STATEMENT 7.12
Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics
FACULTY TENURE, PROMOTION, AND ANNUAL REVIEW GUIDELINES

I. INTRODUCTION:

This is the statement for the Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics required by Section 7.12 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure for Personnel Decisions Concerning Probationary Faculty. This Departmental Statement describes with more specificity the criteria and performance standards that are used to evaluate whether candidates meet the general requirements in Section 7.11 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure for awarding indefinite tenure. This Departmental Statement also includes the evaluation procedures for promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to Full Professor according to Section 9.2 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure, salary adjustment, annual review process, and special reviews such as post tenure review as required by Section 7a of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. (Appendix A) The document is consistent with the Procedures for Evaluating Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty for both tenure and promotion processes.

II. DEPARTMENT MISSION:

The collective research, education and outreach programs of the department will continue to be significant components of the University’s, and the College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences (CFANS) initiatives on safe and healthy foods, environment and renewable energy, enhancing agricultural systems, and bioscience and biotechnology. Our programs provide expertise in basic genetics, biotechnology, plant breeding, cropping and agricultural systems, invasive species, and managed landscapes for the continued improvement of current crops, the discovery of useful attributes in plants, and the development of potential new crops and new cropping systems that are environmentally and economically sustainable. Plant breeding, genomics, and agroecology will be important in advancing all of these programs. Our discipline-based programs are all necessary components of multidisciplinary approaches to provide lasting solutions to the complex problems embedded within the initiatives listed above. All faculty should contribute to the mission of the department and aspire to progress through the faculty ranks to become Professors. In addition to a strong discipline-based research, teaching, outreach and/or extension program that impact diverse clientele from the state to the international arena, participation in interdisciplinary scholarship is encouraged and rewarded.

III. ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY:

Departmental procedures comply with Section 7, Personnel Decisions Concerning Probationary Faculty, of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure as well as the Procedures for Evaluating
Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty. This Departmental Statement contains procedural rules for the consideration of candidates for tenure and promotion and is intended as a guide for candidates, faculty members, and the department head. Several important subjects considered in the Faculty Tenure policy are listed here with the corresponding section reference.

1. Explaining the process to the candidate early in the probationary period (Section 7.12)
2. Holding an annual conference with the candidate (Section 7.2)
3. Informing candidates of options to stop the tenure clock (Section 5.5)
4. Making the tenure decision in a timely fashion (Sections 5.1, 5.2, 5.4, 6.2, 7.3)
5. Collecting information on the candidate’s performance (Section 7.4a)
6. Annual review by tenured faculty (Section 7.2)
7. Preparation of the file for tenure decisions (Section 7.4a)
8. Attendance at tenure meetings (Section 7.4b)
9. Who is eligible to vote (Sections 7.4b)
10. Voting procedures (Sections 7.4c,d)
11. Report of action (Sections 7.4e,f)

Faculty Tenure: http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/faculty/pdf/procedures101207.pdf

The following practices, procedures and protocols were approved by the Department faculty (November 1992, June 1996, February 2007, and October 2007) and are used to facilitate the review and evaluation process for probationary and tenured faculty.

A. Activity File

Each faculty member is required to maintain an Activity File which consists of a Job Description, Long-Range Plan Statement, Personnel Record, Annual Summary and an Abbreviated Annual Summary using the format and instructions approved by the faculty (Appendix C, D, and E). The Long-range plan will cover teaching, extension/outreach, research and service activities. Adjustments to the long-range plan will be made as needed and should be reviewed by the faculty member and the department head at least every five years. Significant departure from the long-range plan requires faculty input and approval by the department head.

Each individual involved in education is to include course or extension program evaluations by students or clientele.

B. Faculty Personnel Committee

The Department Head chairs the Faculty Personnel Committee which consists of six faculty members elected from the Associate and Full Professors with regular appointments as follows: one from Extension [faculty with 50% or more extension appointment] and five from the Faculty at large. Personnel committee members serve three-year terms with two members elected each year. An individual may be re-elected for a second 3-year term, but then must wait 3 years before
again becoming an eligible candidate. Faculty members with primarily administrative appointments outside of the department are ineligible for membership on the Faculty Personnel Committee. The Faculty Personnel 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 Personnel Committee in this advisory role is required.

C. Faculty Evaluations

The Faculty Personnel Committee conducts faculty performance evaluations. Individual faculty are rated by the members of the Faculty Personnel Committee on a scale of 1 to 7 where 1 is unsatisfactory performance and the faculty member fails to meet the expectations of her/his position in most respects to 7 being excellent performance where the faculty member exceeds expectations of her/his position in most respects. The basis for evaluation is based on the individual’s scholarly activities, educational effectiveness, and service in relation to the individual faculty member’s job responsibilities. Faculty Personnel Committee members are required to defend their individual evaluations and comments about faculty in an annual Faculty Personnel Committee meeting. During this meeting the Faculty Personnel Committee agrees on specific points or comments that represent their collective thinking relative to each faculty member. For probationary faculty, the Faculty Personnel Committee assists the Department Head in writing the annual performance statements (Presidential Form 12: Appraisals of Probationary Faculty).

Probationary faculty may stop the tenure clock for childbirth, adoption, caregiver responsibilities, or personal injury or illness, in accordance with Section 5.5 of the Faculty Tenure Code. When reviewing probationary faculty who have elected to stop the tenure clock, criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than criteria for those who do not have an extension on their tenure clock. More explicitly, the record for a probationary faculty member that has stopped the tenure clock must be considered in the same way a record of a probationary faculty member that did not stop the tenure clock.

During an annual performance evaluation meeting, the Department Head shares with each individual the Faculty Personnel Committee’s collective comments, the individual’s average numerical evaluation from the committee members, and the Department Head’s numerical evaluation. Numerical evaluations are used by the Head as one piece of information in determining salary adjustments. General information from the evaluations may also be used during meetings of voting, tenured faculty for tenure and/or promotion deliberations.

As far as practical, faculty members on international assignment are evaluated in the same manner. It is the responsibility of the faculty member on international assignment, working with the Department Head, the International Programs Office for CFANS, and the faculty member’s other administrative leaders to ensure that documentation requirements for evaluation are met.
D. Recommendation for Promotion and/or Tenure

The Voting Faculty Meeting is held annually in October or November to vote on promotion and/or tenure (P&T) decisions. Recommendations for action during this meeting are normally determined one year in advance. The procedure is as follows:

Prior to each Voting Faculty meeting, the Faculty Personnel Committee meets and identifies candidates for P&T recommendations. Voting faculty are also requested to review the Activity File of faculty eligible for promotion and/or tenure prior to the voting faculty meeting [Full Professors review files of Associate and Assistant Professors; Associate Professors review files of Assistant Professors].

