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I. Introduction

This is the departmental statement for Food Science and Nutrition required by Section 7.12 of Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. This statement describes with more specificity the indices and standards which will be used to evaluate whether candidates meet the general criteria for tenure in Section 7.11 and for promotion in section 9.2 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. For a complete perspective, Sections 7 and 9 should be considered in their entirety. This departmental statement is also consistent with the Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty.

II. Department Mission

The general mission of this department is described in its Departmental Guidelines and Operating Procedures to which this separate statement required by Section 7.12 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure is on file, and of which it forms a part. The mission is intended to include teaching, research and service as defined in Sections 7.11 and 9.2 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. To be awarded indefinite tenure, a faculty member will be expected to have demonstrated effectiveness in teaching and productivity in research, and also achievement in discipline-related service. The relative emphasis among these endeavors may vary but shall in all cases include teaching and research as broadly defined in Section 7.11 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. Service may be taken into account for any position but not as a substitute for teaching or research. Likewise, the relative emphasis between teaching and research may vary in accordance with position requirements as influenced by the source of funding or other constraints specific to the position, provided such constraints are clearly understood in advance, but both elements shall be present in all cases. Faculty are encouraged to demonstrate creativity 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

III. Criteria, Standards and Procedures for Recommending Contract Continuation and Indefinite Tenure

A. Teaching

The evaluation of teaching is required. Teaching is a complex multifaceted activity, with many components for potential evaluation, and many sources of evaluation. Evaluation efforts should be so managed as to avoid any direct impact on the teaching process, and should be viewed both cumulatively over time and in terms of any trends that may be evident.

Undergraduate and graduate teaching involve managing the process of educational program development and conducting learning experiences, primarily for students enrolled for credit towards a degree. This process also includes advising and mentoring of undergraduate students.

As a check list in this regard, the specific criteria of evaluation addressed in standards for tenure and promotion will include course content, goals and objectives; teaching methods, their effectiveness, and efforts toward improvement; advising and student learning. Recognized sources of evaluative information include students, colleagues, department head, alumni, employers, and self.

1. In Food Science and Nutrition, all members of the department must conduct course and teaching evaluations for all credit bearing courses* and submit an appropriately documented summary of the results for their file or dossier maintained by the Head.

Three major elements are required in this evaluation -- (1) for each class taught, an up-to-date course outline in standard format including student performance objectives, (2) for each class taught, the Faculty Senate mandated questions (“Student Rating of Teaching”) must be used (additional questions or survey instruments may be added at the instructors prerogative), and (3) at least once each year, one form of additional non-student evaluation, such as a classroom visit by a fellow faculty member, administrator or outside expert, use of videotape, or survey of former students or of their employers, a panel of peers and students assessing the overall course, or other similar approaches is required.*

*According to appointment: resident teaching evaluations of extension faculty should be included regardless of the frequency of course offering.

Documentation of participation in professional improvement activities specifically oriented to improvement of teaching skills and abilities is also considered as a factor in the overall evaluation of teaching performance. For the evaluation of student advising, surveys or individual narrative evaluations may be used.
2. Extension teaching involves outreach educational program development and conducting learning experiences for a diversity of audiences and working in partnership with other professionals and/or the community members. Included is a wide array of activities such as group or one-on-one presentations, and information dissemination through publications, audio-visual materials, and other electronic products. Mechanisms at the department level for evaluating teaching of this kind are parallel to those for resident instruction but less specific. The specific evaluation criteria addressed in standards for tenure and promotion will include effectiveness in educational needs assessment, program development, teaching methods and materials and their effectiveness, effective partnership/relationships with community stakeholders and clientele learning. Recognized sources of evaluative information include colleagues, clientele, department head, administrators, and self.

The annual plan of work serves in lieu of choosing one course and providing an outline in standard format. No one universal but flexible system is as yet available for securing clientele input, but a variety of survey forms are used, both directly by extension faculty and by field staff or persons in analogous positions, the results of which are placed on file. Input in the form of an annual appraisal letter is secured from the relevant program administrators, as well as from field staff or others and from peer colleagues on a voluntary or requested basis. A summary of results is provided in the form of an annually updated resume and achievement record. If the latter is included in terse resume format, it may be accompanied by a narrative memorandum enlarging upon specific programmatic events and the individual's role in them.

When referring to student evaluation of teaching of credit or non-credit courses, a number of questions are required by the Faculty Senate. The responses to all the required questions will be considered in performance standards for promotion and tenure.

