

GUIDELINES FOR DEPARTMENT OF FOOD SCIENCE AND NUTRITION REQUIRED BY SECTION 7.12 OF THE REGENTS POLICY ON FACULTY TENURE **

** Revised by faculty vote on February 12, 1988, May 4, 1990, February 5, 1993 November 5, 1993, February 5, 1999, December 14, 2006, April 30, 2020.
Approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost – May 7, 2020

Document contains:

- I Introduction
- II Department Mission
- III Criteria, Standards and Procedures for Recommending (or recommending the denial of) contract continuation, indefinite tenure, and promotion to Assistant Professor
- IV Criteria, Standards and Procedures for Recommending Promotion
- V Criteria, Standards and Procedures for Conducting Post Tenure Review.

I. Introduction

This is the departmental statement for Food Science and Nutrition required by Section 7.12 of Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*. This statement describes with more specificity the indices and standards which will be used to evaluate whether candidates meet the general criteria for tenure in Section 7.11 (Appendix A) and for promotion in section 9.2 (Appendix B) of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*. For a complete perspective, Sections 7 and 9 should be considered in their entirety. This departmental statement is also consistent with the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*.

II. Department Mission and Faculty Activities and Expectations

The general mission of this department is described in its 2017 Strategic Plan:

“The Department of Food Science and Nutrition creates and shares knowledge to ensure a safe, healthy, and appealing food supply that supports the well-being and prosperity of people and the environment.”

To fulfill the department mission, a faculty member’s activities should include teaching, research and service as defined in Sections 7.11 and 9.2 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*. An exception is made for faculty members with Extension appointments, which are comprised of service, and depending on the appointment, teaching and/or research. To be awarded indefinite tenure, a faculty member will be expected to have demonstrated effectiveness in teaching and productivity in research, and achievement in discipline/department-related service. The relative emphasis among these endeavors may vary but shall in all cases include teaching and research as broadly defined in Section 7.11 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*. Service may be taken into account for any position but not as a substitute for teaching or research. Likewise, the relative emphasis between teaching and research may vary in accordance with position requirements as influenced by the source of funding or

other constraints specific to the position, provided such constraints are clearly understood in advance, but both elements shall be present in all cases. The Department mission also includes public engagement work, which involves a spectrum of activities serving local, state, national and international needs, including activities such as expert consulting/testimony, technology transfer, extension education and community-engaged scholarship. Public engagement work often combines teaching, scholarship and service in projects that involve community stakeholders as co-creators and collaborators, not just recipients of services, programs or consultation. The tenure evaluation process considers public engagement based on the degree to which it contributes to education, scholarship and service activities. Faculty members are encouraged to demonstrate creativity and innovation through interdisciplinary and intercultural scholarship and teaching. Collaboration, interaction and education, which include a wide range of diverse ethnic and cultural perspectives, contribute to the breadth and quality of academic work and represent a core value of the University of Minnesota. Faculty members must be committed to the highest ethical standards of conduct and integrity; fulfill obligations owed to students, advisees, and colleagues; conscientiously meet University responsibilities; be respectful, fair, and civil; and avoid all forms of harassment, illegal discrimination or threats.

III. Criteria, Standards and Procedures for Recommending Contract Continuation and Indefinite Tenure

A. Teaching

The evaluation of teaching is required. Teaching is a complex multifaceted activity, with many components for potential evaluation, and many sources of evaluation. Evaluation efforts should be so managed as to avoid any direct impact on the teaching process and should be viewed both cumulatively over time and in terms of any trends that may be evident.

Undergraduate and graduate teaching involve managing the process of educational program development and conducting learning experiences, primarily for students enrolled for credit towards a degree. This process also includes mentoring of undergraduate students.

As a checklist in this regard, the specific criteria of evaluation addressed in standards for tenure and promotion will include course content, goals and objectives; teaching methods, their effectiveness, and efforts toward improvement; mentoring and student learning. Recognized sources of evaluative information include students, colleagues, department head, alumni, employers, and self.

- 1.** In Food Science and Nutrition, all members of the department must conduct course and teaching evaluations for all credit bearing courses* and submit an appropriately documented summary of the results for their file or dossier maintained by the Head.

Three major elements are required in this evaluation -- (1) for each class taught, an up-to-date course outline in standard format including student performance objectives, (2) for each class taught, the Faculty Senate mandated questions (“Student Rating of Teaching”) must be used (additional questions or survey instruments may be added at the instructor’s prerogative), and (3) at least once each year, one form of additional non-student evaluation, such as a classroom visit by a fellow faculty member, administrator or outside expert, use of videotape, or survey of former students or of their employers, a panel of peers and students assessing the overall course,

or other similar approaches is required.*

Documentation of participation in professional improvement activities specifically oriented to improvement of teaching skills and abilities is also considered as a factor in the overall evaluation of teaching performance. For the evaluation of student mentoring, surveys or individual narrative evaluations may be used.

