

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS FACULTY MEETING

Tuesday, 5 November 2013

3:30 PM

Loftsgard 114

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 PM with a quorum present.

Dean Scott Wood announced that, as promised at the spring 2013 CSM faculty meeting, he has appointed an *ad hoc* committee, chaired by Dr. Sean Sather-Wagstaff, to research conflict-of-interest concerns in College PT&E Committees. Policies from other NDSU colleges and peer institutions have been collected; the committee will review and make recommendations in spring.

New faculty were introduced.

Five faculty were nominated or self-nominated to represent the College on the new Faculty Senate Budget Committee: Ken Magel, Tatjana Miljkovic, Mark Nawrot, Kent Rodgers and Mukund Sibi. Each person introduced themselves and briefly commented on their interest in serving. Ballots were cast and tallied with the result that Dr. Rodgers was elected.

College PT&E policy 4.5.3 was discussed. The current College PT&E policy 4.5.3 reads:

“The department’s Chair/Head and Departmental PTE Committee (if applicable) will perform separate evaluations and formulate independent written recommendations. The College PTE Committee and the Dean will perform separate evaluations and formulate independent written recommendations.”

Dean Wood noted that the parallel language for the relationship between department chair/head and department committee compared to that for the relationship between the dean and the College PTE committee implies there should be no communication between department chair/head and department PTE committee, since NDSU policy does not allow such communication between the dean and college PTE committee. Prohibition of communication between the department chair/head and the department PTE committee is inconsistent with several departments’ current guidelines and likely the intent when the college adopted 4.5.3. The dean asked for comments on amending the policy to read:

“The department’s Chair/Head and Departmental PTE Committee (if applicable) will perform separate evaluations and formulate ~~independent~~ *separate* written recommendations. The College PTE Committee and the Dean will perform separate evaluations and formulate independent written recommendations *without discussion or communication*.”

After discussion, a straw vote was taken and the majority favored a statement making it clear that communication and discussion between chairs/heads and departmental PTE committees *is* allowed. Dr. Hershberger suggested adding a sentence: “This policy does not preclude discussion or communication between department chairs/heads and departmental PTE committees”.

This will be discussed again and voted on at the spring faculty meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 PM.

Submitted by,
Nancy Suttle

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS FACULTY MEETING

Tuesday, 4 March 2014

3:30 PM

Sudro 26

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 PM with a quorum present.

The minutes of the November 5, 2013 faculty meeting were approved.

An election to fill two seats on the College Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee was held. Catalin Ciuperca of Mathematics was nominated prior to the meeting and the floor was opened for additional nominations. Mark Nawrot of Psychology accepted a nomination. It was moved and seconded to close nominations and Drs. Ciuperca and Nawrot were elected by acclamation to serve 2014-2016 terms.

An election was held to fill one seat on the Faculty Senate. Andrew Croll of Physics and Katie Gordon of Psychology were nominated prior to the meeting and the floor was opened for additional nominations. There being none, it was moved and seconded to close nominations, and a paper vote was taken with the result that Dr. Gordon was elected to serve a 2014-2017 term.

Current and newly-elected Senators are Uwe Burghaus (Chemistry and Biochemistry), Mark Clark (Biological Sciences), Erin Gillam (Biological Sciences), Katie Gordon (Psychology), Friedrich Littmann (Mathematics), Sean Sather-Wagstaff (Mathematics), Gang Shen (Statistics), Laura Thomas (Psychology) and Pinjing Zhao (Chemistry and Biochemistry). From this group, Drs. Burghaus, Littmann and Shen volunteered to serve a one-year term on the Senate Executive Committee. Ballots were cast and tallied with the result that Dr. Shen was elected.

The next order of business was discussion of six proposed amendments to the College PT&E policy.

Amendment 1, 4.5.3:

4.5.2: The department's Chair/Head and Department PTE Committee (if applicable) will perform separate evaluations and formulate separate written recommendations. This does not preclude discussion or communication between department chairs/heads and departmental PTE committees. The College PTE Committee and the Dean will perform separate evaluations and formulate independent written recommendations without discussion or communication.

It was moved and seconded to approve the motion. After discussion, the motion carried by voice vote.

Amendment 2, 4.5 and 4.6:

4.5.1: The basis for review of the candidate's portfolio and any recommendations on promotion and/or tenure shall be the promotion and tenure criteria of the appropriate academic unit. For probationary faculty, the criteria are those that were provided to the candidate at the time of the candidate's appointment to the position. Tenured candidates applying for promotion to Professor are evaluated by the criteria in effect at the time of application (NDSU Policy 352.3.3).

4.6.1: The evaluation of a candidate's performance will be based on the criteria specified in 4.5.1.

It was moved and seconded to approve the motion. After discussion, an amendment to strike the last sentence in 4.5.1 (If the criteria have changed since hire, probationary faculty may request in writing to the Chair/Head, Dean, and Provost/VPAA, that the candidate be considered under the revised criteria.) was made. The motion as amended carried by voice vote. There was consensus that faculty should work through Faculty Senate to add a provision similar to the stricken sentence to the NDSU PTE policy. If such an amendment were adopted for NDSU policy, then the college can consider adding back the stricken sentence.

Amendment 3, 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3:

4.1.1 Time toward tenure is counted on an August 15 to August 14 year basis or as stated in the contract appointment agreement. The first probationary year starts on August 15 after the person is hired. For example, the tenure clock will start on August 15, 2008, for a faculty member hired on October 1, 2007. Tenure clocks will begin on August 15 of the individual's first probationary year, unless otherwise specified in the contract appointment agreement. Time accounting associated with tenure credit or extension of the probationary period is described in Special Circumstances (Section 4.3). Faculty currently on tenure track at the time of approval of this document will have the option of continuing their existing tenure time credit or changing to the tenure clock described in this policy and procedures document with the change documented in writing by the Dean.