3. The Department of Food Science and Nutrition values both graduate and undergraduate advising as an essential aspect of student education and as an independently recognized faculty activity. Not every faculty member should or needs to be involved in undergraduate advising, but for those who are, the commitment of time will be substantial and effectiveness in advising is expected. For those faculty who participate in the academic advising process and advise undergraduates in a substantive way, the Department will recognize and reward efforts and effectiveness.

Advising and mentoring of undergraduate students is an integral part of the student experience. Evidence of commitment to advising includes (but is not limited to): advising students on degree requirements and professional development, participation in College advising workshops and update meetings, orientation and registration advising each semester, participation in UROP or summer research programs, involvement in internship placements or programs, meeting with prospective students, and talking to potential students at high schools and colleges. For those faculty who are involved in undergraduate advising in a significant way, an evaluation system will be used to demonstrate effectiveness and to identify ways to improve the advising process.
B. Research

All academic faculty, regardless of appointment, are expected to conduct scholarly activities that bring distinction to themselves and to their department. Scholarly activity is given the broadest interpretation and should include the advising of graduate students. In addition to traditional scientific research, scholarship will include all activities ranging from contributing to the development of new knowledge to the novel dissemination of existing knowledge and the methodologies used in extending this information. This includes interdisciplinary scholarly activity, where appropriate. 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 other appropriate means.

Individual creative effort should be known by distinguished outside experts in the candidate’s field of expertise, and evaluated by them. The faculty member under review for tenure and promotion should suggest a list of such outside reviewers to the Head. The Head should verify that such contracts are appropriate and consult with others to assure inclusion of reviews by experts from peer institutions. Such effort should also be analyzed thoroughly by faculty peers at the department or unit level.

Supporting material, including lists of publications and peer evaluations, should be solicited in such a way as to make them useful within the department in arriving at a recommendation, as well as in providing written documentation when transmitting that recommendation.

Where faculty publish original research in refereed journals, such publications should be listed separately from abstracts, invited talks or popular articles in any lists of publications. However, participation in professional programs through presentations of papers is in itself a criterion which belongs among those used to judge the competence of the individual in research.

Publications are weighted by the individual's contribution to authorship (not necessarily related to order of author listing and thus, the nature and extent of contribution to each collaborative publication must be provided) and by relationship of research to teaching in the individual's appointment and mission, as indicated earlier in discussing the departmental mission. In addition to the papers in refereed journals or monographs, annual meeting abstracts, invited talks and popular articles referred to earlier, book reviews, review articles, software, patents and other forms of “publication” are also considered, with weighting appropriate to the medium involved and any basis for evaluation that may be available.

On a more qualitative basis but still in terms of specific criteria, research and scholarship are considered in terms of imagination (new departure vs. routine follow-up), significance (generating new theory, contributing to understanding of an important principle, or other wide-ranging implication), pertinence (focuses on state, national or international needs and/or advances the mission of the department and the university); soundness (adequate experimental design with proper controls, sample sizes, statistical analysis), sophistication (unique technical
skill or depth of understanding), and interdisciplinary or intercultural cooperativeness (with other scholars, or community partners where appropriate).

Persistence and success in efforts to secure outside funding for research represent still further criteria which overlap and may integrate with some of those already listed.

The major sources of evaluative information relative to the foregoing criteria are (1) a comprehensive resume which includes listing of publications in various classifications and of applications for and awards of research funding, in addition to other personal and professional data, and (2) solicited disciplinary peer evaluations. The resume may be supplemented by a narrative statement explaining how the listed accomplishments advance scholarship and mission, detailing improvement activities and describing anticipated future contributions.

Disciplinary peer evaluations, as mentioned briefly earlier, will be solicited by the department head in such a way as to (1) cover various aspects of the candidate's scholarly activities, utilizing respondents nominated by the candidate as well as others, (2) allow respondents to limit their evaluations to that with which they are already familiar or are willing to study, (3) encourage respondents to provide an objective appraisal rather than support, and (4) make the resulting appraisals available to departmental peers prior to discussion or arrival at a decision about what tenure or promotion recommendations to make. All appraisals solicited and actually provided must be sent to department peers and included with any recommendation which is forwarded.

