

Meeting Agenda
September 12, 2022

- I. Call to Order.
- II. Attendance.
- III. Adoption of the Agenda.
- IV. Approval of Meeting Minutes from May 9, 2022.
- V. Announcements.
 1. David Cook, President
 2. Margaret Fitzgerald, Provost
 3. Anastasiya Andrianova, Faculty Senate President
 4. Florin Salajan, Faculty Senate Past-President
 5. Warren Christensen, Faculty Senate President-Elect
 6. Fred Hudson, Staff Senate President
 7. Christian Walth, Student Body President
 8. Phil Hunt, Registrar
- VI. Committee and Other Reports.
- VII. Consent Agenda.
 1. UCC Report
- VIII. Unfinished Business.
- IX. General Order.
 1. Policy 352
- X. New Business.
- XI. Adjournment.

Meeting Minutes

May 9, 2022

- I. Call to Order: 3:03pm.
- II. Attendance: See Appendix 1.
- III. Adoption of the Agenda: Limb/Christensen
 1. Approved unanimously.
- IV. Approval of Meeting Minutes from April 11, 2022.
 1. Approved by unanimous consent.
- V. Announcements.
 1. Dean Bresciani, President
 - i. No announcements.
 - ii. Pres. Salajan presented Pres. Bresciani with a plaque to thank him for his 12 years of service to NDSU.
 2. Margaret Fitzgerald, Provost
 - i. Provost Fitzgerald apologized for not having the gavel ready to honor Pres. Salajan's service. As soon as it is in, she will present him with it.
 - ii. The budget reduction has not hit its target as of yet. The Provost is working with deans and department heads and chairs to find new ways to cut the budget to reach the \$1.4 million required. The Provost is willing to hold open fora with faculty to answer questions about the budget reductions.
 3. Florin Salajan, Faculty Senate President
 - i. The Faculty Senate Constitution revisions were approved in May-June 2021. Pres. Bresciani has since offered his response. There is a review going on to see if the revisions should be sent to the SBHE.
 - ii. A letter was sent to the ND governor about the memorandum of understanding (MOU) between NDUS community colleges and Western Governors University (WGU). The letter has been shared with the Senators and will be shared with the faculty at large in Pres. Salajan's last update to the faculty.
 - a. Question: What can be done to alter the MOU?
 - a. Pres. Salajan said that legislators could be made aware of the situation and letter to see if they are

interested in the concerns raised within the letter.
Moreover, the letter is a public document.

- iii. UND passed a resolution similar to that of NDSU on academic freedom to teach about race and gender justice. The UND University Senate resolution used the NDSU FS resolution as its basis, and then made changes relevant to UND.
 - iv. Pres. Salajan thanked the Senators who were leaving the Faculty Senate at the end of their term.
4. Dennis Cooley, Faculty Senate Past-President
 - i. No announcements
 - a. Past Pres. Cooley was asked to find out the status of placing more faculty members on the standing Committee on Faculty Rights.
 5. Anastasiya Andrianova, Faculty Senate President-Elect
 - i. Pres.-Elect Andrianova thanked Pres. Salajan, Parliamentarian Amiri, and Past Pres. Cooley for their service during the current academic year.
 - ii. Past Pres. Cooley received a certificate of thanks from the Faculty Senate executive team.
 6. Joshua Schroetter, Staff Senate President
 - i. The Staff Senate awards ceremony went well.
 - ii. The Gunkelman ceremony went very well. The award was won by a graduate student.
 - iii. The new Staff Senate President, Fred Hudson, was introduced.
 - iv. Pres. Salajan thanked Staff Senate President Schroetter for his service and welcomed incoming Pres. Hudson.
 7. Laura Friedmann, Student Body Vice-President
 - i. Absent.
 8. Philip Hunt, Registrar
 - i. Commencement is on 14 May 2022 at the Fargodome. The ceremonies are at 10:00am and 2:00pm.
 - ii. Registrar Hunt thanked the Faculty Senators and the Senate for their service.
- VI. Committee and Other Reports.
1. Budget Committee report:
 - i. M. Petersen reported that the committee wrapped up its work for the academic year. The committee met with the Provost last week for final recommendations. Unfortunately, many of the recommendations that were made do not bring immediate impacts

to the budget. It will take one to two years to have their effects felt, although some of them will be implemented soon.

- ii. M. Peterson thanked the Budget Committee members for their work.
 - a. Question: Where are the reports from the Provost's working groups?
 - b. They are posted on the Provost's webpage.

VII. Consent Agenda.

- 1. UCC Report plus addendum: UCC has moved the review of General Education revalidations from full review to minor or non-substantive changes approval.
- 2. Policy 320
- 3. Policy 327
- 4. Policy 331.1
- 5. Policy 823
 - i. Consent Agenda was approved by unanimous consent

VIII. Special Order

- 1. Election for the Faculty Senate President-Elect
 - i. Nominations
 - a. Dr. Ryan Limb
 - a. Sen. Limb stated that he is a proud member of the NDSU community and wants to advance the university's mission.
 - b. Question: The position of the president acts as a link between the administration and the faculty. There are times in which there is a conflict between the faculty and the administration. How would you handle it?
 - c. Communication is the key. It is the Faculty Senate president's responsibility to represent the position of the Faculty Senate.
 - b. Dr. Warren Christensen
 - a. Sen. Christensen has learned from his committee experiences how to work with students in a number of leadership roles.
 - b. Question: If your leadership objectives are frustrated by the people you are leading or the administration, then what is your approach to handle the situation?

