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Section 1. Introduction

This document is intended to provide guidelines for making decisions regarding promotion and/or tenure of faculty in the College of Engineering (COE) in accordance with the Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation (PTE) Policies (Section 352 of the University and the North Dakota State Board of Higher Education Policies).

These guidelines identify specific factors that apply to the evaluation of COE faculty members in their scholarly performance and development of teaching, research and service responsibilities. Performance evaluations must utilize criteria which are clearly understood, and are consistent with the expectations of the Department, the College, and the University.

Section 2. Mission of the College

The detailed COE mission statement can be reviewed on the College webpage (www.ndsu.edu/coe/administration). Briefly, the College has a threefold mission of teaching, research, and service. The teaching mission of the College is to offer degree and certification programs in Engineering and Construction. The research mission of the College is to support and strengthen the instructional and public service function. The public service mission is to extend the instructional, research, and technological resources of the College throughout North Dakota, the nation, and the world.

Section 3. COE PTE Philosophy

1. Concept of Scholarship

The College expectations for faculty can be unified in the concept of Scholarship. Scholarship is defined as a “… creative, systematic, rational inquiry into a topic and the honest, forthright application or exposition of conclusions drawn from that inquiry. It builds on existing knowledge and employs critical analysis and judgment to enhance understanding”[[1]](#footnote-1). Scholarly work must be made public, must be available for peer-review and critique according to accepted standards, and must be reproducible to be built upon by other scholars. Developing and maintaining a Faculty of Scholars necessitates that the University be “not only a place of teaching, but also a place of learning”[[2]](#footnote-2) for students and faculty alike.

The idea of Scholarship has evolved over time.  In its earliest form, the role of the professoriate was to teach and scholarship was tied to that transfer of knowledge.  After World War II, graduate education and research gained prominence and there was a greater shift toward the scholarship of discovery of knowledge.  More recently, the view of Scholarship has been broadened further to include the Scholarship of Integration, Scholarship of Application, and Scholarship of Teaching[[3]](#footnote-3). Because faculty members make up a mosaic of talents, it is important to recognize the diversity of scholarship in each of these areas. Faculty must be scholars as they carry out their responsibilities in teaching, research, and service.

Some examples of Boyer’s Scholarship:[[4]](#footnote-4)

*The Scholarship of Discovery*

* Search for new knowledge
* Traditional definition of scholarship
* Discovery of new information and new models
* Sharing discoveries through scholarly publication

*The Scholarship of Integration*

* Integration of knowledge from different sources
* Presenting overview of findings in a resource topic
* Bringing findings together from different disciplines to discover convergence.
* Identifying trends and seeing knowledge in new ways.

*The Scholarship of Application*

* Discovering of ways that new knowledge can be used to solve real world problems.
* Design of a system, product, or process.
* “New intellectual problems can arise out of the very act of application.”

*The Scholarship of Teaching*

* Search for innovative approaches and best practices to develop skills and disseminate knowledge.
* Teaching, advising, mentoring.

The qualities of a Scholar are defined as:

1. *Integrity* –Scholars must be truthful and fair in presenting their work.
2. *Perseverance* –Scholars must be curious, exhibit a reasonable level of productivity, and seek to perfect their work over a lengthy period.
3. *Courage* –Scholars must be able to risk disapproval in the name of truthfulness, and must be willing to take on difficult work in the spirit of answering original and important questions.
4. *Collegiality* - Collegiality, as defined by University policy, enhances the ability to be effective in teaching, research/creative activity, and service. Scholars are encouraged to accept and share responsibility for a productive and collegial workplace and to contribute to collegiality by being ethical, courteous, respectful of diversity and helpful to others, and respect the needs of others in all aspects of conduct.
5. Process Overview

The major investment made by a college is in the hiring of its faculty members; development of faculty as scholars must be the central focus of faculty annual reviews to make the best use of that investment. The COE PTE process is designed to encourage academic well-being and continuous improvement in all facets of faculty scholarship.

To this end, the College PTE expectations are based on the demonstration of Scholarship. The PTE process requires that multiple evaluations are conducted over several years, and are performed by a variety of professional colleagues. The intent is to provide regular, unbiased feedback to enhance the scholarly development of all faculty members.