Evaluation of research accomplishments and scholarly achievements of extension specialists in Food Science and Nutrition includes directing the same attention to research and writing as is done with others not having a specific extension mission, with the same regard for the relative weight of research vs. teaching as would be applied to others, and modified only by any differences which may be appropriate in (1) the media of publication and (2) how peer review and approval are evidenced. In this context, "research" means the production and communication of research and scholarly information which may be published in disciplinary refereed journals but may also be represented by other means of dissemination of results, and "professional distinction" is characterized by the broad acceptance and use of such research and educational efforts by peer professionals outside the University as well as inside it, and outside of Minnesota as well as inside it.

Where extension specialists are concerned, scholarly work developed through interactions with communities, thoughtful and creative combination and use of the research results of others into new and/or novel and useful applications, and the skillful and non-repetitive use of demonstration research characterize professional distinction in research and writing. Use of Minnesota extension programs or publications by extension professionals in other states would be one effective form of peer approval.

C. Service
Service in the context of tenure and promotion means service which is related to the individual's disciplinary or academic expertise and the departmental mission and is rendered to professional organizations, learned societies, state and federal agencies, and the community (including individuals, groups or the whole), nationally or internationally. Consulting outside the University on an individual basis also falls in this category, as indicated earlier, as is participation in the governance of the University or its constituent units, including the department.

Sources of evaluative information include (1) the fact and extent (time commitment, documents prepared, impact on Dept/College/University policies etc/involvement of service on committees or task forces of the department, a college, the Experiment Station, Extension Service, or the University, or service on regional, national or international boards or committees; or membership or offices held in professional or scientific societies, including their editorial review boards; or other professionally related service to the community; and (2) the evaluation thereof, as evidenced by appraisals having objectivity and credibility appropriate to the weight to be given to the activity.

D. Standards for probationary appointment as Assistant Professor

1. Doctoral degree in appropriate field conferred;
2. Evidence of interest in teaching, and capability and potential (which may be indirect, based on activities as a student and the appraisal thereof), or actual performance as instructor in a setting comparable to that of the position to be filled;
3. Evidence of interest in research, and capability and/or potential (which may be based on activities as a student and appraisal thereof), or actual performance in terms of fully independent research successfully published in appropriate refereed journals; and
4. Additional requirements as approved/determined for the particular position.
E. Performance standards for tenure

Teaching/Advising

1. Evaluation report prepared and submitted regularly in accordance with department requirements (See III A above for departmental requirements.)

2. Equal or exceed departmental expectations in teaching credit courses and/or for teaching in non-credit settings. Trajectory of improvement in student ratings of teaching is considered;

3. Favorable narrative appraisals from persons of credibility, including administrators, peers, advisees, students, former students or their employers, or others as appropriate;

4. Evidence of participation in organized teaching improvement workshops or comparable activities; evidence of course development, substantial improvement in existing courses and/or curriculum development;

5. Self analysis indicating understanding of issues and ideas for improvement if/as needed; and

6. For those faculty who have responsibilities for undergraduate advising, evidence of participation in workshops and summary data on advising activities, students advised, and other advising-related responsibilities; data or appraisals from students and others on the effectiveness of advising and a self analysis of advising effectiveness.

Research (Level of appointment will be considered with respect to research productivity.)

7. Membership in graduate faculty/faculties.

8. A number of advisees with M.S. or Ph.D. degree requirements completed; supervision of Postdoctoral students will also be considered.

9. A significant number of refereed papers published or in press (beyond PhD thesis and postdoctoral training and papers based directly thereon) in relevant journals as senior author or research director. The tenured faculty shall consider quality and the nature of candidate’s contribution to publications from collaborative work as well as the number of papers published;

10. Evidence of appropriate research grant application activity with success in securing at least one grant involving significant (≥ 50% of salary) extramural support;

11. Evidence of interest and capability to engage in cooperative or collaborative research through clusters, University Centers, external centers and interdisciplinary grants; and
12. Six or more letters of evaluation from persons of credibility (i.e., have direct knowledge and established scholarly expertise in the research field of the candidate) outside the University indicating originality of research and rating it favorably or as comparable to that of successful tenure candidates in comparable institutions. Consistent with Section 12 of the Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty, at least four, and no more than half, of the external reviews must come from individuals with no direct professional or personal interest in the advancement of the candidate.

