

University of Minnesota, Crookston

Departmental Standards for Promotion and Tenure

Required by Section 7.12, Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*

Math, Science and Technology Department

Approved by the Faculty on September 10, 2009

Approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

October 10, 2009

I. Introduction

Reviews of faculty for promotion and tenure at the University of Minnesota, Crookston are conducted in accordance with all-University policies and procedures contained in the University of Minnesota Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* (and the related document, the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenure Faculty*

The purpose of this document is to describe with more specificity the indices and standards that will be used to evaluate whether candidates meet the general criteria for the conferral of indefinite tenure in Section 7.11 of the *Faculty Tenure* policy. Promotion to the rank of associate professor typically occurs with the conferral of indefinite tenure, although faculty members may be appointed as an untenured associate professor. The document also includes the indices and standards for promotion to the rank of professor as they are set out in Section 9.2 Criteria for Promotion to Professor of the *Faculty Tenure* policy, as well as the process for post-tenure review as set out in Section 7a. For a complete perspective, the reader is advised to review Sections 7 and 9 in their entirety.

In this document, the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee is defined as all tenured members of the faculty of the Math, Science and Technology Department. If the Department head is tenured at the University of Minnesota then he/she is a member of this committee. The chair of this committee is a tenured faculty member chosen by the Tenure Committee. If there are fewer than five tenured faculty members in the department, tenured faculty from other departments are to be nominated to serve. The tenured faculty of the department shall forward a list of potential members from other departments to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs who will select the necessary members. The list shall consist of at least twice the number required to complete the committee. The final selection of committee members must be approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost according to Section 2a of the *Procedures*.

The document contains indices and standards for the following faculty evaluations:

- annual appraisals for probationary faculty
- recommendation for conferring indefinite tenure
- recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor
- recommendation for promotion to Professor
- post tenure review

II. Mission Statement

A. University of Minnesota, Crookston Mission Statement (May 2007)

The University of Minnesota, Crookston (UMC) is integral to the University's statewide land grant mission. The Crookston campus provides its unique contribution through applied, career-oriented learning programs that combine theory, practice, and experimentation in a technologically rich environment. UMC connects its teaching, research, and outreach to serve the public good.

Core Values:

Integrity	Practicing honesty, fairness, and respect
Excellence	Supporting quality teaching, research, and service
Diversity	Respecting differences in ideas and community
Innovation	Promoting discovery through creative and critical thinking
Learner Centered	Promoting growth and leadership

B. Math, Science and Technology Mission Statement

The mission of the Math, Science, and Technology (MST) Department is to provide a rich interdisciplinary learning environment that will provide vitality for its faculty, and enhanced opportunities for the students who study the disciplines of math, the sciences, and technology.

III. Annual Appraisal of Probationary Faculty

A. Annual Reviews

The tenured faculty of the Math, Science and Technology Department annually review the progress of each probationary faculty member toward satisfaction of the criteria for receiving tenure as provided by the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* and in accordance with the University's *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/ Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*

B. Departmental Procedures

The tenured faculty members and the Department Head agree upon the due date for the annual review file to be submitted by the probationary faculty member. If the Math Science and Technology department has very few tenured faculty members at a given time, it may be appropriate to include in the Tenure Committee a tenured faculty member from another unit or units in the campus or University. Including additional faculty members is also warranted in cases of candidates whose work encompasses multiple disciplines. In order for faculty members from outside the Math, Science and Technology department to participate, the department tenured faculty, the department head and the vice chancellor must submit a written request to and obtain authorization in writing by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The request must identify the faculty member under consideration and give the names and

appointment homes of those faculty members who will be asked to vote on the candidate. The review file includes:

