

Department of Horticultural Science
7.12 statement (adopted August, 2015)

Approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost, September 1, 2015

Board of Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure (Appendix I)
Performance Requirements, Criteria and Procedures
for Promotion, Tenure and Post Tenure Review (Appendix II)

Section I. Specific Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

A. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

This document describes indices and standards that will be used to evaluate whether candidates meet general criteria in Sections 7.11 and 9.2 of the Board of Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* (Appendix I). In addition, this document contains the Department tenured faculty ‘goals and expectations’ and ‘procedures for annual and special post-tenure review’ (Section II). The University document *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* is also included as Appendix II.

B. DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT

The primary mission of the Department is to discover, interpret, and transfer new knowledge for the purpose of improving quality of life through: a) improving productivity, value, and use of horticulture crops; b) contributing to a quality environment; and c) educating students. The Department of Horticultural Science is a diversified research-oriented organization that has a strong commitment to teaching and extension.

C. UNIVERSITY AND DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

1. Departmental criteria for granting tenure:

The University’s general criteria for tenure are identified in Section 7.11 of *Faculty Tenure* (Appendix I). Individual assignments and programs vary based on expectations for research, teaching, Extension (where the faculty member carries an appointment with the University of Minnesota Extension) and service efforts as defined in the letter of appointment and that are annually determined and agreed upon between the faculty member and Department Head. Performance will be judged according to these expectations.

The departmental criteria for tenure are as follows:

1. Development of a clearly defined research and teaching focus.
2. Demonstrated evidence of scholarly achievement.
3. Documented evaluation of teaching effectiveness at a satisfactory level.
4. Successful advising of students or equivalent activity.
5. Recognition of potential for national or international disciplinary leadership.
6. Evidence of continuing professional and interpersonal growth.

As noted in Section 5 of the *Faculty Tenure* (Appendix I) the maximum period of probationary service is normally six academic years, whether consecutive or not, unless altered by a process identified in Section 5. The Department of Horticultural Science adopts this normal University practice and sets the maximum period as six academic years. Section 5.5 of *Faculty Tenure* (Appendix I) allows a one-year exception for a new parent or caregiver, or for personal medical reasons. A request for extension must be made in writing and meet deadlines identified in Section 5.5.

2. Departmental criteria for promotion to Associate Professor:

Promotion to Associate Professor is usually associated with a decision concerning tenure. Promotion to this rank must meet the above University and Department tenure criteria (Sub-section 1 above).

3. Departmental criteria for promotion to Full Professor:

The basis for promotion to Full Professor is primarily based on demonstrated scholarly achievement and teaching effectiveness. See 'Criteria for Promotion to Professor,' Section 9.2 of *Faculty Tenure* (Appendix I). The departmental criteria for promotion to Full Professor are as follows:

1. Demonstrated scholarly achievement in several research and teaching activities.
2. Documented evaluations of teaching at an excellent level.
3. Recognition of national and/or international disciplinary leadership.
4. Demonstrated ability to direct the research efforts of others and demonstrated effectiveness in the advising of students.
5. Evidence of tangible successful collaborations such as grant proposals or multi-authored publications and demonstrated ability to contribute effectively to interdisciplinary programs.
6. Evidence of a significant service contribution to the University, the community, and/or the discipline.

D. INDICES AND STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING ACHIEVEMENT OF UNIVERSITY AND DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

1. Evaluation of distinction in teaching

Faculty will be evaluated on the effectiveness of their undergraduate and graduate teaching, curriculum design, and on student advising and mentoring activities. For those departmental faculty members with formal appointments in University of Minnesota Extension, evaluation will be made on both the content of extension programs and the effectiveness of extension teaching. Evaluation is both quantitative and qualitative in nature.

The Department Head has authority to make/change teaching assignments consistent with faculty teaching appointments and performance expectations. The Department Head must take into account all duties of departmental faculty when making these assignments.

2. Evaluation of distinction in scholarship:

All academic faculty are expected to conduct scholarly activities that bring distinction to themselves and the Department of Horticultural Science. Scholarly activity is defined in the broadest interpretation. 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. Scholarship may be defined as 1) creation of new knowledge; 2) validation of that knowledge by appropriate peers; and 3) communication of that knowledge to appropriate audiences. Therefore, it is expected that results be made available either through publication or through other appropriate means. As with teaching, evaluation of scholarship is both quantitative and qualitative.

3. Evaluation of service contributions:

Outstanding professional service is accredited in evaluating the performance of a faculty member. Participation in the governance of the institution and other service to the academic unit, the community, and/or the discipline outside the University will be taken into consideration, but are not in themselves bases for awarding tenure.

