed by the candidate's contributions to the overall teaching mission of the university including, where appropriate, classroom, laboratory, and individualized instruction at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, advising of undergraduate students, advising of graduate students, and the supervising of postdoctoral personnel. For faculty with Extension appointments, teaching effectiveness is demonstrated by providing disciplinary leadership to the development and delivery of research-based educational program(s) pertinent to their expertise.

At the graduate level, the primary consideration in establishing teaching effectiveness is advising and mentoring of graduate students at the masters and/or doctoral levels and the supervision of post-doctoral and other research personnel towards successful progress and completion. Expertise and experience in teaching graduate level course(s) will be considered, if the candidate is involved in teaching graduate level classes.

Examples of factors that may be used in the evaluation of effectiveness in teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Written evaluations by students.
- Written evaluations by peers, and/or members of the departmental mentoring committee, as described in Section V, Subsection A, based upon invited classroom visitations and review of teaching materials.
- Modification of currently offered courses, and/or laboratories.
- Development of new and successful courses, and/or laboratories.
- Supervision of undergraduate research projects.
- Advising of undergraduate students.
- Advising of professional student organizations.
- Development of instructional materials.
- Publication of textbooks, peer reviewed journal articles, popular press, handbooks, etc. related to teaching pedagogy, instructional methods etc.
- University, regional and national teaching awards.
- Letters from students that document and/or describe impacts of the candidate's teaching.
- Candidate's demonstrated commitment to teaching excellence through participation in professional development activities that are focused on improvement of teaching.

- Supervision of postdoctoral personnel and other post-baccalaureate programs and students.

Extension teaching includes an array of coordinated activities such as presentations; group and one-on-one teaching; and information development and dissemination through publications, audio-visual materials and computer software. Examples of factors that may be used in the evaluation of effectiveness in Extension teaching include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Documentation of educational program impact including measures such as changes in practices or behaviors.
- Development of an external funding base to support Extension education programming.
- Written evaluations by peers and/or members of the departmental mentoring committee based upon invited Extension teaching visitations and review of teaching materials.
- Written evaluations by clientele.
- Written evaluations of the candidate's Extension program activities and products (publications, teaching materials, and other outputs) by peers.
- Development of educational programs, materials, and learning experiences.
- Development of software used to communicate program-related knowledge or to solve key problems of program stakeholders.
- Letters from educational program participants which describe the impact of the candidate's Extension teaching.
- Local and/or national awards for teaching and Extension education materials.
- Invitations to collaborate on regional, multi-state, or national Extension educational events.

Research Standards

The quality of a candidate's research and the demonstrated or potential impact of the work within the candidate's professional discipline 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 to include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Written evaluations of the candidate's research activities and of the candidate's scholarly achievement. During the promotion process, these evaluations are requested from persons who are recognized as leaders in the candidate's area of research. If the candidate has a strong interdisciplinary component in his/her research, written evaluations are also requested from persons whose research crosses similar interdisciplinary boundaries. These evaluations will include an assessment of the candidate's scholarly publications in peer-reviewed research journals and research monographs relevant to the candidate's area of research.
- Written evaluations of the candidate's non-peer reviewed publications including, but not limited to, abstracts, conference proceedings, and other professional publications. These evaluations are an integral part of the documentation upon which the decision on the quality of the candidate's research is based, but they do not form the primary basis for that decision.

- Participation in discipline-related national and/or international professional conferences, symposia, meetings, and special lectures.
- Development of an external research funding base from sources outside the University occurring as a result of the candidate's research skill and competence.
- Development of new technology or scientific procedures and participation in activities that lead to the public availability of innovative products, practices, and ideas that have significance and value to society.

In evaluating the candidate's research contributions through the various relevant avenues of publication and presentation, the objectives are to establish the work as being of high quality; scholarly and creative contribution to the candidate's professional discipline. Also, the work is a measure of the candidate's contributions and abilities to continue to contribute to pure and/or translational research. In addition to peer-reviewed research journal publications, examples of research contributions to be considered include but are not limited to the following examples that are listed in alphabetical order: 1) Publications: a. abstracts, b. books, c. Extension, d. non-refereed, e. review articles, f. software; 2) Oral presentations: a. invited presentations and seminars, b. professional meetings.

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

- Election to or significant leadership in discipline-related national professional organizations that recognize excellence in a discipline.
- Research awards and honors granted by professional societies, government agencies, industry, and others.
- Patents, inventions, and other creative endeavors of a significant scientific or technical nature.

