

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
MEDICAL SCHOOL
DEPARTMENT OF GENETICS, CELL BIOLOGY AND DEVELOPMENT

7.12 STATEMENT

Statements Required By Section 7.12 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*

PART 1. MEDICAL SCHOOL PREAMBLE

I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

This document describes the specific criteria and standards which will be used to evaluate whether candidates from the Medical School meet the general criteria for tenure in Section 7.11 and for promotion to professor in Section 9.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*. All candidates for promotion and/or tenure in the Medical School are evaluated with the criteria and standards in this preamble. In addition, each department in the Medical School has its own 7.12 Statement (Part II of this document) that further delineates the criteria for promotion and/or tenure within that individual unit. For a complete perspective, the reader is advised to review Sections 7 and 9 in their entirety. Section 7.11 is printed in IV: Criteria for Tenure (see below); Section 9.2 is printed in V.C Promotion to Professor. This preamble contains Criteria and Standards pertaining to:

- A. Appointment
- B. Awarding of indefinite tenure
- C. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor
- D. The process for the annual appraisal of probationary and tenured faculty

The criteria, standards, and procedures are applied without regard to race, religion, color, sex, national origin, handicap, age, veteran status or sexual orientation.

The Medical School issues annually to each department, for distribution and information to faculty members, a set of instructions, memoranda, and other documents, giving detailed information on the procedures to be followed in the preparation and consideration of each proposal for tenure and/or promotion in rank. The pertinent documents are identified as exhibits enclosed with a cover memorandum from the Dean.

The Medical School 7.12 and Departmental 7.12 Statements are reviewed and approved by the dean of the Medical School and the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost.

The relevant University documents regarding criteria for tenure and/or promotion and the procedures for implementing these criteria are:

- University of Minnesota Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*
- *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty*

II. MISSION STATEMENT

Committed to innovation and diversity, the Medical School educates physicians, scientists, and health professionals; generates knowledge and treatments; and cares for patients and communities with compassion and respect.

The Medical School strongly encourages and values interdisciplinary work, including scholarship, public engagement, and teaching, as well as interprofessional collaboration in clinical sciences. Concordant with the position of the National Institutes of Health, the Medical School values Co-Principal Investigators and interdisciplinary collaboration on major funding proposals as well.

III. APPOINTMENT AND ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

A. APPOINTMENT

1. Assistant Professor

In the Medical School the entry level rank for faculty is at the Assistant Professor level. The minimal, general criteria for initial appointment at this rank include:

- a. Possession of a terminal degree (MD or equivalent, or Ph.D.)
- b. Board eligibility or certification (if applicable - clinical specialties)
- c. Demonstrated ability in teaching
- d. Demonstrated involvement in high-quality research which has been accepted for publication or is published in peer-reviewed national or international journals
- e. Documentation of competence in the skills of communication, including effective communication in teaching students and in oral and written presentations of research

Each department may add specialty-specific criteria for appointment, in their Departmental 7.12 Statement.

2. Associate Professor and Professor

- a. The criteria and standards for appointment at the rank of Associate Professor are those stated for awarding of tenure.
- b. The criteria and standards for appointment at the rank of Professor are those stated for promotion to this rank.

In addition, for clinically active faculty, it is expected that for appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor they will have achieved appropriate Board Certification in the specific field where they are practicing.

3. Secondary Appointments

The appointment home for a faculty member is always in the primary department (the tenure home is the University of Minnesota). Joint and/or secondary appointment requests will be made by the secondary department with the support of the primary department in the form of a request letter(s) signed by both department heads, addressed to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs in the Medical School. In the case that the appointment being requested is at the Associate Professor or Professor level, the secondary department may conduct a faculty vote by written ballot, based on the proposed collaborative activity in the secondary department for the faculty member. The results of the vote should be reported at the time of the request for appointment.

B. ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

In fulfillment of Sections 7.11 and 7.12 and in accord with Section 7.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*; “the tenured faculty of each academic unit annually reviews the progress of each probationary faculty member toward satisfaction of the criteria for receiving tenure. The head of the unit prepares a written summary of that review and discusses the candidate’s progress with the candidate, giving a copy of the report to the candidate.”

All tenure-track faculty will undergo an annual review each academic year. An academic year is defined in Section 5.3 in the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*. Annual appraisals in the Medical School and its departments comply with the procedures described in *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*. Each department will outline the specific process and criteria for annual appraisals, but at the very least will include a review by the tenured faculty of the department and an annual conference with the Department Head. These procedures are provided for by Sections 16.3, 7.4, and 7.61 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*.

The annual review of probationary faculty will be recorded on the *University of Minnesota (UM) Form 12* and will reflect the faculty member’s performance relative to the 7.12 Statement. A record of the vote by

the tenured faculty for continuation or recommendation for promotion and/or tenure will be included on the *UM Form 12*, if a vote was taken. (This vote on annual reviews is optional). Each department will determine, and so state in their departmental 7.12 Statement, whether or not such a vote will be taken. If such an annual vote is taken in any department, a 2/3 majority of eligible voting faculty is required for continuation of the probationary appointment. A motion for termination also requires a 2/3 majority of eligible voting faculty for action to be taken. A record of the vote, either for continuation or termination, must be included on the *UM Form 12*. If a faculty member has extended his or her probationary period according to Section 5.5 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, this must be noted on the *UM Form 12* during the annual review.

The department head will meet annually with each probationary faculty member to review his/her completed *UM Form 12*. The department head and faculty member will sign the completed *President's Form 12*. The *UM Form 12* is forwarded to the dean for review, comment, and signoff.

The *UM Form 12* is then forwarded to the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost (SVPP) for review, comment, and signoff. A copy is kept in the SVPP Office. The signed *UM Form 12* will be kept in the probationary faculty member's tenure file and will become a part of the dossier.

For faculty members with joint and/or secondary appointments in another Medical School or University Department, annual reviews will be carried out according to the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*. For a candidate who has an appointment in more than one unit, the candidate's offer letter will specify how the candidate will be evaluated annually and at the time of the tenure and/or promotion decision, including which unit's 7.12 statement will be used as the basis for evaluation and which unit's votes of tenured faculty will be counted or reported for the second level of review in the Medical School. The primary unit will receive input from the secondary unit on performance of responsibilities specific to that unit prior to each annual review and decision on promotion and tenure.

IV. CRITERIA FOR TENURE

Section 7.11 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* states:

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.

