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I. INTRODUCTION

This document describes, with more specificity, the criteria and procedures that are used in making decisions on promotion and tenure in the Department of Plant Pathology as required by Section 7.12 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. Within the document are the (I) Departmental Mission Statement, and criteria and procedures used for (II) Annual Appraisals of Probationary Faculty, (III) Conferral of Indefinite Tenure, (IV) Promotion, and (V) Post-Tenure Review. It will be used to evaluate whether candidates meet the general criteria in Sections 7.11 and 9.2 of the Faculty Tenure Policy.

These criteria are stated to define, with reasonable specificity, how tenure and promotion decisions are made in the Department of Plant Pathology. The department complies with the Regent’s Policy on Faculty Tenure as provided in Sections 16.3, 7.4, 7.61 & 9.2.

A. Departmental Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of Plant Pathology is to serve the people of the State of Minnesota, and where possible citizens of other states and nations in the diagnosis, understanding, management, and control of plant diseases caused by biotic and abiotic agents. The department carries on broad-based, fundamental investigations at the practitioner and theoretical level of plant pathogenic and related agents, and their by-products, which affect human endeavors related to food and fiber production and utilization. The beneficial use of microorganisms as agents of plant health and plant evolution are within the mission of the department.

The mission is accomplished by research, by extending information to clientele through a variety of methods, and by the formal teaching of undergraduate and graduate courses in plant disease, disease control and management, disease theory at all levels of biological organization from molecular to populations, and plant pathogenic and related agents (including fundamental courses in and related to mycology, plant virology, plant bacteriology, plant nematology and other biotic agents as well as abiotic agents of plant disease).

i. Research Mission. Research in the department addresses diverse needs related to plant disease and plant microbiology. By its nature, plant pathology is a problem solving discipline. It is also interdisciplinary in scope. Advances and collaborative research in the areas of plant genetics, plant molecular biology, evolutionary biology, microbiology, human medicine, bioinformatics, to name a few, enrich the field. Faculty involvement in interdisciplinary research is encouraged and is often conducted in partnership with faculty and staff from other departments and units in the university, regional technical committees, USDA-Agricultural Research Service (ARS) researchers, and with external partners in state, federal and
international agencies and organizations. Involvement in international research collaborations is encouraged as a means for solving local and global disease problems.

The focus and scope of the research directed by individual faculty varies with assignment, location, and responsibilities as described in their position descriptions. Faculty at Research and Outreach Centers must be responsive to issues related to plant diseases presently in the state or posing a potential threat to the state or region.

The department values research in interdisciplinary teams or settings in the same manner as independent research. Because of the difficulties of determining individual contributions to interdisciplinary research, individual faculty members engaged in interdisciplinary research efforts should make extra effort to document their contributions to the whole.

Faculty are encouraged to explicitly integrate and explore issues of diversity, inclusion and equity in their research. This might take any of several forms including and not limited to cultural sensitivities related to international research, issues of gender diversity and equality, and aspects of multi-disciplinary perspectives.

**ii. Teaching Mission.** The Department of Plant Pathology participates actively in instruction and advising of graduate students enrolled in the Plant Pathology Graduate Degree program, as well as other graduate programs in plant sciences and ecology and evolutionary biology. The M.S. and Ph.D. programs in plant pathology provide educational experiences and course work in all areas of plant pathology. The department also delivers undergraduate courses in support of various majors and priority areas, especially the Plant Science and Food Systems majors and university Council on Liberal Education requirements, with the mission of providing the basic principles of plant pathology and plant disease management to a broad undergraduate audience.

Faculty are encouraged to explicitly integrate and explore issues of diversity, inclusion and equity in their teaching. This might take any of several forms including and not limited to cultural sensitivities, issues of gender diversity and equality, and aspects of multi-disciplinary perspectives.

**iii. Extension Mission.** The outreach component of the Department of Plant Pathology includes the plant pathology and plant health programs of the University of Minnesota Extension and the related educational programs of the regional Research and Outreach Centers. Additionally, it is expected that research and teaching faculty disseminate their research findings beyond journal publication. Extension education is provided to growers, agricultural-professionals, K-12 educators and students, state and federal agencies, and the public through meetings, mass media, interactive TV, internet, diagnostic schools, written publications (bulletins, newsletters, trade journals, fact sheets, etc.), field demonstrations, social media, multimedia, and participation in local and regional conferences.
Extension activities are closely integrated with other departments in the College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences. Faculty with an Extension component in their appointment are encouraged to participate in, conduct, and publish adaptive research.

Faculty are encouraged to explicitly integrate and explore issues of diversity, inclusion and equity in their Extension and outreach efforts. This might take any of several forms including and not limited to cultural sensitivities, issues of gender diversity and equality, and aspects of multi-disciplinary perspectives.

B. Statement of Goals and Expectations

Every faculty member in the Department of Plant Pathology is expected to contribute to all three duties of university faculty: (1) teaching, which includes extension and outreach teaching as well as undergraduate and graduate instruction; (2) research and scholarship; and (3) service activities. There may, however, be considerable variation for an individual faculty member in the amount of effort devoted to each of these duties from semester to semester and year to year. On an annual basis, usually in the spring of each year, the distribution of effort for each faculty member is planned for the following academic year in consultation with the Department Head, and used as the basis for performance evaluation at the end of the year. The goal is to optimize the contribution of each faculty member to the overall mission of the department, college and university throughout the lifetime of their career at the university.

It should be the goal of every faculty member to attain the rank of full professor in due time. It is further expected that the department will do its part in providing support for career advancement and professional development at all faculty ranks.

The following policies and practices guide the development of annual faculty workloads. The specific criteria and standards, applied in the annual merit and post-tenure review are those described in Section III, IV, and V for tenure and promotion decisions.

- Research, teaching and advising of graduate and undergraduate students, and extension or outreach teaching comprise the bulk of the faculty workload in the Department of Plant Pathology. It is the responsibility of the Head to ensure that the total workload is equitably distributed among faculty, based on the expertise and professional development goals of individual faculty and the needs of the department.

- A typical course load for faculty on a majority research appointment (typically 60 - 80% research with 40 to 20% teaching) is one or two courses per year. Higher teaching loads are expected of faculty with majority teaching appointments. Variation in this load is made in recognition of the additional
effort required to teach some courses as opposed to others. All faculty, regardless of appointment type, may be expected to teach on occasion.

- Appropriate reductions in course loads are made for faculty members with substantial extension appointments and those who undertake major service and/or administrative responsibilities in the department, such as being Head, Director of Graduate Studies, etc. Similar reductions in course loads are made for faculty having major service or administrative responsibilities outside the department. In such cases, it is expected that the unit for which the service or administration is performed will reimburse the department for the corresponding fraction of the faculty member’s time.

- Course loads for a faculty member need not be distributed evenly over the academic year if a different distribution makes it possible for the faculty member to increase his or her overall contribution to the university.

- Newly appointed early career faculty (i.e., Assistant Professors) receive temporarily reduced course loads to enable them to more quickly establish their research programs.

- Every faculty member, regardless of appointment specifics, is expected to engage in research and/or scholarship. Research and scholarship are creative intellectual activities that are both validated by peers and communicated. Peer validation and communication can occur in a variety of ways as noted in the criteria and standards for promotion and tenure discussed later in this document including, but not limited to, peer-reviewed publication.

- Every faculty member is expected to contribute to the governance and administration of the department by participation in faculty meetings and by accepting responsibility for a fair share of assignments to standing committees and various special duties over the course of his or her career.

