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I. INTRODUCTION

Tenured or tenure-track faculty are employed to fulfill the stated mission of the Department of Fisheries, Wildlife and Conservation Biology in teaching, research and service in the context of a land-grant university. This document sets forth the policies, procedures and criteria for the following personnel evaluations:

A. Recommendation for awarding indefinite tenure according to Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure (University of Minnesota, hereafter referred to as Faculty Tenure), Section 7.11. General Criteria (See Appendix A.)

B. Recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor. (See Section 9.2 of Faculty Tenure: Criteria for Promotion to Professor in Appendix B.)

C. Annual performance appraisal of progress toward achieving tenure.

D. Annual performance appraisal for post-tenure review according to section 7a.1 and 7a.2 of the Faculty Tenure.

For a complete perspective, the reader is advised to review Sections 7 and 9 of Faculty Tenure in its entirety (Available at http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/faculty/promotion.html. Section 7.12 is provided in Appendix C. 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. MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Department of Fisheries, Wildlife and Conservation Biology is to acquire and apply scientific knowledge about animals, their natural habitats, and their importance to people, and to share this knowledge with students, scientists, resource managers, and the general public.

To achieve this mission, faculty members will:
1) provide high quality programs at the undergraduate, master's degree and doctoral degree levels for students desiring to broaden their scientific knowledge or to enter the professional disciplines of fisheries, wildlife or conservation biology;
2) conduct innovative basic and applied research;
3) provide extension programs to a diverse public, and service to appropriate agencies in natural resource management, where the unique expertise of the faculty, staff, and facilities can serve the state; and
4) work with regional, national, and international organizations and agencies that share similar interests and goals for the development and application of research technology to significant problems and issues.

In all Department endeavors, faculty members are encouraged to demonstrate inquiry, creativity, attention to questions of diversity, and innovation through interdisciplinary and intercultural scholarship and teaching. Collaboration, interaction and education across a wide range of diverse ethnic and cultural perspectives contribute to the breadth and quality of academic work and represent core values of the University of Minnesota.

III. ANNUAL REVIEW OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

The Department Head will lead an evaluation of the progress of probationary faculty annually relative to Sections 7.11 and 7.12 of Faculty Tenure as well as this 7.12 statement for scholarly achievement, teaching, and service. The tenured faculty members will conduct this evaluation of each probationary faculty member and a secret ballot to determine continuation or termination of the probationary appointment will be taken.

The Department Head will appoint a mentoring committee in the first year for each probationary tenure-track faculty member to guide the individual in the planning and review of his or her Promotion and Tenure documents and process. The committee will include three members of the tenured faculty who represent the breadth of the department as well as key areas related to the probationary faculty member’s areas of interest. The objectives of this mentoring committee are to review official tenure documents and provide timely feedback prior to submission; support the Department Head in organizing faculty discussion of the documents; and assist the Department Head in writing Annual Appraisal of Probationary Faculty Report (President’s Form 12).

The Department Head will provide a list of guideposts describing productivity and achievements of a typical assistant professor. These guideposts will not apply to all probationary faculty members and should be interpreted as advisory rather than prescriptive. The mentoring committee will aid in interpretation of the guideposts for tenure presented in this document.

At the midpoint of the probationary period, typically year three, the faculty member and Department Head will assemble a dossier that documents the faculty member’s professional progress. Documentation will be similar to that required for the promotion and tenure review except evaluation letters by persons in the department, University, and outside the University will not be required. The dossier will include a personal statement of research, teaching and outreach, current CV, summaries of the previous annual activity reports and teaching evaluations, and sample publications. The mentoring committee will meet with the faculty member before submission to discuss dossier
preparation. They will meet again after the tenured faculty members have reviewed the mid-probation dossier to consider recommendations to the probationary faculty member on where he or she should focus their efforts to successfully obtain tenure.