A recommendation for tenure is made when an eligible faculty member has fulfilled the General Criteria for tenure, as stated in Section 7.11, and the standards stated by the Medical School and the department. Candidates must be evaluated for tenure during their mandatory decision year at the latest. The mandatory decision year occurs during the sixth probationary year for tenure-track faculty in the basic science departments, and in the ninth year for tenure-track faculty in clinical departments.

When distinction in research has greater weight in the decision to award tenure, the candidate must also show, at a minimum, evidence of competence in teaching. When distinction in teaching has the greater weight in the decision to award tenure, the candidate must also show, at a minimum, evidence of competence in research. Distinction in research requires documented evidence of high-level, independent scholarly effort. Distinction in teaching requires documented evidence of innovation and effectiveness in teaching, which have attracted national recognition.

Probationary faculty can extend their maximum period of probationary service, by one year for each occurrence of circumstances as described in Section 5.5 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*. In the case of childbirth, adoption, or foster placement of a child, a probationary faculty member must notify the department head, the dean of the Medical School and the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost of this circumstance using University of Minnesota Form UM 1764 and the extension of the probationary period is automatic. In the case of caregiver responsibilities or personal illness or injury, the probationary faculty member must receive the approval of the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost using University of Minnesota Form UM 1765. No probationary period may be extended for more than three years. (See the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* for more details.)

A. TEACHING

Distinction in teaching for the granting of tenure must include scholarly work in education. Evidence of the generation of new methods of pedagogy with national recognition by peers (AAMC, ACE) and impact on educational programs nationally is required. Activities may occur in a variety of educational settings and formats, including: didactic presentations, lectures, seminars, conferences, tutorials, laboratories, case discussions, grand rounds, hospital and clinic rounds, patient care, surgical and other procedures, and

continuing education. Competence in teaching requires participation in appropriate courses with satisfactory learner evaluations.

Assessment of distinction in teaching and advising students is based upon:

1. Innovative contributions to the field of medical education which have been adopted for use by other institutions and are recognized by peers as scholarly contributions.
2. Review of course(s) taught, directed, or developed; a list of students and degree candidates for whom the faculty member has served as academic adviser.
3. Evidence of teaching excellence at the undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-doctoral levels, evaluated by the written statements and/or compiled ratings of students.
4. Written statements by the Head of the Department, academic peers, and others familiar with the candidate's performance in teaching and educational scholarship.
5. Accumulation of above forms of evidence on teaching competence and excellence over a sustained period of time.

Assessment of competence in teaching is based upon:

1. Learner and/or peer evaluations.

B. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

Assessment of distinction in research is based upon the following:

1. A review of the candidate's scientific publications, particularly those in national or international peer-reviewed journals. Evidence is sought that the work is scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance, whether focused on laboratory endeavors, clinical investigations, or analysis or synthesis of clinical observations and experience.
2. Independence of research accomplishments or significant contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative research. Evidence of independence or significant contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative research may include:
 - a. Naming of the candidate as the first or senior author on multi-authored journal articles and/or documentation of major, substantial contributions by the candidate to the collaborative project and publication.
 - b. Statements of peer evaluators on the creativity and significance of the candidate's contributions to a collaborative research project and/or to multi-authored publications.
 - c. Identification of the candidate as the principal investigator or a major collaborator on peer-reviewed, funded research grants or contracts
 - d. Invitations/nominations to serve on study sections, national policy boards, editorial boards, etc.
3. External research funding from federal and other national granting agencies which sponsor programs in biomedical and other scientific research subject to peer review.
4. Significant original contributions based on clinical observations resulting in new therapies or techniques which impact the practice of medicine.

Assessment of competence in research is based upon:

1. Evidence of significant discipline-related publications, including reports of clinical investigations, identification through case reports of new syndromes or treatments, and descriptions of new techniques.
2. Participation in invited scientific and clinical symposia, meetings and lectures.
3. Letters from authorities in the candidate's clinical discipline assessing his/her contributions to the discipline.

C. CLINICAL SERVICE (if applicable)

Clinical Service expectations in decisions for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor include enjoying an excellent reputation inside and outside the Twin Cities area as an authority in a clinical specialty, as

demonstrated by patient referrals from outside the area, invited visiting lectureships, and memberships in professional societies.

D. SERVICE

In the Medical School service contributions are an integral part of the academic unit. Such service can be used to demonstrate an additional area of strength for the recommendation of tenure. Examples of service contributions include:

1. Participation in discipline-specific regional and national organizations.
2. Service to the Department, School, or University on governance-related or policy making committees.
3. Service to the community, State, and public engagement.

V. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION IN FACULTY RANK

A. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

In the Medical School, the entry level rank for faculty is at the Assistant Professor level. It is therefore anticipated that there will be no promotions to this rank.

B. TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The general criteria and standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are those stated for consideration of tenure (see IV above).

In addition, for clinically active faculty, it is expected that they will have achieved appropriate Board Certification in the specific field where they are practicing.

A recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor is made when an eligible faculty member has fulfilled the general criteria applicable to tenure, as stated in Section 7.11, and the specific criteria and standards for promotion to Associate Professor as stated by the Medical School and the Department. It is also an expectation of the University and the Medical School that all faculty promoted to associate professor with tenure are on a trajectory that will result in them achieving the rank of full Professor.

C. TO PROFESSOR

A recommendation for promotion to Professor is based on criteria set by the Medical School and the Department in accord with Section 9.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *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.

Promotion to Professor is not based on time in rank, but on an increasing record of accomplishments. During the period as an Associate Professor, the candidate will have continued to develop his or her already distinguished record in teaching, research, and service and added substantially to the record that was the basis for the promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. The candidate must have achieved a national and international reputation in her or his area of expertise and be recognized as a leader and a mentor.

The proposal of a candidate for Professor will present evidence of additional significant academic, scientific, scholarly, and professional achievements such as:

1. The establishment of a training program for pre- and/or post-doctoral fellows in a specific discipline.
2. Election to prestigious scientific and/or professional organizations which recognize excellence and significant academic contributions.
3. Letters from authorities attesting to the candidate's acknowledged national or international reputation and recognition of leadership in his/her field; letters from prominent senior faculty members at other universities assessing the candidate's qualifications for promotion to the rank of Professor.
4. Nationally recognized leadership roles in the profession or the institution.
5. Evidence of effective mentoring of junior faculty, fellows, and M.D. and Ph.D. trainees.
6. Creating and sustaining a culture that fosters diversity.
7. Ongoing record of peer-reviewed publications.
8. Ongoing record of funding for research or scholarship (if applicable).
9. Ongoing excellence in clinical activity (if applicable).

