

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
MEDICAL SCHOOL
DEPARTMENT OF NEUROSCIENCE

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 SECTION

I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

This document describes the specific criteria and standards which will be used to evaluate whether faculty in the Department of Neuroscience 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*, as defined for this Department.

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 criteria for Post-Tenure Review

II. MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Department of Neuroscience is to:

- A. Conduct outstanding neuroscience research.
- B. Be an educational resource to the Medical School and the University by providing neuroscience education to undergraduate, medical, dental, graduate, and post-graduate students.
- C. Foster scholarly and academic development of its faculty.
- D. Provide leadership and be a focal point for the strengthening of neuroscience across the University by enhancing research, educational, and funding opportunities.
- E. Provide a bridge for the transfer of advances in basic neuroscience into clinical practice with the goal of improving the health of the people of Minnesota.
- F. Enhance the understanding and appreciation of neuroscience by the people of Minnesota.
- G. Mentor Neuroscience faculty members to progress to the rank of full Professor.

III. APPOINTMENT AND ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

A. APPOINTMENT

Tenured and tenure-track hires require pre-approval by the Dean of the Medical School prior to initiating an academic search. Faculty hires with tenure are subject to final approval by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost of the University of Minnesota.

B. ANNUAL APPRAISAL OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

Process

The overall process for Annual Review of Probationary Faculty in the Department of Neuroscience is in compliance with Section 7.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*. Development of Assistant Professors in research and teaching will be fostered through mentorship by senior faculty. Two mentors will be assigned to each probationary faculty member. The goal is for one mentor to have expertise related to the research program of the assistant professor, the second mentor to have a prominent role in a course in which the assistant professor has a teaching role. The research mentor will be designated within the first several months of appointment of the new faculty member; the teaching mentor will be appointed when the teaching responsibilities of the assistant professor are defined. The role of the research mentor is to monitor progress and serve as a resource in grant writing, manuscript submission, laboratory management and departmental culture. The role of the teaching mentor is to

provide guidance in lecture organization and content as well as development of presentation skills. The mentors also help the probationary faculty respond to issues raised in the annual review by senior faculty.

Tenure-track faculty members will be reviewed annually by tenured senior faculty members based upon a cumulative summary of the candidate's Faculty Activities Reports since appointment to the faculty. Probationary faculty members' performance will be reviewed relative to criteria established in this 7.12 Statement. The Department Head will begin the discussion of the probationary faculty member with a summary of the information in the faculty activity report. The research and teaching mentors will then add relevant comments. The report of the discussion will articulate strengths and weaknesses of the candidate, as well as recommendations for improvement when appropriate. The Department Head is responsible for preparing a University of Minnesota (UM) Form 12 (*Appraisal of Probationary Faculty*), which summarizes the discussion and will reflect the faculty member's performance relative to the 7.12 Statement. The Department Head will then meet with each probationary faculty member, individually, to discuss the content of the review, and each will sign the UM Form 12. Typically, it is expected that there will be a gradual increase in teaching and service responsibilities following the initial appointment of a probationary faculty member.

IV. CRITERIA FOR TENURE

The Department of Neuroscience follows the statement on Criteria for Tenure of Faculty from the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* and the Medical School Preamble (Part 1. of this document), with the following standards specific to the department. Research will be weighted more heavily than teaching in decisions regarding conferral of tenure. Evidence of effectiveness in teaching will also be required. When a candidate has been judged to meet the research criteria below in Section IV.B but not to have produced a distinctive record of research, she or he must demonstrate distinction in teaching as described below in Section IV.A.3. The candidate must also show effectiveness in service.

A. TEACHING

1. The Department of Neuroscience follows the Criteria and Standards for Tenure of Faculty in the University of Minnesota Medical School Preamble with respect to effectiveness in teaching. The following are areas in which effective teaching can be demonstrated:
 - a. Participation in teaching undergraduate, professional, and graduate students in the subject of Neuroscience.
 - b. Thesis adviser to candidates for advanced degrees (Master's degree and/or Ph.D.).
 - c. Act as a faculty sponsor for a postdoctoral fellow(s).
 - d. Mentor to students in any of the above categories who engage in research activities in the Department of Neuroscience.
 - e. Participation in outreach programs that provide neuroscience education outside of the University (e.g. Brain Awareness Week, etc.).
2. Evidence of effective teaching includes:
 - a. Review of lectures taught and syllabi of courses directed or developed by the candidate at undergraduate, professional and graduate levels.
 - b. Documentation of mentorship of graduate, undergraduate and professional students as well as postdoctoral trainees.

