

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
MEDICAL SCHOOL

DEPARTMENT OF BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES

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 members of the Department of Biomedical Sciences, 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. Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty Members in the Department of Biomedical Sciences are expected to advance in rank to the level of Full Professor.

This document contains the Department of Biomedical Sciences 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

**II. MISSION STATEMENT**

The Department of Biomedical Sciences supports the broader mission of the University of Minnesota Medical School, Duluth Campus, by fostering excellence in research and the advancement of learning and knowledge.

**III. APPOINTMENT AND ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY**

**A. APPOINTMENT OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY**

Committees made up of department tenured faculty will conduct the search. Tenured and tenure-track appointments to the Department of Biomedical Sciences require pre-approval by the Dean of the Medical School to initiate a search. Faculty hired with tenure are subject to approval by the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University of Minnesota.

For recommendation for appointment to the tenure track at the rank of Assistant Professor, the candidate is expected to demonstrate the potential for scholarship in research and teaching. Although independent research may not always be evident, the individual should demonstrate scholarly contributions to high quality research that has been accepted for publication in high impact peer-reviewed national or international journals in their respective discipline. There should also be evidence of oral and written communication skills that are consistent with a high potential for teaching effectiveness. Appointees at this level must demonstrate strong potential for satisfying criteria for promotion and tenure.

**Mentoring**

Mentoring is recognized as a critical responsibility of senior faculty members to promote faculty development and retention. Team-mentoring is used for mentoring Assistant Professors; peer mentoring is arranged for Associate and Full Professors. The Department Head shall appoint individual team mentors for each probationary faculty member. The mentoring team is expected to develop a mentoring plan in conjunction with the Department Head, to meet at least biannually, and to submit a summary of the team meeting discussions to the faculty member and his or her Department Head.

**B. ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY**

**1. Process**

The overall process for Annual Review of Probationary Faculty in the Department of Biomedical Sciences is in compliance with Section 7.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* and the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*. Following the



Medical School calendar for annual appraisals, the probationary faculty member and Department Head shall assemble a file that includes:

- a. Candidate's current curriculum vitae.
- b. Summary of candidate's teaching assignments including hours and evaluations.
- c. Copies of the candidate's research or other scholarly contributions.
- d. Summaries of discipline-related service activities.
- e. Copies of all annual reports and Appraisal of Probationary Faculty forms from prior years.
- f. Any other relevant information or evaluations of the candidate's activities.

The Department Head shall convene a meeting of the tenured faculty of the Department of Biomedical Sciences at which time each probationary faculty member's file will be presented by the Department Head for discussion and evaluation. The Department Head shall summarize the meeting discussion regarding the performance of each candidate. This summary will then be provided to the tenured faculty in the Department of Biomedical Sciences and to the Medical School Duluth Campus Dean for review. Following review, the Department Head will report the results of the meeting of the tenured faculty and provide the candidate with a copy of the summary of the meeting discussion. The Department Head will complete the University of Minnesota (UM) Form 12 and give the candidate a copy of the annual Appraisal of Probationary Faculty Report. The Department Head will forward the UM Form 12 to the Medical School Duluth Campus Dean's office for further processing.

2. Criteria

The criteria for satisfactory performance to be used for the annual review of probationary faculty members are the same as with the appropriate criteria for rank, as defined in this 7.12 Statement.

#### IV. CRITERIA FOR TENURE

The faculty of the Department of Biomedical Sciences accepts and subscribes to the statement on criteria and standards for tenure of faculty at the University of Minnesota Medical School, as described in Part 1, Medical School Preamble. A two-thirds majority vote of all eligible faculty members is required to support the recommendation for granting indefinite tenure. Eligible members include all tenured faculty members with primary appointment in the Department of Biomedical Sciences. Granting of indefinite tenure is based on a record of sustained performance in research, teaching, and service. Although distinction in research or teaching may be more heavily weighted, the primary element in the tenure decision is a demonstration of nationally recognized scholarly or other creative achievement and teaching effectiveness; service alone is not sufficient for the granting of tenure. When research is more heavily weighted in the tenure decision, the candidate must also demonstrate, at a minimum, teaching effectiveness. When teaching is weighted more heavily in the tenure decision, the candidate must demonstrate, at a minimum, competency in research.

##### A. RESEARCH / SCHOLARSHIP

Research competency: For demonstration of competence in research, candidates must satisfy the criteria of peer-reviewed publications (#1 below) and national or international recognition of scholarly research contributions (#2 below).

