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I. INTRODUCTION

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

These criteria are stated to define, with reasonable specificity, how tenure and promotion decisions are made in the Department of Plant Pathology. The Department complies with the Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty as provided in Sections 16.3, 7.4, 7.61 & 9.2 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure.

This document expires 10 years from the date of approval by the faculty and must be reviewed and re-approved by the faculty at that time.

A. Departmental Mission Statement

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

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

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

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

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

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

**iii. Extension Mission.** The outreach component of the Department of Plant Pathology is provided through the programs of the University of Minnesota Extension and the educational programs of the regional Research and Outreach Centers. Additionally, it is expected that research and teaching faculty disseminate their research findings beyond simple journal publication. Extension education is provided to growers, ag-professionals, K-12 educators and students, state and federal agencies, and the public through meetings mass media, interactive TV, internet, diagnostic schools, written publications (bulletins, newsletters, trade journals, fact sheets etc), field demonstrations, and participation in local and regional conferences.

Extension activities are closely integrated with other departments in the College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences. Faculty with an Extension component in their appointment are encouraged to participate in, conduct, and publish adaptive research.

**B. Statement of Goals and Expectations**

Every faculty member in the Department of Plant Pathology is expected to contribute to all three duties of university faculty: (1) teaching, which includes extension teaching as well as undergraduate and graduate instruction; (2) research and scholarship; and (3) service activities. There may, however, be considerable variation for an individual faculty member in the amount of effort devoted to each of these duties from term to term and year to year. In the spring of each year, the distribution of effort for each faculty member is planned for the following academic year in consultation with the Department Head, and used as the basis for performance evaluation at the end of the year. The goal is to optimize the contribution of each faculty member to the overall mission of the department, college and university throughout the lifetime of their career at the University.
It should be the goal of every tenure-track faculty member to attain the rank of full professor in due time. It is further expected that the Department will do its part in providing support for career advancement and professional development at all faculty ranks.

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

- Research, teaching and advising of graduate and undergraduate students, and extension teaching comprise the bulk of the faculty workload in the Department of Plant Pathology. The Head will see to it that the total workload is equitably distributed among faculty, based on the expertise of individual faculty and the needs of the Department.

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

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

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

- New faculty receive reduced course loads (typically only one semester-course during the first year of appointment) to enable them to more quickly establish their research programs.

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

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

- Faculty who are on approved leaves are relieved of all teaching, service and administrative responsibilities for the period of the leave, unless an exception is made by mutual agreement between the faculty member concerned and the Head. However, faculty on leave may still have continuing obligations to external funding agencies and graduate students during the leave period. Except in the case of formal medical or disability leave, faculty members are responsible for meeting those obligations personally or arranging for them to be satisfied by another suitable faculty member. In medical and disability cases, the department administration arranges for such obligations to be met. Faculty members on leave have the right, but not the obligation, to vote on matters of departmental governance, hiring, and promotion and tenure questions.

- Faculty who are not on leave, but who have no formal course responsibility in a given term, are not relieved of any other teaching, research, service or administrative responsibilities during that term. It is understood that authorized travel may be undertaken during such periods. However, such travel must be arranged so that all other responsibilities are met.

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

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

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

A. Materials required for annual evaluation of probationary faculty

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

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

• Copies of PF-12 forms for previous years.

• Other relevant materials.

B. Review Process and Timeline

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

• In September of each year, probationary faculty will be requested by the Department Head to update their files for review by the Departmental Promotion & Tenure Committee (Faculty Council) and eligible faculty members. The Faculty Council serves as the Promotion and Tenure committee for the Department.

• In October, the updated files will be reviewed at a meeting of the Department Promotion & Tenure Committee which will recommend how the files might be improved and review the productivity of the faculty member relative to progress toward tenure, promotion or both and based on the performance guidelines outlined and detailed in Section III (Conferral of Indefinite Tenure) and Section IV (Promotion) of this document. The faculty member being reviewed will consider the Promotion and Tenure Committee's recommendations and make revisions in his or her file, if requested.