- c. Evaluations by students.
 - i. summary of numerical teaching evaluations
 - ii. letters solicited from students
 - d. Written statements by the Head of the department and other faculty members familiar with the candidate's teaching performance.
 - e. Accumulation of above forms of evidence over a sustained period of time.
3. Distinction in teaching is based on:
- a. The five items given above as sources of evidence for assessment of effectiveness in teaching.
 - b. Evidence of principal investigator status in the acquisition of external funding of projects related to education. Funding must be based upon peer review, and must be provided by federal agencies, international agencies or from nationally competitive private agencies appropriate to the discipline.
 - c. Evaluation of publications, such as books, peer reviewed journal articles, audiovisual aids, and/or other significant contributions to education in the discipline, that have been adopted for use by other institutions and are recognized by peers as scholarly contributions.
 - d. Letters from leading educators in the discipline attesting to the candidate's national reputation, and assessing the candidate's contributions to development of advances in education in the field.
 - e. Participation in national organizations, such as The Society for Neuroscience, that have significant activities devoted to education and educational developmental. Evidence of leadership in such an organization (such as by election to an officer position) would be of particular value.

B. RESEARCH / SCHOLARSHIP

Neuroscience is a research-oriented discipline and thus tenure recommendations are based heavily on scholarly activity of the faculty members. Every faculty member in the Department of Neuroscience must have an independent research program. Interdisciplinary and collaborative work is encouraged; however the candidate's contribution to collaborative work must be defined. Scholarly activity will be judged on the following standards:

1. Publications in Rigorously Peer-Reviewed Journals
Scientific articles reporting high quality biomedical research that significantly advances the candidate's field of research should be published in rigorously peer-reviewed journals appropriate to the discipline of Neuroscience. There are a large number of journals which serve the discipline of neuroscience reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of the field. Examples include, but are not limited to, *Journal of Neuroscience*, *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *Molecular and Cellular Neuroscience*, *Neuron*, *Science*, and *Nature*. Furthermore, the list of appropriate journals is dynamic. It is expected that the candidate publish in those journals recognized as of the highest quality and highest impact. Contributions to prestigious review journals, monographs, etc. that are not peer-reviewed will be taken into consideration, but cannot be the primary basis for a decision.
2. External Research Funding
Every faculty member in the Department of Neuroscience must have an independent research program and must acquire one or more external grants as a principal investigator. The grants must be peer-reviewed and be awarded by

federal agencies, international agencies or by nationally competitive private agencies appropriate to the discipline. Demonstrating the ability to obtain and renew external peer-reviewed grants is considered one of the strongest indicators of research excellence. The high likelihood of maintaining such funding throughout a faculty member's career is also deemed to be of the utmost importance.

3. Creative and Significant Scholarly Contributions
Letters of evaluation will be requested from peers within the Department of Neuroscience, the University, and from national and international leaders in the candidate's field of research. They should provide evidence that the candidate's contributions are scholarly, creative and have contributed significantly to advancement of the field. The assessment should also take into account the difficulty of the experimental approach in judging the productivity of the candidate. Primary resources to be included for assessment will include the candidate's curriculum vitae, statement of research accomplishments, and three publications selected by the candidate. Where appropriate, statements from collaborators defining the candidate's intellectual contribution may be included.
4. Patents
As intellectual property, patents are acknowledged as a significant scholarly contribution; however, evidence of inventorship cannot be used as the sole research criterion for tenure.
5. Invited Participation in Symposia, Meetings and Seminars
Invitations for the candidate to present his or her research at meetings sponsored by national and international scientific organizations and to give seminars before peers in other institutions both nationally and internationally is evidence of the candidate's reputation as a scholar. However, these cannot be used as the sole research criterion for tenure.
6. Service as an Editor or as a Member of the Editorial Board of a Reputable Journal or Monograph in a Biomedical Discipline
Service such as this usually indicates peer recognition for the candidate's contributions, but cannot be considered as the sole basis for tenure.
7. Publications in Monographs, Reviews and Other Books
Publications such as these, which are not generally peer-reviewed, should be part of the activities of a faculty member, but cannot be considered as the sole research basis for tenure.
8. Awards
Competitive research awards given by national and international societies in disciplines related to neuroscience will be considered.
9. Academic Citizenship
All faculty members are expected to contribute to the intellectual environment of the neuroscience community of the University. Examples include sharing of experimental expertise, extending invitations to seminar speakers, and assisting colleagues in preparing manuscripts and grant applications. These activities are expected to occur in a manner that creates and sustains a culture that fosters diversity.