During the Voting Faculty meeting, Faculty Personnel Committee recommendations are presented to the faculty for discussion and voting. If there is disagreement within the Faculty Personnel Committee on any aspect of the recommendation, all points of view are presented. Recommendations of the Faculty Personnel Committee are only advisory to the voting faculty and do not preclude the initiation of recommendations by any faculty member during the meeting. Recommendations are considered and information is shared until all voting faculty have had the opportunity to be heard.

If it is a “decision” year for a probationary faculty member, a vote is taken and the results are included with the candidate’s P&T Dossier. In a “non-decision” year, a vote on continuing the annual appointment is taken by secret ballot, but no vote is taken regarding a person’s tenure or promotion. In the year prior to a “decision” year, an advisory or straw vote is taken on the recommendation for promotion and/or tenure the following year. A simple majority vote by secret ballot is required for a positive recommendation from the voting faculty for the candidate’s promotion and/or tenure the following year. By September of the following year, the dossier should be assembled and the Department Head should request seven to ten letters of evaluation for inclusion in the candidate’s P&T dossier (Section III. E., F. and G).

The P&T dossier should be reviewed by all the voting faculty prior to the next Voting Faculty meeting. The Faculty Personnel Committee assists the process by reviewing the P&T dossier, suggesting individuals for evaluation letters, and for bringing a recommendation to that Voting Faculty meeting concerning promotion and tenure decisions.

A faculty member may nominate another faculty member for promotion and/or tenure at a time other than during the Voting Faculty meeting. Or, any faculty member may ask to have their own case considered for promotion and/or tenure at any time. The nomination or request will be considered by the Faculty Personnel Committee and their recommendation will be shared with the voting faculty. All voting faculty will be asked to review the candidate’s Activity File. If a simple majority of the voting faculty approve the action as determined by secret written ballot prior to June 1, the P&T dossier will be prepared for formal consideration at the Fall Voting Faculty meeting.
E. Preparation of Tenure/Promotion Dossier

The Department Head and the candidate prepare the dossier for each tenure/promotion case according to the instructions from the college on dossier preparation and the Procedures for Evaluating Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty. Voting faculty are expected to review the dossier and make their individual evaluation of each recommendation prior to the voting meeting. The candidate is given an opportunity to review and/or provide written comment on the dossier before the faculty vote is taken, and again before the documentation is forwarded to CFANS administrators. Additions to the dossier after it leaves the department from the College, the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Provost are shared with the candidate.

F. Letters of Evaluation

Seven to ten letters of evaluation are included as part of the tenure/promotion documentation. The candidate is asked to suggest names of letter writers. The head in consultation with the Faculty Personnel Committee consider the candidate’s suggestions in addition to their own suggestions for requesting letters of evaluation. The majority of letters of evaluation should be requested from respected peers who have not had a special connection (such as cooperator, graduate advisor or advisee) to the candidate in the past, but who are aware of the candidate's growing national or international reputation and stature. All relevant letters must be included in the dossier, including negative evaluations which the head may wish to address in his/her letter. A maximum of two letters should come from co-authors and co-investigators, and a maximum of two letters should come from colleagues within the University. See the Procedures for Evaluating Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty for additional discussion about the selection of external reviewers.

G. Voting

The department requires an exceptional 2/3 majority of eligible voting faculty present at the Voting Faculty Meeting plus those voting by absentee ballot prior to the Voting Faculty Meeting to approve tenure and/or promotion. A quorum must be present at the Voting Faculty Meeting and a quorum is defined as more than 50% of the faculty members eligible to vote. Those eligible voting faculty unable to attend the voting faculty meeting will receive the Faculty Personnel Committee's recommendation(s) and review the P&T dossier(s) prior to voting by written absentee ballot. Absentee ballots should be completed prior to the Voting Faculty Meeting and should be delivered in a sealed envelope. Proxy votes, telephone votes, fax votes and email votes are not permitted.

Voting is by written secret ballot. Faculty members with a conflict of interest such as a primary administrative appointment outside of the department are recused from voting on promotion and tenure cases and do not count in the total number of eligible voting faculty. Abstentions are strongly discouraged and are not counted in determining whether a majority of those voting cast
votes in favor of promotion and tenure. But the number of abstentions is reported as part of the vote tally and will be considered an indication of lack of support for the candidate by those abstaining. Tenured faculty have an obligation to decide whether or not a candidate merits promotion or tenure and to vote for or against tenure and promotion. If tenured faculty members are eligible to vote and do not cast a note, the number of these “non-votes” is reported but they are not counted as affirmative or negative votes, or as abstentions. The actual vote is reported which should indicate the number eligible to vote, the number present at the meeting, the number of affirmative and negative votes and abstentions, the number of absentee ballots cast, and the number of ballots not cast by eligible faculty. The percent affirmative vote equals the number of affirmative votes divided by the number of affirmative plus negative votes. Abstentions are not included in the determination of the percentage of affirmative votes cast.

Adjunct faculty members are not tenured in the Department and, therefore, do not participate in the discussion and do not vote on tenure or promotion.

Note that only a simple majority of votes is required to initiate the preparation of promotion and/or tenure dossier; the results of this vote are not included in the dossier. The 2/3 majority vote pertains to voting that occurs after the dossier has been finalized and the actual vote tally is included with the dossier that is forwarded to CFANS administrators.

**IV. CONFERRAL OF INDEFINITE TENURE:**

Tenure may be granted any time that a candidate has satisfied the criteria; probationary status may be terminated by a 2/3 majority vote of the eligible faculty at any point that the appointee fails to satisfy the criteria. The tenure decision is mandatory by the sixth year of probationary service, not counting the years when the candidate stopped the tenure clock. Candidates denied tenure are given a one year termination appointment.

The principal basis for awarding tenure is provided in Section 7.11 of the *Faculty Tenure* policy. (See Appendix A for the full text of Section 7.11). The basis for awarding indefinite tenure 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. The awarding of indefinite tenure presupposes that the candidate’s record shows strong promise of his or her achieving promotion to professor. The department also makes the determination that the candidate has demonstrated the capacity to contribute significantly to the mission of the Department through its programs of education, research, extension or outreach. International program activities will be fully credited when they further the mission of the Department.

