I. Introduction

Reviews of faculty for promotion and tenure at the University of Minnesota, Crookston are conducted in accordance with all-University policies and procedures contained in the University of Minnesota Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure (2007)\(^1\) and the related document, the Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenure Faculty.

The purpose of this document is to describe with more specificity the indices and standards which will be used to evaluate whether candidates meet the general criteria for the conferral of indefinite tenure in Section 7.11 of the Faculty Tenure policy. Promotion to the rank of associate professor typically occurs with the conferral of indefinite tenure, although a faculty member may be appointed as an untenured associate professor. The document also includes the indices and standards for promotion to the rank of professor as they are set out in Section 9.2 Criteria for Promotion to Professor of the Faculty Tenure policy, as well as the process for post-tenure review as set out in Section 7a. For a complete perspective, the reader is advised to review sections 7 and 9 in their entirety.

In this document, the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee is defined as all tenured members of the faculty of the Agriculture and Natural Resources Department. Department heads who are tenured at the University of Minnesota are members of this committee. The chair of this committee is a tenured faculty member chosen by the tenured faculty of this committee.

Only members of the tenured faculty of the unit have the right to participate in the meeting and vote on granting tenure, except as specified in this paragraph. In the cases of small units (less than 5 tenured department members), it may be appropriate to include, in the discussion and vote on tenure, a tenured faculty member or members from another unit or units in the college, campus, or University. Including additional faculty members is also warranted in cases of candidates whose work encompasses multiple disciplines. In order for faculty members from outside the unit to participate, the initiating unit must submit a written request to and obtain authorization in writing by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The request must identify the faculty member under consideration, and give the name(s) and tenure homes of those faculty members who will be asked to vote on the candidate and the reasons for including them.

\(^1\) http://www1.umn.edu/regents/policies/humanresources/FacultyTenure.pdf
The tenured faculty of the Agriculture and Natural Resources Department will review the list of candidates submitted and finalize the committee.

The document contains indices and standards for the following personnel evaluations:

- annual appraisals for probationary faculty
- recommendation for conferring indefinite tenure
- recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor
- recommendation for promotion to Professor
- post tenure review

II. Mission Statement

A. University of Minnesota, Crookston Mission Statement (May 2007)

The University of Minnesota, Crookston (UMC) is integral to the University’s statewide land grant mission. The Crookston campus provides its unique contribution through applied, career-oriented learning programs that combine theory, practice, and experimentation in a technologically rich environment. UMC connects its teaching, research, and outreach to serve the public good.

Core Values:
- Integrity: Practicing honesty, fairness, and respect
- Excellence: Supporting quality teaching, research, and service
- Diversity: Respecting differences in ideas and community
- Innovation: Promoting discovery through creative and critical thinking
- Learner Centered: Promoting growth and leadership

B. Agriculture and Natural Resources Department Mission:

Provide exemplary experiential learning through teaching, applied research, and collaborative outreach interactions with industry to train future leaders in agriculture and natural resources with a long-term goal of resource sustainability and community vitality.
III. Annual Appraisals of Probationary Faculty

A. Annual Reviews

The tenured faculty of the Agriculture and Natural Resources Department annually reviews the progress of each probationary faculty member toward satisfaction of the criteria for receiving tenure as provided by the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure and in accordance with the University’s Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/ Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty.

B. Departmental Procedures

The tenured faculty members and the department head agree upon the due date for the annual review materials to be submitted by the probationary faculty. The review materials include:

- Copies of the Appraisal of Probationary Faculty (President’s Form 12) for all past years
- An evaluative and summative letter from the Department Head in the decision year
- Letters of Evaluation from former students, internal peers, or external reviewers of the candidate’s teaching, scholarly research and creative work, and service. Although these are not required until the final annual review, it is helpful to accumulate these during the probationary period, especially from graduating or graduated students. During the final annual review, it is expected that the candidate will include letters in each area (teaching, research, and service) and include several external reviews (See Section 12. Preparation of the file for tenure decisions, Procedures for Evaluating Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty).
- Curriculum vitae
- Narratives of the scholarly activities of the past year and plans for the next year; one each introducing sections for teaching, research, and service
- Summaries of teaching, teaching assignments, and evaluations, including:
  - a statement of teaching philosophy
  - a list of all courses taught since the initial year of appointment
  - summaries of the official student rankings or evaluations of teaching (SRT/SET) for all sections of all courses taught since the initial year of appointment
  - student and peer evaluations of teaching
  - current syllabi
- Summaries of research and scholarly activity, including
  - a list of refereed and non-refereed publications (published, in press, and submitted, manuscripts in preparation) with an explanation of the role of the probationary faculty. Include copies (or descriptions) of disseminated scholarly & creative work in an appendix.
• a list of past (accepted and declined), current, and pending proposals for internal and external funding for research, teaching, or service, including the award amounts, and a description of the role the probationary faculty played in the proposal and authorship
• a list of presentations at professional meetings, invited symposia, and workshops, including those declined
• Summaries of service activities, including
  o a list of service activities, including departmental or university committees, service in professional organization, manuscript or proposal reviews
  o evidence of extension or outreach activities, or non-technical presentations to general groups
• Well-organized appendices as appropriate or directed by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee may be helpful during the probationary period but are not required for the final dossier.
• Any other material considered by the committee or Department Head as relevant for the evaluation