- Faculty who are on approved leaves are relieved of all teaching, service and administrative responsibilities for the period of the leave, unless an exception is made by mutual agreement between the faculty member concerned and the Head. However, faculty on leave may still have continuing obligations to external funding agencies and graduate students during the leave period. Except in the case of formal medical or disability leave, faculty members are responsible for meeting those obligations personally or arranging for them to be satisfied by another suitable faculty member. In medical and disability cases, the department administration arranges for such obligations to be met. Faculty members on leave have the right, but not the obligation, to vote on matters of departmental governance, hiring, and promotion and tenure questions.
• Faculty who are not on leave, but who have no formal course responsibility in a given semester, are not relieved of any other teaching, research, service or administrative responsibilities during that semester. It is understood that authorized travel may be undertaken during such periods. However, such travel must be arranged so that all other responsibilities are met.

• Faculty are expected to be reasonably accessible on campus during the normal working hours of the university and the period of their appointment, except when teaching, research or service responsibilities require them to be off campus.
II. ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

All progress of probationary faculty will be evaluated relative to university and departmental 7.11 and 7.12 statements, respectively, for scholarship, teaching, and service. At the beginning of the probationary, tenure-track appointment, the Department Head will review the terms of employment with the faculty member. This review includes the following items of discussion:

- The Head will supply the probationary faculty member with copies of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*, Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty, and this departmental 7.12 Statement regarding specific criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure. If the faculty member is unsure about the application of the criteria, the discussion should seek to make that as clear as possible.
- The Head will inform the faculty member about the procedures used in the department to review teaching, research and service. The faculty member must be informed about the annual review process and made familiar with the annual report on Appraisals of Probationary Faculty (PF-12). The faculty member must also be informed about his or her right to inspect their files and right of access to information.
- The Head, with input from and consent of the probationary faculty member, will assign a Mentoring Committee, consisting of at least two tenured faculty members, to the probationary faculty member.
- The Department Head, working with the faculty member and her/his Mentoring Committee, will ensure that documentation requirements for evaluation are met.

A. Materials required for annual evaluation of probationary faculty

Beginning with the first year of the probationary period, the faculty member, the faculty member’s Mentoring Committee, and the Department Head will gather appropriate data for the annual review. Evaluation will be based on the following materials:

- An updated curriculum vitae
- A summary of activities during the current calendar year as required for annual performance reviews (see Appendix A).
- Summaries of all teaching assignments, including student and peer evaluations as adopted by the department. Faculty with Extension appointments should furnish a summary of program activities including titles of presentations and publications, along with a sample or description of materials developed for specific clientele.
• Student evaluations of each course taught, including both summary statistics and the raw data. Faculty having Extension appointments should include audience evaluations using a standardized evaluation form if possible.
• Peer reviews of faculty instructional activities.
• A statement describing grant proposals submitted and those awarded, and other activities regarding internal and external funding.
• Other relevant materials.

B. Review Process and Timeline

(NOTE: Timeline is approximate; exact dates follow timelines set forth annually by CFANS)

• In December of each year, probationary faculty will be requested by the Department Head to update their files for review by eligible faculty members (i.e., tenured faculty of greater rank). Probationary faculty are encouraged to seek review of their files from members of their Mentoring Committee and to respond to suggestions for improvement before submission for evaluation.

• An evaluation meeting of eligible faculty will be scheduled by the Department Head to conduct a review of candidate files. This meeting will generally take place in January. All candidates’ files will be available electronically for examination by eligible faculty at least one week prior to the evaluation meeting. Files will be maintained by the department office.

• The Department Head, in consultation with the probationary faculty member, will assign an advocate to present a verbal summary of the candidate’s updated file at the evaluation meeting. The advocate must be selected from amongst faculty eligible to participate in the evaluation meeting.

• At the evaluation meeting, the advocate will verbally present a candidate’s file for review and discussion. Faculty have a duty to annually review the progress of each probationary faculty member and to participate in the review of probationary faculty. The eligible faculty will vote by written ballot to continue or discontinue the appointment of each probationary faculty member. Faculty members who are eligible to vote and unable to be present at the meeting due to extenuating circumstances can arrange with the Department Head to vote by absentee ballot. A simple majority of all eligible faculty in the department not abstaining from the vote is required to terminate the probationary period.

• If it is a “decision” year for a probationary faculty member, a vote is taken and the results are included with the candidate’s Promotion & Tenure Documents (see Section III).
• For faculty with appointment at a Research and Outreach Center (ROC), a written report from the ROC Head will be sought prior to the evaluation meeting. Alternatively, the ROC Head, at the discretion of the Department Head, may present an oral evaluation of the probationary faculty member at the evaluation meeting. The ROC Head may not participate in the faculty discussion or vote during the meeting unless their is tenured in the department.

• For faculty with split appointments in two or more departments whose tenure home is in the Department of Plant Pathology, the Head(s) of the other department(s) in which the faculty member has appointment(s) may submit a written or verbal report of evaluation by the faculty of those departments. At the discretion of the Department Head, the other Head(s) or a mutually agreed upon alternate may attend the meeting and participate in the discussion about the faculty member, but may not vote.

• The results of the evaluation meeting will be transmitted in writing to the candidate within a reasonable period of time, generally less than two months after the meeting. After the evaluation meeting, the Department Head will meet with each probationary faculty member to discuss progress toward achieving tenure and/or promotion. The Department Head will review the progress, the evaluation and vote of the eligible faculty, plus other relevant information, and will finalize the PF-12 statement or, in the case of non-tenure track faculty, similar document reflecting the faculty’s evaluation and vote. The probationary faculty member will have the right to review and respond to the PF-12 or similar document before submission to the college.

C. Extending the Probationary Period

Probationary faculty may request an extension of the probationary period for either childbirth/adoption or for caregiver responsibilities or faculty illness/injury as specified in Section 5.5 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. When considering the record of a probationary faculty who has extended the probationary period, criteria for promotion and tenure and annual review are no different than the criteria for those who do not have an extension. For example, a record of six years post-hiring with a single year extension must be considered the same way that one considers a record of five years post-hiring with no extension. The annual review process for probationary faculty who have extended the probationary period will be conducted in accordance with university policy and guidelines.
III. CONFERRAL OF INDEFINITE TENURE

This section describes the criteria and standards that will be used to evaluate whether candidates meet the general criteria in Section 7.11 of the Regents Policy on Faculty 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 [FN2]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate’s record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [FN3].

The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision [FN4]. 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. Overview of Tenure Decision Process

i. The Tenure Decision Process. The following is a general summary of the process used in making decisions on tenure. Note that decisions on promotion are made separately but coincide with decisions on tenure. The tenured faculty meets as needed, usually in October (Appendix B). At this meeting, the tenured faculty conducts a comprehensive review of probationary faculty being considered for Tenure, as outlined above in Section II. The procedure is as follows:

The Department Head sends a letter in Spring inviting non-tenured faculty to indicate their request for tenure consideration. Each faculty member requesting consideration for tenure has the right to withdraw the request at any time during the process, unless it is the decision-making year.

The faculty candidate for tenure responds in writing to the Department Head’s annual request, and is responsible for providing the necessary documentation to begin the evaluation process. Candidates are urged to discuss the types and formats of the documentation with the Department Head and their Mentoring Committee before beginning the process, and the Head will advise them on the elements necessary in the documentation.

The candidate is responsible for the preparation or his or her tenure packet materials (See Appendix C). The vitae should include the information on biographical details, education, degrees and dates, employment records, list of courses taught, and records of committee service. Vitae also contain information on offices held in professional organizations, invited participation in symposia or lecture series either at this or other institutions, seminars invited by departments at other institutions, and a complete list of publications, with indications as to whether articles are in refereed journals. Reprints of major contributions may be included. The candidate should also provide student evaluations of courses taught or comparable evidence of teaching performance in non-credit teaching. Any other evaluations provided by other faculty
members who may have shared teaching experiences or conducted peer reviews of teaching should be included in the documentation prepared for this evaluation.