VI. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

In accordance with Section 7a of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* and the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*, each Medical School department will annually conduct a review of each tenured faculty member. The specific Departmental process for annual review and review criteria (i.e. the goals and expectations for continued performance by tenured faculty) will be described in the Departmental 7.12 Statement Part 2.

The Medical School procedures for annual review of tenured faculty are provided in Part 3 of the document (Annual Review of Tenured Faculty).

VII. VOTING PROCEDURES

- A. Promotion and tenure decisions in the Medical School require a positive vote by two-thirds of all eligible voting faculty members on the question to recommend affirmatively for promotion and/or tenure.
- B. Decisions to terminate the contract of a probationary faculty member also require a vote by two-thirds of all eligible voting faculty members in support of the motion to terminate the appointment.

- C. Tenured faculty are eligible to vote on the awarding of tenure to probationary faculty. Tenured faculty holding appropriate rank are eligible to vote on recommendations for promotion of candidates.

VIII. PROCESS FOR UPDATING THIS 7.12 STATEMENT

The Medical School will review its 7.12 Statement Preamble at least every five years, or more frequently as needed. Revisions will be made by the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. The revisions will be presented to the Faculty Advisory Council. All Medical School tenured and tenure-track faculty will be invited to review and give input on the statement, and approval will be obtained through a majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, in conjunction with approval of their departmental criteria, with the approval date noted on the document.

History of Revisions (approved by vote of the Faculty):

Original Document: Date unknown

Revision: April 15, 1993

Revision: July 2, 2009

Revision Approved by Medical School Faculty: June 21, 2012

Approved by Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost: June 22, 2012

PART 2. DEPARTMENTAL ADDENDUM

I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

This document describes the specific criteria and standards which will be used to evaluate whether faculty in the Department of Genetics, Cell Biology and Development, both in the basic and clinical sciences, meet the general criteria in Section 7.11 of the Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, as defined for this Department. It also provides the specific criteria and standards that will be used to evaluate associate professors for promotion to professor according to Section 9.2 of the *Faculty Tenure* policy.

This document contains the Department's Criteria and Standards pertaining to:

- A. Award of indefinite tenure
- B. Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor and from associate professor to professor
- C. The departmental process for the annual appraisal of probationary and tenured faculty
- D. The goals and expectations for the annual review of tenured faculty.

As a unit that is dually supported and administered by the College of Biological Sciences and Medical School, the faculty in Genetics, Cell Biology, and Development support and adhere to the missions and constitutions of both governing bodies. The criteria and standards for promotion and tenure, as well as post-tenure review as outlined in this document have been developed with respect to those constitutions as well as Sections 7 and 9 of the Board of Regents Policy.

II. MISSION STATEMENT

The Department of Genetics, Cell Biology and Development (GCD) spans a broad spectrum of biological disciplines, including the storage and expression of information (genetics), its translation into the workings of individual cells (cell biology), and the assembly of cells into tissues and organ systems (development).

Our mission embraces three critical strategies: 1) integration of methods and ideas across disciplines, 2) collaborative projects that assemble the people required to achieve that integration, and 3) strategic use of model systems that provide the most powerful experimental access to important biological and medical problems. With our uniquely diverse expertise, these approaches will allow us to build upon innovative basic science, educate students, and translate fundamental discoveries into direct benefits for society.

The Department of Genetics, Cell Biology and Development is committed to provide a stimulating professional environment in which faculty, staff and students engage in, and disseminate the results of, high quality research in the fields of genetics, cell biology and development; to provide rigorous education and training for undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral students and scientific colleagues; and to provide expertise in the areas of genetics, cell biology and development to the campus at large and society. As outlined under Section IV of this document, the Department had developed criteria to assess these ideals

III. APPOINTMENT AND ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

A. APPOINTMENT OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

Based on the departmental mission, strategic plans are developed by the departmental faculty in recruitment and hiring of new faculty. In consultation with the Deans of the Medical School and the College of Biological Sciences (CBS), recruitment and interview processes are initiated for hiring faculty who are capable of fulfilling the mission of the Department. Candidates are evaluated on evidence of research and communication skills, with expectation of establishing a highly regarded and funded research program, as well as contributing to the teaching and service needs of the institution. Faculty may be hired at the Assistant Professor level, and placed in the probationary tenure track position either as CBS primary appointees or Medical School primary appointees. Faculty may be hired at advanced ranks with tenure in either School, if they demonstrate clear evidence of a successful research and teaching program that meets or exceeds the requirements of the Department, College, and School's tenure and rank review, and subject to approval by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost of the University of Minnesota.

B. ANNUAL APPRAISAL OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

1. PROCESS

The overall process for Annual Review of Probationary Faculty is in compliance with Section 7.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* and *the Procedures for Reviewing Faculty for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty*.

The Department Head assigns faculty mentors to probationary faculty in research and teaching. The role of these mentors is to promote career development in grant writing, manuscript submission, laboratory management and teaching. Each year the probationary faculty member provides an annual progress report to his/her mentors. At a department faculty meeting, the mentors present the probationary faculty's progress to the department's tenured faculty to monitor and discuss progress, and provide feedback to the probationary faculty. Based on the departmental review, the Department Head prepares the University of Minnesota (UM) Form 12 (Annual Appraisal Form) that summarizes the discussion and recommends continuation, termination, or tenure review. At the annual progress review meeting with the Head, the probationary faculty is provided suggestions for the next year's goals.

In exceptional cases where a probationary faculty is derelict in performance or is incapable of meeting the minimal expectations, the tenured faculty may vote whether to recommend termination. A vote of two-thirds of the eligible voting faculty will warrant a termination recommendation, and it will be indicated on the UM Form 12.

In the spring of the fifth year (with exceptions for termination procedures, or approval of an extension of the probationary period in Section 5.5 of the Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, the Promotions and Tenure Committee will review the progress of the probationary faculty toward meeting tenure, and make a recommendation to the Department Head to support or not support the process for tenure review to promote to a tenured Associate Professor. If determined by the Head to be appropriate, a Promotion Dossier is assembled, according to the guidelines of the collegiate unit to which the faculty is appointed (Medical School or CBS).