• In mid October, the Promotion & Tenure Committee will annually appoint a faculty advocate from the Promotion & Tenure Committee, with approval of the candidate, to present a verbal summary of the candidate's updated file to the meeting with the Tenured Faculty at a meeting in October or November. From the information provided and from other sources, the Promotion & Tenure Committee will summarize the performance of the probationary faculty member in terms of the relevant criteria for annual review and tenure. The Department Head will draft a PF12 statement summarizing the comments of the Promotion & Tenure Committee. All candidates' files will be available for examination by faculty eligible to vote at least one week prior to the annual review meeting. These files will be maintained in the Department office.

• At an October meeting of Faculty Assembly, the faculty advocate from the Promotion & Tenure Committee will verbally present a candidate's file for review and discussion. Faculty have a duty to annually review the progress of each probationary faculty member and to participate in the review of probationary faculty. The Tenured Faculty will vote by written ballot at this meeting on a recommendation from the Promotion & Tenure Committee to continue or discontinue the appointment of each pre-tenure faculty member. Faculty members who are eligible to vote and unable to be present at the meeting due to extenuating circumstances can vote by absentee ballot by submitting the ballot to the Department Head prior to the meeting. A simple majority of all tenured faculty in the Department not abstaining from the vote is required to terminate the probationary period.
• If it is a “decision” year for a probationary faculty member, a vote is taken and the results are included with the candidate’s Promotion & Tenure Documents (see Section III).

• For faculty with appointment at a Research and Outreach Center, a written report from the ROC Head will be sought prior to the time of the Faculty Assembly meeting. Alternatively, the ROC Head may present an oral evaluation of the probationary faculty member at the Faculty Assembly meeting. The ROC Head may not participate in the faculty discussion or vote during the meeting unless he/she is tenured in the Department.

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

• The faculty recommendations will be transmitted in writing to the candidate within one month of the date of the general faculty review. After the annual review meeting, the Department Head will meet with each pre-tenure faculty member to discuss progress toward achieving tenure. The Department Head will review the progress, the evaluation and vote of the tenured and adjunct faculty, plus other relevant information, and will finalize the PF-12 statement reflecting the faculty’s evaluation and vote. The probationary faculty member will have the right to review and respond to the PF-12 statement before submission to the College.

C. Stopping the tenure clock

Probationary faculty may request that the tenure clock be stopped for either childbirth/adoption or for caregiver responsibilities or faculty illness/injury as specified in Section 5.5 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. When considering the record of a probationary faculty who has stopped the tenure clock, criteria for promotion and tenure and annual review are no different than the criteria for those who do not have an extension to the tenure clock. That is, a record of six years post-hiring with a one-year stopping of the clock must be considered the same way that one considers a record of five years post-hiring with no stopping of the clock. The annual review process for probationary faculty who have stopped the tenure clock will be conducted and will be based on the progress made during the time the faculty was on the tenure clock.

III. CONFERRAL OF INDEFINITE TENURE

This section describes the criteria and standards that will be used to evaluate whether candidates meet the general criteria in Section 7.11 of the Regulations on Faculty Tenure:

7.11 General Criteria. What the University of Minnesota seeks above all in its faculty members is intellectual distinction and academic integrity. The basis for awarding indefinite tenure to the candidates possessing these qualities is the determination that each has established and is likely to continue to develop a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for
a national or international reputation or both [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.

A. Overview of Tenure Decision Process

i. The Tenure Decision Process. The following is a general summary of the process
used in making decisions on tenure. Note that decisions on promotion are made separately but coincide with decisions on tenure. The Tenured Faculty meets annually, usually in mid to late October to (Appendix B). At this same meeting, the Tenured Faculty conducts an annual review of probationary faculty, as outlined above in Section II. The procedure is as follows:

The Department Head sends a letter in early Spring inviting faculty to indicate their request for tenure consideration. Each faculty member requesting consideration for tenure has the right to withdraw the request at any time during the process, unless it is the decision-making year. A faculty member may nominate another faculty member for consideration of tenure other than during a Tenured Faculty meeting.