Following the midpoint meeting of tenured faculty, the Department Head will prepare an evaluation report covering both the comments of the tenured faculty and the Head’s own comments. As appropriate, this document will cover assessment of: 1) views on effectiveness in teaching, 2) distinction in research, 3) effectiveness in extension and outreach, 4) service, 5) an evaluation by the Department Head of the balance between the effort the faculty member is spending on research, teaching, and extension responsibilities, and 6) suggestions for improvement in performance or for a change in emphasis of time and effort.

Following each annual and mid-point evaluation, the Department Head will meet with the probationary faculty member, discuss his or her progress toward achieving tenure and report on the meeting of the tenured faculty and their recommendations, if any. The candidate will be shown a copy of the Annual Appraisal of Probationary Faculty Report (Form 12), which contains the major elements to be discussed between the faculty member and the Department Head. The Department Head will place the Report and a written summary of any additional matters discussed in the faculty member's file.

When considering the record of a probationary faculty member who has extended the probationary period, criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than criteria for those who do not have an extension to the tenure clock. That is, a record of 6 years post-hiring with a one-year stopping of the clock must be considered the same way that one considers a record of 5 years post-hiring with no stopping of the clock. Details concerning the University policy on the timing of promotion and tenure may be found in Section 5.5 of the Faculty Tenure policy, available at http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/faculty/promotion.html.

Review and voting procedures for probationary faculty members with appointments in more than one unit should be established at the time of hiring and specifically delineated in their letter of appointment.

IV. CONFERRAL OF INDEFINITE TENURE

Criteria for tenure are given in Section 7.11 of the Faculty Tenure policy. The standards and indices listed below will be used to determine whether criteria have been met.

To be awarded tenure, a faculty member will be expected to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching, a distinguished record of research and effective contributions to service. The department recognizes faculty members may have appointments of varying percentages assigned to expectations in effort devoted to teaching, research, and service. Because of this diversity of effort within the department, the evaluation of each faculty member will vary according to his or her appointment. Section 7.11 of the Faculty Tenure policy specifically includes extension and outreach as one facet of teaching.
Individuals with appointments in more than one unit will be given consideration appropriate to the percentage weighting of the appointment. This weighting and protocol for the tenure decision should be clearly defined in writing in the individual’s appointment letter and any subsequent revisions to the original appointment.

A. Effectiveness in Teaching

Teaching includes undergraduate and graduate instruction, student advising, course development and extension and outreach.

Conferral of tenure will require achieving demonstrated effectiveness in teaching. Policy and Protocol on the Evaluation of Instruction adopted by the Faculty Senate (May 4, 2006) will guide student evaluation of teaching (Available at http://www.fpd.finop.umn.edu/groups/senate/documents/policy/instructionevalpolicy.htm). The effectiveness of teaching is assessed with all available sources. Evidence and documentation should include: peer evaluations, student evaluations, effectiveness and progress in program and course development, advising students, successful completion of graduate advisees, devising and improving learning experiences, planning and perfecting new teaching techniques, implementing methods for evaluation of teaching efforts and accomplishments, awards and special recognition for teaching and invited presentations of education-based papers.

The evaluation of teaching within the Department of Fisheries, Wildlife and Conservation Biology will be performed according to the University of Minnesota policy: Evaluation of Teaching: (Available at http://policy.umn.edu/groups/senate/documents/policy/teachingevaluation_pol.cfm) and the Department’s Protocols for Student Evaluation and Peer Review of Faculty Teaching Contributions adopted 18 May 1994 (Appendix D.).

Extension and outreach include program and content delivery designed to reach a diverse array of professional and citizen audiences. Faculty members with Extension appointments conduct and interpret research in response to local, state, regional, national and/or international needs.

Conferral of tenure for faculty with appointments in Extension will require achieving effectiveness in extension and outreach. Assessment of effectiveness in extension and outreach will be based on peer review, participant surveys and publications. The candidate’s contribution to extension and outreach will be evaluated through letters from authorities in the field as well as people with whom the candidate has worked in extension and outreach efforts.