C. SERVICE

Service activities valued in the Department of Neuroscience include, but are not limited to:

1. Participation in national organizations appropriate to professional activities. Examples include being an editor or serving on an editorial board for a reputable biomedical journal, serving on an NIH study section or being an organizer of a meeting or chaired a symposium.
2. Review of manuscripts submitted to journals or grant applications to local or national foundations or federal granting agencies.
3. Service on Departmental, Medical School or University committees.
4. Participation in community outreach activities such as Brain Awareness Week or the Brain Bee.
5. Participation in Departmental meetings.

V. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION IN FACULTY RANK

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 Neuroscience 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

An expectation of Associate Professors is a commitment to continue to grow academically to meet the criteria for promotion to the rank of full Professor. Not being promoted to the rank of Professor will not in itself result in special-post-tenure review of a tenured Associate Professor.

In addition to continued adherence to the standards on which promotion to Associate Professor was based, with respect to performance and accomplishments in research, teaching, and service, the Department of Neuroscience expects:

1. Research/Scholarship: Scholarly activity will be judged on the following standards.
 - a. Maintained publication of scientific articles reporting high quality biomedical research that continues to advance the candidate's field of research. Publications should continue to be in rigorously peer-reviewed journals and appropriate to the discipline of Neuroscience.
 - b. Maintained competitiveness in the acquisition of external funding based upon peer review, from federal agencies, international agencies, or from nationally competitive private agencies. Leadership in submission of program project and center grants is especially desirable
 - c. Patents filed and granted since promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.
 - d. Letters from authorities in the candidate's field, assessing the candidate's scientific contributions and demonstrating that she/he is among the leaders of his/her field and has added substantially to the field since the time of candidate's promotion to Associate Professor.
 - e. Enhanced reputation in the candidate's field may also be demonstrated by invitations to international symposia, election to prestigious scientific organizations, editorial boards, national review panels and holding offices in international societies since the time of promotion to Associate Professor.

2. Assessment of performance in teaching will include:
 - a. Continued evidence of effectiveness in teaching as defined in criteria for promotion to Associate Professor.
 - b. Increased leadership as an educator. Examples include role as a course director, director of an undergraduate or graduate program, and director of a training grant.
3. Service: Contributions to service will be judged on the basis of:
 - a. Evidence of University or professional service, including leadership roles, as described above.
 - b. Mentorship of Assistant Professors.
 - c. Creating and sustaining a culture that fosters diversity.

VI. ANNUAL AND POST-TENURE REVIEW

The goals and expectations of tenured faculty members in the Department of Neuroscience are guided by the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion*, and the mission statements of the Medical School and of the Department of Neuroscience. Each of these statements emphasizes the triad of Research, Education, and Service that comprise the faculty functions. All faculty members are expected to contribute to each of the three elements of the triad, taking into account different stages of faculty development. Furthermore, it is recognized that not all faculty members have equal strengths - strengths in one element of the triad may balance a weakness in another one. Finally, all tenured faculty members are expected to foster the development of Assistant Professors. Full Professors, in addition, are expected to foster the continued development of Associate Professors.

The principal goal of an annual review is to ensure continuation of high caliber performance following the granting of tenure. Thus the aim of the review is to improve faculty members' performance and to identify faculty members' potential weaknesses at an early stage. When weaknesses are apparent, the goal is to develop a plan for obviating these weaknesses before they become a detriment to an individual's effectiveness.