Service Standards

In BBE, service to the profession is an integral component of a faculty member's professional obligations. Outstanding service enhances the faculty member's professional reputation, and brings recognition to the department and the University. However, service alone to the profession is not a sufficient basis for granting of tenure, and/or promotion.

Examples of service to the discipline and/or discipline-based service include, but are not limited to serving as:

- 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 of a national or international symposium or conference.
- Reviewer of technical or scientific papers for journal publication.
- Reviewer or panel member in national and international granting agencies.

- Leadership role in discipline-based centers, institutes, societies, associations, boards or similar entities.

Where appropriate, participation in the governance of the institution and other services to the University and the academic unit may be included as additional support for a tenure recommendation. Examples of such services include, but are not limited to, active participation in institutional service including administrative, committee, or related service to one's department or college, or University.

Interdisciplinary Activities

For some faculty members, substantive contributions to interdisciplinary activities and research are an important component of their scholarship. Faculty who teach in interdisciplinary teams or classes outside the department will receive appropriate departmental credit. For faculty with a joint appointment in another department, the candidate's teaching, research, and service activities for the other department will be recognized. The sources of evaluation are the same as for other teaching, research, and service activities but may include evaluations by appropriate faculty from the other department. The work done by faculty in interdisciplinary centers or team-teaching situations should count with equal credit toward promotion and tenure. Faculty will receive equal credit for scholarly contributions to interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary journals or conferences. Faculty may request peer evaluation from persons in other fields, and/or with similar interdisciplinary expertise.

IV. Criteria for Promotion

Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to Associate Professor is subject to the tenure guidelines. Thus, a candidate for promotion to associate professor must have established a professional record that demonstrates effectiveness in teaching and will continue to add to a distinguished record of excellence in research and academic or creative achievement. This professional record must serve as the foundation for a distinguished professional reputation with national, and/or international distinction. Service contributions are included in the evaluation of the candidate, but cannot be used in place of either the teaching or research criteria.

Promotion to Full Professor (See Section 9.2 of *Faculty Tenure* in Appendix B)

All associate professors in BBE are expected, with the full use of their individual faculty mentoring committees, to work and progress toward promotion to full professor. A faculty member in BBE for promotion to the rank of professor must have achieved a distinguished professional reputation with national, and/or international distinction through contributions to the candidate's discipline. For promotion to professor, in addition to meeting standards for teaching, research and service stated under Section III, a faculty member in BBE must meet the following:

- Teaching contributions are to be based on consistently high performance of teaching effectiveness including classroom, and/or non-classroom instruction, leadership in

developing courses and curriculum development, educational program development, advising and mentoring graduate, and/or undergraduate students, and/or post-doctoral personnel, and disciplinary leadership activities.

- Research contributions are to be based on their impact to the discipline, quality, and creativity and demonstrated evidence of leadership in the field. High quality research which indicates that the candidate is among the leaders in the field, as documented by letters from acknowledged national, and/or international leaders in the appropriate discipline.
- Outstanding service contributions are to be based on service to the discipline/profession, and/or institutional service. Service to the profession, participation in the governance of the institution, and other services to the department, college, and University, may be taken into consideration, but they are not by themselves bases for promotion to the rank of professor.

Length of employment in the academic unit shall not be a basis for promotion to the rank of professor. Examples of other factors that may be used to establish a candidate's professional reputation include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Special invitations to present research findings (e.g. keynote, invited lectures etc.).
- Provide disciplinary leadership at national and international symposia, and conferences.
- Demonstrated leadership in professional discipline-related societies.
- Professional contributions such as editorships, and other activities that enhance the professional stature of the candidate.
- Demonstrated leadership of departmental, collegiate, and/or university level committees.

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. The procedure to be followed for promotion from associate to full professor is the same as the procedure for the granting of tenure and is outlined below in Section V.

V. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

The Department of Bioproducts and Biosystems Engineering will comply with the University *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* as provided by Sections 7 and 9 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* with the following change in voting majorities.

Tenure decisions may be made in any year of the probationary period, as described in Section 5.2 of *Faculty Tenure* and Section 9 of the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*. 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 Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* the probationary period may be extended by one year at a time at the request of the faculty member for either childbirth/adoption or caregiver responsibilities, or serious illness or injury of the faculty member. The criteria for the evaluation 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 should not be a factor in the evaluation.

A department may also recommend termination of a candidate's appointment at any time in accordance with Section 10 of the “ *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty*.”