Distinction in research: If distinction in research is more heavily weighted in the decision regarding tenure, the candidate must satisfy each of the following criteria (#1, #2 and #3 below):

1. Publication in peer-reviewed journals

Publication of original research that advances the candidate's field of research in national or international peer-reviewed scientific journals. Evidence is sought that the investigator is independent, and that the work is scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance. Generally, faculty members are expected to generate peer-reviewed publications and/or patents throughout their probationary period, the absolute number depends on such factors as order of authorship, impact of articles and journals, and complexity

and constraints of the research area. Although independence of the investigator is a requirement for promotion, the department recognizes the value of collaborative and interdisciplinary research.

2. Recognition of scholarly contributions to the profession

Letters will be sought from external authorities in the candidate's discipline assessing his/her contributions to the discipline, documenting that the candidate's contributions are scholarly, creative, and have contributed significantly to advancement of the field. Objective indicators of the candidate's recognition in the profession include invitations to speak at national meetings and conferences, presentation before peers at other institutions, participation in peer review of manuscripts and grants in the disciplinary area, and individual citation factors.

3. External funding

The candidate must be a lead investigator in a successful and sustained research program. The contribution must be more than technical and include creative, scholarly contributions to the research program. In this capacity, the candidate is expected to successfully compete for external funding based upon peer review from federal, state, regional, national, or private agencies appropriate to their discipline.

B. TEACHING

Teaching effectiveness –Evidence of sustained, effective teaching at undergraduate, graduate, professional and/or post-doctoral levels as demonstrated by the written statements and/or compiled evaluations by both students and peers regarding:

- a) Review of course(s) taught, directed, or developed; a list of students and degree candidates for whom the faculty member has served as academic and/or research advisor.
- b) Written statements by the Head of the department, course directors, academic peers, and others familiar with the candidate's performance in teaching.

Distinction in teaching –requires documented evidence of innovation and effectiveness in education that has attracted national recognition. Teaching activities may occur in a variety of educational settings and formats, including, for example, didactic presentations, lectures, seminars, conferences, tutorials, mentoring, laboratories, case discussions, problem-based learning, and continuing education. Although, a candidate does not have to demonstrate distinction in all five areas, assessment of distinction in teaching is based on the following criteria:

1. Innovative contributions to the field of undergraduate, graduate, professional and/or postdoctoral education that have been adopted for use by other institutions and are recognized by peers external to the University of Minnesota as scholarly works.
2. Publication of peer-reviewed journal articles in appropriate, highly respected journals in the area of scholarship of teaching. Peer-reviewed scholarship may be through traditional publications or a combination of peer-reviewed publications and other scholarly products such as peer-reviewed online repositories such as MedEdPORTAL. Books, e-publications, audiovisual aids, and/or other significant contributions to educational advances in the discipline that are distributed at a national level are helpful, but not sufficient to support promotion with tenure.
3. Letters from leading educators in the discipline attesting to the candidate's national reputation and assessing the candidate's contributions to the development of advances in education in the field.
4. Participation on committees or appointment to the administration of national or international organizations, such as the discipline specific societies that have significant activities devoted to teaching and educational development.
5. Having significant responsibility in a training program for undergraduate, graduate, professional or post-doctoral students or obtaining funding for such programs in the form of nationally competitive training grants.

C. SERVICE

Although service cannot by itself be the basis for awarding of tenure, all faculty members of the Department of Biomedical Sciences are expected to participate in the governance of the institution and provide service to the University, to professional organizations and to the community. This includes for example, membership on standing and/or ad hoc committees of the Medical School Duluth Campus, as well as, committee or administrative service to discipline-specific regional and national organizations and professional societies.

V. **CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION IN RANK**

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. Eligible members include tenured faculty at the proposed rank and above when voting for promotion in rank.

If a faculty member has a joint appointment in another unit, the Department of Biomedical Sciences 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 Medical School (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 Biomedical Sciences are the same as those stated for granting indefinite tenure (see section IV, above). A recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor is made when an eligible faculty member has fulfilled the criteria applicable to tenure.

C. TO PROFESSOR

The *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* require that the tenured faculty members of departments review and provide feedback to tenured Associate Professors every four years regarding their progress toward promotion to the rank of Professor. A recommendation for promotion to Professor is made when an Associate Professor has fulfilled the criteria and standards for the rank of Professor, including University expectations from the Regents: “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 ordinarily resulting from such distinction and achievement. Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, and technology transfer will be taken into consideration in evaluating the candidate’s satisfaction of criteria; such contributions can involve scholarly research or other creative work, education, applied medical and scholarship-area service.”

