

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
MEDICAL SCHOOL
DEPARTMENT OF BIOCHEMISTRY, MOLECULAR BIOLOGY AND BIOPHYSICS

7.12 STATEMENT

Statements Required By Section 7.12 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*

PART 1. MEDICAL SCHOOL PREAMBLE

I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

This document describes the specific criteria and standards which will be used to evaluate whether candidates from the Medical School meet the general criteria for tenure in Section 7.11 and for promotion to professor in Section 9.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*. All candidates for promotion and/or tenure in the Medical School are evaluated with the criteria and standards in this preamble. In addition, each department in the Medical School has its own 7.12 Statement (Part II of this document) that further delineates the criteria for promotion and/or tenure within that individual unit. For a complete perspective, the reader is advised to review Sections 7 and 9 in their entirety. Section 7.11 is printed in IV: Criteria for Tenure (see below); Section 9.2 is printed in V.C Promotion to Professor. This preamble contains Criteria and Standards pertaining to:

- A. Appointment
- B. Awarding of indefinite tenure
- C. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor
- D. The process for the annual appraisal of probationary and tenured faculty

The criteria, standards, and procedures are applied without regard to race, religion, color, sex, national origin, handicap, age, veteran status or sexual orientation.

The Medical School issues annually to each department, for distribution and information to faculty members, a set of instructions, memoranda, and other documents, giving detailed information on the procedures to be followed in the preparation and consideration of each proposal for tenure and/or promotion in rank. The pertinent documents are identified as exhibits enclosed with a cover memorandum from the Dean.

The Medical School 7.12 and Departmental 7.12 Statements are reviewed and approved by the dean of the Medical School and the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost.

The relevant University documents regarding criteria for tenure and/or promotion and the procedures for implementing these criteria are:

- University of Minnesota Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*
- *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty*

II. MISSION STATEMENT

Committed to innovation and diversity, the Medical School educates physicians, scientists, and health professionals; generates knowledge and treatments; and cares for patients and communities with compassion and respect.

The Medical School strongly encourages and values interdisciplinary work, including scholarship, public engagement, and teaching, as well as interprofessional collaboration in clinical sciences. Concordant with the position of the National Institutes of Health, the Medical School values Co-Principal Investigators and interdisciplinary collaboration on major funding proposals as well.

III. APPOINTMENT AND ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

A. APPOINTMENT

1. Assistant Professor

In the Medical School the entry level rank for faculty is at the Assistant Professor level. The minimal, general criteria for initial appointment at this rank include:

- a. Possession of a terminal degree (MD or equivalent, or Ph.D.)
- b. Board eligibility or certification (if applicable - clinical specialties)
- c. Demonstrated ability in teaching
- d. Demonstrated involvement in high-quality research which has been accepted for publication or is published in peer-reviewed national or international journals
- e. Documentation of competence in the skills of communication, including effective communication in teaching students and in oral and written presentations of research

Each department may add specialty-specific criteria for appointment, in their Departmental 7.12 Statement.

2. Associate Professor and Professor

- a. The criteria and standards for appointment at the rank of Associate Professor are those stated for awarding of tenure.
- b. The criteria and standards for appointment at the rank of Professor are those stated for promotion to this rank.

In addition, for clinically active faculty, it is expected that for appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor they will have achieved appropriate Board Certification in the specific field where they are practicing.

3. Secondary Appointments

The appointment home for a faculty member is always in the primary department (the tenure home is the University of Minnesota). Joint and/or secondary appointment requests will be made by the secondary department with the support of the primary department in the form of a request letter(s) signed by both department heads, addressed to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs in the Medical School. In the case that the appointment being requested is at the Associate Professor or Professor level, the secondary department may conduct a faculty vote by written ballot, based on the proposed collaborative activity in the secondary department for the faculty member. The results of the vote should be reported at the time of the request for appointment.

B. ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

In fulfillment of Sections 7.11 and 7.12 and in accord with Section 7.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*; “the tenured faculty of each academic unit annually reviews the progress of each probationary faculty member toward satisfaction of the criteria for receiving tenure. The head of the unit prepares a written summary of that

review and discusses the candidate's progress with the candidate, giving a copy of the report to the candidate."

All tenure-track faculty will undergo an annual review each academic year. An academic year is defined in Section 5.3 in the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*. Annual appraisals in the Medical School and its departments comply with the procedures described in *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*. Each department will outline the specific process and criteria for annual appraisals, but at the very least will include a review by the tenured faculty of the department and an annual conference with the Department Head. These procedures are provided for by Sections 16.3, 7.4, and 7.61 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*.

The annual review of probationary faculty will be recorded on the *University of Minnesota (UM) Form 12* and will reflect the faculty member's performance relative to the 7.12 Statement. A record of the vote by the tenured faculty for continuation or recommendation for promotion and/or tenure will be included on the *UM Form 12*, if a vote was taken. (This vote on annual reviews is optional). Each department will determine, and so state in their departmental 7.12 Statement, whether or not such a vote will be taken. If such an annual vote is taken in any department, a 2/3 majority of eligible voting faculty is required for continuation of the probationary appointment. A motion for termination also requires a 2/3 majority of eligible voting faculty for action to be taken. A record of the vote, either for continuation or termination, must be included on the *UM Form 12*. If a faculty member has extended his or her probationary period according to Section 5.5 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, this must be noted on the *UM Form 12* during the annual review.

The department head will meet annually with each probationary faculty member to review his/her completed *UM Form 12*. The department head and faculty member will sign the completed *President's Form 12*. The *UM Form 12* is forwarded to the dean for review, comment, and signoff.

The *UM Form 12* is then forwarded to the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost (SVPP) for review, comment, and signoff. A copy is kept in the SVPP Office. The signed *UM Form 12* will be kept in the probationary faculty member's tenure file and will become a part of the dossier.

For faculty members with joint and/or secondary appointments in another Medical School or University Department, annual reviews will be carried out according to the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*. For a candidate who has an appointment in more than one unit, the candidate's offer letter will specify how the candidate will be evaluated annually and at the time of the tenure and/or promotion decision, including which unit's 7.12 statement will be used as the basis for evaluation and which unit's votes of tenured faculty will be counted or reported for the second level of review in the Medical School. The primary unit will receive input from the secondary unit on performance of responsibilities specific to that unit prior to each annual review and decision on promotion and tenure.

IV. CRITERIA FOR TENURE

Section 7.11 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* states:

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 [FN 2]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [FN 3]. The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision [FN 4]. 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.*

[FN 2] "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.

[FN 3] 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.

