

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
MEDICAL SCHOOL

DEPARTMENT OF OPHTHALMOLOGY AND VISUAL NEUROSCIENCES

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

DEPARTMENT OF OPHTHALMOLOGY AND VISUAL NEUROSCIENCES

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 which will be used to evaluate probationary faculty in the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Neurosciences, both in the basic and clinical sciences, to determine if they meet the general criteria in Section 7.11 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, as defined for this Department. It also provides the specific criteria and standards that will be used to evaluate associate professors for promotion to professor according to Section 9.2 of the *Faculty Tenure* policy.

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

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

II. MISSION STATEMENT

The missions of the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Neurosciences are teaching, research, provision of excellent clinical care, and service to the Department, the University and the Profession. Primary academic missions of the department are to teach medical students, post-M.D. trainees (residents and fellows), and graduate and undergraduate students in allied health programs and to advance knowledge in the specialty through basic, translational, and clinical research. In their academic activities, some faculty members may concentrate on one or two of the three major missions (teaching/research/service), but all faculty must participate in all three of these functions. Departmental activities are conducted in the following special fields: basic medical sciences in ophthalmology, cornea and anterior segment, glaucoma, neuro-ophthalmology, oculoplastics, retina, and pediatric ophthalmology and adult strabismus. It is our expectation that our faculty will advance to the level of full professor.

III. APPOINTMENT AND ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

A. APPOINTMENT

Tenured and tenure-track appointments require pre-approval by the Dean of the Medical School to initiate a search. Faculty hired with tenure are subject to approval by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost of the University of Minnesota.

B. ANNUAL APPRAISAL OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

1. Process

The overall process for Annual Review of Probationary Faculty in the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Neurosciences 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*. In the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Neurosciences, the Department Head will help select a mentor for each clinical probationary faculty member, in consultation with the subspecialty service. For basic science faculty, the Department Head will help select a mentor for each probationary faculty member, in consultation with the tenured basic scientist faculty member in the department. The mentor will be a tenured associate or full professor, who will meet with the probationary faculty member regularly to

promote career development, to monitor her/his progress, and to help the new faculty members with tasks such as grant writing, manuscript submission, study design, laboratory management, and teaching preparation.

Each academic year, every probationary faculty member, in consultation with his/her mentor, will prepare an updated curriculum vitae that provides evidence of progress made in the areas of research, teaching, and service. The mentor will present this summary to the tenured faculty members of the department at a faculty meeting held in the spring of each year to discuss the probationary faculty member's performance relative to the 7.12 Statement, and plans for subsequent years, and to determine whether or not to continue the appointment or propose for promotion.

2. Criteria

The criteria for satisfactory performance to be used for the annual review in the Department of Ophthalmology & Visual Neurosciences are the same as with the appropriate criteria for rank, as defined in this 7.12 Statement.

IV. CRITERIA FOR TENURE

The Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Neurosciences accepts and subscribes to the criteria and standards for tenure of faculty at the University of Minnesota Medical School, as described in Part 1. Medical School Preamble, with the following department-specific criteria.

The basis for awarding indefinite tenure to the candidates possessing the qualities of excellence in the three areas of research, teaching, and service is the determination that each candidate has established and is likely to continue to develop a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national reputation in Ophthalmology. Evidence of an international reputation is viewed as exemplary, albeit not required for tenure.

The primary criteria for demonstrating this potential are professional distinction in either basic or clinical research that alters medical practice in Ophthalmology as well as effectiveness in teaching. Outstanding discipline-related service contributions will also be taken into account where they are an integral part of the mission of the department. The individual's participation in the governance of the institution and other services to the University and service to the department may be taken into consideration, but are not in themselves basis for awarding tenure.

A major consideration for tenure for clinical faculty members in Ophthalmology is demonstration of significant original contributions based on clinical observations resulting in new therapies or techniques which impact the practice of Ophthalmology.

A. TEACHING

Teaching activities may occur in a variety of educational settings and formats, such as: didactic presentations, lectures, seminars, conferences, tutorials, laboratories, advising of students, case discussions, grand rounds, hospital and clinic rounds, patient care, surgical and other procedures, and continuing education.

The following are educational activities in which competence and accomplishments in teaching can be demonstrated and in which scholarly products may be developed leading to national recognition. Evidence of international reputation is viewed as exemplary, but not required for tenure.