F. Evaluation Process

1. Review of Probationary Faculty

Each year a probationary faculty member will submit to the Head an updated curriculum vitae, which will contain documentation of the faculty member’s teaching, research, and service activities as related to the above (additional documents i.e. a summary of teaching evaluations, peer reviews of teaching and self analysis may also be attached). The Head will distribute these documents to the tenured faculty of the Department at least two weeks prior to a meeting of the tenured faculty for their review. At the meeting, the performance of the probationary faculty member will be discussed, with the Head leading the process. As a group, a draft of the narrative for the President’s Form 12 (PF 12) prepared by the Head prior to the meeting will be discussed and agreed upon. Two faculty will be appointed to act as Tellers to collect and count the ballots including any absentee ballots. There will then be an anonymous written vote on the question of whether to give the probationary faculty member notice of termination. This vote is recorded on the PF 12. Tenured faculty unable to attend the meeting will be able to cast an absentee ballot prior to the meeting. The Head will keep note of all those present voting, those who cast absentee ballots and those who did not vote. While all eligible faculty are expected to vote, a minimum of 90% of the eligible faculty will constitute a quorum. The Head will then finalize the PF 12 statement after the meeting, circulate it to all appropriate faculty for further input or corrections and then complete the finished P12 document. After this, the Head will schedule a meeting with the probationary faculty member to discuss the PF 12. The above is to be done in accordance with sections 7.11 and 7.12 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. Also, if the tenure clock has been stopped (as specified in 5.5 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure) this should be documented in the probationary faculty member’s record.

2. Process for Recommending Tenure. (The following procedures expand the Procedures for Evaluating Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty for this unit.)

To be considered for Indefinite Tenure the faculty member must assemble a dossier documenting contributions to teaching, research and service as related to the above. This dossier will consist of:
a. An updated CV. The CV should be comprised of the following: (1) a list of research publications by category with indication of the degree of involvement in each paper and separating out those papers done at the prior institution from those at Minnesota also separate out those submitted and those accepted but not yet published, (2) a list of book chapters and a list of other types of relevant papers again separating out those done prior to work at Minnesota and the other criteria as for refereed research papers, (3) a list of published abstracts, a list of journal articles reviewed, (4) a list of grants applied for separating out those not funded from those received with indication of degree of involvement in the grant process and the level of funding obtained, (5) a list of courses taught with number of students and indication of % of course lectures and % of mechanics, (6) a list of MS and Ph.D. students separated by being major professor from co-adviser, by completed vs in progress and listing the students major program area and title of research thesis area. For those in progress an estimate of projected data of completion should be made (7) a list of presentations made, separating out by those at the U of M, those at scientific meetings and those invited to give externally, (8) a list of professional society involvement, a list of university committee involvement separated by department, college and university, (9) a list of professional development courses/seminars attended separated by teaching, research and management, (10) a list of any other aspects of public engagement deemed appropriate and (11) any other materials deemed appropriate.

b. A statement of the faculty member’s teaching, research and service philosophies

c. A summary table of teaching (resident and/or extension) evaluations

d. At least two representative peer reviewed research publications completed since coming to the University of Minnesota as a faculty member

e. Copies of PF 12 supplied by the Head

f. If appropriate extension publications done since coming to the University of Minnesota as a faculty member

g. Six to eight letters of evaluation from individuals external to the University of Minnesota will be requested by the Head (this letter of request should also be included). The individuals doing these evaluations will be supplied items a, b, c, and d above. External evaluators should be prominent individuals (a document containing short statements of who these individuals are, is to be included) in the faculty member’s area of activity. Graduate or post-doctoral supervisors as well as close personal friends (if known) should not be considered.

h. Other documents the faculty member may wish to include.
The Head will distribute the dossier to the tenured faculty at least two weeks prior to a meeting of the faculty. After discussion an anonymous vote will be taken on whether to grant or not grant indefinite tenure. Faculty unable to attend the meeting can cast an absentee ballot prior to the meeting. The Head will keep note of all those present voting, those who cast absentee ballots and those who did not vote. While all eligible faculty are expected to vote, a minimum of 90% of the eligible faculty will constitute a quorum. After the meeting the Head will draft a letter which summarizes the discussion. This letter will then be distributed to the tenured faculty for their comments. Comments are then incorporated into the final letter which becomes part of the dossier as it moves forward. The above is to be done in accordance the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure in particular with sections 7.11 and 7.12 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. If the tenure clock had been stopped (as specified in 5.5 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure) this should be documented. The voting process as outlined in F1 above including the Teller process will be followed.