Examples of extension and outreach include: presentation of off-campus credit courses, non-credit courses, workshops, public programs, k-12 programs, continuing education,
and distance learning programs; extension publications and websites; the provision of expert information, including consulting and legal testimony; service to technical, professional groups and agencies that results in extending expertise of the university into government or non-governmental organization or policy or function; and mass media exposure of research, teaching, and extension.

B. Demonstrated Scholarly Achievement

Research includes the generation and dissemination of new knowledge that is related to the academic discipline of the individual or related interdisciplinary work and furthers the mission of the department. To demonstrate scholarly achievement, candidates are expected to develop an active and funded research program involving graduate, undergraduate or postdoctoral students, which results in quality publications.

Letters from authorities in the candidate’s field must assess the candidate’s contribution and distinction in research.

Primary evidence of scholarly achievement or distinction in research is publication in high quality, peer-reviewed professional journals, books, and/or book chapters. Impact factors, citation indices, and descriptions of journals and publications may be part of the primary evidence for quality. Primary evidence of scholarly achievement may also include successful acquisition of peer-reviewed grants. Secondary evidence is non-refereed publications and reports; and participation on regional, national, and international research advisory committees. Additional documentation may include evidence of problem identification; literature surveys; data collection and analysis; interpreting and reporting research results; peer reviews and evaluations; a list of current research projects; indications of invited presentations of research-based papers delivered to scientific audiences; activities in regional, national, and international research projects; requests to review research proposals and publications; and editorial responsibilities, honors, awards, and citations where selection is based on recognition of the individual's scholarly achievements.

C. Contribution in Service

Service includes those endeavors that contribute to the mission of the university or are related to the academic discipline of the individual and further the mission of the department.

Evidence of service may include work on departmental, college, and university committees; participation in committees and offices held in professional societies; editorial responsibilities; organizing symposia; membership in honor societies; honors, awards, and citations for service; recurring and nonrecurring professional commitments; participation in study leaves, workshops, and staff development offerings; public engagement related to the departmental mission and not considered teaching; and service to regional, national, and international organizations and agencies.

The department does not establish quantitative criteria for conferral of tenure and notes that while a modest level of service is expected of probationary faculty, service alone,
without a distinguished record of teaching and scholarly research, is an insufficient basis to award tenure.

D. Procedures for Conferring Tenure

1. Timing

Designation of the time for considering tenure for individual faculty members is the responsibility of the Department Head. The faculty member may initiate the tenure and promotion procedure by requesting such from the Department Head. Guidelines for the time at which action can or must be taken are in the Faculty Tenure policy. The maximum period of probationary service of a faculty member is normally six academic years. The University credits individuals for one year of service for every year of prior service at accredited institutions to a maximum of three years unless other arrangements have been agreed upon (See Faculty Tenure Section 5.4 for details. Available at http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/faculty/promotion.html).

2. Documentation

The candidate for tenure will assist the Department Head in assembling a dossier that documents the candidate's professional progress during his/her current and previous appointments. The dossier comprises documentation of the research, teaching, extension/outreach, and service listed under the section on criteria (Section III) above. The candidate may add any materials he/she considers relevant. Relevant information must not be excluded from the file, but the weight to be given to the views of any particular external reviewer, internal evaluator, or student is a matter to be considered by the decision-making bodies.

The dossier must contain a minimum of 7 and a maximum of 10 letters of evaluation of the candidate's teaching, research, extension/outreach, and service by persons inside and outside the University with at least one inside and outside the university being nominated by the candidate. The candidate may recommend additional evaluators, but the final choice of the evaluators is the responsibility of the Department Head. At least half, and no fewer than 4, of the external reviews must be obtained from individuals with no direct professional or personal interest in the advancement of the candidate's career (for example, they should not be former advisors, mentors, co-authors, or co-investigators on previous work). In the case of extension specialists, the Department Head must confer with or request performance information from appropriate extension administrators.