The materials are evaluated by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee. At a meeting called by the Department Head, members discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the probationary faculty member’s file and vote for or against continuation. The Department Head prepares the written report, namely the Appraisal of Probationary Faculty (President’s Form 12), reflecting the comments from the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee. A meeting is held between the Department Head and the individual probationary faculty member to discuss the appraisal. This meeting may be open to the Chair of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee as agreed upon by the probationary faculty and the Department Head. Throughout, the committee will ascribe to details in Procedures for Evaluating Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenure Faculty.

C. Section 5.5 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure--Exception for New Parent or Caregiver, Or For Personal Medical Reasons. (Extending the probationary period)

A probationary faculty member may request that the probationary period to be extended by one year at a time. Circumstances and timelines for an extension are found in section 5.5 of the Faculty Tenure policy (See Appendix A). The record of a probationary faculty member who received an extension is to be considered in the same way as a record of one who did not receive an extension.
IV. Conferral of Indefinite Tenure

Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure, Subsection 7.11, General Criteria, (June 2007)

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 and 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 show strong promise of his/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.

The following criteria, listed in order of priority, shall guide members of the Agriculture and Natural Resources Department in tenure and promotion recommendations:

A. Teaching
B. Research
C. Service

The individual faculty appointment description will establish the appropriate time proportion in each area. This will be provided in a written document in the personnel file of the probationary faculty member at the time of his or her appointment. Any subsequent changes in time proportion will be recorded in written format throughout the probationary period. The appropriateness of a candidate’s accomplishment is to be judged against the departmental criteria which meets the threshold criteria of Section 7.11 of the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure. The faculty member and the Department Head shall jointly establish work expectations for the academic year (e.g. teaching and advising assignments, service responsibilities, etc.). The goal of these work expectations will be to meet the needs of the Department within the context of the 7.12 statement, to facilitate the academic success of the faculty member, and to be used as a basis for annual merit review purposes. In making tenure decisions, quality of scholarly efforts will be given a higher priority than quantity.

A candidate must be considered in a formal tenure review no later than in the last year of the probationary period; that is, 1) in the sixth year of an ordinary probationary period; or 2) at the designated time in a shorter or longer probationary period; or 3) at the end of the extended probationary period for a candidate who has stopped the tenure clock according to section 5.5 of Faculty Tenure; or 4) at the time required by special contract. A formal tenure review may be initiated at any earlier time by the unit head or by vote of the tenured faculty of the unit. Candidates must be told that the outcome of an early tenure evaluation may be a recommendation for (1) promotion and tenure; (2) continuation of the probationary appointment without tenure and promotion at this time; or (3) termination.

Evaluation of both teaching and research must include external review from experts outside the University of Minnesota. According to the Procedures, at least half of the external reviewers and no fewer than four, must have no personal interest in the candidate’s successful achievement of tenure. See Section 12 of the Procedures for additional details about the selection of external reviewers. External reviewers may be
obtained for the evaluation of service activities, depending upon the faculty member. In addition, reviews may be obtained internally as well.

A. Teaching

Teaching is considered to be those activities performed with the intention that they would engender learning and be directed toward goals that are specified in courses, curricula or programs, and which are designed to aid students to develop appropriate knowledge and competencies in a given area of endeavor. Teaching includes all forms of communicating knowledge and facilitating learning in an instructional setting, including advising, mentoring or supervising students whether individually or in groups.

The effectiveness of the teaching should be the prime consideration, not the mere fact that the activities took place. “Effective” means that a candidate facilitates the intended result of student learning. Specifically, candidates must demonstrate course appropriate content and expertise while transmitting knowledge to students through effective instructional design, delivery, and assessment. Instructional design includes the ability to create, sequence, and present experiences that lead to learning. Instructional delivery refers to the skills that facilitate learning in a respectful environment. Assessment refers to the use of tools and procedures for evaluating student learning, including appropriate grading practices.