- Copies of the Appraisal of Probationary Faculty forms for all past years
- Curriculum vitae
- Narratives of the scholarly activities of the past year and plans for the next year; one each introducing sections for teaching, research, and service. Included in this section will be evidence of effectiveness of work in each area.
- Summaries of teaching, teaching assignments, and evaluations, including:
 - a statement of teaching philosophy
 - a list of all courses taught since the initial year of appointment
 - summaries of the official student ratings or evaluations of teaching for all sections of all courses taught during previous years
 - student and peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness
 - current syllabi
- Summaries of research and scholarly activity, including
 - a list of refereed and non-refereed publications (published, in press, and submitted, manuscripts in preparation) with an explanation of the role of the probationary faculty. Include copies (or descriptions) of disseminated scholarly & creative work in an appendix.
 - a list of past (accepted and declined), current, and pending internal and external grant proposals, with the award amounts, and a description of the role the probationary faculty played in the proposal and authorship
 - a list of presentations at professional meetings, invited symposia, and workshops, including those declined
- Summaries of service activities, including
 - a list of service activities, including departmental or university committees, service in professional organization, manuscript or proposal reviews
 - evidence of extension or outreach activities, or non-technical presentations to general groups
- Supplemental material may be included in well-organized appendices.
- Any other material considered by the committee or Department Head as relevant for the evaluation

The materials are evaluated by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, including the Department Head. At a meeting called by the Department Head, members discuss the merits of the probationary faculty member's file and vote for or against continuation. A meeting is held including the Department Head, and the individual probationary faculty member. The written report is prepared by the Department Head and recorded on the Appraisal of Probationary Faculty (President's Form 12). Throughout, the committee will ascribe to details in *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenure Faculty*.

C. Extending the Probationary Period

A probationary faculty member may request that the probationary period be extended by one year at a time upon the occasion of becoming a new parent or caregiver or for personal medical reasons. Circumstances and timelines for an extension are found in Section 5.5 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*. The record of a probationary faculty member who received an

extension is to be considered in the same way as a record of one who did not receive an extension (see Section 5.5 of *Faculty Tenure – Exception for New Parent or Caregiver, Or For Personal Medical Reasons* in Appendix A).

IV. Conferral of Indefinite Tenure

Section 7.11 General Criteria (for Tenure) [Regents Policy for *Faculty Tenure*]

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 and 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 show strong promise of his or 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.

The following criteria, listed in order of priority, shall guide members of the Math, Science and Technology Department in tenure and promotion recommendations:

- A. Teaching
- B. Research
- C. Service

The individual faculty appointment description will establish the appropriate time proportion in each area. This will be provided in a written document in the personnel file of the probationary faculty member at the time of his or her appointment. Any subsequent changes in time proportion will be recorded in written format throughout the probationary period. The appropriateness of a candidate's accomplishment is to be judged against the departmental criteria, which must meet the threshold criteria of Section 7.11 of the *Faculty Tenure* policy. The faculty member and the Department Head shall jointly establish work expectations for each academic year (e.g. teaching and advising assignments, service responsibilities, etc.). Evaluating progress toward tenure is based on the criteria and indices described below for teaching, research, and service. In making tenure decisions, quality of scholarly efforts will be given a higher priority than quantity of activities.

Evaluation of both teaching and research must include external review from experts outside the University of Minnesota. According to the *Procedures*, at least half of the external reviewers and no fewer than four, must have no personal interest in the candidate's successful achievement of tenure. See Section 12 of the *Procedures* for additional details about the selection of external reviewers. External reviewers may be obtained for the evaluation of service activities, depending upon the faculty member. In addition, reviews may be obtained internally as well.

A. Teaching

Teaching is considered to be those activities performed with the intention that they would engender learning and be directed toward goals that are specified in courses, curricula or programs, and that are designed to aid students to develop appropriate knowledge and competencies in a given area of endeavor. Teaching includes all forms of communicating knowledge and facilitating learning in an instructional setting, including advising, mentoring, or supervising students whether individually or in groups.

The effectiveness of the teaching should be the prime consideration, not the mere fact that the activities took place. "Effective" means that a candidate facilitated the intended student learning.

Specifically, candidates must demonstrate appropriate course content and expertise while transmitting knowledge to students through effective instructional design, delivery, and assessment. Instructional design includes the ability to create, sequence, and present experiences that lead to learning. Instructional delivery refers to the skills that facilitate learning in a respectful environment. Assessment refers to the use of tools and procedures for evaluating student learning, including appropriate grading practices.

Evaluation of probationary faculty will include appraisal of teaching materials, including but not limited to syllabi, lecture notes, laboratory exercises, course web sites, course content, assignments, assessment tools, examinations, classroom performance, and advising materials. There must be evidence of student achievement. This may include, but is not limited to, portfolios of student work that meet course objectives, embedded questions in examinations, performance on standardized or national tests, etc.