The Promotion Dossier materials are collected, and completed by the mid-summer of the same year. The tenured-faculty review the documents, discuss the qualifications in a faculty meeting, and vote on whether to recommend tenure and promotion. The Department Head summarizes the highlights of the complete dossier as well as the discussion points and vote of the faculty in a letter that is placed in the Dossier for evaluation by the Collegiate Promotion and Tenure Committees. Because two colleges administer the Department, the P&T Committees of both the Medical School and the College

of Biological Sciences vote on the Promotion Dossier. The recommendations of both committees of the non-tenure college are provided as a written document to the Dean of the college in which the probationary faculty holds his/her primary appointment as per the attached agreement (Appendix B).

2. CRITERIA

The criteria for satisfactory performance to be used for the annual review in the Department of Genetics, Cell Biology and Development are the same as the appropriate criteria for rank, as defined in this 7.12 statement.

IV. **CRITERIA FOR TENURE**

Criteria for Tenure - Department of Genetics, Cell Biology and Development

Indefinite tenure may be granted at any time when 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 it appears that the appointee is not making satisfactory progress toward meeting the criteria within that period.

The Department of Genetics, Cell Biology and Development adheres to the statement of Criteria for Tenure of faculty in the *Faculty Tenure* policy (Subsection 7.11). To be recommended for indefinite tenure, a probationary faculty member should demonstrate strong performance in research, teaching and service. Service to professional organizations and federal agencies will be taken as evidence of nationally recognized stature, but without the accompanying research and teaching contributions, cannot be the basis for awarding tenure.

The following standards are specific to the Department.

A. TEACHING

Strong teaching skills need to be demonstrated in the classroom, as well as in mentoring students in the laboratory and serving as advisor and critical evaluator on graduate thesis committees.

Categories for evaluation

1. Teaching of degree candidates in the undergraduate, graduate and/or professional schools.
2. Advising of degree candidates in the undergraduate, graduate and/or professional schools.
3. Service as a thesis advisor to candidates for advanced degrees (Master's and/or Ph.D.) in the MCDB&G graduate program or in other graduate programs.

Documentation for performance

1. Review of courses taught, directed or developed by the candidate at undergraduate, graduate and professional student levels.
2. A listing of the degree candidates advised in the graduate and professional schools, and undergraduate research students advised.
3. Written evaluations by undergraduate, graduate, and professional students.
4. Written statements by faculty mentors within the department and others familiar with the candidate's teaching performance.
5. If applicable, written documentation and evaluations of teaching efforts outside the department (e.g. continuing professional forums, corporate or public lectureships).

Strong teaching performance is recognized by positive evaluations on the three categories listed above. Additional contributions as described below are indicators of exceptional teaching performance by probationary faculty:

1. Receipt of teaching awards, and student testimonials.

2. Design of effective new courses.
3. Demonstrated dedication to improving the quality of science education beyond the normal teaching assignment, including seminars, honor's courses and colloquia.
4. By authoring teaching-related publications such as books, peer-reviewed journal articles, audiovisual aids, etc. that are widely adopted at the national level.
5. Participation in a leadership position in national organizations that have significant activities devoted to education and educational development.
6. Organization of short courses or workshops
7. Letters from leading educator's in the field attesting to the candidate's national reputation, and assessing the candidate's contributions to development of advances in education in the field.

Evaluation

The tenured faculty will evaluate the effectiveness of the candidate's teaching performance in the following:

1. Classroom settings. This will be provided by student evaluations as well as faculty colleagues familiar with the teaching in a specific course.
2. Graduate student and/or postdoctoral mentoring in the laboratory setting.
3. Other teaching venues that promote the academic and intellectual advancement of the department and University.

B. RESEARCH / SCHOLARSHIP

Genetics, Cell Biology and Development are research-oriented disciplines. The recommendation for tenure is based on scholarly activity that includes evidence of the ability to establish and maintain a vigorous research program.

Categories:

1. **Publication in rigorously peer reviewed journals**
Scientific articles reporting high quality research should be published in rigorously peer-reviewed journals appropriate to the disciplines of genetics, cell biology, and development. Contributions to prestigious review journals, monographs, etc., that are not peer reviewed will be taken into consideration, but cannot be the primary basis for a decisions. Collaborative publications are encouraged, but must include evidence of active participation in study design and interpretations.
2. **External Research Funding**
The candidate must have an independent research program and must acquire one or more external grants as a principal investigator, or multiple grants as a co-principal investigator. The grants must be peer-reviewed and be awarded by federal agencies, international agencies or by nationally competitive private agencies appropriate to the discipline. Demonstrating the ability to procure external peer-reviewed grants is considered one of the strongest indicators of research excellence. The high likelihood of maintaining such funding into the future is deemed to be of prime importance and will be used by the department when considering faculty for promotion.
3. **Significant scholarly contributions**
Evaluations sought from national and international leaders in the candidate's field of research that the candidate's contributions are scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance. The assessments will also provide clear evidence of whether or not the candidate has a national or international reputation in the discipline of Genetics, Cell Biology or Development. Contributions to interdisciplinary projects are valued and will be weighted appropriately, with evidence of impact on the study design, results, and interpretations.
4. **Invited seminars at Symposia, Universities and Companies and participation in national meetings**

Faculty members are expected to present their work at national meetings on a regular basis. Faculty members should be also invited by national or international scientific organizations to participate in symposia, meetings and conferences and should be invited to give seminars before peers in other institutions nationally or internationally. However, this cannot be used as sole criterion for tenure.

5. **Intellectual Property**

The discovery and development of new knowledge that leads to creation of intellectual property is valued and may be considered for purposes of promotion and tenure. This may include materials, processes, and uses that lead to patents, trademarks, copyrights and other forms of intellectual or commercially valuable property.

Additional evidence of exceptional performance in research by probationary faculty is evidenced by:

1. Attainment of multiple national grants as the primary P.I.
2. Obtaining a prestigious career development award (HHMI, Pew, Searle, Basil O'Connor, etc.).
3. Publication in the highest impact research journals (Cell, Nature, Science).