Evaluation of probationary faculty will include appraisal of teaching materials, including but not limited to syllabi, lecture notes, laboratory exercises, course web sites, material covered, assignments, assessment tools, examinations, classroom performance, and advising materials. There must be evidence of student achievement. This may include, but is not limited to, portfolios of student work that meet course objectives, embedded questions in examinations, performance on standardized or national tests, etc.

There must be evidence of the candidate’s planning and evaluating of his or her teaching. Student and peer evaluations must be included. Senior faculty will provide constructive feedback on teaching, including but not limited to classroom visits. Refer to section 12, Preparation of the file for a tenure decision in the Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenure Faculty.

Evaluation criteria:

a. Relevance. How well do the instructional activities identify course objectives, utilize appropriate subject matter sequences, integrate appropriate technology, consider student differences, and employ appropriate materials and media?

b. Implementation. How well does the encounter with students create the desired learning environment appropriate to the learner outcomes?

c. Evaluation. How well did the teaching, advising, or other educational experiences do what they were intended to accomplish?
Documentation

Evidence may include 1) current syllabi, 2) summaries of the standardized teaching evaluations of all sections of all courses taught during previous years, 3) letters from former students evaluating teaching and learning under the direction of the candidate, 4) peer evaluations of teaching, 5) student portfolios, results of standardized tests of learning or embedded questions results, that demonstrate student learning, and 6) other forms as appropriate. It may be assessed by materials submitted by the faculty member or collected by colleagues. As indicated in Section 12 of the Procedures, the candidate has the right to inspect all materials in the file and to submit written comments relative to the file.

B. Research

Research is meant to include the broadest range of scholarly activities relevant to the mission of the university. The University of Minnesota, Crookston provides a unique contribution through applied, career-oriented learning programs that combine theory, practice, and experimentation in a technologically rich environment. Research may be basic or applied in nature. Applied research may involve the interpretation and or practical application of theories, laws, practices or artistic creations designed to supplement theoretical education. Research usually involves conceptualizing, planning, implementing, evaluating, and disseminating, the results of a project, artistic performance, or the development of a new procedure. Results of research can include scholarly publications or educational products such as, devices, procedures, instructional materials, and systems which are developed to solve educational problems. Examples of dissemination might include publications or presentations to professional or educational organizations, governmental agencies and public or private groups; advising groups in the establishment of professionally or educationally sound practices or programs. Documentation which provides evidence of dissemination should be included in the faculty personnel file. The research may be documented in any appropriate form.

Related to this scholarly activity is the expectation to keep abreast with the appropriate discipline including reading the professional literature. This may also include reviewing papers, books, or other materials, and the development of grant applications.

When considering the record of probationary faculty who have stopped the tenure clock or who are being considered for early promotion, criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than the criteria for those who do not have an extension to the tenure clock or who are not being considered for early promotion.

Evaluation criteria:

a. Relevance. How have these research accomplishments made a significant contribution to the existing body of knowledge in a discipline or make a difference in the practice of education? When directed toward teaching and learning, what is the prospect that these accomplishments will make a difference
in the practice of education or in the assumptions on which the practice of education is based? If directed toward a subject matter topic, what is the prospect that the accomplishment will make a significant contribution to the existing body of knowledge?

b. Quality. How well do the accomplishments focus on central questions, issues, or decisions that yield broad, enduring understanding?

c. Cumulative Effect. How well do accomplishments build on previous work?

Documentation

Evidence of excellence in scholarship is provided by the candidate's research, performance, and/or publication record. This record is assessed both internally, by the department, the unit, and the University of Minnesota and externally, by recognized experts from outside the University, to determine whether it is openly available, scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance. The following points guide the assessment of the candidate's record:

1. Scholarly works can take many forms; among these are presentations of a professional nature, original research articles and books, book chapters, edited collections and anthologies, critical editions, translations, reviews, integrative text books that advance the discipline, published lectures, as well as artistic productions and creations.

2. Peer-reviewed publications or works printed by publishers known for their careful review of manuscripts or articles issued in refereed journals will be given more weight than other publications. Publications by eminent presses and those appearing in journals, series, or volumes that have stringent peer review and major disciplinary significance generally receive the most weight. Similarly, scholarship and creative works reviewed by peers and awarded high levels of distinction will be given more weight than other works.

