

**Department of Biology Teaching and Learning  
 Department Statement of Standard for Tenure and Promotion  
 Request by Section 7.12 of the Regulations Concerning Faculty  
 January 29, 2015**

**Approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost January 11, 2016**

|       |  |                                     |
|-------|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1     | Table of Contents  |                                     |
| 2     | Introduction .....   | 2                                   |
| 3     | Department of BTL Mission Statement (July, 2014) .....   | 2                                   |
| 4     | Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Indefinite Tenure .....                               | 2                                   |
| 4.1   | Research and Inquiry.....  | 4                                   |
| 4.1.a | Definition of scholarly research .....   | 4                                   |
| 4.1.b | Department statement on scholarly research.....  | 4                                   |
| 4.1.c | Criteria and evidence for scholarly research.....  | 4                                   |
| 4.2   | Teaching, Advising, and Public Engagement (Outreach).....  | 5                                   |
| 4.2.a | Definition of teaching.....  | 5                                   |
| 4.2.b | Department statement on teaching, advising, and public engagement.....                                   | 5                                   |
| 4.2.c | Criteria and evidence for teaching .....   | 6                                   |
| 4.2.d | Criteria and evidence for advising .....   | 6                                   |
| 4.2.e | Criteria and Evidence for Public Engagement (Outreach) .....   | 7                                   |
| 4.3   | Service.....   | 8                                   |
| 4.3.a | Definition of service .....  | 8                                   |
| 4.3.b | Department statement on service .....  | 8                                   |
| 4.3.c | Evidence for service .....   | 8                                   |
| 5     | Criteria for Promotion to Professor .....  | 9                                   |
| 5.1   | Definition: See Section 9.2 of Faculty Tenure, (2011) .....  | <b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 5.2   | Department statement.....  | 9                                   |
| 5.3   | Research and Inquiry.....  | 9                                   |
| 5.4   | Expectations for Teaching, Advising, and Public Engagement.....  | 10                                  |
| 5.5   | Expectations for Service.....  | 10                                  |
| 6     | Procedures for Annual Review and Evaluation for Promotion and Granting of Indefinite Tenure              | 11                                  |
| 6.1   | University Policies .....  | 11                                  |
| 6.2   | General Expectations of Faculty Work.....  | 11                                  |
| 6.3   | Probationary Faculty: Annual Review and Promotion & Tenure Evaluation Procedures.....                    | 11                                  |
| 6.3.a | Appointment of Mentors .....   | 11                                  |
| 6.3.b | Clarification of Departmental, College, and University Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures..... | 11                                  |
| 6.3.c | Annual Review of Probationary Faculty .....  | 12                                  |
| 6.3.d | Multiple Appointments .....  | 13                                  |
| 6.3.e | Probationary Period and Potential Outcomes of Review .....   | 14                                  |
| 6.3.f | Extending the Probationary Period.....   | 14                                  |
| 6.3.g | Evaluation Procedures .....  | 14                                  |
| 6.4   | Tenured Faculty (Associate Professors and Professors): Annual Review and Post Tenure Review.....         | 17                                  |
| 6.5   | Procedures for Review of Faculty for Tenure and Promotion to Professor .....                             | 17                                  |

## 2 Introduction

In matters of tenure and promotion, the Department of Biology Teaching and Learning (BTL) follows the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* dated June 10, 2011. In addition, this document is consistent with the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*, hereafter referred to as the *Procedures*. This document describes with more specificity the indices and standards that will be used in the Department to evaluate whether or not candidates meet the general criteria for tenure outlined in Section 7.11 and for promotion outlined in Section 9.2 of *Faculty Tenure*. For a complete perspective, the reader is advised to review the Regents Policy in its entirety.

In the Department of Biology Teaching and Learning, the Collegial review of faculty accomplishments for recommending indefinite tenure and promotion of faculty is based on the criteria described below. These criteria recognize the commitment of the University of Minnesota to the central importance of research and teaching in evaluating faculty productivity. These criteria also recognize the value and importance of external service and outreach to the fulfillment of the university's land-grant mission, as well as the colleges' and the department's mission.

## 3 Department of BTL Mission Statement (July, 2014)

The mission of the Department of Biology Teaching and Learning (BTL) is to discover, adapt, apply, and disseminate innovative strategies that transform biology education. To build on emerging research opportunities, enhance biology education, and increase biology-related outreach including community engagement, BTL will serve as a University of Minnesota nexus for evidence-based teaching, research on effective pedagogies, and public engagement in biology.