1. Participation and competence in teaching undergraduate (pre-baccalaureate) students.

2. Participation and competence in teaching graduate students, residents and fellows.
3. Participation and competence in teaching professional students, including students in the M.D. curriculum and other professional educational programs, and their successful matching in residency programs throughout the country.
4. Service and distinction as a faculty adviser to , post-residency clinical fellows, postdoctoral fellows who have completed a Ph.D. or M.D. /Ph.D. degree, or advanced degree candidates in medical disciplines, interdisciplinary programs or collaborative research programs relating to Ophthalmology and the success of these residents and fellows in obtaining positions throughout the country and world in their field of training.
5. Service as a faculty mentor or advisor to students in any of the above categories, including medical students in the clinical courses of the M.D. curriculum and undergraduate directed research projects which result ultimately in publications in nationally recognized forums.
6. Service as a faculty mentor to students in any of the above categories who engage in research activities in the department.
7. Participation in interdisciplinary or interprofessional scholarship and education.

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

1. Innovative contributions to the field of medical education in Ophthalmology and Visual Neurosciences, which have been adopted for use by other institutions and are recognized by peers in 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 an advisor.
3. Evidence of teaching excellence at the undergraduate, graduate, and/or postdoctoral levels, evaluated by the written statement and/or compiled ratings of students.
4. Written statements by the Head of the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Neurosciences, academic peers, and others familiar with the candidate's performance in teaching.
5. Accumulation of above forms of evidence pertaining to teaching competence and excellence over a sustained period of time.
6. Development of curriculum, lecture notes, and other specific products of learning.
7. Peer-reviewed publication on educational topics.
8. Internal or external funding for educational scholarship.

B. RESEARCH / SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarly activities of a faculty member will be evaluated according to the following standards:

1. Scientific Publications
Scientific articles reporting quality biomedical research should be published in appropriate peer-reviewed journals related to the specific discipline(s) within Ophthalmology and Visual Neurosciences. 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.

Peer-reviewed journals that are recognized as outstanding and appropriate to our discipline include, but are not necessarily limited to:

DEPARTMENT OF OPHTHALMOLOGY AND VISUAL NEUROSCIENCES

American Journal of Ophthalmology
American Journal of Physiology
American Society of Ophthalmic Plastic & Reconstructive Surgery
Anatomical Record
Annals of Neurology
Archives of Neurology
Archives of Ophthalmology
Binocular Vision
Biochemistry
British Journal of Ophthalmology
Canadian Journal of Ophthalmology
Cell and Tissue Research
CLAO Journal
Cornea
Current Eye Research
Documenta Ophthalmologica
Experimental Eye Research
Experimental Gerontology
Eye
Eye & Contact Lens
FASEB Journal
Graefe's Archive for Clinical and Experimental Ophthalmology
Investigative Ophthalmology and Visual Science
Journal of Academic Ophthalmology
Journal of Applied Physiology
Journal of Biological Chemistry
Journal of Cataract and Refractive Surgery
Journal of Gerontology
Journal of Glaucoma
Journal of Muscle Research and Cell Motility
Journal of Neurochemistry
Journal of Neuro-oncology
Journal of Neuro-Ophthalmology
Journal of Neuroscience
Journal of Neurosurgery
Journal of Pediatric Ophthalmology and Strabismus
Journal of Refractive Surgery
Journal of AAPOS (American Association for Pediatric Ophthalmology & Strabismus)
Journal of Vision
Movement Disorders
Muscle and Nerve
Neurology
Neuromuscular Disorders
Ophthalmic Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery
Ophthalmic Research
Ophthalmic Surgery, Lasers & Imaging
Ophthalmology
Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery
Retina
Seminars in Ophthalmology

Survey of Ophthalmology
Telemedicine Journal and e-health
Transactions of the American Ophthalmological Society
Vision Research

2. Independence of Scholarly Activities

Evidence of independence in research activities, or significant contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative research may include:

- a. Contribution of the candidate to clinical practice which improve the practice of Ophthalmology.
- b. Naming of the candidate as the first or senior author (in Ophthalmology journals, the senior author can be listed second) on multi-authored journal articles and/or documentation of major, substantial contributions by the candidate to the collaborative project and publications.
- c. 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.