In the Department of Plant Pathology, the tenured Faculty act as the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The Head assumes responsibility for contacting and working with candidates to provide the necessary documentation, including external peer reviews from other institutions. The Mentoring Committee should also assist the candidate in developing the dossiers for promotion and tenure. The Department Head will notify the candidate of deadlines of when the documentation should be provided.

The Department Head will request names from the candidate of potential external and internal reviewers. The Department Head will contact perspective peer reviewers to determine their willingness to review the candidate’s file. The Department Head will also send a letter to those reviewers agreeing to complete a review; the candidate's file; and copies of his/her scholarly contributions. Reviewers will be requested to provide a letter of evaluation for the candidate. Such reviewers will be told that the letter they submit will be in a file open to the tenured faculty and the candidate. All letters of external review will be incorporated into the candidate’s file. The majority of the letters should come from other institutions. The Department Head will include in the request that the appraisal letter contain some indication of the professional standing of the person being recommended, a specific evaluation of the quality of his/her research or teaching effort, and if possible, an appraisal of the creativity of the candidate. If the candidate has shown exceptional aptitude for synthesis of knowledge or in developing generalizations that advance understanding of knowledge in the field, such value judgments should be included in letters of appraisal.

An Advocate, selected from the tenured faculty in the department by the Department Head in consultation with the candidate organizes the information for presentation to the remainder of the faculty with voting rights. The total documentation for any candidate for tenure is made available to all eligible tenured faculty in the department at least two weeks in advance of the Tenured Faculty meeting on promotion and tenure decisions. During the Tenured Faculty meeting, the Advocate presents a summary of the candidate’s record, including evaluation materials from reviewers, and leads an open discussion of progress towards tenure relative to university (7.11) and departmental (7.12) expectations and guidelines. Discussion continues until all tenured faculty have had the opportunity to express opinion.

A probationary faculty may request an early tenure review; the Department Head, in consultation with Tenured Faculty, will decide whether to conduct it. A formal review may be initiated at any earlier time by the Department Head or by vote of the Tenured Faculty. The decision to initiate a formal review must be made by June 1 of the decision year so that the appropriate documentation can be prepared in time for formal consideration during the following academic year.
**ii. Voting.** Tenure evaluations are made independent of promotion evaluations and tenure may be granted within rank or in conjunction with promotion in rank. The department’s Tenured Faculty vote on whether non-tenured, tenure-track faculty will be recommended for tenure. Associate Professors and Full Professors vote on promotions from Assistant to Associate Professor. Full Professors vote on promotions from Associate to Full Professor. For tenure, tenure and promotion, or promotion decision meetings, a quorum shall be considered a simple majority of those eligible to vote. Tenure, tenure and promotion, and promotion decision meetings will be conducted as described above. In each case, the formal vote is by written secret ballot with each eligible faculty casting a vote for tenure and/or a vote for promotion for each candidate, where applicable. Ballots are tabulated and results recorded. A simple majority constitutes a recommendation of the voting faculty. Voting procedures, questions to be voted upon, and the report of the vote are defined in Section 7.4 of the Regent’s Policy on Faculty Tenure. Note that abstentions do not add to the denominator (i.e., the total number of those voting). Only in exceptional cases should an eligible faculty refrain from casting a vote on a tenure and/or promotion decision. If a real conflict of interest exists, the faculty should recuse himself or herself from the vote. A recusal reduces the denominator (representing the total number of eligible votes), and therefore does not count as a “no” vote. The Department Head votes as a member of the faculty and, as the chief administrative officer of the department, makes the final recommendation, with the faculty vote recorded, to the appropriate administrators for final disposition. The Department Head has the right to make a recommendation contrary to the vote of the faculty and if this differs from the faculty vote it shall be forwarded to the administration with its own justification, together with the faculty recommendation.

**iii. General performance guidelines.** The standards set forth for tenure were developed to reflect the broad range of professional activities within the department. The relative importance of the criteria will vary with differing individual assignments, but each of the criteria should be considered in every decision.

Tenure decisions for all faculty, whether stationed on-campus, at University of Minnesota branch stations (e.g., Research and Outreach Centers), or on university-sanctioned off-campus assignments (distinct from branch station appointments), are arrived at using the same basic procedures as outlined in this document. Off-campus assignments may include, for example, international assignments but do not include assignments at University of Minnesota branch stations. Branch station faculty will be evaluated in the same manner as on-campus faculty with an additional evaluation provided by the appropriate Branch Station Superintendent (e.g., ROC Head), as specified above. Faculty members on off-campus assignments will be given appropriate consideration for tenure. They will be evaluated in the same basic manner as on-campus faculty, and these evaluations will be consistent with approved departmental, collegiate, and university policy and procedures. Upon appointment to an off-campus assignment, a plan or method for evaluation performance and progress of the faculty member during assignment, shall be incorporated into a written agreement between the faculty member, the Department Head, and the appropriate
CFANS Dean or Associate Dean. It is the responsibility of the Department Head, working with the faculty member, the appropriate CFANS Dean or Associate Dean, and the faculty member’s other administrative leaders (Project Director, Campus Coordinator, Principal Investigator, Team Leader, etc.), where applicable, to ensure that appropriate documentation for evaluation are being met for faculty with off-campus assignments.

**iv. General criteria for tenure decision.** Specific criteria and methods for documenting progress for tenure are outlined in more detail in Sections III B, C and D. In general, the major considerations for conferring indefinite tenure are:

- Development of a clearly defined research and teaching focus consistent with position description.
- Evidence of continued professional and interpersonal growth.
- Demonstrated evidence of scholarly achievement.
- Successful advising of students or equivalent activity.
- Recognition of potential for local and national disciplinary or interdisciplinary leadership (especially during the fourth to sixth years).
- Documented evaluation of teaching at an acceptable level.
- Demonstration of service.
- Evidence of adoption and use of research results or extension information by decision makers, scholars, and/or teachers.

Additional consideration will be given to contributions to interdisciplinary research, teaching and outreach and to enhancement of diversity, inclusion and equity or awareness of diversity, inclusion and equity issues.

As per university regulation 7.11, faculty are encouraged to demonstrate inquiry, creativity, attention to questions of diversity, and innovation through interdisciplinary and intercultural scholarship and teaching. Collaboration, interaction and education across a wide range of diverse ethnic and cultural perspectives contribute to the breadth and quality of academic work and represent a core value of the University of Minnesota.

**B. Teaching and Extension**

Decisions of Teaching and Extension performance relative to expectation for tenure will be based on appropriate criteria and evidence that is convincing and acceptable to tenured Plant Pathology faculty. Evaluation of teaching will employ a systematic process focused on the effectiveness of undergraduate, graduate and/or extension teaching, and on student advising activities.

**i. Graduate and Undergraduate Teaching.** Graduate and undergraduate teaching involves all pedagogical activities including but not limited to educational
program development; course design; creation of course content; lecturing, hands-on experiences, delivery of on-line content or other forms of student teaching; and evaluation of student learning. Areas and aspects considered in evaluating teaching effectiveness include course content, stated learning goals and objectives, teaching methods and styles, measurement of student learning, advising roles and activities, and any other relevant information. Sources of input for evaluation include but are not limited to student and peer evaluations, instructional materials, and summaries of teaching goals and progress written by the faculty member.

