
Substitutions – S. Meinhardt for S. Markell and J. Johnson for L. Thomas

I. Approval of December 14, 2015 minutes

MOTION (Bora/Gillam): to approve minutes of the December 14, 2015, Faculty Senate meeting minutes as distributed. MOTION CARRIED WITH UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

II. Consent agenda

a. Approval of the Fall 2015 graduates (attachment 1)

b. Academic Affairs Committee Report (attachment 2)

c. Policy changes (attachment 3) (All housekeeping changes/information only)
   o 183 Nonrenewal and Dismissal of Nonbanded, Nonacademic Staff
   o 220 Staff Job Discipline/Dismissal
   o 515 Travel - Employees

MOTION (Christenson/Noone): to approve the consent agenda report as posted. MOTION CARRIED WITH UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

III. General Announcements

- **B. Ingram, Provost** (attachment 4)
  o Budget allotment/reduction – the reduction could be up to 2.5% of NDSU’s budget; more information forthcoming in the next few weeks; the budget situation is being monitored carefully and the reduction might be managed without seeking reductions from colleges.
  o HLC – initial report has been received and the report is very positive; NDSU met all criteria, but met criteria 4B (student learning outcomes and assessment) with some concerns; will respond to HLC with clarification.
  o Dean searches
    - Dean candidates for the **College of Business and the College of Human Development and Education** will be visiting campus over the next few weeks; candidate information and open forum day/time information available online.
    - Bridget Burke, Dean of Libraries, has accepted a position at the University of Wyoming; she will be here through the end of the semester; a search will start soon.
    - Graduate Dean search update – ten candidates recently had Skype interviews; will bring candidates to campus at end of February.

- **D. Cooley, Faculty Senate President**
  o Workshop on Shared Governance – will include Deans, Vice Provosts, Faculty Senate Executive team, and up to eight Faculty Senators. Retreat will be April 7th in the afternoon. Email President Cooley if interested; the first person to email from each college will be included.
  o Closely monitoring budget situation.

IV. Senate Committee Reports

a. Faculty Senate Bylaws Committee (attachment 5)
   i. G. Totten, H. Hatterman-Valenti, M. Selekwa and B. Pruess have been reviewing by-laws.
ii. Seeking input; will vote at two upcoming Faculty Senate meetings.

iii. Item 3. B. – seeking clarification regarding timing – is it optional – done by design giving timing of the semester;

iv. Section 1 – seems redundant to have additional information since duties are included in Section 8;
Clarification that administrative offices of the Faculty Senate include President Elect, President, and Past President; seek clarification regarding Secretary’s role and duties.

v. Combining Academic Affairs Committee and General Education Committee; changed name of Graduate School to Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies; various housekeeping updates with position and college updates; Rather than a designee from Title IX, have a designee appointed by Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement.

vi. Faculty Senate representation for various administrative search committees: discussion regarding if the process should be included in the bylaws; discussion if the President can seek representation, but not limit to Senators; suggestion to remove the word “tenure”; suggestion to require search committee training to serve on administrative search committees – search committee training could be a pre-or co-requisite of serving on a search.

b. General Education Committee (attachment 6, attachment 7, and attachment 8)

i. A. Rupiper Taggart is moving to Office of Teaching and Learning to an Associate Director role; new co-chairs of General Education are Dr. Joe Mike Jones and Dr. Charlene Wolf-Hall.

ii. General Education course proposal forms and documents for new General Education courses or revalidation of existing courses – information can be found on General Education website.
   - New outcomes are mapped to existing categories.
   - Clarification sought regarding bottom of page 1 and top of page 2 – seems to be missing information.
   - Outcome 7: Personal and Social Responsibility – will always be a secondary outcome, since it is not aligned with a category; Most likely aligns with most wellness courses.

iii. Pilot assessment with General Education committee in the fall; capstone documents – early stage – dynamic criteria mapping assessment; (attachment 9)

V. Unfinished Business

a. Policy 327 – Evaluation of Academic Deans, Directors and Department Chairs and Heads. (attachment 10)

i. Edits include: add certain administrative positions to the policy; clarify annual review process from a comprehensive review, which includes broader input; changes timeline for comprehensive review from three years to five years – requires initial review at end of year three, with subsequent comprehensive reviews every five years; if substantial concerns, another evaluation would be after two years; streamlines customary review evaluation criteria, which would be adapted to a job description; separates policy from the procedure.

ii. #5 (under Procedure) – Recommend to remove references to confidentiality; the review cannot be confidential due to state requirements.

MOTION (Wyum/Secor-Turner): approve Policy 327. MOTION CARRIED WITH UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

VI. New Business

a. Policy 151 Code of Conduct (attachment 11)

i. ad hoc committee reviewed and recommended edits to policy; clear definitions of how to act professionally and according to respective disciplines. Clarification seeking additional definition of professionalism.

MOTION (Peters/Gramig): approve Policy 151. MOTION CARRIED WITH UNANIMOUS CONSENT.
b. Policy 337 Examinations and Grading Appeals Board (attachment 12)
   i. Outcome of the work of the Grade Appeals Board. Adds guidance for students in the appeal process.

   MOTION (Smith/Bora): approve Policy 151. MOTION CARRIED WITH UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

c. Policy 350.4 Board Regulations on Hearings and Appeals (attachment 13)
   i. ad hoc committee provided edits to update policy.

   MOTION (West/Barrett): approve Policy 350.4. MOTION CARRIED WITH UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

d. Policy 713 Records Management (attachment 14)
   i. Slight revisions, including updates to naming of Records Management Advisory Committee, which is in support of North Dakota Century Code 54-46. Additional housekeeping changes.

   MOTION (Hall/Harvey): approve Policy 713. MOTION CARRIED WITH UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

e. Policy 713.1 Litigation Hold (attachment 15)
   i. Changes by request of North Dakota Attorney General’s office. Identifies procedures and process for litigation holds.

   MOTION (Peters/Barrett): approve Policy 713.1. MOTION CARRIED WITH UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

f. Policy 352 PTE (attachment 16)
   i. Clarifies language in policy

   MOTION (West/Barrett): approve Policy 352. MOTION CARRIED WITH UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

g. NDGEC’s request to change SBHE policy 403.7 forwarded from CCF (attachment 17)

   Through an email to Faculty Senate Executives, Larry Peterson requested the agenda item on changing SBHE policy 403.7 be withdrawn because it was "dead in the water" at NDUS.

   K. Noone, on behalf of Council of College Faculties, requested to remove the item from the agenda. The item was removed from the agenda.

VII. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned due to loss of quorum.

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Submitted,
Rhonda Kitch, Ph.D.
Registrar, Faculty Senate Secretary
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NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY
Fall 2015 Graduates
Degree Conferral Date: December 18, 2015

College of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Natural Resources

Bachelor of Science
Blake Wayne Abraham
Scott Michael Alm
Kelsey Marie Amborn
Alexander Michael Andel
Bryce James Andersen
Bayleigh Marie Antonsen
Hannah J. Bakke
Derek Lee Bendickson
Amber Jade Benham
Travis Ethan Benson
Eric Lee Braaten
Ty Michael Bruner
Ellen Mae Buyssse
Grace Elizabeth Cabarle
Patrick Stephen Champa
John Jacob Chisholm
Christopher Thomas Connolly
Nicholas Anthony Conzenius
Daniel Jeffrey Coombe
Markus Todd Dahl
Christina Frances Dulik
Eriq Martin Endres
Ross Mitchell Erickson
Brett Gregory Fellbaum
Kara Marie Froelich
Arielle C. Glaspie
Sarah Marie Glewwe
Stephanie Megan Gross
Joe Helmer Grotsum
Kayla Marie Haglund
Bryn Anndi Hallie
Adam Michael Hansen
Tia Rae Haugrud
Aaron Michael Helbling
Kade Luke Hilde
Cassandra E. Hillen
Tracy K. Hillenbrand
Ashley Ann Hoffmann
Marisa Shantel Holst
Jaden Michael Hunter
Cori Marie Huss
Jace Allen Ingebretson
Nettie Mae Johnson
Ryan Dale Johnson
Yuri Scott Johnson
Daniel Ronald Julson
Tristan C. Juran
Jacob Lambert Keller
Katharine Teresa Kelsven
Brent William Kemp
Dustin Alan Koska
Casey Grant Krieger
Callie Jean Krupke
Daniel Jacob Landman
Jacob Edward Langlie
Jaclyn K. Lee
Alexander Nicholas Lies
Benjamin Michael Lodoen
Elizabeth Anne Lovering
Katherine R. Mahoney
Tyler Scott Mahrer
Mitchell James Maki
Michael Anthony Mann
Elizabeth Amber Mars
Amy Eileen McConnell
Adrian A. McNees
Margaret Sue Meacham
Abdikadir Osman Mohamed
Jared William Monsebroten
Karley Lynn Morgenson
Timothy Richard Mueller
Austin John Musland
Colby Robert Nordstrom
Austin Robert Patten
Bradly Allen Paul
Jacob Patrick Perius
Ian Thomas Pritchard
Alec Boyd Reimche
Aaron Jeffrey Remick
Bradly Charles Richter
Evan Roland Robertson
Dalton John Rolland
Jean Lorraine Rosenau
Tanner E. Rothstein
Megan C. Ruch
Shawn S. Sanford
Amy Lea Scegura
Brian Charles Schaeetz
Malinda Kathrine Scherf
Nicholas James Schimek
Lindsey Schmidt

Bachelor of Arts
Ramla Ali Ibrahim
Shawn Ryan Mohr
John Elijah Roach
Matthew Allen Wagenius

Bachelor of Fine Arts
Nathan Myron Bailey
Rebecca Jean Kelly
Jayce Faye Kравiev

Bachelor of Landscape Architecture
Patrick Reilly O'Keeffe

Bachelor of Music
Michael John Mettler
Jacob David Olsen
Zachery Tyler Pavlick
Richard John Schrom

Bachelor of Science
Jarl Allen Abrahamson
Jenae Estelle Adams
Rachel A. Bakke
Luke Daniel Bakken
Tanya Lucia Birklid
Brittany Catherine Bleich
Sara Marie Boppre
Kristen Renae Bouwens
Chelsea LeAnn Brown
Christopher L. Camara
Eric Austin Clay
Cassandra Ann Coghill
Nicholas Robert Conner
Alex Landon Eberhardt
Bradley Erling Egeland
Wyatt Lee Epple
Emily Ann Erickson
Trevor Christian Folke
Mary Christina Freitag
He Gao
Grant Harlow Genovesi
Michael Adam Goulet
Charles Frank Greywitt
Rachel Ann Grider
Alex John Hendrick

College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences

Bachelor of Arts
Mohammed Saad Alkhuriji
Zhuyun Bian
Lakshan Fonseka Gunawardena
James Joseph Gaspers
David J. Hertsgaard
Nathan James Hulinsky
Gayan Kanishka Kariyawasam
Victoria C. Kennedy
Hans Walter Klopp
Yangxi Liu
Narendra Malaligoda
Maniruzzaman
Melissa Catherine McCann
Suvash Shiwakoti