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

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

In the Department of Plant Pathology, the five faculty-elected members of the Faculty Council, or Council-designated individuals, act as the Tenure and Promotion Committee. In situations where a Faculty Council member does not have tenure or is below the rank of the candidate under consideration, the Faculty Assembly will elect replacement(s) of appropriate rank to serve temporarily on the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The Promotion & Tenure Committee works with the Head of the Department on all phases of the tenure and promotion procedures. The Head assumes responsibility for contacting and working with candidates to provide the necessary documentation, including external peer reviews from other institutions. The Mentoring Committee should also assist the candidate in developing the dossiers for promotion and tenure. The Department Head will notify the candidate of deadlines of when the documentation should be provided.

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

The Promotion & Tenure Committee organizes the information for presentation to the remainder of the faculty with voting rights in the particular decision under consideration. The total documentation for any candidate for tenure is made available to all eligible tenured faculty and adjunct in the department at least two weeks in advance of the Faculty Assembly meeting on promotion and tenure decisions. The Promotion & Tenure Committee chooses a member of its own, or a designate, to present an encapsulation of the documentation to a meeting of those eligible to vote. If there was disagreement within the Promotion & Tenure Committee on any aspect of the recommendation, all points of view are presented. Recommendations of the Promotion & Tenure Committee are only advisory to the voting faculty and do not preclude the initiation of recommendations by any faculty member during the meeting. Recommendations are considered and information is shared until all voting faculty have had the opportunity to be heard.

A probationary faculty may request an early tenure review; the unit will decide whether to conduct it. A formal review may be initiated at any earlier time by the department head or by vote of the tenured faculty. The decision to initiate a formal review must be made by June 1 so that the appropriate documentation can be prepared in time for formal consideration during the following academic year.

**ii. Voting.** The Department’s tenured faculty vote on whether tenure-track faculty will be recommended for tenure in rank, or be recommended for tenure and promotion in rank. Faculty eligible to vote will meet and discuss the merits of each candidate. For tenure decision meetings, a quorum shall be considered a simple majority of those eligible to vote. Associate Professors and Full Professors vote on promotions from Assistant to Associate Professor, and Full Professors vote on promotions from Associate to Full Professor. The formal vote is by written secret ballot. Ballots are tabulated and results recorded. A simple majority constitutes a positive recommendation. Voting procedures, questions to be voted upon, and the report of the vote are defined in Section II.A.2 of the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*. Note that abstentions do not add to the denominator (those voting). Only in exceptional cases should faculty refrain from casting a vote on a tenure and promotion decision. If a real conflict of interest exists, the faculty should recuse himself or herself from the vote. A recusal reduces the denominator (representing the total number of eligible votes), and therefore does not count as a “no” vote. The Department Head votes as a member of the faculty and, as the chief administrative officer of the Department, makes the final recommendation, with the faculty vote recorded, to the appropriate administrators for final disposition. The Head has the right to make a recommendation contrary
to the vote of the faculty and if this differs from the faculty vote it shall be forwarded to the administration with its own justification, together with the faculty recommendation.

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

Tenure decisions for all faculty, whether stationed on-campus, at branch stations, or on University-sanctioned international assignments, are arrived at using the same basic procedures as outlined in this document. Branch station faculty will be evaluated in the same manner as on-campus faculty with an additional evaluation provided by the appropriate Branch Station Superintendent.

Faculty members on international assignments will be given appropriate consideration for tenure. They will be evaluated in the same basic manner as on-campus faculty, and these evaluations will be consistent with approved departmental, collegiate, and university policy and procedures. Upon appointment to an international assignment, a plan or method for evaluation performance and progress of the faculty member while abroad, shall be incorporated into a written agreement between the faculty member, the Department Head, and the Assistant Dean for International Agricultural Programs. It is the responsibility of the Department Head, working with the faculty member and the Assistant Dean for International Agriculture and the faculty member's other administrative leaders (Project Director, Campus Coordinator, Principal Investigator, Team Leader, etc.) to ensure that appropriate documentation for evaluation are being met for faculty with international assignments.