3. A written work is considered to be published when the final revised manuscript has been accepted by the publisher.

4. Work under review may be considered; this category receives less weight than published or completed work.

5. Translations, reprints, and citations or reviews of a candidate's work may provide evidence of the visibility, importance, or influence of the work.

6. For all multi-authored or collaborative works, the file must specifically describe the candidate's contribution. It is understood that in some areas of the discipline, multi-authored works are common.
7. "Openly available" research implies distribution, which includes traditional and electronic publication as well as other media such as audio, video recording, and other sensory creative works.

8. The candidate must present a file documenting research achievements in his or her areas of specialization. Again, quality is more important than quantity.

C. Service

Since University community relationships are of concern, the contributions of faculty members to public engagement should be recognized. 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. A faculty member’s contribution to a related professional association is important. These contributions may involve such activities as advising or serving in professional associations, governmental agencies, other public or private institutions, and community groups. Institutional service may be administrative, committee, or other related contributions to one’s department, unit, or the University. Any contribution will be judged potentially relevant when the faculty member is acting as a professional. Service alone is not a sufficient basis for the awarding of tenure.

Evaluation criteria:

a. Relevance. Did the service activities contribute to the overall functioning of the department and University, the enhancement of academic programs, or the professional development of the faculty member?

b. Mission enhancement. Did the individual contribute to the environment conducive to achieving the mission of the campus and the University?

c. Public engagement. Did the involvement of the faculty member contribute positively to community – local and regional – relations and the image of the University that would be appropriate for the land grant institution?

Documentation may include letters of reference or evaluation relevant to the service provided. It may be assessed by materials submitted by the faculty member or collected by colleagues.

V. PROMOTION

Peer review is an essential part of the evaluation for promotion to the next rank for the three areas of teaching, research, and service as it is in the evaluation of a candidate for tenure. Peer reviews at any level are expected to be from recognized individuals within appropriate disciplines and from individuals who can properly assess the candidate’s professional contributions. These reviews will appear in the file in the form of letters which provide evaluative measures of an individual’s performance in any of the areas of teaching, research, and service.
A. Evaluation Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Promotion to this rank is concomitant with a decision to award tenure. Standards for tenure are set forth in Section IV above. Consideration of promotion is mandatory when tenure is recommended for an Assistant Professor.

A probationary faculty may request a mentoring committee of tenured faculty within the department. This committee will be established by the probationary faculty in consultation with the department head and other tenured faculty.

B. Evaluation Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

Promotion consideration to the rank of Professor is given to those who ask for it or who are recommended by the Department Head or by the faculty senior in rank to the candidate. See Section III (Promotion Procedures in the Procedures document). The candidate wishing to be considered should inform the Department Head and the Department Promotion and Tenure Chair, but the faculty senior in rank will decide when to conduct the review.

Section 9.2 Criteria for Promotion to Tenure. [Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure]

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.

Every faculty member is expected to be promoted to Full Professor eventually. The Department Head should coordinate mentoring opportunities for Associate Professors that are individualized to meet their needs.

For promotion to Full Professor, faculty must continue to meet criteria for teaching, research, and service used for granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Promotion to the rank of Full Professor requires, in addition, a national or international scholarly reputation in the individual’s field of study. Further evidence could include:

* leadership in the candidate’s profession or field of scholarship, as evidenced by letters from authorities assessing the candidate’s professional and/or scientific contributions
* a reputation demonstrated by invitations to industry programs and/or professional organizations
* significant service contribution to the mission of the Department and University

In recognition of the different roles and levels of experience individuals have at different career stages, service expected for promotion to Associate Professor is different from promotion to Full Professor. Roles for faculty who are being considered for promotion to Full Professor are expected to include service to the broader university and scientific communities.

**VI. Process for Post-Tenure Review**

All faculty are evaluated annually during merit review. In addition, a separate post-tenure review process for tenured faculty is in place required by Section 7a of the Regents Policy on *Faculty Tenure*. Goals and expectations for all tenured faculty members should include teaching, research, and service. The faculty member and the department head jointly establish work expectations which will constitute the primary basis for the department review. The goals and expectations may provide for flexibility, allowing faculty the opportunity to contribute to one mission of the unit more than another; these may also take into account the different stages of professional development of a faculty member. A unit head and a faculty member may agree on a distribution of
effort in which one area is weighted more heavily than another relative to the unit statement of goals and expectations.