3. Peer-Reviewed Research Funding

A candidate should show evidence of submission and/or receipt of a grant(s) or contract(s) by designation as Principal Investigator, a major collaborator, or other similar title, from a national or regional granting agency, which customarily utilizes scientific peer review as the primary basis for awards.

While it is desirable to have funding at the time a candidate goes up for promotion it is not considered essential for promotion. However, when reviewing the candidate, the department faculty must make the judgment that the independent research career of the candidate is on a trajectory to achieve the rank of full professor in accordance with Section 7.11 of the Faculty Tenure policy.

Examples of granting agencies include, but are not necessarily limited to:

American Federation for Aging Research
American Health Assistance Foundation
Benign Essential Blepharospasm Research Foundation
British Retinitis Pigmentosa Society
Department of Defense
Eye Bank Association of America
Fight for Sight
Foundation for Fighting Blindness
Glaucoma Foundation
Glaucoma Research Foundation
Howard Hughes Medical Institute
Juvenile Diabetes Foundation
Knights Templar
Minnesota Medical Foundation
National Eye Institute
National Institute of Aging
National Institutes Foundation of Health
National Institutes of Health
National Science Foundation

Pediatric Eye Disease Investigator Group
Pew Charitable Trust
Prevent Blindness America
Research to Prevent Blindness
University of Minnesota Academic Health Center Seed Grant
University of Minnesota Graduate School Grant-in-Aid
Veterans Health Affairs of Health (NIH)
W.M. Keck Foundation
Whitaker Foundation

4. Publications in Monographs, Reviews and Other Books
Publications through these modalities are part of the scholarly activities of a faculty member, but cannot be considered as the sole basis for tenure.
5. Scholarly Service Outside of the University
Faculty members should have developed a national reputation. This includes, but is not limited to, invitations/nominations to serve on study sections of granting agencies, national policy boards, service as an editor or a member of the editorial board of a reputable journal or monograph in a biomedical discipline related to Ophthalmology, election to positions on committees of national organizations within the faculty's area of expertise, serving as an examiner for a medical or technical Board, and contributions as peer-reviewer for scholarly journals.
6. Invited participation in Symposia, Meetings and Seminars
Faculty members should be invited by national organizations to participate in symposia and meetings and should be invited to give seminars before peers in other institutions nationally. Invitations at the international level would be considered exemplary at this level. However, this cannot be used as the sole criteria for tenure.

C. CLINICAL SERVICE

Clinical Service expectations in decisions for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor include an excellent reputation, locally and regionally, as an authority in ophthalmology or one of its sub-specialties, as demonstrated by patient referrals, invited visiting lectureships, and memberships in professional societies.

D. SERVICE

Service activities valued in the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Neurosciences include, but are not limited to:

1. Participation in regional and national ophthalmology and visual neurosciences or subspecialty 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.
4. Creating and sustaining a culture that fosters diversity

V. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION IN FACULTY RANK

Promotion decisions in the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Neurosciences require a positive vote by two-thirds of all eligible voting faculty members on the question to affirmatively recommend for promotion. Eligible members include tenured faculty at the proposed rank and above voting for promotion; and faculty with tenure voting for tenure.

If a faculty member has a joint appointment in another department and is being considered for promotion, the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Neurosciences will contact the other department(s) to obtain their assessment and record of vote on the proposed promotion. (See the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* for details on the evaluation of faculty with joint appointments.)

A. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Not applicable in the Department of Ophthalmology (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 Ophthalmology and Visual Neurosciences 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

The *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* require that the tenured faculty 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, as Associate Professor, the candidate presents evidence of additional significant academic, scientific, scholarly, and professional achievements having fulfilled the criteria and standards for the rank of Professor as follows:

1. Significant academic progress since promotion to Associate Professor.
2. Substantial addition to their scholarly publications in peer-reviewed journals as listed, but not limited, to those in the “Scientific Publications in the Research/Scholarship” section IV B1
3. Ongoing record of funding for research and scholarship by peer-reviewed agencies as listed, but not limited to those, in the “Peer-Reviewed Research Funding in the Research/Scholarship” section IV B3
4. Clinical activity that has resulted in recognized excellence by the Ophthalmic community locally and nationally.
5. Leadership and service in professional organizations.
6. National and international recognition in major ophthalmology organizations as evidenced by election to leadership roles.
7. Evidence of effective mentoring of various categories of departmental professionals such as junior faculty, fellows, MD, and PhD trainees.
8. Letters from national and international authorities that attest to the candidate’s acknowledged national or international reputation and recognition of leadership in his/her field of Ophthalmology and Visual Neurosciences; letters from prominent senior faculty members at other universities assessing the candidate's qualifications for promotion to the rank of Professor.
9. Creating and sustaining a culture that fosters diversity.

