

**Department of Horticultural Science**

**Board of Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure  
7.12 Departmental Statement**

**Performance Requirements, Criteria and Procedures  
for Promotion, Tenure and Post Tenure Review**

**Approved by the Faculty 27 December 2007  
Approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost  
2 March 2008**

**Section I. Specific Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure**

**I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT**

This document describes with more specificity the indices and standards which will be used to evaluate whether candidates meet the general criteria in Sections 7.11 and 9.2 of the Board of Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*. These sections are included in this document as Appendix I. In addition, the document contains the department criteria and procedures for annual and special post-tenure review. The university document *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* is also included as Appendix II.

**II. DEPARTMENTAL MISSION STATEMENT**

The primary mission of the department is to discover, interpret, and transfer new knowledge for the purpose of improving quality of life through: a) improving productivity, value, and use of horticulture crops; b) contributing to a quality environment; and c) educating students. The Department of Horticultural Science is a diversified research-oriented organization that has strong commitment to teaching and extension.

**III. UNIVERSITY AND DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION**

The University's General Criteria for Tenure are identified in Section 7.11 of *Faculty Tenure*. See Appendix I.

Individual assignments and programs may vary based on expectations for research, teaching, Extension (where the faculty member carries an appointment with the University of Minnesota Extension Service) and service efforts defined in the letter of appointment and that are annually determined and agreed upon between the faculty member and department head. Performance will be judged according to these expectations.

#### A. Departmental Criteria for Tenure

1. Development of a clearly defined research and teaching focus.
2. Demonstrated evidence of scholarly achievement.
3. Documented evaluation of teaching effectiveness at a satisfactory level.
4. Successful advising of students or equivalent activity.
5. Recognition of potential for national or international disciplinary leadership.
6. Evidence of continuing professional and interpersonal growth.

As noted in Section 5 of the *Faculty Tenure* the maximum period of probationary service is normally six academic years, whether consecutive or not, unless altered by a process identified in section 5. The Department of Horticultural Science adopts the normal university practice and sets the maximum period as six academic years. Section 5.5 of the *Regent's Policy* (Appendix I) allows a one year exception for a new parent or caregiver, or for personal medical reasons. A request for extension must be made in writing and meet deadlines identified in Section 5.5.

#### B. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to associate professor is usually associated with a decision concerning tenure. Promotion to this rank must meet the above University and Departmental tenure criteria.

#### C. Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

The basis for promotion to Full Professor is primarily demonstrated scholarly achievement and on teaching effectiveness. See Criteria for Promotion to Professor, Section 9.2 of *Faculty Tenure* (Appendix I).

The departmental criteria are as follows:

1. Demonstrated scholarly achievement in several research and teaching activities.
2. Documented evaluations of teaching at an excellent level.
3. Recognition of national and/or international disciplinary leadership.
4. Demonstrated ability to direct the research efforts of others and demonstrated effectiveness in the advising of students.
5. Evidence of tangible successful collaborations such as grant proposals or multi-authored publications and demonstrated ability to contribute effectively to interdisciplinary programs.
6. Evidence of a significant service contribution to the University, the community, and/or the discipline.

## IV. INDICES AND STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING ACHIEVEMENT OF UNIVERSITY AND DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

#### A. Teaching Performance

Individuals will be evaluated on the effectiveness of their undergraduate and

graduate teaching, curriculum design, and on student advising activities. Although primary attention will be given to the faculty member's contributions to credit courses and departmental curricula, evaluation will also be made of, and importance attached to, involvement in discipline-oriented non-credit courses and teaching programs such as those managed by the College of Continuing Education. For those departmental faculty members with formal appointments in the University of Minnesota Extension Service, evaluation will be made on both the content of extension programs and the effectiveness of extension teaching.

## 1. Graduate and Undergraduate Teaching Indices and Standards

### a. Course Content

- 1) Information is important, durable, correct, state of the art, and professionally credible.
- 2) Appropriate for the audience.
- 3) Consistent with title and stated goals and objectives.