2. Publicly engaged teaching involves short courses, workshops, symposia, extension teaching, outreach educational program development and informal learning experiences for a diversity of audiences. Publicly engaged teaching is a primary responsibility for Extension faculty, but all Departmental faculty are encouraged to participate in some form of public engagement work. Publicly engaged teaching often involves working in partnership with other professionals and/or the community stakeholders as co-creators and collaborators, not just recipients of programs or consultation. Included is a wide array of activities such as group or one-on-one presentations, and information dissemination through publications, audio-visual materials, and other electronic products. Public engagement activities may involve disciplinary, interdisciplinary or intercultural work. Mechanisms at the department level for evaluating teaching of this kind may parallel those for resident instruction but are often less specific. Some public engagement activities are assessable using commonly accepted faculty measures of impact, dissemination through publication, peer recognition and acceptance of the teaching/engagement process and other appropriate methods. At times, the impact of public engagement work can be difficult to assess. In these cases, faculty members must conduct a self-assessment of the effectiveness and quality of their efforts through narrative. This assessment is in turn, documented, verified or refuted by letters from appropriate peers, partners and participants in a 360° evaluation. Recognized sources of evaluative information include colleagues, clientele, community partners, department head, administrators, and self.

The annual plan of work serves in lieu of choosing one course and providing an outline in standard format. No one universal but flexible system is as yet available for securing clientele input, but a variety of survey forms are used, both directly by extension faculty and by field staff or persons in analogous positions, the results of which are placed on file. Input in the form of an annual appraisal letter is secured from the relevant program administrators, as well as from field staff or others and from peer colleagues on a voluntary or requested basis. A summary of results is provided in the form of an annually updated resume and achievement record. If the latter is included in terse resume format, it may be accompanied by a narrative memorandum enlarging upon specific programmatic events and the individual's role in them.

When referring to student evaluation of teaching of credit or non-credit courses, a number of questions are required by the Faculty Senate. The responses to all the required questions will be considered in performance standards for promotion and tenure.

3. The Department of Food Science and Nutrition values both graduate and undergraduate mentoring as an essential aspect of student education and as an independently recognized faculty activity. Mentoring of undergraduate students is an integral part of the student experience. Evidence of commitment to mentoring includes (but is not limited to): advising students on degree requirements and professional development, participation in UROP or summer research programs,

* According to appointment: resident teaching evaluations of extension faculty should be included regardless of the frequency of course offering.

involvement in internship placements or programs, mentoring on professional conduct, internships, positions, meeting with prospective students, and talking to potential students at high schools and colleges.

B. Research

All academic faculty are expected to conduct scholarly activities that bring distinction to themselves and to their department. Scholarly activity is given the broadest interpretation and should include the advising of graduate students. In addition to traditional scientific research, scholarship will include all activities ranging from contributing to the development of new knowledge to the novel dissemination of existing knowledge and the methodologies used in extending this information. This includes interdisciplinary scholarly activity, where appropriate. Publicly engaged scholarship is characterized by active and reciprocal partnership and collaboration with the community, rather than the community as recipient of University scholarship, programs or services. Such scholarship may require significant time and effort in building trusting relationships with a community of interest. It is recognized that for knowledge to be useful, it must be communicated to the appropriate audience. Therefore, it is expected that results be made available either through publication or other appropriate means.

Individual creative effort should be known by distinguished outside experts in the candidate's field of expertise and evaluated by them. The faculty member under review for tenure and promotion should suggest a list of such outside reviewers to the Head. The Head should verify that such contacts are appropriate and consult with others to assure inclusion of reviews by experts from peer institutions. Such effort should also be analyzed thoroughly by faculty peers at the department or unit level. Supporting material, including lists of publications and peer evaluations, should be solicited in such a way as to make them useful within the department in arriving at a recommendation, as well as in providing written documentation when transmitting that recommendation.

Where a faculty member publishes original research in refereed journals, such publications should be listed separately from abstracts, invited talks or popular articles in any lists of publications. However, participation in professional programs through presentations of papers is in itself a criterion which belongs among those used to judge the competence of the individual in research.

Publications are weighted by the individual's contribution to authorship (not necessarily related to order of author listing and thus, the nature and extent of contribution to each collaborative publication must be provided) and by relationship of research to teaching in the individual's appointment and mission, as indicated earlier in discussing the departmental mission. In addition to the papers in refereed journals or monographs, annual meeting abstracts, invited talks and popular articles referred to earlier, book reviews, review articles, software, patents and other forms of "publication" are also considered, with weighting appropriate to the medium involved and any basis for evaluation that may be available.