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

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

Additional consideration will be given to contributions to interdisciplinary research, teaching and outreach and to enhancement of diversity or awareness of diversity issues.
As per University regulation 7.11, faculty are encouraged to demonstrate inquiry, creativity, attention to questions of diversity, and innovation through interdisciplinary and intercultural scholarship and teaching. Collaboration, interaction and education across a wide range of diverse ethnic and cultural perspectives contributes to the breadth and quality of academic work and represents a core value of the University of Minnesota.

B. Teaching (and Extension)

While the overall goal of the evaluation of teaching should be improvement, the fact remains that decisions must also be made about teaching quality relative to tenure. The decisions should be based on appropriate criteria and evidence that is convincing and acceptable to a reasonable person. There is no need for an absolute scale on which to rank every person, but there should be evidence of a systematic process that is reasonable and fair.

Individuals will be evaluated in terms of the content and the effectiveness of their undergraduate, graduate and/or extension teaching, and in student advising activities.

i. Graduate and Undergraduate Teaching. Graduate and undergraduate teaching involves managing the process of educational program development and conducting learning experiences for people enrolled for credit toward a degree. Criteria that will be used in evaluating the effectiveness of a faculty member as a teacher include course content, goals and objectives, teaching methods and styles, measurement of student learning, and role in advising. Sources of information for evaluation in this area include student and peer evaluations, instructional materials, and summaries of teaching goals and progress written by the faculty member.

Documentation for evaluating teaching:

a) Written evaluations by students, including standardized evaluation forms and relevant student comments.

b) Peer evaluations of teaching based on reports of classroom visits and analysis of curricular materials.

c) If evaluations of teaching in previous years show room for improvement, progress in teaching should also be evaluated.
   • Has the faculty member participated in programs to improve his or her teaching?
   • Is there an upward trajectory in teaching?

Specific criteria used in documenting effectiveness in teaching:

a) Course content
   Information should be important, correct, current and professionally credible.
   Audience appropriate
   Consistent with title and stated goals and objectives
b) Teaching materials, such as textbooks, readings, workbooks, syllabi, assignments, papers and grading rubrics

Should be appropriate to the level of the course and the students
Should promote gaining a deeper understanding of the topic
Should provide a coherent and logically connected body of knowledge

c) Assignments and learning activities should:
Facilitate learning
Enable the student to be proficient in the subject by the end of the course
Be graded and returned in a timely manner with meaningful feedback.

d) Curricular design should:
Show evidence of periodic reevaluation of course content, readings, and goals with appropriate revision to keep course relevant and up-to-date
Be coordinated where possible with related courses and programs in the department, college and university

e) Professional competence in teaching
Demonstrates mastery of the subject matter
Develops timely, relevant and professionally accepted subject matter content
Is responsive to student and peer evaluations

f) Advising
Is available to students
Is knowledgeable about their own and students’ responsibilities
Expresses concern about individual students’ progress and is willing to help
Advises graduate students in the Plant Pathology Graduate Program or related graduate programs

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

Documentation for evaluating extension teaching:
a) Written evaluations by extension audiences, including evaluation forms and relevant participant comments. Emphasis will be placed on satisfactory or better scores on questions related to: overall communication ability, knowledge of the subject matter, relevance of materials, and how much participants learned from the materials presented.

b) Peer evaluations of extension activities.

c) Extent of audience interest in and use of extension materials, i.e. number of visits to a website, number of attendants at events, etc.

d) If evaluations of extension in previous years showed room for improvement, progress in extension should also be provided.