4. Sources of information and indices and standards:

Sources of information for preparing the file used during annual review of candidates during their Probationary Period are identified in the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* (Appendix II). A similar file is developed for tenure decisions, but it should encompass the entire probationary period.

E. PROCEDURES FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF PROBATIONARY ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

This Section expands upon *Procedures* (Appendix II).

1. Advisory committee for probationary Assistant Professors:

The purpose of the advisory committee is to provide guidance to the faculty member by understanding the candidate's work and to provide advice in regards to the criteria for tenure and/or promotion (Appendix I, Section 7.11). The committee is advisory only and is not responsible for the tenure decision.

The advisory committee shall be composed of at least three tenured faculty members. Members will be invited by the Department Head, in consultation with the probationary Assistant Professor, within the first year of employment. The term of advisory committee members on the committee will be up to three years and can be renewed.

The advisory committee will meet annually with the candidate to review performance and assist with and review development of the candidate's academic vitae and annual plans and accomplishments. The advisory committee will reference the Department 7.12 statement to assist with documenting scholarship and progress towards tenure and promotion. The advisory committee will also communicate opinions and perspectives from other faculty not present, upon occasion, to the probationary faculty member during the meeting.

2. Annual review of probationary Assistant Professors.

Tenured faculty of the Department of Horticultural Science will annually review (at the annual meeting) the accomplishments and plans of each probationary Assistant Professor. The probationary faculty member's file plus verbal reports, including the advisory committee's, will form the basis for the tenured faculty's evaluation for satisfaction of criteria, and progress towards, receiving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (Appendix II). The Department Head will prepare a written report on the appraisal document (PF 12).

Formal action taken at the annual meeting includes consideration for inviting faculty to prepare documentation for a tenure vote the following year, or continuance of appointment within the probationary period. In the fifth probationary year, or prior if a consensus of tenured faculty favor an early invitation for tenure, two tenured faculty will be asked to assist the candidate to prepare the

documentation for the promotion with tenure file. Non-continuance can be decided at any time during the probationary period with a majority vote of tenured faculty.

3. Annual review of Associate Professors:

Professors of the Department of Horticultural Science will annually review the accomplishments and plans of Associate Professors. The Associate Professor's file (similar to that described in Appendix II) plus verbal reports will form the basis for evaluating the Associate Professor's progress toward promotion to Professor. The Department Head will communicate to the faculty member the summary of the discussion of the faculty member's fulfillment of criteria for promotion to full Professor. Formal action taken at the annual meeting includes consideration for inviting faculty to prepare documentation for promotion to Professor the following year. If a consensus of the Professors favors an invitation, two Professors will be asked to assist the candidate to prepare the needed documentation.

4. Tenure and/or promotion decision making:

Specific documentation (Appendix II) required for evaluation will be assembled by the candidate and reviewed by the appointed senior faculty members.

A decision on granting tenure or promotion is made by written ballot by those attending the annual review meeting. A vote is taken after a consensus is reached that all discussion is completed. Absentee ballots, previously delivered to the Department Head in signed, sealed envelopes will be admitted, providing the signatory has, by signature, read the candidate's file. Family members (e.g. spouse, children) cannot be present and may not vote. The faculty vote is recorded by the Department Head and constitutes their recommendation. In all cases, a simple majority vote requires that the application be sent forward with the recommendation for tenure and/or promotion.

Candidates who are applying for tenure in the department but who are administratively attached to another program or location will be represented at the faculty discussion by their appropriate program chair or administrative supervisor, in accordance with (Appendix II). The latter will be asked to submit a letter of evaluation and recommendation, but will not be permitted to vote. This letter will be made a part of the candidate's file, with a copy being sent to the candidate.

The Department Head will prepare a report immediately following the faculty meeting, which includes the vote of the faculty and a summary of the discussion preceding the vote. Specifically addressed will be minority views that may relate to negative votes recorded. A draft of this report will be made available to eligible faculty who will have four working days to provide written comment. The final draft is made part of the candidate's file with a copy being sent to the candidate. In addition, the Department Head will prepare a report which includes a summary statement on the candidate's performance and potential and his or her recommendation for tenure or promotion. This report will be made a part of the candidate's file, with a copy being sent to the candidate.

Section II. Specific Criteria and Procedures for Annual and Special Post Tenure Review.