Documentation for evaluating effectiveness in teaching:

a) Written evaluations by students, including standardized evaluation forms and relevant student comments representing the range of opinions expressed by students but reflecting general consensus of student reviews.
b) Peer evaluations of teaching based on reports of classroom visits and analysis of curricular materials.
c) If evaluations of teaching in previous years show room for improvement, progress in teaching should also be evaluated. Appropriate documentation should include evidence of participation in programs to improve teaching effectiveness and appropriate metrics allowing evaluation of overall trajectory in teaching effectiveness throughout the evaluation period.

Specific criteria used in documenting effectiveness in teaching:

a) Course content should be:
   • important, correct, current and professionally credible.
   • audience appropriate.
   • consistent with course title and stated goals and objectives.
b) Teaching materials, including but not limited to textbooks, readings, workbooks, syllabi, on-line content, presentations and other lecture materials, assignments, and grading rubrics should:
   • be appropriate to the level of the course and the students.
   • promote acquisition of a deeper understanding of the course topic.
   • provide a coherent and logically connected body of knowledge.
c) Assignments and learning activities should:
   • facilitate learning.
   • enable the student to become proficient in the subject by the end of the course.
   • be graded and returned in a timely manner with meaningful feedback.
d) Curricular design should:
   • show evidence of periodic reevaluation of course content, readings, and goals with appropriate revision to keep course relevant and up-to-date.
   • be coordinated with related courses and programs in the department, college and university, whenever possible.
e) The faculty member should demonstrate professional competence in teaching as evidenced by:
   • a demonstrated mastery of the subject matter.
   • development of timely, relevant and professionally accepted subject matter.
   • responsiveness to student and peer evaluations related to course content or teaching approach.

f) The faculty member should demonstrate competence in student advising as evidenced by:
   • availability to students.
   • knowledge about faculty and student responsibilities.
   • expression of concern about individual student progress.
   • willingness to help students making inadequate progress
   • advising of graduate students in the Plant Pathology Graduate Program or related graduate programs in a professional manner that allows routine and adequate progress towards degree completion, within the abilities of the student.

g) Teaching and/or advising improvement should be documented by:
   • adaptive response to audience and peer evaluations.
   • participation in workshops or structured programs to improve instructional ability.

**ii. Extension Teaching.** Extension teaching differs from graduate and undergraduate teaching in that the learners are not necessarily enrolled in a degree program. This difference does not diminish the importance of Extension teaching in the evaluation process. Extension teaching activities can include, but are not limited to, presentations to groups of a diverse clientele, participation in short courses and workshops, online educational programs, written publications, media releases and appearances, and maintenance of social media outlets. Criteria used in evaluation of Extension teaching include: educational needs assessments, program development, and teaching effectiveness. A variety of sources of information are used to evaluate Extension teaching because the clientele base is so diverse.

**Documentation for evaluating Extension teaching:**

a) Written evaluations by Extension audiences, including evaluation forms and relevant participant comments. Faculty are expected to routinely achieve a rating of “satisfactory” or better on questions related to: overall communication ability, knowledge of the subject matter, relevance of materials, and how much participants learned from the materials presented.

b) Peer evaluations of Extension activities.

c) Extent of audience interest in and use of Extension materials, (e.g., number of visits to a website, number of attendants at events, etc.).
d) Documented change in behavior by an Extension audience resulting from Extension education materials and/or activities.

e) If evaluations of Extension in previous years showed room for improvement, documentation of progress in Extension should also be provided.

Criteria for evaluating Extension teaching:

a) The faculty member should be:
   - directly responsible for establishing Program goals aligned with audience needs and institutional priorities.
   - directly responsible for developing and delivering curriculum and other Program content.
   - within the established Program area, widely recognized and acknowledged by peers and audience as a leader responsible for providing information to groups and individuals via formal and informal settings.

b) Program content should:
   - be important, timely, accurate, research-based, and professionally credible.
   - be appropriate for the audience.
   - lead to measurable audience learning gains.
   - be consistent with stated Extension Program goals.

c) Program development should entail:
   - adoption of interdisciplinary content and/or approaches as appropriate.
   - integrate consultation with other faculty as appropriate.
   - identification and consideration of audience needs and priorities.

d) Program presentation should entail:
   - effective communication of information and knowledge.
   - use of appropriate program delivery methods.
   - demonstrated awareness of and sensitivity to audience needs.

e) Program impact should result in:
   - utilization of Program knowledge by the identified audience.
   - changes in behavior by the audience served as a result of the Program.
   - a major resource and a point of contact of reliable information for print and media programs.

f) Teaching materials should:
   - promote depth of understanding.
   - be understandable and engaging for the target audience.

g) Professional competence should be demonstrated by:
   - utilization of the best available research-based information.
   - mastery of the subject.
   - development and delivery of relevant information in a timely manner.

h) Teaching improvement should be documented by:
   - adaptive response to audience and peer evaluations.
• participation in workshops or structured programs to improve instructional ability.

C. Research and Scholarship

All academic faculty, regardless of appointment, are expected to conduct scholarly activities that bring distinction to themselves and to the department. Scholarly activity is given the broadest interpretation. In addition to traditional scientific research, scholarship includes 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. It is recognized that for knowledge to be useful, it must be communicated to the appropriate audience. Therefore, it is expected that results be made available either through publication or through other appropriate means. As with teaching, evaluation of scholarship is both quantitative and qualitative and should be weighed by appointment. In general, research/scholarship is evaluated in terms of:

• the significance or impact of the research.
• the scientific merit of the research.
• the level of innovation and imagination shown.
• the relevancy of the research to problems facing the state, region, or specific ecosystem.
• the quality of research findings.

i. Quantitative evaluation of scholarship.

a) Publications to include but not limited to books, Extension publications, refereed and non-refereed publications, review articles, pre-print articles, computer software and abstracts.
b) Presentations of research findings at professional meetings, invited symposia and seminars.
c) Patents.
d) External funding proposals attempted and funded.
e) Awards and distinctions.

ii. Qualitative evaluation of scholarship. In general, the quality of research reported is evaluated based on the scientific soundness, in that the work includes proper controls, sufficient sample size, and statistical analysis where appropriate.

a) Significance and Impact
   The research should generate a new approach, hypothesis, theory or understanding to an important principle that is unique and will have an influence on the scientific community and/or society.
• Types of research undertaken will vary with appointment but in each case should balance issues of local, regional or international significance with cutting edge science.
• Increasing national recognition as evidenced by professional honors, membership on national committees, and invitations to make presentations at national and international meetings and seminars.
• Grant support in areas of research where such funding is available. While funding support on a year to year basis can fluctuate, succeeds overall in obtaining funding for research activities from external and/or internal sources.
• Research activities are recognized as significant contributions and of national or international significance by peers.

b) Publications
• Publishes peer-reviewed articles in major professional journals with impact factors appropriate to the discipline. While submission of articles to pre-print repositories (e.g., bioRxiv) does not rise to the standard of peer-reviewed publication, such activity is interpreted as documented, incremental progress towards publication in peer-reviewed journals. In no instance will pre-print articles substitute for peer-reviewed articles.
• Where the length of service permits, establishes a record for citation of these publications as evidence of significance.
• Recognition of specific papers by the journal as “most-frequently read” or “most frequently-downloaded papers” in a given year.
• Publishes books, chapters in books, or review articles that synthesize and extend research findings, and extend their distribution.
• Develops and maintains other forms of publication for research findings, including websites and newsletters.
• Promotes the use of research findings in industry, by government agencies and internationally.

c) Professional Activities
• Is invited to give presentations and seminars at the institutional, national or international level.
• Is invited to participate in professional discussions of emerging issues and their importance.
• Receives special professional honors and recognition.

d) Professional Improvement
• Updates research skills by participation in workshops, semester and sabbatical leave programs, federal multistate programs, and other professional development activities.
• Initiates research into new lines of inquiry.