On a more qualitative basis but still in terms of specific criteria, research and scholarship are considered in terms of imagination (new departure vs. routine follow-up), significance (generating new theory, contributing to understanding of an important principle, or other wide-ranging implication), pertinence (focuses on state, national or international needs and/or advances the mission of the department and the university); soundness (adequate experimental design with proper controls, sample sizes, statistical analysis), sophistication (unique technical skill or depth of understanding), and interdisciplinary or intercultural cooperativeness (with other scholars, or community partners where

appropriate).

Persistence and success in efforts to secure outside funding for research represent still further criteria which overlap and may integrate with some of those already listed.

The major sources of evaluative information relative to the foregoing criteria are (1) a comprehensive resume which includes listing of publications in various classifications and of applications for and awards of research funding, in addition to other personal and professional data, and (2) solicited disciplinary peer evaluations. The resume may be supplemented by a narrative statement explaining how the listed accomplishments advance scholarship and mission, detailing improvement activities and describing anticipated future contributions.

Disciplinary peer evaluations, as mentioned briefly earlier, will be solicited by the department head in such a way as to (1) cover various aspects of the candidate's scholarly activities, utilizing respondents nominated by the candidate as well as others, (2) allow respondents to limit their evaluations to that with which they are already familiar or are willing to study, (3) encourage respondents to provide an objective appraisal rather than support, and (4) make the resulting appraisals available to departmental peers prior to discussion or arrival at a decision about what tenure or promotion recommendations to make. All appraisals solicited and actually provided must be sent to department peers and included with any recommendation which is forwarded.

Evaluation of research accomplishments and scholarly achievements of extension specialists in Food Science and Nutrition includes directing the same attention to research and writing as is done with others not having a specific extension mission, with the same regard for the relative weight of research vs. teaching and public/civic engagement as would be applied to others, and modified only by any differences which may be appropriate in (1) the media of publication and (2) how peer review and approval are evidenced. In this context, "research" means the production and communication of research and scholarly information which may be published in disciplinary refereed journals but may also be represented by other means of dissemination of results, and "professional distinction" is characterized by the broad acceptance and use of such research and educational efforts by peer professionals outside the University as well as inside it, and outside of Minnesota as well as inside it.

Where extension specialists are concerned, scholarly work developed through interactions with communities, thoughtful and creative combination and use of the research results of others into new and/or novel and useful applications, and the skillful and non-repetitive use of demonstration research and public engagement approaches characterize professional distinction in research and writing. Publicly engaged scholarship is characterized by partnership and collaboration with the community to achieve academic and community change goals using appropriate methods, reflective critique, ethical interaction and socially responsible conduct of research. Distinction in public engagement for granting of tenure must include scholarly products including publications and dissemination of programs, models, approaches or publications for use by extension professionals in other states as one effective form of peer approval.

C. Service

All faculty members are expected to be active contributors to the departmental, collegiate, and university communities. They are expected to attend faculty meetings and required departmental, collegiate and university assemblies, and actively participate in departmental, undergraduate and graduate committee meetings.

All faculty members are expected to provide related to the individual's disciplinary or academic expertise and service to the department, College and University, and their respective missions and strategic development. Service can be rendered through public/civic engagement to professional organizations, learned societies, state and federal agencies, and the community (including individuals, groups or the whole), within the state of Minnesota, nationally or internationally-

Sources of evaluative information include (1) the fact and extent (time commitment, documents prepared, impact on Dept/College/University policies etc./involvement of service on committees or task forces of the department, a college, the Experiment Station, Extension Service, or the University, or service on regional, national or international boards or committees; or membership or offices held in professional or scientific societies, including their editorial review boards; or other professionally related service to the community; and (2) the evaluation thereof, as evidenced by appraisals having objectivity and credibility appropriate to the weight to be given to the activity.

D. Standards for probationary appointment as Assistant Professor

1. Doctoral degree in appropriate field conferred;
2. Evidence of interest in teaching, and capability and potential (which may be indirect, based on activities as a student and the appraisal thereof), or actual performance as instructor in a setting comparable to that of the position to be filled;
3. Evidence of interest in research, and capability and/or potential (which may be based on activities as a student and appraisal thereof), or actual performance in terms of fully independent research successfully published in appropriate refereed journals; and
4. Additional requirements as approved/determined for the particular position.

