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

This document contains the Department’s Criteria and Standards pertaining to:
A. Award of indefinite tenure
B. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor
C. The departmental process for the annual appraisal of probationary and tenured faculty.
D. The goals and expectations for the annual review of tenured faculty.

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

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

• To pursue and to disseminate the results of high quality and highly regarded research on the molecular mechanisms of biological processes. The Department maintains a broad representation in the fields that constitute the biochemical sciences with special emphasis in (1) molecular biology, (2) metabolic and systems biology, (3) synthetic biology and biotechnology, and (4) chemical and structural biology.

• To provide rigorous education and training in contemporary biochemistry, molecular biology and biophysics for undergraduate, professional, graduate and postdoctoral students and scientific colleagues. The Department’s educational mission is carried out in classrooms, laboratories and scientific forums.

• To provide expertise in the areas of biochemistry, molecular biology and biophysics for the campus at large and for the people of the State of Minnesota.

• It is our expectation that faculty will advance to the rank of full Professor.

III. APPOINTMENT AND ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY
A. APPOINTMENT
At appropriate times, the Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology and Biophysics hires scientists to become Assistant Professors who by virtue of their graduate, professional
and postdoctoral work show evidence of being capable of fulfilling the missions of the Department. As biochemistry, molecular biology and biophysics is a set of research-based disciplines, the major emphasis for probationary faculty members is to establish a vigorous, highly regarded, and externally funded research laboratory that incorporates graduate, undergraduate, professional and/or postdoctoral students. In addition, new faculty members must possess outstanding skills in communication that include writing of both research grants and scientific publications, teaching both in the laboratory and in the classroom, and collegial discourse to foster collaborative efforts within the University and recognition in the world community.

B. ANNUAL APPRAISAL OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

1. Process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The following are the criteria that are examined by the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, by the tenured faculty members and by the Department Head to make the determination whether to recommend tenure and promotion to the Collegiate Promotion and Tenure Committees and to the Deans of the respective colleges.
2. Criteria
The criteria for satisfactory performance to be used for the annual review in the Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology and Biophysics are the same as with the appropriate criteria for rank, as defined in this 7.12 Statement.

IV. CRITERIA FOR TENURE
Criteria for Tenure - Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology and Biophysics
Note that while every candidate is judged on each criterion, the degree to which each candidate meets each criterion may differ greatly among candidates. The sections on Evaluation describe the indicators of fulfillment.

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

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

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

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

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

The tenured faculty members judge effective mentoring by the quality of graduate student and postdoctoral work produced in the laboratory and the timeliness with which the work is completed.
While the Department highly values effective classroom teaching, no candidate can receive tenure based primarily on his or her teaching abilities. Conversely, the tenured faculty shall not recommend tenure for candidates who cannot competently fulfill their teaching responsibilities.

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

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

B. RESEARCH / SCHOLARSHIP

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

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

Evidence:
- As part of the Promotion Dossier, the candidate will include his or her curriculum vitae documenting his or her publications, research funding (including duration, percent effort and direct cost amounts), attendance at meetings, invited seminars and professional activities relating to the review of manuscripts and grants.
- The candidate annotates publications (produced during the probationary period) to indicate the contributions of his/her laboratory and his/her collaborator’s laboratories in the publications. This is especially important when the work is done in collaboration with other investigators.
- Similarly, if the candidate lists grant support from awards where she/he is not the Principal Investigator, the candidate should include a clear statement of her/his role including percent effort on such grants.
- A critically important source of evidence for the worthiness of a candidate’s tenure comes from letters that the Department Head solicits to evaluate the candidate’s dossier. These will be of two types. First, the Department Head solicits letters from colleagues within the Department and the University. Besides commenting on the
candidate’s suitability for promotion, internal letters provide valuable insight into matters such as teaching, service and collegial interactions that may not be apparent to outside reviewers. Second, the Department Head solicits letters from colleagues outside the University. The Department Head solicits reviewers to write an unbiased and candid judgment about the candidate’s abilities to contribute to the advancement of their field and their stature within their scientific community. Reviewers are asked to judge the quality and impact of the candidate’s scholarly work as communicated via publications and oral presentations. The Department Head’s solicitation also asks for judgment as to whether the writer believes the candidate has met or exceeded the criteria set out by the Department. The list of reviewers to solicit, both internal and external, is made by the Department Head in consultation with the candidate, the Mentoring Committee and others with expertise. No more than four external letters are solicited from reviewers with a direct personal or professional interest, in accord with the Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty. This includes former mentors and collaborators. Eight-to-eleven total external letters are required. In practice, the Department Head solicits both from reviewers suggested by the candidate and from additional reviewers who are likely to give an incisive view. Because the laws of the state permit candidates to read these letters, candidates may write comments about the letters that can be placed in their dossier.

