

**Department of Computer Science and Operations Research
North Dakota State University
Tenure and Promotion Policy**

Approved by Department: May 8, 2006
Approved by Dean Schwert, College of Science & Mathematics, May 30, 2006
Amended to be consistent with college and university policy, July 2010

*Approved
Craig Schmitt
27 July 2011
see note at
end*

0. Scope

This policy covers the Departmental procedures for third year review of pre-tenure faculty, for nonrenewal of nontenured faculty, and for promotion and tenure. Satisfaction of the minimum requirements described here does not imply automatic granting of the promotion and/or tenure for which a candidate has applied. Each case is evaluated for individual merit, and no formulas apply.

1. References

This policy is consistent with the Tenure and Promotion Policy of the College of Science and Mathematics. If this policy should conflict in any way with the College policy or with University policies, the College and University policies prevail. The relevant University Policies include:

- a. 350.1: Board Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure, Academic Appointments
- b. 352: Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation
- c. 350.2: Board Regulations on Standing Committee on Faculty Rights; Special Review
- d. 350.4: Board Regulations on Hearings and Appeals
- e. 353: Grievances - Faculty

2. Supervision

This policy is implemented by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Chair/Head. That Committee consists of three tenured full-time faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor or above who have been elected by the tenure-track faculty of the Department for overlapping three year terms. To be eligible, a faculty member must have been a full time member of the Department for at least the three years prior to their election. Faculty with administrative responsibilities are not eligible for the Department Committee. Terms will run from May 15th through May 14th.

In 2006, to form the Committee, three faculty will be elected: one for a one year term, one for a two year term, and the third for a three year term. This election will be held in early May, 2006. Thereafter, one Committee member will

be elected each year to replace the member whose term is expiring. Any Committee member may be re-elected.

Faculty who might consider promotion to Professor during their potential term, should not accept nomination or election to the Committee. If a Committee member does decide to apply for promotion to Professor, they must resign from the Committee. A replacement member to serve the remainder of the term will be appointed by the Chair/Head if necessary.

Committee members who leave the University or become ineligible to be members will be replaced by appointment by the Chair/Head to serve the remainder of that term.

If there are not at least three eligible faculty within the Department, the Chair/Head will appoint additional members from faculty in other Departments who meet the requirements for Committee membership (except, of course, for service in the Department). The candidate, Chair/Head, and Dean must give written approval for each such appointment. The signed copy of that approval is included in the candidate's portfolio. If the candidate and the Chair/Head cannot agree on an appointment, the Dean will appoint with written approval from the Provost. These outside faculty will serve one year terms and may be re-appointed if the need arises.

3. Third Year Review

a. Process

The College PT&E document details when the third year review must occur. Candidates for this review are expected to determine when they are subject to the third year review and to begin the process at the start of the fall semester in which they will be reviewed the following spring.

The candidate may use either the Department PT&E policies under effect when they were hired for a tenure-track position or the current policies. The candidate must indicate clearly which set of policies apply. This indication must be delivered to the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee and to the Department Chair/Head before the dossier is made available.

The candidate prepares a portfolio according to College and University requirements. This portfolio is a subset of the portfolio prepared for promotion or tenure applications. The portfolio must be delivered to the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee by the first Monday in January.

That Committee reviews the portfolio and prepares a report by the third Monday in January. The report is submitted to the Department Chair/Head and to the candidate. The original of the report is added to the portfolio. This report should explain the Committee's evaluation of the candidate's progress towards tenure and make constructive recommendations assisting the candidate towards

becoming a strong candidate for tenure. The candidate is entitled to enter a response to the Committee recommendation into the portfolio.

The Chair/Head prepares a similar report by the fourth Monday in January. The original of this report goes in the portfolio. Copies are given to the candidate and placed in the candidate's Department personnel file. The candidate is entitled to enter a response to the Chair/Head report into the portfolio.