Evaluation

Based on evaluation of the Tenure Dossier, and presentations to the faculty by the probationary faculty mentors, discussion and review by the tenured faculty will be done at a summer faculty meeting, typically at the end of the fifth year. The tenured faculty will judge each candidate based on the criteria listed above, as evidence of scholarly achievement deserving promotion with tenure. A candidate worthy of indefinite tenure should possess qualifications that indicate the candidate has established and is likely to continue to develop a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for national and/or international recognition. The tenured faculty members expect candidates for tenure to have procured external, competitive, peer reviewed funding, to have published in well-recognized journals, and to be identified by internal and external reviews as an important contributor to their field of study. The voting faculty will also consider the trajectory of the candidate's record of accomplishments, including the likelihood of a sustained impact on their field, producing high-quality publications, and receiving peer-reviewed grants. Collaborative and interdisciplinary efforts are also important and will be recognized when the candidate has demonstrated clear contributions in study design, experimental data collection and interpretation. Other forms of productivity will be recognized, including patents, licensing agreements, copyrights, etc., as indicators of valued intellectual property resulting from research activities.

C. SERVICE

Service to professional organizations, learned societies, state and federal agencies, and to the community, when appropriate to the candidate's academic expertise and the mission of the Department, will be considered during tenure deliberations. Similarly, service to the Department, the College of Biological Sciences, the Medical School, and the University will also be evaluated. Service outside the University (grant review committees, editorial boards, symposia development, etc.) is viewed as an important example of professional accomplishment. Evidence of the ability to contribute satisfactorily to the service needs of the professions will be required of all successful candidates. However, external or internal service activities are not in themselves bases for recommending tenure.

Evaluation

The tenured faculty will review all service contributions of the candidate, with the expectation that such service reflects professional development, recognition, and advancement of the institution.

V. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION IN FACULTY RANK

The Department of Genetics, Cell Biology and Development accepts and subscribes to the Medical School and College of Biological Sciences' statement on Criteria and Standards for Promotion of Faculty at the University of Minnesota.

A. TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Not applicable in the Medical School and the College of Biological Sciences (Entry level rank is Assistant Professor)

B. TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The criteria and standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in the Department of Genetics, Cell Biology and Development are those stated for consideration of tenure (see IV above). A recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor is made when an eligible faculty member has fulfilled the general criteria applicable to tenure.

C. TO PROFESSOR

There is no expected timeline for promotion from Associate to Full Professor. This promotion is to be based on continued academic and professional development, with substantial achievement that distinguishes the candidate as described below. Faculty may remain at the rank of Associate Professor indefinitely, and promotion to Full Professor does not occur based solely on time in residence. However, there is an expectation that those who have become tenured associate professors in the department show strong promise of achieving promotion to full professor and continue to work toward that goal.

The process for promotion to Full Professor is initiated when either the Promotion and Tenure Review Committee or the Department Head believe the achievements warrant consideration by the department's Full Professors and the collegiate unit. The *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* requires that the tenured full professors of departments review and provide feedback to tenured associate professors every four years regarding their progress toward promotion to the rank of professor. The candidate may request review and consideration by the P&T Committee and/or Head. The Promotion Dossier will contain information as described for the tenure process (e.g. achievements as evidenced by grant support, publications, recognition in the field, professional service, and teaching).

Criteria

A candidate for promotion to Full Professor is judged according to the following criteria:

1. A substantial enhancement in academic record as based on accomplishments in teaching and research beyond what was necessary for promotion to Associate professor
2. Evidence of contributions of mentoring of junior faculty and a training program for pre- and/or postdoctoral trainees that has resulted in placing of trainees in academic positions, industrial positions, or positions in which their training is applied to their own career (e.g. law or policy positions).
3. A clear reputation of scientific advancement in the field of study, as demonstrated by some or all of the following: invitations to international symposia, election to prestigious scientific organizations, editorial boards, national review panels and holding offices in national and international societies.
4. Letters from authorities in the candidate's field, assessing the candidate's scientific contributions and demonstrating that she/he is among the leaders of his/her field. Some letters must come from scientists outside the United States and will be used to document the candidate's international reputation.

5. Creating and sustaining a culture that fosters diversity.

Evaluation

The Full Professors in the department evaluate the Promotion Dossier and determine if the candidate has met the criteria. Some indicators of satisfying the criteria are:

1. Sustained, peer-reviewed, national funding.
2. Evidence of multiple grant supported projects.
3. Publications in highly regarded journals, including those that are considered specialty journals in the field of study.
4. A training program that shows sustained and successful mentoring of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, undergraduates, and professional staff.
5. Subsequent placement of mentored personnel in academic or other scientific positions.
6. Participation in multi-investigator projects, grants, publications, demonstrating impact in scientific contributions to others.
7. Invited presentations at national and/or international meetings.
8. Organizational/leadership role in national / international meetings
9. Service on editorial boards and grant study sections.
10. Election to positions in professional societies or foundations.
11. Other evidence of productive achievements, such as patents, licensing agreements, consulting arrangements, copyrights.
12. Evidence of significant contribution to teaching, and adaptability in teaching undergraduate, graduates, and professional students.
13. Service as a course director, or active participant in new course development.
14. Evidence of mentoring junior faculty.
15. Service on dissertation committees.
16. Production of instructional material.
17. Service to the Department and University.
18. Evidence of public service outside the University.

The Promotion Dossier materials are collected, and completed by the mid-summer to comply with the annual promotion consideration of the University. The Full Professors in the Department review the documents, discuss the qualifications in a faculty meeting, and vote on whether to recommend promotion. The Department Head summarizes the highlights of the complete dossier as well as the discussion points and vote of the eligible faculty in a letter that is placed in the Dossier for evaluation by the Collegiate Promotion and Tenure Committees. Because two colleges administer the Department, the P&T Committees of both the Medical School and the College of Biological Sciences vote on the Promotion Dossier with the non-tenure college/school committee playing an advisory role. The recommendations of both committees are provided as a written document to the Dean of the college in which the faculty holds his/her primary appointment.

VI. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

The Department of Genetics, Cell Biology and Development utilizes the processes for post tenure review defined by the College of Biological Sciences and the Medical School Faculty Review Policy (Part 3 Annual Review Of Tenured Faculty).