There also must be evidence of the candidate's planning and evaluating of his or her teaching. Student and peer evaluations must be included. Senior faculty will provide constructive feedback on teaching; including but not limited to classroom visits. Refer to section 12, Preparation of the file for a tenure decision in the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenure Faculty*.

Evaluation criteria:

- a. **Relevance.** How well do the instructional activities identify course objectives, utilize appropriate subject matter sequences, integrate appropriate technology, consider student differences, and employ appropriate materials and media?
- b. **Implementation.** How well does the encounter with students create the desired learning environment appropriate to the learner outcomes?
- c. **Evaluation.** How well did the teaching, advising, or other educational experiences do what they were intended to accomplish?

Documentation

Evidence may include 1) current syllabi, 2) summaries of the standardized teaching evaluations of all sections of all courses taught during previous years, 3) letters from former students evaluating teaching and learning under the direction of the candidate, 4) peer evaluations of teaching, 5) student portfolios, results of standardized tests of learning, or embedded questions results, that demonstrate student learning, and 6) other forms as appropriate. It may be assessed by materials submitted by the faculty member or collected by colleagues. As indicated in Section 12 of the *Procedures*, the candidate has the right to inspect all materials in the file and to submit written comments relative to the file.

B. Research

Research is meant to include a broad range of scholarly activities relevant to the mission of the university. The University of Minnesota, Crookston provides a unique contribution through applied, career-oriented learning programs that combine theory, practice, and experimentation in a technologically rich environment. Research may be basic or applied in nature. Applied

research may involve the interpretation and or practical application of theories, laws, practices or artistic creations designed to supplement theoretical education. Research usually involves conceptualizing, planning, implementing, evaluating, and disseminating the results of a project, artistic performance, or the development of a new procedure. Results of research can include scholarly publications or educational products such as devices, procedures, instructional materials, and systems that are developed to solve educational problems. Examples of dissemination might include publications or presentations to professional or educational organizations, governmental agencies, and public or private groups; and advising groups in the establishment of professionally or educationally sound practices or programs. Documentation that provides evidence of dissemination should be included in the faculty annual review file. The research may be documented in any appropriate form.

Related to this scholarly activity is the expectation of keeping abreast with the appropriate discipline including reading the professional literature. This also may include reviewing papers, books, or other materials, and the development of grant applications.

When considering the record of probationary faculty who stopped the tenure clock or who are being considered for early promotion, criteria for tenure and promotion are no different than the criteria for those who did not have an extension to the tenure clock or who are not being considered for early promotion.

Evaluation criteria:

- a. **Relevance.** How have these research accomplishments made a significant contribution to the existing body of knowledge in a discipline or make a difference in the practice of education? What is the prospect that these accomplishments will continue to make significant contributions?
- b. **Quality.** How well do the accomplishments focus on central questions, issues, or decisions that yield broad, enduring understanding?
- c. **Cumulative Effect.** How well do accomplishments build on previous work?

Documentation

Evidence of excellence in scholarship is provided by the candidate's research, performance, and/or publication record. This record is assessed both internally, by the department, the unit, and the University of Minnesota and externally, by recognized experts from outside the University, to determine whether it is openly available, scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance. The following points guide the assessment of the candidate's record:

- 1) Scholarly works can take many forms; among these are presentations of a professional nature, original research articles and books, book chapters, edited collections and anthologies, critical editions, translations, reviews, integrative text books that advance the discipline, published lectures, as well as artistic productions and creations.
- 2) Peer-reviewed publications or works printed by publishers known for their careful review of manuscripts or articles issued in refereed journals will be given more weight than other publications. Publications by eminent presses and those appearing in journals, series, or

volumes that have stringent peer review and major disciplinary significance generally receive the most weight.

- 3) A written work is considered to be published when the final revised manuscript has been accepted by the publisher.
- 4) Work under review may be considered, but this category receives less weight than published or completed work.
- 5) Translations, reprints, and citations or reviews of a candidate's work may provide evidence of the visibility, importance, or influence of the work.
- 6) For all multi-authored or collaborative works, the file must specifically describe the candidate's contribution. In some areas of the discipline, multi-authored works are common.
- 7) "Openly available" research implies distribution, which includes traditional and electronic publication as well as other media such as audio, video recording, and other sensory creative works.
- 8) While quality is more important than quantity, the candidate must present a file documenting the research achievements in the candidate's areas of specialization.