Doctor of Philosophy
Rakesh Awale
Francisco Bittara Molina
Yuanyuan Gao
Renata Jung
Kasia Marie Kinzer
Santosh Sharma
Rui Wang
Jason D. Zurn
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor of Science in Architecture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rebekah Anne Gurule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh Ann Marie Mehs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie Kyle Miller</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master of Architecture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polly Allen Prins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Allen Wrestling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master of Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibtissem Belmihoub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Elaine Duchsherer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesreen A. Eldolify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Victor Wakefield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctor of Musical Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shantel Marie Twogood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master of Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breanna C. Koval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonix Atieno Owino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Cathline Pruett</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctor of Philosophy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel Nzungung Nojang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Marie Steinmann</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Berry LeCompte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Daniel Winter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Berry LeCompte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Daniel Winter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor of Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adil Mohamed Hamad Abdelnour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Lynn Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Joseph Ackerman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 25, 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saad Mohammed Alajlan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Robertine Albertson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasper Darrin Asplin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William David Ayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Marie Becker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tashana Elizabeth Bergren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Alan Bigwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigale Mary BlackCloud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Howard Boe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Michael Bonnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Michael Bontje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin James Brendel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor John Clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jedre Brian Cyr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan M. Dahlgren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabei Hassan Damlakhuan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Edward DeConcini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Joseph Dehler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittany Jean Diederich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenece Erble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Todd Erickson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra Noelle Evenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Dean Fausti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiuya Feng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michaela Delaney Baggenstos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Michael Fitterer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Thomas Fiaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sha Fu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenna Elizabeth Galegher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory Paul Goehner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Timothy Graff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika Marie Guthmiller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mitchell Hagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Steven Harmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Veronica Haugen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce Christian Heustis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Lee Holzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Mitchell Houle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Mae Huber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adityee Jain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Wallace Jaunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amidu Daddy Jusu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce Steven Karel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Karl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Henry Knoll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen Paul Korcska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander James Lacey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah Mark Landon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuan-Chi Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa Kay Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leilin Li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Robert Lidberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Douglas Liebl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Thomas Lindseth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chenggang Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Francis Mangan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chontay Joy Mastel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Logan McGrath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel David Moody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Conrad Olson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewuulkeuebeu Jone Ordu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor John Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Rose Petermann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Jo Potter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob William Redepenning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary Allan Remple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocelyn Renea Ripley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Philip Sabin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Michael Schmitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryder Austin Schwager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon Troy Schwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Amia Sisk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander James Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael William Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rui Song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Mark Sorenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew Daniel Spooner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Paul Strand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhen Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter James Swanke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary Lee Swanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nils Newman Tang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandry Marie Thiesing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna Lynne Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karly Joanna Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christel Marie Thorsell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler D. Toy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Allen Trevis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Faith Trevis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Wayne Tuftef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Allen Tufto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Lea Wade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juncheng Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaylee Lynn Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Lynn Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody R. Wendt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ty Zachary Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocilin Marie Wimmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Daniel Winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Lynn Woodley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qirui Ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manlin Zhang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tianxin Zhu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Attachment 1

Master of Accountancy
Yasitha Mawella Vithanage
Ruth Nakawungu
Carleen Elizabeth Terres
Elizabeth Mary Winkels
Peishan Yang

Master of Business Administration
Eric R. Christianson
Phuc Le Hong Nguyen
Merrenage Ravin Lalindra Salgado

College of Engineering

Certificate
Moh’d Jawad Albakri
Brent Anders Lundstrom
Adedeji Olukoya Osinubi
Donavan S. Rogness

Bachelor of Science in Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering
Bethany Anne Biallas
Jesse Q. Cickavage
Ryan Channing Larson
Matthew James Mortenson

Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering
Ryan Cole Brown
Kevin A. Cernik
Laura Elizabeth Claresn
Christopher J. Dahn
Monte Dean Deis
Dylan Joseph Dunn
Mason Aaron Eisenzimmer
Kelliem John Grubb
Douglas Alexander Hansen
Carissa Ann Keller
Benjamin Phillip Kugler
Derek T. Lalim
Kyle Reese Ogren
Priyan Subhagyava Palleke
Shaun Patrick Parsons
Mark T. Pederson
Nicholas Lee Powers
Jordan W. Prazak
Tylor James Steffens
Matthew Mark Suek
Logan Brett Tretter
Sarah Louise Walker
Kyle A. Wang

Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering
Jordan Thomas Birrenkott
Nicholas Kenneth Blonigen
Jared Isaac Green
Abhishek Gupta
Christopher Scott Jordan-Denny
Saurabh Sharma
Igor A. Simanovich

Bachelor of Science in Construction Engineering
Tyler Brian Gandrud
Anthony J. Leihgnow
Jonathan Laurell Pistorius
Justin Joseph Weigel

Bachelor of Science in Construction Management
Ryan Mitchell Beyer
Walker Lee Busse
Michael J. Clarys
Brittany Jean Diedrich
Keenan John Hemming
Michael Casey Jones
Jesse Lee Kieper
Michael James Murphy
Matthew Michael Nilson
Seth Thomas Provost
Adam Richard Snelgrove
Brenton James Umlauf
Xinyuan Yang

Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering
Momodou Faja Barry
Mark Jason Benolken
LaMarr John Boehm
Andrew Bryan Bosser
Dale Robert Bromschenkkel
Jedediah Gene Ellenberg
Sean Richard Klaeus
Casey Scott Larson
Jacob Dennis Leerssen
Wyatt Avi Linstad
Nicolette Rose Constance Lippert
Wesley Richard Mason
Tareen Geddes McCullough
Matthew Raymond Pelfrey
Jenna Marie Stephanie Pender
Tanner Robert Scheidecker
Gabriel Lee Schur
Abhishek Sharma
Benjamin Jacob Sherman
Andrew Vu Tran
Bharat Verma
Joshua Paul Vetter
Gabriel Dennis Wicklund
Nicholas Charles Woinarowicz
Kaiwen Zhou

Bachelor of Science in Industrial Engineering and Management
Tingjun Chen
Madeline Marie Hager
Logan Michael Hahn
Siyu Hou
Stephen Thomas Kriegler
Kjell Arnold Kroh
David Martin Mills
Nicholas Joseph Schmitz
Austin James Simonieig
Megan Colleen Supan
Matthew Scott Trana

Bachelor of Science in Manufacturing Engineering
Cooper Gene Bierscheid
Kyle Younger Johnson
Jacob Rinne Lesar
Jacob D. Markson
Justin G. Paulson
Neil Matthew Worms

Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering
Andrew Taylor Amundson
Bjorn Gaspard Anderson
John Carl Anderson
Benjamin Alvin Berntson
Xingyu Chen
Yusheng Chen
Tanner Russel Eull
Nicholas Frank Fruci
Cody Randal Geiser
Michael Steven Gerlach
Alexander John Gibas
Matthew Edward Gingrey
Jacob R. Gunelson
Meranda Jean Hennen
Karry Alan Hoganson
Abraham David Kolstad
Nathan Bernard Kukson
Michael Charles Leach
Tyler J. Loll

Doctor of Philosophy
Dhan Prasad Gautam
Rizwana Irfan
Zahid Mahmood
Ehab Noureldin
Yidong Peng
Muhammad Nadeem Rafiq
Asghar Rezaei
Hesam Sarvaghad Moghaddam
Juan Vargas-Ramirez
Doctor of Philosophy
Chunju Gu
Daniel Kevin Margarit
Christopher Samuel Olson

College of Human Development and Education
Certificate
Renee Jeneanne Bourdeaux
Shanda D. Lauer
David Charles Mettler

Bachelor of Arts
Mikaela M. Walker

Bachelor of Science
Kelsey Jo Aakre
Brianna Kathryn Allen
Hannah Renea Andring
Carly Elizabeth Arett
Stephanie Atkinson
Samantha Lynn Baglivio
Macy Alexander Barrett
Hannah Blanche Belk
Nicole Suzanne Benson
Rebecca Marie Bidwell
Victoria Shirleen Boldremay
Ben Roger Borgerding
Callie Jo Bowen
Jordan Nicole Brown
Samuel Parker Burns
Quincy Ivan Carter
Natasha Ann Cary
Emily E. Champa
Jordan Anthony Champion
Laura J. Cisewski
Kathryn Lynn Citterman
Charis Condon
Kaitlin Elizabeth Crowds
Carolyn Marie Dahlquist

January 25, 2016

Master of Science
Sarah Kathleen Deyle
Kaitlyn Shelby Dotson
Michael Scott Feickert
Kaylee Mae Fisher
Megan Christine FitzSimmons
Megan Marie Fogelson
Joshua Alan Formanek
Presley Anne Forward
Kathryn Ann Fronning
Lacey Starr Gebro
Ashley Marie Gehr
Ingrid E. Grande
Leah Helen Gulickson
Lauren Therese Gunther
Ana Maria Guttrumson
Samuel Luther Hanson
Stephanie Lynn Hoard
Jamie R. Hodgson
Kalya K. Horvey
Rachel Marie Iverson
Jaime Catherine Marie Jarmin
Alexandra Emily Jenkins
Holly Taylor Johnson
Nicholas James Kaczmarczyk
Haley Rose Kaspari
Trent Andrew Keefer
Dylan Andrew Kopischke
Caitlyn Jo Krueger
Corey Dean Landowski
Rachel Marie Lawton
Benjamin Berry LeCompte
Mackenzie Marie Lockwood-Katelin Rae Madsen
Morgan C. Martin
Tashina Marie Maruska
Jenna Grace McKay
Taylor Chase McMillan
Kayla Jean Meehan
Krista Jo Menke
Courtney Lynn Miller
Leah Miller
Madison Sara Millner
Jordan Marie Novacek
Christina V. Nystrom
Odeline Oriental
Brittany Anne Paulson
Emily Kay Pearson
Stephanie Marie Raguse
Ashley Alexis Renton
Alaina LaRae Ritchie
Nicole Irma Rivera
Scott T. Rorvig

Janet Lynn Rudolph
Cole Matthew Sandford
Hope Katherine Sapp
Rachel Margaret Schmidt
Katherine Marie Scholz
Wen Min See
Charles Smith
Tanner Richard Steffen
David Michael Stookey
Sarah M. Storandt
Brenna Mae Stout
Louise Marie Tegtmeyer
Elizabeth LaVonne Temple
Kara A. Thomas
Tyler Nathan Tweet
Blayne Richard Waselk
Emily Karin Weis
Paisley K. Wurgle

Master of Education
Stacy L. Adamson
Jessica Ann Brown
Jennifer L. Colter
Megan Nicole Diemert
Michael Shawn Dobberstein
Adam Michael Dodd
Hollyanne E. Huggins
Sheena Audrey Johnson
Christopher D. Kalsow
Katherine Lynn Laubenstein
Kaelen Frick Napoleon
Lauren Ebsen Olsen
Andrew L. Potter
Hanna NM Puetz
Holly Renea Strand
Debra H. Uetz
Molly Westphal

Master of Science
Dawn Renee Baldwin
Mary M. Bartram
Jennifer Lynn Christoferson
Emily Marie Corturillo
Melissa Anne Dau
Megan Eileen Kirby
Ali Nila
Amanda Pieters
Margaret Mary Pulkabek
Sara Josephine Raap
Elizabeth A. Schwartz
Debra Ann Shapiro
Brett A. Thielges

Doctor of Education
Miriam B. Tobola

Doctor of Philosophy
Julie Lynn Nash

College of Health Professions
Bachelor of Science
Salam Mohammed Alanazi
John Donavon Anderson
Matthew Eugene Bernu
Jenae Andrea Dabill
Deena N. Dahal
Danielle Nico Engel
Gregory Ladona Fondong
Benjamin Hunter Graf
Bobbi Lee Kramer
Steven Anthony Lewis
Hannah Marie Magrum
Brandon Lee Nelson
Renee S. Sina
Allison Marie Van Zulien
Gina Christine Vosberg