As part of the process, each faculty member is required to submit an Annual Progress Report (Appendix A) detailing achievements in research, teaching and service as well as plans and goals for the upcoming year. All faculty are reviewed annually by the Faculty Merit Review Committee. The Faculty Merit Review Committee, elected by the faculty of the department, evaluates the collected materials and

determines a numerical score that is normalized and weight averaged according to one of two tracks; research-intensive or teaching-intensive. The research-intensive track requires at least 10% annual salary recovery on grants as averaged over the course of a rolling three-year period and will be weighted with a 45-40-15, formula reflecting scoring in research, teaching, and service, respectively. For reference, a 40% teaching effort for research-intensive faculty is expected to be approximately 3 credits and active mentoring of undergraduates, graduate students and postdoctoral fellows in research. For teaching-intensive faculty, the weighting formula is 5-80-15 scoring (research, teaching and service) with the expectation that an 80% teaching effort represents between 9 -12 credits on average. Teaching- intensive faculty will be peer reviewed each year by the teaching evaluation committee whose members are elected by the faculty. The same committee will review research-intensive faculty once every five years or more frequently if the average score of all criteria in the student evaluations of teaching (SRT) fall below the satisfactory range.) Transitioning between the research-intensive and teaching-intensive tracks will take place after three consecutive years of external non-funding with less than 10% salary recovery and may be phased at the Department Heads discretion if there is objective evidence for continued research activity in the form of new grant submissions and published papers. A faculty member may begin to transition back to research-intensive on a timeline developed in consultation with the department head, if new grant support is obtained. The Faculty Merit Review Committee issues a report to the Head using quantitative metrics of faculty performance as well as a qualitative assessment related to meeting expectations of a faculty member.

The specific criteria for performance evaluation in the Department include:

A. TEACHING (Teaching effectiveness and mentoring)

1. Outstanding
 - a. National leadership in shaping the curriculum
 - b. Author or editor of new education media (e.g., textbook, video, computer software) that are distributed nationally.
 - c. Leader in the development of a new program or revitalization of an existing program.
 - d. Principal investigator in the acquisition or renewal of a training grant.
 - e. Director of a graduate program.
 - f. Outstanding teacher as indicated by course evaluation by students and peers.
 - g. Teaching substantially above average (i.e., a larger teaching load and maintaining high quality).
2. Meritorious
 - a. Director of a professional, graduate or undergraduate course.
 - b. Development of a new or revitalization of an existing course.
 - c. Lecturer in one or more courses.
3. Below expectations
 - a. Failure to meet a minimum of three of the above criteria under the Outstanding or Meritorious category will result in an unsatisfactory evaluation for this component of the review.

B. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP (Excellence in research scholarship including quality of research publications and scholarly communications)

1. Outstanding
 - a. First or senior author of a research publication in journals of very high

- quality (e.g., Nature, Science or Cell).
 - b. Organize a symposium/workshop that is presented at a prominent national or international meeting.
 - c. Plenary talk at a national or international meeting.
 - d. Principal investigator in the acquisition of new research funds that contribute to a program that extends beyond the research of an individual's laboratory (e.g. program project grant, center grant); principal investigator of the renewal of such funds.
 - e. Recipient of a merit award or career development award (e.g. Howard Hughes Investigator).
 - f. 50% or greater salary recovery on grants
2. Meritorious
 - a. Organize a local symposium.
 - b. Speaker at a national symposium.
 - c. Publications in high quality, refereed journals.
 - d. Speaker in a departmental seminar.
 - e. Principal investigator of a research grant
 3. Below expectations
 - a. Failure to meet a minimum of three of the above criteria under the Outstanding or Meritorious category will result in an unsatisfactory evaluation for this component of the review.

C. SERVICE (Service to the unit and university)

1. Outstanding
 - a. Chair of a major committee (University-wide, Medical School or CBS).
 - b. Editor of a journal.
 - c. Chair of NIH Study Section or chair of a national committee.
 - d. Involvement in programs that impact public policy.
 - e. Chair of departmental or graduate program committee.
 - f. Organizer of an outreach program.
2. Meritorious
 - a. Member of a major committee (University-wide, Medical School or CBS).
 - b. Member of a editorial board of a journal.
 - c. Member of NIH Study Section or member of a national committee.
 - d. Involvement in public education, media recognition.
 - e. Member of a departmental or graduate program committee.
 - f. Member of examination committee(s) for graduate students.
 - g. Member of committees that impact education at the University.
 - h. Contributor to an outreach program.
3. Below expectations
 - a. Failure to meet a minimum of three of the above criteria under the Outstanding or Meritorious category will result in an unsatisfactory evaluation for this component of the review.

Evaluation

From the annual progress report, the Committee evaluates faculty performance with attention to the following:

1. Publications appearing in print during the previous calendar year.
2. Current and pending research support (grants in force plus submitted) indicating your percent salary effort on each grant.
3. Invited presentations (international, national, local and U of MN). Also include student/postdoc presentation at meetings.
4. Prizes, lectureships, special honors.
5. Other research related distinctions, e.g. patents (filed and issued) as well as invention disclosures copyrights, licensing agreements.
6. Courses taught including number of students, contact hours, and evaluation scores.
7. New course developments, innovation or restructuring of existing courses.
8. Textbooks published.
9. Undergraduate students mentored including the frequency of meetings.
10. Teaching awards and/or nominations.
11. Graduate student thesis committees on which faculty have served.
12. Other teaching-related distinctions.
13. Departmental committees served on, indicating role, i.e., member, chair, sub-committee chair, time-commitment, etc.
14. Directorship of departmental or institutional core facility.
15. Service on Collegiate or University committees indicating role and time commitment.
16. Service on national committees, e.g., peer review committees of federal or private funding agencies (describe role and time commitment).
17. Other service at the national and international level that results from one's scholarly accomplishments that would include:
 - Editorial review boards.
 - Reviewer for scholarly journals (list journals and number of reviews).
 - Ad hoc reviewer for funding organizations.
 - National societies in which you performed some official duty.
 - National and international meetings organized/chaired.
18. Other service activities, such as consulting arrangements derived from faculty expertise.

Overall Evaluation

The final overall evaluation will reflect the weight averaging of effort in the three performance categories as described above (research, teaching, service). If a faculty member's performance is deemed below expectations in areas comprising 55% or more total effort, then the overall evaluation is deemed below expectations. This outcome will trigger consultations between the head and the faculty merit review committee to develop a written Faculty Improvement Plan, as specified in section 8 of Part 3. Annual Review of Tenured Faculty.

Appeal

If the individual feels that the assessment of the Merit Review Committee is unfair, he or she may file a written appeal to the Department Head. The outcome of this appeal will be communicated to the individual and to the Committee.