[FN 4] 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 recommendation for tenure is made when an eligible faculty member has fulfilled the General Criteria for tenure, as stated in Section 7.11, and the standards stated by the Medical School and the department. Candidates must be evaluated for tenure during their mandatory decision year at

the latest. The mandatory decision year occurs during the sixth probationary year for tenure-track faculty in the basic science departments, and in the ninth year for tenure-track faculty in clinical departments.

When distinction in research has greater weight in the decision to award tenure, the candidate must also show, at a minimum, evidence of competence in teaching. When distinction in teaching has the greater weight in the decision to award tenure, the candidate must also show, at a minimum, evidence of competence in research. Distinction in research requires documented evidence of high-level, independent scholarly effort. Distinction in teaching requires documented evidence of innovation and effectiveness in teaching, which have attracted national recognition.

Probationary faculty can extend their maximum period of probationary service, by one year for each occurrence of circumstances as described in Section 5.5 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*. In the case of childbirth, adoption, or foster placement of a child, a probationary faculty member must notify the department head, the dean of the Medical School and the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost of this circumstance using University of Minnesota Form UM 1764 and the extension of the probationary period is automatic. In the case of caregiver responsibilities or personal illness or injury, the probationary faculty member must receive the approval of the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost using University of Minnesota Form UM 1765. No probationary period may be extended for more than three years. (See the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* for more details.)

A. TEACHING

Distinction in teaching for the granting of tenure must include scholarly work in education. Evidence of the generation of new methods of pedagogy with national recognition by peers (AAMC, ACE) and impact on educational programs nationally is required. Activities may occur in a variety of educational settings and formats, including: didactic presentations, lectures, seminars, conferences, tutorials, laboratories, case discussions, grand rounds, hospital and clinic rounds, patient care, surgical and other procedures, and continuing education. Competence in teaching requires participation in appropriate courses with satisfactory learner evaluations.

Assessment of distinction in teaching and advising students is based upon:

1. Innovative contributions to the field of medical education which have been adopted for use by other institutions and are recognized by peers as scholarly contributions.
2. Review of course(s) taught, directed, or developed; a list of students and degree candidates for whom the faculty member has served as academic adviser.
3. Evidence of teaching excellence at the undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-doctoral levels, evaluated by the written statements and/or compiled ratings of students.
4. Written statements by the Head of the Department, academic peers, and others familiar with the candidate's performance in teaching and educational scholarship.
5. Accumulation of above forms of evidence on teaching competence and excellence over a sustained period of time.

Assessment of competence in teaching is based upon:

1. Learner and/or peer evaluations.

B. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

Assessment of distinction in research is based upon the following:

1. A review of the candidate's scientific publications, particularly those in national or international peer-reviewed journals. Evidence is sought that the work is scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance, whether focused on laboratory endeavors, clinical investigations, or analysis or synthesis of clinical observations and experience.
2. Independence of research accomplishments or significant contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative research. Evidence of independence or significant contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative research may include:
 - a. Naming of the candidate as the first or senior author on multi-authored journal articles and/or documentation of major, substantial contributions by the candidate to the collaborative project and publication.
 - b. Statements of peer evaluators on the creativity and significance of the candidate's contributions to a collaborative research project and/or to multi-authored publications.
 - c. Identification of the candidate as the principal investigator or a major collaborator on peer-reviewed, funded research grants or contracts
 - d. Invitations/nominations to serve on study sections, national policy boards, editorial boards, etc.
3. External research funding from federal and other national granting agencies which sponsor programs in biomedical and other scientific research subject to peer review.
4. Significant original contributions based on clinical observations resulting in new therapies or techniques which impact the practice of medicine.

Assessment of competence in research is based upon:

1. Evidence of significant discipline-related publications, including reports of clinical investigations, identification through case reports of new syndromes or treatments, and descriptions of new techniques.
2. Participation in invited scientific and clinical symposia, meetings and lectures.
3. Letters from authorities in the candidate's clinical discipline assessing his/her contributions to the discipline.

C. CLINICAL SERVICE (if applicable)

Clinical Service expectations in decisions for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor include enjoying an excellent reputation inside and outside the Twin Cities area as an authority in a clinical specialty, as demonstrated by patient referrals from outside the area, invited visiting lectureships, and memberships in professional societies.

D. SERVICE

In the Medical School service contributions are an integral part of the academic unit. Such service can be used to demonstrate an additional area of strength for the recommendation of tenure. Examples of service contributions include:

1. Participation in discipline-specific regional and national organizations.
2. Service to the Department, School, or University on governance-related or policy making committees.
3. Service to the community, State, and public engagement.

V. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION IN FACULTY RANK

A. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

In the Medical School, the entry level rank for faculty is at the Assistant Professor level. It is therefore anticipated that there will be no promotions to this rank.

B. TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The general criteria and standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are those stated for consideration of tenure (see IV above).

In addition, for clinically active faculty, it is expected that they will have achieved appropriate Board Certification in the specific field where they are practicing.

A recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor is made when an eligible faculty member has fulfilled the general criteria applicable to tenure, as stated in Section 7.11, and the specific criteria and standards for promotion to Associate Professor as stated by the Medical School and the Department. It is also an expectation of the University and the Medical School that all faculty promoted to associate professor with tenure are on a trajectory that will result in them achieving the rank of full Professor.

C. TO PROFESSOR

A recommendation for promotion to Professor is based on criteria set by the Medical School and the Department in accord with Section 9.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*

9.2 Criteria for Promotion to Professor. *The basis for promotion to the rank of professor is the determination that each candidate has (1) demonstrated the intellectual distinction and academic integrity expected of all faculty members, (2) added substantially to an already distinguished record of academic achievement, and (3) established the national or international reputation (or both) ordinarily resulting from such distinction and achievement [FN 7]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [FN 8]. 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.*

[FN 7] "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.

[FN 8] 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.

Promotion to Professor is not based on time in rank, but on an increasing record of accomplishments. During the period as an Associate Professor, the candidate will have continued to develop his or her already distinguished record in teaching, research, and service and added substantially to the record that was the basis for the promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. The candidate must have achieved a national and international reputation in her or his area of expertise and be recognized as a leader and a mentor.

The proposal of a candidate for Professor will present evidence of additional significant academic, scientific, scholarly, and professional achievements such as:

1. The establishment of a training program for pre- and/or post-doctoral fellows in a specific discipline.
2. Election to prestigious scientific and/or professional organizations which recognize excellence and significant academic contributions.
3. Letters from authorities attesting to the candidate's acknowledged national or international reputation and recognition of leadership in his/her field; letters from prominent senior faculty members at other universities assessing the candidate's qualifications for promotion to the rank of Professor.
4. Nationally recognized leadership roles in the profession or the institution.
5. Evidence of effective mentoring of junior faculty, fellows, and M.D. and Ph.D. trainees.
6. Creating and sustaining a culture that fosters diversity.
7. Ongoing record of peer-reviewed publications.
8. Ongoing record of funding for research or scholarship (if applicable).
9. Ongoing excellence in clinical activity (if applicable).