The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be comprised of all faculty tenured in the department at or above the proposed rank of the faculty member being reviewed.

The procedures relating to promotion, and/or tenure shall be carried out in the following manner:

- A. All faculty in the department at the rank below full professor will have a three-person faculty mentoring committee formed or chosen as early as their first full year of employment in the department or as soon as is practical thereafter. This mentoring committee will be agreed upon in discussions between the candidate, the Head, and potential members of the mentoring committee. Membership in this committee can be changed based on discussions between the candidate and Head (or based on other factors such as faculty retirements, professional leave or departure of committee members) at any time, except after the candidate has been nominated for consideration of promotion, and/or tenure (see Sections B&C below). The responsibilities of the mentoring committee are to provide advice, counsel and mentor on all aspects of the faculty candidates’ performance including teaching, research and service in helping them make successful progress in the promotion, and/or tenure process to potentially successful completion.
- B. All faculty in the department shall be informed by the Head, at least one month in advance (normally no later than July 1st), when procedures are to be initiated for nomination of members for promotion, and/or tenure.
- C. Nomination for consideration of an individual for promotion, and/or tenure may be by one or more of three methods:
 1. Fellow faculty members
 2. Head
 3. Self-nomination by the candidate

In all cases other than self nomination, the candidate shall be informed of the nomination and given the opportunity to withdraw or agree before the review procedures are initiated.

- D. With the oversight of the head, the candidate shall be the responsible for assembling material into an organized dossier following standard collegiate guidelines relating to the criteria outlined in this document and to make this material available to the committee.
- E. Once the candidate’s initial dossier is assembled in a format that is acceptable to the candidate, the Head, and the mentoring committee, evaluation letters will be invited via contact from the Head from faculty at a rank above the rank of the candidate who are

recognized as national, and/or international leaders in the discipline, and/or others who are also recognized as national, and/or international leaders in the discipline. The final list of reviewers will be chosen by the Head, but will be selected based on discussions and recommendations by the mentoring committee, the Head, and the candidate. Majority of the reviewers will be external to the University of Minnesota. In addition, the department adheres to Section 12 of the *Procedures*, which requires that at least half, and no fewer than four, of the external reviews must come from individuals with no direct personal or professional interest in the candidate (see Section 12 for details). All letters received from these reviewers shall become part of the candidate's dossier.

- F. The candidate's assigned mentoring committee shall develop a synopsis of the dossier relative to the performance and productivity of the candidate, once the review letters are received from the reviewers. This synopsis will be prepared as a report without recommendation to the faculty with tenure (for tenure decisions), and senior-in-rank to the candidate (for promotion decisions).
- G. The mentoring committee report compiled into the candidate's full dossier shall be made available to the appropriate faculty in hardcopy or electronic format for study for at least two weeks prior to the departmental faculty promotion and tenure committee meeting to consider the promotion, and/or tenure.
- H. Attendance and participation at tenure review meetings are important parts of the duty of a member of the tenured faculty. A meeting of faculty with tenure (for tenure decisions) and senior-in-rank to the candidate (for promotion decisions) shall be convened and one representative, preferably all members, of the mentoring committee shall be present and explain the committee's report without recommendation. For promotion or tenure decision meetings, a quorum is defined as more than 50% of the faculty members eligible to vote.

At this time, faculty members will discuss of the merits of each candidate providing constructive feedback to the candidate highlighting their accomplishments as well as areas that need improvement. This will be captured in the meeting summary report (see Section J below). Faculty members who are eligible to vote and unable to be present at the meeting, due to extenuating circumstances, need to vote by absentee ballot by submitting the ballot to the Head prior to the meeting.

- I. Following presentation of the committee report and discussions, members of the faculty, eligible to vote, shall vote by secret ballot at the meeting on the question of promotion, and/or tenure of the candidate. Faculty members may vote either for or against promotion and/or tenure, or may abstain. Abstentions are strongly discouraged (see Section 2, paragraphs e and f of the *Procedures*). As stated in the *Procedures*, tenured faculty members have an obligation to decide whether or not a candidate merits tenure or promotion, and to vote for or against tenure or promotion. A recusal is only to be used when there is a conflict of interest. For tenure decisions, the voting faculty is defined as members of the departmental faculty holding indefinite tenure.