### b. Teaching Materials (text, readings, assignments, tests)

- 1) Provides challenges appropriate for the level of the course and the students.
- 2) Promotes depth of understanding.
- 3) Provides a coherent and logically connected body of knowledge.
- 4) Promotes active student participation in learning.
- 5) Demands an appropriate amount of student's time given the number of credits.
- 6) Provides up-to-date materials.

### c. Student Learning

- 1) Lectures and other means of presenting and addressing course content are well organized and content is clearly communicated.
- 2) Lecture and laboratory sessions are designed to address multiple learning styles.
- 3) Interaction is fostered among students and between student and instructor.
- 4) Technical material is discussed in the context of its use.
- 5) Timely and meaningful feedback is provided on student questions, assignments, quizzes, and exams.
- 6) Enables students to be proficient in the subject by the time the course is finished.
- 7) Principles of academic integrity are discussed in the context of the course.

### d. Advising

- 1) Available to students.
- 2) Knowledgeable about their own and student's responsibilities.
- 3) Expresses concern about individual student's progress and a willingness to help.

### e. Curriculum Design and Updating

- 1) Periodically re-evaluate course content, readings, and goals: revise appropriately.

- 2) Coordinate course content with related courses and programs in the department, college, and university.
- f. Teaching Improvement
  - 1) Responsive to student and peer evaluations.
  - 2) Periodically participate in seminars or structured programs designed to foster teaching excellence.
- 2. Extension Teaching Indices and Standards
  - a. Program Content
    - 1) Information is important, durable, correct, state of the art, and professionally credible.
    - 2) Appropriate for identified clientele.
    - 3) Consistent with title and stated goals and objectives.
  - b. Program Development
    - 1) Consults and collaborates with Extension Educators and clients.
    - 2) Involves clientele in program development.
  - c. Program Presentation
    - 1) Serves as a resource in informal and formal meetings and workshops with client groups.
    - 2) Serves as a resource in print and on electronic media programs.
    - 3) Effectively communicates information and knowledge.
    - 4) Demonstrates sensitivity to needs of learners.
    - 5) Demonstrates imaginative use of program delivery mechanisms.
  - d. Teaching Materials
    - 1) Develops educational materials including: extension publications, audio-visual materials including PowerPoint presentations, movies, videos, web sites, etc., computer-assisted learning programs, and any other materials used in teaching.
    - 2) Challenges clientele at the appropriate level for the course.
    - 3) Promotes depth of understanding.
    - 4) Provides a coherent and logically connected body of knowledge.
  - e. Professional Competence
    - 1) Demonstrates mastery of the subject matter.
    - 2) Creatively packages and uses existing educational materials developed by others.
    - 3) Develops timely, relevant, and professionally accepted subject matter content.
  - f. Teaching Improvement
    - 1) Responds to clientele and peer evaluation.
    - 2) Participates in seminars or structured programs designed to improve instructional quality.

## B. Professional Distinction in Scholarship

All academic faculty, regardless of the specific nature of the individual assignments noted above, are expected to conduct scholarly activities that bring distinction to

themselves and to the Department of Horticultural Science. Scholarly activity is given the broadest interpretation. 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, Scholarship may be defined as 1) creation of new knowledge; 2) validation of that knowledge by appropriate peers; and 3) communication of that knowledge to appropriate audiences.

Therefore, it is expected that results be made available either through publication or through other appropriate means.

As with teaching, evaluation of scholarship is both quantitative and qualitative.

#### 1. Quantitative (Specific Criteria) Evaluation of Scholarship

a. Publications - Categories of publications that can provide evidence of scholarship include (in alphabetical order):

- 1) Abstracts
- 2) Books
- 3) Book and manuscript reviews
- 4) Extension publications
- 5) Non-refereed publications
- 6) Peer-review publications
- 7) Review articles
- 8) Software
- 9) Web sites, CDs, Videos

Other types of publications may also be considered as evidence.

b. Invited Presentations – where proceedings are later published.