IV. Criteria, Standards and Procedures for Recommending Promotion

A. Performance standards for promotion to Assistant Professor

Applicable only in the case of a recommended candidate meeting all approved search and hiring requirements for appointment as Assistant Professor except conferring of the doctoral degree or completion of all requirements for it. Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor shall occur upon receipt of satisfactory evidence that the degree has been conferred or that all requirements for it have been completed.

B. Performance standards for promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor has the same criteria as those appropriate for the granting of tenure and is usually decided upon immediately following a positive decision on the vote for tenure. All Associate Professors and Full Professors participate in this vote. If unable to attend the meeting, a faculty member may cast an absentee ballot. While all eligible faculty are expected to vote, a minimum of 90% of the eligible faculty will constitute a quorum. The above is to be done in accordance the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure in particular with sections 7.11 and 7.12 of the Faculty Tenure policy. If the tenure clock had been stopped for a specified period (as outlined in 5.5 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure), this should be documented. The voting process as outlined in F1 above including the Teller process will be followed.

C. Performance standards for promotion to Professor (Section 9.2, Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure)
1. Meet and exceed performance standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, as stated in Section 9.2 of the Faculty Tenure policy (which includes adding to one’s academic record significantly and establishing a national and international reputation):

Teaching/Advising

2. Equal or exceed departmental expectations in teaching credit courses and/or for teaching in non-credit settings.

3. Evidence of continued and substantive evaluation and innovation in teaching; activities may include participation in workshops, seminars or equivalent activities on teaching effectiveness, or other outside or campus recognition of superior teaching performance; and

4. For those faculty who have responsibilities in undergraduate advising, evidence of substantive participation in advising workshops and favorable evaluation of advising effectiveness.

Research (Level of appointment will be considered with respect to research productivity.)

5. Membership in graduate faculty/faculties;

6. Where research time and mission are judged by peers to permit, a minimum of two advisees with Ph. D. degree requirements completed;

7. Significant additional peer reviewed research papers published or in press in relevant journals as senior author or research director, or the equivalent in scholarly achievement as judged by peers and discussed earlier under Criteria for Tenure: Research; One of these may be a significant review paper that is peer reviewed;

8. Continued success in securing extramural funding;

9. Except where judged clearly unnecessary or inappropriate by peers, evidence of substantive engagement in cooperative or collaborative research;

10. Six or more new appraisal letters requested by the Head from persons of appropriate credibility outside the University which clearly indicates national and/or international visibility and stature in research and external service of the faculty member.

Process for Recommending Promotion to Professor (Refer to the Procedure for Evaluating Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty)
To be considered for promotion to Professor the faculty member must assemble a dossier documenting contributions to teaching, research and service as related to 1 through 10 above. This dossier will consist of:

i. An updated CV done in accordance with F2 a above;

j. A statement of the faculty member’s teaching, research and service philosophies;

k. A summary table of teaching (resident and/or extension) evaluations;

l. At least two representative major research publications which establishes substantive accomplishments and scientific advancements in a defined field of research;

If appropriate extension publications and;

m. A listing of service or administrative accomplishments

n. Six to eight letters of evaluation from individuals external to the University of Minnesota will be requested by the Head (this letter of request should also be included). The individuals doing these evaluations will be supplied items a, b, c, d and e above. External evaluators should be prominent individuals (a document containing short statements of who these individuals are should be included) in the faculty member’s area of activity. Graduate or post-doctoral supervisors as well as close personal friends (if known) should not be considered.

o. Other documents the faculty member may wish to include.

The Head will distribute the dossier of the candidate to the faculty at least two weeks prior to a meeting of the faculty. After discussion an anonymous vote will be taken on whether to promote to Professor. The anonymous written ballot voting process as outlined in F1 above including the Teller process will be followed. Professors unable to attend the meeting can cast an absentee prior to the meeting. While all eligible faculty are expected to vote, a minimum of 90% of the eligible faculty will constitute a quorum. After the meeting the Head will draft a letter which summarizes the discussion and includes the outcome of the vote. This letter will then be distributed to the Professors on the faculty for their comment. Comments are then incorporated into the final letter which becomes part of the dossier as it moves forward. The above is done in accordance with the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure in particular 9.2.

VI. Criteria, Standards and Procedures for Conducting Post Tenure Review
(Section 7a. Annual review of Faculty)

Intent of Departmental Post-Tenure Evaluation:

1. The process is intended to be constructive and enable improvement of faculty performance. It will be initiated only when unacceptable faculty performance and productivity are
identified by the Head relative to criteria presented in the departmental guidelines required by Section 7.12 of Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure.