VI. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

In accordance with Section 7a of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* and the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*, each Medical School department will annually conduct a review of each tenured faculty member. The specific Departmental process for annual review and review criteria (i.e. the goals and expectations for continued performance by tenured faculty) will be described in the Departmental 7.12 Statement Part 2.

The Medical School procedures for annual review of tenured faculty are provided in Part 3 of the document (Annual Review of Tenured Faculty).

VII. VOTING PROCEDURES

- A. Promotion and tenure decisions in the Medical School require a positive vote by two-thirds of all eligible voting faculty members on the question to recommend affirmatively for promotion and/or tenure.
- B. Decisions to terminate the contract of a probationary faculty member also require a vote by two-thirds of all eligible voting faculty members in support of the motion to terminate the appointment.
- C. Tenured faculty are eligible to vote on the awarding of tenure to probationary faculty. Tenured faculty holding appropriate rank are eligible to vote on recommendations for promotion of candidates.

VIII. PROCESS FOR UPDATING THIS 7.12 STATEMENT

The Medical School will review its 7.12 Statement Preamble at least every five years, or more frequently as needed. Revisions will be made by the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. The

revisions will be presented to the Faculty Advisory Council. All Medical School tenured and tenure-track faculty will be invited to review and give input on the statement, and approval will be obtained through a majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, in conjunction with approval of their departmental criteria, with the approval date noted on the document.

History of Revisions (approved by vote of the Faculty):

Original Document: Date unknown

Revision: April 15, 1993

Revision: July 2, 2009

Revision Approved by Medical School Faculty: June 21, 2012

Approved by Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost: June 22, 2012

PART 2. DEPARTMENTAL ADDENDUM

I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

This document describes the specific criteria and standards that will be used to evaluate whether faculty in the Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology and Biophysics meet the general criteria in Section 7.11 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, as defined for this Department. It also provides the specific criteria and standards that will be used to evaluate associate professors for promotion to professor according to Section 9.2 of the *Faculty Tenure* policy.

This document contains the Department's Criteria and Standards pertaining to:

- A. Award of indefinite tenure
- B. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor
- C. The departmental process for the annual appraisal of probationary and tenured faculty.
- D. The goals and expectations for the annual review of tenured faculty.

As a unit that is dually supported and administered by the College of Biological Sciences and Medical School, the faculty in Biochemistry, Molecular Biology and Biophysics support and adhere to the missions and constitutions of both governing bodies. The criteria and standards for promotion and tenure, as well as post-tenure review as outlined in this document have been developed with respect to those constitutions as well as Section 7.11 of the Board of Regents Policy.

II. MISSION STATEMENT

The Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology and Biophysics is committed to professional excellence in research and teaching by providing a stimulating environment in which faculty, staff and students can work productively together in pursuit of the following goals:

- To pursue and to disseminate the results of high quality and highly regarded research on the molecular mechanisms of biological processes. The Department maintains a broad representation in the fields that constitute the biochemical sciences with special emphasis in (1) molecular biology, (2) metabolic and systems biology, (3) synthetic biology and biotechnology, and (4) chemical and structural biology.
- To provide rigorous education and training in contemporary biochemistry, molecular biology and biophysics for undergraduate, professional, graduate and postdoctoral students and scientific colleagues. The Department's educational mission is carried out in classrooms, laboratories and scientific forums.
- To provide expertise in the areas of biochemistry, molecular biology and biophysics for the campus at large and for the people of the State of Minnesota.
- It is our expectation that faculty will advance to the rank of full Professor.

III. APPOINTMENT AND ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

A. APPOINTMENT

At appropriate times, the Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology and Biophysics hires scientists to become Assistant Professors who by virtue of their graduate, professional and postdoctoral work show evidence of being capable of fulfilling the missions of the Department. As biochemistry, molecular biology and biophysics is a set of research-based disciplines, the major emphasis for probationary faculty members is to establish a vigorous, highly regarded, and externally funded research laboratory that incorporates graduate,

undergraduate, professional and/or postdoctoral students. In addition, new faculty members must possess outstanding skills in communication that include writing of both research grants and scientific publications, teaching both in the laboratory and in the classroom, and collegial discourse to foster collaborative efforts within the University and recognition in the world community.

B. ANNUAL APPRAISAL OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

1. Process

The overall process for Annual Review of Probationary Faculty in the Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology and Biophysics is in compliance with Section 7.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* and the *Procedures for Reviewing Faculty for Tenure and/or Promotion; Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty*. The Department Head assigns a Mentoring Committee to each probationary faculty member. The committees are composed of three tenured (Associate and full Professors) faculty members. Committees meet with probationary faculty members regularly to promote career development, to monitor their progress and to help new faculty members with tasks such as grant writing, manuscript submission, laboratory management and teaching preparation. An explicit charge to the Mentoring Committee is that one member must attend one or more classroom sessions presented by the probationary faculty member.

Each year, each probationary faculty member, in consultation with his/her Mentoring Committee, prepares an updated curriculum vitae that provides evidence of progress made in the areas of research, teaching and service. The chair of the mentoring committee presents this summary to the tenured faculty members of the Department at a faculty meeting held in the spring of each year. The tenured faculty members monitor the progress of probationary faculty members and provide feedback to the Mentoring Committee and to the probationary faculty member. Progress is judged in relation to the Criteria, Evidence and Evaluation sections of this 7.12 Statement.

The Department Head takes a vote of the tenured faculty to recommend continued appointment of the probationary faculty member. The Department Head is responsible for preparing the *President's Form 12* (Annual Appraisal Form), which summarizes the discussion. Details of this discussion are provided in the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*. Each probationary faculty member meets with the Department Head to review her/his progress and to learn the comments of the tenured faculty. Once the Department Head meets with the probationary faculty and completes *President's Form 12*, the *President's Form 12* is forwarded to the Dean and then to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for review and approval. Each probationary faculty member receives a copy of this form once approved at the Provostal level.

In exceptional cases where a probationary faculty member is derelict in performance of his/her responsibilities or is incapable of making the accomplishments that will lead to tenure, the tenured faculty members will vote whether or not to recommend termination by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. A vote of two-thirds majority of the tenured faculty members will warrant such a recommendation. The termination is shown on the *President's Form 12*.

