

Department of Design, Housing, and Apparel

FACULTY PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

FOR

TENURE, PROMOTION, AND POST TENURE REVIEW

Guidelines for departmental statements required by Section 7.12 and 7a
of *Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure* (September 12, 1997)

I. Introductory Statement

This document describes indices and standards for the following personnel evaluations:

- A. Recommendation for awarding indefinite tenure according to *Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure* (University of Minnesota, 1997; hereafter cited as *Regulations*), Section 7.11. General Criteria.
- B. Recommendation for promotion parallel to those for consideration of tenure.
- C. Annual performance appraisal of progress toward achieving tenure.
- D. Annual performance appraisal for post tenure review according to Section 7a.1 and 7a.2 of the *Regulations*.

II. Departmental Mission Statement

The Department of Design, Housing and Apparel is a multidisciplinary department that is centered on the interactions between people and the components of apparel, housing, interiors and visual communication. We are committed to developing a richer understanding of these interactions to contribute toward socioeconomic well-being and empowerment, to enhance the well-being of communities through effecting positive change, and to improve environmental conditions. Our systematic inquiry advances knowledge in these areas and provides a basis for undergraduate and graduate learning, discovery and engagement.

The mission of the Department of Design, Housing, and Apparel includes teaching, scholarly and/or artistic inquiry and production, as well as discipline-related professional service as defined in Section 7.11 of the *Regulations*. To be awarded indefinite tenure a faculty member will be expected to have demonstrated effectiveness in teaching, scholarly and/or artistic inquiry and productivity, and distinguished achievement in discipline-related service. Because there is diversity within the department in the distribution of responsibilities among these three areas, the emphasis on each endeavor may vary

by position description. However, accomplishment in all three areas must be demonstrated by each faculty member.

The Department of Design, Housing, and Apparel (DHA), is one of three units of the University of Minnesota's College of Design. The College of Design is composed of the School of Architecture; the Department of Design, Housing, and Apparel; and the Department of Landscape Architecture.

Educational activities of the Department facilitate the completion of undergraduate and graduate degrees. Creative problem solving is fostered to prepare students to be skilled professionals and resourceful decision makers in business, industry, education, government, and the arts. The purpose of DHA research and creative production is to identify and deal with problems and opportunities in design, housing, apparel and textiles. The results are delivered through credit and non-credit instruction and services to the wider public. DHA outreach serves residents throughout Minnesota and the nation through publications and creative production. We value approaches to teaching and scholarship that represent diversity, utilize technological advances, and that are socially responsible.

III. Criteria for Tenure

The section that specifies the criteria in the *Regulations* is as follows:

“Section 7.11. General Criteria. The basis for awarding indefinite tenure is the determination that the achievements of a faculty member have demonstrated the individual's potential to continue to contribute significantly to the mission of the University and to its programs of teaching, research, and service over the course of the faculty member's career.... The relative importance of the criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision.”

Furthermore, in this department different weighting may vary according to position description. The candidate must demonstrate outreach in one of these categories.

A. Teaching

Determination of effectiveness in credit and non-credit teaching should include:

1. Review of graduate, undergraduate, and non-credit courses, seminars, workshops and short courses developed, taught, or directed by the candidate. Evaluation by peers through classroom visitations and/or seminar presentations, or review of pertinent classroom materials including text, material covered, assignments and examinations.
2. Review of advising by degree candidates in undergraduate and graduate programs.
3. Evaluations by students, extension educators, and/or clientele.

B. Creative Production Including Scholarly and/or Artistic Work

Determination of distinction in creative production is based on one or more of the following (the terms refereed and juried are used synonymously to represent peer-reviewed work):

-
1. A review of the candidate's record of: exhibitions; papers; abstracts; refereeing, jurying or curatorial responsibilities; computer programs; extension and experiment station publications; catalogs; telecommunication and commercial mass media productions, particularly those peer-reviewed. Evidence must be presented that the work is significant and of high quality. This includes:
 - a. Independent and/or collaborative character of accomplishments. In collaborative work, the contribution of the individual under review should be specifically described.
 - b. Funding support obtained from sources outside the department.
 - c. Participation in invited and/or juried professional symposia, exhibits, and or lectures.
 2. Both DHA and UMN recognize creative production as equivalent to research publication. Juried exhibitions and juried design publications are equal to refereed journal publications and many of the same circumstances prevail--review, size and prestige of venue, and competition. Publication of design work in a trade journal or popular-audience publication would be similar to an article published in the same venue. Samples of visual work may be included in the candidate's promotion and tenure document in addition to samples of writing. (Appendix A defines DHA's authorship policy.)