C. Service

Because University and community relationships are a priority, contributions of faculty members to public engagement efforts should be recognized. 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. A faculty member's contribution to a related professional association is important. These contributions may involve such activities as advising or serving in professional associations, governmental agencies, other public or private institutions, and community groups. Institutional service may be administrative, committee, or other related contributions to one's department, unit, or the University. Any contribution will be judged potentially relevant when the faculty member is acting as a professional. All faculty members are expected to engage in service activities, but only modest institutional service should be expected of probationary faculty. Service alone is not a sufficient basis for the awarding of tenure.

Evaluation criteria:

- a. **Relevance.** Did the service activities contribute to the overall functioning of the department and University, the enhancement of academic programs, or the professional development of the faculty member?
- b. **Mission enhancement.** Did the individual contribute to the environment conducive to achieving the mission of the department, campus, and the University?
- c. **Public engagement.** Did the involvement of the faculty member contribute positively to community – local and regional – relations and the image of the University that would be appropriate for the land grant institution?

Documentation

Evidence may include letters of reference or evaluations relevant to the service provided. It may be assessed by materials submitted by the faculty member or collected by colleagues.

V. PROMOTION

Peer review is an essential part of the evaluation for promotion to the next rank for the three areas of teaching, research, and service as it is in the evaluation of a candidate for tenure. Peer reviews at any level are expected to be from recognized individuals within appropriate disciplines and from individuals who can properly assess the candidate's professional contributions. These reviews will appear in the file in the form of letters that provide evaluative measures of an individual's performance in any of the areas of teaching, research, and service.

A. Evaluation Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Promotion to this rank is concomitant with a decision to award tenure. Standards for tenure are set forth in Section IV above.

B. Evaluation Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

Promotion consideration to the rank of Professor is given to those who ask for it or who are recommended by the Department Head or by the faculty senior in rank to the candidate. See Section III. Promotion Procedures in the *Procedures* document. The candidate wishing to be considered should inform the Department Head and the Department Promotion and Tenure Chair, but the faculty senior in rank will decide when to conduct the review.

Section 9.2 Criteria for Promotion to Tenure. [Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*]

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.

Every faculty member is expected to be promoted to Full Professor eventually. The Department Head should coordinate mentoring opportunities for Associate Professors that are individualized to meet their needs.

For promotion to Full Professor, faculty must continue to meet criteria for teaching, research, and service used for granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and add substantially to an already distinguished record of academic achievement and must exceed them substantially. Promotion to the rank of Full Professor requires, in addition, a national or international scholarly reputation in the individual's field of study. Further evidence could include:

- leadership in the candidate's profession or field of scholarship, as evidenced by letters from authorities assessing the candidate's professional and/or scientific contributions
- a reputation demonstrated by invitations to industry programs and/or professional organizations
- significant service contribution to the mission of the Department and University
- A national or international scholarly reputation in the individual's field of study

In recognition of the different roles and levels of experience individuals have at different career stages, service expected for promotion to Associate Professor is different from promotion to Full Professor. Roles for faculty who are being considered for promotion to Full Professor are expected to include service to the broader university and scientific communities. If the Math Science and Technology department has very few faculty members at the rank of professor at a given time, the procedure specified in Section III: Promotion Procedures of the University *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion* will be followed. This section states that in small departments with very few faculty members at the rank of professor, it may be appropriate to include, in the discussion and vote on promotion, a professor or professors from another unit or units in the, campus, or University. Including additional faculty members is also warranted in cases of candidates whose work encompasses multiple disciplines. In order for faculty members from outside the Math, Science and Technology department to participate, the department faculty at professor rank, the department head and the vice chancellor must submit a written request to and obtain authorization in writing by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The request must identify the faculty member(s) under consideration, and give the name(s) and appointment homes of those faculty members who will be asked to vote on the candidate and the reasons for including them.

VI. Post-Tenure Review

All faculty members are evaluated annually during merit review. In addition, a separate process for post-tenure review of tenured faculty is required by Section 7a of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*.