**Evaluation Criteria:** Tenure, promotion, and salary evaluations are based on the effectiveness of individuals in carrying out their specific education, research, extension or outreach responsibilities as designated in their job descriptions. Service is considered a responsibility of every faculty member; only modest institutional service is expected from probationary faculty. Job descriptions are developed according to Departmental Guidelines and Protocols for Job
Descriptions and Long-range Plans (Appendix C). The basis for evaluation is the individual within her/his own assignment, faculty are not compared to other faculty within or outside the Department. Evaluation information may be obtained from numerous sources including colleagues, students, clientele, department head, administrators, alumni, and/or the faculty member. 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 contributes to the breadth and quality of academic work and represents a core value of the University of Minnesota.

Research: Faculty research projects range from fundamental laboratory research to problem-solving field activities. Research is conducted at molecular and cellular levels, on whole plants, and at the cropping and natural systems level.

Teaching: Teaching: Faculty instruct undergraduate students, graduate students and persons of the extended community in aspects of plant breeding, molecular genetics, ecology, crop management, physiology, agricultural and natural systems, production, and/or weed control.

Extension: Faculty extension programs are developed to solve problems and transfer research results and emerging technologies to the private, public, and consumer sectors of the state and beyond.

Service: Service is included in all three of the above activities but pertains to discipline related service and public engagement, outreach and institutional service which includes specific work on committees, task forces, governance, special events, etc. Service can be professional or administrative at the department, college, university, state, regional, national, or international level.
Research: Research in the Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics is mission oriented and translational ranging from fundamental to applied research activities. Research must include significant publications in appropriate peer-reviewed publications. The research must be original, and include cooperative and interdisciplinary investigation. The research program should address the broad mission of the department and include postdoctoral associate, graduate student, and/or undergraduate training; securing grants, gifts and other funds; germplasm, cultivar(s), and/or genetic stock(s)s release and registration, and when appropriate the patenting and licensing of technology.

General Performance Standards for Research and Scholarship:

Required Performance Standards:

Publishes significant publications in peer-reviewed journals in addition to popular articles, books, and/or book chapters. Releases genetic stocks, cultivars and germplasm, and secures patents and licensing agreements for appropriate technology transfers as appropriate. Makes presentations at professional meetings and workshops. Publications, presentations and technology transfers are timely and meet the needs of clientele.

Manages a research program which is original, well planned, and relevant to the departmental mission. Collaborates with other scientists in interdisciplinary research activities that complement the departmental mission.

Supervises and assists undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or post doctoral associates and assures that they are productive and receive a quality research experience.

Obtains external financial resources (grants, contracts, gifts) in support of research.

Desired Performance Standards:

Enrolls in professional development activities that foster leadership and research excellence and should participate in semester leaves, sabbaticals, and/or scientist exchanges.

Achieves recognition for quality research programs via citations of research findings, invited presentations and consultations, extent and impact of developed products and/or practices, technology transfer (varieties, germplasm, management practices, etc.), and special awards.
Teaching:

Teaching: Teaching in the Department includes undergraduate and graduate instruction, continuing education programs, individual student advising, student group or club advising, and communicating knowledge to the extended community. Teaching also includes developing instructional programs and curricula, textbooks, laboratory manuals, fact sheets, digital media, and other learning exercises in addition to supervising, advising and/or mentoring graduate and and/or undergraduate students individually and in groups. Evaluation of instruction by students and through peer review is required for all course instructors (Appendix F).

General Performance Standards for Teaching: (See Appendix F for assessment information.)

Required Performance Standards:

- Offers quality formal credit courses, informal courses, and/or educational experiences that support the goals of the Department, College and University. Orients courses to program needs of students and promotes applications of scientific principles and an understanding of local, national and international agriculture. Uses teaching methods and resource materials that stimulate learner’s interests and help students meet course and department learner objectives and develop the student’s critical thinking skills.

- Advises graduate and/or undergraduate students in development of courses of study that best suit their talents and career goals. Demonstrates advisory skills that focus on the student’s best interests. Promotes personal and professional leadership skills in students.

Desired Performance Standards:

- Publishes refereed articles, popular articles, books, book chapters, syllabi, digital media, and/or training manuals related to teaching responsibilities. Participates in presentations at professional meetings and workshops.

- Enrolls in professional development activities that foster leadership and educational excellence and participates in semester leaves, sabbaticals and/or scientific exchanges.

- Obtains external financial support for teaching/education-related activities.

- Achieves recognition for quality educational programs via positive course evaluations, peer evaluations, analysis of syllabi and other course materials, citations of publications, invited lectures and consultations, and special awards.

- Participates in credit and non-credit teaching experiences and outreach activities with registered University students, traditional clientele groups, and/or persons in the extended
community.

**Extension:** Extension activities in the Department consists primarily of education of non-campus clientele. It involves oral and written communication; formulation of efficient, profitable and environmentally sensitive crop production, crop utilization; and land use management options; conveying clientele needs and concerns to researchers; and facilitating or conducting applied research and field demonstrations.

**General Performance Standards for Extension:** (See Appendix F for assessment information.)

**Required Performance Standards:**

- Plans and conducts quality, research-based educational programs that address current needs of primarily non-campus clientele and that are based on the priority issues of the University of Minnesota Extension. Achieves recognition for quality extension programs as indicated by positive clientele and peer evaluations.

- Uses appropriate communication technologies and educational materials and methods that effectively address the needs of clientele.

- Publishes in peer-reviewed journals in addition to web sites, electronic communications, newsletters, popular magazines, folders, fact sheets, bulletins, training manuals and/or other appropriate outlets. Presents at professional meetings and workshops. Publications and presentations are timely and meet the needs of clientele.

**Desired Performance Standards:**

- Obtains external financial support for extension efforts through partnering with state agencies, NGO’s and industries, fee-based programs, grants and/or gifts.

- Achieves recognition for quality extension programs as indicated by positive evaluations, assessment of impacts, citation and use of publications, invited presentations and consultations, and special awards.

- Provides effective information for research needs and is involved in research projects and demonstrations that serve clientele needs.