In the spring of the fifth year of employment (unless for deviations as described below or for extensions of the probationary period granted under Section 5.5), the Mentoring Committee presents the probationary faculty member's curriculum vitae to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee (composed of three tenured faculty members). This committee analyzes the candidate's curriculum vitae, reviews the previous submissions of the *President's Form 12*, and discusses with the Mentoring Committee the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. The Promotion and Tenure Committee then prepares for the Department Head and the tenured faculty a summary of the probationary faculty member's accomplishments that will support or diminish her/his worthiness for tenure.

At the spring meeting of the tenured faculty (during which probationary faculty of all years are discussed) the Promotion and Tenure Committee presents its summary, leads a review of the previous submissions of the *President's Form 12*, and guides the discussion on the merits of the candidate.

Soon after the spring faculty meeting the Department Head meets with the probationary faculty member to convey the level of enthusiasm of the tenured faculty for his/her promotion and to begin to prepare the Promotion Dossier.

The materials for the Promotion Dossier are collected in the months following the spring meeting. Once the Promotion Dossier has been completed, the tenured faculty members review the document and take a formal vote in the early fall of the sixth year on whether to recommend tenure and promotion. A vote to promote of less than two-thirds of the voting faculty is considered unacceptable and not worthy of tenure and promotion. This metric will be stated by the Department Head in her/his letter explaining the outcome of the vote. The Department Head's letter explains the reasons for the recommendation and states his or her own opinion of the candidate's worthiness. A second letter, written by the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, states the reasons for the Committee's recommendation. The Promotion Dossier is then sent to the Medical School and College of Biological Sciences Promotion and Tenure Committees who review and pass judgment on the candidates.

Because two colleges administer the Department, the Promotion and Tenure Committees of both the Medical School and the College of Biological Sciences vote upon promotion dossiers. The recommendations of both committees are forwarded to the Deans of the colleges. The Dean of the collegiate appointment home then makes the recommendation to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The exact procedures are stated in the Memorandum of Understanding Joint Departments College of Biological Sciences/Medical School Promotion and Tenure Protocol dated November, 2006 (Appendix A).

The following are the criteria that are examined by the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, by the tenured faculty members and by the Department Head to make the determination whether to recommend tenure and promotion to the Collegiate Promotion and Tenure Committees and to the Deans of the respective colleges.

2. Criteria

The criteria for satisfactory performance to be used for the annual review in the Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology and Biophysics are the same as with the appropriate criteria for rank, as defined in this 7.12 Statement.

IV. CRITERIA FOR TENURE

Criteria for Tenure - Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology and Biophysics

Note that while every candidate is judged on each criterion, the degree to which each candidate meets each criterion may differ greatly among candidates. The sections on Evaluation describe the indicators of fulfillment.

A. TEACHING

The Department highly values effective teaching that enriches the students understanding of the discipline. Teaching includes more than didactic classroom teaching. Teaching also includes mentoring students in the laboratory, advising undergraduate, graduate, and/or professional students, and active participation on graduate thesis committees.

Criteria:

- Substantive classroom teaching (defined below)
- Substantive mentoring of graduate, undergraduate, postdoctoral and professional students in the laboratory

Evidence:

Candidates will include in their Promotion Dossier the following information:

- A list of courses they have taught that includes contact hours and effort for each course
- A list of graduate, undergraduate, professional, postdoctoral and visiting scientists they have mentored in the laboratory
- A list of doctoral committees on which they have served
- A list of undergraduate and/or other students they have advised/mentored
- Course evaluations and written statements from students.
- Additional annotations or copies of curricula or textbooks the candidate has developed or written

The Promotion Dossier will also include peer reviews of the candidate's teaching proficiency. The candidate's mentoring committee is specifically charged to observe the candidate's classroom skills and to observe her/his mentoring of undergraduate, graduate and postdoctoral students in the laboratory. In addition, at least one internal reviewer will be chosen who has direct knowledge of the candidate's classroom teaching by virtue of direct observation or having served as course director of a course in which the candidate has taught.

Evaluation:

The tenured faculty members judge whether a candidate is an effective classroom teacher by the course evaluations of the students and by the peer reviews provided by the mentoring committee and an internal reviewer.

The tenured faculty members judge effective mentoring by the quality of graduate student and postdoctoral work produced in the laboratory and the timeliness with which the work is completed.

While the Department highly values effective classroom teaching, no candidate can receive tenure based primarily on his or her teaching abilities. Conversely, the tenured faculty shall not recommend tenure for candidates who cannot competently fulfill their teaching responsibilities.

Benchmarks that mark the accomplishments of ideal candidates are: candidates who receive outstanding evaluations from students, volunteer for additional teaching, develop new curricula, and are adaptable in the courses they can teach.

The Department also values colleagues who are well regarded as mentors of graduate and postdoctoral students, not only in their own laboratory, but in other laboratories as well.

B. RESEARCH / SCHOLARSHIP

Biochemistry, molecular biology and biophysics are research-oriented disciplines. For promotion from tenure-track assistant professor to tenured associate professor, faculty members in BMBB must have an independent research program and have demonstrated scholarly excellence in their research area. In addition, the Department highly values collaborative investigation and encourages all faculty members to carry out multi-investigator, group-based projects. From both independent and group projects the research program needs to garner a strong positive reputation in the scientific community. As evidence of such accomplishment, faculty members must have acquired one or more peer-reviewed external research grants as Principal Investigator (or equivalent) to be considered for promotion to tenured associate professor. The Department believes that the ability to obtain and sustain a funded research program is one of the strongest indicators of scholarly excellence. As such, candidates being considered for promotion and tenure will have significant externally funded research at the time the dossier is evaluated.

Criteria:

- Publication in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals
- Funding from external, peer-reviewed, competitive grant programs
- Invited seminars at symposia, universities and companies and participation in national meetings
- Professional activities such as participation on study sections or panels, editorial boards or meeting/symposia organization.