Candidates for promotion in rank to Professor will be expected to demonstrate a sustained high level of productivity and accomplishment in research, teaching and service beyond those expected of an Associate Professor. They must also have achieved national or international recognition in research or teaching. Examples of criteria that are consistent with this level of distinction include:

1. Invitations to present at national or international scientific or educational symposia.
2. Election as an officer to national or international scientific or educational societies or organizations.
3. Appointment to editorial boards for scientific or educational journals.
4. Appointment to federal or international review or scientific advisory panels.
5. Letters from nationally and internationally recognized authorities in the candidate’s discipline attesting to the significance of the scientific or educational contributions and their impact on advancing the discipline.
6. Other forms of documentation of national or international recognition.

In addition, candidates for the rank of professor must demonstrate accomplishment in each of the following areas:

**1. Research Scholarship**

Demonstrated by activities listed below (items A and B are required):

- A. Sustained record of publication of original research results in respected peer-reviewed scientific journals. Comprehensive reviews or book chapters, although not necessarily peer-reviewed, that are recognized as exerting a major influence in the biomedical or biobehavioral sciences as well as service as editor to textbooks or journals will also be considered.
- B. Successful and sustained acquisition of competitive external funding to support the faculty member's independent scientific or educational research program.

For the evidence of scholarship, it should be documented that these scholarly innovations have been disseminated to other academics and/or clinicians through national and/or international presentations and publications, the majority of which are senior authorship, with the absolute number of publications depending on such factors as authorship, impact of articles and journals, consistency of publication record, and complexity of research.

**2. Teaching**

Effectiveness in teaching as evidenced by:

- A. Successful mentoring of medical, graduate, or undergraduate students; clinical or postdoctoral fellows; or junior faculty.
- B. Positive learner evaluations of curriculum, courses or lecture developed by the candidate for promotion
- C. Review by peers at the local or national level.

If distinction in teaching is weighted more heavily in promotion to the rank of professor, the faculty member must be recognized nationally and/or internationally as a leader and innovator in professional, graduate or post-doctoral medical education. This should be apparent as demonstrated by invitations to present at discipline-based professional societies or other academic institutions and from letters solicited from external experts in medical education. One example of peer recognition is the development of original peer-reviewed teaching materials, such as new curriculum offerings, educational programs, textbooks, syllabi, or electronic media that are widely adopted and used nationally or internationally. If the primary scholarly product is teaching materials or methods, documentation of these activities and copies of the most significant published teaching materials (e.g., written curriculum or course syllabus) must be provided.

**3. Service**

The candidate should be recognized by peers as a leader in his/her specific discipline as demonstrated by:

- A. Leadership on committees or administrative positions in national professional organizations.
- B. Invitations to membership or fellowship in prestigious professional societies.
- C. Other academic recognition or awards

**VI. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY**

The review for each tenured faculty member of the Department of Biomedical Sciences utilizes the process for Post-Tenure Review defined by Part 3 of the Medical School criteria for the Annual Review of Tenured Faculty. The Annual Review of each faculty member is intended to document the individual's contributions and accomplishments with respect to research, teaching, and service responsibilities to the unit. All faculty members are expected to contribute to each of the three elements of the triad, taking into account individual differences in scholarly strengths and career aspirations. An individual faculty member's balance of contributions across the three areas may vary from year to year, but should be consistent with the professional development of the faculty member and may involve changing career patterns.

The principal objective of the annual review is to ensure continuation of high caliber scholarly performance following the granting of tenure. The aim is to maximize individual faculty member's performance and encourage individual contribution to the overarching mission of the Department of Biomedical Sciences.

The Department of Biomedical Sciences has established basic goals and expectations for performance in research, teaching and service – all faculty members are expected to meet these goals and expectations on an annual basis. Performance with regard to achieving these basic goals and expectations will be noted by the Department Head when conducting the annual review and will be discussed with the faculty member when drafting the written annual plan for the upcoming year. Faculty members who exceed expectations will be recognized and appropriately rewarded by the Department Head and the Medical School Duluth Campus administration. Examples that meet and/or warrant distinction in scholarship, teaching and service are listed below.

#### **A. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP**

##### **1. MEETS EXPECTATIONS**

A tenured faculty member is expected to demonstrate evidence of at least three of the following indicators of scholarship annually with a & b prioritized:

- a. Sustained submission of research applications to nationally competitive, peer-reviewed funding agencies.
- b. Sustained record of publication of original research in peer-reviewed scientific or educational journals.
- c. Directing a research program.
- d. Publication of non-refereed book chapters, proceedings, or other scholarly products.
- e. Presentations at regional and national scientific or educational meetings.
- f. Invited lectures.
- g. Awarded competitive intramural/ local (e.g., Graduate School, MMF, Whiteside, etc.) individual research grant.