The PTE process must be used to develop the Scholar in a fair, transparent, and open manner. Annual reviews by Department leadership are the foundation of the process. This process takes place in the spirit of honest and constructive feedback in the development of the Scholar. The leadership may include the Department Chair (or Head) and the Department PTE Committee. Multiple evaluations help provide the Scholar with more constructive feedback and reduce the likelihood of a negative decision later in the PTE process. If the PTE process is carried out faithfully by all parties throughout the pre-tenure period, the final outcome of the process should never be a surprise to the Scholar.

Each department has its own specific needs. Each faculty member within a department has different interests and expertise. These varying needs, interests, and expertise must be blended together to achieve the department goals. The faculty member, together with the Chair/Head, should develop a job description and goals that support programs of excellence in the College.

1. Assessment Elements

In the book, “Scholarship Assessed”, Glassick et al. lay out clear assessment guidelines and the ideas expressed herein are borrowed heavily from this work[[5]](#footnote-5). Scholarship of a faculty member’s body of work will be assessed based on evidence provided by the faculty member that addresses the following six criteria:

1. Clear goals – Does the scholar clearly state the basic purpose of the work, define realistic and achievable objectives, and identify important problems in the field?
2. Adequate preparation – Does the scholar demonstrate understanding of the existing scholarship in the field, utilize necessary skills and tools in the work, and integrate the necessary resources to move the project forward?
3. Appropriate methods – Does the scholar effectively use appropriate methods, and modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?
4. Significant results – Does the scholar achieve the stated goals, make a consequential contribution to the field, and open additional areas for further exploration?
5. Effective presentation – Is the scholar’s work presented with clarity and integrity, with a suitable style and effective organization, and in appropriate forums to communicate to intended audiences?
6. Reflective critique – Does the scholar use a critical self-evaluation, based on an appropriate breadth of evidence, to improve the quality of work?

It is the responsibility of faculty members to explain how the above elements of scholarship are present in their teaching, research, and service responsibilities. A major focus, therefor, will be the narrative that describes scholarly development.

Annual reviews and critical feedback to the faculty member throughout the PTE process must also address the six criteria noted above. In addition, the annual review must address a broader view of the faculty member’s work by addressing the following two questions.

1. Is the current cumulative body of work appropriate for the field and for the stage of development of the Scholar?
2. Is there an appropriate progression and improvement of the faculty member’s scholarship?

Section 4. University Expectations

University Policy (Section 352) recognizes teaching, research, and service as the three areas in which faculty are expected to contribute towards the mission of the University. The quality and quantity of contributions in all three areas will be considered at the time of promotion and tenure. Contributions and forms of supporting evidence will vary according to discipline. The performance evaluation of a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure shall also be based upon the individual's job description and work load over the time period under review.

Consistent with University Policy (Section 352), it is within the authority of the NDSU administration to grant credit toward early promotion or tenure when substantial, relevant experience has been documented in the original letter of appointment (hiring contract). Probationary-period faculty are encouraged to take full advantage of the customary six-year period to demonstrate continuing effectiveness with the context of NDSU. PTE committees for the Department and the College are bound to evaluate the faculty member based on the original letter of appointment and the candidate’s job description. Evidence of achievement in the areas of teaching, research, and service shall be evaluated based on a level of documented activity in all areas equivalent to that expected from six-years of service at NDSU.

Section 5. Department Expectations

Specific expectations unique to the Department may be articulated in the Department tenure and promotion documents. The College PTE Committee shall use these Department guidelines for promotion and tenure. The effort expectation in teaching, research, and service should be outlined in the candidate’s job description and any modifications that have occurred during the performance period.

The Department of Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering (ABEN) is required to meet the expectations and requirements set forth by both CAFSNR and COE. The COE PTE Committee evaluates faculty from the ABEN on their scholarship of teaching in engineering courses and scholarship of service but not scholarship of research.

Section 6. College Expectations for Teaching, Research, and Service

1. Teaching

Teaching scholarship refers to the broad area of student/faculty interaction for educational purposes. Teaching encompasses not only classroom activities but the full range of activities which result in educational and professional development of students. Teaching scholarship may include outreach and extension educational programs directed primarily toward clientele outside of the university. The College expects each faculty member to be a competent teacher and advisor who cares about student learning and is a knowledgeable and skilled communicator.