C. Service

We recognize the importance of service in carrying out the mission of the University and Department. Service contributions will be taken into consideration, but are not in themselves sufficient for awarding tenure.

Service contributions may include any or all of the following:

1. Participation in the governance of the institution and other services to the University and academic unit.
2. Service to professional organizations, learned societies, state and federal agencies, and to the community when it is within the faculty member's academic expertise and the mission of the academic unit.
3. Discipline-related and/or professional practice (i.e., consulting) when it is related to the mission of the academic unit.

IV. Promotion

All University faculty considered for promotion are evaluated based upon standards cited in *Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure* (September 12, 1997). Specific procedures for faculty promotion and tenure review are issued annually by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Specific standards will be described for promotion at the time of initial appointment.

A. To Assistant Professor:

Where initial hiring is done at the instructor level, promotion to Assistant Professor involves a review using tenure criteria, completion of a terminal degree, demonstrated effectiveness in teaching, advising, and evidence of creative production including scholarly and/or artistic work.

B. To Associate Professor:

Where initial hiring or current appointment is at the Assistant Professor level, promotion to Associate Professor with tenure is based on effectiveness in both teaching and creative production including scholarly and/or artistic work and must achieve distinction in either teaching or creative production.

C. To Professor:

Where initial hiring or current appointment is at the Associate Professor level, promotion to Professor (in addition to criteria used for Assistant and Associate Professor appointments) involves evidence of:

1. A regional, national, and, if possible, an international reputation in the candidate's discipline or field as evidenced, for instance, by invitations to symposia, election to offices within professional organizations, and awards and honors.
2. Testimonials from authorities in the candidate's field assessing the candidate's creative contributions, particularly to determine whether or not the candidate is among the leaders in his/her field.

V. Post Tenure Review of Faculty Performance

- A. The goals and expectations for tenured faculty members will parallel those used in the granting of tenure, but will take into account the different stages of professional development of faculty, providing for flexibility.
- B. The indices of acceptable performance are included in Appendix B.

VI. Procedures

- A. The Department complies with the Procedures for Reviewing the Performance of Probationary Faculty as provided by Sections 16.3, 7.4, and 7.61 of the *Regulations*.
- B. The Department procedures for annual review of tenured faculty are in accordance with Section 7a.2. of the *Regulations* and are described in Appendix C.

Appendices:

- Appendix A. Policy for multiple authorship and guidelines for evaluating creative production.
- Appendix B. Indices of performance for post tenure review.
- Appendix C. Procedures for post tenure review.
- Appendix D. Probationary faculty annual review procedures

Adoption and Amendments by the Department of Design, Housing, and Apparel

APPROVED MAY 5, 1986

AMENDED SEPTEMBER 17, 1987

AMENDED OCTOBER 2, 1987

AMENDED FALL 1996 (approved Appendix A)

AMENDED JUNE 4, 1998 (approved Appendices B and C)

AMENDED JUNE 4, 1999 (revised to incorporate appropriate language in documents)

AMENDED FEBRUARY 18, 2005 (approved new departmental mission statement)

AMENDED JANUARY 29, 2007 (approved changes to language of Sections II, III, and IV and indices of performance in Appendix B; minor language changes to sections and appendices for consistency)

AMENDED OCTOBER 5, 2007 (approved final changes and edits based on review of the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost for Academic Affairs, final approval January 15, 2008) THIS AMENDMENT CREATED A NEW DHA 7.12 APPLICABLE TO SOME FACULTY – SEE 2008 DHA P&T DOCUMENT

AMENDED OCTOBER 17, 2008 (approved change in teaching criteria for Appendix B Part A.2. to reflect new UMN form and questions for student ratings of teaching)

AMENDED JANUARY 23, 2009 (approved Appendix D establishing departmental probationary faculty annual review procedures)

APPENDIX A: POLICY FOR MULTIPLE AUTHORSHIP AND GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING CREATIVE PRODUCTION

The Department of Design, Housing and Apparel recognizes that distinction in creative production is based on evidence of an individual's work in exhibitions, papers, abstracts, refereeing, jurying, among other activities. To make clear the significance and contribution of an individual's work we adopt the following policies concerning production credit on work produced. [Adapted from the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association 4th Edition*. (1994). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.]