- 1) Professional meetings
- 2) Symposia
- 3) Seminars

c. Consultation – public and private as this provides quantitative evidence of scholarly value.

d. Patents, cultivars, germplasm releases, and other forms of technology transfer

e. Outside funding proposals attempted and funded

f. International activities and initiatives

- 1) Professional work abroad (sabbaticals, leaves, consulting).
- 2) International collaborations and exchanges.
- 3) International professional meetings and symposia.

g. Other

#### 2. Qualitative (Applicable Standards) Evaluation of Scholarship

Each of the quantitative criteria listed above will be evaluated on the basis of all appropriate qualitative standards described below. Faculty will provide, in their annual review information, a brief commentary on their intellectual contribution to each example of scholarship presented. Greater emphasis will be given to

publications with greater intellectual contribution. Qualitative standards are listed in alphabetical order.

- a. Collaboration and interdisciplinary work – the scholarship is cooperative both within and across disciplines. The individual's intellectual contribution must be identified and evaluated.
- b. Imagination – the scholarship is not routine follow-up, but a new departure.
- c. Pertinence and Civic Engagement – the scholarship focuses on state, national, and international needs; advances the Land Grant mission of the department and the university; and engages the appropriate public in its pursuit.
- d. Scientific soundness – the scholarship follows scientific method, builds upon, and is a logical continuation of existing knowledge. Results are reliable.
- e. Significance – the scholarship generates new theories, contributes to understanding of an important principle or has wide ranging implications in a number of areas.
- f. Sophistication – the scholarship requires unique technical skill or the problem requires great depth of understanding.

#### C. Professional Service Contributions

Outstanding professional service is accredited in evaluating the performance of a faculty member. Participation in the governance of the institution and other service to the academic unit may be taken into consideration, but are not in themselves bases for awarding tenure.

#### D. Sources of Information Regarding Indices and Standards

Sources of information for preparing the file used during annual review of candidates during their probationary period are identified in Section II.C.6. of the *Procedures*.

A similar file is developed for tenure decisions, but it should encompass the entire probationary period. Relevant information for inclusion in the tenure decision file is listed in Section II.D.12 of *Procedures*.

Files prepared for annual review, tenure and promotion to full professor decisions shall, as appropriate, include information regarding departmental indices and standards drawn from the following sources:

1. Teaching
  - a. Colleagues
  - b. Students
  - c. Alumni/Clientele
  - d. Administrators
  - e. Self

## 2. Scholarship

a. Personal statement – statement from candidate should:

- 1) Outline scholarly activities and emphasize how these fit with the individual assignment, program and departmental mission.
- 2) Detail professional and interpersonal improvement activities.
- 3) Describes anticipated future contributions to the department and university.

b. Solicited disciplinary expert and peer evaluations – for promotion and tenure files, letters will be invited from senior experts and peers identified by the candidate, department head, and appropriate administrators.

Typically letters will not be solicited for the annual review process.

c. Outside funding – for promotion and tenure files candidates should list and describe successful applications for extramural funding. For the annual review document, a statement describing attempts to acquire funding should also be included.

d. Publications – candidates should select and provide reprints illustrative of their work.

## 3. Professional Service Contributions

a. Serves on university, extension, collegiate, or unit task forces and committees.

b. Serves on regional, national, or international committees.

c. Is a member of committees, boards, or as an officer of a professional organization or society. Engages in editorial work for professional journals.

d. Provides professional service to the community, state, federal, or international agencies.

## V. PROCEDURES FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF PROBATIONARY ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

This section expands upon *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* (Appendix II)

### A. Annual review of probationary assistant professors.

The tenured faculty of the Department of Horticultural Science annually, at a meeting held in November, will review the accomplishments and plans of each probationary faculty member. The probationary faculty member's file (as described in Section 12 of *Procedures*) plus verbal reports will form the basis for the tenured faculty's evaluation for satisfaction of criteria and progress for receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor. The department head will prepare a written report of the evaluation for:

1. Summarization on the appraisal document
2. Inclusion in the faculty member's file.
3. Presentation and discussion with the probationary faculty member.

Formal action taken at the annual meeting includes consideration for inviting faculty to prepare documentation for tenure vote the following year. Prior to the fifth probationary year, if a consensus of the tenured faculty favor an invitation, two tenured faculty members will be asked to assist the candidate to prepare the needed documentation. In the fifth probationary year, two tenured faculty members will be asked to assist the candidate to prepare the needed documentation.