The faculty member should provide a personal narrative with a portfolio of evidence to demonstrate competency as a scholarly teacher and advisor. The personal narrative should highlight the following with regards to the faculty member’s teaching responsibilities: clear and appropriate goals, adequate preparation, use of appropriate methods, significant results, and effective presentation. The narrative should also integrate a reflective critique of the scholar’s own work highlighting changes that have been made in teaching methods along with the motivations for, and results of, those changes. The narrative should synthesize the scholar’s body of teaching responsibility with reference to supporting evidence outlined below. It is important to note that a compilation of evidence is not sufficient, in and of itself, to demonstrate scholarly teaching competency. Rather, that evidence must be integrated in a cohesive narrative.

*Criteria for tenure, promotion, and maintenance of rank*

1. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor: For promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, the faculty member shall demonstrate scholarly teaching competency. This competency should be demonstrated through an organized narrative, as outlined above. The faculty member shall be a proficient instructor for all courses taught. “Proficient” means knowledgeable in the subject(s) taught, effective in communication, and competent in assessing student learning. The faculty member shall also be a proficient advisor to all assigned undergraduate and graduate students.
2. Tenure: An applicant for tenure is expected to meet the same criteria for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. In addition, the faculty member should demonstrate long-term potential value to the Department, College, and University based on scholarly teaching that aligns with the institutional mission.
3. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor: For promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, the faculty member shall demonstrate a continued progression of scholarly teaching and participation in curriculum development. The expectation for promotion to Full Professor is that the faculty member demonstrates a significantly higher level of achievement and recognition than for promotion to Associate Professor. Integration of new models for student learning and integration of research into the instructional of students is particularly encouraged. The responsibility is on the faculty member to explain the progression in teaching scholarship in the reflective narrative as outlined above.
4. Full Professor: Full Professors are expected to maintain their work as teaching scholars by continuing to improve the transfer of knowledge using the principles of Scholarship outlined above.

*Supporting Evidence*

Although the narrative serves as the primary basis for documenting teaching scholarship, that narrative must be supported by documented evidence. The following are primary examples of supporting evidence that can be referenced to demonstrate teaching and advising scholarship:

* Peer and/or other professional evaluations of: course content, teaching methods, improvement of instructional programs, and course or program assessment
* Student evaluation of teaching effectiveness including summary data for all required Student Rating of Instruction questions
* Summaries of feedback from student evaluations of advising
* Presentations at regional and national meetings on innovative instructional and assessment techniques
* Other documentation of innovative methods to evaluate student learning
* Course development including faculty or administrative evaluation
* Supervision of theses and dissertations
* Active involvement in accreditation activities

The following are secondary examples of supporting evidence that can be referenced to demonstrate teaching and advising scholarship:

* Receipt of awards or special recognition for effective teaching
* Receipt of awards or special recognition for advising students and/or organizations
* Offering or contributing to continuing education courses and workshops including evaluation of course content and delivery
* Participation in professional development related to improving teaching effectiveness

1. Research

Research scholarship includes activities that focus on discovery and integration related to a scholar’s defined area(s) of study. Such areas may include foundational science, applied engineering, or instructional pedagogy.

Faculty members should provide a personal narrative with a portfolio of supporting evidence demonstrating scholarly research competency in their area(s) of expertise. The personal narrative should highlight the following with regards to the faculty member’s research program: clear and appropriate goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, and effective presentation. The narrative should also integrate a reflective critique of the scholar’s own work which informs future scholarly activities. The narrative should synthesize the scholar’s body of work with reference to supporting evidence outlined below. It is important to note that a compilation of evidence is not sufficient, in and of itself, to demonstrate scholarly research competency. Rather, that evidence must be integrated in a cohesive narrative.

*Criteria for tenure, promotion, and maintenance of rank*

1. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor: For promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, faculty members shall demonstrate scholarly research competency in their area(s) of expertise. This competency should be demonstrated through an organized narrative, as outlined above.
2. Tenure: An applicant for tenure is expected to meet the same criteria for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. In addition, the faculty member should demonstrate long-term potential value to the Department, College, and University based on a scholarly research program that aligns with the institutional mission.
3. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor: For promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, the faculty member shall demonstrate a continued progression of scholarly work and research leadership. The expectation for promotion to Full Professor is that the faculty member demonstrates a significantly higher level of achievement and recognition than for promotion to Associate Professor. The responsibility is on the faculty member to explain the research progression and leadership in the reflective narrative as outlined above.
4. Full Professor: Full Professors are expected to maintain their work as research scholars by continuing to search for new knowledge through the principles of scholarship outlined above.