##### **2. EXAMPLES OF ACHIEVEMENTS THAT WARRANT DISTINCTION IN RESEARCH:**

- a. Recipient of a Merit Award or career development award (e.g. Howard Hughes Investigator, Research Career Development Award or other nationally competitive career development award).
- b. Multiple senior author publications in high quality, national or international refereed journals in the faculty member's discipline.
- c. P.I. or co-PI on an extramural research grant, including educational research, that supports the faculty's individual research.
- d. P.I. or co-PI on a new or competing renewal of a nationally competitive research grant that contributes to a program that extends beyond the research of an individual's laboratory (e.g., a program project grant, training grant, center grant, core grant, or shared instrumentation grant).
- e. Organization of a symposium/workshop at a prominent national or international meeting.
- f. Delivery of an invited plenary talk at a prominent national or international meeting.
- g. Inventor or co-inventor on a provisional or approved patent or other technology transfer agreement

#### **B. TEACHING**

##### **1. MEETS EXPECTATIONS**

A tenured faculty member is expected to demonstrate evidence of at least two of the following indicators of effective teaching annually:

- a. Teaching effort that is consistent with departmental teaching needs for undergraduate, graduate, professional and/or postdoctoral students.
- b. Teaching effort factors in teaching evaluations from students/peers.
- c. Member of thesis advisory committee(s) for graduate students.

- d. Member of education committees at the University.
- e. Mentoring of medical, graduate or undergraduate students, or clinical or postdoctoral research fellows.

**2. EXAMPLES OF ACHIEVEMENTS THAT WARRANT DISTINCTION IN TEACHING:**

- a. National leadership in shaping the curriculum.
- b. Author or editor of education media (e.g., textbook, electronic media, multimedia) that are used nationally.
- c. Leader in the development of a new educational program or revitalization of an existing program.
- d. Recipient of a prominent University, national or international award in education.
- e. Internal Medical School teaching award.
- f. Director of a Medical School, graduate or undergraduate course.
- g. Major graduate thesis advisor or post-doctoral advisor.
- h. Employing student learning outcomes evaluations of instructional methods.

**C. SERVICE**

**1. MEETS EXPECTATIONS**

A tenured faculty member is expected to demonstrate evidence of at least two of the following indicators of effective service annually:

- a. Graduate program committee member.
- b. Contributor to a public outreach program
- c. Contributor to University or Medical School Center.
- d. University-wide or Medical School committee/task force member.
- e. Ad hoc grant or manuscript reviewer.
- f. Contributor to a discipline based professional society.
- g. Member of an NIH Study section or similar regional/national granting agency.
- h. Mentoring of faculty members.

**2. EXAMPLES OF ACHIEVEMENTS THAT WARRANT DISTINCTION IN SERVICE:**

- a. Development of and/or direction of graduate program.
- b. Organizer of an outreach program
- c. Directs a University or Medical School Center.
- d. Chairs University or Medical School committee.
- e. Editor of a journal.
- f. Officer/committee member of a discipline-based professional society or organization.
- g. Chair of an NIH Study section or regional/ national granting agency.

If the performance of a tenured faculty member is found to be substantially below the goals and expectations of the Department of Biomedical Sciences, the case will be referred to a committee of elected, tenured faculty as specified in part 3, section H of this document.

**VII. PROCEDURES**

- A. Decisions to recommend advancement in rank are decided by a 2/3 majority vote by all eligible faculty members of the Department of Biomedical Sciences.
- B. A vote by the faculty will be taken for all proposals to terminate the contract of a probationary faculty member. Such a vote will require a 2/3 majority for the motion to pass. Eligible faculty members include all full-time tenured faculty members of the Department of Biomedical Sciences.

**VIII. PROCESS FOR UPDATING 7.12 STATEMENT**

This policy will be reviewed every 5 years or when University circumstances indicate a review is appropriate. Draft revisions to the Department of Biomedical Sciences 7.12 Statement will be forwarded to all tenured and tenure-track faculty members of the Department at least two weeks prior to a scheduled meeting to discuss and vote on the proposed changes. The new 7.12 statement will be effective on the date of approval by the Executive Vice President and Provost and will apply to all Tenured/Tenure Track faculty hired after that date. Faculty members will be granted the opportunity to elect the revised 7.12 statement to supersede the statement in force at the time of their initial appointment or latest promotion.

**History of Revisions:**

*Approved by the Biomedical Sciences Faculty: May 3, 2018*

*Approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost on 3 August 3, 2018*

**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*