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

A guiding principle of judgment is best stated in Section 7.11 of the Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure; “The basis for awarding indefinite tenure to the candidates possessing these qualities is the determination that each candidate has established and is likely to continue to develop a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national or international reputation or both.” The Department interprets this to signify that a candidate shows promise of career-long success in research.

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

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

The tenured faculty members expect candidates to have procured external, competitive, peer-reviewed funding, to have published in appropriate journals and to be recognized as contributors to their field. Candidates should have laboratories with students and staff that are contributing to publication of quality work. Candidates should have gained sufficient stature to receive manuscripts for peer review and/or grants to review.
In the disciplines covered by Biochemistry, Molecular Biology and Biophysics, the expectation is that funding will come from governmental, charitable or industrial sources. These include the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy, the Department of Agriculture, the American Cancer Society, the Muscular Dystrophy Society, the American Diabetes Association and the Lymphoma and Leukemia Society as well as others.

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

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

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

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

D. SERVICE

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

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

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

Evaluation:
- The Department expects limited but enthusiastic participation in governance.

V. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION IN FACULTY RANK

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

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

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

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

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

Candidates may be encouraged by the Department Head or by other faculty members to pursue promotion. When a candidate believes that he/she has fulfilled the criteria for promotion by the Departmental and Collegiate Promotion and Tenure Committees, the candidate should submit to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, a curriculum vitae with a cover letter explaining how and why she/he meets the criteria for promotion. As in the case of a probationary faculty member, the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee will make a recommendation to the Professors and to the Department Head as to whether the committee concurs with the candidate’s petition. These decisions are normally made at a faculty meeting held in the spring. If either the Professors (by a majority vote) or the Department Head recommends going forward with the promotion process, then the Department will assemble a Promotion Dossier. As in the case of the dossier prepared for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the Promotion Dossier for promotion to Professor will include information on grant support, publications, recognition, professional service, teaching and service to units of the University, community and scholarly societies.
The completed Promotion Dossier is reviewed and voted on at an early fall faculty meeting, usually at the same meeting when the dossiers of Assistant Professors are reviewed. As before, the Professors vote as to whether or not the candidate should be promoted. A vote to promote of less than two-thirds of the voting Professors is considered unacceptable and not worthy of promotion. This metric will be stated by the Department Head in her/his letter explaining the outcome of the vote. The Department Head’s letter explains the reasons for the recommendation and states his or her own opinion of the candidate’s worthiness. The Chair of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee also writes a letter explaining the reasons for the committee’s recommendation. The dossier is passed to the Collegiate Promotion and Tenure committees. These committees review and pass judgment on promotion to Professor at the same meetings that they decide on tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The candidate annotates publications (produced since promotion to Associate Professor) to indicate the contributions of his/her laboratory and his/her collaborator’s laboratories in the publications. This is especially important when the work is done in collaboration with other investigators.

- Similarly, if the candidate lists grant support from awards where she/he is not the Principal Investigator, the candidate should include a clear statement of her/his role including percent effort on such grants.