E. Performance standards for tenure

Teaching/Mentoring/Advising

1. Evaluation report prepared and submitted regularly in accordance with department requirements (See III A above for departmental requirements.)
2. Equal or exceed departmental expectations in teaching credit courses and/or for teaching in non-credit settings. Trajectory of improvement in student ratings of teaching is considered;
3. Favorable narrative appraisals from persons of credibility, including administrators, peers, advisees, students, former students or their employers, or others as appropriate;
4. Evidence of participation in organized teaching improvement workshops or comparable activities; evidence of course development, substantial improvement in existing courses and/or curriculum development;
5. Self-analysis indicating understanding of issues and ideas for improvement if/as needed; and
6. Evidence of significant mentoring of undergraduate students and advising of graduate students

Research (Level of appointment will be considered with respect to research productivity.)

7. Membership in graduate faculty/faculties.
8. A number of advisees with M.S. or Ph.D. degree requirements completed; supervision of Postdoctoral students will also be considered.
9. A significant number of refereed papers published or in press (beyond PhD thesis and postdoctoral training and papers based directly thereon) in relevant journals as senior author or research director. The tenured faculty shall consider quality and the nature of candidate's contribution to publications from collaborative work as well as the number of papers published;
10. Evidence of appropriate research grant application activity with success in securing at least one grant involving significant ($\geq 50\%$ of salary) extramural support;
11. Evidence of interest and capability to engage in cooperative or collaborative research through clusters, University Centers, external centers and interdisciplinary grants; and
12. Six or more letters of evaluation from persons of credibility (i.e. have direct knowledge and established scholarly expertise in the research field of the candidate) outside the University indicating originality of research and rating it favorably or as comparable to that of successful tenure candidates in comparable institutions. Consistent with Section 12 of the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure- Track and Tenured Faculty*, at least four, and no more than half, of the external reviews must come from individuals with no direct professional or personal interest in the advancement of the candidate.

F. Evaluation Process

1. Review of Probationary Faculty

Mentoring is an important component of the promotion and tenure process. In consultation with each probationary faculty member, the Department Head will appoint two tenured members of the Food Science and Nutrition Department and one outside the Department to serve as the faculty member's Tenure Mentoring Committee. This committee will meet at least once per year with the probationary faculty member to discuss progress and offer advice. The probationary faculty member will be encouraged to share appropriate information with his/her Tenure Mentoring Committee, including reviews of research proposals and manuscripts, and teaching evaluations. The Tenure Mentoring Committee will submit an annual written report to the Department Chair. The report should summarize the Tenure Mentoring Committee's views on the probationary faculty member's progress, and it should describe issues (e.g., lab space) that the committee or the probationary faculty member feels may be impeding progress toward tenure.

The Department Head, in consultation with the mentoring committee, will provide a list of expectations describing productivity and achievements based on that individual's formal appointment and field of study. These guideposts should be clearly articulated in the Appraisal of Probationary Faculty Report (President's Form 12), and should be interpreted as advisory rather than prescriptive. The mentoring committee will aid in interpretation of these expectations.

Each year a probationary faculty member will submit to the Head an updated curriculum vitae, which will contain documentation of the faculty member's teaching, research, and service activities as related to the above (additional documents i.e. a summary of teaching evaluations, peer reviews of teaching and self-analysis may also be attached). The Head will distribute these documents to the tenured faculty of the Department at least two weeks prior to a meeting of the tenured faculty for their review. At the meeting, the performance of the probationary faculty member will be discussed, with the Head leading the process. As a group, a draft of the narrative for the President's Form 12 (PF 12) prepared by the Head prior to the meeting will be discussed and agreed upon. Two faculty members will be appointed to act as Tellers to collect and count the ballots including any absentee ballots. There will then be an anonymous written vote on the question of whether to give the probationary faculty member notice of termination. This vote is recorded on the PF 12 form.

Tenured faculty unable to attend the meeting will be able to cast an absentee ballot prior to the meeting. The Head will keep note of all those present voting, those who cast absentee ballots and those who did not vote. While all eligible faculty are expected to vote, a minimum of 90% of the eligible faculty will constitute a quorum. The Head will then finalize the PF 12 statement after the meeting, circulate it to all appropriate faculty for further input or corrections and then complete the finished P12 document. After this, meeting, the Head will schedule a meeting with the probationary faculty member to discuss the PF 12. The above is to be done in accordance with sections 7.11 and 7.12 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*. Also, if the tenure clock has been stopped (as specified in 5.5 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure) this should be documented in the probationary faculty member's record.

2. Process for Recommending Tenure. (The following procedures expand the *Procedures for Evaluating Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty* for this unit.)