Bachelor of Science in Nursing
Caytlin A. Albert
Chesney Ann Arneson
Rachel R. Bachmeier
Andrea K. Berglund
Amity Marie Blohm
Cheryl Brant
Rebecca J. Buchholz
Yoshiko Coyle
Sabrina Mire Elmi
Kristi Jo Erickson
Jon Michael Esperum
Julie Marie Faure
Nichole Angelique Fields
Brittany Lee Fulsebakke
Stacy Lynn Galbraith
Marissa C. Gieszler
Jenna M. Grinsteinner
Esther Marie Gunderson
Rachel Amelia Hanneman
Alexa Nicole Hanson
Anna Leigh Hanson
Fawzia Ahmed Hassan
Meghan J. Hilzengrger
Amanda M. Humann
Christina Leigh Jones
Brandi L. Kastner
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Bachelor of Science
Lucas F. Albers
Reily Grace Altenburg
Corey Christopher Arneson
Karlee Jo Beavens
Brooke Marie Bjerke
Kayla Alexis Bjorlie
Trevor Patrick K Brosius
Akshay Chaturvedi
Solji G. Choi
Tim Gene Cogger
Kevin M. Cortes
Katelynn Elizabeth Cox
Brandon David Ebersohl
Cassandra Daisy Hoffman
Samantha Joyce Holweger
Levi J. Horner
Wynn Rider Hoskins
Jessica Marie Hutchinson
Keeler Timothy Johnson
Langston M. Johnson
Monty Lee Johnson
Nicholas Edwin Johnson
Adit Joshi
Peter James Keefe
Taylor J. King
Brenton T. Knutzen
Malin Elese Kunerth
Megan Rose Lawler
Kaitlin Elizabeth Lindsey
Matthew Leon Louwagie Gordon
Logan Ray Martin
Gretchen Marie Merry
Abigail Jean Nelson
Nicoie Susan Nelson
Ryan Richard Ness
Michael Larry Paavola
Kyle Lee Palmer
Michelle Jean Pierce
Cody Alexander Raeder
Alexander William Rieder
Nakiedra Shena Robinson
Annette Ruiz
Amber L. Schneider
John Roger Schutz
Carl Michael Sheldon
Nikhil Singh
Alexander Paul Spacek
Riley D. Spiker
Tyler John Stadel
Becker Thomas Steinemann
Eugene Michael Stepan
Katelyn Helene Swearingen
Logan Tanner Thiel
Kevin John Thomas
Adam Daniel Toop
Calvin Derrick Trudel
Emily Christine Vinych
Joshua Stewart Warmbold
Allison Hulda Weisgarber
Michael Alan Welker
Anna Kathryn Well
Scott Dean Weniger
Taylor Kay West
Natasha Marie Weston
Brian Richard Willett
Jackie M. Wrage
Qianwen Yan
Samantha Jo Yineman
Parker Riley Zimmer

Master of Science
Abhishek Agarwal
Babitha Battu
Kevin Kaalz Bauer
Krittika Bhattacharyya
Megan Sue Bouret
Eric John Christeson
Chaitanya Dumpala
Srikanth R. Gaganganapalli
Anisha Ginjala
Nathaniel Charles Grosz
Krishna Kanth Kambhampaty
Nicholas Jacob Kuvaas
Sowjanya Mattaparthi
Swapna Gautam Phadke
Prateek Rajan
Kekoura Sakouvogui
Rahul Sharma
Rupali Shevkar
Guilherme Volpe Bossa
Xing Xu

Master of Software Engineering
Zubeen Sahjawani
Ryan Richard Summey

Doctor of Philosophy
Meenu Baloda
Rahaf Barakat
Otto Jerome Borchert
Charith Chitranarjan
Thomas B. Dunn
Anant Singh Gurung
Semere Kidane Habtemicael
Jennifer Elizabeth Johnson
Steve Biko Wanjara

College of University Studies
Bachelor of University Studies
Jalee Rose Abrahamson
Ryan Michael Amundson
Neil Disse
Wesley Forrest Dunker
Morgan Winter Hessman
Andrew James Jones
Diandra Rae Knapper
Eugene H. Lee
Emily Christine Mielke
Russell Louis Ouart
Bailey Margaret Richardson
Brock Edward Russell
Andre Jermaine Smith
Jared Mark Swanson
Erin Adeline Wanner

Master of Public Health
Nasra Omar Osman

Master of Science
Allison Kathleen Danzl

Doctor of Pharmacy
Hiral Rajiv Bhatt
Matthew Charles Osebold

Doctor of Philosophy
Shuang Zhou

College of Science and Mathematics
Certificate
Jill Fabricius Keith
Myungwoo Lee
Yujuan Wang

Bachelor of Arts
Jonathan Kristopher Allen
Nicole Angeline Dahl
Madeline Marie Gordon
Ryan John Remke
Jimena D. Schroeder
### New Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Cs.</th>
<th>Effective Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uniform</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Course Changes

**From:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Cs.</th>
<th>Dept No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Cs.</th>
<th>Effective Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHYS</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>Classical Mechanics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHYS</td>
<td>355 Classical Mechanics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change in Prerequisites/Co-Requisites and Change in Bulletin Descriptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Prerequisite/Co-requisite Change</th>
<th>Effective Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>Algebra I</td>
<td>Prereq or Co-req: MATH 621. Desc: Graduate level survey of algebra: rings, modules, linear algebra and selected advanced topics.</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>Complex Analysis</td>
<td>Prereq: MATH 650</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>Integral Equations</td>
<td>Prereq: MATH 650</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>Calculus of Variations</td>
<td>Prereq: MATH 650</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>Topics in Applied Mathematics</td>
<td>Prereq: MATH 650 or MATH 680</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHRM</td>
<td>452L</td>
<td>Pharmaceutical Care Laboratory II</td>
<td>Prereq: PSCI 413 and PSCI 414</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHRM</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>PTDI: Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Diseases</td>
<td>Prereq: PSCI 413 and PSCI 414</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHRM</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>Pharmacy Law</td>
<td>Prereq: BS degree in Pharmaceutical Sciences</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHRM</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>Pharmacotherapy Capstone</td>
<td>Prereq: a grade of C or higher in PHRM 536 and PHRM 537. Desc: Using clinical practice guidelines, current scientific literature, and pharmacotherapy concepts, students will evaluate integrated patient case scenarios.</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>Complex Analysis</td>
<td>Prereq: MATH 650</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>Integral Equations</td>
<td>Prereq: MATH 650</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>Calculus of Variations</td>
<td>Prereq: MATH 650</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>Topics in Applied Mathematics</td>
<td>Prereq: MATH 650 or MATH 680</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHRM</td>
<td>452L</td>
<td>Pharmaceutical Care Laboratory II</td>
<td>Prereq: PSCI 413 and PSCI 414</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHRM</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>PTDI: Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Diseases</td>
<td>Prereq: PSCI 413 and PSCI 414</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHRM</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>Pharmacy Law</td>
<td>Prereq: BS degree in Pharmaceutical Sciences</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHRM</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>Pharmacotherapy Capstone</td>
<td>Prereq: a grade of C or higher in PHRM 536 and PHRM 537. Desc: Using clinical practice guidelines, current scientific literature, and pharmacotherapy concepts, students will evaluate integrated patient case scenarios.</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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If the changes you are requesting include housekeeping, please submit those changes to ndsu.policy.manual@ndsu.edu first so that a clean policy can be presented to the committees.

SECTION: 183 Nonrenewal and Dismissal of Nonbanded, Nonacademic Staff

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: Housekeeping, Policy 232 is no longer so should not be referenced in this policy.

2. This policy change was originated by (individual, office or committee/organization):
   - Office/Department/Name and the date submitted Human Resources and Payroll. 12/04/2015
   - Email address of the person who should be contacted with revisions Colette.erickson@ndsu.edu
   - ]

   This portion will be completed by Mary Ashem.
   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 ndsu.policy.manual@ndsu.edu. All suggestions will be considered, however due to policy format guidelines, they may not be possible. Thank you for your understanding!
SECTION 183
NONRENEWAL AND DISMISSAL OF NONBANDED, NONACADEMIC STAFF

SOURCE: SBHE Policy Manual, Section 608.2

1. Employees excluded from the broadbanding system who are not members of the academic staff at an institution may be terminated, without cause, pursuant to written notice of termination in accordance with the following schedule:

   a) At least three months, if written notice is given during the first year of service;
   b) At least six months, if written notice is given during the second year of service or thereafter.

2. Employees excluded from the broadbanding system who are not members of the academic staff at an institution may be dismissed for just cause or based upon financial exigency as determined by the Board, loss of appropriations, loss of institutional or program enrollment, consolidation of organizational units or program areas or elimination of courses, in which cases the notice requirements of the preceding section shall not apply. If a dismissal other than for just cause is implemented pursuant to this subsection, no less than 90 days notice shall be given the employee.

3. Just cause means just cause for dismissal of staff employees as defined in the North Dakota University System Human Resource Policy Manual. (See NDSU 220.2) Notice of intent to dismiss for cause, stating the reasons for the proposed action, shall be given by a department head or other designated official unless the employee is a vice president or other officer who reports directly to the institution's chief executive, in which case notice shall be given by the chief executive. The notice shall be given at least five calendar days prior to the date of dismissal and the employee has the right, within that time, to respond in writing and request a pre-termination review. Following notice of intent to dismiss and, if requested by the employee, the pre-termination review, the department head or other designated individual, if the notice of intent to dismiss was not given by the chief executive, shall forward a recommendation to the institution's chief executive. The chief executive shall make a final decision and give written notice of that decision.

4. An employee who is dismissed for just cause pursuant to this policy may, within 20 days of dismissal, appeal the decision by filing a notice of appeal, accompanied by a specification of the reasons or grounds upon which the appeal is based, with the institution's chief executive. The chief executive shall appoint a hearing officer to conduct an evidentiary hearing and submit recommended findings, conclusions and a recommended order to the chief executive. The hearing officer shall conduct the hearing according to appeal procedures governing hearings conducted by a staff personnel board that are set forth in Section 27 of the North Dakota University System Human Resource Policy Manual (Policy 231 of the NDSU Policy Manual). The chief executive shall make a final decision and provide written notice of that decision to the hearing officer and the employee within 20 calendar days of receiving the hearing officer's recommendation.

5. Except for positions explicitly exempt as stated in this section 5 or 6, this policy applies to all employees excluded from the broadbanding system who are not members of the academic staff and, with respect to their positions as administrators or other non-academic positions, to employees with appointments to the academic staff. This policy applies to coaches unless the employing institution has adopted a different policy governing coaches and that policy is stated or
adopted by reference in a coach's employment contract, in which case the institution's policy applies. This policy does not apply to faculty; employees with academic appointments are governed by SBHE Policy Sections 605.1, 605.2, 605.3 and 605.4. Staff employees at the institutions are governed by the North Dakota University System Human Resource Policy Manual.

6. **Dismissal actions of regular staff employees** are governed by the NDSU Policies 220 and 223.

7. **Dismissal actions of temporary staff employees** may occur at any time with or without cause (NDUS Human Resource Policy Manual, Section 2).

8. **Dismissal or non-renewal actions for faculty** are governed by NDSU Policy 350.1-350.4 and 352.

9. This policy does not apply to the Chancellor and institution presidents. Subsections 1 and 2 do not apply to student residence hall assistants, work-study students and other students employed on a part-time basis for a limited term. The terms and conditions of employment for student residence hall assistants shall be stated in a written contract.