- Participates in professional development activities that foster leadership and educational excellence such as semester leaves, sabbaticals, and/or scientist exchanges.
**Service:** Service in the Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics consists of contributions to the departmental mission by involvement in committees, governance assignments, reviews, special events, etc. Service is an important aspect of the profession and is essential for the fulfillment of the Department’s mission and goals. Service includes both professional, discipline-based service and institutional service. Participation in service-type activities is not to exceed 20% of a faculty member’s time unless agreed to by the Department Head. Service activities are considered for merit, promotion, and/or tenure decisions.

**General Performance Standards for Service:**

**Required Performance Standards:**

- Serves on department, college, university, regional, national and international committees related to job responsibilities and expertise.

- Performs service and participates in public engagement with the local, state, national, or international community based on one's academic expertise.

**Desired Performance Standards:**

- Performs effectively on committees, task forces, and editorial or review assignments.

- Accepts or volunteers for governance assignments and completes tasks in a quality and timely manner.

- Contributes to the success of seminars, group meetings and other sponsored events.

**V. PROMOTION**

**A. Promotion to Associate Professor**

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 (see General Performance Standards above). The process of promotion for probationary faculty from Assistant to Associate Professor with indefinite tenure is described under Section III. Annual Appraisals of Probationary Faculty and Section IV. Conferral of Indefinite Tenure.
B. Promotion to Professor

Promotion to Professor requires documented evidence of sustained scholarly achievement in research, teaching and/or extension activity and being recognized as a disciplinary leader. The faculty member should have demonstrated intellectual distinction and academic integrity. This should be documented by adding substantially to a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation of a national or international reputation or both. See the full text of Section 9.2 of the Faculty Tenure policy in Appendix A.

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 education 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. Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, attention to questions of diversity, and technology transfer will be taken into consideration. (See General Performance Standards above and Section 9.2 of the Faculty Tenure policy).

C. Adjunct Faculty

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

VI. PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY INCLUDING POST-TENURE REVIEW

A. Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure and Senate Policy: Departmental procedures comply with Section 7a, Review of Faculty Performance, of the Faculty Tenure policy. 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 in the Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics is to ensure that all faculty members are contributing to the 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 and the University, and to their
profession and discipline. An individual faculty member’s responsibilities are developed and specified in her/his Job Description and Long-range Plan. 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.

C. Annual Review: The Faculty Personnel 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 Personnel Committee in this advisory role is required.

The Faculty Personnel Committee members and the Head each conduct an Annual Review of all faculty members. Their comments and numerical evaluations are summarized in a meeting of the Faculty Personnel Committee and the Head. This Annual Review is used, in part, for salary determinations by the Head and to provide suggestions and recommendations to the faculty member concerning his/her development.

D. Determination of Below-Standard Performance: Either the Head or the Faculty Personnel Committee may initiate consideration that a faculty member’s performance is “substantially below the goals and expectations for the Department” as stated in Section VI. B. Goals and Expectations for Tenured Faculty. If the Head initiates consideration, the Faculty Personnel Committee will conduct an independent assessment. The decision of the Faculty Personnel Committee will be determined by a majority secret vote [4 of the 6 Faculty Personnel Committee members]. If the Head and the Faculty Personnel 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 Faculty Tenure Code. 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 Head and Faculty Personnel Committee. The faculty member will then develop a plan of action for discussion, review and approval by the 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. (Section VI. F.)

If the Head and the Faculty Personnel Committee agree that the faculty member’s performance has not improved adequately by the end of the specified time, the Head and the Personnel Committee will request that the Dean initiate a Special Peer Review as specified in Section 7a.3 of the Faculty Tenure Code.

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, it will be conducted by a panel of five tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank. One member may be selected by the individual under review. 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 head of the academic unit 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; d) the faculty member’s performance is so inadequate as to justify salary reductions; e) the faculty member’s performance is so inadequate to recommend the Dean commence formal termination or involuntary leave of absence; or f) 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.

F. Criteria for Post Tenure Review: The Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics annual review process is designed 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 and the University, and to their profession and discipline. The performance evaluation for each faculty member is made relative to her/his individual assignment and responsibilities. The faculty will be evaluated with a holistic approach using historical performance encompassing at a minimum the previous two years of performance evaluations.

Minimum Research and Scholarship Expectations:

Faculty must have documented evidence of research and scholarship through the publication of refereed journal article(s), refereed extension/outreach publication(s), submission of grant application(s), invited or volunteered presentations at scientific meetings, and technology transfer as appropriate.

Faculty must adequately manage their 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.

Faculty must supervise and assist undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or post doctoral associates and ensure that they receive a quality research experience.
Minimum Teaching Expectations:

**Teaching:**

Faculty should teach quality graduate or undergraduate courses in line with the faculty member’s teaching appointment.

Faculty must contribute to curriculum and program development.

Faculty should advise graduate and/or undergraduate students in their academic programs as appropriate.

**Extension:**

Faculty should develop new and/or enhance existing extension programs individually, collaboratively with teams, or through interdisciplinary efforts.

Faculty should provide quality educational programs with supporting materials and resources for clientele using appropriate communication technologies and evaluation methods to assess quality and impacts.

Minimum Service Expectations:

Faculty are expected to provide service to the University community primarily through serving on University, College, and Departmental committees.

Faculty are expected to provide disciplinary-related service through the peer review of scholarly publications; participating on external grant and review panels; editorial services for professional journals; service to professional societies through committee membership and holding office(s); and participates in public engagement activities.
Appendix A: Faculty Tenure Code Section 7.11: See website for complete tenure code at http://www1.umn.edu/regents/policies/humanresources/FacultyTenure.pdf

Appendix B: Policy for Adjunct Faculty Appointments: See website for complete tenure code at http://www1.umn.edu/regents/policies/humanresources/FacultyTenure.pdf

Appendix C: Guidelines and Protocols Adopted by Faculty of the Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics with examples of a Job description and Long-Range Plan

Appendix D: Instructions for Annually Updating Personnel Record

Appendix E: Instructions for Preparing Annual Summary

Appendix F: A Brief Guide to Teaching Evaluation Policies

Appendix G: Department of Agronomy & Plant Genetics - Faculty Personnel Committee

Appendix H: Timeliness Policy pertaining to Personnel Committee Evaluations

Appendix I: Annual Performance Evaluation Guide for use by the Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics Faculty Personnel Committee
Appendix A

Key Sections of the Faculty Tenure policy

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. On the occasion of the birth of that faculty member’s child or adoptive/foster placement of a child with that faculty member; or

2. When the faculty member is a major caregiver for a family member[2] who has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition. A faculty member may use this provision no more than two times; or

3. When the faculty member has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition. The request for extension must be made in writing within one year of the events giving rise to the claim and no later than June 30 preceding the year a final decision would otherwise be made on an appointment with indefinite tenure for that faculty member.

