

Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior
Department Statement of Standard for Tenure and Promotion
Request by Section 7.12 of the Regents Policy on
Faculty Tenure

April 2, 2008

Approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
on May 1, 2008

In matters of tenure and promotion, the Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior follows the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* dated June 8, 2007. This document describes with more specificity the indices and standards that will be used to evaluate whether or not candidates meet the general criteria for tenure outlined in Section 7.11 and promotion in Section 9.2 of *Faculty Tenure* (see below). For a complete perspective, the reader is advised to review Sections 7 and 9 in their entirety.

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.

Specific details on the nature and weight of these contributions in the individual academic unit are given in the statements required by subsection 7.12 ("Departmental Statement" – See Appendix A), but the primary emphasis must be on demonstrated scholarly or other creative achievement and on teaching effectiveness. Service standing alone, without a distinguished record of teaching and scholarly research or other creative work, is an insufficient basis to award tenure. The awarding of indefinite tenure presupposes that the candidate's record shows strong promise of his or her achieving promotion to professor.

II. Department Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior is to advance and disseminate knowledge in these fields through excellence in theoretical, experimental, and field research; undergraduate and graduate education; scholarly activities; and outreach. The integration of this knowledge across levels of biological complexity is a prerequisite to addressing many of the biological and environmental challenges facing society.

III. Criteria for Tenure

Accomplishment of the mission of the Department requires excellence both in teaching and research. To achieve tenure, a probationary faculty member must demonstrate strong performance in both activities and excellent performance in at least one¹. In addition, the pattern

¹ Probationary faculty must be aware that excellence in teaching as defined below may not be achievable during the relatively short probationary period.

of performance should indicate, by its consistency, that the faculty member is likely to contribute to both activities during the remainder of the tenured career at levels no less proficient.

Judgment of strength and excellence in teaching and research is based on a balance of qualitative and quantitative factors, as detailed below. Performance in research is evaluated especially by comparison with national and international standards, whereas performance in teaching is judged by comparison with peers within the University. 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.

In the case of a faculty member whose appointment is less than full time, 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 a stoppage of the tenure clock according to Section 5.5 of *Faculty Tenure* or early consideration for promotion.

A. Teaching and Education

Evaluation of probationary faculty will include a summary of the candidate's teaching assignments, evaluation of teaching materials, including but not limited to syllabi, lecture notes, laboratory exercises, course web sites, material covered, assignments, and examinations. To aid in judging the quality of teaching, the Department requires student evaluations of each course taught by its faculty. The department office shall keep copies of all student evaluations of its faculty. In addition, senior faculty will provide constructive feedback on teaching, including but not limited to classroom visits.

Strong teaching performance is documented by a combination of the following or similar activities:

- student evaluations that indicate that the candidate provides a positive learning experience
- successful mentoring of an undergraduate student in a research experience
- successful advising or co-advising of a student towards the M.S. or Ph.D. degree
- successful advising or co-advising of a postdoctoral trainee
- contributions to the organization and improvements of curricula beyond serving on the departmental curriculum committee
- evidence of scholarly approaches to teaching, such as consultation with the Center for Teaching and Learning, attending teaching workshops, etc.
- innovative teaching

To be considered excellent in teaching requires national or international recognition, such as:

Ecology, Evolution and Behavior,
Department Standards for Tenure and Promotion

- teaching awards, including University-wide awards, such as the Morse-Alumni award or the Graduate and Professional Teaching award
- publications concerning teaching, teaching methods, or other pedagogic subjects in refereed journals
- major contributions to the organization or improvement of curricula
- textbook(s) authorship
- development of teaching tools, including but not limited to technology-based tools, that are adapted by others
- organization of short courses or workshops on teaching attracting national attendance
- invitations to lecture in symposia, write reviews, etc., on education in biology
- extramural grants for innovation in education
- extramural letters of recommendation with favorable mention of contributions to education or outstanding training of students

B. Research

Highly favorable, external letters of recommendation from prominent scientists in the area of research must attest to the high quality of research contributions and their national or international impact. The selection of external appraisals follows the Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion, as approved by the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

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.

Faculty are expected to seek venues to communicate their research results that will lead to a national or international reputation. This may be accomplished, for instance, by publishing at least some of the research findings in journals with a broad scientific readership or high visibility within the field, or by presenting at conferences that attract participants from the broader scientific community.