10. Notwithstanding section 1, employees excluded from the broadbanding system who are not members of the academic staff at an institution and whose first day of service preceded September 26, 2012, may be terminated, without cause, pursuant to written notice of termination in accordance with the following schedule:

    a. At least three months, if written notice is given during the first year of service;
    b. At least six months, if written notice is given during the second year of service;
    c. At least twelve months, if written notice is given thereafter.

---

**HISTORY:**

- New June 1994
- Amended May 1996
- Amended February 1998
- Amended July 1999
- Amended December 1999
- Amended January 2000
- Amended January 3, 2013
- Housekeeping August 26, 2013
- Amended September 18, 2013
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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 ndsu.policy.manual@ndsu.edu first so that a clean policy can be presented to the committees.

SECTION: 220 Staff Job Discipline/Dismissal

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 □X No
   - Describe change: Adding Designee to the policy to update the policy to match the current pre-action business practice. There are 3 HR positions that handle staff employee relations (Director and the 2 Associate Directors of HR). Our practice is if one position assists a supervisor or an employee; that position does not do the independent review of the pre-action.

2. This policy change was originated by (individual, office or committee/organization):
   - Office/Department/Name and the date submitted: Office of Human Resources and Payroll, Colette Erickson, 12/01/2015
   - Email address of the person who should be contacted with revisions: Colette.Erickson@ndsu.edu
   -

This portion will be completed by Mary Asheim.

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 ndsu.policy.manual@ndsu.edu. All suggestions will be considered, however due to policy format guidelines, they may not be possible. Thank you for your understanding!
SECTION 220
STAFF JOB DISCIPLINE/DISMISSAL

SOURCE: NDUS Human Resources Policy Manual, Section 25

1. A regular staff employee may be dismissed from employment, suspended without pay, changed to a lower pay rate, or changed to a position with a lower pay rate, for just cause. Just cause includes conduct related to the employee's job duties, job performance, or working relationships which is detrimental to the discipline or efficiency of the institution in which the employee is or was engaged.

2. The employing department shall notify the employee and the Director of Human Resources/Payroll of the proposed action in writing. The written notice must include:
   a. A statement that the supervisor intends to dismiss, suspend, or lower the pay rate of the employee.
   b. A statement identifying any policies violated by the employee.
   c. A statement of the specific charges against the employee; citing the employee's behavior, dates and/or occurrences, witnesses, and other evidence against the employee.
   d. Notice that the employee may provide the supervisor with evidence, explanation, or other information in writing which contradicts the allegations and evidence.
   e. Notice of the employee's status until the final decision is made. (i.e. whether the employee to continue working or be placed on leave of absence with pay)

3. A regular staff employee who is being suspended without pay, changed to a lower pay rate for disciplinary reason or dismissed shall be entitled to a pre-action review. This review will be conducted by the Director of Human Resources/Payroll or designee and may be limited to the written record including the employee's written response to the allegations, or at the option of the Director of Human Resources/Payroll or designee may be conducted in person. The pre-action review shall be held no sooner than three working days from the time notice as provided to the employee.
   a. The review official shall consider all evidence and will make a determination whether there are reasonable grounds to believe the charges against the employee are true and support the proposed action.
   b. The employee and the department head will be notified, in writing, of the review official's determination. The department head will then give the employee a written notice of his/her final decision. A notice of dismissal, suspension without pay, or demotion must include a written detailed statement of the basis for the action and inform the employee of their right to appeal.

HISTORY:
New April 1992
Amended June 1997
If the changes you are requesting include housekeeping, please submit those changes to ndsu.policy.manual@ndsu.edu first so that a clean policy can be presented to the committees.

SECTION: 515 – Travel - Employees

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: Housekeeping: IRS mileage allowance rate changes effective January 1st 2016

2. This policy change was originated by (individual, office or committee/organization):
   - Accounting Office / Accounting / Ricki Martin 12/28/2015
   - Ricki.martin@ndsu.edu

   This portion will be completed by Mary Asheim.

   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 ndsu.policy.manual@ndsu.edu. All suggestions will be considered, however due to policy format guidelines, they may not be possible. Thank you for your understanding!
SECTION 515
TRAVEL - EMPLOYEES

SOURCE: NDSU President
North Dakota Century Code (NDCC)
North Dakota Office of Management and Budget Policy

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1.1 DEFINITION OF "TRAVEL" - (NDSU Interpretation)
For purposes of this policy, except for No. 2 below, the term "travel" means the absence from the city or community where a person normally works and/or maintains an office. For purposes of travel by staff members employed on the University campus their "community" shall include, Fargo, West Fargo, and Moorhead.

1.2 MEANS OF TRAVEL - (NDSU Interpretation)
Employees must choose the most prudent and economical means of travel, considering factors such as: travel expenses, time away from the office, and the needs of the University.

1.3 ACCOUNTING OFFICE RESPONSIBILITY - (NDSU Interpretation)
The NDSU Accounting Office is responsible for the initial development of NDSU's employee travel expense reimbursement policy, in addition to the final review and approval of individual employee travel expenses. Employees may be contacted by the Accounting Office for more documentation or a cost/benefit justification. The NDSU Accounting Office must apply the travel rules in this policy on a reasonable, fair and consistent basis.

1.4 TRAVEL VOUCHER REQUIREMENTS - (NDCC 54-06-09 (6))
Before an allowance for any such mileage or travel expenses may be made, the employee shall file with the employee's department an itemized statement showing the mileage traveled, the hour of departure and return, the days when and how traveled, the purpose thereof, and such other information and documentation as may be prescribed by rule of the employee's department, college, or division.

(NDCC 44-08-05.1)
Any employee who has the power to approve a voucher for a department shall determine, before approving such voucher, the following:

1.4.1 That the expenditure for travel or other expenditures were for lawful and official purposes.

1.4.2 If for travel expense, that the travel actually occurred and that the sums claimed for travel expenses are actually due the individual who is seeking reimbursement, allowance, or payment.

1.4.3 If the voucher is for expenditure other than travel expense, that the expenditure is lawful and that the voucher contains no false claims.
2. TRAVEL WITHIN THE CITY OF EMPLOYMENT

Employees may be reimbursed for expenses incurred within their "city or community" of employment for the following:

2.1  (NDSU Interpretation)
Parking fees for personal vehicles when conducting University functions or attending University meetings.

2.2  (OMB Policy 507)
Mileage at in-state rates for personal vehicles used to transport equipment or university guests for university functions.

2.2.1  (OMB Policy 507)
Mileage from a normal work station to a conference or meeting is reimbursable, if an employee actually reports to work prior to attendance at the meeting. However, mileage for travel from an employee's residence directly to the conference/meeting site is not reimbursable, since it is considered normal commuting travel.

2.3  (NDSU Interpretation)
Meals may be reimbursed as provided under NDSU Policy 170.

2.4  (NDSU Interpretation)
Transportation between the employee's residence and airport, which consists of taxi fare or mileage plus airport parking, whichever is less.

3. OUT-OF-STATE TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION - (NDSU Interpretation)

Employees must have each out-of-state trip pre-approved by their immediate supervisor. In addition, employees in a department, college, or division must have each out-of-state trip pre-approved by their Dean or Director. Deans and Directors who report directly to a Vice President or Provost must have their out-of-state trips pre-approved by their Vice President or Provost. Vice Presidents, Provost, and others reporting directly to the President, must have each out-of-state trip pre-approved by the President. Prior approval is to be obtained by using the Travel Authorization – Out-of-State form.

3.1 WORKERS COMPENSATION - (NDSU Interpretation)
In cases where employees are working out-of-state for 30 consecutive days, or for any international trip, the employee must notify the University Police and Safety Office to arrange proper Workers Compensation coverage.

3.2 FOREIGN TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION - (NDSU Interpretation)
Each trip to a foreign country must be approved by the appropriate Vice President or Provost or their designee.

4. PRIVATELY OWNED TRANSPORTATION - (NDCC 54-06-09)
An employee, when required to travel by motor vehicle or truck in the performance of official duty, should use a state-owned vehicle, whenever possible.

(OMB policy 511)
When an employee drives a state fleet vehicle, the State's liability coverage is primary should an accident occur. If an employee drives a personal vehicle on state business, the employee's personal insurance is primary. If an employee must drive a personal vehicle because no state fleet vehicles are available, then the State would have primary responsibility.
Where more than one state employee travels in the same car while engaged upon official duty, whether belonging to different departments, subdivisions, boards, or commissions or not, no claim may be made for more than one mileage, such claim to be made by the owner or lessee of such car.

If an employee is allowed to use a personal vehicle, reimbursement will be made according to the rates below.

4.1 IN-STATE MILEAGE - (NDCC 54-06-09 (1a))
The sum of \textcolor{red}{56.057.5} cents (for travel prior to 01/01/20156) or \textcolor{red}{57.554} cents (for travel on or after 01/01/20156) per mile actually and necessarily traveled in the performance of official duty when such travel is by motor vehicle.

4.2 (NDCC 54-06-09 (1a))
The sum of \textcolor{red}{86.81} cents per mile when such travel is by private airplane.

4.3 OUT-OF-STATE MILEAGE - (NDCC 54-06-09 (3))
If only one person engages in travel exceeding any geographic point 300 miles beyond the borders of this state, reimbursement shall be limited to eighteen cents per mile for the out-of-state portion of the travel beyond the first 300 miles.

\textcolor{red}{(NDSU Interpretation)}
When interpreting the law indicated in 4.3 above, it may be helpful to visualize that the state's border has expanded in all directions by 300 miles. When only one person travels outside the state of North Dakota and uses their own vehicle, their miles traveled within the 300 mile expanded border, the employee may be reimbursed at the \textcolor{red}{56.057.5} cents (for travel prior to 01/01/20156) or \textcolor{red}{57.554} cents (for travel on or after 01/01/20156) per mile rate. This includes both the departure and return parts of the trip.

When two or more state employees travel in the same vehicle, the per mile allowance is \textcolor{red}{56.057.5} cents (for travel prior to 01/01/20156) or \textcolor{red}{57.554} cents (for travel on or after 01/01/20156). State employees accompanying the vehicle owner must be listed on the travel voucher.

4.4 (NDCC 54-06-09 (5))
State employees permanently located outside the state or on assignments outside the state for an indefinite period of time, exceeding thirty consecutive days, will be allowed and paid \textcolor{red}{56.057.5} cents (for travel prior to 01/01/20156) or \textcolor{red}{57.554} cents (for travel on or after 01/01/20156) per mile for each mile actually and necessarily traveled in the performance of official duty when such travel is by motor vehicle, the 300 mile restriction, in 4.3 above, does not apply.

\textcolor{red}{(NDSU Interpretation)}
Mileage allowances are assumed to be total operating costs for vehicles. No additional amounts will be reimbursed to employees for personal items such as: traffic or parking tickets, vehicle repairs, or any other normal automobile expenses.

5. COMMERCIAL AIRLINES - (OMB Policy 510)
For travel on official state business, airline tickets may be either purchased through a travel agency and billed to the department, or purchased by the employee and reimbursed. In either case, the original itinerary should be used to support the travel agency payment or employee reimbursement.
Reimbursement to an employee or tickets directly billed to a department will be allowed for the actual cost of tourist or coach fare, purchased at the lowest reasonable rate available, except when approved by the President, or President's designee, unless not permitted by federal rules or regulations. Approvals must be filed in the President's Office. First Class or Business Class tickets should normally be through a frequent flyer upgrade or the employee should use frequent flyer miles earned via state travel. Invoices from third parties (like travel agencies) must identify if travel is First Class or Business Class.

5.1 (NDSU Interpretation)
If the ticket is paid by the employee in a month prior to the travel dates, with appropriate department approval, the employee may be reimbursed immediately after the ticket is paid using an accounts payable voucher.