## 4 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Indefinite Tenure

Section 7.11 of *Faculty Tenure* specifies the general 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 [FN2] This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [FN3]. The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision [FN4]. 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.

[FN2] “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.

[FN3] 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.

[FN4] 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.

Granting of tenure requires faculty members to have an established record of significant contributions in the areas of Research, Teaching and Advising, and Service. The overarching expectation is that, based on the presented evidence, the faculty member is making a significant contribution to his or her field(s) and is developing a national and/or international reputation.

Accomplishing the BTL mission requires excellent performance in both research and teaching. To achieve tenure, a probationary faculty member must demonstrate at least “very good” levels of performance (as defined in the rating system for probationary faculty, page 11). In addition, by its consistency, the overall pattern of performance should indicate that the faculty member is likely to contribute to both research and teaching during the remainder of their tenured career, at sustained levels of at least similar proficiency. Judgment of strength and excellence in research and teaching is based on a balance of qualitative and quantitative factors, as detailed below. It is also expected that BTL faculty engage in some public engagement/outreach activities and service.

Performance in research is evaluated by comparison with national and international standards; performance in teaching is judged by comparison with peers within the University and the biology education community nationally. The examples below are not meant to be a checklist for a successful tenure decision. Instead, they provide a list of examples of evidence that may be used by individual

faculty, promotion and tenure committees, and departmental leadership in evaluating each individual case.

At the time of appointment, faculty with joint appointments will determine their primary departmental affiliation, in consultation with appropriate departmental and college administrators. Faculty with joint appointments will be evaluated by both BTL and the other department(s), with the recommendation of the secondary department(s) provided as advisory to the primary department. In the case of a faculty member whose appointment is less than full time in BTL, the standards of quality of performance expected for tenure are the same as for full-time appointees but the quantity of work expected is adjusted to match the percent of appointment. In making decisions about tenure for such an individual, the department will take special care that judgments of quality are not biased by the reduced expectations of quantity. The qualitative and quantitative standards for tenure and promotion must be met by faculty regardless of an extension of the probationary period according to Section 5.5 of Faculty Tenure or early consideration for promotion.

The University of Minnesota is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Teaching, research, professional and public service contributions that promote diversity and equal opportunity are encouraged and recognized in the evaluation of the candidate's qualifications. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of Minnesota's diverse population, research in a scholar's area of expertise that highlights inequalities, or professional development activities such as participation in the Office for Equity and Diversity (OED) Equity and Diversity Certificate program.

## 4.1 Research and Inquiry

### 4.1.a Definition of scholarly research

[QUOTED FROM: From *Faculty Tenure*, Section 7.11. 2011 update) "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."]

### 4.1.b Department statement on scholarly research

The department is part of the University of Minnesota, a research university with very high research activity. To meet this research expectation, tenure-track faculty workloads are balanced to provide significant time in which to advance knowledge in their field by conducting and publishing significant scholarly work. Expectations for research productivity of tenure-track faculty in the Department are consistent with those expectations in other CBS departments. To be considered for promotion and tenure in this Department, faculty research must emphasize biology teaching and learning.

### 4.1.c Criteria and evidence for scholarly research

The candidate's record should show a sustained and focused line(s) of inquiry during the period leading up to promotion. The record should provide clear evidence that the faculty member has advanced knowledge within their specific focus line(s) and has established

and is likely to continue to add to a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national and/or international reputation. The record should indicate that the faculty member has demonstrated significant independence and scholarly responsibility, including contributions to the advancement of equitable access and diversity in education. One way of demonstrating this record is through sole or senior authorship. However, since interdisciplinary as well as disciplinary work is valued, evidence of leadership in joint scholarly inquiry projects can also demonstrate independence and responsibility.