The Chair/Head is responsible for transmitting the portfolio to the College office by the first Monday in February.

b. Expectations

i. Research

The candidate should have an active, research program well underway. Collaborative research efforts are encouraged, but the candidate's significant contribution to these efforts should be identified.

The candidate should submit publications to high quality, refereed media. At least one grant proposal to a national, competitive source of external funding must have been submitted. Candidates should be prepared to provide reviews of pending publications and of submitted grant applications, if so requested.

A candidate's case would be strengthened by any of:

- a. advising M.S. and/or Ph.D. students on their research;
- b. reviewing or refereeing manuscripts or proposals
- c. research-oriented presentations;
- d. service on editorial boards or conference committees.

ii. Service

Service expectations for faculty subject to third year review are minimal.

Good The candidate should have been an active participant in Department faculty meetings and have participated in some Departmental, College, or University service.

iii. Teaching

Any faculty member is expected to teach a variety of undergraduate and graduate courses as assigned to meet Department needs. The candidate should be able to demonstrate competent teaching, concern for student learning, and desire to improve his or her teaching.

Competent teaching is shown through receiving approximately average or above ratings on the student rating of instruction forms in nearly all courses taught, but especially in those taught during the most recent two semesters before the third year review. The base line peer reviews of teaching described in

section 5.d.ii are equally important in providing indications of competent teaching.

Teaching improvement efforts may include participation in University-sponsored teaching improvement activities, participation in formal or informal peer review of teaching beyond that required by this policy, or participation in teaching-oriented professional meetings.

iv. Collegiality

The candidate is expected to help advance the goals of the Department through efforts to work positively with colleagues toward those goals.

4. The Process for Promotion and/or Tenure Application

Any tenure-track faculty member who wishes to apply for promotion and/or tenure or who must apply for tenure, is required to inform the Chair/Head by June 1st of the year in which that person expects to make an application. The Chair/Head is responsible for informing the Department Committee of expected candidates by August of each year.

The candidate may use either the Department PT&E policies in effect when they were hired for a tenure-track position or the current policies. The candidate must indicate clearly which set of policies apply. This portfolio must be submitted to the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee by the first Monday in September

The Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will work with each candidate during the first two weeks of September to ensure that the portfolio presents the best possible case for this candidate. During the second week of September, the Committee will make the portfolio available to the Department faculty and solicit their evaluations with an anonymous survey concerning each candidate's research, service, teaching, and collegiality.

The Committee will prepare their own written evaluation including a discussion of the survey results by the third Monday of September. This evaluation must include a tally of a vote of the Committee and discuss all the areas of evaluation for the promotion and/or tenure. This written evaluation will be submitted along with the candidate's portfolio to the Chair/Head by the third Monday of September. Copies of the evaluation will be given to the candidate and placed in the candidate's Department personnel file. The official evaluation will be placed in the candidate's portfolio.

The candidate may respond to the Committee evaluation in writing by the fourth Monday in September, if he or she wishes. This response must be

submitted to the Committee and the Chair/Head. A copy will be placed in the candidate's Department personnel file.

The Committee may respond to the candidate's response in writing by the first Monday in October and may modify their original evaluation, if they wish. The Committee response must be submitted to the candidate and to the Chair/Head. If the Committee amends their evaluation, the new evaluation replaces the original evaluation in the candidate's portfolio. An amended evaluation must be given to the candidate and to the Chair/Head by the first Monday in October.

The Chair/Head will prepare a written evaluation of each candidate including a recommendation for or against the promotion and/or tenure for which the candidate is applying. This evaluation must be completed by the first Wednesday in October. This evaluation must be submitted to the candidate and the official form placed in the candidate's portfolio. Another copy will be placed in the candidate's Department personnel file.