- c. He would sit down and talk with stakeholders to connect with the other people involved.
- c. There were no further nominations from the floor.
- d. Voting results - (See Appendix 2. Q1)
 - a. Limb: 18
 - b. Christensen: 21
 - c. Abstain: 1
 - d. Sen Christensen was declared the winner. His term as Pres.-Elect begins on 17 May 2022.

IX. Unfinished Business.

X. General Order.

XI. New Business.

1. Policy 325

i. Motion to approve: Cooley/Limb

- a. No discussion.
- b. Motion to approve passed: 36 aye; 0 nay; 2 abstain - (See Appendix 2. Q2)

2. Policy 335

i. Motion to approve: Andrianova/Burt

- a. No discussion.
- b. Motion to approved passed: 37 aye; 1 nay; 2 abstain - (See Appendix 2. Q3)

3. Policy 352

i. Motion to approve: Limb/Burt

- a. Discussion
 - a. The addition of emeritus faculty to serve on PTE committees is a flawed idea for three reasons:
 - i. Emeritus faculty could be less diverse and their knowledge of the field outdated.
 - ii. The stakes are not as high for them because they will not be working directly with the faculty who receive tenure as a result.
 - iii. Emeritus faculty will not be paid for the work they do, which means that service work is being outsourced rather than done by paid faculty employees. Using emeritus faculty to do the work might also send the message that we do not need more paid faculty lines and thus cause faculty lines not to be replaced.

- b. There are college documents that are in conflict with this policy change.
- c. D. Friesner was asked why emeritus faculty were added to this policy.
 - i. Response: The language in the policy allows the flexibility to use emeritus faculty for these jobs but there is no requirement to do so.
- d. Motion to postpone until the next Faculty Senate meeting in September: Roberts/Ross
 - 1. Motion to postpone passed: 31 aye; 7 nay; 2 abstain - (See Appendix 2. Q4)

4. Guiding Principles for Shared Governance at NDSU

- i. Sen. Hassell provided background on the document. It is not a formal policy but rather an endorsement of the principles for shared governance. If adopted, then they will be put on the websites of the various governing bodies.
- ii. Pres. Salajan stated that this same document is going through Staff Senate. Student Government might take it up, but they have not communicated with Faculty Senate when that will be.
- iii. Motion to adopt the Guiding Principles for Shared Governance document: Christensen/Limb
 - a. Discussion: The work of the committee and value of the document was recognized.
 - a. Motion to adopt the document on shared governance principles: 38 aye; 1 nay; 1 abstain - (See Attachment 2. Q5)

XII. The Faculty Senate gavel was passed to Pres. Elect Andrianova by Pres. Salajan.

XIII. Adjournment at 4:17pm: Cooley/Ross

- 1. Passed unanimously.

Appendix 1: Attendance

Name	Substitution	Present
Aldrich-Wolfe, Laura		X
Amiri, Ali		X
Andrianova, Anastassiya		X
Arnold, Lisa		X
Asa, Eric		X
Berg, Eric		X
Burt, Sean		X
Byrd, Christopher		X
Choi, Juwon		X
Christensen, Warren		X
Cooley, Dennis		X
Creese, John		X
Emanuelson, Pam		X
Fellows, Kristen		X
Gao, Jerry		X
Harringer, Shannon		X
Hassel, Holly		X
Hershberger, John		X
Hong, Yontao (David)		X
Huseth-Zosel, Andrea	Laam, L.	X
Jackson, Jeremy		
Kilina, Svetlana		
Larson, Jamee		X
Limb, Ryan		X
Lin, Zhibin		X
March, Raymond		X
McGrath, Ryan		X
Nordstrom, Onnolee		X
O'Rourke, Stephen		X
Overton, Kimberly		X
Peltier, Allison		
Philbrick, Candace		X
Rahman, Mukhlesur		X
Roberts, David		X
Ross, Darrell		X
Salajan, Florin		X
Selekwa, Majura		X
Smith, Matthew		X
Thompson, Sara		X

Tian, Ruilin	Jones, J	x
Ungar, Abraham		x
Wood, Scott		x
Yan, Changhui		x
Yan, Guiping		x
Zhang, Qi		x
Zhao, Pinjing		x

Appendix 2: Voting Record

Session Name: Ballot 5-9-2022 4-57 PM

Date Created: 5/9/22, 2:54:44 PM Active Participants: 34 of 34

Questions: 5

Results Detail

Last Name	First Name	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
ALDRICH-WOLFE	Laura	CHR	AYE	AYE	NAY	AYE
ANDRIANOVA	Anastasiya	LIM	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
ARNOLD	Lisa	CHR	AYE	AYE	NAY	AYE
BERG	Eric	LIM	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
BURT	Sean	CHR	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
BYRD	Christopher	LIM	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
CHRISTENSEN	Warren	CHR	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
CHOI	Juwon	LIM	AYE	AYE	NAY	AYE
COOLEY	Dennis	LIM	AYE	NAY	AYE	AYE
FELLOWS	Kristen	CHR	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
HARRIGER	Shannon	-	-	AYE	-	-
HASSEL	Holly	CHR	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
HONG	Yongtao	CHR	AYE	AYE	NAY	AYE
LAAM	Leslie	-	ABS	ABS	ABS	ABS
LARSON	Jamee	LIM	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
LIMB	Ryan	LIM	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE

