I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT
This document describes the specific criteria and standards that will be used to evaluate whether probationary faculty in the Department of Microbiology 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. Awarding 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 Annual Review of Tenured Faculty

II. MISSION STATEMENT
The mission of the Department of Microbiology is to achieve and maintain preeminence in the discipline of microbiology through excellence in teaching and research. This mission goes hand-in-hand with the department’s long-term goal for all faculty to achieve the rank of full Professor.

To be awarded indefinite tenure, a faculty member will be expected to have demonstrated productivity and distinction in research and effectiveness in teaching in the discipline. While extraordinary contributions to interdisciplinary work, technology transfer, public engagement and other special kinds of professional activities may be considered when applicable, the primary basis for the award of tenure will be scholarly achievement and effectiveness in teaching and research.

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 Dean of the Medical School and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost of the University of Minnesota. Faculty appointed must meet minimum requirements as prescribed by the Department of Microbiology and Medical School.

B. ANNUAL APPRAISAL OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY
1. Process
The overall process for Annual Review of Probationary Faculty in the Department of Microbiology 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 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. 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.

The head of the department prepares a written summary of the annual review and discusses the candidate's progress with the candidate, giving a copy of the report to the candidate. This written summary is provided on the University of Minnesota (UM) Form 12 and is signed by the candidate, the head of the department, the Dean of the Medical School, and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

At the end of the fifth probationary year, all probationary faculty must begin the process of review for conferral of indefinite tenure. Probationary faculty who have received approval to extend their maximum period of probationary service for circumstances described in subsection 5.5 of the Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure can delay this process by one to three years, depending on the approved circumstances.

2. Criteria
The criteria for satisfactory performance to be used for the annual review in the Department of Microbiology are the same as with the appropriate criteria for rank, as defined in this 7.12 Statement.

IV. CRITERIA FOR TENURE
Standards for Tenure - Department of Microbiology
In accordance with Section 7.11 of the Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure, the Department of Microbiology 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 standards specific to the department.

Both effectiveness in teaching and professional distinction in research are the bases for tenure decisions; service is also considered. Teaching must reach the level of competence as described in IV.A below and research must reach the level of competence in IV.B. In order to receive tenure, a candidate must also reach either the level of distinction in teaching or distinction in research or both.

A. TEACHING
While the distribution of faculty effort will reflect relative strengths that may change over a career, faculty members will generally be expected to have primary or shared responsibilities for at least one lecture or lab course per year. Instruction at a minimum should be judged competent.

The following are areas in which competence in teaching can be demonstrated.

1. Participation in teaching and advising graduate and professional students (including students in the M.D. curriculum, pharmacy, dentistry, or other professional education programs) in the subject of Microbiology and allied fields.
2. Service as a thesis adviser to candidates for advanced degrees (master’s degree and/or Ph.D.) in the discipline of Microbiology, or in interdisciplinary graduate programs.
3. Service and distinction as a faculty sponsor for a postdoctoral fellow(s) in Microbiology or in a collaborative research program.
4. Service as a faculty mentor to students in any of the above categories who engage in research activities in the Department of Microbiology.
5. Participation in teaching undergraduate (pre-baccalaureate) students, including students in other colleges of the University of Minnesota.

**Competence in teaching is based on:**
1. Review of courses taught, directed or developed by the candidate, at both undergraduate and graduate levels.
2. Degree candidates advised in both professional and graduate schools.
3. Evaluations by students.
4. Written statements by the Head of the Department.

**Distinction in teaching is based on:**
1. The four items given above as sources of evidence for assessment of competence in teaching.
2. Evaluation of publications, such as books, peer-reviewed journal articles, audiovisual aids, and/or other significant contributions to educational advances in the discipline, that are distributed at a national level.
3. Letters from leading educators in the discipline attesting to the candidate’s national reputation, and assessing the candidate’s contributions to the development of advances in education in the field.
4. Participation in national organizations, such as the American Society for Microbiology, that have significant activities devoted to education and educational development. Evidence of leadership in such an organization (such as by election to an officer position) or recognition by teaching awards from such an organization would be of particular value.