The goals and expectations for performance of tenured faculty for teaching, research, and service in the Department are below. General criteria for defining the levels of performance are stated below. Illustrative examples for each of the five levels are provided. These examples are not exclusive. The numerical rating for each category (research, teaching and service) is the mean of the scores given by each of the four Merit Review Committee members. Reaching any level of merit is based on the sum of a faculty member's achievements in the three categories. The overall ratings will be based on percent effort weightings. Thus, teaching performance expectations will be greater for a faculty member with a teaching effort of 70% vs. an effort of 25%.

The following includes prominent characteristics of each of the five levels of merit.

1. OUTSTANDING

- a. Very high threshold.
- b. Truly stellar accomplishments of very high impact and national or international recognition.
- c. Acquisition of research and training funds that impact more than the faculty member's own laboratory.

2. EXCELLENT

- a. Moderately high threshold, making this level of merit a reasonable incentive for attainment.

- b. Leadership in the University community.
- c. Acquisition of a major new or renewed research grant for the faculty member's own laboratory.

3. MEETS EXPECTATIONS

- a. Significant contributions to teaching and maintenance of an individual's research program.

4. MARGINALLY BELOW EXPECTATIONS

- a. Sub-par contributions to teaching and service and sub-par performance in an individual's research program.

5. SUBSTANTIALLY BELOW EXPECTATIONS

- a. Little or no contribution to teaching and service and poor performance in an individual's research program.

The first three levels of performance are considered meritorious. A ranking of "Marginally below expectations" should be construed as a sign that there are weaknesses in one or more areas of the faculty member's performance. In such an instance, the faculty member would be encouraged to work with the Merit Review Committee and the Department Head to remedy the weaknesses. In the case of a tenured faculty member, *an overall ranking of worse than 4.0 is considered as performance substantially below expectations and would trigger the procedures outlined in the Post-Tenure Review document.* For non-tenured, probationary faculty such a ranking would be an indication that the individual would be unlikely to be granted tenure, absent a dramatic improvement in performance. The intent of these procedures is to identify weaknesses in performance before they become serious and to provide all means of assistance to the individual to improve his/her performance.

The rating criteria for teaching, research and service are as follows:

A. TEACHING

1. OUTSTANDING

- a. National leadership in shaping the curriculum within a discipline.
- b. Author or editor of new education media (e.g., textbook, video, computer software) that are used nationally.
- c. Leader in the development of a new program or revitalization of an existing program.
- d. Prominent national or international award in education.

2. EXCELLENT

- a. Outstanding teaching as defined by course evaluations by students and peers.
- b. Director of a professional school course, didactic course in a graduate program, or undergraduate course.
- c. Director of a new course or revitalization of an existing course.

3. MEETS EXPECTATIONS

- a. Teaches in courses in an amount that is consistent with mean departmental teaching load.
- b. Member of thesis advisory committee(s) for graduate students.
- c. Member of committees that impact education at the University.

4. MARGINALLY BELOW EXPECTATIONS

- a. Little participation in courses or receiving below-par student evaluation scores in courses taught.
- b. No participation in thesis advisory committees.

5. SUBSTANTIALLY BELOW EXPECTATIONS

- a. No participation in courses or receiving very poor student evaluation scores in courses taught.

B. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

1. OUTSTANDING

- a. Recipient of a Merit Award or career development award (e.g. Howard Hughes Investigator, RCDA or other nationally competitive award).
- b. P.I. in the acquisition of new research funds that contribute 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 (shared instrumentation grant). P.I. in the renewal of such funds.
- c. First or senior author of a research publication in very high impact journals (e.g., *Nature*, *Science*, or *Cell*).
- d. Multiple first or senior author publications in high quality, refereed journals.
- e. Publications that have had an exceptionally high impact in the faculty member's field.
- f. Organize a symposium/workshop that is presented at a prominent national or international meeting.
- g. Delivery of a plenary talk at a prominent national or international meeting.

2. EXCELLENT

- a. P.I. in the acquisition of a nationally competitive new or renewed research grant (including educational research).
- b. P.I. of a program project grant, training grant, center grant, or core grant.
- c. First or senior author of publications in high quality, refereed journals.

3. MEETS EXPECTATIONS

- a. Publications in mid-level impact journals.
- b. Speaker in a departmental seminar.
- c. Principal investigator of a nationally competitive research grant (including educational research).