Evidence of research productivity includes:

- **Publications:** Scholarly inquiry should result in a significant number of quality research publications. Sustained and regular publication activity is expected. Publications should be in high quality national and international outlets, the majority of which are peer reviewed. Examples of appropriate outlets for publication include but are not limited to: (1) discipline-specific research journals, e.g. biology education research journals (2) major journals that are not discipline specific, (3) major practitioner-oriented journals, (4) scholarly books published by highly regarded publishers, and (5) chapters in major books.
- **Grants:** Demonstrating the ability to procure external, peer-reviewed grants is considered to be one of the strongest indicators of research excellence. Thus, participation in submission of external grant proposals and/or generating contracts is expected and success in obtaining external funding is viewed as a strong positive indicator of quality.
- **Conference Presentations, Invited Seminars, and Proceedings:** Evidence of dissemination of scholarship through papers, presentations, posters, abstracts, or workshops at major scholarly conferences and academic institutions is expected.
- **Other Evidence of Research Productivity:** Production of new technologies, software, textbooks, externally adopted curriculum materials, and other procedures and innovative products can be appropriate evidence of research productivity, but they should not be viewed in lieu of peer-reviewed publications.

## 4.2 Teaching, Advising, and Public Engagement (Outreach)

### 4.2.a Definition of teaching

[QUOTED FROM From Section 7.11 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure, “Teaching” is not limited to classroom instruction. It includes other forms of communicating knowledge (to both registered University students and persons in the extended community) as well as supervising, mentoring, and advising students.”]

### 4.2.b Department statement on teaching, advising, and public engagement

The department values teaching as essential for both promoting student learning and for modeling evidence-based instructional practices, whether at the undergraduate or graduate levels, in formal or informal situations, or in credit-bearing courses or non-credit

learning situations. In addition to traditional “one professor-one section” teaching, we also value other teaching modalities (e.g., collaborative teaching, service learning classes).

We recognize that an important component of teaching includes advising, mentoring, and supervising students. The quality of candidates’ advising is evident in the extent to which they are available to advisees; their knowledge of requirements and student services; their awareness and sensitivity to advisees’ needs, progress, and goals; their ability to provide students with relevant information in a clear and consistent manner; and their ability to provide students working on theses and dissertations with timely, constructive feedback. The successful completion of advisees’ research projects, dissertations, and graduate degrees (together with associated publications) is viewed as an important indicator of successful advising.

Public engagement is encouraged of all departmental faculty as a form of communicating knowledge to the extended community. The department particularly values activities that bring biology to K-12 students and teachers and to the citizens of the state. However, community engagement alone is not sufficient to meet the teaching and advising expectations for tenure or promotion.

#### 4.2.c Criteria and evidence for teaching

High quality teaching implements evidence-based practices, such as active learning and strategies that include all learners. High quality teaching is also reflective and iterative, so that teachers adapt their approaches in response to student learning outcomes and other data about teaching effectiveness.

Evidence of teaching quality includes, but is not limited to the following components:

- Summary of the candidate’s teaching responsibilities and engagement with students outside of the classroom
- The candidates teaching philosophy including short and long term goals, teaching objectives, strategies, and methods, and regular reflection on how to better achieve them.
- Evidence of student learning
- Publications and grants related to classroom practices
- Evaluation of teaching by others, including peers, students, and external evaluators
- Description of teaching innovations and significant accomplishments, including development of particularly effective strategies for the educational advancement of students in various underrepresented or disadvantaged groups
- Awards/recognition for teaching

#### 4.2.d Criteria and evidence for advising

Positive interactions with faculty are among the most powerful influences for promoting student retention and graduation, and on the students’ view of the quality of their education. High quality advising assists students in developing and achieving their goals, in finding opportunities and resources that will enrich their education, and in better understanding themselves and the world around them.

Evaluation of probationary faculty on advising, mentoring, and supervising will include a summary of the candidate's participation and leadership in advising undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral students both in academic progress and in student development goals.

Evidence of effective advising/mentoring/supervising includes but is not limited to:

- Documentation of advising and mentoring responsibilities, including advising of individual or groups of students (e.g. undergraduate advisees, student groups, graduate certificate students, MEd, MA, MS, MBS, doctoral), advising related to student development and career explorations, supervising/mentoring students on research projects or internships, participation in undergraduate programs that address issues of student development, and addressing the professional advancement of individuals in underrepresented groups in the candidate's field.
- Record of advisee accomplishments, including undergraduate honors theses, completed MEd, MA, MS, MBS, or PhD degrees, and resulting publications
- Letters of support from advisees
- Record of supporting students' professional development through publications, conference presentations, workshops, nominations for awards, writing letters of recommendation, etc.
- Awards/recognition for advising or mentoring

#### 4.2.e Criteria and Evidence for Public Engagement (Outreach)

Public engagement may involve collaborating with others in and beyond the university to bring knowledge from multiple disciplines to bear on decisions and actions that affect the public good and are in the public interest. Public engagement is the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching, and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.