**iii. Sources of evaluative information for scholarship.** These materials are part of the tenure document, which typically follows the form below and outlined in Appendix C. Tenure document format requirements may change from year to year and are specified by the Provost’s office. In general, specific sources of evaluative information include:

a) Current resume (CV)

b) Personal statement including:
   • outline of scholarly activities emphasizing how these fit with position description and departmental, collegiate and university mission.
   • detail of professional and interpersonal improvement activities.
   • description of anticipated future contributions to the college and the university.

c) Solicited disciplinary peer evaluation
   • Letters received from peers identified by the candidate, Department Head, and/or appropriate administrators, as described above.

d) Outside funding
   • Statement describing attempts and results of acquiring extramural funding.
   • Statement of effective use of internal funding.

e) Publications
   • If not organized in the curriculum vitae, a separate list should be prepared listing each publication in its relevant category.
   • Copies of the candidate’s research or scholarly publications.

D. Professional Service

Though of proportionally lesser importance than research or teaching, service contributions made to the department, college, or university will be credited and evaluated, as will contributions to professional associations / societies and to community or governmental units where the contribution has significant “professional” content. All faculty, regardless of appointment, are expected to participate in faculty governance and committee service.

Service in the context of tenure and promotion means service related to the individual’s disciplinary or academic expertise and the departmental, collegiate, and university’s mission. This service may be rendered to professional organizations, learned societies, state and federal agencies, and the community, nationally or internationally. Participation in the governance of the university or its constituent units, including the department, also falls into this category. Service to the community that is not professionally related is not relevant to decisions on tenure and promotion.
Service should not be considered a major factor in performance evaluations, particularly for promotion and tenure.

**i. Criteria for evaluating service.** Success in service may be supported by the evidence of service to departmental, collegiate, and university committees; authorship of major reports produced by such committees; leadership in departmental programs; membership or office in professional and scholarly organizations; assuming program responsibilities at professional and scholarly meetings; editing professional and scholarly journals; review of professional or scholarly publications; voluntary professional services to community organizations, governmental units, businesses, industries, and social service organizations; service to student organizations; consulting activities of a professional nature, especially those that can be used to enhance instruction in the college or to stimulate professional growth; and honors and awards related to professional service, such as honorary degrees, election to honorary societies, outstanding achievement awards, fellowships, and citations.

a) Service to the department, college and/or university
   - serves on committees, task forces, or working groups.
   - attends and participates in departmental staff meetings, seminars and workshops. Responds to requests for voluntary tasks.
   - exhibits leadership towards resolution of departmental issues or problems.

b) Service to the profession
   - attends and participates in professional meetings.
   - serves on committees or boards or as an officer.
   - engages in editorial work and/or reviews manuscripts in professional journals.
   - Serves on review panels for grants, departmental reviews, etc.

c) Service to community, state, federal or international agencies
   - Provides professional service to community, state, federal or international agencies.

**ii. Sources for evaluation of service:**

a) candidate's current resume (CV)
b) a statement of the candidate’s professional activities
c) peer evaluation letters and non-solicited and solicited letters from organizations or individuals served

E. **Extending the Probationary Period**
Probationary faculty may request that an extension to the probationary period for childbirth/adoption, for caregiver responsibilities, or for faculty illness/injury as specified in Section 5.5 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*. When considering the record of a probationary faculty who has extended the probationary period, criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than the criteria for those who do not have an extension. For example, a record of six years post-hiring with a one-year extension must be considered the same way that one considers a record of five years post-hiring with no extension.
IV. PROMOTION

This section complies with Section 9.2 of the Regent Policy on Faculty Tenure, which describes the university-wide criteria for promotion to the rank of Full Professor.

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.

Those faculty electing to be considered for a promotion decision on a given year will be required to meet with the Department Head for guidance on his or her packet prior to entering the formal promotion submission process. It is the option of any Associate or tenured Assistant Professor to request that his or her documentation be reviewed by the tenured faculty in any year, even though it may not be a year in which the
faculty member has asked to be considered for promotion. Assistant Professors will be reviewed by Associate Professors and Full Professors and, if requested, Associate Professors by Full Professors, only.

Criteria for promotion in rank from Assistant to Associate Professor are the same as those outlined in Section III (Conferral of Indefinite Tenure). In the case of probationary tenure-track faculty, the decision on promotion in rank parallels the tenure process and is made during the tenure decision-making year. The following performance guidelines are used in summarizing a candidate's performance in teaching, research, service, and international program participation for tenure and/or promotion consideration.

A. Performance guidelines for promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to Associate Professor is usually associated with a decision concerning tenure. Promotion to Associate Professor will be based on research, teaching, and/or extension productivity and scholarly activity; continuing professional growth; the establishment of a distinguished record of academic achievement that will be the foundation for a national or international reputation; and documented evidence of satisfactory teaching, research, and/or Extension. The process for deciding on promotion of probationary faculty from Assistant to Associate Professor is the same as that described Section III (Conferral of Indefinite Tenure).

B. Performance guidelines for promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to Full Professor requires documented evidence of sustained satisfactory research, teaching and/or extension activity and recognition as a disciplinary leader. The faculty member should have demonstrated intellectual distinction and academic integrity. This must be documented by a distinguished record of academic achievement and evidence of national or international recognition. For faculty with primary research appointments, a demonstrated ability to effectively direct the research efforts of others, and demonstrated effectiveness in advising students is required, including the advising of a graduate student to degree completion. For faculty with primary teaching appointments, a demonstrated ability to motivate and change the learning of others through traditional classroom instruction and/or Extension programming and outreach to persons in the extended community is required. Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and technology transfer will be taken into consideration. A greater contribution in the area of institutional service is expected of candidates under consideration to the rank of Full Professor than was expected for the award of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. General expectations include:

- recognized national and/or international disciplinary reputation.
• demonstrated ability to direct the research efforts of others.
• effective contribution to interdisciplinary programs.
• evidence of tangible successful collaboration such as on grant proposals or multi-author publications.
• documented evaluation of Extension and/or classroom teaching at an effective level.
• demonstrated effectiveness in the advising of students.
• evidence of adoption and use of research results or Extension information by decision makers, scholars, and/or teachers.

C. Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty will be evaluated for promotion according to the same guidelines as outlined for regular (non-adjunct) faculty. The department has developed a policy for conferring adjunct appointments.

D. Promotion Review Process and Timeline

The timeline for promotion is the same as for conferral of indefinite tenure (Section III, Appendix B). Required documentation and general procedures for evaluation for promotion are identical to those related to conferral of indefinite tenure, described above. Documentation for any candidate for promotion is made available to all eligible faculty (i.e., those of greater rank) in the department. The Department Head chooses an eligible faculty member as Advocate to present an encapsulation of the documentation to an annual meeting of faculty eligible to vote. This meeting typically will take place in the Fall. The eligible faculty vote via written ballot on the recommendation for promotion in rank. Associate Professors and Full Professors vote on promotions from Assistant to Associate Professor, and Full Professors vote on promotions from Associate to Full Professor. Ballots are tabulated and results recorded. A simple majority constitutes a positive recommendation. The Department Head votes as a member of the faculty and, as the chief administrative officer of the department, makes the final recommendation, with the faculty vote recorded, to the appropriate administrators for final disposition.

E. Annual Performance Review

Every faculty and academic professional and administrative staff member’s performance in research, teaching (both graduate/undergraduate teaching and Extension teaching), and service is evaluated annually. The purpose of the Annual Performance Review is to review the individual’s effectiveness in fulfilling the agreed upon responsibilities as well as his or her own growth and development. Recommendations for salary adjustments are made to the appropriate Deans and
Directors by the Department Head based on these evaluations. The Annual Performance Review is used as the basis for the Post-Tenure Review (Section V) and as further documentation of progress toward promotion.