Criteria for evaluating Extension teaching:

a) Program content standards
   - Information is important, timely, accurate, research-based, and professionally credible
   - Appropriate for the audience
   - Consistent with the stated Extension Program goals.
   - Responsible for development and delivery of curriculum and other program content.

b) Program Development
   - Interdisciplinary as appropriate
   - Consults with other faculty as appropriate
   - Considers audience needs and priorities
   - Acknowledged leadership role in Extension Program area.

c) Program Presentation
   - Effectively communicates information and knowledge
   - Appropriate use of program delivery methods
   - Demonstrates sensitivity to needs of clientele.
   - Serves as a major resource person in print and media programs
   - Widely recognized as the person responsible for providing information to groups and individuals via formal and informal settings.

d) Program Impact
   - Evidence that program knowledge was utilized
   - Changes in behavior by clientele served as a result of the program

e) Teaching Materials
- Promotes depth of understanding
- Provides materials that are understandable and engaging for the clientele

f) Professional Competence
- Utilizes the best available research-based information
- Demonstrates mastery of the subject
- Develops and delivers information in a timely manner

g) Teaching Improvement
- Responds to clientele and peer evaluations
- Participates in workshops or structured programs to improve instructional ability

C. Research and Scholarship

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

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

i. Quantitative evaluation of scholarship

a) Publications to include but not limited to books, Extension publications, refereed and non-refereed publications, review articles, computer software and abstracts.
b) Presentations of research findings at professional meetings, invited symposia and seminars.
c) Patents
d) External funding proposals attempted and funded.
e) Awards and distinctions.
ii. Qualitative evaluation of scholarship. In general, the quality of research reported is evaluated based on the scientific soundness, in that the work includes proper controls, sufficient sample size, and statistical analysis where appropriate.

a) Significance and Impact

The research should generate a new approach, hypothesis, theory or understanding to an important principle that is unique and will have an influence on the scientific community and/or society.

- Types of research undertaken will vary with appointment but in each case should balance issues of local, regional or international significance with cutting edge science.
- Increasing national recognition as evidenced by professional honors, membership of national committees, and invitations to make presentations at national and international meetings and seminars.
- Grant support in areas of research where such funding is available. While funding support on a year to year basis can fluctuate, succeeds overall in obtaining funding for research activities from external and/or internal sources.
- Research activities are recognized as significant contributions and of national or international significance by peers.

b) Publications

- Publishes peer-reviewed articles in major professional journals with impact factors appropriate to the discipline.
- Where the length of service permits, establishes a record for citation of these publications as evidence of significance.
- Recognition of specific papers by the journal as “most-frequently read” or “most frequently-downloaded papers” in a given year.
- Publishes books, chapters in books, or review articles that synthesize and extend research findings, and extend their distribution.
- Develops and maintains other forms of publication for research findings, including websites and newsletters.
- Promotes the use of research findings in industry, by government agencies and internationally.

c) Professional Activities

- Is invited to give presentations and seminars at the institutional, national or international level.
- Is invited to participate in discussions of emerging issues and their importance.
- Receives special professional honors and recognition.
d) Professional Improvement
   - Updates research skills by participation in workshops, semester and sabbatical leave programs, federal CRIS programs, and other professional development activities
   - Initiates research into new lines of inquiry

iii. Sources of evaluative information for scholarship. These materials are part of the tenure document, which typically follows the form below and outlined in Appendix C. Specific sources include:
   a) Current resume.
   b) Personal statement including
      - Outline of scholarly activities emphasizing how these fit with position description and collegiate and university mission.
      - Detail of professional and interpersonal improvement activities.
      - Description of anticipated future contributions to the College and the University.
   c) Solicited disciplinary peer evaluation
      - Letters received from peers identified by both the candidate, Department Head, and appropriate administrators.
   d) Outside funding
      - Statement describing attempts and results of acquiring extramural funding.
      - Statement of effective use of internal funding.
   e) Publications
      - If not organized in the curriculum vitae, a separate list should be prepared listing each publication in its relevant category.
      - Copies of the candidate’s research or scholarly publications.

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

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

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

**a) Service to the Department, College and/or University**

- Serves on committees, task forces, or working groups.
- Attends and participates in departmental staff meetings, seminars and workshops.
- Responds to requests for voluntary tasks.
- Exhibits leadership towards resolution of departmental issues or problems.