Authorship encompasses not only those who do the writing/production but also those who have made substantial contributions to the work. Substantial contributions may include the following: structuring the research design, formulating the hypotheses, organizing and conducting data analyses, interpreting results, and contributing to various phases of design project development. Lesser contributions should be acknowledged in a note and may include the following: designing a tool for conducting the research, collecting/entering data, modifying a computer program, recruiting subjects, routine observations, and supportive design work.

The name of the principle contributor to the project shall be listed first with subsequent names listed in the order of decreasing significance. If authors played an equal role in the research and production/publication, they should note this in the author's note. A student is listed as principle contributor to the project on any article that is substantially based on the student's dissertation, thesis, or project (Plan B). Order of authorship may be reassessed under certain conditions including: student's willingness to prepare work for publication/formal presentation, need for additional data analyses beyond the scope of the theses or dissertation, and the extended development of a design concept or project beyond the scope of the original project or paper.

Citations of creative production should follow standard APA format, with title of the project or design work listed, media used, dates and location of exhibition, and awards or honors if received. Design projects that involve a collaborative team approach will include the names of all major contributors to the project, beginning with the major contributor and other contributors following, listed in order of decreasing significance. Substantial contributions may include the following: project concept and development, research, major production roles, and dissemination of the project. Lesser contributions would be acknowledged in a note and may include the following: minor research and project involvement, in-process review and critique, and small production tasks. A student is listed as principle contributor to Plan B projects.

Order of contribution may be reassessed under certain conditions including: student's willingness to prepare work for display or presentation, or the need for additional development of a design concept beyond the scope of the original project.

APPENDIX B: INDICES OF PERFORMANCE FOR POST TENURE REVIEW

Minimum Faculty Standards for Annual Performance Review

Faculty standards require that at a minimum all faculty members will meet the expectations in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Post-tenure review will be based on a 3-year period. Performance reviews will be based on:

1. *DHA standards and expectations*
2. *Individual's position description*
3. *Current vitae*
4. *Annual goals statement*
5. *Annual Faculty Activity Report*

A. Teaching Expectations

Teaching effectiveness includes and extends beyond classroom instruction. It includes the communication of knowledge (to both registered University students and persons in the extramural community) as well as supervising, mentoring, or advising graduate or undergraduate students and others engaged in the teaching mission whether individually or in groups. It is expected that contribution toward teaching will vary between individuals and type of faculty appointment. In these efforts, collaboration and interdisciplinarity is valued but not requisite.

Determination of effectiveness in credit and outreach teaching will include a holistic review of the individual's contributions to teaching as indicated by the following:

1. Syllabi for all courses offered during the period under review.
2. University of Minnesota Student Rating of Teaching results. Ratings are expected to be a median of 4 (somewhat agree) or above for questions 1, 2, and 3 for all courses taught during the period under review. Ratings on the other questions also will be considered.
3. Peer evaluation of teaching/training (one course or outreach program per year)

Additional materials could include:

4. Current teaching materials/support materials such as assignments, exams, lecture outlines, textbooks, electronic presentations, and so forth.
5. Outcomes including projects, papers, exhibits, and so forth.
6. Effective teaching strategies such as active learning, service learning or online education.
7. Curriculum/Program development activities such as course development, course revisions, participation in program activities, and program development.
8. Advise graduate students and serve on graduate committees
9. Advise undergraduates concerning activities such as Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program, study abroad opportunities, honors capstone projects, student organizations, and internships.

B. Scholarship including Creative Production and Research

Scholarship in this context means the dissemination of creative production and/or research. "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.” (*Faculty Tenure* Section 7.11. General Criteria).

A holistic review of the individual’s contributions to scholarship will be conducted. A qualitative assessment of the excellence and significance of the work will be considered in conjunction with quantity expectations. Determination of effectiveness in scholarship will include review of contributions to scholarship noted below. Consideration will be given to submission and acceptance of the work(s) along with whether the work has been blind peer reviewed, refereed, juried, invited, or non-refereed. Based on the teaching load of the faculty member, scholarship contributions average six to eight works of dissemination each year.