- J. Prior to the conclusion of the meeting, results of the vote are tabulated and presented. Following the faculty meeting, the Head and mentoring committee prepares a report summarizing the evaluations of the faculty and revealing the number of votes for and against promotion and/or tenure and the number of abstentions. In accordance with the *University Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty*, the action of the unit is based on the vote of the majority of those voting on the question, including absentee ballots cast as specified in Section V, Subsection H above. The report is made available to the departmental promotion and tenure committee faculty members including faculty with tenure (for tenure decisions) and senior-in-rank to the candidate (for promotion decisions).
- K. The Head prepares his/her own recommendation letter.
- L. The Head informs the candidate of the faculty evaluation, the results of the vote and his/her own recommendation, and gives the candidate a copy of the final report.
- M. The faculty candidate shall have the right to withdraw his/her name from further consideration except in tenure cases in the decision year.
- N. After discussing results of the faculty vote with the candidate, and if the candidate desires that the process continue, the Head shall submit the final report with the results of the voting along with the necessary documents and his/her own recommendation to the Dean as put forth in the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*.
- O. The final dossier submitted to the College will include the following plus other items as specified by the College in their dossier format guidelines and in accordance with the *University Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*:
- 1) Candidate's personal statement - Statement from candidate should:
 - a) outline his/her academic achievement and impacts including professional and personal improvement and emphasize how these fit with the mission of the Department, College, and University.
 - b) describe anticipated future contributions to academic excellence to the department, college and the university.
 - 2) Solicited disciplinary reviews - Written evaluations of the candidate's research activities and of the candidate's scholarly publications by persons who are recognized as leaders in the candidate's area of research.
 - 3) Candidate's File - See the University's *Procedures* document for information on items contained in the file and for information on responsibilities pertaining to the file.
 - 4) The Department Mentoring Committee Report - A report prepared for a synopsis of the candidate's file.

- 5) A report from the Head summarizing the comments from departmental discussions and faculty recommendation and faculty voting results.

VI. ANNUAL REVIEW OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

At the beginning of the probationary, tenure-track appointment, the Head will review the terms of employment with the probationary faculty. This review includes the following items of discussion:

- 1) Making certain that credit for prior service (i.e. prior service at another institution at an equivalent capacity) has been granted and appropriately recorded, and that there is a mutual understanding about the maximum length of the probationary period.
- 2) Supplying the candidate with copies of the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure, Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*, and this *Departmental Statement* regarding specific criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure. If the candidate is unsure about the application of the criteria, discussion should seek to make the criteria as clear as possible.
- 3) Informing the candidate about procedures used in the department to review teaching, research and service. The candidate must be informed about the annual review process and made familiar with the annual report on *Appraisals of Probationary Faculty (President's Form 12)* which will be completed. The candidate must also be informed about his or her right to inspect the file, and right of access to information.
- 4) The Head shall work with the faculty member and the faculty member's other administrative leaders, as appropriate, to ensure that documentation requirements for evaluation are being met.

A. Policies

Annual reviews are intended to provide the probationary faculty member with input from colleagues and administrators regarding his/her progress, and development. In the annual review of probationary faculty, all tenured members of the departmental faculty evaluate the probationary faculty member.

Probationary faculty are those with regular appointments leading to the possibility of tenure. Instructors, assistant professors, and others on temporary (T) appointments are not considered probationary faculty since their appointments are not assumed to be of long duration. Years spent on T appointments do not count toward the six-year evaluation period for tenure.

Under the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*, the probationary period cannot exceed six academic years except in the case in which the probationary faculty member has stopped his or her tenure clock according to Section 5.5 of *Faculty Tenure*. At the end of the six-year period, a decision must be made to confer tenure or to terminate the appointment with one-year notice. Assistant professors with probationary (N) appointments must be given a full

academic year notice in the event of termination. The regulations require they be notified by May 15 of the previous academic year if their appointment is not to be continued. An assistant professor with an N appointment must be reviewed each year and a recommendation made to either continue, terminate, or confer tenure. If an individual has been nominated for promotion and/or tenure, the promotion/tenure review process becomes the annual review, and the procedures for that process as described above are followed.

B. Procedures

Following the University's *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure, and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*, the probationary faculty member's performance is reviewed and analyzed at a meeting of all tenured faculty that is scheduled regularly each year. Section V, Subsection H of this document contains important information regarding faculty participation at these meetings, attendance, quorum, absentee ballots etc. Beginning with the first year of the probationary period, the department will gather data about the performance on all relevant criteria. This function will be performed by the departmental mentoring committee with major assistance from the candidate. The content of the documentation will vary depending upon the responsibilities of the faculty member involved. For all faculty appointments, evidence of teaching effectiveness and research productivity must be presented. The candidate, with assistance from the Head, should supply the following information for the current calendar year.