Evidence of effective public engagement might include but is not limited to:

- Documentation of activities that engage K-12 schools or teachers
- Record of engagement in community services such as biology tutoring programs for K-12 students
- Leadership or participation in programs through science museums or parks
- Involvement in local or state level education reform to prepare students to enter college
- Involvement in local, state, or federal government educational or biological policy decisions

## 4.3 Service

### 4.3.a Definition of service

[QUOTED FROM Section 7.11 of Faculty Tenure, (2011) "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.]

### 4.3.b Department statement on service

Consistent with the regulations of the University of Minnesota, the Department of Biology Teaching and Learning identifies service as an important part of a faculty member's responsibilities. Effective service requires that the individual participates fully and fulfills obligations or assignments. However, an exceptional record of service alone will not be sufficient for promotion and tenure. Whenever possible, service should be integrated with research, publication, and teaching activities, thus supporting the faculty member's reputation as a scholar and leader in the field. Institutional service is expected of all faculty members, but only modest institutional service by pre-tenured faculty is expected.

### 4.3.c Evidence for service

A candidate for indefinite tenure should demonstrate a commitment to service at the national or international level as well as state or local level, including contributions furthering diversity and equal opportunity within the University through participation in such activities as recruitment, retention, and mentoring of scholars and students.

Evidence of service may be demonstrated by documentation of participation in activities such as:

- Organizing and oversight of academic programs
- Reviewing submitted manuscripts for publication in national and international journals
- Reviewing paper/abstract submissions for professional meetings
- Planning local, state, regional, national and international professional meetings
- Holding office or committee membership in professional organizations
- *Ad hoc* reviews or service on external review panels and teams (for grants, accreditation, graduate program reviews, etc.)
- Legislative testimony
- Consultantships
- Board membership of appropriate organizations
- Discipline-related and interdisciplinary work with community-based or other organizations (e.g. NGOs, educational foundations, etc.)
- Review of tenure and promotion dossiers, for either internal or external candidates

## 5 Criteria for Promotion to Professor

### 5.1 Section 9.2 of the Faculty Tenure specifies the general criteria for promotion to full professor:

[QUOTED FROM Section 7.11 of Faculty Tenure, (2011) **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

[FN7]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [FN8]. 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.

[FN7] "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.

[FN8] 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.

### 5.2 Department statement

In the Department of Biology Teaching and Learning it is the expectation that all faculty members will achieve the rank of full professor. The performance expectations for doing so exceed those required for promotion to associate professor. Annual reviews and promotional review (both described in Section V.) of associate professors are the basis for measuring progress towards promotion to full professor.

### 5.3 Research and Inquiry

The department values research and research-based publications. Consequently, the standards for evidence of scholarly inquiry are high. The record of scholarly inquiry should

demonstrate the ongoing development of a scholar pursuing significant questions as part of a cohesive body of work. The record should indicate a *demonstrated* national/international reputation for knowledge, contributions, and leadership regarding the scholarly topic(s). This record can be demonstrated by a significant number of publications in highly-regarded, peer-reviewed research journals, as well as publications aimed at other audiences, including non-academic audiences; major books, chapters in books, or edited books; and externally funded research. Publications should reflect the leadership of the candidate through sole or senior authorship, or as a key leader/influence in publications from a collaborative project. Presentations, including major addresses and keynotes at national and international conferences or academic institutions, are further evidence of a national/international reputation.

In judging the frequency of research publication, each publication will be weighted by its quality, by its comprehensiveness, by the importance of its contribution to fundamental questions of the discipline, and by the time required to obtain results in the particular areas of inquiry. Those involved in collaborative work must explain their role in resulting publications; leadership and/or senior roles on these collaborative multi-authored publications are weighed more heavily than ones in which the role was more peripheral.

Evidence of pursuit of external funding for research activities is expected.