Expectations for research productivity will be applied uniformly across probationary faculty. For those faculty involved in highly collaborative, multidisciplinary work, it is recognized that senior authorship will be less frequent than for those involved in more independent studies. Those involved in collaborative work must explain their role in multi-authored publications and are encouraged to take a leadership role in at least some of the multi-authored publications.

To recognize the increasingly collaborative nature of research, lead-PI status on collaborative grant proposals is not required of a probationary faculty. However, if all grants of the probationary faculty are collaborative, he or she is expected to have played a major role in some of the collaborative grants.

To be considered strong, the research of a faculty member should make significant contributions of strong scientific quality to the discipline or across disciplines. Such an achievement may be documented by the following or similar activities:

- publication of scholarly works in refereed, disciplinary or interdisciplinary journals
- significant participation in extramurally funded, peer-reviewed research
- highly favorable evaluations of grant proposals that were not funded because of lack of funding at the grant agency
- presentations of research results at scientific meetings

Extramural letters of recommendation from prominent scientists in the discipline must attest to the high quality of research contributions.

To be considered excellent, the research of a faculty member should make substantial contributions to fundamental questions in the discipline or across disciplines, and should be widely recognized nationally or internationally. Such achievements may be documented by some combination of the following or similar activities:

- publications evaluated on impact, quality, and quantity that indicate establishment of a leadership position in the field.
 - Impact might be demonstrated by strong evaluations in extramural letters of recommendation. Impact might also be measured by invitations to participate in other projects, seminars, workshops, or conferences as a result of a publication. If citations in important publications or the frequency of citations are used as a measure of impact, standards appropriate to the field and to peers must be employed.
 - Quality might be demonstrated by strong evaluations in extramural letters of recommendation. If quality of the journal is used as a measure of quality of publication, standards appropriate to the field must be employed. We recognize that the Institute for Scientific Information impact factors (or similar measures) of journals are a poor proxy for quality of a journal in the sense that while journals with high impact factors generally have high impact and are of high quality, the converse may not be true.
 - Quantity might be demonstrated by the frequency and regularity of publications in refereed, disciplinary and interdisciplinary journals, where the candidate played a major role².
- extramural, peer-reviewed grant support in which the candidate provides major intellectual leadership and that adequately supports a high level of research, including, but not limited to obtaining multiple grants or renewal of a previously funded grant
- recruitment of postdoctoral students or visiting faculty
- frequent extramural invitations to present lectures, participate in symposia, write review articles, etc.

² Different traditions in indicating seniority of authorship will be considered.

C. Service

Service, such as membership on committees that lie within the faculty member's academic expertise and serve the mission of the academic unit, is essential to the mission of the Department and is expected of the faculty at all levels. However, such service is not a sufficient basis for awarding tenure. In recognition of the different roles and levels of experience individuals have at different career stages, service expected for promotion to Associate Professor is different from promotion to Full Professor. Roles for faculty who are being considered for tenure might be largely service to the department. Service to society and groups outside the University that is related to the educational and research mission of the Department is not a prerequisite for awarding of tenure, but outstanding service of that kind may be considered positively in the decision.

Consideration will be given for a faculty member's dissemination of knowledge to the general public. This service could be, for instance, through coverage of research by newspapers or magazines, radio or television appearance, web pages, public lectures, articles in popular press outlets, design of museum exhibits.

IV. Promotion

A. To Associate Professor

Promotion to this rank is concomitant with a decision to award tenure. Standards for tenure are set forth in Section III above. Mentoring of Assistant Professors is offered by the department. A mentoring committee led by tenured faculty is assembled by the department head each year. This committee meets regularly with all probationary faculty. In addition, probationary faculty can choose individual mentors to meet their needs with respect to research and teaching. Furthermore, the department head plays an active role in mentoring of probationary faculty.

B. To Professor

Every faculty member is expected to eventually be promoted to Full Professor. The department offers mentoring opportunities for Associate Professors from a menu of options. This menu is regularly reviewed and, if needed, changed by Associate Professors. Mentoring of Associate Professors is individualized to meet their needs.

For promotion to Full Professor, faculty must continue to meet criteria for teaching and research used for granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (Section III). Promotion to the rank of Full Professor requires, in addition, a national or international scholarly reputation in the individual's field of study. The criteria for promotion to Professor are specified in Section 9.2 of *Faculty Tenure* below.