*Supporting Evidence*

Although the narrative serves as the primary basis for documenting scholarship, that narrative must be supported by documented evidence. The following are primary examples of supporting evidence that can be referenced to demonstrate scholarship of research:

* External peer evaluations of faculty scholarly research contributions such as evaluations of research proposals and reviews of manuscripts (required)
* Pursuit and success in obtaining external funding to support scholarly research goals
* Publication of original work related to the individual's scholarly goals in books and refereed archival publications appropriate to the scholarly field
* Peer reviewed scholarly publications in teaching and instructional pedagogy
* Demonstrating leadership in research through leadership in publications and grantsmanship
* Effective direction and mentoring of graduate students toward completion of dissertations and theses
* National or international recognition in their field of expertise
* Invited technical presentations at national and international conferences
* Collaborative investigations with industrial partners
* Registration of patents
* Establishment of campus infrastructure to serve as a platform to support scholarly research goals

The following are secondary examples of supporting evidence that can be referenced to demonstrate scholarship of research:

* Publications of original work related to the individual's scholarly goals in non-refereed conference proceedings
* Presentation of original work related to the individual's scholarly goals at regional, national, or international conferences
* Externally requested technical reports
* Awards or other recognition within the faculty member’s discipline for research accomplishments
* Participation in multidisciplinary and intercollegiate research activities

The following are examples of supporting evidence that may be used to demonstrate research leadership:

* A strong record of publication citations
* Invitations to speak at national or international meetings
* Holding leadership positions on national committees
* Developing or directing national collaborative research programs

1. Service

The scholarship of teaching and research has received considerable attention, but teaching and research are not the only expectations of faculty members. The faculty are also expected to engage in campus governance, and to serve their profession and broader society as NDSU employees. Scholarly service involves the same critical and reflective components that faculty apply to teaching and research: clear and appropriate goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and critical reflection.

The faculty member should provide a personal narrative with a portfolio of supporting evidence to demonstrate a scholarly approach and contributions in service activities. The personal narrative should highlight the faculty member’s personal role and scholarly contributions to the service activities. The narrative should also include a reflective critique of the service activities of the faculty member. It is important to note that compilation of evidence alone is not sufficient. Rather, that evidence must be integrated in a cohesive narrative pointing to the growth and active participation in scholarship of service.

*Criteria for tenure, promotion, and maintenance of rank*

1. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor: For promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, the faculty member shall demonstrate scholarly participation and growth in service at the University and to the Profession. This activity should be demonstrated through reflective narrative, as outlined above. Active and meaningful participation in Department, College and/or University committees is required to achieve the rank of Associate Professor unless hiring at this level. Consistent and appropriate service to the Profession and participation in professional societies is also required.
2. Tenure: An applicant for tenure is expected to meet the same criteria for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. In addition, the faculty member should demonstrate long-term potential value to the Department, College, and University based on scholarly service activity that aligns with the institutional mission.
3. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor: In addition to those requirements for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, the faculty member must demonstrate a continued progression in breadth and depth of scholarly service and outreach activities. The expectation for promotion to Full Professor is that the faculty member demonstrates involvement in significantly higher levels of service activities than required for promotion to Associate Professor. Leadership in professional activities and/or public service in one’s area(s) of expertise is required for promotion to Full Professor.
4. Full Professor: Full Professors are expected to maintain their work in scholarship of service through thoughtful and active participation in Department, College, and University governance as well as broader service to the Profession and community.

*Supporting Evidence*

The following activities are primary examples of supporting evidence that can be used to demonstrate scholarship of service:

* Institutional service at the level of Department, College and/or University such as faculty governance, formulation of policies, and administrative responsibilities.
* Service to technical, professional, and scholarly societies such as participating in committee activities, organizing and/or chairing conferences, reviewing manuscripts and proposals, and serving as an editor or on the editorial board of journals.
* Service to local/state/national agencies or the general public in the context of the faculty member’s discipline.
* Service to the public could include discipline-related outreach to local government, businesses, schools, or other community groups.
* Leadership roles in any of the above service categories.
* Involvement in educational and/or research and/or professional outreach.
* Contributions to fostering a campus climate that supports and respects faculty, staff, and students who have diverse cultures, backgrounds, and points of view.