**B. RESEARCH / SCHOLARSHIP**
Microbiology and the related discipline of immunology are research-oriented disciplines and thus tenure recommendations are based on distinction and competence in research judged qualitatively by its originality and impact and by the following specific criteria:

1. **Publications in Rigorously Peer-Reviewed Journals**
Scientific articles reporting high quality microbiological and immunological research that significantly advances the candidate’s field of research should be published in rigorously peer-reviewed journals. Contributions to prestigious review journals, monographs, etc., that are not peer-reviewed will be taken into consideration, but cannot be the primary basis for a decision. Examples of peer-reviewed journals include, but are not limited to:

   - *Journal of Infectious Diseases*
   - *Journal of Virology*
   - *Science*
   - *Infection and Immunity*
   - *Journal of Bacteriology*
   - *Nature*
   - *Journal of Immunology*
Nature Medicine
Cell
Molecular Microbiology
Cellular Microbiology
Immunity
Journal of Biochemistry
Journal of Experimental Medicine
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences

Publications in Monographs, Reviews and Other Books
Publications such as these, which are not generally peer-reviewed, should be part of the activities of a faculty member, but cannot be considered as the sole basis for tenure.

Service on a Study Section or as an Editor or as a Member of the Editorial Board of a Reputable Journal or Monograph in a Microbiological or Immunological Discipline
Service such as this usually indicates peer recognition for the candidate’s contributions, but cannot be considered as the sole basis for tenure.

Expectations
Generally, faculty members’ laboratories are expected to generate an average of 1–3 research papers per year with additional recognition for highly cited articles. Research competence is associated with at least 1 research paper per year in publication venues such as those listed above; research distinction is associated with a greater number of highly cited research papers in such venues.

2. External Research Funding
Expectations
Every faculty member in the Department of Microbiology must have an independent research program and must acquire one or more external grants as a principal investigator. The grants must be peer-reviewed and be awarded by federal agencies, international agencies or by nationally competitive private agencies appropriate to the discipline. Demonstrating the ability to obtain and renew external peer-reviewed grants is considered one of the strongest indicators of research distinction. The high likelihood of maintaining such funding throughout a faculty member’s career is also deemed to be of the utmost importance and will be used by the department when considering faculty for promotion. The dossier must demonstrate in the judgment of those voting for promotion and tenure that the faculty member is on a trajectory for receiving continued funding and promotion to full professor.

3. Invited Participation in Symposia, Meetings and Seminars
The research of faculty members is expected to be recognized by invitations from other educational institutions and national and international scientific organizations to give seminars and to participate in symposia, meetings and conferences. However, this cannot be used as the sole criterion for tenure.
4. **Peer Recognition of Creative and Significant Scholarly Contributions**
   Evidence will be sought from peers within the Department of Microbiology, the University, and from national and international leaders in the candidate’s field of research that the candidate’s contributions are scholarly, creative, and have contributed significantly to the advancement of the field. The assessments will also provide clear evidence of whether or not the candidate has the groundwork for a national or international reputation in the discipline of Microbiology.

5. **Technology Transfer**
   Patented and licensed technologies, and/or founding of start-up biotechnology companies can serve in part as evidence of research leadership and productivity. This activity alone cannot be considered as the sole basis for tenure.

**C. SERVICE**
Faculty members are expected to serve on one or more departmental committees of which search committees and the Committee on Graduate Studies in Microbiology, Immunology, and Cancer Biology are the most important. Professional service is also valued. However, committee and professional service cannot be the sole basis for awarding tenure.

**D. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS**
At the end of the fifth year, all probationary faculty will begin the process of review for conferral of indefinite tenure. Probationary faculty who have received approval to extend their maximum period of probationary service for circumstances described in section 5.5 of the Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure can delay this process by one to three years, depending on the approved circumstances.

**V. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION IN FACULTY RANK**
The Department of Microbiology accepts and subscribes to the following standards specific to the department:

**A. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**
Not applicable in the Medical School (entry level rank is Assistant Professor).