1. Publications
 - a. *Journal articles
 - b. *Book chapters
 - c. *Books
 - d. Abstracts
 - e. Reviews
 - f. Reports
 - g. Catalogs
2. Exhibitions
 - a. *Works
 - b. Curated
 - c. Designed
3. Presentations:
 - a. Papers
 - b. Posters
 - c. Educational displays
4. *Grant applications following a coherent strategy for obtaining funding and resources.
5. Media Production

(*Preference is given to these types of contributions to scholarship).

C. Expectations of Service

All faculty members, tenured or not, are expected to fulfill citizenship obligations of the academic community, which includes institutional service as well as discipline-based and outreach service. Members of committees are expected to attend scheduled meetings, facilitate the work of the committee, share in the workload, and participate in decision making. Members are typically elected or appointed to committees to represent departmental interests, not solely one’s own subject matter area and so should bring that broad perspective to their committee role.

1. Institutional Service. All faculty, regardless of appointment, are expected to serve on one but no more than five institutional committees a year. Institutional service may include, but is not limited to, the following:
 - a. University committees
 - b. College committees
 - c. Departmental committees

2. Discipline-Based Service. All faculty, regardless of appointment, are expected to provide service to their profession and the public. Discipline-based service may include, but is not limited to, the following:
 - a. Peer review of: scholarship, promotion and tenure dossiers, grant applications, award nominations
 - b. Leadership roles in professional organizations
 - c. Editing professional publications
 - d. Creative practice

3. Outreach Service
 - a. Board membership
 - b. Legislative testimony
 - c. Community group presentations
 - d. Jury entries for community activities or events
 - e. Consulting with community members

APPENDIX C: POST TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES POLICY

An annual performance review of all tenured faculty will be conducted by the Department Head as part of the Annual Faculty Review process. The post-tenure performance review is intended to identify outlier cases in which a tenured faculty member is clearly functioning substantially below the needs and expectations of the department as outlined in the DHA Minimum Faculty Standards for Annual Performance Review, the individual's position description, and annual goals statement. After completing all faculty reviews, the Department Head will notify the individual and the Post-Tenure Review Committee when any tenured faculty member's performance was identified by the Department Head as substantially below the DHA Faculty Performance Standards for Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review. The Post-Tenure Review Committee will be required to evaluate all cases identified by the Department Head as being substantially below departmental expectations.

Composition of the DHA Post-Tenure Review Committee

The Post-Tenure Review Committee will consist of a three (3) member panel of elected tenured faculty members (any rank) in the department. The election will be arranged by DHA administrative staff. The members of the committee will elect the chairperson. Members of the committee will serve a two-year term. In the first year of the committee, two members will be elected for two-year terms and one for a one-year term in order to allow for staggered membership. If a member of the committee has been identified by the Department Head as performing substantially below expectations, the review of that case will be conducted by the other two members of the committee.

Post-Tenure Review Committee Procedures

Within three (3) weeks of notification by Department Head, the committee will conduct a review of the records of all faculty members identified by the Department Head as having substantially below expected performance and report back to the Head in writing. The committee *will not* consider the case for annual compensation decisions.

The review of performance will be based on materials submitted by the faculty member for the annual faculty review (vita and activity report). The faculty member is allowed to include additional documents. The materials will be evaluated according to the DHA Faculty Performance Standards. The DHA Post-Tenure Review Committee will report to the Department Head in writing whether or not they agree that the faculty member's performance was substantially below departmental expectations.

If the committee disagrees with the Department Heads determination that the faculty member's performance was substantially below departmental expectations, they will inform the Department Head of that decision in writing. The Department Head and the Chair of the Post Tenure Review Committee will jointly sign a letter informing the faculty member of the committee's decision. The case *does not* advance to the Dean for special review by the College.

However, if the committee concurs with the Department Head that the faculty member's performance is substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit, a 'notification of substandard performance' letter signed by both the Department Head and Chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee will be sent to the faculty member stating the finding, specifying deficiencies, and setting a time period of not less than one year

during which the faculty member should address the identified problems. The objective of the substandard performance review notification is to assist the faculty member to improve his or her productivity. The Department Head and the elected committee members should work with the faculty member to improve performance during that time.

At the end of the stated time period, the Post-Tenure Review Committee will review the case based on materials submitted by the faculty member for the annual faculty review including vita and activity report. At this time, if the performance remains substantially below the goals and expectations of the unit, the Committee and the Department Head may jointly request the Dean to initiate a special peer review of that faculty member. To do so, a letter will be sent to the Dean and to the faculty member, setting out their findings and attaching a copy of the documents they have reviewed.