3. Voting Eligibility

All academic faculty holding tenured appointments in the department shall have the right to vote on tenure recommendations. Those tenured faculty members who are senior in rank to the candidate may vote on promotion recommendations. A copy of the candidate's dossier will be available to each voting faculty member and the Department Head will subsequently call a meeting subsequently for discussion of the recommendations.
Persons who are or were closely related to a candidate, or who have or have had an intimate personal relationship with a candidate, must not attend or participate in the meeting where that candidate is being considered. If the candidate (or another member of the tenured faculty) wishes to challenge the participation of any member of the tenured faculty, that challenge must be made in writing to the challenged faculty member and to the department head at least two weeks before the scheduled tenure meeting, stating the reasons for the challenge and setting forth the relevant evidence. The fact that a member of the tenured faculty has formed a negative view of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, or service during the course of the candidate's career is not a basis for disqualification. In most cases, the department head will decide whether the challenged faculty member may participate in the decision. In cases where the department head is the challenged faculty member, the dean, chancellor, or other administrator to whom the department head reports will make the decision. In doubtful cases, the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action should be consulted in reaching a decision about disqualification, pursuant to its responsibilities under the Nepotism and Consensual Relationships Policy of the Board of Regents. The record of the challenge and its resolution will be included in the file forwarded for review. If the challenged faculty member is not permitted to participate in the discussion and vote, that person shall be considered ineligible to vote and therefore shall not count toward the quorum requirement.

Attendance and participation at tenure review meetings are important parts of the duty of a member of the tenured faculty. A quorum must be present for discussion and vote on promotion and tenure. A quorum is defined as more than 50% of the faculty members eligible to vote on the matter. Abstentions are not counted in determining whether a majority of those voting cast votes in favor of tenure or promotion, as required to report an affirmative recommendation, but the number of abstentions is reported as part of the vote tally and, in the review process, they will be considered an indication of lack of support for the candidate by those abstaining. Abstentions are strongly discouraged. Tenured faculty members have an obligation to decide whether or not a candidate merits tenure or promotion and to vote for or against tenure or promotion. If tenured faculty members are eligible to vote, and do not cast a vote, the number of such non-votes is reported but they are not counted as affirmative or negative votes, or as abstentions.

In addition, an effort must be made to provide a copy of the file to every tenured faculty member who will be absent from the meeting but wishes to cast a ballot. Such faculty members must be given an opportunity to vote by written absentee ballot, which should be sent in a sealed envelope to the unit head. These faculty members are encouraged to include a written evaluation of the candidate to contribute to the discussion. Proxy votes, telephone votes, fax votes, and email votes are not permitted.

4. Conduct of Meeting

The candidate has the prerogative to speak or write in his/her behalf to the voting faculty. If the candidate wishes to meet with the voting faculty, this is welcomed, but he/she will not remain for the discussion and voting.
Voting options, except in the final year of the probationary period, are to recommend:
1. tenure,
2. continuation in present status, or
3. termination of the appointment.

In the final year of the probationary period, only options 1 and 3 are available. Absent members may vote by written absentee ballot and are required to include a written evaluation of the candidate to contribute to the discussion. A secret ballot is taken. Ballots are tallied by any two of the voting faculty excluding the Department Head. A simple majority of those voting determines the recommendation. When the three voting options are available, a plurality or a tie vote is a recommendation for continuation. In the final year of the probationary period, a tie vote is a recommendation for termination of appointment. The details and results of the vote are included on the Faculty Tenure Record, which is then submitted to the Dean of the College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences.