5.2 (NDSU Interpretation)
Meal and lodging expenses will be limited to the days needed to complete the business trip. Meal and lodging expenses for additional travel necessary to get a discounted or reduced airline rate are reimbursable, if a cost savings can be documented.

6. MEAL REIMBURSEMENTS - (NDCC 44-08-04)
Reimbursement is allowed only for overnight travel or other travel, away from the normal place of employment, for four hours or more. Verification of expenses by receipt is required only for lodging expenses.

6.1 DEFINITION - QUARTERS - (NDCC44-08-04 (2)) (NDSU Interpretation italicized)
For purposes of employee meal and lodging reimbursements, state law defines the four quarters of a day as follows:

First quarter shall be from six (6) a.m. to twelve (12) noon. No reimbursement may be made if travel begins after seven (7) a.m.

Second quarter shall be from twelve (12) noon to six (6) p.m. (No reimbursement will be made for this quarter if travel begins after one (1) p.m. or ends prior to twelve (12) noon.)

Third quarter shall be from six (6) p.m. to twelve (12) midnight. (No reimbursement will be made for this quarter if travel begins after seven (7) p.m. or ends prior to six (6) p.m.)

Fourth quarter shall be from twelve (12) midnight to six (6) a.m. (This quarter pertains to claiming lodging expense.)

6.2 CONFERENCE, SEMINAR, OR OTHER MEETING - (NDCC 44-08-04 (1))
Claims may also be made for meals that are included as part of a registration fee for a conference, seminar, or other meeting and for meals attended at the request of and on behalf of the University; however, if a meal is included in a registration fee, the applicable quarter's meal allowance cannot be claimed for that meal.

6.3 TAXABLE MEALS - (NDSU Interpretation of IRS regulations)
Meal reimbursements that do not involve "overnight lodging" are reported as taxable gross income on the employee's W-2 and are subject to withholding and employment taxes. A lodging receipt is considered adequate proof of overnight lodging. Also, a notation on the travel voucher that the employee stayed overnight with a friend or relative is sufficient.
6.4 PAYMENT FOR MEALS OF STAFF & GUESTS, WHILE IN TRAVEL STATUS - (NDSU Interpretation)

NDSU Policy 170 allows reimbursement to employees for meals of staff and guests, even though the employee is not in travel status. Employees while in travel status may also occasionally encounter meal expenses when they are required to be at a meeting and there is a need to pay for meals of guests, such as when interviewing candidates, recruiting, or fund raising.

If an employee is at a required meeting and pays for meals of guests (while in travel status), the employee may be reimbursed for the actual receipt amount. If the employee meal is reimbursed at actual receipt amount on the travel voucher, he/she must not claim the applicable quarter's meal allowance.

When employees are reimbursed for the actual receipt amount for meals under this section, the expenses should be reflected under the "miscellaneous expense" column on the travel voucher. The purpose of the meeting and names of guests must be documented on either the travel voucher or an attached banquet and meeting documentation form.

6.5 TEAM TRAVEL - (Excerpt from NDCC 44-08-04, Subsection 1)

If a higher education athletic team or other organized institution organization group meal is attended at the request of and on behalf of the institution, actual expenses for the entire group, including coaches, trainers, and other employees, may be paid or submitted for payment of a team or group travel expense report: subsection 2 does no apply; and officers and employees are not required to document individual expenses or submit individual travel reimbursement vouchers.

(NDSU Interpretation)

Meal expenses of athletic department employees, when traveling with student athletes to games, are covered by travel advances issued from the Accounting Office. These meals are attended at the request of and on behalf of the University and, therefore, the meals are paid from the travel advance at the actual cost of the meals, in accordance with the Athletic department meal reimbursement guidelines for student athletes. Since the meals are paid out of the travel advance, it is not necessary for the employees involved in the team travel to complete a travel voucher to claim reimbursement for the meals.

As an alternative to actual meal costs, some head coaches may prefer to distribute a cash per diem to the employees and student athletes. The cash per diem is distributed from the travel advance for the individual to use for meals. The cash per diem for employees must not exceed the meal allowance allowed policy and must not exceed the Athletic department meal reimbursement guidelines for student athletes. Since the employee cash per diem is paid from a travel advance, it is not necessary for the employee to complete a travel voucher to claim reimbursement for the meals.

6.6 MEAL ALLOWANCE RATES - (NDCC 44-08-04 (2))

Meal reimbursement rates depend upon the time of day the employee is in travel status and whether the travel is in-state or out-of-state. Verification of receipts shall not be required for the first three quarters listed above in Section 6.1.
6.6.1 IN-STATE - (NDCC 44-08-04 (2))

For travel prior to August 1, 2013, in-state rates are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Daily Total</th>
<th>First Quarter</th>
<th>Second Quarter</th>
<th>Third Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>$ 30.00</td>
<td>$ 6.00</td>
<td>$ 9.00</td>
<td>$ 15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For travel on or after August 1, 2013, in-state rates are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Daily Total</th>
<th>First Quarter</th>
<th>Second Quarter</th>
<th>Third Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>$ 35.00</td>
<td>$ 7.00</td>
<td>$ 10.50</td>
<td>$ 17.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6.2 OUT-OF-STATE, WITHIN CONTINENTAL U.S. - (NDCC 44-08-04 (3))

The allowance for out-of-state meals, within the continental United States, is equal to per diem meals rate in the city for which a claim is made on that day as established by the United States general services administration and must be allocated twenty percent to the first quarter, thirty percent to the second quarter, and fifty percent to the third quarter.

(NDSU Interpretation)
The standard meal allowance rate (per diem) for cities in the continental United States is currently $51.00 per day effective 10/01/2015. The North Dakota Office of Management and Budget (NDOMB) web site shows the official current out-of-state meal allowance rates that NDSU will follow. The NDOMB web site includes a listing of cities whose meal allowance rates are higher than the standard rate.

The table below (effective 10/01/2015) shows examples of how the meal allowance per diem is split between the first quarter or breakfast (20%), second quarter or lunch (30%), and third quarter (50%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Daily Total</th>
<th>First Quarter</th>
<th>Second Quarter</th>
<th>Third Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State, within continental U.S. (depending on city)</td>
<td>$ 51.00</td>
<td>$ 10.20</td>
<td>$ 15.30</td>
<td>$ 25.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(depending on city)</td>
<td>$ 54.00</td>
<td>$ 10.80</td>
<td>$ 16.20</td>
<td>$ 27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(depending on city)</td>
<td>$ 59.00</td>
<td>$ 11.80</td>
<td>$ 17.70</td>
<td>$ 29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(depending on city)</td>
<td>$ 64.00</td>
<td>$ 12.80</td>
<td>$ 19.20</td>
<td>$ 32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(depending on city)</td>
<td>$ 69.00</td>
<td>$ 13.80</td>
<td>$ 20.70</td>
<td>$ 34.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(depending on city)</td>
<td>$ 74.00</td>
<td>$ 14.80</td>
<td>$ 22.20</td>
<td>$ 37.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6.3 NON-CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES AND OVERSEAS NONFOREIGN AREAS - (NDCC 44-08-04 (4))

The allowance for meals in noncontinental United States and overseas nonforeign areas, including Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam, is equal to the per diem meals rate in the city for which a claim is made on that day as established by the rule for federal employees established by the United States per diem committee and must be
allocated twenty percent to the first quarter, thirty percent to the second quarter, and fifty percent to the third quarter.

(NDSU interpretation)
The Accounting Office website will have a link to the appropriate meal allowance for foreign travel.

6.6.4 FOREIGN TRAVEL - NDCC 44-08-04(5))
The allowance for meals outside the United States is equal to the per diem meals rate in the city for which a claim is made on that day as established by rule for federal employees established by the United States department of state and must be allocated twenty percent to the first quarter, thirty percent to the second quarter, and fifty percent to the third quarter.

(NDSU Interpretation)
The Accounting Office website will have a link to the appropriate meal allowance for foreign travel.

7. LODGING REIMBURSEMENTS - (NDCC 44-08-04 (1)(2d)(6)) (NDSU Interpretation italicized)
Reimbursement for in-state lodging expenses incurred while in travel status during the fourth quarter shall not exceed 90% of the rate established by the United States General Services Administration (GSA) for North Dakota, plus applicable state or local taxes on lodging. As of October 1, 2013, the GSA rate for lodging in North Dakota was $83; therefore, the maximum amount that can be claimed is $74.70, plus applicable taxes. For travel on or after October 1, 2015, the GSA rate for lodging in North Dakota was $89; therefore, the maximum amount that can be claimed is $80.10, plus applicable taxes.

The GSA will update their rates periodically during the biennium and the allowable lodging reimbursement will also change at that time. See the city/county rate exceptions, found on the Accounting website. The amounts shown are 90% of the GSA rates and are the maximum state reimbursable rates that can be claimed, plus applicable state and local taxes. These rates are effective October 1, 2012.

Out-of-state lodging expenses shall be reimbursed at actual expense.

An original lodging receipt is required for reimbursement to the employee. (When an original receipt is lost, a photocopy or faxed invoice should be obtained with a notation by the employee that the original receipt was lost.)

7.1 IN-STATE LODGING RATES OVER MAXIMUM - (SBHE 806.1.10)
In the unlikely situation an employee cannot find lodging at 90% of the GSA rate, the following process needs to be followed:

7.1.1 Prior-approval by campus designated approver must be obtained.

7.1.2 The request must document the name of the employee, name of city traveling to, dates of lodging, name and local phone number of the lodging facility, the rates quoted for the dates of travel or if there were no available rooms. A minimum of 3 facilities should be contacted. If traveling to a North Dakota community that does not have 3 lodging facilities, indicate on documentation.
7.1.3 This documentation must be attached to the travel reimbursement form.

7.1.4 Occasionally, additional documentation will be requested to ensure the most cost-effective rates possible were obtained.

7.1.5 If a room is more than the 90\% maximum GSA rate for North Dakota, allowed in section 7, above, the additional taxes eligible for reimbursement must be pro-rated. For example (using the $80.10 maximum rate): if the room is $90.00 and taxes are $13.50, the individual will be reimbursed $80.10 plus $12.02 pro-rated taxes ($80.10/90.00 \times 13.50 = $12.02).

7.2 DIRECT BILLING OF LODGING TO DEPARTMENT - (NDSU Interpretation)
Employee lodging must be first paid by the employee and then reimbursed using the travel voucher. An employee's lodging expense should not be paid directly by the department to the lodging facility.

EXCEPTIONS - (NDSU Interpretation)

7.2.1 State law (NDCC 44-08-04.5) allows a state agency or institution to pay an out-of-state lodging provider directly when the North Dakota Office of Management and Budget has obtained a sales tax exemption from the destination state.

(NDSU Interpretation)
(At this time, OMB does not have an agreement with any other state. State agencies will be notified when such agreements have been obtained.) The state law exception does not apply to in-state lodging.

7.2.2 (NDSU Interpretation)
A lodging facility may be paid directly by the department if the travel involves a student field trip or athletic team travel.

7.3 REQUIRED DEPOSITS - (NDSU Interpretation of OMB Policy 513)
If a lodging facility requires a paid deposit to hold a room in advance, it should be paid by the employee. If the deposit is paid by the employee in a month prior to the travel dates, the employee may be reimbursed immediately after the deposit is paid using a Request for Payment form. The employee will need to verify that the deposit was properly credited to the lodging bill when the travel takes place.