[2] The term “family member” is meant to include a spouse or domestic partner, an adopted or foster child, or other relative.

See website for complete tenure code at: http://www1.umn.edu/regents/policies/humanresources/FacultyTenure.pdf
Appendix B.  

Policy for Adjunct Faculty Appointments  
Approved by the faculty December 18, 1994  

Eligibility:  
All adjunct appointments must be made in concert with Section 3 of the University of Minnesota Regulations concerning Faculty Tenure. (See Subsections 3.3 and 3.4 define types of faculty appointments and describe their limitations at the website for complete tenure code at http://www1.umn.edu/regents/policies/humanresources/FacultyTenure.pdf.)

Rationale for Adjunct Appointments:  
The purpose for appointing adjunct faculty in the Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics is to enhance the quality and strengthen our education and research mission.

Minimum Requirements for Eligibility:  
Professionals are eligible and may be appointed to adjunct status if: (1) they have an appropriate active research program or are conducting cooperative research with current members of the Agronomy and Plant Genetics faculty, or (2) they are qualified to teach approved courses or advise undergraduate or graduate students in the college or department.

Application and Approval Process:  
All adjunct appointments must be approved by the faculty of the department in a regular or special meeting. A formal request for an adjunct appointment must be initiated by a faculty member (sponsor). The process begins with the submission of a current vitae, including a list of publications in the format required for regular faculty. A letter describing the rationale for this appointment and the benefits to both parties should be attached. The candidate will be required to present a seminar or lead a critical topic discussion as a part of the process. All supportive material shall be available for review by the faculty at least one week before the meeting where approval is to be considered. After an appropriate discussion, a vote on the appointment will be taken. Adjunct appointment request require an affirmative vote by two-thirds of all the regular and adjunct voting faculty. The results of a positive vote and the supporting documentation will then be forwarded by the head to the appropriate university administrators for their approval.

Expectations of Adjunct Faculty:  
Adjunct appointments carry rank (Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Full Professor) and provide opportunities to advise students, and/or teach undergraduate or graduate courses, and/or conduct independent or cooperative research, as space and departmental needs dictate. Adjunct faculty are expected to make tangible contributions to the programs of the department and will be expected to document these contributions. This documentation will consist of an up-to-date vitae/personnel record (using the same format as the other faculty); along with an abbreviated annual summary emphasizing specific contributions to the department during the past year. This will be kept on file in the department office. Documentation will be reviewed each year by the Personnel Committee who will bring a recommendation for continuation of the appointment to the faculty. Continuation requires an affirmative vote by two-thirds of the regular and adjunct voting faculty.
Appendix C

Guidelines and Protocols
Adopted by Faculty of the Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics

Department Mission Statement: The collective research, education and outreach programs of the department will continue to be significant components of the University’s, and the College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences (CFANS) initiatives on safe and healthy foods, environment and renewable energy, enhancing agricultural systems, and bioscience and biotechnology. Our programs provide expertise in basic genetics, biotechnology, plant breeding, cropping and agricultural systems, invasive species, and managed landscapes for the continued improvement of current crops, the discovery of useful attributes in plants, and the development of potential new crops and new cropping systems that are environmentally and economically sustainable. Plant breeding, genomics, and agroecology will be important in advancing all of these programs. Our discipline-based programs are all necessary components of multidisciplinary approaches to provide lasting solutions to the complex problems embedded within the initiatives listed above.

Each faculty member will develop a job description and a long-range plan. The long-range plan will be consistent with the mission of the Department and the job description. This effort will be beneficial to strategic planning activities, decision making regarding salaries, accountability, and promotion, and for planning program effort shifts as needs, funding or personnel change.

Job description: The job description will characterize the overall goals of the position, and indicate the percentage of time devoted to each activity, i.e., teaching, extension/outreach, research and service. It should be limited to 10 lines (see attached example). It should be updated by the faculty member as deemed appropriate in conjunction with updating the long-range plan statement.

Long-range plan: The long-range plan will cover teaching, extension/outreach, research and service activities. For new hires, the long-range plan should correspond to the job description used in the employment process. Adjustments to the long-range plan will be made as needed and should be reviewed by the faculty member and the department head at least every five years. At the department head’s discretion, this can be done at the time of the CSREES departmental review or at the time of the Experiment Station research project review. Significant departure from the long-range plan requires faculty input and approval by the department head.

To facilitate change as the position evolves, a step-wise procedure should be followed that includes:

1. Preparation of a revised long-range plan and, if necessary, job description by the faculty member.
2. Distribution of the new job description and long-range plan to the faculty followed by discussion at a faculty meeting. This item applies only to those situations where a major change in long-range goals is contemplated.
3. Review by a faculty committee (when item b. applies) and the department head with feedback to the faculty member.
4. Final approval of proposed changes by department head.
Example

John Doe
Extension Agronomist – Weed Scientist

Appointment: 75% Extension and 25% Research

Job Description:

This is an extension position with an integrated research component. My primary responsibilities are planning and implementing extension programs in weed control in agronomic crops and research on forage crops, pastures and non-cropland weed control. I have primary responsibility for teaching statewide extension programs in forage crops, pasture and non-cropland weed control and for herbicide impacts on water quality. I work with regulatory agencies in herbicide use clearance and on environmental impacts of herbicide use and non-chemical alternatives. My extension clientele include farmers, extension educators, industry personnel, state and federal agency personnel, and the general public affected by my program responsibilities.

Long-Range Plan:

Objectives

1. To develop education and research programs to better understand the impacts of weed control systems on the quality of water resources in Minnesota.

   Research: Increase the understanding of the dissipation of herbicides in Minnesota and the potential environmental impacts of their use. Current work will focus on field and laboratory research to determine the sorption, persistence and behavior of atrazine and alachlor and their metabolites at field use rates and at elevated levels common at point source sites.

   Extension: Develop educational materials and conduct workshops on management practices to minimize herbicide contamination of surface waters, specifically the Minnesota River. A state pesticide management plan will be developed in cooperation with the MDA. This plan will provide the basis to develop Best Management Practices for Minnesota. State Best Management Practices to fulfill US EPA requirements will be developed building on the existing research knowledge based integrated with the ongoing farmer focus group effort on the Minnesota River. My involvement in Whole Farm Planning, the MDA Common Detection Committee, and the MPCA will enhance overall policy development and ensure the needs of Minnesota producers and the general public are considered when resolving environmental issues in agriculture. The Anoka Sand Plain Demonstration
Project will continue as a targeted federally funded effort to reduce the impacts of pest and nutrient practices on ground water resources in a vulnerable geologic site.