**b) Service to the profession**

- Attends and participates in professional meetings.
- Serves on committees or boards or as an officer.
- Engages in editorial work and/or reviews manuscripts in professional journals.
- Serves on review panels for grants, departmental reviews, and others.

**c) Service to community, state, federal or international agencies**

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

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

**a) Candidate’s current resume and a statement of the candidate’s professional activities.**

**b) Peer evaluation letters, non-solicited and solicited letters from organizations or individuals served.**

**E. Stopping the tenure clock**

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

This section complies with Section 9.2 of the tenure code, which describes the university-wide criteria for promotion to the rank of full professor.

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

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

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

Those faculty electing to be considered for a promotion decision on a given year will be required to meet with the Promotion and Tenure Committee for guidance on his or her packet prior to their entering the formal promotion submission process. It is the option of any associate or tenured assistant professor may also request that his or her documentation be reviewed by the tenured faculty in any year, even though it may not be a year in which the faculty member has asked to be considered for promotion. Assistant professors will be reviewed by associate professors and professors and, if requested, associate professors by professors, only.

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

A. Performance guidelines for promotion to Associate Professor

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

B. Performance guidelines for promotion to Full Professor

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

- Recognized national and/or international disciplinary reputation.
- Demonstrated ability to direct the research efforts of others.
- Effective contribution to interdisciplinary programs.
- Evidence of tangible successful collaboration such as on grant proposals or multi-author publications.
- Documented evaluation of extension and/or classroom teaching at an effective level.
- Demonstrated effectiveness in the advising of students.
- Evidence of adoption and use of research results or extension information by decision makers, scholars, and/or teachers.
C. Adjunct Faculty

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

D. Promotion Review Process and Timeline

The timeline for promotion is the same as for conferral of indefinite tenure (Section III, Appendix B). Documentation for any candidate for tenure is made available to all eligible tenured faculty in the department. The Promotion and Tenure Committee chooses a tenured faculty member of its own, or a designate, to present an encapsulation of the documentation to a late-Fall meeting of tenure-track faculty eligible to vote. The Department tenured faculty vote on the recommendation for promotion in rank. Associate Professors and Full Professors vote on promotions from Assistant to Associate Professor, and Full Professors vote on promotions from Associate to Full Professor. The formal vote, by eligible faculty, is a written ballot. Ballots are tabulated and results recorded, a simple majority constitutes a positive recommendation. The Department Head votes as a member of the faculty and as the chief administrative officer of the Department makes the final recommendation, with the faculty vote recorded, to the appropriate administrators for final disposition.

E. Annual Performance Review

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

All non-probationary faculty members will submit the Annual Faculty Data Form (Appendix A) for the past calendar year along with an updated curriculum vitae to the Department Head. The timing for submitting the Annual Faculty Data Form is generally in late December, such that it provides adequate time for review during a meeting of the Faculty Council early in the new-year. Probationary faculty members have the option of updating the materials previously submitted for their annual review.

The Faculty Council will meet with the Department Head to evaluate the materials each faculty member submits. Promotion and Tenure Committee members must recluse themselves from evaluation of their own annual achievements. Faculty Council will submit a written summary report to the Department Head.

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

V. POST-TENURE REVIEW

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

B. Goals and Expectations for Tenured Faculty: The goal of annual and post-tenure review of the Department of Plant Pathology is to ensure that all faculty members are contributing to the general mission of the Department as evidenced by their scholarly activities and productivity in teaching, research, and/or extension. It is recognized that the amount of effort devoted to teaching, research, or extension may vary significantly from faculty member to faculty member, and that it is appropriate for the distribution of effort to change over time for an individual faculty member. Each faculty member is also expected to contribute to service and administrative activities related to the mission of the Department and the University, and to their profession and discipline. The evaluation criteria for post-tenure review are based on the performance standards for teaching, research, extension and service given previously in this Departmental Statement. The performance evaluation for each faculty member is made relative to her/his individual assignment and responsibilities.

i. Minimum Research and Scholarship Expectations

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

- Faculty must adequately manage and maintain an active research program which is original, well planned, and relevant to the departmental mission. Faculty are encouraged to collaborate with other scientists in interdisciplinary research activities that complement the departmental mission.