A. Departmental goals and expectations for tenured faculty:

In accordance with Section 7a.1 (Appendix II), the Department of Horticultural Science has established the following 'goals and expectations' for tenured faculty. Goals and expectations of tenured faculty in the Department build on the criteria for promotion to Full Professor. Therefore, tenured faculty are expected to show continued productivity toward fulfilling and/or maintaining the following criteria:

1. Demonstrated scholarly achievement in several research and teaching activities.
2. Documented evaluations of teaching at an excellent level.
3. Recognition of national and/or international disciplinary leadership.
4. Demonstrated ability to direct the research efforts of others and demonstrated effectiveness in the advising of students.
5. Evidence of tangible successful collaborations such as grant proposals or multi-authored publications and demonstrated ability to contribute effectively to interdisciplinary programs.
6. Evidence of a significant service contribution to the University, the community, and/or the discipline.

In addition to the criteria identified for promotion above, it is also an expectation that tenured faculty participate actively in advancing the interests of the Department, College and the University of Minnesota for the benefit of the institution, industry and citizens of Minnesota by participating in the functioning of the Department and Institution. To that end, tenured faculty are expected to attend regular faculty meetings, including special meetings and meetings designated for discussion of promotion and tenure. Faculty are also expected to attend committee meetings at the department, college, and/or university level on which they serve.

Failure to meet the goals and expectations of the Department will be determined during the annual review process (Section II.D, see below).

B. Purpose and timing of the annual review:

The annual review will serve as a post-tenure review as required by the Regent's Policy on *Faculty Tenure* (Appendix I), and as a merit review for compensation purposes for probationary and tenured faculty. The Department Head and annual review committee will jointly set a date for the annual review meeting. Each faculty member who holds at least a partial appointment in the Department of Horticultural Science or whose tenure home is in the Department shall be reviewed.

C. Documentation of accomplishments and plans:

Each faculty member shall submit an updated curriculum vitae and an annual statement of accomplishments and plans in advance of the annual evaluation meeting. The format of the annual statement of accomplishments and plans document will be provided by the Department Head.

D. Accomplishments and plans discussion with the Department Head:

Each faculty member will meet yearly with the department head after submission of the accomplishments and plans document to discuss performance during the past year and individual assignment/s for the coming year. Any decisions made in this discussion shall be summarized in writing, signed by both the faculty member and the Department Head, and kept in the faculty member's permanent file. This meeting can be either before or after the Head and the annual review committee meeting.

E. Annual review committee:

After submission of the accomplishments and plans, the annual review committee will review each faculty member's documents and meet with the Department Head to review each faculty member's performance. The annual review committee shall be composed of the Full Professors (at least four) of the department consultative committee. The annual review committee will determine a Chair at the start of the meeting. Each member of the annual review committee will provide a score for each faculty member based on the percentages used for evaluation and the score scale shown below:

Percentages used for evaluation: During the annual review, the annual review committee shall use the following evaluation percentages in determining the performance score (for score definitions see the scale below):

75% of the annual review score will be based on faculty accomplishments in areas of individual assignment (teaching, research, extension). That evaluation will be based on indices and standards outlined in I.D above.

15% will be based on professional and university services rendered by the individual, such as membership and leadership in scientific societies, organizing meetings, editorships, reviewing duties, and service on University and Department committees.

10% will be based on efforts to aid in the functioning of the Department, and cooperative behavior with staff, students, and fellow faculty. Included in this category are teaching, research, or extension contributions above and beyond the individual assignments and programs. For example, here is where one would receive recognition for extension activities without a formal Extension appointment or for teaching without a formal teaching appointment.

Performance scores scale: Each faculty member will be rated by each member of the annual review committee based on the following rating scale.

5.0 = Outstanding (limited to top 10-15%)

4.0 = Exceeds job expectations

3.0 = Meets job expectations

2.0 = Needs improvement

1.0 = Unsatisfactory (does not meet job expectation).

Scores will be made in whole or half numbers, i.e. 3.0 or 3.5. The performance scores should be made relative to other faculty of the same rank, with the underlying premise that job expectations are higher for a Professor than an Associate Professor and higher for an Associate Professor than an Assistant Professor. Section I.C above provides some guidance for evaluation. Section II.A above outlines post-tenure 'goals and expectations.'

Annual review committee scores will be advisory to the Department Head, who may alter them slightly to reflect internal and/or year-to-year consistency, and to account for additional 'effort' when appropriate. The Department Head will then convert these scores to a salary adjustment, depending on the allocation of salary funds and policies determined by the College and University. The Department Head will communicate in writing to each faculty member both the overall performance score and their salary adjustment.

F. Substandard performance.

If the annual review committee and the Department Head agree that a faculty member's mean performance score is less than or equal to 2.0, then they must send a letter to the faculty member stating the faculty member's performance is below expectations. The letter must be signed by the Department Head and the annual review committee Chair, must specify the deficiencies, and must set a time period during which the faculty member should address the identified problems. Both the Department Head and the annual review committee should work with the faculty member to improve performance during that time. For probationary faculty members, this input should also be conveyed in the PF-12 statement, and to the advisory committee.