All faculty members will submit the Annual Faculty Data Form (see Appendix A for an example) for the past calendar year along with an updated curriculum vitae to the Department Head. The timing for submitting the Annual Faculty Data Form is generally in late December, such that it provides adequate time for review during a meeting of the Faculty Council or appointed ad hoc committee early in the new-year.

The Faculty Council or appointed ad hoc committee will meet with the Department Head to evaluate the materials each faculty member submits. Committee members must recuse themselves from evaluation of their own annual achievements. The Department Head or appointee with capture the substantive essence and any quantitative evaluations shared during this meeting.

After completing his/her evaluation of the submitted materials by the candidate and the Faculty Council or ad hoc committee, the Head then meets with each faculty member to discuss past performance and future plans. This meeting constitutes the faculty member’s annual review for compensation and is used in developing salary adjustment recommendations for the Dean and Directors.
V. POST-TENURE REVIEW

A. Tenure Code and Senate Policy: Departmental procedures comply with Section 7a, Review of Faculty Performance, of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. This departmental statement sets forth the goals and expectations for the performance of all faculty, the procedures for the conduct of Annual Reviews and, if necessary, the procedures for Special Peer Review. This Statement is intended as a guide for tenured faculty members and the Department Head.

B. Goals and Expectations for Tenured Faculty: The goal of annual and post-tenure review of the Department of Plant Pathology is to ensure that all faculty members are contributing to the general mission of the department as evidenced by their scholarly activities and productivity in teaching, research, and/or extension. It is recognized that the amount of effort devoted to teaching, research, or extension may vary significantly from faculty member to faculty member, and that it is appropriate for the distribution of effort to change over time for an individual faculty member. Each faculty member is also expected to contribute to service and administrative activities related to the mission of the department, the college, and the university, and to their profession and discipline. The evaluation criteria for post-tenure review are based on the performance standards for teaching, research, extension and service given previously in this departmental statement. The performance evaluation for each faculty member is made relative to her/his individual assignment and responsibilities. Minimal performance in Research Teaching/Extension and Service (specified below) should be routinely met or exceeded for any contiguous three year period.

i. Minimum Research and Scholarship Expectations

- Faculty must have documented evidence of impactful research and scholarship through a combination of publication of refereed journal article(s), refereed Extension/outreach publication(s), submission of grant application(s), invited or volunteered presentations at scientific meetings, and/or technology transfer, as appropriate.
- Faculty must adequately manage and maintain an active, substantive research program which is original, well planned, and relevant to the departmental mission. Faculty are encouraged to collaborate with other scientists in interdisciplinary research activities that complement the departmental mission. Tangible evidence of an active and substantive research program may include but is not limited to publication and presentation of research that meets professional standards; successful procurement of research funding; training of graduate students, undergraduate students and postdoctoral researchers through active engagement in research activities; or other
documentable disciplinary contributions that produce or communicate research data, facts, or theories.

- Faculty must supervise and mentor research professionals/trainees such as staff scientists, post-doctoral associates, graduate students, and/or undergraduate students and do so in an effective, high-impact manner to ensure that they receive a quality research experience and professional development.

**ii. Minimum Teaching Expectations**

a) Teaching

- Faculty should teach high-impact graduate and/or undergraduate courses in line with the faculty member's teaching appointment.
- Faculty must meaningfully contribute to curriculum and program development. Contributions may be at the departmental, college, or university level. Tangible examples might include service on curriculum review committees, designing/executing new courses, conducting peer-review of courses, and contributing to faculty discussions on curriculum.
- Faculty should provide high-quality advisement to graduate and/or undergraduate students in their academic programs as appropriate. Tangible contributions might include service as a graduate advisor or co-advisor, serving on graduate advisory committees, or serving as a faculty mentor for undergraduate students.

b) Extension and Outreach:

- Faculty should develop impactful new and/or enhance existing Extension or outreach programs individually or collaboratively with disciplinary, commodity-based or interdisciplinary teams.
- Faculty should develop, provide, and/or maintain high-quality, up-to-date supporting materials and resources for educational programs with clientele using appropriate communication technologies and evaluation methods to assess impacts.

**iii. Minimum Service Expectations:**

- Faculty are expected to provide meaningful service to the university community primarily through serving on university, college, and departmental committees.
- Faculty are expected to provide substantive disciplinary-related service through activities such as peer review of scholarly publications; participation on external grant and review panels; editorial services for professional journals; service on professional society committees and holding leadership positions in professional societies; participating in shared governance and/or participating in public engagement activities.
C. Annual Performance Review: The Faculty Council or appointed ad hoc body, acting as the Post-Tenure Review Committee, contributes information that assists the Department Head in assuring equitable treatment of all faculty in tenure, promotion, post-tenure review, and salary considerations. Participation by the Faculty Council or appointed ad hoc body in this advisory role is required.

The Faculty Council or appointed ad hoc body and the Head conduct an Annual Review of all faculty members, as described in Section IV E. Their comments and numerical evaluations are summarized in a meeting of the Faculty Council or appointed ad hoc body and the Head. The Annual Performance Review provides documentation of the performance level of every faculty in the department.

D. Determination of Below-Standard Performance: Based on the Annual Performance Evaluation, either the Head or an appointed Post-Tenure Review Committee may initiate consideration that a tenured faculty member’s performance is “substantially below the goals and expectations for the department”. If the Department Head initiates consideration, the appointed Post-Tenure Review Committee will conduct an independent assessment. The decision of the Post-Tenure Review Committee will be determined by a majority secret vote. If the Department Head and the Post-Tenure Review Committee agree that action is needed, they will provide the faculty member written suggestions for improving performance over a designated period [usually at least one and no more than two years] as specified in Section 7a.2 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. To initiate discussion and possible resolution of the performance issues, the faculty member may respond in writing to the suggestions and may request a discussion with the Department Head and Post-Tenure Review Committee. The faculty member will then develop a plan of action for discussion, review and approval by the Department Head. Throughout this process, the department will be supportive of the faculty member and, as appropriate, will endeavor to provide suitable resources and/or release time for training or other activities for the purpose of improving the faculty member’s performance. If the Department Head and the Post-Tenure Review Committee agree that the faculty member’s performance has not improved adequately by the end of the specified time, then the Dean will be requested to initiate a Special Peer Review as specified in Section 7a.3 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure.

E. Special Peer Review in Cases of Alleged Substandard Performance By Tenured Faculty: The Dean will review the faculty member’s file to determine if a Special Peer Review is warranted. If the Dean determines a Special Peer Review is required, a panel of five tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank will conduct it. The individual under review may select one member. The remaining members will be selected by secret ballot by the tenured faculty in the unit, but do not have to be members of their academic unit. The Special Peer Review Panel will provide adequate opportunity for the faculty member to participate in the review process and shall consider alternative measures to assist the faculty member to improve
performance. The panel makes recommendations to the Dean, the Department Head and the faculty member. These findings may range from recommending: a) the faculty member’s performance is adequate; b) the faculty member’s allocation of effort be altered to capitalize on their strengths; c) the faculty member undertake specific steps to improve performance with subsequent review (Section 7a.2 and 7a.3); d) the faculty member’s performance is so inadequate as to justify salary reductions (Section 7.4a); e) the faculty member’s performance is so inadequate as to recommend the Dean commence formal termination or involuntary leave of absence (Sections 10 and 14) or some combination of these measures. Within 30 days of receiving the report, the faculty member may appeal to the Judicial Committee the recommendations of the special peer review analogous to the review of tenure decisions (Section 7.7).
VI. APPENDICES

Appendix A. Annual Data Form for Evaluation of Faculty (subject to change annually)

DEPARTMENT OF PLANT PATHOLOGY ANNUAL
FACULTY DATA FORM JANUARY 1 – DECEMBER 31, 200X

NAME: DATE COMPLETED:

General Information:

1. IF KNOWN, please indicate from your original job appointment your assigned percentage in each of the following. (If unknown, leave this section blank.):

   Teaching %:
   Research %:
   Extension %:

2. Do you hold an adjunct faculty appointment outside of the University of Minnesota? If yes, please indicate title, institution, and department.