- Faculty must effectively supervise and assist post-doctoral associates, graduate students, and/or undergraduate students to ensure that they receive a quality research experience.

ii. Minimum Teaching Expectations

a) Teaching

- Faculty should teach graduate or undergraduate courses in line with the faculty member’s teaching appointment.
- Faculty must contribute to curriculum and program development.
- Faculty should advise graduate and/or undergraduate students in their academic programs as appropriate.

b) Extension:

- Faculty should develop new and/or enhance existing extension programs individually, collaboratively with teams, or through interdisciplinary efforts.
- Faculty should provide educational programs with supporting materials and resources for clientele using appropriate communication technologies and evaluation methods to assess impacts.

iii. Minimum Service Expectations:

- Faculty are expected to provide service to the University community primarily through serving on University, College, and Departmental committees.
- Faculty are expected to provide disciplinary-related service through the peer review of scholarly publications; participating on external grant and review panels; editorial services for professional journals; service to professional societies through committee membership and holding office(s); and participates in public engagement activities.

C. Annual Performance Review: The Faculty Council, acting as the Post-Tenure Review Committee, contributes information that assists the Department Head in assuring equitable treatment of all faculty in tenure, promotion, post-tenure review, and salary considerations. Participation by the Faculty Council in this advisory role is required.

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

D. Determination of Below-Standard Performance

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

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

Appendix A. Annual Data Form for Evaluation of Faculty

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

NAME: ___________________________ DATE: ___________________________

I. Teaching ___________________________ Estimated time ____%

1. Course instruction and guest teaching:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Contact hr/wk</th>
<th>Total contact hr/semester</th>
<th>Student Evaluation (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

3. Teaching improvement activities (workshops, seminars, etc.):

4. Student evaluation summary: U of M uniform teaching evaluation Form D [Instructor items: 1-3 (scale 1-7) and 6-11 (1-5)]
5. Other teaching activities initiated or performed this calendar year: [Courses developed, science fair, judging or mentoring, K-12 activities, UROP, laboratory preparation (estimate hours/week) etc.]

6. Student advising
   a. Undergraduate: Number of students______
   
   b. Graduate (students you advise):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>M.S. or Ph.D.</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Est. Degree Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   c. Membership on graduate committees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>M.S. or Ph.D.</th>
<th>Reader (Yes/No)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **Graduate Student Plans:**
   d. Please discuss your graduate advising plans for the coming year. In particular, indicate whether you have plans to bring any additional students into your program or whether you intend to seek additional funding for graduate students:

   e. Postdoctoral, Research Fellow and Research Associate advising:

7. Teaching awards or special recognition:

8. Peer teaching evaluation (Professors: once every two years; Assistant and Associate Professors, yearly). Provide the written summary of peer evaluation:
II. Research

1. Research publications:

Make a list below of your research publications for this calendar year. Use the citation style in the AIDS style manual. For each citation, list all authors in proper order, and categorize each citation by placing an appropriate abbreviation (see below) in the left margin adjacent to the citation. Do not list material now in press.

BO-A Book, (Author)
BO-ED Book, (Editor)
CH Chapter
REF Refereed Article
ABS Abstract
CS Computer Software
PAT Patents
PRO Proceedings

2. List research projects in which you are involved:

3. Cooperative breeding work:

   a. Name of plant species:

   b. List cooperators: (if any)

   c. Type of work done: (check items)

   ______i. Plant
   ______ii. Make crosses
   ______iii. Increase inoculum
   ______iv. Inoculate
   ______v. Take notes in field
   ______vi. Make tests in greenhouse
   ______vii. Marker assisted breeding
   ______viii. Other (explain)

   d. Varieties, lines, or numbered populations released for which you have provided input:

      (last 5 years)

4. Grants/Contracts/Gifts:

   - List new grant proposals submitted this year. (Give title, grant source, amount of funding per year and number of years funded, date of request, any co-investigators).