2. The identity of the faculty member undergoing Post-Tenure Review and all performance documentation will remain confidential to the extent possible. However, if any aspect does become known, the review process will not be discontinued.

**Goals and Expectations for All Faculty Members and Guidelines for Post-Tenure Evaluation:**

1. Criteria for assessing faculty performance will be those presented in the Guidelines for Department of Food Science and Nutrition Required by Section 7.12 of Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure, latest revision.

2. Post-Tenure Review procedures and policies will follow/ conform with those of the University of Minnesota presented in: 1) Rules and Procedures for Annual and Special Post-Tenure Review, Revised by the Tenure Subcommittee, March 5, 1998; and 2) Regents’ Policy on Faculty Tenure: Specified Units, Section 7a. Review of Faculty Performance, approved by Faculty Senate, January 23, 1997.

**Post-Tenure Review Committee:**

1. Will consist of three elected members of the tenured full professors Food Science and Nutrition faculty. Elected committee members will serve staggered 3-year terms.

2. A replacement for the Committee member whose term has been completed will be elected during the second semester (May) of each year by tenure-track and tenured faculty members. The term will begin immediately upon election. The Department Head is not eligible to serve.

3. The Committee member whose term has been completed will serve as an alternate for one additional year. The alternate will replace any P-T Review Committee member who is undergoing Post-Tenure Review.

**Procedure for Departmental Post-Tenure Evaluation:**

1. The annual performance review of the individual faculty member with the Head is the initial and reoccurring control point in the departmental review process. Goals and actions of the individual faculty member for each year are agreed upon and documented. These are used by the Head to assess performance at the following year’s performance review.

2. If the Head determines that there was acceptable performance in the past year, then goals and actions are agreed upon for the next year and the cycle repeats. However, if unacceptable performance/ “substantially below the goals and expectations of the department” is determined for the past year, then the Head informs the individual faculty member and the Post-Tenure (P-T) Review Committee in writing of the performance issues. The faculty
member has an opportunity to provide a written response to the P-T Review Committee and the Head. The P-T Review Committee reviews performance documentation and meets with the Head within two weeks of notification of the Committee. If the P-T Committee disagrees with the Head (performance is acceptable), then goals and expectations are agreed upon by the Head and faculty member and documented for the "next year's" performance review. If the P-T Review Committee agrees (at least two of the committee members) with the Head as to unacceptable performance, then a letter signed by the Head and P-T Review Committee Chair is sent to the faculty member specifying deficiencies, as well as how and by what date(s) the identified issues should be addressed. The time period for making improvements in performance will be at least one year. The Head will also appoint a confidential Peer Mentoring Team to assist the faculty member with achieving performance improvement goals including support for training. The Peer Mentoring Team working in consultation with the P-T Review Committee will meet with the faculty member within two weeks of forming the Team and on a regular basis thereafter as appropriate.

3. If the Head determines that there was acceptable performance in the past year, then goals and actions are revised for the year ahead and the annual performance review cycle repeats. However, if unacceptable performance is determined by the Head for the minimum one-year of the performance improvement, the Head informs the P-T Review Committee. The P-T Review Committee reviews the performance documentation within two weeks. The Head and P-T Review Committee need to concur on the sub-standard performance before informing the individual faculty member. If the Committee concurs (at least two of the committee members) the Head informs the faculty member of the determination of sub-standard performance. The head informs the faculty member and the P-T Review Committee that a Special Peer Review is recommended. The Head sends the Special Peer Review request to the Dean. The Special Peer Review Request is to be in the form of a letter stating the P-T Review Committee findings and a copy of the documents reviewed. If the P-T Review Committee does not agree with the Head’s decision to recommend a Special Peer Review, then the P-T Review process ends and the annual performance review of the individual faculty member with the Head continues.
Appendix A – Section 7.11 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure

Section 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.
Appendix B - Section 9.2 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure

9.2 Criteria for Promotion to Professor. The basis for promotion to the rank of professor is the determination that each candidate has (1) demonstrated the intellectual distinction and academic integrity expected of all faculty members, (2) added substantially to an already distinguished record of academic achievement, and (3) established the national or international reputation (or both) ordinarily resulting from such distinction and achievement [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.
Appendix C - Section 5.5 of the Regents Policy on Faculty 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.