The following activities are secondary examples of supporting evidence that can be used to demonstrate scholarship of service:

* Non-remunerative consulting in one’s area(s) of expertise
* Service to public and private organizations in areas outside the faculty member’s specific discipline (e.g. fraternal organizations, community-based organizations) but done in the capacity as an NDSU faculty member.
* Faculty mentoring

The following are examples of supporting evidence that may be used to demonstrate leadership in service activities:

* Taking leadership roles on committees at any level
* Developing or directing collaborative outreach programs
* Developing and/or running university-wide governance initiatives

Section 7. Procedures

1. Tenure and Promotion

The College will follow the detailed PTE Procedures as outlined and defined in NDSU Policy 352 Section 6. For probationary faculty, the basis for review of the candidate’s portfolio and any recommendations on promotion and/or tenure shall be the promotion and tenure guidelines and criteria of the department which were provided to the candidate at the time of the candidate’s appointment to the position. The Department Chair/Head has the responsibility to provide to the appointee these documents along with a position description, contract, or other document that constitutes a tenure or work plan. Tenured candidates for promotion to professor shall be evaluated by the criteria in effect at the time of application.

1. Evaluation

The Chair/Head will meet with each faculty member annually to conduct annual reviews. The purpose will be to review the job description for each faculty member, review accomplishments since the last review, review cumulative progression toward promotion, and to collaboratively define expectations for accomplishments for the next review cycle. The Department PTE Committee participates in the third-year process by providing the Department Chair/Head a brief written evaluation of probationary faculty progress. The faculty member’s expectations should be aligned with the Department’s goals and needs, the interests and expertise of the faculty member, and the general evaluation criteria listed above.

1. Probationary Faculty

According to University policy and specific Department guidelines, the probationary faculty member will prepare summaries of teaching, research, and service progress and accomplishments for each year. The summary and an updated, cumulative curriculum vita will be provided to the Department Chair/Head to be used for annual review and for setting goals for the upcoming year. The Department Chair/Head and the individual probationary faculty member will establish objectives and review the job description on an annual basis. The summary and an updated, cumulative curriculum vita will be also provided to the Department PTE committee.

The Chair/Head and the Department PTE Committee will each provide a performance report to the probationary faculty member as feedback for tenure and promotion purposes. These reports should include an assessment of the faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion. Assessments should be rated as acceptable, improvement plan required (marginally meeting expectations), or unacceptable (non-renewal). In making a judgment on minimum progress toward tenure, due consideration shall be given to the candidate's academic record, performance of assigned responsibilities, and potential to meet the criteria for promotion and tenure at the end of the probationary period.

If either the Chair/Head or the Department PTE committee recommends an improvement plan, the faculty member will meet with both the Chair/Head and PTE committee to discuss the review and the required areas of improvement. The faculty member will write an improvement plan based on this feedback and the plan should be reviewed and signed by all parties. The signed plan and a summary of progress made towards the plan must be included in the following year’s annual review.

If either the Chair/Head or the Department PTE Committee make a recommendation for non-renewal, their reports (recommendations) shall be submitted to the COE for review by the Dean and the College PTE committee. The four recommendations shall then be submitted to the Provost. The non-renewal process shall be carried out according to NDSU Policy Section 350.3.

For third year reviews, the probationary faculty member will complete the evaluation documents defined by the current NDSU Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Preparation including all annual evaluations by the Chair/Head and Department PTE committee. Completed portfolios will be submitted for review by the Department Chair/Head, Department PTE Committee, the COE Dean, and the COE PTE committee.

At the beginning of the last year of the probationary period, both the Department PTE Committee and the Department Chair/Head will evaluate the applicant's record and submit individual recommendations for tenure/promotion to the College PTE Committee and the COE Dean by November 1.

2. Tenured Faculty

Consistent with the Scholarship development model of the COE PTE process, tenured faculty members will periodically present a portfolio for review to encourage continued growth in teaching, research, and service. Portfolios will be reviewed by Department and College PTE Committees and will be used to provide constructive feedback. Associate Professors will submit a portfolio for review every four years after achieving rank and Professors will submit a portfolio every six years after achieving rank. The portfolio should consist of an updated CV, and narratives describing scholarly development in the areas of teaching, research, and service as outlined in Section 6, above, and the annual performance reports provided by the Department Chair/Head. Faculty are encouraged to use appendices to include other documentation that will help the committees understand the faculty member’s progression of scholarship and provide appropriate feedback. Such documentation may include external reviews of research, manuscript or grant proposal review comments, peer reviews of teaching, or documentation of professional service activity and accomplishments. Feedback will be returned to the faculty member and the Department Chair/Head as a reference for continued annual evaluations.