- A. **Goals and Expectations.** Goals and expectations for all tenured faculty members should parallel those used in the granting of tenure and include teaching, research, and service. The following are examples in each area. Not all of these activities need to be completed and others may be appropriate. One from each of the three areas must be completed annually.
- Teaching:
 - Positive student evaluations demonstrating being prepared for class, clear, providing feedback to students, showing respect for students and demonstrating student learning
 - Peer reviews including positive classroom observations and review of syllabi
 - Implementing curricular changes by creating new courses, changes to majors/minors, laboratories, service learning etc.
 - Development of on-line course materials
 - Development of new courses or new programs
 - Development of instructional materials
 - Research:
 - Publish a peer-reviewed article, non-peer reviewed article, book chapter, book etc. or submit one of these for publication
 - Present a paper or poster at a state, regional or national meeting
 - Exhibit materials at a show or meeting
 - Publish a curriculum guide
 - Submit a grant proposal
 - Review a book or journal article
 - Development of educational products for dissemination
 - Development of new uses of technology in teaching for dissemination
 -
 - Service:
 - Serve on department or campus committee
 - Serve in a professional association
 - Provide professional service in a community organization

The goals and expectations may provide for flexibility, allowing faculty the opportunity to contribute to one mission of the unit more than another; these may also take into account the different stages of professional development of a faculty member. A unit head and a faculty member may agree on a distribution of effort in which one area is weighted more heavily than another relative to the unit statement of goals and expectations.

A. Procedures for Post-Tenure Review

All faculty members are evaluated annually during the merit review. Each faculty member submits the Faculty Accomplishment Form to the Department Head for use in the annual merit review. The Department Head provides the faculty member with written feedback from the annual review relative to the stated goals and expectations below as well as any standards established for merit review. Refer to section Sections 7a.2 and 7a.3 of the *Faculty Tenure* policy for more information on this process.

Section 7a of the *Faculty Tenure* policy requires annual review of tenured faculty by a unit head to determine if the faculty member has met the goals and expectations of the unit; the unit must elect a peer review committee as well. This Review Committee may review all tenured faculty each year and must review any tenured faculty who do not meet the goals and expectations according to the unit head. The Review Committee consists of five tenured faculty members who are elected by the department, representing the different areas within the department, excluding the unit head. The chair of the committee shall be from the unit and elected by the committee. Faculty are elected to serve on the Review Committee for three years. If the Math Science and Technology department has very few tenured faculty members at a given time, it may be appropriate to include in the Review Committee a tenured faculty member from another unit or units in the campus or University. Including additional faculty members is also warranted in cases of candidates whose work encompasses multiple disciplines. In order for faculty members from outside the Math, Science and Technology department to participate, the department tenured faculty, the department head and the vice chancellor must submit a written request to and obtain authorization in writing by the senior vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The request must identify the faculty member under consideration and give the names and tenure homes of those faculty members who will be asked to vote on the candidate and the reasons for including them.

If the Review Committee concurs with the Department Head's finding that a faculty member's performance is "substantially below the goals and expectation of the unit" as listed above, the Department Head and the committee must send a letter or memorandum to the faculty member, stating these findings. The letter must be signed both by the Department Head and by the chair of the committee, must specify the deficiencies relative to the goals and expectations, and must set a time period (of at least one year from the date of the letter) during which the faculty member is to address the identified problems. The faculty member may communicate in writing to the committee chair and the Department Head relevant information if he or she disagrees with the committee's judgment. The Department Head and the committee chair also will meet individually with the faculty member whose work has been evaluated as substandard to discuss means of improving performance to acceptable levels. There must be a written record of that meeting. The Department Head shall document efforts to support the faculty member's performance during that time.

At the end of the specified time period, both the Department Head and the elected Tenure Review Committee will again review the performance. If they again find the performance is "substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit," they can ask the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs to initiate a special review. To do so, they should send a letter or memorandum to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and to the faculty member, setting out their findings with a copy of the documents they have reviewed.

Section 7a.3 of the Faculty Tenure policy specifies the process for a *Special Peer Review in Cases of Alleged Substandard Performance By Tenured Faculty*.

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 preceding the year a final decision would otherwise be made on an appointment with indefinite tenure for that faculty member.

Appendix B - Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* – Section 7.12

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.