G. Special review of tenured faculty:

If the mean score of the annual review committee is less than 2, and the Department Head agrees, for two consecutive years, they must ask the Dean to initiate a special review. To do so, they should send a letter to the Dean and to the faculty member; setting out their findings with a copy of the documents they have reviewed. The Dean shall determine the subsequent course of action, consistent with College and University procedures.

Appendix I. Sections 7.11, 7.12, 9.2, and 5.5 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* (2011). (full text available at <https://policy.umn.edu/hr/tenure>)

7.11 General Criteria. What the University of Minnesota seeks above all in its faculty members is intellectual distinction and academic integrity. The basis for awarding indefinite tenure to the candidates possessing these qualities is the determination that each has established and is likely to continue to develop a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national or international reputation or both [3]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [4]. The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision [5]. Demonstrated scholarly or other creative achievement and teaching effectiveness must be given primary emphasis; service alone cannot qualify the candidate for tenure. Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, attention to questions of diversity, technology transfer, and other special kinds of professional activity by the candidate should be considered when applicable. The awarding of indefinite tenure presupposes that the candidate's record shows strong promise of his or her achieving promotion to professor.

[3] "Academic achievement" includes teaching as well as scholarly research and other creative work. The definition and relative weight of the factors may vary with the mission of the individual campus.

[4] The persons responsible and the process for making this determination are described in subsections 7.3 through 7.6.

"Scholarly research" must include significant publications and, as appropriate, the development and dissemination by other means of new knowledge, technology, or scientific procedures resulting in innovative products, practices, and ideas of significance and value to society.

"Other creative work" refers to all forms of creative production across a wide range of disciplines, including, but not limited to, visual and performing arts, design, architecture of structures and environments, writing, media, and other modes of expression.

"Teaching" is not limited to classroom instruction. It includes extension and outreach education, and other forms of communicating knowledge to both registered University students and persons in the extended community, as well as supervising, mentoring, and advising students.

"Service" may be professional or institutional. Professional service, based on one's academic expertise, is that provided to the profession, to the University, or to the local, state, national, or international community. Institutional service may be administrative, committee, and related contributions to one's department or college, or the University. All faculty members are expected to engage in service activities, but only modest institutional service should be expected of probationary faculty.

[5] Indefinite tenure may be granted at any time the candidate has satisfied the requirements. A probationary appointment must be terminated when the appointee fails to satisfy the criteria in the last year of probationary service and may be terminated earlier if the appointee is not making satisfactory progress within that period toward meeting the criteria.

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

9.2 Criteria for Promotion to Professor. The basis for promotion to the rank of professor is the determination that each candidate has (1) demonstrated the intellectual distinction and academic integrity expected of all faculty members, (2) added substantially to an already distinguished record of academic achievement, and (3) established the national or international reputation (or both) ordinarily resulting from such distinction and achievement [8]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate’s record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [9]. The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision. Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, attention to questions of diversity, technology transfer, and other special kinds of professional activity by the candidate should be considered when applicable. But the primary emphasis must be on demonstrated scholarly or other creative achievement and on teaching effectiveness, and service alone cannot qualify the candidate for promotion.

[8] "Academic achievement" includes teaching as well as scholarly research and other creative work. The definition and relative weight of the factors may vary with the mission of the individual campus. Not being promoted to the rank of professor will not in itself result in special post-tenure review of a tenured associate professor.

[9] The persons responsible for this determination are the full professors in the unit who are eligible to vote. The outcome of the vote is either promotion to the rank of professor or continuation in rank as an associate professor. The procedures for voting are identical to those outlined in Section 7.4 for the granting of indefinite tenure, the nondisclosure of grounds for the decision (Section 7.5), and the review of recommendations (Section 7.6). In addition, a petition to the Judicial Committee for review of a recommendation of continuation in rank as an associate professor follows the procedures specified in Section 7.7 for decisions about promotion to associate professor and conferral of indefinite tenure.

5.5 Exception For New Parent Or Caregiver, Or for Personal Medical Reasons. The maximum period of probationary service will be extended by one year at the request of a probationary faculty member:

1. On the occasion of the birth of that faculty member's child or adoptive/foster placement of a child with that faculty member; or
2. When the faculty member is a major caregiver for a family member[2] who has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition. A faculty member may use this provision no more than two times; or

3. When the faculty member has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition.

The request for extension must be made in writing within one year of the events giving rise to the claim and no later than June 30 proceeding the year a final decision would otherwise be made on an appointment with indefinite tenure for that faculty member.

Appendix II. *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty.* (see <https://policy.umn.edu/hr/tenure>)