7.4 ROOM SHARING - (NDSU Interpretation)
When two or more state employees share lodging accommodations, each employee should normally claim his/her own reimbursement. In instances where one employee pays the total lodging costs, he/she may claim reimbursement for the same by listing the other employee(s) sharing the lodging accommodation.

(OMB Policy 513)
When a state employee is accompanied by an individual not eligible for reimbursement (a spouse or traveling companion), the state employee must have the lodging establishment clearly certify the room rate for a single person and only that amount may be claimed.
8. MISCELLANEOUS TRAVEL EXPENSES - (NDSU Interpretation)
Reimbursement may also be requested for such necessary miscellaneous travel expenses as registration fees, car rental, taxi fares, toll fees, business telephone calls, parking fees and up to $5.00 per day for personal telephone calls while in travel status. All miscellaneous travel expenses claimed on the travel voucher must be individually identified and explained. Receipts are required for all individual miscellaneous travel expenses exceeding $10.00.

8.1 ENTERTAINMENT & PERSONAL EXPENSES - (NDSU Interpretation)
Employee entertainment or other personal expenses are not reimbursable. Expenses claimed by an employee that appear to fall in this category, will need additional justification to support claiming them as necessary business expenses.

8.2 CAR RENTAL - (OMB Policy 518)

8.2.1 The university will reimburse an employee for car rental if the employee used an aircraft to get to their destination, and if the use of the vehicle is sufficient to justify that mode of travel instead of a taxi. It is generally the policy to discourage car rentals unless their cost effectiveness is self-evident.

8.2.2 When renting a car for university business, purchase of additional insurance is not necessary because it is covered by the State's Risk Management Fund. However, the North Dakota Risk Management Division does recommend purchasing the liability insurance if renting outside the United States. Also, when out of the country, it is advisable to purchase the loss damage waiver as well. Employees should consider what coverages the employee's personal auto insurance provides.

8.3 TIPS AND OTHER CHARGES - (NDSU Interpretation)
Reasonable tips, not to exceed $5.00 per tip, and service charges that are a necessary part of the business trip are reimbursable. Examples include: tips to bellhops and taxicab drivers. No reimbursement is allowed for tips on meals that are covered by the meal allowance.

8.4 LOST RECEIPTS - (NDSU Interpretation)
When an original receipt is lost, a photocopy or faxed invoice should be obtained with a notation by the employee that the original receipt was lost. Credit card receipts are not sufficient.

9. TRAVEL ADVANCES - (NDCC 44-08-04.2)
The Accounting office may approve a travel advance to employees for payment of meal and lodging expenses incurred while the employee is traveling on official business of this state, provided that such travel is planned to be in excess of five days per month, and provided that the funds advanced do not exceed eighty percent of the estimated expenses for the period.

NDSU LIMITATIONS - (NDSU interpretation)
Funds advanced for meals and lodging must be accounted for as required by this Policy. Travel advances may not be made from state appropriated funds. A travel advance form is available to request an advance. The Accounting Office will generally limit travel advances to the following two situations:

9.1 When an employee is chaperoning a group of students or other guests and is expected to pay some of the student's or guest's expenses.
9.2 When an employee is going on a trip for an extended period of time, such as more than one month. Usually these are international trips funded by a special grant.
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1. At one time university money could pay for faculty membership in our professional organizations. Now we are prevented from doing so. Why the change, especially since these memberships are vital to our research abilities and networking, and some dues are very high?

The policy governing memberships is 152.2, which was created in December 1993. This policy hasn’t changed, and states:

Normally, dues and membership fees are the employee’s own personal responsibility. The University may pay organization or institutional fees in professional and service organizations when the membership is regarded, either by the organization or the University, as an institutional membership or is otherwise considered directly beneficial to the University. In such cases, all benefits of membership, such as resource materials, belong to the University. All such funded memberships must be approved by the employee’s supervisor who has budgetary responsibility for the unit or division. For the colleges of the University, this shall mean the Dean.

The colleges were interpreting this policy differently; the change is that we now have a consistent interpretation of what it means for a membership to be an institutional membership. Note that if the University does pay for a membership, all of the benefits belong to the University, not to an individual faculty member.

2. For some time, there were travel grants/funding from the Provost’s office, but this year that has been eliminated. Given the need to travel for our research and other work, and the paucity of other funding sources on campus, why the elimination? I believe that it was also went mostly to newer faculty who could use the hand up with their research careers.

In the past, the Office of the Provost had allocated $40,000 to a travel grant program, using summer funds that were retained by the Office of the Provost. Given the changes in summer school, the retained funds from summer of 2015 are being set aside to help fund courses in summer of 2016. I made the decision to allocate the summer funds to support summer school.

3. A new faculty development award was approved, without changing policy 132. Although awards benefitting faculty are a great idea, in practice this one would put considerable financial strain on departments that try to implement it. How is the award supposed to work? How should departments deal with its funding? Why weren’t faculty and chairs/heads consulted to see if the award was a priority for them? It would be a good idea for some sort of training or information for Chairs/Heads to know how and when to implement it?

Information about the award is available on the Provost’s website under awards. The award was developed by the members of the Research Council – who are faculty – as suggested by the Strategic Plan. This award is similar to the leave programs available at most major research universities. The proposal was discussed and approved by the Deans’ Council. The Deans were invited to share the proposal with their chairs and heads. Since this is an award, and not a policy, it was treated like a competitive award program.
Bylaws

Article I: Faculty Senate Membership

Section 1.
Each representation unit shall have one elected senator for every fifteen eligible faculty (see Constitution Article 3, Section 1), or major fraction thereof, assigned to the Fargo Campus as of October 1 of each year. Faculty members in the Agriculture Experimental Station and the NDSU Extension Service shall be counted in and vote with their assigned representation unit.

Section 2.
Members of representation units, including senior lecturers, professors of practice, research faculty, assistant, associate, and full professors, chairs/heads/or their equivalents, assistant/associate deans, and deans shall be eligible to vote for representatives.

Section 3.
The following are considered representation units for the purposes of determining Faculty Senate seats:

a. College of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Natural Resources
b. College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences
c. College of Business
d. College of Engineering
e. College of Human Development and Education
f. College of Pharmacy, Nursing, and Allied Health Sciences
   and Professions
g. College of Science and Mathematics

Section 4.
The Faculty Senate President with the assistance of the Secretary of the Senate will stagger Senate terms so that approximately 1/3 of the senators from each representation unit are elected each year. Each unit shall hold a meeting to elect the necessary senators by April 15 of each year.

Section 5.
Terms of office shall begin on the Tuesday following Spring Commencement. The term of office of an elected senator shall be three years. Senators cannot be reelected for consecutive terms.

Section 6.
If a senator must vacate her or his seat, the vacancy shall be filled by a special election within the unit from which she or he was elected. The term of a member under these circumstances shall
commence immediately and shall be for the duration of the absence or unexpired term of the regularly elected member.

Section 7.
A senator may be removed from office by way of a two-thirds majority vote at a regular Faculty Senate meeting, followed by a 2/3 majority vote at the next meeting. This action may never be part of a consent agenda. **In the event a senator is removed, the Faculty Senate President will inform the relevant academic unit to elect another senator before the senate meets in its next regular meeting.**

Section 8.
All senators are expected to:

1. Attend all Faculty Senate meetings. If unable to attend the meeting the senator must find a competent substitute (who is not already a senator) to act as her or his proxy at the meeting. Said proxy will have all rights and privileges accorded a regular senator. The senator must provide signed notification of the substitution to the Secretary of the Faculty Senate prior to start of the meeting.
2. Prepare for Faculty Senate meetings including reading the agenda and all attachments prior to the meeting.
3. Participate in meetings as long as doing so advances the business of the Faculty Senate.
4. Disseminate Faculty Senate information to their individual representation units.
5. Gather opinions and other information from their representation units concerning Faculty Senate activity.
6. Show proper decorum during meetings.

Article II: Organization and Faculty Senate Operation

Section 1.
Administrative officers of the Faculty Senate consist of the President and the President-Elect. **The Immediate Past President provides advice to the President and President-Elect regarding past practices and other matters for the maintenance of continuity from one administration to the next.**

Section 2.
The President-Elect shall be elected for a one-year term by the Faculty Senate at the last April or May meeting of the Faculty Senate in the academic year. The President-Elect will be elected from the roster of current or former Senators.

Section 3.
At the end of the term, **the President will assume the role of the Immediate Past President, and the President-Elect will succeed the President for a one-year term of office.**
outgoing President is unable or unwilling to serve as the Immediate Past President, the President will appoint another past President as a replacement for the position of Immediate Past President.

Section 4.
During their respective terms the President-Elect and, the President and the Immediate Past President will not represent their or his representation units in the Senate.

Section 5.
The authority of the President, President Elect or Immediate Past President will be terminated before the end of its term if he/she loses the eligibility, voluntarily resigns with eligibility or is removed from office by the Senate with/without eligibility.

1. Voluntary resignations shall be tendered before the Senate at its regular meetings.
2. Removal of the President or President-Elect or Immediate Past President by the Senate requires a 2/3 vote at a regular Senate meeting, followed by a 2/3 vote at a special meeting of the Senate convened in not more than 2 weeks after the first meeting. The second meeting will be convened and presided by a Special Returning Officer who will be appointed by the Senate immediately after the first vote. The removed officer shall not complete his/her term as a Senator.
3. In the event that the authority of the President is terminated, the President is removed or unable to complete their term out of their own decision but the President-Elect is still in good standing, the President-Elect will assume the role of President and will continue as President to finish the term left by the removed President and then he/she will start his/her originally elected term.
   a. The removed president will not serve as Immediate Past President until the President-Elect’s original term is concluded.
   b. The assumed President may wish to appoint one of the senators to assist in the duties of the President-Elect. This appointment does not necessarily imply automatic elevation to the full position of President-Elect at the end of the term.
4. In the event that the authority of the President-Elect is terminated, the Senate will vote to replace the President-Elect at the next regular meeting of the Senate. These actions may never be part of a consent agenda.
5. In the event the authority of the Immediate Past President is terminated, the President will appoint the most recent eligible past president to serve in that capacity.
6. In the event that the authority of both the President and the President-Elect is terminated at the same time:
   a. If the authority of the Immediate Past President is still in good standing, then he/she will convene and preside the Senate meeting to elect a new President and the President-Elect in not more than two weeks.
   a.b. If the authority of the Immediate-Past President is also terminated, then a Special Returning officer appointed by the Senate will convene and preside of the election of the President and the President-Elect in not more than two weeks. Section 5.5 above will then be used to fill the position of the Immediate Past President. The removed officer shall not complete her or his term as a Senator.
Section 6.
Duties of the President shall include the following:
   1. Preside at all meetings of the Senate.
   2. Set the agenda of the Faculty Senate in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee.
   4. Chair the Senate Executive Committee.
   5. Introduce the President at the State of the University Address.
   6. Appoint committee members, as outlined in Articles IV and V.
   7. Coordinate the dissemination of information relating to Senate activities.
   8. Represent the Faculty Senate on administrative councils.
   9. Provide the Secretary of the Senate and the incoming President with an annual report summarizing the Senate activities for the preceding year.
  10. Submit policies or actions approved by the Faculty Senate to the University President for consideration.
  11. Moderate the official faculty listserv.

Section 7.
Duties of the President-Elect shall include the following:
   1. Assist the President in executing the duties of the office.
   2. Serve as President during any absence by the President.
   3. Serve on the Senate Executive Committee.
   5. Represent the Faculty Senate to the Staff Senate and the Student Government.