Evidence:

- As part of the Promotion Dossier, the candidate will include his or her curriculum vitae documenting his or her publications, research funding (including duration, percent effort and direct cost amounts), attendance at meetings, invited seminars and professional activities relating to the review of manuscripts and grants.
- The candidate annotates publications (produced during the probationary period) to indicate the contributions of his/her laboratory and his/her collaborator's laboratories in the publications. This is especially important when the work is done in collaboration with other investigators.
- Similarly, if the candidate lists grant support from awards where she/he is not the Principal Investigator, the candidate should include a clear statement of her/his role including percent effort on such grants.
- A critically important source of evidence for the worthiness of a candidate's tenure comes from letters that the Department Head solicits to evaluate the candidate's dossier. These will be of two types. First, the Department Head solicits letters from colleagues within the Department and the University. Besides commenting on the candidate's suitability for promotion, internal letters provide valuable insight into matters such as teaching, service and collegial interactions that may not be apparent to outside reviewers. Second, the Department Head solicits letters from colleagues outside the University. The Department Head solicits reviewers to write an unbiased and candid judgment about the candidate's abilities to contribute to the advancement of

their field and their stature within their scientific community. Reviewers are asked to judge the quality and impact of the candidate's scholarly work as communicated via publications and oral presentations. The Department Head's solicitation also asks for judgment as to whether the writer believes the candidate has met or exceeded the criteria set out by the Department. The list of reviewers to solicit, both internal and external, is made by the Department Head in consultation with the candidate, the Mentoring Committee and others with expertise. No more than four external letters are solicited from reviewers with a direct personal or professional interest, in accord with the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*. This includes former mentors and collaborators. Eight-to-eleven total external letters are required. In practice, the Department Head solicits both from reviewers suggested by the candidate and from additional reviewers who are likely to give an incisive view. Because the laws of the state permit candidates to read these letters, candidates may write comments about the letters that can be placed in their dossier.

Evaluation:

From the completed dossier the tenured faculty will attempt to discern the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate and make a final recommendation on his/her overall worthiness. The tenured faculty members judge each candidate on his/her own merits recognizing the unique path each faculty member takes in her/his academic career.

A guiding principle of judgment is best stated in Section 7.11 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*; "*The basis for awarding indefinite tenure to the candidates possessing these qualities is the determination that each candidate 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.*" The Department interprets this to signify that a candidate shows promise of career-long success in research.

The Department values outstanding research productivity and elevated stature. Benchmarks that mark the accomplishments of ideal candidates are: list an extraordinary number of quality publications, have many publications in high-profile journals, received prestigious and lucrative grants, bestowed national awards, received invitations to give seminars at other universities, given plenary talks at meetings, served on editorial boards and study sections and have been chosen as a meeting organizer.

The candidate will be judged and evaluated by the tenured faculty not only on the number of publications but on the quality of the publications as evidenced by their placement in journals with high Impact Factors as given by the ISI Web of Knowledge.

The tenured faculty members expect candidates to have procured external, competitive, peer-reviewed funding, to have published in appropriate journals and to be recognized as contributors to their field. Candidates should have laboratories with students and staff that are contributing to publication of quality work. Candidates should have gained sufficient stature to receive manuscripts for peer review and/or grants to review.

In the disciplines covered by Biochemistry, Molecular Biology and Biophysics, the expectation is that funding will come from governmental, charitable or industrial sources. These include the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy, the Department of Agriculture, the American Cancer Society, the

Muscular Dystrophy Society, the American Diabetes Association and the Lymphoma and Leukemia Society as well as others.

Recognizing that within the spectrum of the research represented in the Department the means of funding and the format of publication vary, the tenured faculty attempts to judge each candidate in the context of his/her specialty. Nevertheless, the tenured faculty will judge whether the grant funding and publication record are likely to support continued research efforts.

The Department promotes collaborations among research laboratories. The Department looks favorably on collaborations in which the candidate has made substantial contributions. Collaborations where the candidate is directed by another faculty or provides only materials or equipment are less valued.

The Department also recognizes that other forms of productivity including patents and web-based products may be appropriate indicators of research activity. As in the case of collaborative efforts, the tenured faculty will judge whether such activities represent scholarly contributions as do research publications.

Letters from outside reviewers play an important role in the decision to grant tenure to a probationary faculty member. The tenured faculty looks for statements that indicate any of the following: (1) high quality and productivity in research, (2) novel contributions to their field, (3) exceeding the criteria our Department has set for tenure.

D. SERVICE

Criteria:

Service within the University including Departmental obligations and Collegiate/University committees or service in the community or service to professional societies

Evidence:

Candidates will include in their Promotion Dossier the following information:

- The candidate should list the committees on which she/he has served and the duration of their service. The description should include the function of the committee, if not obvious, and the candidate's role.
- The candidate should describe any community and professional service that he/she has done. While much professional service, such as editorial board service, can be considered a part of research effort, other service, such as election to an office in a professional society, can be considered in the Service category.

Usually, the Department Head will choose an internal reviewer who will be able to comment in her/his letter on the service of the probationary faculty.

Evaluation:

- The Department expects limited but enthusiastic participation in governance.

V. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION IN FACULTY RANK

Promotion decisions in the Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology and Biophysics require a positive vote by two-thirds of eligible voting faculty on the question to affirmatively recommend for promotion. Eligible members include faculty at the proposed rank and above voting for promotion, and faculty with tenure voting for tenure.

If a faculty member has a joint appointment in another department and is being considered for

promotion, the Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology and Biophysics will contact the other department(s) to obtain their assessment and record of vote on the proposed promotion. (See the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* for details on the evaluation of faculty with joint appointments.)

A. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Not applicable in the Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology and Biophysics (Entry level rank is Assistant Professor)

B. TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The criteria and standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in the Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology and Biophysics are those stated for consideration of tenure (see IV above). A recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor is made when an eligible faculty member has fulfilled the general criteria applicable to tenure.

C. TO PROFESSOR

Unlike the timeline associated with the granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, no timeline exists for promotion to Professor. The Department and the Medical School and College of Biological Sciences' Promotion and Tenure Committees consider approximately four to six years after tenure and promotion to Associate Professor as an appropriate amount of time before promotion in rank. However, faculty may remain at the rank of Associate Professor indefinitely and there is no expectation that faculty will be promoted to Professor solely on the basis of time in residence. The *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* requires that the tenured faculty of departments review and provide feedback to tenured associate professors every three years regarding their progress toward promotion to the rank of professor.

Candidates may be encouraged by the Department Head or by other faculty members to pursue promotion. When a candidate believes that he/she has fulfilled the criteria for promotion by the Departmental and Collegiate Promotion and Tenure Committees, the candidate should submit to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, a curriculum vitae with a cover letter explaining how and why she/he meets the criteria for promotion. As in the case of a probationary faculty member, the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee will make a recommendation to the Professors and to the Department Head as to whether the committee concurs with the candidate's petition. These decisions are normally made at a faculty meeting held in the spring. If either the Professors (by a majority vote) or the Department Head recommend going forward with the promotion process, then the Department will assemble a Promotion Dossier. As in the case of the dossier prepared for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the Promotion Dossier for promotion to Professor will include information on grant support, publications, recognition, professional service, teaching and service to units of the University, community and scholarly societies.