APPENDIX D. PROBATIONARY FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES

The procedures described in this appendix provide implementation information for DHA consistent with the University of Minnesota “Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty,” section II.C.7. (dated October 15, 2007).

The annual schedule for DHA review during the probationary period is described in the DHA document, “Tenure and Promotion Timeline.” Information about mentor committees is in the DHA document, “Mentor Committees.” These documents are available from the DHA office and on the DHA intranet.

Outline of this appendix:

1. Candidate Responsibilities in Preparation for Review by Tenured Faculty
2. Department Administration Responsibilities in Preparation for Candidate Review by Tenured Faculty
3. Responsibilities of the Presenter
4. Tenured Faculty Members’ Responsibilities in Preparation for Meeting to Review Candidates
 - a. General Responsibilities
 - b. Preparation Specific to a Candidate
5. Tenured Faculty Meeting to Review Candidates
 - a. Basic Premises
 - b. Chairperson
 - c. Basic Meeting Sequence
 - d. Discussion
 - e. Recording Information during Discussion
6. Voting Process
7. The Faculty Summary Statement
8. Meeting Outcome
9. Process for Tenured Faculty Applying for Promotion to Full Professor
10. Additional Issues to Consider Ensuring a Climate of Cooperation

Roles described in this appendix:

Presenter (at Tenured Faculty Meeting, see Sections 2 and 3)

Tenured Faculty Meeting (see Section 5)

Chairperson (of Tenured Faculty Meeting, see Section 5.b.)

Recorder (at Tenured Faculty Meeting, see Section 5.e.)

1. Candidate Responsibilities in Preparation for Review by Tenured Faculty

- Arranges a meeting of his/her Mentor Committee to review progress at least once a year
- Prepares a philosophy statement of his/her research, teaching, outreach, and service
- Gathers and submits materials in a timely manner to the Department Head so that they may be available for faculty review
- Responsible for the accuracy and integrity of the materials
- Accomplishments completed during the most recent academic year highlighted in the vitae by the candidate to track progress
- Responsible for and is required to incorporate information to the evaluation materials as requested by the Mentor Committee, the DHA Tenured Faculty Meeting, the Department Head, and relevant college and university committees

2. Department Administration Responsibilities in Preparation for Candidate Review by Tenured Faculty

- Department Head is responsible for ensuring that the applicable departmental and UM regulations are followed
- The Department Head assigns a Presenter for each candidate from among the tenured faculty members who are not on the Mentor Committee and not in the program area of the candidate
- The Department Head, with the assigned Presenter, insures that the candidate has submitted all appropriate materials for the review
- The Department Head shall provide to each tenured faculty member a copy of the candidate's vitae to review before the meeting

3. Responsibilities of the Presenter

- The Presenter is responsible for presenting the candidate's case at the Tenured Faculty Meeting and preparing the draft statement after the discussion and vote
- The Presenter, with the Department Head, insure that the candidate has submitted all appropriate materials for the review
- Each year, the Presenter should revolve among tenured faculty members who are not serving on the candidate's Mentor Committee nor in the candidate's program area

4. Tenured Faculty Members' Responsibilities in Preparation for Meeting to Review Candidates

a. General Responsibilities

- Review UM 7.11 statement, DHA 7.12 criteria, and procedures relevant to annual probationary review, and promotion and/or tenure decision
- Understand performance outcomes that are addressed by the DHA 7.12 criteria and information that is and is not appropriate for consideration
- Be prepared to ask questions for clarification of standards and procedures before discussion of candidates

b. Preparation Specific to a Candidate

- Responsible for thorough review of the candidate's dossier with respect to the DHA 7.12 criteria
- Review actual work—articles, artistic work, syllabi, etc.
- By the 3rd year of the probationary review (of a normal 6 year review period), assess candidate's dossier to determine if candidate is getting up to speed, i.e., is he/she developing a dossier that will eventually meet the expected outcomes of our post-tenure review standards

5. Tenured Faculty Meeting to Review Candidates

a. Basic Premises

- All members of tenured faculty come prepared to discuss candidate's body of work and performance based on DHA 7.12 criteria
- Faculty participate in an open discussion in a non-hostile climate
- Multiple scheduled meetings provide for reflection between the meetings
- If a tenured faculty member misses one or more of the meetings, they must talk with the Chairperson about what transpired at the meeting(s) missed

b. Chairperson of Tenured Faculty Meeting

- Department Head assigns a Chairperson to conduct the fall series of scheduled meetings
- Chairperson of Tenured Faculty Meeting may be different each year

c. Basic Meeting Sequence (additional meetings may be scheduled)