VI. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

The Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Neurosciences utilizes the process for post tenure review defined in Part III. Annual Review of Tenured Faculty. The faculty member will be reviewed on the basis of the quality of efforts in research, teaching, and service. The review will focus on whether the faculty member has met the goals and expectations for tenured faculty members as outlined in the departmental 7.12 Statement.

The goals and expectations in each category listed below are representative examples but not necessary standards for performance in each category. All tenure track faculty must remain active in all three areas listed below.

Goals and expectation in Research

Outstanding

- Principal investigator or major contributor on a nationally competitive new or renewed research grant.
- First or senior author at least 2 publications per year in high quality, refereed journals.
- Organize a local symposium or a national workshop, or speak at a national symposium.
- Principal investigator of a program project grant, center grant, shared instrumentation grant.
- Publication of scholarly books, book chapters, review articles, and postings to web-sites or other non-refereed venues.
- Mentoring multiple undergraduates, graduate students, post-docs, residents, fellows and/or other faculty in their research.

Satisfactory

- Publications in non-refereed journals or special editions.
- Speaker in departmental or local seminars.
- Principal investigator of a research grant(s) which may be from industry or foundation.
- Co-investigator on a research grant(s).
- Mentoring a residents or faculty in their research.

Unsatisfactory

- Little or no activity in the above areas

Goals and expectations in Education

Outstanding

- Recipient of teaching awards.
- Outstanding teaching as defined by course evaluations by students and peers.
- Director of a professional school course, didactic course in a graduate program, or undergraduate course.
- Design of an innovative new course or revitalization of an existing course at the University or at a National/International meeting.
- Principal investigator of a training grant.
- Mentors multiple junior faculty.
- Asked to function as American Board of Ophthalmology (ABO) examiner or director.

Satisfactory

- Lecturer in one or more courses.
- Member of examination committee(s) for graduate students.
- Member of committees that impact education in the Department or at the University.
- Serves as a mentor for junior faculty.
- Other activities judged as comparable to the above.
- Precepting residents, fellows and students in clinic
- Supervising hospital rounds

Unsatisfactory

- Little or no activity in the above areas

Goals and Expectations in Service

Outstanding

- Member or Chair of a major committee (University-wide, Medical School)
- Member of editorial board of a journal.
- Chair of departmental or graduate program committee.
- Active service as an office holder or committee member for relevant professional organizations
- Member or Chair of NIH Study Section or national committee.
- Organizer of an outreach program faculty member's scientific and professional expertise.
- Member of community organization— e.g. National Alliance for the Mentally Ill (NAMI).
- Administrator of clinical program in university affiliated practices.

Satisfactory

- Member of departmental or graduate program committee.
- Contributor to outreach activities/program faculty member's scientific and professional expertise.
- Providing patient care in university affiliated practices.
- Active committee member for relevant professional organizations.

Unsatisfactory

- Little or no activity in the above areas

VII. PROCEDURES

A. VOTE

1. A vote will be taken for decisions to recommend a candidate for promotion and/or tenure. All tenured associate and full professors in the department will be eligible to vote on advancement of associate professors. All tenured full professors will be eligible to vote on advancement to full professor. Such a vote will require a 2/3 majority for the motion to pass.

2. A vote will be taken for all decisions to terminate the contract of a probationary faculty member. Such a vote will require a 2/3 majority for the motion to pass. All tenured associate and full professors in the department will be eligible to vote.

VIII. PROCESS FOR UPDATING 7.12 STATEMENT.

The Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Neurosciences will review its 7.12 Statement every five years, or more frequently as needed. Revisions will be made by the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Neurosciences Promotions and Tenure Committee. All departmental 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 by the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Neurosciences faculty, with the approval date noted on the document.

History:

Voted on and approved by the Ophthalmology and Visual Neurosciences Faculty: February 7, 2013

Approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost: February 8, 2013

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