- 1) The candidate's current resume and a statement of the candidate's professional activities during the current year. The listing of publications should be categorized according to the nature of publication review. These categories include refereed as a requirement for publication, external peer review, internal peer review, or no formal peer review. This listing should reflect the order of authorship of all co-authored material, and if senior authorship is not assigned, so indicate.
- 2) Summaries of the candidate's teaching assignments, including audience and peer evaluations, using the methods of evaluation which have been adopted by the department. Candidates with formal appointments in Extension shall furnish a summary of teaching and instructional activities including the number of separate publications, materials, and products developed.

Each listed course (not seminar or independent study projects) taught by the candidate should be evaluated by students using the standardized evaluation form. Similarly, candidates with formal appointments in Extension should seek evaluation from the intended audience using a standardized evaluation form if possible. Candidates are also encouraged to have other courses, seminars and small enrollment courses evaluated using appropriate questionnaires or modified standardized evaluation form.

The candidate is responsible for distributing and collecting the forms, and having the results summarized.

The candidate should discuss all his/her teaching evaluations, including appropriate methods of evaluation, with the faculty mentoring committee members annually for the purpose of receiving further advice, help and encouragement in teaching excellence.

Candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure are required to put the raw data and a summary of each course evaluation in their tenure file. Non-tenured faculty are encouraged to invite a member(s) of their mentoring committee to evaluate their course outline(s) or Extension program, learning materials and activities using the departmental criteria and standards. The faculty mentor(s) will provide advice to the non-tenured faculty member about their overall teaching performance.

- 3) Copies of the candidate's research or scholarly publications. These publications should be categorized according to the nature of the review: peer-reviewed, non-peer reviewed. Probationary candidates are encouraged to invite faculty mentor(s) to review their research programs, publication productivity, and publication outlets.
- 4) A statement describing attempts and results of acquiring external and internal funding.
- 5) Summaries of the candidate's service activities.
- 6) Where relevant, evaluations of the candidate's discipline-related service activities.
- 7) Summaries of the supplementary criteria which the candidate may have satisfied, such as participation in the governance of the University, College or Department.
- 8) Copies of the *Appraisal of Probationary Faculty forms (PF-12)* for this and previous years.
- 9) Any other relevant material relating to the satisfaction by the candidate of the requirements for tenure.

Following the meeting of tenured faculty, the Head will prepare an evaluation report covering both the comments of the tenured faculty and his/her own comments, if different. This document will cover:

- 1) teaching effectiveness.
- 2) effectiveness of research planning, grant development, and contact with potential users.
- 3) research quality and productivity as demonstrated by publications, papers presented, and manuscripts.
- 4) service activities performed, recognition from outside groups, writings, honors received, and service to professional societies.
- 5) an evaluation by the Head of the balance between the effort the faculty member is spending on teaching, research, Extension responsibilities, and service.

- 6) suggestions for improvement in performance or for a change in emphasis of time and effort.

The Head, after the annual review meeting, will meet with the candidate to discuss the candidate's progress toward achieving tenure. The Head will review the progress, the evaluation, and vote from the tenured faculty meeting regarding the candidate, plus any other information relied upon. The primary purpose of this meeting is to provide guidance and suggestions to the faculty member for improvement of effectiveness, and performance during the next year. The Head will add the completed *Annual Appraisal* form to the candidate's file, and include a written summary of matters discussed at this meeting including the summary of the evaluation and vote of the tenured faculty.

The faculty member may file a written response if desired. This must be filed within 15 days after the meeting with the department Head. Any such written response, however, is not to be construed as agreement with all aspects of the Head's and tenured faculty's evaluation of performance.

A file will be maintained in the departmental office that includes: 1) all correspondence regarding salary and appointment decisions, 2) all documents on appointments and salaries, 3) all previous reviews of the employee, 4) an annually revised curriculum vitae, 5) a list of publications, 6) any evidence or materials regarding teaching performance, and 7) information regarding honors or other recognition the faculty member has received. The responsibility for maintaining information pertaining to items 1, 2, and 3 rests with the department Head. The responsibility for maintaining information pertaining to items 4, 5, 6, and 7 is that of the faculty member.