- First meeting
 - Presenter presents material regarding candidate
 - Faculty discuss candidate
- Second meeting
 - Continue discussion
 - Vote (see Section 7)
- Third meeting
 - Review statement (see Section 8)
 - Reach consensus

d. Discussion during the Tenured Faculty Meeting

- Chairperson convenes the meeting
- The Presenter presents the candidate's information (this could be a list but not in paragraph text format)
 - Description of position
 - Rank and years in position, 9 vs. 12 month,
 - Scholarship focus/foci and accomplishments
 - Typical teaching load (in classroom and/or in community)
 - Course numbers, titles, and evaluations of courses taught
 - Service activities
 - Terminology and headings need to be clear (e.g., books, monographs, refereed, national or international)
- Faculty discuss the candidate's accomplishments focusing on the vitae and record of accomplishments, not on ideas or works in progress
- Discuss strengths and concerns of research/creative production, teaching, and service
- Discussion includes the assessment of the quantity, quality, value, and impact of accomplishments each year based on DHA 7.12 criteria
- Mentor Committee may be called on to clarify, but not to defend the work of the candidate

e. Recording Information during Discussion at the Tenured Faculty Meeting

- The Assistant to the Head of the Department is designated by the Department Head as the Recorder to take written notes of the discussion
- Accurate notes must be taken including both positive and negative comments
- Comments should not be attributed to individuals by name
- All comments must be respected and noted
- When asked for opinions, it is fundamental that faculty be frank and open; willing to be honest, direct, and professional, focusing on assessment not accusation
- After the end of discussion, the faculty Presenter will take the Recorder's notes and compile a draft statement to be presented to faculty after vote is taken (see Sections 6 and 7)

6. Voting Process

- After final discussion, but before a statement is drafted, the official vote is taken by written unsigned secret ballot
- The statement is then prepared by the Presenter according to Section 7, below.

7. The Faculty Summary Statement

- After the discussion and vote, the Presenter of the candidate's accomplishments prepares a statement based on the written comments recorded by the Recorder. An outline of the content that needs to be in the statement should be developed and then the statement written based on the Recorder's notes
- The statement is circulated, revised, and approved by consensus of the faculty indicating that it accurately reflects the discussion of the candidate's record and the vote of the faculty
- Statement must reflect the candidate's accomplishments relative to the DHA 7.12 criteria and, for probationary faculty, response to previous year's recommendations
- Statement should include:
 - Description of position
 - Rank and years in position, 9 vs. 12 month, typical teaching load (in classroom/in community)
 - Scholarship focus/foci
 - Objective list of accomplishments for the previous year or for all years considered in the tenure decision year
 - Three sections consistent with DHA 7.12 criteria to include: creative production and research, teaching, outreach/engagement, and service
 - Quantify performance when applicable, e.g., three refereed journal publications, mean ratings of student evaluation of teaching, number of committees served
 - Objective explanation or description of accomplishments based on criteria in DHA 7.12

8. Meeting Outcome

- Annual review results are discussed with the candidate, including the vote results and the statement.
- Mentor Committee and Department Head report back to candidate to give the nuance of conversations

9. Process for Tenured Faculty Applying for Promotion to Full Professor

- Faculty members who are associate professors should develop a plan mid-point in the time period of being an associate professor about going up for promotion to full professor
- In consultation with the Department Head, the associate professor should identify faculty members who could serve as mentors—it is likely that two faculty mentors would be sufficient
- The role of the Mentor Committee for this promotional purpose is one of advocacy
- The Tenured Faculty Meeting includes only the tenured full professors, but follows the same procedures for conducting the meeting as outlined in this document.

10. Additional Issues to Consider Ensuring a Climate of Cooperation

- Issues of safety—i.e., need to be able to contradict each other without defensiveness or creation of a negative environment
- Issues of culture—i.e., difference versus diversity; of ideology versus personality
- Issues of confidentiality—i.e., comments and opinions not shared or discussed outside of meeting
- Issues of objectivity—i.e., review annual accomplishments for content rather than for rationale for a predetermined opinion
- Issues of disciplinary standards—i.e., understand conventions in various fields