LIN	Zhibin	-	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
MARCH	Ray	CHR	-	ABS	AYE	NAY
MCGRATH	Ryan	-	AYE	AYE	ABS	AYE
NORDSTROM	Onnolee	CHR	AYE	AYE	NAY	AYE
O'ROURKE	Stephen	LIM	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
OVERTON	Kimberly	LIM	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
PHILBRICK	Candace	CHR	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
RAHMAN	Md Mukhlesur	LIM	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
ROBERTS	David	CHR	ABS	AYE	AYE	AYE
ROSS	Darrell	CHR	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
SELEKWA	Majura	LIM	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
SMITH	Matthew	CHR	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
THOMPSON	Sara	LIM	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
WOOD	Scott	CHR	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
ZHANG	Qi	CHR	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
ZHAO	Pinjing	LIM	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
YAN	Changhui	LIM	AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE
YAN	Guiping	LIM	-	AYE	AYE	AYE

Some Senators were unable to access online voting. Their votes are recorded below:

Q1: Christensen: Hersberger, Asa, Emanuelson, Harriger, Gao, Creese.

Limb: Jones, Lin, Unger,

Abstain: McGrath

Q2: AYE: Creese, Hersberger, Emanuelson, Asa, Ungar, Gao; NAY: 0; ABSTAIN: 0.

Q3: AYE: Creese, Hersberger, Emanuelson, Asa, Jones, Gao; NAY: 0; ABSTAIN: 0.

Q4: AYE: Creese, Hersberger, Emanuelson, Asa, Ungar, Gao; NAY: 0; ABSTAIN: 0.

Q5: AYE: Hersberger, Jones, Asa, Ungar, Gao; NAY: Creese, Emanuelson; ABSTAIN: 0.

Policy Change Cover Sheet

This form must be attached to each policy presented. All areas in **red**, including the header, must be completed; if not, it will be sent back to you for completion.



If the changes you are requesting include housekeeping, please submit those changes to ndsuscc@ndsus.edu first so that a clean policy can be presented to the committees.

SECTION: Policy Number and Name: 352 – Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation

1. Effect of policy addition or change (explain the important changes in the policy or effect of this policy). Briefly describe the changes that are being made to the policy and the reasoning behind the requested change(s).
 - Is this a federal or state mandate? Yes No
 - Describe change: Language was added to i) include community engaged scholarship as an explicit criterion to satisfy research requirements; ii) align interpretation of PTE guidelines with a candidate's position description; iii) address issues related to PTE clock extensions during pandemics or changes in PTE guidelines during the probationary window; and iv) address the use of emeritus faculty on PTE committees.
 - [Matt Hammer rephrased the second paragraph of section 5.2 relating to emeritus faculty serving on PTE committees.](#)
 - [The 352 Working Group accepted with AG's edit with relatively minor revisions.](#)
2. This policy change was originated by (individual, office or committee/organization):
 - NDSU Policy 352 Working Group, October 4, 2021
 - Daniel.Friesner@ndsus.edu

Formatted: Font: Italic

This portion will be completed by Ann Fredrickson.

Note: Items routed as information by SCC will have date that policy was routed listed below.

3. This policy has been reviewed/passed by the following (include dates of official action):

Senate Coordinating Committee:

Faculty Senate:

Staff Senate:

Student Government:

President's Cabinet:

The formatting of this policy will be updated on the website once the **content** has final approval. Please do not make formatting changes on this copy. If you have suggestions on formatting, please route them to ndsuscc@ndsus.edu. All suggestions will be considered, however due to policy format guidelines, they may not be possible. Thank you for your understanding!

North Dakota State University

Policy Manual

SECTION 352

PROMOTION, TENURE AND EVALUATION

SOURCE: NDSU President
NDSU Faculty Senate

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The promoting of faculty and awarding of tenure, and the prerequisite processes of evaluation and review, are of fundamental importance to the long-term ability of the University to carry out its mission. Promotion recognizes the quality of a faculty member's scholarship and contributions in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Promotion acknowledges that the faculty member's contribution to the university is of increasing value. Tenure assures academic freedom and enhances economic security for faculty members who show promise of sustained contributions in those three areas. Tenure aims to both recognize a candidate's potential long-term value to the institution as evidenced by professional performance and growth and to provide the expectation of continued employment. The decision to award tenure rests on criteria that reflect the potential long-term contribution of the faculty member to the purposes, priorities, and resources of the institution, unit, and program. With the individual autonomy derived from academic freedom and tenure comes the responsibility to create and/or maintain an ethical, respectful, and professional work climate for oneself, one's colleagues, one's students, and others with whom one relates professionally. Failure to meet this responsibility should be noted in periodic reviews of teaching, research, and service and may be addressed through the enforcement of other NDSU policies, such as Policy 151 Code of Conduct and Policy 326 Academic Misconduct. Due to the emphasis on institutional purposes and priorities, tenure recommendations should be reviewed at department, college, and university levels.
- 1.2 From the University's mission flows the expectation that each faculty member will make contributions of high quality to the areas of teaching, research, and service. "Teaching" includes all forms of instruction both on- and off-campus. "Research" includes basic and applied research and other creative activities. "Service" includes public service, service to the University, college, and department, and service to the profession. Because of the University's mission, the quality and quantity of contributions in all three areas will be considered at the times of promotion and tenure. But, because of variations among faculty in strengths and/or responsibilities, faculty members are not expected to exhibit equal levels of accomplishment in all areas. Moreover, disciplines will vary with respect to the kinds of evidence produced in support of quality of contributions.
- 1.3 Colleges [and units](#) are responsible for ensuring that promotion and tenure evaluation criteria be aligned with official position descriptions.
- 1.4 The policies and standards of each college should be congruent with the University's mission and its policies on promotion and tenure, and also should reflect the college's unique expectations of its faculty members. The policies and standards of academic units within each college should be consistent with the missions of the University and college and their

policies on promotion and tenure, and also should designate evidence of how faculty in the academic unit meet the expectations of the college and University.