#### 5.4 Expectations for Teaching, Advising, and Public Engagement

BTL considers excellent teaching to be essential to our mission. We expect that candidates for promotion to the rank of Full Professor have demonstrated excellence in teaching and advising. This excellence can be documented through publications regarding teaching, high student ratings of teaching, excellent evaluations by peers and by external evaluators, syllabi and other evidence of course development, honors and awards for teaching, active involvement in course/program development, documentation of the completion of PhD and MA students in a timely manner, demonstrated evidence of collaborative work with PhD and MA students, and excellent placements of PhD advisees and mentees. Additionally, public engagement is expected of all faculty with the level of engagement appropriate to their other duties.

#### 5.5 Expectations for Service

Service is an important part of a senior faculty member's responsibilities. Promotion to the rank of Full Professor requires that the candidate have a substantial record of service to the profession, the public, and the university. In addition to membership on committees within the department, college, and university, candidates are expected to take on leadership roles in one or more service areas, such as: leadership positions in professional organizations; service on editorial or review boards for national and international professional journals; reviewing external grants and external candidates for tenure; organizing and chairing national and international meetings; service as a professional in local/state/national school endeavors; leading outreach and/or community engagement efforts; chairing of committees; and accepting administrative roles. A greater contribution in the area of institutional service is

expected of candidates for the rank of professor than was expected for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

## 6 Procedures for Annual Review and Evaluation for Promotion and Granting of Indefinite Tenure

### 6.1 University Policies

The elements of the annual review process for pre-tenure faculty are explained in section II.E.1. of the *Procedures* (<http://policy.umn.edu/hr/tenure-proc01#IIE> ).

The elements of the annual review process of tenured faculty are explained in section VI of the the *Procedures* (<http://policy.umn.edu/hr/tenure-proc01#VI>).

### 6.2 General Expectations of Faculty Work

Tenured faculty in the Department of Biology Teaching and Learning are expected to conduct research, educate students, and contribute service to the University and the public. Most faculty are expected to devote approximately 45% of their efforts to research, 45% to teaching, and 10% to service and administration. However, given that faculty roles may change over time, proportional effort devoted to these specific areas may change substantially from year to year. Such changes in effort distribution require approval by the Department head.

### 6.3 Probationary Faculty: Annual Review and Promotion & Tenure Evaluation Procedures

The tenure review process is in compliance with policies available at the website of the Office of the Provost for Academic Affairs:

<http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/faculty/tenure/implementing.html>

#### 6.3.a Appointment of Mentors

The Department head will appoint at least one tenured faculty member to serve as mentor for each new assistant professor, to help guide the professor to tenure and promotion to associate professor and, ultimately, to full professor. Mentors meet regularly with the mentee to provide specific feedback regarding progress and to assist with preparation of their annual reviews and P&T Dossier. The mentors present the mentee's Dossier to the Department prior to the faculty votes on promotion and tenure.

#### 6.3.b Clarification of Departmental, College, and University Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures

Within the first three months of the probationary appointment, the Department head must review the terms of appointment and promotion/tenure with the assistant professor, including:

- Clarifying the timeline, criteria, and key points in the process.
- Ensuring that there is a common understanding about the maximum length of the probationary period (i.e. six years). (See *Faculty Tenure*, section 5.4).
- Ensuring that the assistant professor understands how years of service are measured and that prior service is appropriately accounted.

- Providing the candidate with copies of the university's current Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure and Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure- Track or Tenured Faculty, as well as related college policies and the Department 7.12 statement (i.e. this document).
- Explaining the procedures used in the department to review teaching, research, and service, the annual review process, and the University's Appraisals of Probationary Faculty Report (Form 12) report that is completed each year during the probationary period.
- Affirming the rights of the assistant professor to inspect the Dossier file as well as to be apprised of the results of faculty discussions and votes.

The department head must document this meeting, including the time and date it took place, and include it in the candidate's personnel record. The probationary faculty member must sign and date this summary.

### 6.3.c Annual Review of Probationary Faculty

Assistant professors are evaluated annually for both performance and readiness for early promotion. Decisions are based on evaluation of the following documentation by the Department head, Promotion & Tenure Committee, and tenured faculty in the Department. These materials are aligned with the University's and Colleges' requirements for dossier preparation for promotion and tenure, so that the effort devoted to the annual review process will provide the foundation of the P&T Dossier with minimal reformatting.

#### (1) Curriculum Vitae

University P&T Format: see the web page for the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost;

<http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/faculty/tenure/documents/mastercurriculumvitaePandT.doc>) Assistant professors are encouraged to maintain a record of their accomplishments using the University's online faculty activity repository, *Works* ([works.umn.edu](http://works.umn.edu)).