A candidate may respond to the evaluation by the first Friday in October. Such a response must be delivered in writing to the Chair/Head who will have until the second Monday in October to respond to the candidate and, possibly, to modify his or her evaluation. If the evaluation is modified, the new version replaces the original in the portfolio and in the personnel file. The candidate must be given a copy by the second Monday in October. The candidate has the right to request that responses to the Committee and/or Chair/Head evaluation be added to the portfolio, but this request must be delivered to the Chair/Head by the second Monday in October.

The Chair/Head is responsible for delivering all portfolios including both the Committee's evaluation and the Chair/Head's evaluation to the College of Science and Mathematics Dean's office no later than October 15th or the following Monday (if October 15th is not a University working day).

5. Application for an Extension of Time Before Required Tenure Review

University policy describes the procedures in cases where probationary faculty become the parent of a child or children by birth or adoption. In unusual circumstances, a candidate may request an extension of the time allowed before that candidate's required evaluation for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (if the candidate is not already an Associate or Full Professor). These unusual circumstances would include:

- a. Delays in the candidate's research program of at least four months due to factors such as destruction of equipment or loss of data that were not due to the candidate's actions or inactions;

- b. Significant health-related occurrence such as major illness that prevents the candidate from performing her or his job for at least four months.

The candidate must initiate the request with a written letter to the Department Chair/Head explaining the reason for the request, and indicating whether an extension of one or two years is requested. This letter must be submitted to the Chair/Head prior to July 1st of the year in which the application for tenure normally would be due. Prior discussions with the Chair/Head concerning this issue are recommended.

The Chair/Head must respond to this request within two weeks with a letter indicating whether or not the Chair/Head supports the request. The Chair/Head notifies the Dean and College Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee Chair of the request by July 15th. Copies of the original request letter and the Chair's response are placed in the candidate's Department personnel file.

The candidate's letter and the Chair/Head's response are delivered to the Dean by the Chair/Head. If the Chair/Head's response does not support the request, the candidate may include a response to the Chair/Head's response. These materials must be submitted to the Dean by August 1st.

The College Dean makes a recommendation to the Provost. The Provost decides whether or not to grant the requested extension. The Provost should inform the candidate and the Department Chair/Head of this decision as soon as possible. The candidate should proceed with normal preparations for the tenure and, possibly, promotion process until learning the Provost's decision. If the Provost's does not grant the extension, the candidate must continue the normal process.

6. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

a. Timing

Section 4.1 of the College of Science and Mathematics Policy and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Evaluation describes how tenure credit is accrued. Once the needed tenure credit has been achieved, the faculty member must apply for both promotion to Associate Professor and tenure. Section 6 of this document describes the criteria for early promotion to Associate Professor without tenure.

b. Research

i. Criteria

The candidate must demonstrate an active, high quality, independent research program of national stature. Collaborative research is viewed as productive scholarship and can contain independent contributions. The candidate must exhibit a research program that is a distinct advance from their Ph.D. dissertation. The candidate must describe a research agenda that includes future work that is significant and nationally important.

ii. Methods of Evaluation

The most important evidence a candidate can present is high-quality refereed publications to which the candidate has made significant, recognizable contributions. The candidate's role and contributions in collaborations that result in publications must be significant, clearly identifiable, and documented. A letter from a collaborator describing the nature and extent of the candidate's contributions is one form of documentation. To be of high quality requires that the publication satisfies all three of these necessary (but not sufficient) conditions:

- a. The full paper was refereed by several professional referees; *anonymously*
- b. Written evaluations of the paper are returned to the candidate ~~from the~~ referees including specific suggestions for improvement or other comments;
- c. The medium to which the paper was submitted has a significant rejection rate.

All international journals and ACM or IEEE international conferences qualify. Other venues may be high-quality, but evidence must be provided by the candidate. This evidence might include referees' reports for submitted manuscripts, conference committee report on acceptance rate, high rank in reputable citation indices or written opinions from major figures in the field. The candidate should submit evidence of several such publications over a period of at least three years (an average of one paper each of those years) including the most recent two years.