2. UNIVERSITY PROMOTION, TENURE, POST-TENURE, AND EVALUATION: CRITERIA AND EVIDENCE

- 2.1 Promotion and granting tenure are not automatic. In addition to contributions in the areas of teaching, research, and service, consideration may be given to factors such as professional background and experience. Expectations for faculty in Professor of Practice and Research Professor positions may differ from those for tenure-line faculty.
- 2.2 The evaluation of a candidate's performance shall be based on the individual's contributions to teaching, research, and service, on- and off- campus, in regional, national, or international activities. Judgments will be based on evidence of both the quality and significance of the candidate's work.

2.2.1 TEACHING

- 2.2.1.1 **CRITERIA** In the areas of teaching (as defined above), the following criteria apply to evaluation of contributions by a candidate for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review:
 - 2.2.1.1.1 the effective delivery of instruction to and the stimulation of learning by students and/or clients;
 - 2.2.1.1.2 the continuous improvement of courses or instructional programs;
 - 2.2.1.1.3 the effective advising and mentoring of undergraduate and/or graduate students.
- 2.2.1.2 **EVIDENCE** Consistent with NDSU Policy 332 Assessment of Teaching, a candidate demonstrates quality of teaching (encompassing both instruction and advising) by providing evidence and information from multiple sources such as:
 - 2.2.1.2.1 the receipt of awards or special recognition including certification or licensing for teaching;
 - 2.2.1.2.2 student, peer, and client evaluation of course materials, expertise, and ability to communicate knowledge (note that student ratings of instruction, by themselves, are insufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness);
 - 2.2.1.2.3 peer evaluation of an individual's contribution to the improvement of instructional programs through the development and/or implementation of new courses, curricula or innovative teaching methods;
 - 2.2.1.2.4 the dissemination of best practices in teaching;
 - 2.2.1.2.5 evaluation by advisees of the quality of graduate and undergraduate advising.

2.2.2 RESEARCH

2.2.2.1 CRITERIA In the areas of research and creative activities (as defines above), the following criteria apply to evaluation of contributions by a candidate for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review:

2.2.2.1.1 contributions to knowledge, either by discovery or application, resulting from the candidate's research; and/or

Deleted: .

2.2.2.1.2 creative activities and productions that are related to the candidate's discipline; and/or

Deleted: .

2.2.2.1.3 documented evidence of community-engaged scholarship, collaboration, or multi-disciplinary work, and demonstrated beneficial impact on the department/unit, university, local community, and discipline.

2.2.2.2 EVIDENCE A candidate demonstrates quality of research by providing evidence of completed original work (i.e. published/in press, exhibited, or funded) from multiple sources such as:

2.2.2.2.1 dissemination of scholarly or professional papers, and publication of books, book chapters or articles;

2.2.2.2.2 juried or invited presentations or productions in the theater, music, or visual arts, design, and architecture;

2.2.2.2.3 the development and public release of new products or varieties, research techniques, copyrights, and patents or other intellectual property;

2.2.2.2.4 peer evaluation of research by colleagues from an individual's discipline or area of expertise;

2.2.2.2.5 the receipt of awards or special recognition for research;

2.2.2.2.6 the receipt of grants or other competitive awards.

2.2.3 SERVICE

2.2.3.1 CRITERIA In the areas of service (as defined above), the following criteria apply to evaluation of contributions by a candidate for promotion, tenure and post-tenure review:

2.2.3.1.1 contributions to the welfare of the department, college, university, or profession, and/or

2.2.3.1.2 contributions to the public that make use of the faculty member's academic or professional expertise.

- 2.2.3.2 EVIDENCE A candidate demonstrates quality of service by providing evidence and information from multiple sources such as:
- 2.2.3.2.1 the receipt of awards or special recognition for service;
 - 2.2.3.2.2 evaluation of an individual's service contributions by peers, administrators, and constituents;
 - 2.2.3.2.3 active participation in and leadership of societies which have as their primary objective the furtherance of scholarly or professional interests or achievements;
 - 2.2.3.2.4 active participation and leadership in University governance and programs at the department, college, university and system levels;
 - 2.2.3.2.5 contributions to fostering a campus climate that supports and respects faculty, staff, and students who have diverse cultures, backgrounds, and points of view;
 - 2.2.3.2.6 contributions to the management or improvement of administrative procedures or programs;
 - 2.2.3.2.7 contributions to knowledge as editors of scholarly publications, or service on editorial boards, juries, or panels;
 - 2.2.3.2.8 contributions to the operation of public or private organizations, boards, and agencies;
 - 2.2.3.2.9 contributions to NDSU's Land Grant mission.

2.3 The foregoing lists are not exhaustive, and other forms of information and evidence might be produced in support of the quality and significance of the candidate's work. The mission statements and specific promotion and tenure criteria of the individual academic units are important in defining the appropriate forms of evidence in the context of the candidate's discipline and distribution of responsibilities.

3. COLLEGE AND DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION, TENURE, POST-TENURE, AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

3.1. Each academic unit is responsible for refining the University promotion, tenure, post-tenure, and evaluation criteria and applying those criteria within the special context of the unit. Thus, each academic unit will develop specific promotion, tenure, post-tenure, and evaluation criteria and designate the types of evidence to be used for evaluation of progress toward tenure, for renewal, promotion, and tenure decisions, and for post-tenure review. Within the framework of the University's promotion and tenure criteria, each academic unit shall specify the relative emphasis on teaching, research, and service, and the extent to which a faculty member's assigned responsibilities can be allocated among teaching, research, and service. Expectations for faculty in Professor of Practice and Research Professor positions may differ from those for tenure-line faculty.