VII. VOTING PROCEDURES

A. Vote

1. A 2/3 majority vote will be needed to recommend a candidate for advancement.
2. A vote will be taken for all decisions to terminate the contract of a probationary faculty member. Such a vote will require a 2/3 majority for the motion to pass.

VIII. PROCESS FOR UPDATING 7.12 STATEMENT

The Department of Genetics, Cell Biology and Development will review this 7.12 Statement at least every five years. If changes are recommended, the document will be forwarded to the Deans of the Medical School and the College of Biological Sciences who will then submit to the Senior Vice President Academic Affairs and Provost.

History:

Voted on and approved by the Genetics, Cell Biology and Development Faculty, August 31, 2012
Approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, September 4, 2012

PART 3. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

I. ANNUAL REVIEW

All tenured faculty must undergo an annual review each year. This process is key in allowing the faculty member and the department to assess individual progress. It also helps to protect the faculty member, the department, and the School, in case of any misunderstanding or conflict that may arise. For any questions about this process, please call the Office of Faculty Affairs and/or the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs.

- A. During the spring of each academic year, all department heads will schedule an annual review conference with each tenured faculty member. This responsibility may be delegated to Division Chiefs, Departmental Review Committee, Center Directors or other designee. All reviews must receive final approval and signature from the Department Head.
- B. Prior to this conference the individual faculty member will provide the requisite information, as well as an updated curriculum vitae, following the department's annual review reporting format.
- C. Annual reviews may be carried out in the format preferred by each department but must, at a minimum, be compliant with the rules detailed in the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, Section 7a, and the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*.
- D. The annual review documentation should include:
 1. Accomplishments of the previous year, particularly in relation to goals set for the year.
 2. Detailed accomplishments in each domain relevant to the faculty member (as applicable: teaching, research and/or scholarship, service, and clinical activity (if applicable)):
 - a. Evaluation of quality and quantity of teaching, attitude towards learners, knowledge of subject matter, and specific contributions to continuing education.
 - b. Evaluation of research and/or scholarly activity including current projects, grants applied for or funded, publications, and papers presented or submitted.
 - c. Evaluation of service.
 - d. Evaluation of clinical activity (when applicable), including volume of patients served, breadth of referrals, incorporation of patient care into teaching program, activity in local and national professional organizations.
 3. Percentage of effort in each domain, to be updated annually.
 4. Agreed upon goals for the upcoming year.
 5. Plans for subsequent years with specific recognition of outstanding accomplishments and plans to maintain high performance level.
- E. The Annual Review conference should emphasize frank discussion concerning the faculty member's past and present performance in given areas of responsibility, noting progress in achieving previously established goals and objectives. In particular, it is important to frame the evaluation in the context of the proposed distribution of responsibilities in the four domains of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, Service, and Clinical Activity (if applicable). If the faculty member is working towards promotion, the Department Head and the faculty member should ensure that year-by-year progress, consistent with the Departmental 7.12 Statement, has been appropriate to date and specific goals for the coming year should be agreed upon.

Pursuant to the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty*, each department's tenured faculty shall review their tenured associate professors at a

minimum of every four years regarding their progress toward achieving the rank of professor. This review is based upon the criteria for promotion to professor in the department 7.12 statement. This four-year progress review can be part of the annual review process.

- F. Following the Annual Review conference, the Department Head or designee will complete the Medical School Annual Review Form, summarizing the conference and stating the agreed upon goals for the upcoming year. The Medical School Annual Review Form must be signed by the faculty member, the evaluator (if applicable), and the Department Head.

- G. For faculty members who have met the goals and expectations for tenured faculty for the department, according to the department 7.12 statement, the signed Medical School Annual Review Form is sent to office of Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs who signs on behalf of the Dean. The review form will be handled confidentially by the Dean and the Associate Dean and will assist them in supporting recommendations for promotion, special recognition, or salary adjustments.

- H. If the department head or designee finds that the tenured faculty member's performance is below that of the goals and expectations of the department as specified in the 7.12 statement, then the case is referred to a committee of elected, tenured faculty members in the department. If that committee concurs with the judgment of the department head, then both the department head and the committee formulate a detailed written Faculty Improvement Plan for the faculty member. The letter from the department head and the elected committee must identify the ending date for the period of performance improvement and must request that the faculty member provide a report at that time describing his or her progress towards meeting the goals and expectations of the department.

The department head and the committee chair should make reasonable efforts to meet with the faculty member to discuss the plan for meeting the goals and expectations of the unit. The faculty member may request modification of the plan from the department head and the committee but may not at this stage file a complaint with the Senate Judicial Committee.

At the end of the time period specified for performance improvement, the faculty member under review must provide a report describing his or her progress toward meeting the goals and expectations of the department. The department head and the elected committee of tenured faculty will then review the progress that the faculty member has made regarding the recommendations as specified in the report from the faculty member.

This process above may be repeated for a second year if the faculty member has failed to complete the initial plan.

II. SPECIAL PEER REVIEW

A. Initiation

In compliance with Section 7a.3 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, a Special Peer Review may be requested by the department head and the departmental review committee of elected, tenured faculty members following the unsuccessful completion of a Faculty Improvement Plan as described in Section A.8 above.

B. The Medical School Dean will be notified and asked to initiate a Special Review. The Dean must first review the file independently to determine that the faculty member falls below the department's goals and expectations and has not successfully completed the Faculty Improvement Plan. S/he determines that special peer review is warranted.

C. The *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* describe details of the process for the special peer review. Some of these are highlighted below but the reader is referred to the *Procedures* and the *Faculty Tenure* policy for a complete perspective. All of the steps in the *Procedures* and subsection 7a.3 of the *Faculty Tenure* policy must be followed even if they are not described in this document.

D. Review Panel

A Special Review Panel composed of tenured members at the same rank or above the rank of the faculty member under review:

1. Members are elected independently for each Special Review, by the tenured faculty of the department.
2. Members (5) include:
 1. 1 member appointed by the faculty member being reviewed.
 2. 4 members elected from a slate of candidates nominated by department head and the tenured faculty.
3. Members may be in the department or outside, if appropriate – case by case. If the faculty member has a secondary appointment in another department, that department should be represented on the committee.
4. Members should not be the same as any previous review committee for that faculty member

E. Special Review materials include:

1. Department head and previous Review Committee statement(s) requesting Special Review.
2. Annual review with goals and effort distribution (at least 5 years if available).
3. Previous recommendations for faculty development and outcomes (Performance Improvement Plans).
4. Personal statement by the faculty member.
5. Current annotated curriculum vitae.
6. Teaching evaluations.
7. Reprints.
8. Supporting documentation, including, but not limited to, letters of acceptance for articles in press, and acknowledgement by journal or funding agency of manuscript or proposal receipt.
9. Any other relevant documentation.