The completed Promotion Dossier is reviewed and voted on at an early fall faculty meeting, usually at the same meeting when the dossiers of Assistant Professors are reviewed. As before, the Professors vote as to whether or not the candidate should be promoted. A vote to promote of less than two-thirds of the voting Professors is considered unacceptable and not worthy of promotion. This metric will be stated by the Department Head in her/his

letter explaining the outcome of the vote. The Department Head's letter explains the reasons for the recommendation and states his or her own opinion of the candidate's worthiness. The Chair of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee also writes a letter explaining the reasons for the committee's recommendation. The dossier is passed to the Collegiate Promotion and Tenure committees. These committees review and pass judgment on promotion to Professor at the same meetings that they decide on tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

Because two colleges administer the Department, the Promotion and Tenure Committees of both the Medical School and the College of Biological Sciences vote upon Promotion Dossiers. The recommendations of both committees are forwarded to the Deans of the colleges. The Dean of the tenure home then makes the recommendation to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost or . The exact procedures are stated in the *Memorandum of Understanding Joint Departments College of Biological Sciences/Medical School Promotion and Tenure Protocol* dated November, 2006 (Appendix A).

Deviations:

Expedited promotion to Professor is possible when a candidate has an exceptional record at the rank of Associate Professor.

Departmental Consideration:

In the spirit of Section 9.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, the Department evaluates how the candidate's achievements have changed since tenure. The Department looks to see whether the candidate has added substantially to their scholarly achievements in research and teaching. Thus, while continued adherence to the criteria for achievement of tenure is required, the evaluation is directed towards assuring that the faculty member has gained an elevated stature in the global research community and makes substantive contributions to the teaching and service missions of the Department.

Note that while every candidate is judged on each criterion, the degree to which each candidate meets each criterion may differ greatly among candidates. The sections on Evaluation describe the indicators of fulfillment.

As in the case of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to the rank of Professor is based on the merit of the candidate with respect to their research, teaching and service as delineated by this 7.12 Statement.

1. Research

Criteria:

- Publication in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals
- Research funding from external, peer-reviewed, competitive programs
- Invited seminars at symposia, universities and companies and participation in national and/or international meetings
- Professional activities such as participation on study sections or panels, editorial boards or meeting/symposia organization.

Evidence:

- As part of the Promotion Dossier, the candidate will include his or her curriculum vitae documenting his or her publications, research funding, attendance at meetings, invited seminars and professional activities relating to the review of manuscripts and grants.

- The candidate annotates publications (produced since promotion to Associate Professor) to indicate the contributions of his/her laboratory and his/her collaborator's laboratories in the publications. This is especially important when the work is done in collaboration with other investigators.
- Similarly, if the candidate lists grant support from awards where she/he is not the Principal Investigator, the candidate should include a clear statement of her/his role including percent effort on such grants.
- A critically important source of evidence for the worthiness of a candidate's promotion comes from letters that the Department Head solicits to evaluate the candidate's dossier. These will be of two types. First, the Department Head solicits letters from colleagues within the Department and the University. These letters make a critical judgment on the merit of the candidate for promotion. Internal letters provide valuable insight into matters such as teaching, service and collegial interactions that may not be apparent to outside reviewers. Second, the Department Head solicits letters from colleagues outside the University. The Department Head solicits reviewers to write an unbiased and candid judgment about the candidate's contributions to their field and their stature within their scientific community. Reviewers are asked to judge the quality and impact of the candidate's publications. The Department Head's solicitation also asks for judgment as to whether the writer believes the candidate has met or exceeded the criteria set out by the Department. The list of reviewers to solicit, both internal and external, is made by the Department Head in consultation with the candidate, and others with expertise. No more than four external letters are solicited from reviewers with a direct personal or professional interest, in accord with the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty*. This includes former mentors and collaborators. Eight-to-eleven total external letters are required. In practice, the Department Head solicits both from reviewers suggested by the candidate and from additional reviewers who are likely to give an incisive view. Because the laws of the state permit candidates to read these letters, candidates may write comments about the letters that can be placed in their dossier.

Evaluation:

From the completed dossier, the Professors of the Department will discern the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate and make a final recommendation on his/her overall worthiness. The Professors judge each candidate on her/his own merits recognizing the unique path each faculty member takes in her/his academic career.

While a number of indicators are listed below, the primary consideration is that the candidate has successfully led a research laboratory that has made exceptional scholarly contributions in an area of science important to the mission of the Department. Recognition stems from high quality work disseminated through publications, talks and laboratory alumnae who themselves are garnering global recognition.

The Professors look for the following as indicators of Professorial stature:

- Sustained external, peer-reviewed funding
- Procurement of multiple grants
- Continual publication of high quality work

- A strong rate of publication
- A training program that shows sustained and successful mentoring of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows
- Placement of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows in prestigious fellowships or jobs
- Placement of laboratory personnel in academic or other scientific positions
- Mentoring of junior faculty members
- Procurement of training grants
- Presentations at other research institutions
- Presentations at meetings with global audiences
- Meeting organizer
- Collegial interactions that foster advancements in other laboratories
- Service on editorial boards and study sections
- Election to positions in professional societies
- Leadership roles locally, nationally, and internationally

The Department promotes collaborations among research laboratories. The Department looks favorably on collaborations in which the candidate has made substantial contributions. Collaborations where the candidate is directed by another faculty or provides only materials or equipment are less valued.

The Department also recognizes that other forms of productivity including patents and web-based products may be appropriate indicators of research activity. As in the case of collaborative efforts, the Professors will judge whether such efforts represent the same scholarly effort as do research publications.

Letters from outside reviewers play an important role in the decision to promote from Associate Professor to Professor. The Professors look for statements that indicate any of the following: (1) high quality and productivity in research, (2) novel contributions to their field, and (3) meeting or exceeding the criteria our Department has set for promotion.

Some letters will come from scientists outside the United States and will be used to document the candidate's international reputation.

2. Teaching

Professors should be successful teachers both in the classroom and in the laboratory.

Criteria:

- Outstanding classroom teaching
- Mentoring of graduate, undergraduate, postdoctoral and/or professional students in the laboratory

Evidence:

Candidates will include in their Promotion Dossier the following information:

- A list of courses they have taught that includes contact hours and effort for each course
- A list of graduate, undergraduate, professional, postdoctoral and visiting scientists they have mentored in the laboratory

- A list of doctoral committees on which they have served
- Course evaluations and written statements from students
- Additional annotations or copies of curricula or textbooks the candidate has developed or written

Usually, one or more of the internal reviewers will be able to comment in their letters on the teaching capabilities of the candidate.