3.2. A statement of promotion, tenure, post-tenure, and evaluation criteria specific to each college shall be developed by the Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation (PTE) committee of the college in consultation with the Dean and approved by the faculty of the college. The faculty of each department shall also develop a statement of criteria for promotion, tenure, post-tenure, and evaluation that shall be reviewed and approved by the college PTE committee and the Dean to assure consistency with the college promotion, tenure, post-tenure, and evaluation criteria. The college and departmental statements, and any subsequent changes, shall be reviewed and approved by the Provost assure consistency with University and State Board of Higher Education (SBHE) policies.

3.3. For probationary faculty, and for non-tenure-line faculty at the assistant rank, 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 academic unit that were provided to the candidate at the time of the candidate's appointment to the position. In the event that a unit or college revises its guidelines and criteria, a candidate may choose to be evaluated based on the criteria in effect at the time of application. The dean or director of the college or equivalent unit has the responsibility to provide to the appointee these documents, as well as a position description, contract, or other document that constitutes a tenure or work plan. Tenured and non-tenure-line candidates for promotion to the rank of full professor may choose to be evaluated by the criteria in effect at the time of the previous promotion, if the application is made within eight years of the previous promotion. Thereafter, candidates shall be evaluated by the criteria in effect at the time of application. Candidates applying for promotion to the rank of full professor more than eight years after the previous promotion may choose to be evaluated based on work completed in the eight years immediately prior to applying rather than on their entire post-promotion record.

3.4. When evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure, PTE committees shall align their applications of the criteria with the candidate's position description.

3.5. Faculty Hired Without Previous, Relevant Experience

For a faculty member without previous academic-relevant experience, eligibility for tenure requires a probationary period of six years. Evaluations for promotion to Associate Professor and granting of tenure will ordinarily be conducted concurrently. However, exceptional academic accomplishments may warrant early promotion 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.

3.5 Faculty Hired with Previous Relevant Experience

3.5.1 Individuals hired into a tenure-eligible position at a negotiable faculty rank may be hired with tenure and at a rank of Associate Professor or Professor when this is negotiated as a provision of the original contract. Decisions regarding tenure and advanced rank are made using the same process and standards as in the customary promotion and tenure process, although the timeline may be altered. The recommendation proceeds through the regular channels, including the respective Department and College PTE Committees, the Department Chair/Head, College Dean, Provost and President, prior to hire. The process of review is initiated by the Chair/Head of the unit in which the tenure line is housed.

3.5.2 A probationary faculty member with relevant professional/academic experience may be given credit toward tenure and promotion when this is negotiated as a provision in

the original contract. The Department PTE Committee recommends to the Department Chair/Head the maximum number of years of tenure credit offered.

There are two options:

3.5.2.1 Faculty may be hired with one to three years of tenure credit. For each year of tenure credit awarded, one year shall be subtracted from the tenure application deadline. For example, given one year of credit, promotion and tenure application would be due in the fifth year of service; given three years, the application would be due in the third year of service. Faculty accomplishments during the tenure credited years are included as accomplishments in the faculty member's promotion and tenure portfolio. Requirements for promotion and tenure shall be adjusted according to the years at NDSU to maintain productivity at the same rate as that expected for promotion and tenure without tenure credit; for example, if six quality publications are required in the six-year probationary period for promotion and tenure, then one quality publication shall be required for each year the faculty member is at NDSU.

3.5.2.2 Faculty may be allowed the full six-year probationary period with the option of applying for promotion and/or tenure at any time following three years of academic service. How prior work is considered must be specified in the appointment letter.

3.5.2.3 For either option, failure to achieve tenure will lead to a terminal year contract. 3.6 Extensions to Probationary Period, apply in all other cases.

3.5.3 Any exceptions to Section 3.5 must be approved by the President.

3.6 Extension of Probationary Period

At any time during the probationary period but prior to the sixth year (or prior to the year in which the portfolio is due), a faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period not to exceed a total of three years based on institutional, personal or family (pertaining to a child, spouse/partner or parent, as described in NDSU Policy 320) circumstances, personal illness or disability, which, according to reasonable expectations, impede satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure. Faculty given promotion and tenure credit are also eligible for this extension. Faculty members are encouraged to request probationary period extension as soon as they recognize the need for extension. 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 NDSU Policy 350.4, however, appeals will not be granted for requests that are submitted outside the required timeline for extension.

3.6.1 Extension of Probationary Period for Childbirth or Adoption

A probationary faculty member who becomes the parent of a child (or children in case of twins, triplets, etc.) by birth or adoption, prior to the year in which the portfolio is due, will automatically be granted a one-year extension of the probationary period upon written notification to the Provost. While NDSU supports the use of the extension, the probationary faculty member has the option at any time after the birth or adoption to return to the original schedule of review. Any additional extensions beyond the one year (per birth/adoption occurrence, not to exceed three years total extension) must be requested under the provisions of 3.6 above.