Candidates for promotion and tenure also should submit evidence of substantial attempts to attain external, competitive research funding. Normally, the candidate should demonstrate they have submitted several external research proposals. The candidate should be the principal investigator on at least one of these proposals and a co-principal investigator or non Co-PI Senior Personnel on the other proposals.

Supplementary evidence that can strengthen a case includes:

- a. supervision of Ph.D. and M.S. students who complete their degree programs;

- b. presentation of invited research seminars to research-active groups;
- c. service on editorial boards and conference committees;
- d. service as a reviewer of research proposals and/or a referee for publications.

c. Service

i. Criteria

The candidate should contribute to the service of the Department, the College, the University, and the profession. The candidate should be able to point out specific contributions made.

ii. Methods of Evaluation

The candidate is expected to be an active participant in Department faculty proceedings. While junior faculty are not expected to take on substantial service obligations, a candidate for promotion and tenure should have served on at least one Departmental and one College or University committee.

d. Teaching

i. Criteria

The candidate is expected to demonstrate quality teaching in all assigned courses. The candidate also is expected to show multi-year efforts to improve his or her teaching and demonstrate concern for student learning.

ii. Methods of Evaluation

Three methods may be used for evaluating teaching. The first two methods must be used while the third is at the option of the candidate. Whichever methods are employed, their results will be given approximately equal weight in an overall teaching evaluation.

The candidate's student rating of instruction (SROI) forms for all courses taught will be reviewed. Candidates are expected to show approximately average or above average ratings for most semesters in most courses, especially those during the most recent two years. Some improvement in these ratings from the first year to the most recent year in comparable courses is expected.

The candidate's instruction will be evaluated by a faculty member selected by the Chair/Head during at least one course in the second or third years of the candidate's service to the Department. These evaluations will form a base line for later peer evaluations in the year prior to the candidate's application for promotion and tenure. Up to two faculty will be asked to do these later evaluations and compare them to the earlier evaluations.

Any candidate may submit teaching materials created by that candidate for evaluation by the Department's Undergraduate or Graduate Coordinator, as appropriate. All three of these forms of evaluation will receive approximately equal weight in the overall teaching evaluation for tenure and promotion.

A candidate can strengthen his or her case in the teaching area by submitting any of the following:

- a. unsolicited written student testimonials on the candidate's teaching;
- b. Evidence of participation in teaching improvement efforts;
- c. Course and curriculum development efforts;
- d. Evaluations by peers outside of those described above including faculty from other Departments.

e. Collegiality

While collegiality is not one of the formal areas of evaluation for a candidate, the Department does require that each candidate contribute positively to the Department's progress towards its goals. A successful candidate must be considered by at least two-thirds (rounded down, if not a whole number) of the Department faculty to be a positive factor in the Department's progress.

7. Criteria for Early Promotion to Associate Professor

a. Timing

When a candidate has exceptional achievements that surpass those required for promotion to Associate Professor at the time of tenure, that faculty member may apply for promotion to Associate Professor without tenure. Usually, at least three years of full time service in the Department would be required. Candidates are cautioned, however, that work done prior to arrival at North Dakota State University receives much less consideration than work done at NDSU. The application for tenure would follow when the candidate has satisfied the need to accrue tenure credits as described in section 4.1 of the Policy and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Evaluation of the College of Science and Mathematics.

b. Research

i. Criteria

A candidate for early promotion is expected to exceed significantly the requirements for promotion and tenure described in the previous section of this document. The most likely area for the candidate to exceed those requirements is in Research.

ii. Methods of Evaluation

The candidate must receive competitive, national research funding. The candidate's contribution to the proposal that led to this funding must be significant and identifiable. The candidate must be the principal investigator or co-principal investigator on this proposal. Further, the candidate must be an important member of the team doing the funded research. There must be evidence that the funding is likely to be sustainable.