To be considered for Indefinite Tenure the faculty member must assemble a dossier documenting contributions to teaching, research and service as related to the above. This dossier will consist of:

- a. An updated CV. The CV should be comprised of the following: (1) a list of research publications by category with indication of the degree of involvement in each paper and separating out those papers done at the prior institution from those at Minnesota also separate out those submitted and those accepted but not yet published, (2) a list of book chapters and a list of other types of relevant papers again separating out those done prior to work at Minnesota and the other criteria as for refereed research papers, (3) a list of published abstracts, a list of journal articles reviewed, (4) a list of grants applied for separating out those not funded from those received with indication of degree of involvement in the grant process and the level of funding obtained, (5) a list of courses taught with number of students and indication of % of course lectures and % of mechanics, (6) a list of MS and Ph.D. students separated by being major professor from co-adviser, by completed vs in progress and listing the students major program area and title of research thesis area. For those in progress, an estimate of projected data of completion should be made. (7) A list of presentations made, separating out by those at the University of Minnesota, those at scientific meetings and those invited to give externally, (8) a list of professional society involvement, a list of university committee involvement separated by department, college and university, (9) a list of professional development courses/seminars attended separated by teaching, research

and management, (10) a list of any other aspects of public engagement deemed appropriate and (11) any other materials deemed appropriate.

- b. A statement of the faculty member's teaching, research and service philosophies
- c. A summary table of teaching (resident and/or extension) evaluations
- d. At least two representative peer reviewed research publications completed since coming to the University of Minnesota as a faculty member
- e. Copies of PF 12 supplied by the Head
- f. If appropriate extension publications done since coming to the University of Minnesota as a faculty member
- g. Six to eight letters of evaluation from individuals external to the University of Minnesota will be requested by the Head (this letter of request should also be included). The individuals doing these evaluations will be supplied items a, b, c, and d above. External evaluators should be prominent individuals (a document containing short statements of who these individuals are, is to be included) in the faculty member's area of activity. Graduate or post-doctoral supervisors as well as close personal friends (if known) should not be considered.
- h. Other documents the faculty member may wish to include.

The Head will distribute the dossier to the tenured faculty at least two weeks prior to a meeting of the faculty. After discussion an anonymous vote will be taken on whether to grant or not grant indefinite tenure. Faculty unable to attend the meeting can cast an absentee ballot prior to the meeting. The Head will keep note of all those present voting, those who cast absentee ballots and those who did not vote. While all eligible faculty are expected to vote, a minimum of 90% of the eligible faculty will constitute a quorum. After the meeting the Head will draft a letter which summarizes the discussion. This letter will then be distributed to the tenured faculty for their comments. Comments are then incorporated into the final letter which becomes part of the dossier as it moves forward. The above is to be done in accordance the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure in particular with sections 7.11 and 7.12 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. If the tenure clock had been stopped (as specified in 5.5 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure) this should be documented. The voting process as outlined in F1 above including the Teller process will be followed.

IV. Criteria, Standards and Procedures for Recommending Promotion

A. Performance standards for promotion to Assistant Professor

Applicable only in the case of a recommended candidate meeting all approved search and hiring requirements for appointment as Assistant Professor except conferring of the doctoral degree or completion of all requirements for it. Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor shall occur upon receipt of satisfactory evidence that the degree has been conferred or that all requirements for it

have been completed.

B. Performance standards for promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor has the same criteria as those appropriate for the granting of tenure and is usually decided upon immediately following a positive decision on the vote for tenure. All Associate Professors and Full Professors participate in this vote. If unable to attend the meeting, a faculty member may cast an absentee ballot. While all eligible faculty are expected to vote, a minimum of 90% of the eligible faculty will constitute a quorum. The above is to be done in accordance the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* in particular with sections 7.11 and 7.12 of the *Faculty Tenure* policy. If the tenure clock had been stopped for a specified period (as outlined in 5.5 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*), this should be documented. **The voting process as outlined in Section F.1, including the Teller process, will be followed.**

C. Performance standards for promotion to Professor (Section 9.2, Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*)

1. Meet and exceed performance standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, as stated in Section 9.2 (Appendix B) of the *Faculty Tenure* policy (which includes adding to one's academic record significantly and establishing a national and international reputation):

Teaching/Mentoring

2. Equal or exceed departmental expectations in teaching credit courses and/or for teaching in non-credit settings.
3. Evidence of continued and substantive evaluation and innovation in teaching; activities may include participation in workshops, seminars or equivalent activities on teaching effectiveness, or other outside or campus recognition of superior teaching performance; and
4. Significant contributions to the mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students as approved by the head.

Research (Level of appointment will be considered with respect to research productivity.)