3.6.2 Extension of Probationary Period for Personal Illness or Disability

A probationary faculty member who experiences a personal illness or disability may request an extension of his/her probationary appointment. Medical documentation of the personal illness or disability is required. Such documentation shall be collected and housed by the Office of Human Resources/Payroll following guidelines provided in NDSU Policy 168. However, the Office of Human Resources/Payroll shall not make recommendations to the Provost pertaining to probationary period extension requests. The faculty member will grant the Provost access to Human Resources records relevant to the request. The Provost shall maintain strict confidentiality of such documentation. Written notification of the request for an extension, along with supporting documentation, must be provided to the Provost.

3.6.3 Extension of Probationary Period for Institutional Circumstances

A probationary faculty member may be granted an extension of probationary period due to institutional circumstances, such as major disruption of work or faculty's ability to perform their duties beyond the reasonable control (e.g., natural or human-caused disaster, or lab-space unavailability) of the faculty member. Written notification of the request, along with supporting documentation, for an extension must be provided to the Provost.

3.6.4 Procedures for Initiating, Reviewing, and Approving Notifications/Requests for Extension of the Probationary Period

- 3.6.4.1 Notification of extension of the probationary period due to childbirth or adoption may be initiated by the faculty member, the Department Chair/Head, or the Dean of the college.
- 3.6.4.2 Request for extension of the probationary period due to personal or family circumstances, personal illness or disability shall be initiated by the faculty member. In the case of requests involving disability or illness, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide appropriate documentation to adequately demonstrate why the request should be granted.
- 3.6.4.3 Request for extension of the probationary period due to institutional circumstances may be initiated by the faculty member, the Department Chair/Head, or the Dean of the college.
- 3.6.4.4 Faculty members may inform their Department Chair/Head and/or Dean of the college of their request if they wish to do so, but they are not required to do so.

- 3.6.4.5 Extension of the probationary period requests shall be submitted to the Provost using the Request for Probationary Period Extension form.
- 3.6.4.6 Once an extension of the probationary period request is approved, the faculty member, Department Chair/Head, and the Dean of the college will be notified in writing by the Provost. If the request is denied, the faculty member will be notified in writing by the Provost.

3.6.5 Confidentiality

Individuals involved in the extension of the probationary period process (which may include the supervisor, the Department Chair/Head, the Dean of the college, the Provost, and/or the Office of Human Resources/Payroll) have the responsibility of keeping information pertaining to the request confidential and not sharing such information with individuals not involved in the process. Medical documentation provided by a faculty member requesting extension of the probationary period shall be maintained in a confidential file separate from the employee's official personnel file in the Office of Human Resources/Payroll. Other written documentation and forms pertaining to the request/notification of extension of the probationary period shall be maintained in a confidential file separate from the employee's official personnel file in the Office of the Provost. It is understood that some information provided pursuant to this policy may be subject to disclosure pursuant to North Dakota open records laws.

- 3.6.6 Notwithstanding other extensions, in extraordinary circumstances (e.g., pandemic, building collapse), the Provost may grant a one-year automatic extension of the probationary period to impacted probationary faculty (consistent with Section 3.6) and of the time in rank to impacted associate professors (consistent with Section 3.3). While NDSU supports the use of this extension, faculty have the option at any time to return to the original schedule of review. Extensions granted under this provision are not subject to the three-year cumulative cap on extensions.

- 3.6.7 Granting of an extension does not increase expectations for performance. For instance if the department requires at least five refereed journal articles in the standard six year probationary period, and a faculty member receives an extension of the probationary period, then the department will still only require at least five refereed journal articles for that faculty member's probationary period.

Related Policies and Procedures:

Policy 156. Discrimination, harassment, and retaliation complaint procedures (<http://www.ndsu.edu/fileadmin/policy/156.pdf>)

Policy 168. Reasonable accommodation on the basis of disability - guidelines for employee requests (<http://www.ndsu.edu/fileadmin/policy/168.pdf>)

Policy 320. Faculty obligations and time requirements (<http://www.ndsu.edu/fileadmin/policy/320.pdf>).

- 3.7 As part of its statement on promotion, tenure, post-tenure review, and evaluation, each academic unit shall establish the criteria for promotion and tenure, including early

promotion, and shall establish the minimum timeline for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor.

4. PERIODIC REVIEW

- 4.1 Periodic reviews of faculty serve multiple functions. The reviews assist faculty members in assessing their professional performance, assist the administration in delineating areas to which particular effort should be directed to aid in improving the professional achievement of the faculty members, and contribute to the cumulative base upon which decisions about renewal, promotion, and tenure are made. In addition, periodic reviews may result in changes in responsibilities, modified expectations, and/or altered goals for performance.
- 4.2 The procedures for periodic review that are developed by each academic unit shall be reviewed and approved by the college PTE committee and the Dean.
- 4.3 All full-time faculty will be reviewed annually. Unless college or department procedures provide otherwise, annual reviews of non-tenured faculty shall be conducted so that decisions and notifications can be made in accord with the deadlines listed in Section 350.3.
- 4.4 Probationary faculty hired into tenure-track positions must receive special review during their third year of service to the institution. This third-year review shall recognize and reinforce areas of strength as well as point out areas of weakness that could jeopardize the case for promotion and tenure. Specific formative evaluations shall be provided to help candidates prepare their strongest case for promotion and tenure. Any extension granted prior to the third year review will delay the review by an equal period.
- 4.5 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.
- 4.6 Unless college or department procedures provide otherwise, the department chair or head of the academic unit will be responsible for the conduct of the reviews and the communication of their results. Periodic reviews shall result in a written report to the faculty member being reviewed. The report shall state expectations and goals for the coming review period. For probationary faculty, the report shall include an assessment of the faculty member's progress toward tenure and recommendations for improvement. Should the periodic reviews indicate that a faculty member is not making satisfactory progress toward tenure, the report may include a recommendation for nonrenewal. In making a judgment on satisfactory 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.
- 4.7 Colleges and departments shall develop specific post-tenure review policies appropriate to their faculty. Annual reviews of tenured faculty shall include an evaluation of the faculty member's performance relative to the current position description. For Associate Professors, annual reviews must include specific recommendations to strengthen the case for promotion. Annual reviews of Professors must recognize and reinforce areas of strength, as well as discuss areas of weakness and recommend improvements. Should the annual

reviews indicate that performance of a faculty member is unsatisfactory under the standards for post-tenure review, the report shall include a recommendation for appropriate remedial action.