Section 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.

Further, evidence is sought for:

- leadership in the candidate's field of scholarship, as evidenced by letters from authorities assessing the candidate's scientific contributions
- establishment of training programs for pre- and postdoctoral trainees that has resulted in placing trainees in academic or other positions in their fields
- a truly international reputation, as shown, for instance, by invitations to scientific symposia, election to prestigious societies, or holding offices in prominent international societies
- significant service contribution to the mission of the Department and University

In recognition of the different roles and levels of experience individuals have at different career stages, service expected for promotion to Associate Professor is different from promotion to Full Professor. Roles for faculty who are being considered for promotion to Full Professor are expected to include service to the broader university and scientific communities.

V. Procedures

The Department complies with the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty* as provided by Sections 16.3, 7.4, and 7.61 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*.

A. Annual Review of Probationary Faculty

Probationary faculty are evaluated annually. The head requests the following materials from the probationary faculty:

- Essay describing research, educational, and other scholarly activities of the past year and plans for the next year (1-3 pages).
- Biographical Data
 - Education
 - Positions held
 - Honors and fellowships
- Teaching and Advising
 - A summary of teaching assignments (graduate and undergraduate courses, graduate and undergraduate seminars, guest lectures)
 - A list of current and past graduate advisees, a list of past and present advisory/thesis committees, a list of written/oral preliminary examination committees, other committee service that is related to teaching/advising
 - A list of undergraduate advisees (including honor's theses, UROP advisees, REU advisees)
 - A list of post-doctoral advisees
- Research Activities
 - A list of past (accepted and declined), current, and pending proposals, including duration, foundation name, title of proposal, and award amounts, including a description of the role the probationary faculty played in the grant and authorship.
 - A list of publications (published, in press, and submitted publications, manuscripts in preparation) with an explanation of the role the probationary faculty played.
 - A list of contributed talks and posters at scientific meetings, invited seminars, invited symposia and workshops, public lectures, including those declined.
- Description of curatorial services if the probationary faculty is a member of the Bell Museum faculty.
- A list of service activities, including those declined (departmental, college, or university committees, external committees, service on national panels, manuscript and proposal reviews)
- Teaching evaluations of the courses taught during the previous year.
- Any other material relevant for the evaluation

The materials are evaluated by the Department's P&T Committee, which submits a report to the department head. The report is discussed by the tenured faculty in a department meeting. The department head shares the report with the probationary faculty and the report is the basis of the report on the Form 12. If a probationary faculty has an appointment in more than one department and if EEB is the tenure home, EEB is responsible for conducting the annual review and the department head will seek input from the other departments and share the report with the head/chair/director of the other unit(s). If EEB is not the tenure home, EEB will provide an annual evaluation but the materials requested may differ from the ones required in EEB to be consistent with the criteria in the tenure home of the probationary faculty.

B. Process for Evaluation for Tenure

The EEB 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* (see the web page for the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost). The format of the dossier follows CBS guidelines. The department head is responsible for the timely completion of the dossier. A department vote by all tenured EEB faculty is preceded by a vote and recommendation of the EEB Promotion & Tenure Committee. The department head is responsible for the timely reporting of the action to the Dean's Office of CBS for review by the Dean of CBS, following the procedures outlined in the "Procedures for Reviewing the Performance of Tenure-Track Probationary Faculty" (ibid.)

C. Process for Post-tenure Review

All tenured faculty are evaluated annually during merit review. In addition, a separate post-tenure review process of tenured faculty is in place, which is described in the departmental document on post-tenure review (see Appendix B). Annual review and post-tenure review of associate professors are the basis for measuring progress towards promotion to full professor.

Appendix A

7.12 Departmental Statement. [6] Each department or equivalent academic unit must have a document that specifies (1) the indices and standards that will be used to determine whether candidates meet the threshold criteria of subsection 7.11 (“General Criteria” for the awarding of indefinite tenure) and (2) the indices and standards that will be used to determine whether candidates meet the threshold criteria of subsection 9.2 (“Criteria for Promotion to Professor”). The document must contain as an appendix the text and footnotes of subsections 7.11 and 9.2, and must be consistent with the criteria given there but may exceed them. Each departmental statement must be approved by a faculty vote (including both tenured and probationary members), the dean, and other appropriate academic administrators, including the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The chair or head of each academic unit must provide each probationary faculty member with a copy of the Departmental Statement at the beginning of the probationary service.