5. Membership in graduate faculty/faculties;
6. Where research time and mission are judged by peers to permit, a minimum of two advisees with Ph. D. degree requirements completed;
7. Significant additional peer reviewed research papers published or in press in relevant journals as senior author or research director, or the equivalent in scholarly achievement as judged by peers and discussed earlier under Criteria for Tenure: Research; One of these may be a significant review paper that is peer reviewed;
8. Continued success in securing extramural funding;

9. Except where judged clearly unnecessary or inappropriate by peers, evidence of substantive engagement in cooperative or collaborative research;
10. Six and stature in or more new appraisal letters requested by the Head from persons of appropriate credibility outside the University which clearly indicates national and/or international visibility research and external service of the faculty member. =

D. Process for Recommending Promotion to Professor (Refer to the *Procedure for Evaluating Tenure and /or Promotion: Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty*)

To be considered for promotion to Professor the faculty member must assemble a dossier documenting contributions to teaching, research and service as related to 1 through 10 above. This dossier will consist of:

- a. An updated CV done in accordance with Section F.2.a above;
- b. A statement of the faculty member's teaching, research and service philosophies;
- c. A summary table of teaching (resident and/or extension) evaluations;
- d. At least two representative major research publications which establishes substantive accomplishments and scientific advancements in a defined field of research;

If appropriate extension publications and;

- e. A listing of service or administrative accomplishments
- f. Six to eight letters of evaluation from individuals external to the University of Minnesota will be requested by the Head (this letter of request should also be included). The individuals doing these evaluations will be supplied items a, b, c, d and e above. External evaluators should be prominent individuals (a document containing short statements of who these individuals are should be included) in the faculty member's area of activity. Graduate or post-doctoral supervisors as well as close personal friends (if known) should not be considered.
- g. Other documents the faculty member may wish to include.

The Head will distribute the dossier of the candidate to the faculty at least two weeks prior to a meeting of the faculty. After discussion an anonymous vote will be taken on whether to promote to Professor. The anonymous written ballot voting process as outlined in F1 above including the Teller process will be followed. Professors unable to attend the meeting can cast an absentee prior to the meeting. While all eligible faculty are expected to vote, a minimum of 90% of the eligible faculty will constitute a quorum. After the meeting the Head will draft a letter which summarizes the discussion and includes the outcome of the vote. This letter will then be distributed to the Professors on the faculty for their comment. Comments are then incorporated into the final letter which becomes part of the dossier as it moves forward. The above is done in accordance with the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* in particular 9.2.

V. Criteria, Standards and Procedures for Post Tenure Review of Faculty Performance

Each tenured faculty member is expected to continue to make significant, career-long contributions in the categories of A. Teaching, B. Research, and C. Service.

The goal of the PTR is to identify faculty who are performing substantially below goals and expectations of their rank, and to initiate a process encouraging low-performing individuals to regain academic vitality and productivity at a level expected within the Department.

With recognition that there are challenges in distinguishing between teaching and research activity at the advanced level (e.g., activities with research students in one's own laboratory), a typical distribution of effort for a tenured faculty member in the Food Science and Nutrition Department (FScN) is 50% teaching, 50% research, and an undefined level of service. Those who hold certain administrative positions within the Department will have smaller absolute percentages of effort in each category, but the apportionment among A.-C. will still be similar. Distribution of effort substantially different from the above, including situations wherein a faculty member is on a leave of absence or sabbatical, should be specifically agreed upon by the faculty member and the Department Head in a written Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), with possible input from the Post Tenure Review Committee. For example, if a tenured faculty member stops conducting research at a sufficiently productive level, that person may negotiate assignment to other duties, such as increased teaching and/or service. It is expected that a MOU signed by one Department Head will be honored by subsequent Department Heads in the timeline as expressed in the most recent MOU.

The criteria for "Satisfactory" level of performance in each of categories A.-C. are described below. "Unsatisfactory" performance in any category is that which does not meet minimum expectations for "Satisfactory." Judgment of performance is made by the Department Head as part of her/his annual review of each faculty member (see the Procedures outline below). If activity in an area is deemed to be unsatisfactory or if adherence to a previously agreed upon action plan is deemed to be poor, the Head may seek input from members of the PTR Committee. Unless otherwise permitted by a written MOU, as stipulated above, any of the following three circumstances will lead to referral to the PTR Committee:

1. Unsatisfactory performance in teaching for the year under review.
2. Unsatisfactory performance in both research *and* service for the year under review.
3. Unsatisfactory performance in research *or* service over three consecutive years.

The performance criteria for each of categories A.-C. are:

A. TEACHING

Satisfactory

Tenured faculty members must do both of the following (unless previously agreed upon with the Department Head in writing):

- a. Teach the courses assigned by the Department Head according to the % teaching appointment with satisfactory performance based on course evaluations by students and/or peers. This requirement may be relaxed if a course is taught for the first time by the faculty member for the year under review. With the agreement of the Head, certain administrative responsibilities may reduce the expected course load. Those with extension teaching responsibilities must complete extension teaching with satisfactory performance based on program evaluation by participants and/or peers and publications.
- b. Routinely accept all responsibilities associated with serving on preliminary written, preliminary oral, and final oral examination committee(s) for graduate students and honors or senior thesis committees of undergraduate students.