5. Reporting Recommendations

The Department Head solicits statements, written or oral, pro or con, from the voting faculty to aid him/her in preparing a summary recommendation without personal attribution. Any written statements must be retained and made available to the candidate. The Department Head prepares a draft summary recommendation that is circulated for review by the voting faculty. The Department Head then prepares a final version, which is also open to the voting faculty for comment. Voting faculty who wish to submit additional written information, pro or con, may provide it to the Department Head for inclusion with the departmental recommendation to ensure that minority views, if any, are represented. Input submitted after the meeting must be identified as having been received after the meeting. The Department Head also prepares an additional statement of personal agreement or disagreement with the departmental recommendation. Before submitting the recommendations to the Dean, the Department Head informs the candidate of the results of the vote, and the recommendations, and gives him/her a copy of the final Form 12 report. The candidate may submit comments on the report to the Dean, with a copy for the Department Head and tenured or senior faculty. Recommendations by the department are reviewed at the college and University levels, according to procedures indicated in the Faculty Tenure policy and the Procedures for Evaluating Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty.

V. PROMOTION

A. To Associate Professor
Because promotion to associate professor is associated with a decision concerning tenure, such a promotion must meet tenure standards, as outlined in Section IV.

B. To Professor
Promotion to professor requires evidence of distinction in teaching, and national or international recognition for distinction in research and professional service. Please refer to section 9.2 of the *Faculty Tenure* policy (Included here as Appendix B).

In addition to meeting the criteria for granting of tenure, documentation for promotion should include the following:

1. Invitations to symposia, election to prestigious scientific organizations, holding elected office in national or international societies, serving on an editorial board, or appointment to national or international research advisory committees.
2. Letters from authorities assessing the candidate’s scientific contributions and indicating that the candidate is among the leaders in his/her field.
3. Evidence that at least one doctoral student has completed his/her degree under the faculty member’s guidance and that graduate student advisees of the candidate have been placed in academic, public agency, or private business positions in their field.
4. Letters from students or former students indicating effectiveness in teaching and/or mentoring.

C. Conduct of Meeting

Conduct of the meeting for promotion from Associate to Full Professor is identical to that used in conferring tenure except that it is convened only with faculty members who are senior-in-rank to the candidate. A quorum is defined as more than 50% of the faculty members eligible to vote on the matter.

VI. POST TENURE REVIEW

A. Annual Appraisal

Faculty members who have been awarded tenure will continue to submit documentation annually to summarize their contributions in the areas of teaching, research and service. Each faculty member will meet annually with the Department Head to review their document, discuss progress and short- and moderate-term goals. The goals and expectations for tenured faculty members will parallel those used in the granting of tenure, but will take into account the different stages of professional development of faculty.

A tenured faculty member must continue to demonstrate contributions as defined by all of the following criteria:

i. Teach a number of courses consistent with their teaching/extension appointment and receive satisfactory or better student evaluations for those courses; maintain the currency and relevancy of all courses they teach; provide appropriate advising assistance to undergraduate students assigned to them; successfully mentor graduate students and/or post-graduates by advising and serving on committees through completion of their studies.
ii. Sustain a significant research and scholarship program of high quality, primarily through publication of their research and scholarship activities through refereed publications. In addition, publication of non-refereed publications, presentations at seminars, symposia, or conferences and maintaining research and scholarship support through active, externally funded grants can be considered as contributing to scholarship.

iii. Serve on a combination of departmental, college, or University committees or the equivalent (e.g. advise a student organization); document continued service to their profession or public (e.g. peer review of articles or grant proposals, evaluations of faculty/scientists from units other than Fisheries, Wildlife and Conservation Biology, active participation, including leadership, in professional associations, scholarly or technical assistance to relevant public and private organizations).

B. Departmental Post-Tenure Review

When the Department Head makes the determination that a tenured faculty member has consistently, when viewed over a period of three years, failed to demonstrate contributions with respect to criteria i., ii., and iii. in section VI. A. above, the Head must notify the individual in writing and refer the case to the departmental Post Tenure Review Committee. This must be done by February 15 or other specified date following submission of the faculty member’s annual appraisal form. The Post Tenure Review Committee will consist of three tenured faculty elected by their departmental peers (tenured faculty). If the faculty member whose performance is in question is a Committee member, (s)he will be replaced by a special vote of tenured faculty. If the faculty member whose performance is in question is at the rank of professor, voting and committee membership is restricted to faculty at the rank of professor. If fewer than three eligible faculty members exist in the Department, the committee will consist of all eligible faculty members. No committee members may hold an administrative appointment that involves supervision of the faculty member.