The candidate must have significant, refereed publications that are internationally recognized as important. The candidate should have research results that are being used by other researchers as a basis for their own research.

A candidate's application would be strengthened by any of:

- a. Requests by potential graduate students to come to our Department to work with the candidate;
- b. Invitations to collaborate on major research proposals and research programs with researchers at other institutions;
- c. evidence that the candidate's publications are regularly cited by other researchers working in the same areas;
- d. Invited keynote presentations at national or international research meetings.

c. Service

i. Criteria

The requirements for early promotion in the service area are the same as for normal promotion and tenure as described in the previous section.

ii. Methods of Evaluation

The same methods of evaluation are used as for normal promotion and tenure as described in the previous section.

d. Teaching

i. Criteria

OK The requirements for early promotion in the teaching area are the same as those for promotion at the regular time. An application that depends primarily on teaching accomplishments beyond those given in the previous section will not be successful. Extraordinary teaching accomplishments can strengthen a candidate's application for early promotion but will not serve by themselves.

that the candidate should surpass those requirements for promotion to Associate Prof. at the same level.
achievements

ii. Methods of Evaluation

The methods described in the previous section for regular promotion to associate professor with tenure will be followed. A candidate's case can be strengthened by any of:

- a. Development of teaching methods or practices that are adopted by other institutions;
- b. Leadership in developing a new or revising an existing Departmental curriculum;
- c. Leadership in developing or adopting a new method of assessment.

e. Collegiality

The requirements for this area are identical with those described in the previous section for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

8. Criteria for Promotion to Professor when already tenured

a. Timing

The College policy on tenure and promotion describes the service as Associate Professor expected before promotion to Professor may be attempted.

b. Research

i. Criteria

The candidate must demonstrate a level of research performance substantially exceeding that required for promotion to Associate Professor. Their independent research program must be competitive for external funding from national sources. They must show leadership in research, which might include leading research teams, significant mentoring of other faculty and of graduate students, or other substantial research activities.

ii. Methods of Evaluation

The same methods of evaluation are used as for promotion to Associate Professor, but the successful candidate must demonstrate a research program that has been nationally competitive for several years and shows the potential to continue to improve for several additional years.

In addition, the candidate must demonstrate leadership in research through showing significant mentoring of other researchers. This demonstration should include the graduation of M.S. and Ph.D. advisees, and collaboration with other faculty (locally or from elsewhere) in the candidate's research.

c. Service

i. Criteria

The candidate must demonstrate service to the Department, to the University and to the profession. This service must be sustained over at least the most recent three year period.

ii. Methods of Evaluation

The same methods of evaluation are used as for promotion to Associate Professor. In addition, the candidate should have served on at least one University-level committee and made significant, identifiable contributions to Departmental goals as determined by the department PT&E committee.

d. Teaching

i. Criteria

The candidate must be a capable teacher who has taught a variety of undergraduate and graduate courses for the Department. The candidate should demonstrate leadership in curriculum or course development or improvement for the Department.

ii. Methods of Evaluation

The same methods of evaluation are used as for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. In addition, the candidate should have served in a leadership position for curriculum or course improvement either for the Department or for the profession.

e. Collegiality

The requirements and evaluation in this area are the same as for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

9. Criteria for Tenure When Already a Professor

a. Timing

Section 4.1 of the College of Science and Mathematics Policy and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Evaluation describes the manner in which tenure credit is accrued. Once the needed tenure credit has been achieved, a faculty member may apply for tenure.

b. Research

i. Criteria

The candidate must have a sustainable independent research program of national quality that is competitive for external funding. In addition, the candidate must demonstrate leadership in research within the Department.

ii. Methods of Evaluation

The same methods are used as for Associate Professor with tenure. In addition, the candidate should have graduated M.S. and Ph.D. students, and involved other faculty (in the Department, the University, or elsewhere) in his or her research program.

c. Service

The criteria and methods of evaluation are the same as those for the promotion to Professor.

d. Teaching

The criteria and methods of evaluation are the same as those for promotion to Professor.

e. Collegiality

The criteria and evaluation methods in this area are identical with those for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

10. Nonrenewal of probationary faculty members

In accordance with NDSU Policy 350.3, a probationary appointment may be terminated, without cause, with notice to the faculty member that the appointment will not be renewed. The Chair/Head may initiate this process at any time. The process is described in University Policy 350.3.