2. Develop and gain adoption of weed management systems for use in forage production. These systems will consider environmental, soil conservation, and economic risk management needs of Minnesota agriculture.

   **Research:** Field plot research will determine the impacts of weeds on alfalfa forage quality and persistence under different tillage systems. Herbicide and non-chemical establishment systems will be compared.

   **Extension:** Develop educational materials and conduct learning exercises to gain adoption of environmentally sound, profitable alfalfa establishment techniques by dairy farmers in southeastern Minnesota. This will be coordinated with the Minnesota Forage Expo. A series of Ag. Professional Workshops will be held in the state for in-depth training using a fee-based format. Information on weed management in forage systems will also be presented in the Minnesota Ag. Professional School during the winter meeting circuit.

3. Determine the potential for biological control of Lythrum salicaria (purple loosestrife) in Minnesota with insect and disease agents.

   **Research:** Insects and disease pathogens for biological control of *Lythrum salicaria* will be researched in the field and greenhouse to determine biological control agent adaptation to Minnesota climate and habitat. Impact of the biocontrol agents on *Lythrum* seed production, root carbohydrate levels, and persistence will be determined.

   **Extension:** Participate in the Minnesota DNR sponsored national symposium for wildlife and wetland managers providing information on the biology of purple loosestrife and how that can impact the performance of biological control agents. Work with MDA and DNR personnel to educate land owners on the control needs for purple loosestrife. Educational materials will be developed with the DNR in cooperation with Bernd Blossey at Cornell. Education programs will include presentations to the MDA weed inspectors at their annual meeting.
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Instructions for Annually Updating Personnel Record

Numbers correspond to sections of the outline (following page); do not rearrange the order of these items. Be sure to indicate the date of the most recent updating under the title.

1. Use the percentages for each category from your appointment document as provided.

4. List only those positions held after completion of your Ph.D. degree B unless you held a full-time job in your professional area before you completed your Ph.D.

List each rank you have held at the University of Minnesota as a separate position.

5. List only those organizations in which you hold an active (participating or dues paying) membership.

6. This is a cumulative career list; please indicate in bold face type any new entries for this reporting year.

7. List your significant committee assignments and your role (member, chair, secretary) in chronological order within each subheading. Try to keep this listing at a reasonable length by retaining only significant past committees. Show inclusive dates for assignments that have been completed. Continuing assignments should be indicated by the start date followed by a dash. Indicate in bold face type all new or ongoing entries for this reporting year.

8. Provide appropriate citations for all papers (only published or officially accepted for publication) in each of the categories listed. Indicate in bold face type any new entries for this reporting year.

9. Restrict entries to the most recent five year period. Only list career enhancement activities here. Sabbatical leaves, semester leaves, credit/audit courses, computer skill update courses, public speaking workshops, are appropriate. Attendance at ASA, WSSA, regional research conferences, etc. are not appropriate entries here. Indicate in bold face type any new entries for this reporting year.

10. Restrict entries to the most recent five year period. Indicate in bold face type any new entries for this reporting year. Use the following format for citing these grant entries:

Grant title; Principal investigator followed by other cooperators (list in order of contribution to the grant work); date(s); agency or grant sponsor's name; amount of grant.

11. Place items here which do not clearly fit in other categories. Most faculty will not have items here on a regular basis. (Editorial assignments, consultanthips, etc. are appropriate entries under this category).
PERSONNEL RECORD
(date updated)

1. Name: Rank:
   Appointment: T ___%  R ___%  E ___%  Admin ___%
   Date tenure was received:
   Graduate School Appointment(s) and date(s):

2. Date and Place of Birth:

3. Educational History:
   | Name of Institution | Years | Major | Degree |

4. Professional Positions:
   | Employer | Dates | Position |

5. Professional Organizations and Honor Societies:

6. Honors and Awards and Dates Received:

7. Name and dates of committee and other professional activities:
   Department
   College and Institute
   University and State
   Regional, national, and international
   Other

8. Publications:
   Professional journal articles and other refereed publications
   Chapters in books, reviews, or monographs
   Extension bulletins, folders and fact sheets
   Teaching publications and course syllabi
   Abstracts and proceedings
   Experiment Station publications
   Research reports and articles (non-refereed)
   Popular publications
   Other (computer software developed, videotapes, slide sets, etc.)

9. Professional development activities and dates (past 5 years):

10. Grants:

11. Miscellaneous activities:
Appendix E

Instructions for Preparing Annual Summary

This document is to reflect your effort and activities from October 1st to September 30. It should not exceed four pages in length. Numbers correspond to sections of the outline (following page); do not rearrange the order of these items.

2. Describe your position and activities related to it. This might be an elaboration of your normal job description or it might take the form of a narrative of your responsibilities during the past year. (Your formal job description is the one on your most recent 5 year project review document).

3. Use numbers provided in the PAF slots; estimates are developed from records and your appraisal of your own activity.

4. Provide narrative highlights and analyses that will demonstrate your contributions. Review the Generic Performance Standards for ideas on what to cover. Cite the bold face entries in your updated Personnel Record rather than repeating them here. Include appropriate evaluation summaries and interpretations. You may choose to discuss in detail one outstanding contribution, publication, change of research direction, thesis completed, etc.

Directors of Graduate Studies should report their yearly activity in the teaching section since this activity relates to course program development, advising, etc. related to courses.

The Service section should be reserved for activities (including international activities) that do not directly fit in any of the other categories in this section. Activities in University Senate, Search Committees, Awards Committees, International Advisory Committees, etc., are to be described here. Activity that is related to your specific job or professional area should be covered in the appropriate category above. Advising on-campus international students is not an international activity; report this under teaching.

5. This section is reserved for career enhancement activities only. Limit this to the most important items during the past year. Sabbatical leaves, quarter leaves, audited and/or credit courses taken, computer skill updates, public speaking courses, etc. are items to describe here. Attendance at ASA, WSSA, regional research conferences, etc. are not appropriate entries here.
Abbreviated Annual Summary

The abbreviated annual summary is very useful for the Department Head when meeting with College and Experiment Station administrators; it serves as an effective overview of faculty responsibilities and activities.