The Post Tenure Review Committee will meet to review the case including the faculty member’s annual appraisal forms for the three years in question and the Department Head’s findings. The faculty member has the right to communicate with the committee as well, in either written or oral form. The Committee may seek additional information regarding the case from individuals either inside or outside the department.

Upon completion of its investigation, the Committee will vote by secret ballot on the case. The vote shall be whether the faculty member has or has not consistently, when viewed over a period of at least three years, failed to demonstrate contributions with respect to one or more criteria (i., ii., and iii.) in section VI. A. above. The vote must be unanimous to become the Committee’s finding. Regardless of the outcome, the Committee must produce a written report of its investigation and finding, including all sources of information it used in arriving at the finding. The report must be made available to the faculty member and Head by April 1 or other specified date of the year.
the case is presented to the Committee.

If the Committee agrees with the Department Head’s finding, the Committee then must work with the Head and faculty member to define a plan to overcome the deficiency within one year from the date of the letter informing him or her about the performance improvement plan. The plan should be included as an addendum to the Committee’s written finding.

If within one year the Head determines the faculty member has continued to fail in demonstrating contributions with respect to criteria i., ii., and iii. in section VI. A. above, the Committee must again meet to review the case. If they concur with the Head’s determination, the Committee and the Head will jointly request the Dean initiate a special review as provided in Rules and Procedures for Annual and Special Post-Tenure Review, Tenure Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, revised March 5, 1998 and Section 7a. of Faculty Tenure.

VII. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

The department complies with the Procedures for Evaluating Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty as provided by Sections 16.3, 7.4, and 7.61 of the Faculty Tenure policy.
Appendix A

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.
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

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

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

Department of Fisheries and Wildlife

PROTOCOLS FOR STUDENT EVALUATION AND
PEER REVIEW OF FACULTY TEACHING CONTRIBUTIONS
(5/25/94)

Introduction
These protocols are the department response to the University Senate policy on the
Evaluation of Teaching Contributions by faculty, adopted May 14, 1992. They were
approved by the department voting staff on May 18, 1994. (Since these protocols were
approved, a new form, Student Rating of Teaching (SRT) was adopted by the University
Faculty Senate in December 2007, which is used instead of the former Student Evaluation
of Teaching Survey (SOS).)

Administration and Use of the Student Rating of Teaching form (SRT)
1. All courses except independent study courses (FW 5278, 5279, 5393, 5398) will be
evaluated with the SRT every time they are taught.
2. The department office sends to the TA, or instructor if there is no TA, a packet of the
SRT forms and an envelope addressed to the data processing center.
3. Students are given time during a class period in the last week of class to fill out the
forms. The instructor will not be present when the surveys are filled out and collected.
4. The TA or a student collects the forms from the class, seals them in the envelope and
delivers them to the department office where they are logged in before sending to the data
processing center.
5. The data processing center returns the full analysis to the faculty member and a
summary version to the department head.
6. The instructor may use other evaluation forms or procedures in addition to the SRT
and may add questions to the SRT.
7. The SRT should be used by the instructor to improve teaching. Instructors may seek
help from the head, peers, or University instructional resource services.
8. Teaching evaluations for promotion, tenure, and merit decisions are based on
responses to questions 1-6 on the SRT.
9. The head will summarize SRT results for the previous five years and make it available
once a year to department faculty or upon request of a department faculty member. The
summary will consist of the mean and range for 1xxx-3xxx, 5xxx, and 8xxx course
groupings.
9. SRT summaries for individual courses will be maintained in the instructor's personnel
file and will be available to the instructor, head, promotion and tenure committee, and
higher level University administrators only.