- A critically important source of evidence for the worthiness of a candidate’s promotion comes from letters that the Department Head solicits to evaluate the candidate’s dossier. These will be of two types. First, the Department Head solicits letters from colleagues within the Department and the University. These letters make a critical judgment on the merit of the candidate for promotion. Internal letters provide valuable insight into matters such as teaching, service and collegial interactions that may not be apparent to outside reviewers. Second, the Department Head solicits letters from colleagues outside the University. The Department Head solicits reviewers to write an unbiased and candid judgment about the candidate’s contributions to their field and their stature within their scientific community. Reviewers are asked to judge the quality and impact of the candidate’s publications. The Department Head’s solicitation also asks for judgment as to whether the writer believes the candidate has met or exceeded the criteria set out by the Department. The list of reviewers to solicit, both internal and external, is made by the Department Head in consultation with the candidate, and others with expertise. No more than four external letters are solicited from reviewers with a direct personal or professional interest, in accord with the Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty. This includes former mentors and collaborators. Eight-to-eleven total external letters are required. In practice, the Department Head solicits both from reviewers suggested by the candidate and from additional reviewers who are likely to give an incisive view. Because the laws of the state permit candidates to read these letters, candidates may write comments about the letters that can be placed in their dossier.

Evaluation:

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

While a number of indicators are listed below, the primary consideration is that the candidate has successfully led a research laboratory that has made exceptional scholarly contributions in an area of science important to the mission of the Department. Recognition stems from high quality work disseminated through publications, talks and laboratory alumnai who themselves are garnering global recognition.
The Professors look for the following as indicators of Professorial stature:
- Sustained external, peer-reviewed funding
- Procurement of multiple grants
- Continual publication of high quality work
- A strong rate of publication
- A training program that shows sustained and successful mentoring of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows
- Placement of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows in prestigious fellowships or jobs
- Placement of laboratory personnel in academic or other scientific positions
- Mentoring of junior faculty members
- Procurement of training grants
- Presentations at other research institutions
- Presentations at meetings with global audiences
- Meeting organizer
- Collegial interactions that foster advancements in other laboratories
- Service on editorial boards and study sections
- Election to positions in professional societies
- Leadership roles locally, nationally, and internationally

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

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

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

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

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

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

   **Evidence:**
Candidates will include in their Promotion Dossier the following information:
   o A list of courses they have taught that includes contact hours and effort for each course
   o A list of graduate, undergraduate, professional, postdoctoral and visiting scientists they have mentored in the laboratory
   o A list of doctoral committees on which they have served
   o Course evaluations and written statements from students
   o Additional annotations or copies of curricula or textbooks the candidate has developed or written

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

**Evaluation:**
The Professors look for the following indicators:
   o Outstanding teaching evaluations by students and peers
   o Adaptability in teaching courses at multiple levels (undergraduate, professional and graduate)
   o Adaptability in changing curricula and pedagogic methodologies
   o Service as course director
   o Dedicated mentoring of junior faculty
   o Graduation of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows
   o Service on dissertation committees
   o Publication of books or other instructional material

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

**Criteria:**
   o Service within the University including Departmental obligations and Collegiate/University committees

**Evidence:**
Candidates will include in their Promotion Dossier the following information:
   o A list of committees on which they have served and the duration of their service.

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

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

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

The specific criteria for performance evaluation in the Department include:

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

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

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

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

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

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

C. SERVICE
   1. Outstanding accomplishments
      a. Direct a departmental service facility, core or ISO
      b. Serve as Director of Postdoctoral, Graduate or Undergraduate Studies
      c. Chair a major College or University Committee
      d. Be an Editor or Associate Editor of a journal related to the discipline.
      e. Chair an NIH Study Section or other similar national committee
      f. Hold an elected office in a scientific or learned society related to the discipline

   2. Satisfactory accomplishments
      a. Be a member of an all-university committee
      b. Chair or be a member of a Departmental committee
      c. Organize or contribute to an outreach program
      d. Be a member of a journal editorial board
      e. Carry out ad hoc reviews for journals or granting agencies

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

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

VIII. PROCESS FOR UPDATING 7.12 STATEMENT
This document will be reviewed, and revised as necessary, every five years or when changes in the Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure warrant.