The abbreviated annual summary must be limited to the space provided on the form and should not exceed two pages. Significant contributions must be limited to three, and each contribution should be limited to one sentence or phrase.

1. Name: 

2. Brief Statement of Primary Duties or Assignment:

3. Time Allocation on my Personal Action Form (PAF) appointment is:
   T _____%   R _____%   E _____%   Adm _____%
   My Estimate of Actual (total 100%) Time Spent on
   Research _____  Teaching _____  Extension _____  Service _____  Adm _____

4. Contributions:

   Extension

   Research

   Teaching

   Service (Including International Programs)

5. Professional Development:
ABBREVIATED ANNUAL SUMMARY

Name: 
Year 1:

Appointment Date 
Rank

Distribution of Effort:

Teaching: Official Appointment: _____% Personal Estimate: _____%
Primary responsibilities:

Extension/Outreach: Official Appointment: _____% Personal Estimate: _____%
Primary responsibilities:

Research: Official Appointment: _____% Personal Estimate: _____%
Primary responsibilities:

Service: Official Appointment: _____% Personal Estimate: _____%
Primary responsibilities:

Significant Contributions:
(major publications, support grants, redirection of effort, varieties released, appointments, invitations, course or program improvements, etc.)

1 Most recent October 1 to September 30 reporting period.
Publications (number):
- Professional Journals and other Refereed Publications
- Book, Review and/or Monograph Chapters
- Extension Bulletins, Folders, Fact Sheets
- Teaching Publications/Course Syllabi
- PH.D. Theses
- M.S. Theses
- Abstracts and Proceedings
- Experiment Station Publications
- Research Reports (non-refereed)
- Popular Publications
- Other (computer software, videotapes, etc.)

Professional Development:

Honors or awards:

Extension/Teaching Evaluations: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course/Activity</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Distribution: excellent very good good satisfactory fair poor unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Distribution: excellent very good good satisfactory fair poor unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty should also note efforts to improve presentations.

Classroom teachers NOTE: for <instructor> use question #1 pg 32; for <content> use question #6.

Based on: excellent = 7, very good = 6, good = 5, satisfactory = 4, fair = 3, poor = 2, unsatisfactory = 1.
Appendix F

POLICY AND PROTOCOL ON THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The University of Minnesota seeks to achieve teaching of the highest quality so that students and clientele learn to their maximum potential. The evaluation of teaching, either with traditional or non traditional audiences is one way to help ensure excellence in instruction. There are reasons to evaluate instruction including the improvement of instruction, and to provide information for salary and promotion decisions based on merit and faculty tenure decisions. The evaluation of teaching for tenure and promotion decisions should have two major components, peer review and student or clientele evaluation of teaching.

University Policy and Protocol:

Every course with a University course number shall be evaluated by the use of student rating forms every time it is offered, except that thesis-only credits, directed or independent study, internships, and classes with fewer than five students shall not be evaluated using such forms.

The directions for students, written on the student rating forms, should stress the three purposes of the form: evaluation of instructors, improvement of teaching, and assistance to future students in selecting courses.

The student rating forms shall be anonymous.

The teaching performance of all instructors, regardless of their academic rank or tenure status, is subject to evaluation.

For tenured and tenure-track faculty, faculty peers must evaluate course objectives and syllabi, handouts, assignments and tests, theses and dissertations, and examples of graded student work to measure their quality and appropriateness.

Faculty must always be allowed to respond to student rating results when those results are used for performance evaluation; faculty members must be permitted to add written comments to their files.

All student evaluation data used in personnel decisions must be accompanied by the response rates for the data.

Student evaluations used in promotion and salary decisions will be administered at the beginning of a class period, during the last two weeks of instruction for the term. The instructor may give instructions but must not be present while the forms are being completed and collected. Once collected, evaluations will be put in a sealed envelope or box. The instructor must never see completed forms until after grades are turned in.

The full Senate policy adopted in 2006 are available on the web at:
http://www.fpd.finop.umn.edu/groups/senate/documents/policy/instructionevalpolicy.html
Course and Teaching Evaluation Policies
in the
Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics

The primary purpose of course and teaching evaluation is to improve quality of instruction. A secondary purpose is to provide documentation for annual salary and promotion-and-tenure decisions. Methods of evaluation include: course content review by appropriate committee, peer review and student evaluations.

1. Course Content Review

The appropriate undergraduate or graduate committee shall review the proposed outline for a new course before it is submitted to the Curriculum Committee for approval. Once the course becomes a part of the curriculum, the content of the course shall be reviewed by the Educational Management Committee at intervals no longer than every five years. Recommended modifications will be made in writing directly to the instructor.

2. Peer Review

A peer review will take place during the third year of each course offering and no longer than every five years thereafter. For teaching improvement purposes, a single peer review may suffice, but for P&T evaluations, two or more reviewers should be appointed. Colleagues knowledgeable in the field will be asked to provide a written review of teaching, in terms of content, assessment instruments, and effectiveness of instruction. All faculty are expected to participate in the peer evaluation of teaching. Flexibility in timing permits qualified individuals to review classes according to professional interests. Timing and appointment of a peer reviewer will be the responsibility of the instructor in consultation with the appropriate departmental committee. Peer reviewers will attend a sufficient number of classes, a minimum of two, during the term to adequately observe all aspects of teaching. A signed, written review (no longer than two pages) plus an additional observational checklists will be provided to the instructor and the Personnel Committee.

3. Student Evaluation

Student evaluations will be administered according to the policy adopted by the University Senate. Additional questions may be added or an additional questionnaire may be utilized to serve individual instructor’s purposes. Questions pertaining to what a course has meant to a student’s learning and personal and professional development are encouraged. Student evaluations will be obtained every time a course is offered.

Instructors will summarize all information provided by evaluation instruments together with their interpretation of same. They should also include plans for course alteration and improvement when the course is next offered.
For the evaluation of teaching, individuals will be evaluated on the course content, goals and objectives, teaching methodologies and styles, student learner outcomes, role in advising as appropriate. Standards specific to the criteria used for the evaluation of teaching are as follows:

Course content:

- The information presented should be correct, current and professionally credible.
- The course content should be audience appropriate.
- The course content should be consistent with the title, goals and objectives and learner outcomes.

Teaching Materials: Teaching materials include textbooks, readings, workbooks, syllabi, assignments, papers, and grading rubrics.