- 4.8 The faculty member being reviewed shall have 14 days to respond in writing to the written report if the faculty member wishes to do so. The written report, and any written response from the faculty member, shall become part of the faculty member's official personnel file.

5. COMPOSITION OF PTE COMMITTEES

- 5.1 Each college shall have a PTE Committee consisting of at least three faculty members elected by the faculty of the college. The college PTE committee shall be as reflective as possible of the college's breadth of disciplines and fields of expertise. Ordinarily, at least three departments or sub-units of a college will be represented on the committee, and usually no more than one member of the same department may serve on the committee at one time.
- 5.2 Only tenured faculty members who have completed three years of full-time appointment with the University and who have attained the rank of associate professor or above are eligible for service with full voting rights on a college or department PTE Committee. When reviewing applications for promotion of Professors of Practice or Research Professors, PTE committees are encouraged to solicit advisory input from Associate/Full Professors of Practice or Research Professors. If allowed by department and college policies, PTE committees may include representation from Associate/Full Professors of Practice or Research Professors holding terminal degrees. Voting rights for Professors of Practice or Research Professors on applications for promotion shall be determined by the respective colleges or departments. Only in cases where unit policy allows can Professors of Practice or Research Professors who hold positions in the evaluating unit have voting rights on applications for promotion of Professors of Practice or Research Professors, respectively.

In the absence of otherwise qualified individuals within the academic unit, individuals external to their unit, but internal to the institution, including emerita/emeritus faculty, may serve as members of a unit PTE committee, if allowed by unit policy. In such cases, the voting rights of emerita/emeritus faculty on PTE committees shall be the same as their rights consistent with the final title they held prior to retirement.

- 5.3 Prior to commencement of deliberations, the chair of any PTE committee must have received PTE committee training within the last three years, provided through the Office of the Provost. Nonadministrative faculty members who have applied for promotion and/or tenure may not be involved in the review and recommendation process of any candidate. Administrators who have applied for promotion may not be involved in the review and recommendation process of any candidate where there may be an actual or apparent conflict of interest. A candidate may provide input concerning selection of external reviewers if allowed by department and college policies.
- 5.4 The department and college PTE committees' reviews and recommendations are part of a process of peer review. Thus, faculty holding academic administrative appointments, including those with interim status, are not eligible to serve. ("Academic administrative appointment" includes appointments as President, Provost, Vice President or Provost, Associate or Assistant Vice President or Provost, Dean, Associate or Assistant Dean, Department Chair or Head, Associate, Assistant or Vice Chair or Head, and any other

Formatted: Not Highlight

Deleted: unless prohibited by college or unit policy

Deleted: college or

Deleted:

Deleted: T

Deleted: emeritus faculty members

Deleted: such individuals

Formatted: Not Highlight

Deleted: emerita/

administrators who supervise and/or evaluate other faculty.) Center or Program Directors who do not supervise and/or evaluate other faculty are eligible to serve.

- 5.5 A college PTE committee member who has voted on the promotion/tenure of a candidate in the department PTE committee shall be recused from the vote by the college PTE committee. In such a case, college policy shall determine whether the committee member may or may not deliberate with the committee on the candidate.
- 5.6 Faculty members, including administrators, who participate in the PTE process shall be recused from deliberations and decisions regarding a candidate if there is a past or current relationship that compromises, or could have the appearance of compromising, a faculty member's judgment with regard to the candidate. The following list, while not exhaustive, illustrates the types of relationships that constitute a conflict of interest:
- A family relationship
 - A marital, life partner or dating/romantic/intimate relationship
 - An advising relationship (e.g., the faculty member having served as the candidate's PhD or postdoctoral advisor)
 - A direct financial interest and/or relationship
 - Any other relationship that would prevent a sound, unbiased decision

Recusal due to a conflict of interest with one candidate does not prevent a faculty member from participating in deliberations and decisions regarding other candidates.

Conflicts of interest must be identified and resolved as soon as they are recognized, but no later than the start of the departmental PTE committee's review of a candidate's portfolio. Conflicts of interest may be identified by the candidate or anyone participating in the PTE review process for that candidate. Any individuals evaluating that candidate may voluntarily recuse themselves from the PTE process. A conflict of interest that would lead to involuntary recusal will be resolved by the Standing Committee on Faculty Rights (SCOFR). In such a case, the PTE process will be suspended until the conflict of interest is resolved. Every effort will be made to complete the review in the same academic year that the portfolio was submitted. If a delay exceeds 60 days, the candidate may request an altered timeline for consideration and approval by the Provost.

