

Tenure Review Process Department of Chemistry, 2009-2010

The information described in this document¹ regarding the tenure review process is more specific but consistent with and complementary to the University of Minnesota “Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty” (dated October 15, 2007; <http://tinyurl.com/UMfactenureprocess>) and the Department of Chemistry 7.12 statement (<http://tinyurl.com/CHEM7-12>). The attributes of the Mentor Committees are described in the Department of Chemistry document “Mentor Committees”.

1. Candidate Responsibilities in Preparation for Review by Tenured Faculty

- Arranges a meeting of his/her Mentor Committee to review progress at least once each November or December
- Prepares a dossier, including curriculum vita, of his/her research, teaching, and service and presents it to the Mentor Committee approximately one week before the above mentioned meeting
- Gathers and submits materials for the dossier in a timely manner to the Department Chair, the Mentor Committee, and the Tenure Committee.
- Is responsible for the accuracy and integrity of the materials in the dossier
- Is responsible for and is required to incorporate information to the evaluation materials in the dossier as requested by the Mentor Committee, the Tenure Committee, the Department Chair, and relevant college and university committees.

2. Department Chair Responsibilities in Preparation for Review by Tenured Faculty

- Department Chair is responsible for ensuring that the applicable departmental and UM regulations are followed
- Department Chair appoints members of the Mentor and Tenure Committees, and designates the Chairs of these committees each year.
- Department Chair provides to each tenured faculty member a copy of the candidate’s dossier to review approximately two weeks before the tenure review meeting

3. Tenure Committee Responsibilities in Preparation for Review by Tenured Faculty

- The Tenure Committee is responsible for presenting and analyzing the candidate’s case at the tenured faculty meeting, and should meet at least once prior to that meeting to discuss the candidate’s case (see approximate dates below). The Tenure Committee may also schedule a meeting with the candidate to discuss any submitted material or any other matter relevant to the tenure decision.
- The Tenure Committee, with the Department Chair, insures that the candidate has submitted all appropriate materials for the dossier for the review.
- Any members of the Tenure Committee who are also members of a candidate’s Mentor Committee should recuse themselves from discussion of that candidate during meetings of the Tenure Committee, and should not participate in the presentation of the candidate’s case during the tenured faculty meeting (note: participation in the *discussion* of the case by the tenured faculty during the tenured faculty meeting is *not* prohibited).

4. Tenured Faculty Responsibilities in Preparation for Review by Tenured Faculty

- All tenured faculty are responsible for reviewing section 7.11 of the “Faculty Tenure” document (see <http://tinyurl.com/UMtenure>), the University of Minnesota “Procedures for Reviewing

¹ This document is based on a related document from the Department of Design, Housing, and Apparel (<http://dha.design.umn.edu/intranet/>).

Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty” (dated October 15, 2007; <http://tinyurl.com/UMfactenureprocess>) and the Department of Chemistry 7.12 statement (<http://tinyurl.com/CHEM7-12>).

- Understand performance outcomes that are addressed by the Department of Chemistry 7.12 statement, and information that is appropriate for consideration
- Responsible for thorough review of the candidate’s dossier and the actual work (e.g. publications) with respect to the Department of Chemistry 7.12 criteria

5. The Tenure Review Process

- The procedure described in section VII of the Department of Chemistry 7.12 statement is to be followed.
- The candidate and the Tenure Committee will each suggest the names of 10 reviewers to the Department Chair by August 1 of the tenure consideration year. The Chair, in consultation with the Tenure Committee and the Mentor Committee, will identify a list of about ten reviewers to be asked to submit written evaluations of the candidate, at least half of them from the 10 suggested by the candidate. The Department Chair will solicit the letters in mid-August, to be due at the end of September.
- A member of the Tenure Committee is the primary presenter and analyzer of the case at the tenured faculty meeting, which is typically scheduled in October.
- At the second meeting of the tenured faculty (1-2 weeks after the meeting at which the case was presented), any tenured faculty member may request further discussion prior to taking the vote, but such discussion is optional. If requested, this discussion will be led by the Department Chair.
- The assistant to the Department Chair will be present and will take notes on the discussions at the two meetings of the tenured faculty. These notes will be summarized in written “minutes” of the meetings, which will be subject to the access and confidentiality rules for all materials collected in the tenure file (section I.D., p. 5, in the “Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion”). Similarly, all verbal communications at the meetings of the tenured faculty are private and must not be disclosed to anyone except the candidate and those participating in the tenure decision. (** *this paragraph may be revised*)
- After the vote at the second meeting of the tenured faculty, the Department Chair will prepare a statement based on the discussion at the two meetings. This statement will be made available to all tenured faculty, revised, and approved by consensus indicating that it accurately reflects the discussion of the candidate’s record and the vote of the faculty. This statement must reflect the candidates accomplishments relative to the Department of Chemistry 7.12 criteria and response to previous years recommendations, and will be included in the file forwarded for the tenure decision.²
- The Department chair will discuss with the candidate the results of the meetings, including the vote results and statement.

6. Annual Review of Probationary Faculty

- The procedure described in section VII of the Department of Chemistry 7.12 statement is to be followed.
- The Tenure Committee will lead discussion of the progress of each probationary faculty member at the annual meeting, which is typically scheduled in February. All materials for consideration by the committee must be supplied by each probationary faculty member by the first Thursday in January after the beginning of spring semester classes.

² Note that in addition to this statement that is to be included in the file, and as specified in section 13 of the Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion”, the Department Chair includes “an additional statement of his or her agreement or disagreement with the unit’s recommendation, including the reasons for any disagreement.” (p. 15)

- If the probationary faculty member approves, the Department Chair will forward the annual report of the Mentoring Committee to the Tenure Committee.³
- The Department Chair will prepare a statement summarizing the results of the discussion at the annual meeting, which will be circulated to the Tenure Committee and revised accordingly. This statement will then be input into the President's Form 12 (<http://tinyurl.com/PRESform12>). The Department Chair will meet with the candidate and discuss the outcome of the review. The President's Form 12, which is signed by both the unit head and the probationary faculty member, is then sent to the Dean of the Institute of Technology and to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for all faculty. These annual reviews become part of the promotion and tenure dossier for probationary faculty.

³ This clause reflects the 7.12 statement "The probationary faculty member may also provide the Tenure Committee with other information he or she feels is relevant, including the report of the Tenure Mentoring Committee."