   - List grants awarded this year (title, source, amount of funding per year and number of years funded co-investigators)

5. Special Research Awards
III. **Extension**  

**Estimated Time_____ %

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

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

3. **Liaison activities with government agencies:**

4. **Phone consultations: (approximate number)**

5. **Grants for extension educational activities**

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

IV. **Service Activities**  

**Estimated Time_____ %

1. **Committees/task forces: (indicate whether you were an officer or leader).**
   a. International
   b. National
   c. State
   d. University
   e. College
   f. Department
   g. Extension
2. Plant pathology services: (grant reviewer, editorial boards, plant pathology-related community service, other). Indicate extent of involvement.
   a. Manuscripts reviewed
   b. Service on search committees
   c. Other (explain)

3. Invited lectures/presentations:

4. Workshops/symposia: Indicate extent of involvement (e.g., organizer, planning committees, speaker, etc.)

5. Professional development: attendance at professional meetings, conferences, workshops, etc. List meetings and extent of involvement (e.g., present paper, chair meeting, etc.). Membership in professional societies.

6. International service activities.

7. Administrative activities: (Describe) Estimated time___% 

8. Special awards for service:

V. General Information

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

2. Identify significant obstacles that made it difficult for you to accomplish as much as you had planned.

3. What professional improvement activities have you participated in during the past year? (e.g., quarter leaves, sabbaticals, workshops, etc.). See section IV-5 above

4. In a few paragraphs, describe in layman’s terms what is exciting about the work you are doing and how your efforts may have an effect on the general public. Assume you are writing for an intelligent audience but one that is not formally educated in plant pathology. It is intended that these statements could be used in promotional documents for the Department.
VI. **Work Plan for Next Calendar Year**
List objectives you expect to achieve during the next 12 months in the following areas. Please be brief and as specific as possible.

1. Teaching
2. Research
3. Extension
4. Service and administrative activities
5. Publications (journals, chapters, books, fact sheets. Include slide sets, videotapes, films, etc.).
6. Professional development (professional meetings, study leaves, sabbatical or quarter leaves, etc.)
7. Funding proposals
8. Are there new directions you would like to pursue in your program? If so, please identify them and indicate, if necessary, how you would adjust your program to accommodate this new direction.
9. Please indicate the percent time you plan to spend on teaching, research, extension, and service in the coming year.

   Teaching___________%
   
   Research___________%
   
   Extension___________%
   
   Service___________%

Revised - Jan 2002
Appendix B. Annual Promotion and Tenure Calendar

These are approximate dates and are subject to vary from year to year.

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

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

July 15 Candidates should submit a list of ten potential reviewers to the Department Head. The Head, in collaboration with Faculty Council, will determine a list of external evaluators.

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

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

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

October 1 The Head will compile the letters of reference and will collate them with the Candidate’s dossier. These documents will be made available for review by Promotion and Tenure Committee and by eligible faculty in the department. The Promotion & Tenure Committee organizes the information for presentation to the remainder of the faculty with voting rights in the particular decision under consideration. Promotion & Tenure Committee will develop an encapsulation of the candidate’s complete file and develop a recommendation.

October 15 The Faculty Assembly will meet to evaluate the Candidate and vote on the Tenure or Promotion case. The Department Head will inform the Candidate of the vote tally and will inform the Candidate that they have the right to submit a written response if they wish.

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

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

The dossier submitted for evaluation for Tenure or Promotion in academic rank should provide a thorough summary of the activities, accomplishments, goals, and philosophy of the faculty member. These documents should include the following sections supplied by the candidate:

Personal Statement.

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

Curriculum Vita

An updated CV is required.

Research

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

Teaching (where applicable)

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

Extension (where applicable)

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

Service

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

Sample Publications (3)

PF-12 Documents (for Tenure cases only)

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