3. Do you serve on the Graduate Faculty of a University of Minnesota program outside of Plant Pathology? If yes, please indicate the name of the program.

4. How can this form be improved? (Please be as specific as possible, recognizing that the information requested is needed for a thorough and fair evaluation of your performance and for promotion of the Department.)
I. TEACHING AND STUDENT ADVISING

Estimated time you spent on Teaching and Student Advising this year (may be different from original appointment) %:

1. Course instruction and guest teaching, including seminar (PLPA 8200 or similar) advising. Please list all teaching activities including guest lectures from this year, providing the following information for each class:

   Designator and Course Number (e.g. PLPA 2003):
   Course Title:
   Credits:
   Semester Taught:
   Enrollment:
   Contact Hours/Week:
   Total Contact Hours/Semester:

2. Teaching innovations: (development of course guides, computer software, publications, slide-sets, videotapes, web pages, etc.).

3. Participation in teaching improvement activities (workshops, seminars, etc.):

4. Student evaluation summary: U of M Student Rating of Teaching (SRT) Form [Instructor items: 1-5 (scale 1-6) ] If student comments are included, add both positive and negative

5. Other teaching or non-Extension outreach activities initiated or performed this calendar year: [Courses developed, science fair, judging or mentoring, K-12 activities, UROP, laboratory preparation (estimate hours/week) etc.]
6. Advising:

   a. Undergraduate:

      Indicate number of students for whom you serve as an officially designated Mentor as part of a degree program ______
      Indicate number of students for whom you serve as a research mentor through UROP, directed studies, or similar undergraduate training opportunity ______
      Indicate number of students for whom you serve as supervisor (i.e., how many undergrads do you employ?) ______

   b. Graduate students you advise or co-advice. For each graduate advisee, indicate:

      Student Name:
      Degree Sought (MS, PhD):
      Start Date:
      Title of Research Project:
      Estimated Degree Completion Date:
      Current Funding Source:
      Co-advisor (if applicable: specify your role as primary or co-advisor):

   c. Membership on graduate committees (do NOT include your own advisees). For each graduate committee you serve on, indicate:

      Student Name:
      Graduate Program:
      Degree Sought (MS, PhD):

   d. Please discuss your graduate advising plans for the coming year. Do you have plans to accept additional Plant Pathology Graduate Students? Are you currently seeking additional funding for graduate students?

   e. List Postdoctoral, Research Fellow and Research Associate advisees.

   f. List visiting scientists indicating name, home institution, and approximate dates of visit.

   g. List any other advisees or mentees with whom you’ve had significant contact. For each, please indicate length and nature of your relationship.
7. Teaching awards or special recognition:

8. Please describe any international teaching activities (e.g., study abroad courses, lecturing in courses at institutions outside the U.S., innovative teaching strategies that incorporate international studies into existing or planned UMN courses, etc.):

9. Please attach your peer teaching evaluation for this year, if applicable (Professors - once every two years; Assistant and Associate Professors - yearly).
II. RESEARCH

Estimated time you spent on Research this year (may be different from original appointment) %:

1. Research publications:
   
a. Peer Reviewed Research and Extension Publications (do not include published abstracts in this section). For each publication, please provide a complete citation using any standard format. Note that you may be able to access a complete list of your publications at experts.umn.edu. For each publication, please also include an estimate of your contribution to project conception; research/analysis; writing; and editing. See example, below.

   EXAMPLE:

   Figueroa, Melania; Upadhyaya, Narayana M.; Sperschneider, Jana; Park, Robert F.; Szabo, Les J.; Steffenson, Brian; Ellis, Jeff G.; Dodds, Peter N. (2016). *Changing the game: Using integrative genomics to probe virulence mechanisms of the stem rust pathogen Puccinia graminis f. sp. tritici*. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 7(FEB2016), [205].

   project conception: 50%
   research/analysis: 15%
   advising: 25%
   writing: 40%
   editing: 70%

   b. Published Abstracts (please use any standard citation format)

   c. Books and Editorship (please use any standard citation format)

   d. Non-peer reviewed publications, conference proceedings etc. (please use any standard citation format)

   e. Extension publications not included above (bulletins, fact sheets, newsletters, newspaper and magazine articles, etc.)

   f. Manuscripts – Please indicate status: accepted, in press, submitted, in preparation (authors, title, planned publication outlet)

   g. Other publications, videos, websites, media productions, etc. not specifically mentioned in any other section.
2. Research presentations: Talks, papers or speeches presented based on your scholarship, research, or experience (yours or your graduate students). Please use the format indicate below. Indicate presenter in **bold**. Indicate invited talks by placing an asterisk (*) to the left of the first author. Indicate keynote talks by including “(KN)” to the left of the first author.

**EXAMPLE:**


3. Research patents.
4. List research projects in which you are involved

5. Does any of your research take place outside of the U.S. (Yes or No)?

Does any of your research involve collaborators outside of the U.S. (Yes or No)?

If you answered “yes” to either question above, please provide the following for each international project:
(i) brief (1-2 sentence) title or description of research project
(ii) location of international research
(iii) location of international collaborators, including partner institutes where relevant

6. Cooperative breeding work:

a. Name of plant species:

b. List cooperators: (if any)

c. Type of work done: (check items)

   i. Plant
   ii. Make crosses
   iii. Increase inoculum
   iv. Inoculate
   v. Take notes in field
   vi. Make tests in greenhouse
   vii. Marker assisted breeding
   viii. Other (explain)

d. Varieties, lines, or numbered populations released for which you have provided input: (last 5 years)
7. Research and/or Extension Funding Proposals and Grants

a. Please list ALL sources of research and/or Extension funding for this year. For each source, please indicate the following:

   - **PI and co-PIs (as applicable):**
   - **Project title:**
   - **Funding agency or source:**
   - **Duration (mm/yr to mm/yr):**
   - **Total funding to you this year:**

b. Please list ALL submitted research and/or Extension funding proposals from this year. For each proposal, please indicate the following:

   - **PI and co-PIs (as applicable):**
   - **Project title:**
   - **Funding agency or source:**
   - **Duration (mm/yr to mm/yr):**
   - **Status (“Funded”, “Declined”, “Pending”):**
   - **Total requested funding (all PIs and CoPIs):**
   - **Total requested funding for your program:**

8. Special Research Awards and Recognition

9. List and describe any Research activities (e.g., Plant Disease Clinic activities) not explicitly included above.
III. EXTENSION

Note: Faculty without an official Extension appointment should leave this section blank. All non-Extension public teaching should be listed under section I5.