- These should be appropriate to the level of the course and students.
- These should promote a deeper understanding of the course topic(s).
- These should provide a coherent and logically connected body of knowledge.

Assignments and Learning Activities:

- These activities should facilitate learning.
- Assignments and activities should be graded in a timely manner and provide meaningful feedback to the students.

Curricular Design:

- Courses should undergo periodic re-evaluation with the goals of keeping the course relevant and up-to-date.
- Curriculum should be coordinated, where appropriate, with the related courses and programs in the department, majors and minors, college and university.

Professional Competence:

- Faculty should demonstrate the mastery of the subject matter.
- Faculty should participate in programs to improve and/or reinvigorate teaching activities as appropriate.
Extension Evaluation Policies
in the
Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics

Extension teaching differs from classroom instruction and often includes presentations to diverse clientele and adult learners, participation in short courses and workshops, online educational programs and websites, and preparation of written and electronic media. Criteria used for the evaluation of extension teaching activities is diverse due to the diverse clientele base but must include the evaluation of programs and presentations by audience members.

Participant Evaluations: Evaluations of programs and presenters must be conducted as part of the evaluation of extension teaching activities. As with course evaluations, programs and faculty presenters at Extension/Outreach activities should be evaluated by the participants with the purpose of improving extension teaching activities, for promotion and tenure decisions, and for programmatic guidance.

The participant rating forms will be anonymous.

The extension teaching performance of all faculty, regardless of their academic rank or tenure status, is subject to evaluation.

Faculty must be allowed to respond to participant rating results when those results are used for performance evaluation; faculty members must be permitted to add written comments to their files.

All participant evaluation data used in personnel decisions must be accompanied by the response rates for the data.

For the evaluation of extension teaching, the following criteria will be used to assist in assessing the effectiveness of extension faculty teaching activities:

Standards specific to the criteria used for the evaluation of extension teaching are as follows:

Program Content Standards:
- Program information is timely, accurate, and research-based
- Appropriate content for the audience
- Consistent with the goals of the University of Minnesota Extension

Program Development:
- Considers audience needs and priorities
  - Demonstrated leadership roles in University of Minnesota Extension program area

Program Presentation:
- Effectively communicates information and knowledge
- Appropriate use of program delivery methods
- Serves as major resource person for clientele, media and others

Program Impact:
- Evidence of program knowledge utilization
  - Demonstrated changes in behavior by clientele as a result of extension programming
Professional Competence:
  Utilizes the best available research-based information
  Demonstrates a mastery of the subject materials
  Develops and delivers programs in a timely manner

Extension Teaching Improvement:
  Responds to clientele and peer evaluations
  Participates in workshops and educational programs to improve instructional ability as needed
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Department of Agronomy & Plant Genetics
FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

Committee Composition:

The Faculty Personnel Committee [FPC] shall consist of six faculty members elected from the Associate and Full Professors according to the following categories:

One from Extension [faculty with 50% or more extension appointment]
Five from Faculty at large

Personnel Committee members serve three-year terms with two members elected each year. An individual may be re-elected for a second 3-year term, but then must wait 3 years before again becoming an eligible candidate. Faculty members with primarily administrative appointments outside of the department are ineligible for membership on the FPC.

Election Procedures:

There are no nominations. Each regular tenured and tenure-track faculty member is asked to vote for one person per vacancy within the appropriate category. A majority of the votes is required for election. When a majority vote is not obtained or in the case of ties, a runoff vote is held between the two faculty members receiving the most votes per respective vacancy.

Committee Duties:

1. Develop tenure and/or promotion recommendations; assist the Department Head in preparing a brief written justification of each tenure recommendation for discussion and approval by the voting members of the faculty.

2. Develop and update faculty performance standards and evaluation guidelines and procedures for approval by all members of the faculty.

3. Evaluate the performance of all tenure-track, tenured, and adjunct faculty on an annual basis using the approved guidelines, and review each member’s evaluations in a meeting of the Personnel Committee with the Department Head.

4. Advise the Department Head on personnel matters that do not require the vote of the faculty.

5. Individual members are excused from evaluation and discussion of themselves. All FPC members may participate in the evaluation and discussion of the promotion of an Associate Professor to Professor. Only Full Professors may vote, however, if a vote is taken by the FPC with respect to such promotions.

Approved by the faculty 13 September 2006.
Appendix H

Timeliness Policy
pertaining to
Personnel Committee Evaluations
in the
Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics

In its Faculty Meeting of January 13, 1995, the faculty of the Department voted to adopt a timeliness policy pertaining to merit and promotion evaluations. The policy consisted of three points:

1. Any person whose activity file is not updated by the announced due date will not be evaluated by the Personnel Committee.

2. Any person who is not evaluated by the Personnel Committee will not be considered for salary adjustments for the corresponding period.

3. Any person who is not considered for salary adjustment will receive the minimum salary increase that is required, below which written justification is required.

In the Faculty Meeting of February 10, 1997, and again in the Faculty meeting of March 10, 1997 this policy was re-visited. It was confirmed that the faculty does place a high value on the Personnel Committee’s work, and it was agreed that the Timeliness Policy be upheld.

There was discussion over whether any “penalty” resulting from the Policy was intended to be life-long, or to be only temporary (i.e., lasting only for the corresponding period). It was concluded that all salary adjustments are life-long, and that temporary adjustments are not possible with recurring money. It was recommended however, that the Department Head take steps to implement a strategy to make the penalty as temporary as possible. This recommendation was approved in the March 10, 1997 Faculty Meeting.
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Annual Performance Evaluation Guide

for use by the

Department of Agronomy & Plant Genetics Personnel Committee

Name of faculty member being evaluated

% of appointment / estimated % of time

number of evaluation of performance in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific ways that this person has exceeded expectations:


Specific ways that this person could better meet expectations:


Name of evaluator ____________________________

Approved by the Department Personnel Committee in December, 1992

Provide a numerical evaluation of 1 to 7 based on the following criteria:

7 excellent: exceeds expectations of her/his position in most respects
6 very good: exceeds expectations of her/his position in many respects
5 good: exceeds expectations of her/his position in some respects
4 satisfactory: meets expectations of her/his position
3 fair: fails to meet expectations of her/his position in some respects
2 poor: fails to meet expectations of her/his position in many respects
1 unsatisfactory: fails to meet expectations of her/his position in most respects

The basis for evaluation is the individual and should have no relationship to the performance of other faculty. Use the scale as defined. Use only whole numbers.