Additions to CV Required for BTL Annual Review:

- Grant Section: include all past (accepted and declined), current, and pending grant proposals, including date of submission, duration, foundation name, title of proposal, brief description of the supported work, amount of funding requested or awarded (including direct and indirect costs), and a description of the role the probationary faculty played in the grant and its authorship.
  - Publication Section: include published, in press, and submitted publications, as well as manuscripts in preparation, with an explanation of the role the probationary faculty played in each.
  - Advisee Section: provide information about each advisee's project (title; type of project, i.e. PhD dissertation, REU, directed research, volunteer, etc.; descriptive title of project) as well as the advisee's current status/position.
- (2) Research Effectiveness Statement: explanation of research goals and progress, evidence of effectiveness, and responses to previous feedback

- (3) Teaching Effectiveness: explanation of teaching philosophy and goals, evidence of teaching effectiveness (including teaching evaluations), and responses to previous feedback
- (4) Advising/Mentoring Effectiveness: explanation of advising/mentoring philosophy and goals, evidence of advising/mentoring effectiveness, and responses to previous feedback
- (5) Any other material considered to be relevant for the evaluation
- (6) Updated BTL Faculty Webpage

The Department's P&T Committee, in collaboration with the assistant professor's mentor and the Department head, evaluate the annual review materials and present their analysis to the tenured faculty. As a means to provide feedback on progress, the tenured faculty vote each year on the progress of each assistant professor.

The following rating system for probationary faculty progress toward tenure is used:

- *Exceptional progress*: Truly superlative progress in all areas; a candidate for an early tenure decision if an exceptional rating is given in multiple years.
- *Very good progress*: Strong progress in all areas. The candidate is on track, with no deficiencies.
- *Satisfactory progress*: Adequate progress in all areas, although there are some areas that the candidate should give particular attention to improving in the next year.
- *Marginal progress*: The candidate has made progress in some areas, but without improvement would be in danger of a negative tenure decision.
- *Unsatisfactory progress*: The candidate is deficient in multiple areas, and early dismissal is a possible consideration.

A record of the annual review process and results will be summarized in the "Appraisal of Probationary Faculty" form (UM Form 12) and discussed with the probationary faculty member at an annual conference. The Department head and the Mentor(s) will use this report as the basis to help the probationary faculty develop a plan of action for the next year.

#### 6.3.d Multiple Appointments

All BTL faculty will have a BTL appointment of less than or greater than, but not equal to 50%. For any probationary faculty member who has an appointment in more than one department, BTL is responsible for conducting the annual review if the faculty member has a greater than 50% appointment in BTL. The department head will invite the tenured faculty of the other department(s) to participate in the discussion and will share the report with the head/chair/director of the other unit(s). If the probationary faculty member has less than a 50% appointment in BTL, BTL will provide an annual evaluation to the partner department(s), but the materials requested may differ from those required by BTL, to ensure that the faculty review is consistent with the criteria of the probationary faculty's tenure home. This evaluation will be advisory to the other department(s).

During the probationary period, the appointment of the assistant professor will be automatically renewed until the maximum probationary period is reached (i.e. six years of

service), unless there is a recommendation for formal action, including granting tenure or terminating the appointment.

#### 6.3.e Probationary Period and Potential Outcomes of Review

In keeping with the “Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure and Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty, Assistant Professor”, assistant professors will be reviewed for tenure and promotion no later than fall of their sixth year of service. For assistant professors who undergo review in the sixth year of service, the possible outcomes of review are: (1) promotion and tenure; or (2) termination following the seventh year of service.

Upon a majority vote by the BTL tenured faculty, an assistant professor may undergo review for promotion and tenure at any time during the probationary period. Outcomes of early tenure review will be a recommendation for either: (1) promotion and tenure; (2) continuation of the probationary appointment without tenure and promotion at this time; or (3) termination following the next year of service.

#### 6.3.f Extending the Probationary Period

In accordance with Section 5.5 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure and Section 7 of the Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure, probationary faculty have the right to request an extension of the probationary period for childbirth, adoption, caregiver responsibilities, or personal illness/injury. When considering the record of probationary faculty who have extended the probationary period, criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than the criteria for those who do not have an extension to the tenure clock. That is, a record of six years of service that includes a one-year extension must be considered the same way as a record of five years of service without an extension. The request for an extension of the probationary period is made to the Department head, who forwards it to the College for action.