Section 8
Duties of the Immediate Past President shall include the following:
   1. Advise the President and the President-Elect regarding past practices and other matters for the maintenance of continuity from one administration to the next.
   2. Preside over the senate regular meetings in the absence of both the President and the President-Elect.
   3. Serve on the Senate Executive Committee.

Section 89
The University Registrar shall be the Secretary of the Senate; the Secretary of the Senate is not a voting member of the Senate. The duties of the Secretary shall include:
   1. Acquire the agenda and related attachments, if any, from the President, then prepare and disseminate the agenda in accordance with Section 13.
   2. Maintain a current roster of senators and record attendance to confirm a quorum.
3. Collect and read the member substitution authorizations at the meeting.
4. Record, prepare and disseminate meeting minutes according to Section 15.
5. Schedule a room for all Faculty Senate meetings.
6. Maintain a permanent record of Faculty Senate minutes.
7. Maintain a permanent record of annual reports submitted by the President and chairs of Faculty Senate committees.
8. Maintain records of standing committee membership.
10. Archive all past versions of Constitutions and Bylaws.
11. Verify the eligibility of senators and committee members.

**Section 910.**
Regular meetings of the Senate shall be held at 3:30 pm on the second Monday of each month of the academic year. The meetings will be held the third Monday of the month if the second Monday is a University or state holiday, or if University classes are not yet in session at least one week prior to the second Monday of the month.

**Section 110.**
Special meetings may be called by the President or on petition of one-third of the membership of the Senate.

**Section 121.**
Meetings of the Faculty Senate shall be open to the public. At each Senate meeting the President of the University, the Provost, the Student Body President, and the Staff Senate President will be invited to make announcements. The Faculty Senate President may allow other non-senators to speak and/or provide reports. However, only senators may make motions and only senators may vote on motions before the Senate.

**Section 1213.**
Faculty Senate meetings shall be conducted under Robert’s Rules of Order, Newly Revised. The Faculty Senate will confirm the appointment of a person not on the Senate to serve as Parliamentarian. Whenever doubt arises on questions of procedure the President or a senator may ask the Parliamentarian for a ruling. There is no term limit for Parliamentarian.

**Section 134.**
The primary business of the Faculty Senate is to review, propose, and approve of policy with respect to the following matters:
   a. Academic freedom, including rights and responsibilities.
   b. All curricular matters, including establishment, dissolution, and substantial changes to degree programs.
   c. Research and scholarship.
   d. Admissions standards and prerequisites.
e. Requirements for regular certificates and degrees.

f. Regulations regarding attendance, examinations, grading, scholastic standing, and honors.

g. Teaching quality.

h. Professional standards and criteria for positions accorded academic rank.

i. Policies and procedures for promotion, tenure, and evaluation.

j. And other academic matters.

The agenda for each regular meeting shall be posted to the Faculty Senate website at least one week before each meeting. Any member of the Faculty Senate may request of the President of the Faculty Senate that an item be placed on the agenda. The order of business for Faculty Senate meetings shall be as follows:

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting.
3. Announcements.
4. Consent agenda.
5. Committee and other reports.
6. Unfinished business.
8. Adjournment.

At the October meeting, the primary order of business will be planning and prioritizing Faculty Senate goals for the academic year. The order of business for this meeting will be as follows:

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting.
3. Announcements.
4. Consent agenda.
5. Planning and prioritizing Faculty Senate action for the year.
6. Adjournment.

The President, in consultation with the Executive Committee, may add an urgent piece of new or committee business to this meeting if the timing is critical.

Section 1415.
A quorum of at least 55 percent of the total voting membership of the Senate shall be present in order to conduct Senate business.

Section 1516.
The minutes of the meeting shall be posted to the Senate website by the Secretary within one week after the meeting.


Article III: Senate Committees

Section 1.
Duties of standing committees include:

1. Selecting a chair who will serve as a liaison to the Faculty Senate.
2. Initiating and reviewing policy and policy changes in their areas of responsibility.
3. Providing their recommendations to the Faculty Senate for action.
4. Consulting with and providing advice to the administration, students, and staff when requested to do so.
5. Promptly and responsively discharging their duties.

Section 2.
The Faculty Senate shall confirm the membership of all standing committees, except the Standing Committee on Faculty Rights.

Section 3.
Committees shall determine their own procedural rules. However, no committee shall conduct business without a majority of members present. Each committee will keep such records as necessary to conduct business. In addition, every Faculty Senate Committee (except Academic Integrity, Conflict of Interest Advisory, Executive, Faculty Rights, and Grade Appeals) will make an oral report of progress (5 minutes) at the May meeting of the Faculty Senate or, at the President of the Faculty Senate’s request, submit a written report at the end of the academic year.

Section 4.
Individual representation units will determine their own methods for selecting members of standing committees consistent with Articles IV and V. Such membership shall be presented to the Faculty Senate at the first meeting of each academic year. Committee members will serve two-year terms for at most four consecutive years, unless otherwise specified under the committee description. Committee service begins and ends at the last senate meeting of spring semester, unless otherwise specified.

Section 5.
After the Faculty Senate has approved membership in the Standing Committees, each committee will meet and elect a chair, who will communicate all committee business to the Senate.

Section 6.
All Faculty Senate committee action is subject to review and approval by the Senate.

Section 7.
The Faculty Senate may create special committees as it deems necessary. Such committees shall be discharged upon the completion of their assigned duties. The duties of a special committee should not duplicate work being done by or usurp the responsibility of a standing committee without approval by said standing committee. Special committees shall be commissioned by a majority vote of the full Senate.
Article IV: Faculty Senate Standing Committees

Section 1. Academic Affairs
1. Voting members shall consist of one faculty member, with the rank of full or associate professor, from each of the representation units, a faculty representative of the College of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies designated by the Dean of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies, and two students.
2. Non-voting members shall consist of the Provost (or designee) and the University Registrar.
3. Committee responsibilities include:
   a. Coordinating and recommending actions on proposals for curriculum and course changes that have been received from the colleges
   b. Recommending policies for the evaluation of transfer credit
   c. Recommending policies for graduation
   d. Recommending candidates for graduation
   e. Recommending the scheduling of policies for the efficient utilization of classrooms and laboratories

Section 2. Academic Integrity
1. Membership shall consist of one tenured faculty member with the rank of professor from each representation unit. If a full professor is not available, an associate professor may be appointed.
2. Committee responsibilities include:
   a. Providing investigative assistance on cases involving academic misconduct as described in Policy 326.
   b. Selecting panels of three persons competent to investigate allegations; such panels may include members from outside the University.
   c. Reviewing and recommending policies on academic integrity.

Section 3. Budget
1. Voting members shall consist of one faculty from each representation unit, and a faculty representative of the College of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies designated by the Dean, faculty representative of the Graduate School designated by the Dean of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies.
2. Non-voting members shall consist of the Provost (or designee) and Vice President for Finance (or designee).
3. Committee responsibilities include:
   a. Becoming familiar with the university budget process.
   b. Developing a set of guiding principles which align with strategic priorities, with the intent of informing university budget decisions from a faculty perspective.
c. Soliciting input regarding the budget process from a wide range of faculty and on an ongoing basis.

d. Serve as a resource for the Provost in budget matters.

e. Acting as a conduit of information between faculty and administration for budget discussions and decisions.

Section 4. Conflict of Interest Advisory
1. Committee membership shall consist of five tenured faculty recommended by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and appointed by the Faculty Senate President.

2. No two committee members may have primary appointments in the same representation unit.

3. Committee responsibilities include:
   a. Serving as an advisory body to the administration on the issue of Conflict of Interest.
   b. Initiating and reviewing policies concerning Conflict of Interest and making recommendations regarding such policy at the Faculty Senate.
   c. Hearing and ruling on appeals of decisions in conflict of interest cases.
   d. Acting in accordance with procedures approved by the Faculty Senate, specifically Policy 151.1.

4. In the event that a member of the committee recuses himself/herself from the committee for a particular case or is recused by committee vote, the committee will appoint a replacement, first considering those who have previously served on the committee.

Section 5. Council of College Faculties
1. Membership shall consist of three faculty members elected to staggered three-year terms.

2. Each spring the faculty shall elect by secure electronic ballot a faculty member to serve on the Council of College Faculties.

3. Responsibilities and procedures of the Council of College Faculties are determined by the Constitution and Bylaws of the Council.

Section 6. Equity and Diversity
1. Voting membership shall consist of five faculty members and a faculty representative from the Commission on the Status of Women Faculty recommended by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and appointed by the Faculty Senate President. The Executive Committee shall strive for representation from diverse groups.

2. Non-voting membership shall consist of a representative from the Title IX Co-ordinator (or designee) office of the Vice President for Equity, Diversity, and Global Outreach.

3. Committee responsibilities include:
   a. Reviewing, revising and proposing policies to ensure that rights and considerations of diverse groups or faculty are included in NDSU policy, practices, and procedures.
b. In particular, the committee will explore and identify ways that NDSU can be more inclusive for diverse faculty including women, people of color, and sexual minorities (e.g., lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgendered).

Section 7. Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
1. Voting membership shall consist of one senator from each representation unit, the President, the immediate Past President, and the President-Elect. In the event the immediate Past President is unable or unwilling to serve, the President will appoint another past President as a replacement for the immediate Past President on the committee. The term of office shall be for one year following the regular May meeting.

2. Non-voting membership shall consist of a faculty representative of the College of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies designated by the Dean, a faculty representative of the Graduate School designated by the Dean of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies, a faculty representative of the Provost’s Office designated by the Provost (or designee), a faculty representative from the Commission on the Status of Women Faculty, the Faculty Senate Secretary, and the parliamentarian. The term of office of all members of Executive Committee shall be for one year following the regular May meeting.

3. During the first week of the fall semester, the Executive Committee shall meet and organize for the academic year.

4. Committee responsibilities are the following:
   a. Delegating tasks to Faculty Senate committees.
   b. Reviewing the progress of Faculty Senate committees.
   c. Setting the agenda for upcoming Faculty Senate meetings.
   d. Interpreting, when necessary, provisions of the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws.

Section 8. Faculty Affairs
1. Membership shall consist of one faculty member from each representation unit, a non-voting faculty representative from the Commission on the Status of Women Faculty, and a nonvoting faculty representative of the College of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies designated by the Dean, faculty representative of from the Graduate School designated by the Dean of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies.

2. Committee responsibilities include:
   a. Reviewing policies and procedures relating to faculty affairs such as academic freedom, promotion, tenure, and evaluation, teaching and service.
   b. Reviewing and recommending revisions to the personnel sections of the Faculty Handbook concerning faculty affairs.

Section 9. Faculty Pool for Administrative Search Committees
1. Membership shall consist of two tenured faculty members (at associate or full professor level) from each representation unit and two tenured faculty members appointed by the Faculty Senate President. Areas of expertise, and a two page CV need to be shared with the Faculty Senate President.

2. Members shall serve for a two year term.
3. For each administrative search out of the Provost office, the Provost shall send a request to the Faculty Senate President listing the qualifications required to serve on the committee and the number of faculty members from the faculty pool the Provost will seat on the search committee.

4. The Faculty Senate President (or designee) shall search the pool for qualified candidates, create a list of qualified candidates, and then contact those on the list to see if they are willing to serve. Conflicts of interest need to be revealed at this time. The list shall contain at least the number who will serve on the committee plus one.

5. Once an adequate list of qualified candidates is created, that list shall be sent by the Faculty Senate President (or designee) to the Provost.

6. The Provost shall select from that list the number of faculty members she/he indicated are needed for that search committee.

Section 910. Faculty Rights

1. Membership, responsibilities, and procedures are determined by directives of the North Dakota State Board of Higher Education.