4.2. Third Year Pre-tenure Review Policy

Purpose

The College requires all faculty in tenure-track positions to undergo a formal review during the spring semester of the third year of their probationary appointments. The purpose of the review is to familiarize faculty members with the process of tenure review and to allow the College PTE Committee to provide constructive feedback to probationary faculty members and their departments regarding progress toward tenure.

Procedure

The faculty member and the department's Chair/Head will meet with the College PTE Committee during the spring semester of the third year of the probationary appointment to evaluate progress toward tenure.

4.3.2 EXTENSION OF PROBATIONARY PERIOD

At any time during the probationary period but prior to the sixth year (when the portfolio is due), a faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period not to exceed three years based on personal or family circumstances, which, according to reasonable expectations, impede satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure (see NDSU Policy 352.3.6). Faculty given promotion and tenure credit are eligible for this extension. The request must be in writing and will be reviewed and forwarded sequentially with recommendation by the Chair/Head, Dean, and Provost/VPAA to the President who will approve or deny the request. Denial of an extension may be appealed under NDSU Policy 350.4.

A probationary faculty member who becomes the parent of a child or children by birth or adoption will automatically be granted a one-year extension of the probationary period. The probationary faculty member has the option at any time after the birth or adoption to return to the original schedule of review.

(Granting extensions does not change expectations for performance.)

An extension granted prior to the pre-tenure third year review will delay that review by an equal period.

It was moved and seconded to approve the motion. After discussion, the motion carried by voice vote. It was discussed that recent proposed changes to NDSU policy 352 may require further changes to these sections in the future.

Amendment 4 (addition to 5.1):

5.1.3 Members of the CSM PTE committee may neither participate in discussion nor vote on cases of current or former immediate family members: parent by birth or adoption, spouse, partner, son or daughter by birth or adoption, stepchild, brother or sister by whole or half blood or by adoption, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, or son-in-law or daughter-in-law.

It was moved and seconded to approve the motion. After discussion, an amendment to add “current or former” family members in sentence 1 was proposed. The motion as amended carried by voice vote.

Amendment 5: date changes in Table 1 and footnotes

Table 1 describes the timeline for all the promotion and tenure application processes.

Table 1. Dates at Which Document and Reviews Must Arrive at Following Locations

Department Chair/Head	Department PTE Committee (if applicable)	Office of the Dean; College PTE Committee	Dean ¹	Provost/VPAA ²	President ³
At discretion of Department	At discretion of Department	October 15	December 31	January 5	March 31

¹Upon review of the Portfolio, copies of the reports of the College PTE Committee will be forwarded to the candidate, department’s Chair/Head, and the Dean no later than December 31. The original signed report will be added to the candidate’s portfolio.

²Upon review of the Portfolio, copies of the report of the Dean will be forwarded to the candidate, the department’s Chair/Head, and members of the College PTE Committee no later than January 5. The original signed report will be added to the candidate’s portfolio. The portfolio is to be delivered by the Dean to the Provost/VPAA no later than January 5.

³The President normally gives a recommendation to the SBHE for action at its April meeting, and tenure and/or promotion is normally awarded on August 16.

It was moved and seconded to approve the motion. After discussion, the motion carried by voice vote.

Amendment 6: 5.1.1

5.1.1 The College PTE Committee should be as reflective as possible of the College's breadth of disciplines and fields of expertise. No more than one member of the same department may serve on the committee at one time. The College PTE Committee will consist of five faculty members elected by the tenured or tenure-track faculty of the College. Each member will be elected for a term of two (2) years and may be re-elected. Only tenured faculty members who have completed three years of full-time appointment with the University are eligible for election. The College PTE Committee is part of a process of peer review. Thus, faculty holding administrative appointments are not eligible. (Administrative appointment includes appointments as Vice President, Dean, Associate or Assistant Dean, Chair or Head, or Associate, Assistant, Vice Chairs/Heads of an academic unit, including those who hold interim positions).

It was moved and seconded to approve the motion. After discussion, the motion carried by voice vote.

The final item of business was discussion of the recommendations of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Conflict of Interest in PTE Policy on whether CSM PTE committee members should be required to recuse themselves from discussing and/or voting on cases from their home department.

Recommendation 1: All members of the CSM PTE committee be allowed to participate in discussion of cases from home department.

Recommendation 2: If a member of the CSM PTE committee is an eligible voter on a case at the departmental level (at any departmental level, in case of joint appointments), then she/he is expected to vote at the department level and is not allowed to vote at the college level.

Recommendation 3: The candidate be allowed to submit to the CSM PTE committee the name of at most one member of their department to be interviewed by the committee. Such a name would be included in the Supplemental Materials section of the dossier. The committee would be obligated to interview this person. However, this person would not participate in other discussion of this case (or other cases) with the committee, and would have no voting privileges with this case (or any other cases) at the college level.

Dean Wood asked if this issue should be returned to the *ad hoc* committee or the PTE committee. There was not a clear consensus. A straw vote was taken and a majority favored abolishing the meetings of the PTE committee with the candidates and chairs/heads, although it was by no means unanimous. Another straw vote was taken with the result that the majority was not in favor of recommendation 2 or recommendation 3, but again there was no real consensus.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 PM.

Submitted by,

Nancy Suttle