As stated in Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure, probationary faculty members may not be given notice of termination of their appointment during a year in which the clock has been stopped except as otherwise specified (e.g., fiscal emergency, disciplinary action).

#### 6.3.g Evaluation Procedures

The BTL Department follows the policies of the University of Minnesota as outlined in the “Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty.”

##### 6.3.g.i The Dossier for Promotion and Tenure

The assistant professor’s mentor(s) and the Department head assist the assistant professor in preparing the Dossier that contains the evidence in support of tenure/promotion. The Dossier follows the standards of the University and the College of Biological Sciences. The candidate is provided the opportunity to review and/or provide written comment on the documentation in the Dossier before the faculty vote is taken, and again before the

documentation is forwarded to the Dean and the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. All additions to the Dossier after it leaves the department are shared with the candidate. The candidate can also add additional documentation to the Dossier; these materials must be dated and marked as coming from the candidate.

#### 6.3.g.ii Letters of Evaluation

The head solicits letters from ten external reviewers. The Promotion and Tenure Committee, in conjunction with the Department head, will ask the candidate for suggestions for letter writers and will independently add their own suggestions. Additionally, up to four letters of evaluation can be requested from faculty members at the University of Minnesota. The P&T Committee and Head have the final authority in choosing letter writers. All submitted letters must be included in the Dossier, which will contain a minimum of seven letters (five external and two internal) and a maximum of fourteen letters (ten external and four internal). These letters contain the independent evaluation of the letter writers and, thus, may include positive or negative perspectives concerning the assistant professor's record and issues related to tenure/promotion. Letter writers must be informed that their evaluations cannot be guaranteed to be held in confidence, since state law may permit the candidate to inspect letters upon request.

Letter writers will be asked to evaluate the:

- Scholarly quality of the candidate's work, including its conceptualization, methodology, etc.
- Impact of the candidate's work in the field.
- The candidate's reputation among scholars in his or her field(s) (as defined by the candidate's research statement).
- How the candidate compares to others in the field at comparable stages in their careers.
- Evidence of teaching effectiveness and innovation

#### 6.3.g.iii Faculty Evaluation and Voting Process

In the semester in which faculty will vote on the candidate's promotion and tenure, the assistant professor will present a seminar to summarize his or her research progress and teaching accomplishments. At least two weeks prior to this scheduled seminar, the current curriculum vitae of the assistant professor will be available for view by all Department members.

Prior to the candidate's seminar, the candidate's mentor(s) will present the candidate's accomplishments at an open meeting of the BTL Department. For candidates with joint appointments, faculty from the other department(s) will be invited to participate in this meeting. This open meeting can include audience comments about the candidate's accomplishments, but not issues related to granting tenure or promotion.

When the seminar has been completed, tenured BTL faculty will adjourn for discussion of whether or not the candidate is worthy of being recommended for promotion and

tenure. Tenured faculty with less than 50% appointment in BTL may vote on tenure/promotion decisions of BTL faculty with greater than 50% appointments in BTL, with approval by the associated department heads, deans, and provost.

The eligible faculty will vote using unsigned secret ballots. The ballot will contain the question: "Shall the assistant professor be granted indefinite tenure and be promoted to associate professor?" The response options will be "yes", "no", and "abstain", and include "If abstaining, provide reasons here", so that abstaining faculty members can explain their reasoning. Abstentions should only be used for compelling reasons, such as conflict of interest. Abstentions will not be counted in determining the majority of "no" or "yes" votes, but the number of abstentions must be reported in the Dossier as part of the overall vote tally.

All ballots, including absentee ballots, will be counted during the meeting of tenured faculty and the result will be immediately reported to the attendees. Whether present at the meeting or not, the number of tenured faculty members who are eligible to vote but do not cast a vote is also reported; the numbers of non-voting faculty are not counted as affirmative or negative votes, or as abstentions. The department head will record the discussion and the vote. A two-thirds majority of the eligible voting faculty is required for recommending the candidate for tenure and promotion.

In the case of a tie vote in which all eligible faculty voted and there were no abstentions, the assistant professor will be recommended for termination. If some of the voting faculty abstained or declined to vote, a three day period will be taken to allow all faculty to re-review the dossier and reconsider their vote, lack of vote, or abstention. The voting faculty will then re-vote and that final vote will be reported. If the final vote results in a tie, the assistant professor will be recommended for termination.