Estimated time you spent on Extension this year (may be different from original appointment) %: __________

1. Extension Programs:
   a. County agent training
   b. Producer meetings/workshops/symposia
   c. Short courses
   d. Special training sessions (i.e., Agricultural Professional Programs)
   e. Industry sponsored workshops/training session
   f. Invited lectures/presentations, extension
   g. Field days
   h. Other (please specify)

2. Publications written for extension teaching:
   a. Fact sheets
   b. News releases
   c. Plant Pest Newsletter/other newsletters
   d. Feature articles in trade journals - mass media (radio, T.V., papers, interviews)
   e. Handbooks
   f. Audio visual aids (slide sets, video tapes, powerpoint presentations)
   g. Computer software development
   h. Special production guides
   i. Desktop publications
   j. Other

3. Liaison activities with government agencies:

4. Phone consultations (approximate number):

5. Grants for extension educational activities not listed above:

6. Significant one-on-one consultations (type and number):

7. International Extension activities (please provide brief description and location, including partner institutes or collaborators where relevant):

8. Please provide any available documentation for Extension teaching effectiveness (e.g., summary of workshop participant survey results, etc.)

9. Other Extension activities not captured above.
EFANS Questions

1. Share in brief narrative form (one paragraph) an Extension activity you participated in that defines a situation, the response, and the result of your work in this area.

2. Summarize your primary Extension activities from the past year in short, bulleted form, specifically highlighting current research and other contributions to Extension programming.
IV. SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Estimated time you spent on Service this year %:

1. Committees/task forces: (indicate whether you were an officer or leader)
   a. International
   b. National
   c. State
   d. University
   e. College
   f. Department
   g. Extension
   h. Other (specify)

2. Plant pathology services: (grant reviewer, editorial boards, plant pathology-related community service, other). Indicate extent of involvement.
   a. Manuscripts reviewed
   b. Service on search committees
   c. Other (explain)

3. International service activities not listed above.

4. Other professional development and service activities:
   a. Attendance at professional meetings, conferences, workshops, etc. Include only meetings not already specified in the “Research presentations” section. Please list extent of your involvement (e.g., attended, chaired a session, meeting organizer, etc.).
   b. Membership in professional societies.
   c. Other professional development or service activities not specified elsewhere.

5. Special awards for service:

6. Administrative activities: (Describe)
   Estimated time %
V. PERSPECTIVES

Please be brief; limit this section to 2 pages or less.

1. What was (were) your most significant accomplishment(s) during the past year?

2. Identify any significant obstacles that impacted your productivity.

3. What professional improvement activities have you participated in during the past year? (e.g., semester leaves, sabbaticals, workshops, etc.).

4. Individual faculty pages are the Department’s most heavily viewed webpages—please help us keep them up-to-date. Please review your “Areas of Interest” statement on your PLPA faculty webpage. If updates are needed, provide new text below. Updated photos can be submitted to Dylan (vanbo022@umn.edu) or you can schedule a time for him to take one for you.

5. All University of Minnesota faculty are expected to contribute to a diverse and inclusive environment for students, staff, faculty, and stakeholders. Please describe your contributions to diversity and inclusion including participation in professional development activities.

6. In a few paragraphs written for an educated lay audience, tell us why your work is exciting and how it changes the world. Please include a title of no more than 50 characters. Please also submit ideas for future promotion as Research Spotlights on the Departmental webpage and for use in promotional materials.
VI. WORK PLAN FOR NEXT CALENDAR YEAR

List objectives you expect to achieve during the next 12 months in the following areas. Please be brief and as specific as possible; limit this section to 2 pages or less.

1. Teaching:

2. Research:

3. Extension:

4. Service and administrative activities:

5. Publications (journals, chapters, books, fact sheets, etc.).

6. Professional development (professional meetings, study leaves, sabbatical or quarterly leaves, etc.)

7. Funding proposals

8. Are there new directions you would like to pursue in your program? If so, please identify them and indicate, if necessary, how you would adjust your program to accommodate this new direction.

9. Identify any awards for which you would like to be nominated:

10. Please indicate the percent time you plan to spend on teaching, research, extension, and service in the coming year.

Teaching  %
Extension  %
Research  %
Service  %
Appendix B. Annual Promotion and Tenure Review Calendar
These are approximate dates and are subject to vary from year to year.

May 1  Faculty who are in their Tenure Decision Year, who seek early Tenure and/or Promotion, or who seek Promotion to Full Professor, meet with the Department Head to discuss their candidacy.

May 15 Faculty who proceed to candidacy for Tenure and/or Promotion should meet with their Mentoring Committees, where applicable, and begin preparation of their dossier. The Head will supply each candidate with a copy of the department 7.12 statement and provide information about the review calendar and process.

July 15 Candidates should submit a list of ten potential reviewers to the Department Head. The Department Head will determine a list of external evaluators.

August 1 The Department Head will contact the potential external evaluators to determine their willingness to serve as an external reviewer. Candidates should submit draft dossiers to their Mentoring Committee and Department Head to be evaluated for completeness.

August 20 Candidates should submit a final copy of their dossier to the Department Head.

August 30 The Head will send copies of the dossier, along with a letter of request and a copy of the department's 7.12 statement, to those external reviewers agreeing to review the candidate's dossier. Reviewers will be requested to submit their reviews to the Department Head within four weeks.

October 1 The Department Head will compile the letters of reference and will collate them with the candidate’s dossier. These documents will be made available for review by eligible faculty in the department. The Department Head appoints an Advocate who organizes the information for presentation to the remainder of the eligible faculty (i.e., those with voting rights).

October 15 Eligible faculty will meet to evaluate the candidate and vote on the Tenure and/or Promotion case. The Advocate will present the candidate's dossier and lead an open discussion among eligible faculty. Eligible faculty will vote. The Department Head will inform the candidate of the vote tally and will inform the candidate that they have the right to submit a written response if they wish.

November 1 The Department Head will write a letter summarizing the faculty discussion and vote. A copy will be provided to the candidate and they will be informed they have the right to submit a written response if they wish.

November 15 The Candidate’s dossier will be submitted to the Collegiate Promotion and Tenure Committee for evaluation.
Appendix C. Format for Tenure File

The dossier submitted for evaluation for Tenure or Promotion in academic rank should provide a thorough summary of the activities, accomplishments, goals, and philosophy of the faculty member. The Provost specifies format and required format may change over time. The candidate should consult with the Department Head for exact format in any given year to ensure the correct information is provided in the required format. In general, the documents should include the following sections supplied by the candidate:

Personal Statement
This statement should summarize the research, teaching, extension, outreach, and service accomplishments of the candidate. It should also outline and provide a philosophical framework for the candidate’s overall program.

Curriculum Vita
An up-to-date CV.

Research
A description of accomplishments in research, including a description of the candidate's main research efforts/areas and his/her role in those projects; presentations at professional meetings; grant applications submitted and funded, along with the approximate portion of multi-investigator awards going to the candidate, and a description of awards or other measures of impact.

Teaching (where applicable)
A description of accomplishments in teaching, including the candidate's philosophy of instruction; a full listing of courses taught; a description of coursework development efforts; student evaluation summaries; reports of peer evaluations; and a description of awards or other measures of impact.

Extension (where applicable)
A description of accomplishments in Extension programming, including presentations, workshops, publications, and others; development of educational materials such as oral presentations, web pages, brochures, articles for the popular press, and others; leadership roles on programming teams, service as Area Program Leader; and a description of awards or other measures of program impact.

Service
A description of service to the profession, including service on committees at the department, college, university, or national/international levels; service to professional organizations, including membership on committees, organizing meetings or sessions, editorial board positions, review of manuscripts and
proposals, service on panels, and other appropriate service; other types of professional service; and a description of awards or other measures of impact.

Sample Publications (3)

PF-12 Documents (for Tenure cases only)

Additional Materials (where applicable)
May include unsolicited letters from students or other individuals; the candidate's response to specific materials; or other applicable materials that may help in the evaluation process.

Revisions:

Minor revision approved April 2019: Updated language in section V, Post-Tenure Review