11. Amendment of this Policy

Once this policy has been approved by the Department faculty, the College PT&E Committee, the Dean, and the Provost, the policy may be amended at any time. Amendment requires a scheduled Department Faculty Meeting to discuss and vote upon proposed amendments. Those amendments must be distributed to all tenured and tenure-track faculty at least two days before the meeting. For an amendment to pass, a majority of the faculty present which includes at least four faculty must approve the amendment.

The Chair/Head decides if approved amendments are editorial or substantive. Editorial amendments take effect following the Department Meeting at which they are approved. Substantive amendments must be approved by the Dean, the College PT&E Committee, and the Provost before they can take effect.

12. Implementation

This policy is being adopted at the end of the 2005-06 academic year. Its provisions will be implemented as soon as practically possible starting with the 2006-07 academic year. For example, requirements for peer teaching evaluations during the candidate's first two years in the Department will be implemented only for new faculty in 2006-07.

description of process for early promotion - best I have seen. However, strength of decision is based solely on research. Would like to see that teaching must be better than average. However, best description so far.

TCP

13. The Dept. policy w/rt Professor of Practice is the same as that of the College of Science and Math.

Ubhaya, Vasant

From: Ubhaya, Vasant
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 3:16 PM
To: slator@wwwic.cs.ndsu.nodak.edu
Cc: brian.slator@ndsu.edu; Magel, Kenneth; Denton, Anne; Perrizo, William; Ubhaya, Vasant
Subject: RE: PTE policy, handling survey documents (Ubhaya, Perrizo, Denton)

Brian:

The PT&E Committee had already conveyed its decision to you on January 14, 2013. A copy of that email is given below. In the January faculty meeting you discussed the issue, and left the decision (possibly faculty voting) to the February faculty meeting. Since this was an item on the February meeting agenda, Ken M. opened the discussions about the issue. No final decisions have been taken. The PT&E Committee has left the decision to you in its January 14 email which copied below. Regards.

Vasant

COPY OF JANUARY 14 EMAIL.

Brian:

Change in the departmental PT&E document regarding the anonymous faculty evaluation survey sheets:

Please modify the 3rd sentence in Section 4, paragraph 4 of that document to the following:

'This written evaluation and the original survey sheets will be submitted along with the candidate's portfolio to the Chair/Head by the third Monday of September.'

The words in red indicate the addition to the sentence.

Other Comments: The latest PT&E document on our department web carries the date May 8, 2006. There has been a hand-written addition on 27th July 2011 on a hardcopy concerning the evaluation of Professor of Practice signed by R. Craig Schnell. The PT&E document should be updated by including the additions stated above.

I will be placing in your mailbox two hardcopies of the PT&E document with hand-written changes with explanatory notes.

Best Regards.

Vasant
Chair, CS PT&E Committee

-----Original Message-----

From: slator@wwwic.cs.ndsu.nodak.edu [mailto:slator@wwwic.cs.ndsu.nodak.edu]

Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 2:23 PM

To: Denton, Anne; Perrizo, William; Ubhaya, Vasant

Cc: brian.slator@ndsu.edu; Magel, Kenneth

Subject: PTE policy, handling survey documents (Ubhaya, Perrizo, Denton)

PTE policy, handling survey documents (Ubhaya, Perrizo, Denton)

I just talked to Carole about the faculty meeting on Monday and she says there was discussion about going first to the University Council with the questions.