Once voting is complete, the candidate will be notified of the vote count. The BTL Promotion & Tenure Committee will prepare a letter outlining the candidate's qualifications, the Committee's evaluation of that record, and the Committee's recommendation for promotion and tenure. The Department head will write a letter reporting the vote of the faculty, the nature of the discussion at the faculty tenure meeting, and his/her independent evaluation of the candidate's case for tenure. The Assistant Professor receives a copy of these letters and the vote tally. Then, these documents are added to the Dossier and forwarded to the Dean's Office of CBS for review, following the procedures outlined in the "Procedures for Reviewing the Performance of Tenure-Track Probationary Faculty." The Assistant Professor may add comments related to the Dossier by submitting them to the CBS Dean's Office.

#### 6.3.g.iv Summary of Final Steps in the P&T Process

The CBS P&T Committee will review the Dossier and forward their recommendation to the CBS Dean. The CBS Dean will then review all of the information and forward his/her recommendation to the Provost, who will, in turn, make a recommendation to the Board of Regents. The Board of Regents vote will be the final step in the procedure for granting

promotion to associate professor with tenure. The external letter writers are notified of the outcome of the process and thanked for their participation.

#### 6.4 Tenured Faculty (Associate Professors and Professors): Annual Review and Post Tenure and Promotional Review

All faculty, probationary and tenured, are evaluated annually for merit review. The basis for this review is (1) an updated curriculum vitae in the University of Minnesota P&T format, with the same adaptations noted in the Annual Review of Assistant Professors; (2) an updated faculty member's BTL webpage; and (3) updated statements of effective research, teaching, and service. This information is the basis for discussion with the Department head and review by the Department Consultative Committee, which makes recommendations for salary increases, assuming funding is available.

In addition to annual reviews, a separate review of associate professors designed to provide feedback with respect to their progress towards meeting the criteria for promotion is required at least every four years. Annual review of associate professors are the basis for measuring performance and progress toward promotion to full professor. Since our expectation is that every associate professor should ultimately be promoted to full professor, the Head will discuss each associate professor's progress toward promotion as part of the annual review process, and offer recommendations for action to increase competitiveness for promotion to professor. Four year promotional appraisals of tenured associate professors will be recorded using form UM13.

If both the Department head and a majority of the Consultative Committee find that a tenured faculty member's performance is substantially below the goals and expectations of the Department the Committee and the Head will send a letter to the faculty member specifying the deficiencies, and will set a time period (usually by the next annual review) during which the faculty member should address the identified problems. The Department head, mentor, and the Consultative Committee will work with the faculty member to help him/her improve performance during that time.

If the tenured faculty member has not improved performance to meet the goals and expectations of the department in the time period designated, as specified in the letter cited above, the Head and the Consultative Committee will jointly request that the Dean of the College of Biological Sciences assemble a special review committee according to Section 7a.3 of *Faculty Tenure*.

#### 6.5 Procedures for Review of Faculty for Tenure and Promotion to Professor

The process for promotion from associate to full professor is the same as that required for promotion from assistant to associate professor: the Dossier format, number of letters, voting process, etc., is the same. However, only tenured faculty at the rank of professor are eligible to vote on promotion of an associate professor to full professor.

The criteria for promotion to professor for the University of Minnesota are provided in Section 9.2 of *Faculty Tenure*: (1) demonstration of "the intellectual distinction and academic integrity

required of all faculty members; (2) substantial contributions “to an already distinguished record of academic achievement; and (3) “established national or international reputation (or both) ordinarily resulting from such distinction and achievement.” In BTL, evaluation of achievement is based on the same types of evidence as outlined for promotion to associate professor, including:

1. Substantial record of scholarship and excellent teaching (e.g. publications, grants, innovative curriculum materials)
2. Invitations to international symposia, election to prestigious scientific organizations, editorships, or holding of offices in international societies.
3. Letters from authorities in the candidate's field assessing the candidate's scientific contributions, particularly to determine whether the candidate is among the intellectual leaders in his/her field
4. Establishment of a research program involving undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-doctoral trainees that has resulted in furthering the trainees' career goals (e.g., placement in graduate or professional school; placement in academic or industrial positions.)