6. PTE PROCEDURES

- 6.1 The candidate shall ensure that the electronically submitted portfolio is current, accurate and complete for review at the department level using procedures consistent with department and college policies. The chair or head must forward the electronic portfolio together with the department's recommendations, and an explanation of the basis for them, to the College Dean and the College's PTE Committee according to the PTE Timeline published by the Office of the Provost:
https://www.ndsu.edu/fileadmin/provost/PTE/PTE_Timeline.pdf
- 6.2 In the absence of an approved extension, faculty who do not submit a tenure portfolio during their final probationary year, or who withdraw a submitted tenure portfolio, shall receive a one-year terminal contract for the following year. Only the candidate may withdraw a submitted tenure or promotion portfolio.
- 6.2.1 After the deadline for submission of the portfolio to the Dean's office, as stated on the PTE timeline, the information that may be added to the portfolio is limited to
- a) Recommendations by the evaluating units considering the portfolio at that time;

- b) the candidate's response to those recommendations;
- c) any materials requested by the evaluators.

6.2.2 Candidates may petition the college Dean and PTE committee to add additional materials after the deadline. The Dean and PTE committee must both agree to the addition in order for additional material to be added.

6.2.3 Any additional materials added to the portfolio must pertain to information or material already in the portfolio, such as pending publications or grant proposals.

- 6.3 Unsolicited individual faculty input is limited to the department level of review.
- 6.4 Recommendations and any other materials collected as part of the evaluation process at the department, college, and university levels must be added to the candidate's portfolio before being sent forward to the next level of review. At the time that any written materials are added to the candidate's portfolio, copies of the added material must be sent to the candidate for review. The candidate shall have 14 calendar days to respond in writing to the additional materials. Any response from the candidate to such materials must be in writing and must be included in the portfolio for review at the next level.
- 6.5 Allegations of misconduct discovered after the deadline for submission of the portfolio to the Dean's Office that could be detrimental to a candidate's case (e.g. academic misconduct) shall be handled through the appropriate University policy and mechanisms. In such cases, the PTE process will be suspended by the Provost (or designee). Once the allegations are resolved, the PTE process will resume, using the version of the candidate's portfolio under consideration immediately prior to the allegations. The Provost (or designee) will apprise the PTE committee of any outcomes of a misconduct inquiry or investigation that may impact the evaluation of the portfolio. Any delays in resolving misconduct allegations will not adversely affect the candidate's evaluation. If a delay exceeds 60 days, the candidate may request an altered timeline, consistent with NDSU Policy 352, Section 3.6, for consideration and approval by the Provost (or designee). Once the PTE process resumes, the candidate may update the portfolio.
- 6.6 Colleges and departments shall document that they have followed all procedures; e.g., by a comprehensive checklist of the steps in the PTE process. The documentation must be included in the portfolio.
- 6.7 The College PTE Committee and the College Dean shall separately and independently review and evaluate the candidate's portfolio without discussion or communication.
- 6.8 The college PTE Committee shall prepare a written report, including recommendations and an explanation of the basis for them, that shall be included in the candidate's portfolio. The report and recommendations shall be submitted to the Provost according to the PTE Timeline. A copy shall be sent to the Dean, the chair or head of the academic unit, and the candidate.
- 6.9 The College Dean shall also prepare a separate written report, including recommendations and an explanation of the basis for them that shall be included in the candidate's portfolio. The Dean shall forward the report and recommendations, and the portfolio of the candidate, to the Provost according to the PTE Timeline. A copy of the Dean's report shall be sent to the College PTE committee, the chair or head of the academic unit, and the candidate.

- 6.10 The Provost shall review the candidate's materials and the recommendations of the Department, College PTE Committee, and College Dean, and shall solicit input from a nonvoting advisory committee consisting of a faculty representative from each College PTE Committee, selected by the Provost with attention to diversity. The Provost shall submit a recommendation to the President in writing, including an explanation of the basis for it, by the deadline established in the PTE guidelines. Copies of the Provost's written recommendation shall be sent to the candidate, the Department Chair/Head, the College Dean, and the Department and College PTE Committees.
- 6.11 When appropriate, the President shall then make the final recommendation to the SBHE for tenure. When appropriate, the President shall notify the candidate of promotion or denial of promotion.
- 6.12 In the case of joint appointments, the primary responsibility for the review rests with the department and the college that hold the majority or plurality of the appointments. Such department or college shall solicit input from the other units holding the remainder of the appointment as appropriate to the allocation of effort. This input from other units which shall be included in the portfolio.
- 6.13 When evaluating faculty participating in interdisciplinary programs, the primary department may solicit input from the director of the interdisciplinary program as appropriate to the allocation of effort.

7. APPEALS

- 7.1. Appeals of periodic reviews are made by requesting a reconsideration by the evaluating party. If not satisfied, the faculty member may initiate the grievance process pursuant to Section 353.
- 7.2. Appeals of nonrenewal and nonpromotion decisions shall be pursuant to Policy 350.3.

8. DOCUMENT RETENTION

Electronic copies of portfolios shall be maintained by the appropriate college for the length of time specified by the university records management policy. Disposal of these documents, as well as filing of archival copies, will also conform to the university records management policy.

HISTORY:

Amended	May 13, 1974
Amended	February 10, 1975
Amended	December 12, 1988
Amended	May 14, 1990
Amended	April 1992
Amended	December 12, 1994 (Effective date July 1, 1995)
Amended	June 1997
Amended	November 2000
Amended	October 2001
Amended	October 2007
Amended	July 2008
Housekeeping	February 14, 2011
Amended	October 11, 2011
Amended	June 19, 2014
Amended	October 19, 2015

Amended January 27, 2016
Amended April 11, 2016
Amended September 8, 2016
Amended April 12, 2017
Housekeeping April 19, 2017
Amended March 29, 2018
Amended February 27, 2019
Amended June 18, 2019
Amended September 23, 2020