The Agriculture and Natural Resources Department expects that its tenured faculty will be regularly active in all three domains: teaching, research, and service. A faculty member who falls substantially below the goals and expectations in one or more of those domains for two consecutive years will be informed in writing of her/his performance and will be informed of steps that should be taken to improve in the deficient domains within a specified period of time.

Performance measures for tenured faculty members in each of the following domains include:

- **Teaching.** It is expected that a faculty member will meet at least one of these goals (open bullets) over a two-year rolling window and should include documentation.
  - Scores on the Student Rating of Teaching should:
    - Have a goal to be consistently above the 80th percentile rating for all questions.
    - Be no less than the mid-range rankings for all questions in 80% of course sections.
    - Scores and comments should reflect that the faculty member is prepared, clear, provides feedback, shows respect for students, and is interested in student’s learning and their success.
  - Peer review standards
    - Positive classroom observation once a year
    - Positive review of syllabi
  - Creating new courses or updating laboratories, developing service learning projects, integrating new technologies into teaching, etc. Faculty should complete one of these at least once during a two-year period.

- **Demonstration of scholarship.** It is expected that a faculty member will meet at least one of the following goals over a two-year rolling window:
  - Publish a peer-reviewed article or creative work, non-peer reviewed article or creative work, book chapter, book, etc. or submit one of these for publication.
  - Present a paper or poster at a state, regional, or national meeting.
  - Exhibit scholarly materials or artistic creations at a show or meeting.
  - Publish a curriculum guide.
  - Submit a grant proposal.
  - Review a book or journal article.

- **Evidence of service** to the Department, College, and/or University as well as to professional societies and disciplines at the regional, national, or international level. It is expected that a faculty member will meet at least one of these goals annually.
  - Make curricular contributions such as articulation agreements, program reviews, or Program Improvement and Advisory Committee activity
  - Serve on at least one department or campus committee
  - Service to one’s professional association
  - Service to a community organization
PROCEDURES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW

An annual review of the performance of the jointly established work expectations of each faculty member is conducted by the Agriculture and Natural Resources Department Head based on the goals and expectations of the unit. Each faculty member submits the Faculty Accomplishment form to the Department Head for use in the annual review. The department head provides the faculty member with written feedback from the annual review.

Section 7a of the Faculty Tenure policy requires annual review of tenured faculty by a unit head to determine if the faculty member has met the goals and expectations of the unit; the unit must elect a peer review committee as well. This Post-Tenure Review Committee may review all tenured faculty each year and must review any tenured faculty who do not meet the goals and expectations according to the unit head. The Post-Tenure Review Committee consists of five tenured faculty who are elected from the department, representing the different areas within the department. Department heads do not serve on the committee. If there are fewer than five tenured faculty in the department, then tenured faculty from other departments are to be elected to serve. The review committee for Post-Tenure Review will follow the University process for small units. Tenured faculty within the Agriculture and Natural Resources Department will make the final selection of committee members of the post-tenure review committee. The chair shall be from the unit and elected by the committee. Faculty who are elected to the Post-Tenure Review Committee will serve a three year term.

If the Post-Tenure Review Committee and the department head find a faculty member’s performance is to be “substantially below the goals and expectation of the unit,” the Department Head and the committee must send a letter or memorandum to the faculty member, stating the findings. The letter must be signed both by the department head and by the chair of the committee, must specify the deficiencies and must set a time period (of at least one year from the date of the letter) during which the faculty member is to appropriately address the identified problems. The faculty member may communicate to the committee chair and the department head in writing relevant information if he or she disagrees with the committee’s judgment. The department head and the committee chair will also meet individually with the faculty member whose work is alleged to be substandard to discuss means of improving performance to acceptable levels. There must be a written record of that meeting. The department head shall document efforts to support the faculty member’s performance during that time.

At the end of the specified time period, both the department head and the elected Faculty Post-Tenure Review Committee should again review the performance. If they again find that performance is “substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit,” they can ask the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to initiate a special review. To do so, they should send a letter or memorandum to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and to the faculty member, setting out their findings with a copy of the documents they have reviewed.
Section 7a.3 of the Tenure Code specifies the process for a *Special Peer Review in Cases of Alleged Substandard Performance by Tenured Faculty.*
Appendix A – Section 5.5

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

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

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

3. When the faculty member has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition.

The request for extension must be made in writing within one year of the events giving rise to the claim and no later than June 30 proceeding the year a final decision would otherwise be made on an appointment with indefinite tenure for that faculty member.
Appendix B

Regents Policy - Departmental Criteria – Subsection 7.12

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 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.