Where a probationary faculty has shown less than satisfactory progress for two consecutive years, and which has been documented and affirmed in each of those years by a majority vote, a two-thirds vote of the faculty present and voting shall constitute grounds for non-reappointment.

#### B. Annual review of associate professors.

Full professors of the Department of Horticultural Science annually, at a meeting held in November, will review the accomplishments and plans of associate professors. The associate professor's file (similar to that described in Section 12 of *Procedures*) plus verbal reports will form the basis for evaluating the associate professor's progress toward promotion to full professor. The department head will prepare a written report of the evaluation for:

1. The faculty member's file.
2. Presentation and discussion with the associate professor.

Formal action taken at the annual meeting includes consideration for inviting faculty to prepare documentation for promotion to full professor the following year. If a consensus of the full professors favors an invitation, two senior faculty members will be asked to assist the candidate to prepare the needed documentation.

#### C. Tenure and/or promotion, formal action

1. Specific documentation required for evaluation will be assembled by the candidate and reviewed by the appointed senior faculty members.  
Documents to be assembled include: Vitae; personal statement; teaching evaluation summary documents; peer review report; list of publications; and solicited peer evaluation letters.
2. A decision on granting tenure or promotion is made by written unsigned ballot by those attending the annual review meeting. A vote is taken after a consensus is reached that all discussion has been completed. Absentee ballots, previously delivered to the department head in signed, sealed envelopes will be admitted, providing the signatory has, by signature, read the candidate's file.
3. Family members (husband, wife, daughter, son) should not be present and may not vote.
4. The faculty vote is recorded by the department head and constitutes their recommendation. In all cases, a simple majority vote requires that the application be sent forward with the recommendation for tenure and/or promotion.

5. The department head will prepare a report immediately following the faculty meeting which includes the vote of the faculty and a summary of the discussion preceding the vote. Specifically addressed will be minority views which may relate to negative votes recorded. A draft of this report will be made available to eligible faculty who will have four working days to provide written comment. The final draft is made part of the candidate's file with a copy being sent to the candidate. In addition, the department head will prepare a report which includes a summary statement on the candidate's performance and potential and his or her recommendation for tenure or promotion. This report will be made a part of the candidate's file, with a copy being sent to the candidate.
6. Candidates who are applying for tenure in the department but who are administratively attached to another program or location will be represented at the faculty discussion by their appropriate program chair or administrative supervisor, in accordance with Section II.A.2.a of *Procedures*. The latter will be asked to submit a letter of evaluation and recommendation, but will not be permitted to vote. This letter will be made a part of the candidate's file, with a copy being sent to the candidate.

## **Section II. Specific Criteria and Procedures for Annual and Special Post Tenure Review.**

These procedures are promulgated to implement the requirements of Section 7a of *Faculty Tenure* which mandates a system of annual review and "special peer review in cases of alleged substandard performance by tenured faculty."

A. Purpose and Timing. The Annual Review will serve as both a post-tenure review as required by the *Faculty Tenure* and as a merit review for compensation purposes. It shall ordinarily occur in the spring of each year, depending on the College's requirement for recommendations on faculty compensation. Each faculty member who holds at least a partial appointment in the Department of Horticultural Science or whose tenure home is in the Department shall be reviewed.

B. Accomplishments and Plans. Each faculty member shall submit an annual statement of accomplishments and plans by a date to be announced at least four weeks in advance, usually no later than March 1 of each year. The format of this submission is appended. Faculty curriculum vitae will be maintained in the department office and will be updated every two years.

C. Annual Review Discussion with the Department Head. Subsequent to the submission of the accomplishments and plans statement, each faculty member shall meet individually with the Department Head to discuss his/her performance during the past year and individual assignment for the coming year. Any decisions made in this discussion shall be

summarized in writing, signed by both the faculty member and the Department Head, and kept in the faculty member's permanent file.

D. Annual Review Committee. Those faculty who are members of the Department Consultative Committee will also serve as the Annual Review Committee. As described in the Department Guidelines, these faculty include the Director of the Minnesota Landscape Arboretum and five other tenured faculty members who shall be elected by mail ballot to serve for a staggered two-year period. Faculty may not serve for consecutive periods.