Evaluation:

The Professors look for the following indicators:

- Outstanding teaching evaluations by students and peers
- Adaptability in teaching courses at multiple levels (undergraduate, professional and graduate)
- Adaptability in changing curricula and pedagogic methodologies
- Service as course director
- Dedicated mentoring of junior faculty
- Graduation of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows
- Service on dissertation committees
- Publication of books or other instructional material

3. Service

- Professors should serve on and lead and/or chair Departmental, Collegiate and University committees.
- Creating and sustaining a culture that fosters diversity.

Criteria:

- Service within the University including Departmental obligations and Collegiate/University committees

Evidence:

Candidates will include in their Promotion Dossier the following information:

- A list of committees on which they have served and the duration of their service.

Usually, the Department Head will choose an internal reviewer who will be able to comment in her/his letter on the service of the candidate.

Evaluation:

The Professors look at the following indicators:

- Effective mentoring of junior faculty. Effective mentorship means helping junior faculty achieve the accomplishments in research, teaching and service needed for tenure.
- Leadership roles in the Department, e.g., Director of Graduate Studies
- Service and leadership roles on Departmental committees
- Service and leadership roles on Collegiate committees
- Service and leadership roles on University committees
- Leadership roles in the College or University, e.g., election to the University senate
- Community service

VI. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

The Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology and Biophysics utilizes the process for post tenure review defined in subsection 7a of the *Faculty Tenure* policy and the *Procedures for Reviewing Faculty for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty*. The faculty member will be reviewed on the basis of goals and expectations in research, teaching, and service. For a satisfactory review, a faculty member should have two or more accomplishments in the outstanding or satisfactory category for at least two of the three major activity sectors (teaching, research and service).

The specific criteria for performance evaluation in the Department include:

A. TEACHING

1. Outstanding accomplishments
 - a. National leadership in teaching and/or curricular issues
 - b. Authoring a new textbook or other educational media (video, software, etc)
 - c. Leadership in restructuring an existing course or course series
 - d. Recipient or nominee for a teaching award
 - e. Serving on editorial board for a journal emphasizing teaching and pedagogy
 - f. Development of a new course

2. Satisfactory accomplishments
 - a. Lecturer in one or more courses with substantial contact time and satisfactory evaluations by students and peers.
 - b. Member of college or university committee that addresses educational activities.
 - c. Serve on graduate or undergraduate student thesis committee
 - d. Serve as advisor to a student group

3. Unsatisfactory accomplishments
 - a. Does not satisfy at least two of the criteria under the satisfactory or outstanding category each year.

B. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

1. Outstanding accomplishments
 - a. First or senior authorship of a research publication in a very high profile journal (Science, Nature, Cell, etc.)
 - b. Organize or co-organize a major scientific meeting, workshop or symposium.
 - c. Deliver a plenary talk or named lectureship at a meeting or academic institution.
 - d. Be principal investigator on a multi-PI, center, PPG or training grant that supports research beyond that in your own laboratory.
 - e. Be a recipient of a MERIT award or other similar career development award.
 - f. Be the recipient of multiple federal awards concurrently.
 - g. Have a patent issued or license a product or invention

2. Satisfactory accomplishments
 - a. Publish original research in peer-reviewed journals related to the discipline.
 - b. Be principal investigator on a national research grant (e.g., NIH, NSF, ADA).
 - c. Organize a local research symposium.
 - d. Be a speaker at a meeting related to your discipline
 - e. Publish peer-reviewed review articles in your research area.
 - f. File an invention disclosure

3. Unsatisfactory accomplishments
 - a. Does not satisfy at least two of the criteria under the satisfactory or outstanding category each year.

C. SERVICE

1. Outstanding accomplishments
 - a. Direct a departmental service facility, core or ISO
 - b. Serve as Director of Postdoctoral, Graduate or Undergraduate Studies
 - c. Chair a major College or University Committee
 - d. Be an Editor or Associate Editor of a journal related to the discipline.
 - e. Chair an NIH Study Section or other similar national committee
 - f. Hold an elected office in a scientific or learned society related to the discipline
2. Satisfactory accomplishments
 - a. Be a member of an all-university committee
 - b. Chair or be a member of a Departmental committee
 - c. Organize or contribute to an outreach program
 - d. Be a member of a journal editorial board
 - e. Carry out ad hoc reviews for journals or granting agencies
3. Unsatisfactory accomplishments
 - a. Does not satisfy at least two of the criteria under the satisfactory or outstanding category each year.

VII. VOTING PROCEDURES

A. VOTE

1. A vote will be taken for decisions to continue a probationary appointment or recommend a candidate for promotion and/or tenure. Such a vote will require a 2/3 majority for the motion to pass.
2. A vote will be taken for all decisions to terminate the contract of a probationary faculty member. Such a vote will require a 2/3 majority for the motion to pass.

VIII. PROCESS FOR UPDATING 7.12 STATEMENT

This document will be reviewed, and revised as necessary, every five years or when changes in the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* warrant.

History:

Approved by Biochemistry, Molecular Biology and Biophysics Faculty: October 17, 2012
Approved by Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost: October 18, 2012

PART 3. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

A. ANNUAL REVIEW

All tenured faculty must undergo an annual review each year. This process is key in allowing the faculty member and the department to assess individual progress. It also helps to protect the faculty member, the department, and the School, in case of any misunderstanding or conflict that may arise. For any questions about this process, please call the Office of Faculty Affairs and/or the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs.

1. During the spring of each academic year, all department heads will schedule an annual review conference with each tenured faculty member. This responsibility may be delegated to Division Chiefs, Departmental Review Committee, Center Directors or other designee. All reviews must receive final approval and signature from the Department Head.
2. Prior to this conference the individual faculty member will provide the requisite information, as well as an updated curriculum vitae, following the department's annual review reporting format.
3. Annual reviews may be carried out in the format preferred by each department but must, at a minimum, be compliant with the rules detailed in the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, Section 7a, and the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*.
4. The annual review documentation should include:
 - a. Accomplishments of the previous year, particularly in relation to goals set for the year.
 - b. Detailed accomplishments in each domain relevant to the faculty member (as applicable: teaching, research and/or scholarship, service, and clinical activity (if applicable)):
 - i. Evaluation of quality and quantity of teaching, attitude towards learners, knowledge of subject matter, and specific contributions to continuing education.
 - ii. Evaluation of research and/or scholarly activity including current projects, grants applied for or funded, publications, and papers presented or submitted.
 - iii. Evaluation of service.
 - iv. Evaluation of clinical activity (when applicable), including volume of patients served, breadth of referrals, incorporation of patient care into teaching program, activity in local and national professional organizations.
 - c. Percentage of effort in each domain, to be updated annually.
 - d. Agreed upon goals for the upcoming year.