And must meet at least one of the following criteria:

- a. National leadership in shaping the curriculum within a discipline.
- b. Authoring or editing of new educational media or instruments (e.g., textbook, video, computer software) that are distributed nationally.
- c. Principal Investigator (PI) in the year of acquisition or renewal of a training grant (e.g., NIH or NSF-REU).
- d. Recipient of a teaching award.
- e. Successfully developing and implementing a new course.
- f. Successfully developing and implementing major improvements to an existing course (e.g., rewriting a lab manual).
- g. Authoring one or more papers in a peer-reviewed journal focused on education.
- h. Member of a committee that significantly impacts education at the campus level.
- i. Significant contributions to the mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students as approved by the head
- j. Additional outstanding contributions to teaching approved by the Head.

B. RESEARCH

Satisfactory

Tenured faculty members must have a record of:

- a. Regular publication in recognized and high quality, peer-reviewed journals related to Food Science and Nutrition;
- b. Success in securing extramural funding and
- c. Serving as advisor to graduate students.

And must meet at least two of the following criteria:

- a. Inventor on one or more patent applications.
- b. Advisor to one or more undergraduate student researchers.
- c. Invited speaker at a national or international meeting.
- d. Invited seminar speaker at colleges, universities, companies, or national laboratories.
- e. Organizer or co-organizer of a symposium at local, national, or international meetings.
- f. Other significant research contributions approved by the Head.

C. SERVICE

Satisfactory

Tenured faculty members are expected to provide a contribution to the departmental, collegiate and university communities that is commensurate to their seniority. Tenured faculty members have a specific responsibility in acting as mentors to probationary faculty. They must furthermore regularly

participate in faculty meetings and in both undergraduate and graduate program committee meetings, and meet at least five of the following criteria:

- a. Chair or member of a major (University- or College-wide) committee.
- b. Chair or member of one or more department committee(s).
- c. Director of Graduate Studies, or Director of Undergraduate Studies.
- d. Chair or member of a mentoring committee for probationary faculty
- e. Organizer of, or major contributor to, an outreach activity.
- f. Reviewer of scholarly articles and grant proposals written by others.
- g. Member of one or more journal editorial advisory boards.
- h. Member of other Departmental committees (outside FScN).
- i. Editor or Associate Editor of an internationally recognized journal.
- j. Chair or member of a national committee.
- k. Officer in a scientific society or division thereof.
- l. A member on a national grant agency review panel.
- m. Director of a Multi-Investigator Center with steady external funding.
- n. Other significant service contributions approved by the Head.

Service as performed by a tenured faculty member should include a minimum of two departmental assignments and one at the College or University level.

VI. Procedures

A. Tenure and/or Promotion Procedures

The Department of Food Science and Nutrition complies with Sections 7.4, 7.61 and 16.3 of the *Faculty Tenure*, except that statement (2) of Section 7.4 is modified for the Food Science and Nutrition Department to read: “The decision is made by vote, by written secret ballot, at a meeting of the regular faculty who have indefinite tenure in the academic unit. An affirmative vote shall be at least a two thirds (2/3) majority of those voting.”

The procedure for all promotion and tenure decisions in FScN is that two meetings of the faculty eligible to vote shall be held, with an interval of one to two weeks between the two meetings. At least one week prior to the first meeting, written materials relevant to the case shall be circulated to all faculty members eligible to vote.

Outside letters that arrive after this date but before the vote is taken shall be distributed as they arrive. At the first meeting, a summary and analysis of the written materials shall be presented by the Department Head, followed by general discussion. No vote will be taken at this meeting. The interval between the two meetings provides an opportunity to gather additional information based on the discussion at the first meeting. At the second meeting, discussion is continued, followed by a vote by written secret ballot. Absentee ballots by those eligible to vote are permitted only if they are received prior to the vote by those present.

B. Procedures for the Annual Review of Probationary Faculty

Each year there will be a meeting of the tenured faculty to review the progress of all probationary faculty not being considered for promotion and/or in that year. This meeting can be organized in conjunction with the promotion and tenure meeting that is described in Section II.A. A summary of progress for each probationary faculty member will be presented by the probationary faculty member's Mentoring Committee. The presentation of each summary will be followed by general discussion. Based on this discussion and any other relevant information, the Head may decide to initiate formal consideration of either early promotion or termination of a probationary faculty member. If termination is to be considered, a separate meeting of the tenured faculty on that issue will be scheduled a minimum of two weeks later. Detailed written information relevant to that decision will be circulated to those eligible to vote at least two weeks prior to the meeting at which termination is considered. This meeting will culminate in a vote of the tenured faculty. Absentee ballots by those eligible to vote are permitted only if they are received prior to the vote by those present. A two thirds (2/3) majority of those voting is required to recommend termination. If early promotion is to be considered, the procedures and timetable for departmental action will be the same as for promotion at the end of the normal probationary period.