Procedures for Peer Review of Teaching
Documentation (Teaching Portfolio):
1. The department will maintain a file for each course taught by department faculty. The file will include a course syllabus, examples of exams, assignments, and handouts prepared by the instructor. Faculty will be asked to submit the most recent version of these materials when they submit their annual activity report.

2. The annual activity report submitted by faculty will include information on courses taught, guest lecturing, teaching improvement activities, graduate student advising, grad committees, undergrad advising, UROP advising, teaching related committee work, and other teaching activities.

**Merit Pay Increases and Promotion and Tenure:**

1). The department head will evaluate the teaching portfolio of each faculty member each year as part of the overall evaluation for merit increases. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will similarly evaluate the teaching portfolio annually for all tenure-track faculty and for tenured faculty who are under consideration for promotion. At the time of consideration for promotion or tenure, faculty will submit a self-assessment of his/her teaching strengths and weaknesses. The following specific items will be considered in the evaluation. Weights indicate the relative importance of each item.

   a. Questions 1-6 from the SRT for all courses taught during the past year.
   b. Written reports from colleague evaluations or classroom visitations, if available.
   c. Syllabus evaluation
   d. Number Student Credit Hours taught.
   e. Number of courses taught during past year.
   f. Number of guest lecturing/other teaching
   g. Number of grad advisees receiving degrees during the past year.
   h. Number of grad advisees receiving degrees during the past 4 years.
   i. Number of grad committees served on.
   j. Participation in teaching improvement activities and innovative teaching method development
   k. Undergrad advising/mentoring activities

**Classroom visitations:**

1. Tenure track faculty will have one course evaluated by classroom visitation in their first or second year of his/her appointment. If there appears to be a problem, a second evaluation by classroom visit will be conducted prior to consideration for tenure. Tenured faculty will have courses evaluated if the SRT for that course is consistently below department norms.

2. At least two faculty members will serve on a classroom visitation team. Team members will be selected by the department head in consultation with the instructor and need not be departmental faculty.

3. Each evaluation team member will attend at least two different class sessions. The instructor will provide the team with a class schedule and will be informed of the attendance of an evaluator at least three days in advance of the class.

4. The evaluation team will meet with the instructor prior to and after the visitations. The first meeting will include discussion of course materials. This meeting will allow the instructor to provide the evaluators with a context (subject matter, teaching objectives, and classroom dynamics) for the visits. The instructor may also wish to ask the
evaluators to give special attention to something for which she/he wants specific feedback. The meeting after the visitations should be used to discuss the observations.

5. Each evaluation team member will write a separate report of his/her findings; a summary report may be submitted in addition to the separate reports at the discretion of the evaluation team. A copy of the reports must be given to the instructor who has the right to respond to it in writing within a reasonable period of time before it is forwarded to the department head. Both the evaluation reports and the instructor's response must be forwarded to the head.

6. While the colleague evaluation of teaching should be as objective as possible, the report should be in a narrative form. The evaluations should not be in the form of a numerical expression or rating. Items to be considered by the evaluation team include, but are not limited to the following questions:
   a. Are class notes, reading lists, and textbook requirements appropriate for the course and updated appropriately? Do lectures or discussions cover the materials claimed to be covered? Are examination questions appropriate to the objectives of the course? Are the teaching methods appropriate to the class size and setting?
   b. Is the course content appropriate for the level of the students? Are differing views/approaches presented?
   c. Does the instructor exhibit an interest in or commitment to teaching?
   d. Is the instructor competent with the subject matter and is his/her knowledge up to date?

7. Colleague reports of classroom visitations will be maintained in the instructor's personnel file and will be available to the instructor, head, promotion and tenure committee, and higher level university administrators only.

8. The department head will review and incorporate the report of the colleague evaluation team and any written response by the instructor into his/her merit evaluation. The head will discuss the materials with the evaluation team and the instructor to clarify any uncertain issues.