- e. Plans for subsequent years with specific recognition of outstanding accomplishments and plans to maintain high performance level.
5. The Annual Review conference should emphasize frank discussion concerning the faculty member's past and present performance in given areas of responsibility, noting progress in achieving previously established goals and objectives. In particular, it is important to frame the evaluation in the context of the proposed distribution of responsibilities in the four domains of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, Service, and Clinical Activity (if applicable). If the faculty member is working towards promotion, the Department Head and the faculty member should ensure that year-by-year progress, consistent with the Departmental 7.12 Statement, has been appropriate to date and specific goals for the coming year should be agreed upon.

Pursuant to the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty*, each department's tenured faculty shall review their tenured associate professors at a minimum of every four years regarding their progress toward achieving the rank of professor. This review is based upon the criteria for promotion to professor in the department 7.12 statement. This four-year progress review can be part of the annual review process.

6. Following the Annual Review conference, the Department Head or designee will complete the Medical School Annual Review Form, summarizing the conference and stating the agreed upon goals for the upcoming year. The Medical School Annual Review Form must be signed by the faculty member, the evaluator (if applicable), and the Department Head.
7. For faculty members who have met the goals and expectations for tenured faculty for the department, according to the department 7.12 statement, the signed Medical School Annual Review Form is sent to office of Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs who signs on behalf of the Dean. The review form will be handled confidentially by the Dean and the Associate Dean and will assist them in supporting recommendations for promotion, special recognition, or salary adjustments.
8. If the department head or designee finds that the tenured faculty member's performance is below that of the goals and expectations of the department as specified in the 7.12 statement, then the case is referred to a committee of elected, tenured faculty members in the department. If that committee concurs with the judgment of the department head, then both the department head and the committee formulate a detailed written Faculty Improvement Plan for the faculty member. The letter from the department head and the elected committee must identify the ending date for the period of performance improvement and must request that the faculty member provide a report at that time describing his or her

progress towards meeting the goals and expectations of the department.

The department head and the committee chair should make reasonable efforts to meet with the faculty member to discuss the plan for meeting the goals and expectations of the unit. The faculty member may request modification of the plan from the department head and the committee but may not at this stage file a complaint with the Senate Judicial Committee.

At the end of the time period specified for performance improvement, the faculty member under review must provide a report describing his or her progress toward meeting the goals and expectations of the department. The department head and the elected committee of tenured faculty will then review the progress that the faculty member has made regarding the recommendations as specified in the report from the faculty member.

This process above may be repeated for a second year if the faculty member has failed to complete the initial plan.

B. SPECIAL PEER REVIEW

1. Initiation

In compliance with Section 7a.3 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, a Special Peer Review may be requested by the department head and the departmental review committee of elected, tenured faculty members following the unsuccessful completion of a Faculty Improvement Plan as described in Section A.8 above.

2. The Medical School Dean will be notified and asked to initiate a Special Review. The Dean must first review the file independently to determine that the faculty member falls below the department's goals and expectations and has not successfully completed the Faculty Improvement Plan. S/he determines that special peer review is warranted.

3. The *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* describe details of the process for the special peer review. Some of these are highlighted below but the reader is referred to the *Procedures* and the *Faculty Tenure* policy for a complete perspective. All of the steps in the *Procedures* and subsection 7a.3 of the *Faculty Tenure* policy must be followed even if they are not described in this document.

4. Review Panel

A Special Review Panel composed of tenured members at the same rank or above the rank of the faculty member under review:

- i. Members are elected independently for each Special Review, by the tenured faculty of the department.
- ii. Members (5) include:

1. 1 member appointed by the faculty member being reviewed.
 2. 4 members elected from a slate of candidates nominated by department head and the tenured faculty.
 - iii. Members may be in the department or outside, if appropriate – case by case. If the faculty member has a secondary appointment in another department, that department should be represented on the committee.
 - iv. Members should not be the same as any previous review committee for that faculty member
5. Special Review materials include:
- a. Department head and previous Review Committee statement(s) requesting Special Review.
 - b. Annual review with goals and effort distribution (at least 5 years if available).
 - c. Previous recommendations for faculty development and outcomes (Performance Improvement Plans).
 - d. Personal statement by the faculty member.
 - e. Current annotated curriculum vitae.
 - f. Teaching evaluations.
 - g. Reprints.
 - h. Supporting documentation, including, but not limited to, letters of acceptance for articles in press, and acknowledgement by journal or funding agency of manuscript or proposal receipt.
 - i. Any other relevant documentation.
6. Review Criteria and Methodology
- a. The main focuses of the Special Review are the area(s) of deficiency identified in previous review(s).
 - b. Due process procedures, as defined in University documents, will be applied to address disagreements at different levels of the review and to offer protection for academic freedom.
 - c. Faculty members undergoing review may examine any material in their file at any time in the review process
 - d. Faculty member's performance will be evaluated as either:
 - i. Satisfactory: meeting department and/or Medical School goals and expectations for tenured faculty members.
 - ii. Unsatisfactory: not meeting department and/or Medical School goals and expectations for tenured faculty members.
 - e. The actions that the Panel may recommend, listed in section 7a.3 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, include:
 - i. Terminate review if the Panel finds that the faculty member's performance meets the goals and expectations of the department.
 - ii. Alter allocation of effort if the Panel determines that the faculty member's strengths are not being fully utilized: it might suggest

- that the allocation of effort between teaching, research, and service be altered so as to maximize the faculty member's contributions to the University.
- iii. Suggested improvements: if the faculty member's performance is likely to be improved by specific steps, and that process can adequately be monitored by further regular Annual Reviews, the Panel may suggest that those steps be taken and remit the case to the Annual Review process.
 - iv. Salary reduction if the faculty member's performance has declined in such a way as no longer to warrant the base salary that is attached to the position, the Panel may recommend a reduction in base salary of up to 10% (see Board of Regents Policy: *Tenure Faculty* for complete details).
 - v. Dismissal: if the faculty member's performance has fallen below the standard of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* Section 10.21(a), "sustained refusal or failure to perform reasonably assigned duties adequately," the Panel can recommend the commencement of proceedings for termination of appointment, or involuntary leave of absence (see details below).
 - vi. The Panel may also recommend a combination of these measures.
- f. The recommendations of the Panel will be implemented by the Department, the Dean's Office or other administrative body, as appropriate, depending on the specific recommendation.

History of Revisions (approved by vote of the Faculty):

Original Document: Date unknown

Approved by Medical School Faculty: June 21, 2012

Approved by Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost: June 22, 2012