C. Procedures for Post-Tenure Review

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to provide the Head with updated information on teaching, research and service contributions in the format requested and by the specified departmental deadline. The Head will then schedule a private conference with each faculty member to discuss this information. If in the annual review the performance of a tenured faculty member is found to be substantially below the goals and expectations of the Department, the Head will refer that case to the Post Tenure Review (PTR) Committee. The PTR Committee should independently assess if the performance of the specific faculty member is substantially below goals and expectations of the rank. Together with the Head, the PTR Committee will initiate a process encouraging low-performing individuals to regain academic vitality and productivity at the level that is expected within the Department.

The Department designates the PTR Committee as the peer faculty review committee for post-tenure review. The PTR Committee consists of three tenured faculty members, serving staggered 3-year terms. Members are elected by the tenured faculty of the Department, normally with one new member elected each year. Nominations by the Department Head or by any regular faculty member in the department are permitted. Special elections are held as needed for the replacement of any PTR Committee member who is unable to serve during some portion of his or her term of PTR committee service.

If the PTR Committee agrees with the Department Head that performance is substantially below the goals and expectations of the Department, the faculty member will be notified in writing of this result. The Department Head and PTR Committee members will provide the faculty member with a letter specifying the nature of the deficiencies, suggestions for improving performance, and a defined time period of at least one year from the receipt of the letter, during which time the faculty member must work to address the identified problems. At any point in the process just described the faculty member may respond directly to the Department Head and the PTR Committee in writing. If, at the end of this time period, both the PTR Committee and the Department Head continue to find that performance is substantially below the goals and expectations of the Department, the Dean will be asked to initiate a special review according to the procedures described in section 7a.3 of the *Faculty Tenure* regulations.

Appendix A – Section 7.11 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*

Section 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.^[FN 2] This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service.^[FN 3]

The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision.^[FN 4] 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.

^[FN 2] "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.

^[FN 3] 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.

^[FN 4] 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*

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.^[FN 7] This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service.^[FN 8] 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.

^[FN 7] "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.

^[FN 8] 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.

Appendix C – Section 5.5 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*

5.5 Extension Of Maximum Probationary Period For New Parent Or Caregiver, Or For Personal Medical Reasons.

Upon the written request of a probationary faculty member, the maximum period of that faculty member's probationary service will be extended by one year at a time for each request:

- (a) On the occasion of the birth of the faculty member's child or placement of an adoptive/foster child with the faculty member. Such a request for extension will be granted automatically if the faculty member notifies the unit head, dean, and executive vice president and provost in writing that the faculty member is eligible for an extension under subsection 5.5 because of the birth or adoption/foster placement; or
- (b) If the faculty member is a major caregiver for a family member with an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition and the executive vice president and provost determines that the circumstances have had or are likely to have a substantial negative impact on the faculty member's ability to work over an extended period of time;
- (c) If the faculty member has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition, and the executive vice president and provost determines that the circumstances have had or are likely to have a substantial negative impact on the faculty member's ability to work over an extended period of time. If the faculty member's illness, injury, or debilitating condition reduces the faculty member's ability to work to less than two-thirds time during the faculty member's contract year [i.e., the academic year or twelve months], the probationary period is automatically extended by one year in accordance with subsection 5.3.

"Family member" means a faculty member's spouse or domestic partner, child, or other relative. "Child" includes a biological child, an adopted or foster child, and the child of a spouse or domestic partner.

The probationary period may be extended for no more than three years total, except that the extension may be for no more than one year total for (1) an instructor with a probationary appointment under subsection 6.22 or (2) an associate professor or professor with a three-year probationary appointment under subsection 6.21.

The notification of birth or adoption/foster placement for provision (a) and the request for extension for provisions (b) and (c) in this subsection must be made in writing within one year of the events giving rise to the claim and no later than June 30 preceding the year a final decision would otherwise be made on an appointment with indefinite tenure for that faculty member.

A request for an extension under provision (b) or (c) will not be denied without first providing the faculty member making the request with an opportunity to discuss the request in a meeting with an administrator designated by the executive vice president and provost. A claim that a request for an extension under provision (b) or (c) was improperly denied may be considered in any subsequent review by the Senate Judicial Committee of a termination under subsection 7.7.