Appendix B

Goals and Expectations for Post-Tenure Review of Faculty in the Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior

Endorsed by faculty vote, February 9, 2000

Approved by Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Personnel, July 17, 2000

The purpose of Post-Tenure Review is to recognize outstanding contributions as well as to help assure that all tenured faculty meet departmental expectations for teaching, research and service. All tenured faculty in the Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior are expected to maintain a high level of contribution to the mission of the Department throughout their careers. In general, it is expected that tenured faculty will continue to perform so as to meet the standard described in the Department Statement of Standards for Tenure and Promotion as Requested by Section 7.12 of the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure. If the department's expectations for faculty include contributions to other units, the total contribution will be evaluated. It is recognized that the interests and aspirations of faculty may change during their careers, causing the relative contributions to teaching, research and service to change, but keeping the total contribution from all three areas undiminished. Thus, Post-Tenure Review is designed to evaluate the total contributions of each faculty member to the mission of the Department and University.

Procedures for Conduct of Post-Tenure Reviews

Post-Tenure Review Schedule

There are two forms of Post-Tenure Review in the Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior.

First, based on annual merit reviews by elected committee, and utilizing the detailed information on teaching, research and service that individual faculty members submit to that committee, the Department Head will consider how a faculty member's performance contributes to departmental goals and expectations. Should the Department Head's review indicate a likely case of sub-standard performance, it will be referred to the elected Post-Tenure Review committee.

Second, Post Tenure Review by elected committee will occur at least every three years for Associate Professors and at least every five years for Full Professors, with the exception of years in which a faculty member is being considered for promotion to Full Professor, when that review will also serve as a Post-Tenure Review.

Post-Tenure Review Committee

The Post-Tenure Review Committee will consist of five members elected by departmental vote of tenured faculty. At the discretion of the faculty, the Post-Tenure Review Committee may combine its functions with other functions for elected committees, such as the Departmental Advisory Committee or the Merit Compensation Committee. All tenured faculty will be eligible to serve on the committee except for the Department Head and faculty members having just completed a term on this committee. Probationary (non-tenured) faculty are not eligible to vote or to serve on the Post-Tenure Review Committee. Terms will be two years and will be overlapping. No persons will serve on the committee during an academic year in which they are scheduled for Post-Tenure Review.

Committee Responsibilities

1. The Post-Tenure Review Committee will meet in the spring of each year to review the performance of faculty who are due for Post-Tenure review. The committee will seek input from cooperating units such as departments, centers, or the Bell Museum with regard to faculty responsibilities in those units. The committee will provide brief written evaluations to the individual faculty members and to the Department Head. These reviews should be constructive, and are designed primarily to provide helpful feedback to the faculty.
2. The Post-Tenure Review Committee will identify possible cases of sub-standard performance. If the Head and the Committee agree that a faculty member's performance is below departmental standards, the faculty member and Department Head will write and mutually endorse a plan to correct the problem along with a timetable of re-evaluation of the case. Times to re-evaluation may vary: a teaching or service deficiency might be corrected in one year, while a research deficiency could take longer. Time to re-evaluation will be one to two years. In the event of an unsatisfactory re-evaluation, the committee will formally notify the Department Head in writing. If the Department Head concurs, then the Department will notify the Dean and request implementation of the special Post-Tenure Review process.

Responsibilities of the Department Head

1. Each year, based on annual merit reviews, the Department Head will evaluate faculty accomplishments in the context of the departmental goals and expectations for tenured faculty.
2. The Department Head will determine when off-cycle reviews by elected committee are warranted, and if so, notify that faculty member and the departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee in writing.

3. The Department Head and each faculty member will discuss results of Post-Tenure Review during annual merit review meetings.
4. The Department Head is responsible for maintaining brief written departmental records of Post-Tenure Review.

Faculty Responsibilities

1. Faculty are expected to obtain teaching evaluations for all courses taught.
2. Tenured faculty who are due for Post-Tenure Review are required to submit a suitably complete, detailed, and up-to date resume, information on service and outreach activities, and teaching evaluations for the previous five years (or three years for Associate Professor).
3. Optionally, a statement of up to two pages explaining the significance of particular accomplishments or circumstances can be submitted at the same time.