**B. TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**
The criteria and standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in the Department of Microbiology 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 requires that the tenured faculty of departments review and provide feedback to tenured faculty members every four years regarding their progress toward promotion to the rank of professor. Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to continue to adhere to the standards on which promotion to Associate Professor was based, with respect to performance and accomplishments in teaching and research. Candidates will also be judged on the following standards:

1. Requirements outlined under section IV. Criteria for Tenure
2. A truly international reputation in research or teaching as shown, for instance, by invitations to international symposia, election to prestigious scientific organizations, holding of offices in international societies and leadership roles.

3. Letters from leading authorities in the candidate’s field attesting to the candidate’s acknowledged national and international reputation and leadership. Establishment of a training program for pre- and postgraduate trainees that has resulted in placing trainees in academic and industrial positions in their fields.

4. Contributions to mentoring of junior faculty and trainees.

5. Creating and sustaining a culture that fosters diversity.

VI. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

The Department of Microbiology utilizes the process for the annual review of tenured faculty defined by Part 3. 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 of tenured faculty members in the Department of Microbiology are guided by the Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure, the Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty, and the mission statements of the Medical School and of the Department of Microbiology. Each of these statements emphasizes the triad of Research, Education and Service that comprise the faculty functions. All faculty members are expected to contribute to each of the three elements of the triad, taking into account different stages of faculty development. Furthermore, it is recognized that not all faculty members have equal strengths - strengths in one element of the triad may balance a weakness in another one. Finally, all tenured faculty members are expected to foster the development of Assistant Professors. Full Professors, in addition, are expected to foster the continued development of Associate Professors.

The principal goal of an annual review is to ensure continuation of high caliber performance following the granting of tenure. Thus the aim of the review is pro-active and positive – it seeks to improve faculty members’ performance and to identify potential faculty members’ weaknesses at an early stage. If weaknesses are apparent, the goal is to develop a plan for limiting these weaknesses to enhance the faculty member’s effectiveness towards the Department’s mission.

The specific criteria for performance evaluation in the Department include:

A. TEACHING

1. Outstanding:
   a. National leadership in shaping the curriculum within a discipline.
   b. Author or editor of new education media (e.g., textbook, video, computer software) that are distributed nationally.
   c. Leader in the development of a new program or revitalization of an existing program.
   d. Principal investigator in the acquisition or renewal of a training grant.
   e. Receipt of a teaching award.
   f. Outstanding teaching as defined by course evaluations by students and peers.
   g. Director of a professional school course, didactic course in a graduate program, or undergraduate course.
2. Satisfactory
   a. Lecturer in one or more courses with satisfactory performance based on course evaluations by students and peers.
   b. Member of examination committee(s) for graduate students.
   c. Member of committees that impact education at the University.

3. Unsatisfactory
   Activity does not meet at least one of the above criteria under the satisfactory or outstanding category each year.

B. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

1. Outstanding
   a. First or senior author of a research publication in generally acknowledged high-profile journals with high Impact Factors (including, but not limited to, e.g., Nature, Science, Cell, Nature Medicine, JCI).
   b. Organize a symposium/workshop that is presented at a prominent national or international meeting.
   c. Delivery of a plenary talk or named lectureship at a prominent national or international meeting.
   d. Principal investigator in the acquisition of new research funds that contribute to a program that extends beyond the research of an individual's laboratory (e.g., a program project grant, center grant (local or national, shared instrumentation grant), principal investigator in the renewal of such funds).
   e. Recipient of multiple NIH grants, MERIT Award, or career development award (e.g. Howard Hughes Investigator or other nationally competitive award).

2. Satisfactory
   a. Publication in peer-reviewed journals related to microbiology and immunology.
   b. Principal investigator or co-investigator of a national research grant (NIH/NSF), foundation grants or industry award.
   c. Organizer of a local symposium, speaker in a national symposium.

3. Unsatisfactory
   Activity does not meet at least one of the above criteria under the satisfactory or outstanding category each year.

C. SERVICE

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

2. Satisfactory
   a. Member of a major committee (University-wide, Medical School).
   b. Chair or member of a departmental or graduate program committee.
   c. Organizer of or contributor to an outreach program.
3. Unsatisfactory
   Activity does not meet at least one of the above 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
The faculty will review and revise these regulations to reflect changes in the discipline as needed
and at least every five years.

History:
Voted on by secret ballot and approved by the Microbiology Faculty, July 17, 2012
Approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, July 18, 2012