F. Review Criteria and Methodology

1. The main focuses of the Special Review are the area(s) of deficiency identified in previous review(s).

2. Due process procedures, as defined in University documents, will be applied to address disagreements at different levels of the review and to offer protection for academic freedom.
3. Faculty members undergoing review may examine any material in their file at any time in the review process
4. Faculty member's performance will be evaluated as either:
 - a. Satisfactory: meeting department and/or Medical School goals and expectations for tenured faculty members.
 - b. Unsatisfactory: not meeting department and/or Medical School goals and expectations for tenured faculty members.
5. The actions that the Panel may recommend, listed in section 7a.3 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, include:
 - a. Terminate review if the Panel finds that the faculty member's performance meets the goals and expectations of the department.
 - b. Alter allocation of effort if the Panel determines that the faculty member's strengths are not being fully utilized: it might suggest that the allocation of effort between teaching, research, and service be altered so as to maximize the faculty member's contributions to the University.
 - c. Suggested improvements: if the faculty member's performance is likely to be improved by specific steps, and that process can adequately be monitored by further regular Annual Reviews, the Panel may suggest that those steps be taken and remit the case to the Annual Review process.
 - d. Salary reduction if the faculty member's performance has declined in such a way as no longer to warrant the base salary that is attached to the position, the Panel may recommend a reduction in base salary of up to 10% (see Board of Regents Policy: *Tenure Faculty* for complete details).
 - e. Dismissal: if the faculty member's performance has fallen below the standard of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* Section 10.21(a), "sustained refusal or failure to perform reasonably assigned duties adequately," the Panel can recommend the commencement of proceedings for termination of appointment, or involuntary leave of absence (see details below).
 - f. The Panel may also recommend a combination of these measures.
6. The recommendations of the Panel will be implemented by the Department, the Dean's Office or other administrative body, as appropriate, depending on the specific recommendation.

History of Revisions (approved by vote of the Faculty):

Original Document: Date unknown

Approved by Medical School Faculty: June 21, 2012

Approved by Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost: June 22, 2012

Appendix A

IX. ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT OUTLINE

DEPARTMENT OF GENETICS CELL BIOLOGY AND DEVELOPMENT

Faculty Activities Report (Year)

Your Name

Note: This report covers a period of twelve months, ending April 1, 2007. If you were on leave for any portion of the review period, please provide dates and conditions (%) of your leave. Remember that the Faculty Review Committee relies on this record of activities to determine your level of performance in research/teaching/service, with a direct impact on salary increases. Be sure to enter information only once. Please refer to the instructions included on this form, in order to provide all of the information requested.

Research Activities

Publications. Please note the number of cumulative career publications. Following this, list 2006/2007 publications (for the time period April '06 to March '07). Itemized citations should be complete and reprints should be submitted. Include papers published, papers in press, and papers submitted. Peer-reviewed articles, review articles, and book chapters should be distinguished. If the paper is collaborative, please define your role. You may provide a one to two sentence synopsis detailing the significance of the paper and your role in the research.

(Career total - number of publications = _____)

Itemized 2006-2007 citations:

Participation in Meetings or Symposia. Include the meeting, date, location and title of either a talk or poster presentation (distinguish). You may include a synopsis or copy of the abstract.

Invited seminars. List by date, institution, department and title (distinguish between internal and external).

Other scholarly contributions. Examples include patents, the development of antibodies, clones, transgenic animals, software, scientific equipment, and web-based publications (for this last category, if peer-reviewed or large in scope). Provide a short description, including its scientific importance.

Research Grants. List ALL applications from the last year, whether they were funded or not. Include current support and applications pending. List the agency, grant number, annual and total direct costs, your role (PI, co-PI, etc.), your percent effort and the funding period. For pending and unsuccessful applications, also be sure to list the date submitted. If relevant, please provide scores and/or copies of summary statements. For joint grants, provide a brief statement about your role and be sure to list percent effort; also list direct costs specifically related to your laboratory, not the overall project.

Active

a.

b.

Pending

a.
b.

Submitted, but not funded

a.
b.

Research staff (other than students and postdoctorals)

1.
2.

Research-related awards: (Work on study sections is to be listed under “Service”.)

Collaborative Research Projects (describe briefly):

Teaching Activities

Courses taught. For each lecture and laboratory course, provide the course number, course name, number of credits, number of hours taught, and the calculated number of contact hours. It is essential to provide teaching evaluations from students and peers (e.g., from the course director, if available). Please list the scores for the first three questions on the standardized forms (Overall teaching ability/Instructor's knowledge/Concern for students) and indicate the scale used. If evaluations are not available for the current year, supply the previous year's data. Indicate involvement in the administration of the course.

Lectures:

Laboratory:

2. Graduate students advised in your lab: (list student committees under “Service”). List current graduate advisees and their projects, including those who have completed degrees between March '06 and April '07, as well as students who have done rotations in your laboratory.

Current students

a.
b.

Rotating students

Undergraduate research advisees: List undergraduates who have done research in your laboratory and their project title.

Postdoctorals trained: Postdoctoral students in your laboratory and their projects

Visiting faculty: List approximate length of stay and the project involved

Teaching Awards:

Scholarly Productivity Directly Related to Teaching. List publications and books directly related to teaching, and new course materials developed.

- 1.
- 2.

Service Activities

NOTE: If you receive a salary augmentation for any of your duties, please provide the amount and the specifics about the duties involved.

Departmental service.

Graduate program service

1. Student committees (List)

Other University service

Journal reviews (list specific journals involved)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

E. Grant reviews (list specific agencies, distinguish between ad hoc and regular membership)

F. National committees, editorial boards, other

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

G. Outreach into the community (This includes talks given for different organizations, including schools, teaching within K-12 classrooms, offering workshops for teachers, serving as a resource in the biomedical sciences for different community groups or even companies and other functions where you share your expertise.)

IV. Statement of Goals and Plans for Next Year.

Consider research, teaching and service. Be sure to identify aspects that represent significant change with respect to the last year. If the department could help you more effectively meet your goals, be sure to indicate how this might work.