1. Recommendations

When a faculty member from a Department in the COE is evaluated for promotion and/or tenure, the evaluations by both the Department PTE Committee and the Chair/Head shall be forwarded to the Dean and the College PTE Committee.

The Dean of the College of Engineering and the College PTE Committee will independently prepare recommendations in compliance with the University Policy (Section 352). The Dean and the College PTE Committee will send their final recommendations along with the individual's application to the Provost by January 5 for final disposition.

1. Early Promotion and Tenure

1. Probationary Faculty

For a faculty member without prior relevant experience, eligibility for tenure requires a probationary period of six years. In this case, evaluations for promotion to Associate Professor and granting of tenure are conducted concurrently. Within this probationary period, faculty members who have demonstrated exceptional academic accomplishments may apply for early promotion (without tenure) prior to the completion of the six years of the probationary period. Petitions for early promotion shall be initiated by Department Heads/Chairs, and not by faculty members themselves.

A faculty member with relevant professional /academic experience at the time of initial NDSU appointment may be awarded credit toward tenure. Awarded credit must be stated in the original hiring contract. There are two options:

1. Faculty may be given one to three years of tenure credit (maximum allowed) and then would apply for promotion and tenure prior to the sixth year of academic service. For example: given one year of credit, the promotion and tenure application would be due in the fifth year of service; given three years of credit, the promotion and tenure application would be due in the third year of service.
2. A new faculty appointee who is eligible for award of probationary credit may elect a full six-year probationary credit with the option of applying for promotion and/or tenure at any time following three years of academic service.

In either option, failure to achieve tenure will lead to a terminal year contract.

2. Tenured Faculty

Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor is typically applied for no earlier than the 6th year following promotion to Associate Professor. However, faculty who have demonstrated exceptional academic accomplishments and leadership, and meet all criteria for promotion to Full Professor, may apply for promotion earlier, but not before serving at least 3 years as Associate Professor.

1. Extension of Probationary Period

According to NDSU Policy 352 Section 3.6, a faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period not to exceed three years based on institutional, family, or personal circumstances. The request may be made any time during the probationary period prior to the sixth year (or prior to the year in which the portfolio is due). Written notification to the Provost must be submitted within one year of the beginning of the event for which the extension is requested and approved prior to July 1 of the year in which the tenure/promotion portfolio is due. A faculty member who submits an extension request during the academic year in which they are to undergo third year review must successfully undergo third-year review and renewal before any extension can take effect. The request must be in writing and will be submitted to the Provost who will review the request and will approve or deny the request. Denial of an extension may be appealed under University Policy 350.4.

1. Professors of Practice and Research Professors

While faculty in Professor of Practice and Research Professor positions are not eligible for tenure, promotion through ranks is encouraged and is based on time in rank and satisfactory evaluations of assigned responsibilities. An application for promotion is initiated via a departmental recommendation and follows the same procedure and submission deadlines as for tenure-line faculty. Faculty in such positions are eligible to apply for promotion from assistant to associate after the completion of five years in rank.

1. COE PTE Committee Members’ Voting and Deliberation Rights

According to NDSU Policy 352 Section 5.4, a college PTE committee member cannot vote on the promotion/tenure of a candidate in both the department and college PTE committees. For the COE, a college PTE committee member shall NOT vote on the promotion/tenure of a candidate from their home department in the college committee; they may only vote in their department’s PTE committee. They may however deliberate with the college committee regarding candidates from their department.

Section 8. Changes

In those instances, where the COE Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Procedures and Criteria must be modified, the COE PTE Committee will make the proposed changes and forward those changes to COE faculty council. The proposed changes are to be shared with faculty at least ten (10) business days prior to voting at a College Faculty Meeting. The modified document, as approved by the College Faculty, will be forwarded first to the COE Dean, and then to the Provost, for their approvals. Upon approval, faculty will be informed of approved changes to the policy.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chair, College PTE Committee Date

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Dean, College of Engineering Date

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Provost Date
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