E. Annual Evaluation Meeting. After each faculty member has met individually with the Department Head, the Annual Review Committee shall meet with the Department Head to evaluate the entire faculty according to the follows procedures:

Two separate systems will be used for evaluating performance. The first of these has three major components:

1. 75% will be based on accomplishments in areas of individual assignment (teaching, research, Extension). The overall quality of an individual's teaching record will be assessed based on the information available, on the review discussion with the Department Head, on student evaluations when available, and on undergraduate and graduate student advising. Research quality is based on publications, scientific impact of completed work, number of talks given, awards, consulting, grant support, and graduate student success. Extension quality is to be judged for both programming and teaching and is based on meetings held, talks given, contacts made fact sheets and other extension-related publications prepared, awards received, and relationship with clientele groups.
2. 15% will be based on service: professional and university services rendered by the individual, such as membership and leadership in scientific societies, organizing meetings, editorships, reviewing duties, and service on university and department committees.
3. 10% will be based on effort: efforts to aid in the functioning of the department, and cooperative behavior with staff, students, and fellow faculty. Included in this category are teaching, research, or extension contributions above and beyond the individual assignments and programs. For example, here is where one would receive recognition for extension activities without a formal Extension appointment or for teaching without a formal teaching appointment.

Each faculty member will receive a point score between 1 and 10 in each of the above categories, 10 being the highest. In category 1, each assignment area will be scored and the raw score multiplied by the percentage appointment in that area. Numerical scores in each category will be multiplied by the percentage weight of the category to obtain the net score for each faculty member. The maximum score anyone can obtain is 10. Each of

the members of the Annual Review Committee evaluates each faculty member (except him- or herself), and the evaluations of each of the FCC members are averaged.

These evaluations are to be done following a discussion of each faculty member's performance, and then a second system is used to rate overall performance as follows:

- 4 = Outstanding (limited to top 10-15%)
- 3 = Commendable (exceeds job expectations)
- 2 = Satisfactory (meets job expectations)
- 1 = Unsatisfactory (does not meet job expectations).

This overall rating will be made relative to other faculty of the same rank, with the underlying premise that job expectations are higher for a full professor than for an associate professor and higher for an associate professor than for an assistant professor. When a member of the Committee (or his/her family) is being discussed, he or she shall leave the room and not participate in the discussion or vote.

These ratings will be advisory to the Department Head, who may alter them slightly to reflect internal and/or year-to-year consistency. The Department Head will then convert these ratings to a salary increase, depending on the allocation of salary funds and the policies determined by the College. The Department Head will communicate in writing to each faculty member both the overall performance rating and the consequent salary increase.

F. Substandard Performance. If the Annual Review Committee and the Department Head agree that a faculty member's overall performance is equal to 1 (does not meet job expectations), then they must send a letter to the faculty member stating that the faculty member's performance is "substantially below the goals and expectations of the Department of Horticultural Science." The letter must be signed by both the Department Head and the Chair of the Consultative Committee, must specify the deficiencies, and must set a time period during which the faculty member should address the identified problems. Both the Department Head and the Annual Review Committee should work with the faculty member to improve performance during that time. For probationary faculty members, this input should also be conveyed through the PF-12 process.

G. Special Review. If both the Department Head and the Annual Review Committee agree that a tenured faculty member's performance is equal to 1 for two years in a row (i.e., the faculty member has not significantly improved performance since the first such review), they can ask the Dean to initiate a Special Review. To do so, they should send a letter to the Dean and to the faculty member; setting out their findings with a copy of the documents they have reviewed. The Dean shall determine the subsequent course of action, consistent with College and University procedures.

**Appendix I. Sections 7.11, 7.12, 9.2, and 5.5 of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure* (2007). (full text available at <http://www1.umn.edu/regents/policies/humanresources/FacultyTenure.pdf>)**

**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.

**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.

**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<sup>[2]</sup> 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 proceeding the year a final decision would otherwise be made on an appointment with indefinite tenure for that faculty member.

**Appendix II. Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty.** (see <http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/faculty/pdf/procedures101207.pdf>)