4. MARGINALLY BELOW EXPECTATIONS

- a. Few publications and only in low-impact journals.
- b. No nationally competitive research grants.

5. SUBSTANTIALLY BELOW EXPECTATIONS

- a. No publications in the past three years.
- b. No nationally competitive research grants in the past three years.

C. SERVICE

1. OUTSTANDING

- a. Director of graduate or undergraduate program.
- b. Acquisition of major funding for an outreach program.
- c. Chair of a major University-wide or Medical School committee.
- d. Editor of a journal.
- e. Chair or member of an NIH Study Section or chair of a national committee.

2. EXCELLENT

- a. Member of a major University-wide or Medical School committee.
- b. Member of editorial board of a journal.

- c. Member of NIH Study section or national committee.
 - d. Numerous ad hoc grant or manuscript reviews
 - e. Chair of departmental or graduate program committee.
 - f. Organizer of an outreach program.
- 3. MEETS EXPECTATIONS**
- a. Member of departmental or graduate program committee.
 - b. Contributor to an outreach program.
 - c. Ad hoc grant or manuscript reviews.
- 4. MARGINALLY BELOW EXPECTATIONS**
- a. Sub-par contribution to a departmental or graduate program committee.
- 5. SUBSTANTIALLY BELOW EXPECTATIONS**
- a. Not a member of any departmental or graduate program committee.
 - b. Did not contribute to an outreach program.

Annually, each departmental faculty member must submit a Faculty Activities Report detailing research, teaching, and service activities, as well as plans for the coming academic year. The report is to be submitted to the Department Head. The evaluation of each faculty member will be based on the report and the agreed-upon goals from the previous year and will be conducted by the departmental Merit Review Committee. The Merit Review Committee will consist of four tenured members elected by all faculty members with primary appointments in the Department of Neuroscience. The Department Head will appoint the Chair of the committee. Terms of appointment will be three years, with at least one year to elapse between appointments. The charge of this committee is to conduct the Merit review process as detailed in the Merit Review Guidelines.

The Merit Review Committee will review the annual Merit Activities Report of each faculty member and will assign numerical ratings for performance in research, teaching and service based on the scale and criteria defined above. The report will include specific examples justifying the ratings. The Department Head will calculate a summary rating; the weightings afforded to Research, Teaching and Service for most faculty members will be 65%, 25%, and 10%, respectively. These weightings may vary based on negotiations with the Head. The report will be shared with each faculty member in individual meetings with the Department Head during which the goals for the next year will be negotiated.

For probationary faculty members, some of the examples in the *Outstanding* category are unrealistic and many of the examples of *Excellent* would merit a ranking of *Outstanding* if they were achieved by a probationary faculty member.

The Merit Review Committee will meet with faculty members who have received “Substantially below expectations” evaluations during the annual merit review process. The Department Head must also concur that the faculty member has demonstrated performance that is “Substantially below expectations”. The Merit Review Committee will evaluate the faculty member’s problems and work with the faculty member to develop a plan in the deficient areas of research and/or teaching that will help return performance to satisfactory levels.

In the case of a tenured faculty member, an overall rating above 4.0 by the Merit Review Committee with the concurrence of the Head would trigger the procedures outlined in Part 3 of this document, Annual Review of Tenured Faculty. For

probationary faculty members such a ranking would be an indication that the individual would be unlikely to be granted tenure, absent a dramatic improvement in performance. The criteria for satisfactory performance to be used for the annual review in the Department of Neuroscience are the same as with the appropriate criteria for rank, as defined in this 7.12 Statement.

VII. VOTING PROCEDURES

A. VOTE

1. An anonymous vote using written ballots will be taken for decisions to recommend a candidate for tenure and/or advancement in rank. These decisions require a 2/3 majority for the motion to pass.
2. An anonymous written 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.

B. OTHER

In fairness to the candidate and because of the professional impact of the vote, each faculty member is requested to state the rationale for their vote (including abstention) on the anonymous ballot.

VIII. PROCESS FOR UPDATING 7.12 STATEMENT

The Department of Neuroscience will review its 7.12 Statement at least every five years.

History:

Approved by Neuroscience Faculty: February 29, 2012

Approved by Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost: June 22, 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 REVIEW1. 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