VII. GOALS AND EXPECTATIONS AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW, POST-TENURE REVIEW

- A. Goals and Expectations for Tenured Faculty in Bioproducts and Biosystems Engineering
A tenured faculty member must continue to demonstrate contributions as defined by all of the following criteria:

- 1) Continue and maintain teaching responsibilities consistent with their teaching/Extension appointment and receive satisfactory or better student evaluations for those courses (or other measures of effectiveness, in the case of Extension teaching); maintain the currency and relevancy of all courses they teach; provide appropriate advising assistance to undergraduate students assigned to them; successfully mentor graduate students, and/or post-graduates through completion of their studies.
- 2) Sustain a significant research and scholarship program of high quality; communicate the results of their research and scholarship activities through refereed and non-refereed publications as well as presentations at seminars,

symposia, or conferences; maintain research/scholarship support through active, externally funded grants.

- 3) Serve on a combination of departmental, college, and/or University committees or the equivalent (e.g. advise a student organization); accurately document continued service to their profession or public (e.g. peer review of articles or grant proposals, evaluations of faculty/scientists from units other than BBE, active participation, including leadership, in professional associations, scholarly or technical assistance to relevant public and private organizations). Faculty at the rank of professor are further expected to document the mentoring of assistant, and/or associate professor colleagues where the opportunity is presented.

B. Annual Performance Review

Each faculty member meets with the Head annually to discuss the past year's performance, and future plans. The Head reviews the individual's effectiveness in fulfilling the agreed upon responsibilities and future plans from the previous year's Annual Performance Report. This meeting constitutes the faculty member's annual review for determining merit salary adjustments, and for tenured faculty, their annual review as a first step post-tenure review. The goals and expectations given below as criteria 1), 2), 3) (See Section 7a of the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*) for tenured faculty will parallel those used in the granting of tenure taking into account the different stages of professional development and providing for flexibility, as described in Section III standards for teaching/Extension, research, and service.

Discussions about personal improvement, professional development, and evaluation are carried out using procedures that are determined by the Head in consultation with faculty. Plans for the next year may involve a redistribution of effort agreed upon by the faculty member and the Head. The Head summarizes the agreement and sends a copy to the faculty member. This agreement serves as the basis for the faculty member's merit and post-tenure review the following year.

C. Post-Tenure Review

If during an annual review the Head determines that a faculty member's performance may be substantially below the goals and expectations for tenured faculty in the Department (given above in criteria 1), 2), 3), the Head will work with the faculty member to help him/her meet the department's goals and expectations. After one year from the time of the first substandard review, if the Head determines that the faculty member's performance remains substantially below the department's goals and expectations, then the Head must refer the case to the department Post-tenure review committee following the section 7a.2 of the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*. The Head will submit background information of the case to the committee and the faculty member in writing. The faculty member will have the right to respond in writing, and/or orally to the committee.

The post-tenure peer review committee shall be composed of all faculty tenured in the department at or above the rank of the faculty member being reviewed, excluding the

department Head and any faculty member whose case is being referred to the committee for consideration.

The committee meets upon notification that the Head has determined during the annual review that the performance of a particular tenured faculty member is substantially substandard in light of the goals and expectations of the Department.

The committee will elect a committee chair from its membership. The committee will conduct an independent evaluation. It may contact individuals both inside and outside the department to obtain additional relevant information. The committee may decide to delegate the process of collecting information to a subcommittee of three or more individual faculty members.

To complete its investigation, the committee will vote, by secret ballot at the meeting. The vote shall be whether or not the faculty member's performance is substantially below the departmental goals and expectations (given above in criteria 1, 2, 3). The proposed subpar finding will be discarded unless it receives at least 66% of the possible votes.

If the committee finds that the performance of the faculty member is "substantially below the goals and expectations," it should endeavor to find an improvement plan to which both the faculty member and Head agree and which can be expected to produce the necessary improvement in performance within a certain time limit (of at least one year from the time that the faculty member is notified in writing).

The committee's investigation and its findings and the mutually agreed upon improvement plan will be written in a detailed report signed by the committee chair and the Head. This will be given to the faculty member.

In the case that the Committee's finding is that the performance of the faculty member is "substantially below the goals and expectations," at the end of the time provided for remediation both the Committee and the Head must again review the performance. If they again find that the faculty member's performance is still substantially below the goals and expectations of the Department, the committee and the Head may jointly request that the Dean initiate a special review as provided in *Rules and Procedures for Annual and Special Post-Tenure Review* and Section 7a.3 of the *Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure*.

Appendix A

Section 7.11 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* describing the general criteria for faculty tenure reprinted here for Reference:

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

Section 9.2 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* describing the general criteria for promotion to professor reprinted here for Reference:

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.