2. Membership consists of five members, from different representation units, elected for five-year terms by the faculty. Membership is restricted to tenured full professors who do not hold an administrative appointment in an academic or non-academic unit.

3. Each spring the faculty shall elect by secure electronic ballot a faculty member to serve on the Standing Committee on Faculty Rights. Committee members’ terms will begin and end on August 15.

4. In the event that a member of the committee recuses himself/herself from the committee for a particular case or is recused by committee vote, the committee will appoint a replacement to serve for that case, preferably a faculty member who has previously served on the committee. Broad representation, while a worthwhile goal, is not always achievable. However, the replacement member should be from a different representation unit than the other four members if reasonably possible.

5. Members sitting on an appeal shall complete that appeal even if the member’s term expires while the appeal is pending.

Section 110. General Education

1. Voting membership shall consist of one tenured faculty member from each representation unit, a representative from the Assessment Committee, and two students selected by the Student Government.

2. Non-voting members shall consist one representative from each of the following: the NDSU Library, Registration and Records, and the Provost (or designee).

3. Committee responsibilities include:
   a. Ensuring that existing courses and experiences meet general education requirements.
   b. Developing criteria and procedures for submitting, evaluating, and approving courses and experiences that meet general education requirements of NDSU and the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.
c. Developing criteria and procedures for submitting, evaluating, and approving courses or experiences that meet the general education requirements for integration into students’ curricula.

d. Coordinating and recommending actions to the Faculty Senate on proposals for approving general education courses.

e. Providing periodic assessment of students’ attainment of intended student outcomes in general education.

f. Studying, coordinating, and recommending to the Faculty Senate policies and procedures for continuing improvement in general education.

g. Selecting two representatives and one alternate for the North Dakota General Education Council.

Section 121. Grade Appeals Board
The purpose of this Board is to provide an avenue for students to challenge any grade they believe to have been unfairly assigned. Membership shall consist of one faculty member and one alternate from each representation unit, the Associate Vice-President of Academic Affairs, a faculty representative of the College of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies designated by the Dean, faculty representative of the Grad School designated by of the Dean of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies, three students and three student alternates selected by the Student Government. The Associate Vice-President of Academic Affairs will serve as Board Chair, and Policy 337 governs process.

1. Faculty shall be elected for three-year terms by their representation unit.
Students should be full-time students with a minimum 2.00 cumulative grade point average and junior standing.

3. Committee responsibilities include:
   a. Hearing charges of inequitable or prejudiced academic evaluations and to provide redress for improper evaluation.
   b. Acting in accordance with procedures approved by the Faculty Senate, specifically Policy 337.

Section 132. Program Review
1. Membership shall consist of one tenured faculty member from each representation unit, the immediate past president of the Faculty Senate, a faculty representative of the College of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies designated by the Dean, a faculty representative of the Grad School designated by the Dean of the College of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies, a faculty representative of the Provost’s Office designated by the Provost (or designee), and two students selected by the Student Government. Each representation unit shall also select an alternate faculty member to serve in case of recusal.

2. Committee responsibilities include:
   a. Developing criteria and procedures for review of academic programs.
   b. Performing a continuing review of graduate and undergraduate academic programs with regard to such factors as mission, need, quality, cost, and contribution to other programs.
   c. Addressing concerns and making recommendation to the Faculty Senate regarding duplication of programs and courses.
   d. Recommending policies for University support to individual programs.
   e. Coordinating the time of and use of external program reviews by accrediting agencies and/or other expert evaluators in its review of specific academic programs.

Section 143. Research & Consulting
1. Voting membership shall consist of one faculty member from each representation unit and a faculty representative of the College of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies designated by the Dean, faculty representative of the Grad School designated by the Dean of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies.

2. Non-voting membership consists of a representative of the Vice President for Research, Creative Activities, and Technology Transfer.

3. Committee responsibilities include:
   a. Initiating and reviewing policies related to University research and consulting issues and make recommendation for consideration of said policy to the Faculty Senate.
Reviewing research development programs and providing technical and funding reviews for faculty proposals submitted to the development programs.

**Section 154. Technology and Instructional Services Committee**

1. Voting membership shall include one faculty member from each of the representation units and a faculty representative of the College of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies designated by the Dean, a faculty representative of the Grad School designated by the Dean of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies.

   Non-voting membership shall include one representative from Information Technology Division Services (ITS).

3. Committee responsibilities shall include:

   a. an annual review of ITS support services to the NDSU teaching and research communities.
   
   b. making recommendations for Faculty Senate approval of any changes proposed by the ITS Division regarding policy, implementation procedures, or classroom and instructional technologies.
   
   c. formulating recommendations regarding needs of the faculty that are unmet by the ITS Division.
   
   d. serving as the liaison between the Faculty Senate and the ITS Division’s administration.

**Article V: Joint Standing Committees**

**Section 1. Senate Coordinating Council**

1. Voting membership shall consist of two representatives each from the Faculty, Student, and Staff Senates, the Faculty Senate President, the Staff Senate President, and the Student Body President.

2. Non-voting membership shall consist of the Provost (or designee), the Vice President for Student Affairs (or designee), the Vice President for Finance and Administration (or designee), and representatives of one of these Vice President’s offices, one of whom will facilitate meetings and one of whom will maintain records. The Vice President’s offices will rotate responsibility for calling meetings and maintaining records every three to five years. The coordinating council may decide to invite policy initiators to the meetings as nonvoting members to explain policy changes.

3. Committee responsibilities include:

   a. Reviewing policy to determine first whether it is ready to bring to any of the Senates or whether it should be returned to the policy makers for clarification and revision.
b. Coordinating the distribution of policies to the appropriate senate body consistent with the Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, and Student Government Constitutions.

c. Sending policies that have been voted on to appropriate channels at NDSU for final approval.

d. Serving in a liaison capacity regarding the Faculty Senate, administration, Staff Senate, and Student Government.

Section 2. Campus Space & Facilities

1. Voting members shall consist of one faculty member from each representation unit, three staff members appointed by the Staff Senate, three student members (graduate, undergraduate, and on-campus) appointed by the Student Government, a faculty representative of the College of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies designated by the Dean, a faculty representative of the Grad School designated by the Dean of College of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies, the Provost (or designee), the Registrar, and the Vice President for Finance and Administration (or designee).

Non-voting members shall consist of the Director of Facilities Management, the Chair of the Department of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, the Assistant to the Director of the North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station, and a representative of the Dean of Libraries.

3. Committee responsibilities include:

a. Provide for the systematic development and review of the “Campus Master Plan” and Guidelines for Campus Development.

b. Recommending policies and procedures to meet the current and future needs for all physical facilities and reviewing changes in University space allocation including classrooms and laboratories.

c. Reviewing proposed building projects and major building renovations prior to presentation to the State Board of Higher Education and the Legislature.

d. Recommending policies for site location for new buildings and for overall landscaping.

e. Recommending traffic and parking regulations, to include cars, buses, bicycles, and pedestrians.

f. Recommending plans for sidewalks, streets, and parking lots.

Section 3. Library

1. Membership shall consist of one faculty member from each representation unit, one undergraduate and one graduate student appointed by the Student Government, a staff member appointed by the Staff Senate, a representative from Information Technology Services, a faculty representative of the College of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies designated by the Dean, a faculty representative of the Grad School designated by the Dean of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies, and the Dean of Libraries.
2. Committee responsibilities include:
   a. Formulating policy recommendations for the NDSU Libraries.

Section 4. University Athletics
1. Membership consists of one faculty member from each representation unit, two students, the Student Body Vice-President, the President of the Student-Athletes Advisory Council, two representatives of the Staff Senate, the Director of Intercollegiate Athletics, the Director of Intercollegiate Women’s Athletics, the Title IX Co-ordinator (or designee) the Vice President for Equity, Diversity, and Global Outreach (or designee) Senior Women’s Administrator, and the Faculty Athletic Representative.

2. The University Athletics Committee serves as the NDSU Athletics Advisory Board as described in the constitution of the National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA).

3. Committee responsibilities include:
   a. Promoting compliance with principles of conduct as defined by the NCAA.
   b. Acting as the Board of Appeals for athletic grievances.
   c. Initiating and reviewing policies concerning University Athletics and making recommendations for consideration of said policy to the Faculty Senate. Such areas of
concern include Guidelines for athletic schedules, guidelines for participation in postseason activities, awards for excellence in athletics, eligibility of athletes.

d. Reviewing upcoming issues at intercollegiate conference meetings and recommending institutional positions.

e. Reviewing the budget of the athletic programs prior to its approval by the University President.

f. Stimulating interest in athletic events throughout the University community.

Section 5. Equal Opportunity Hearing Panel
1. Membership shall consist of six faculty members appointed by the Faculty Senate President in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee, six students appointed by the Student Government President, and six Staff members appointed by the Staff Senate President.

2. Each President shall strive for diverse representation (gender, ethnicity, etc) in her/his group of appointees.

3. Committee responsibilities include:
   a. Acting in accordance with procedures and policy approved by the Senate, specifically Policy 156.

Section 6. University Assessment
1. Membership shall consist of one faculty member from each representation unit, a representative from the General Education Committee, a faculty representative of the College of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies designated by the Dean, a faculty representative of the Grad School designated by the Dean of Graduate and Interdisciplinary Studies, the Provost (or designee), one undergraduate student, and one graduate student appointed by the Student Government, a representative from the Division of Student Affairs, a representative from the NDSU Extension Service, a representative from the Office of Institutional, Research and Analysis, a representative from Distance and Continuing Education, and the Director of the Office of Accreditation and Assessment.

2. Committee responsibilities include:
   a. Periodically reviewing the assessment of student learning in undergraduate and graduate academic programs, within the units in the Division of Student Affairs and in the NDSU Extension Service.

   b. Developing procedures for annual reporting of assessment activities by departments and other academic units, units in the Division of Student Affairs, and the NDSU Extension Service on their assessment activities.

   c. Providing feedback and assistance to departments and other academic units on their assessment activities.
d. Providing a yearly summary of assessment activities to the Faculty Senate, the Provost, the Vice President for Agriculture and University Extension, and the Director of the NDSU Extension Service.

Article VI: Amending the Bylaws

Section 1.
Amendments to the bylaws may be proposed by the Faculty Senate or by a petition signed by twenty-five percent of the Faculty. At a meeting of the Faculty Senate where the amendment is proposed, a vote will be cast to determine whether to consider the amendment at the next regular Faculty Senate meeting. If two-thirds of the votes cast are in favor of the bylaws change will be added to the agenda for the next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Section 2.
The Secretary of the Faculty Senate will distribute the proposed amendment to all members of the faculty no later than nine days after the Faculty Senate votes to consider the amendment at their next regular meeting.

Section 3.
At the next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate, if approved by two-thirds of the ballots cast, the change will be submitted to the University President.

Section 4.
When approved by the University President the changes shall become effective immediately.
General Education New Course Application Guidelines

Any department or college may propose courses to the General Education Committee for consideration as meeting NDSU's General Education requirements. The GE committee will evaluate courses in terms of their meeting the Undergraduate Learning Outcomes approved by the Faculty Senate on April 10, 2015. Proposals will continue to identify the appropriate category within the current general education model, as stipulated by NDUS policy 403.7.

Submission Format
Interested departments must submit the required materials electronically as attachments, preferably as a single PDF file to ndsu.gen.ed@ndsu.edu or as an attachment in Courseleaf CIM, if they are proposing a new course through Academic Affairs.

What to Submit
I. Syllabus or Syllabi
The syllabus serves as the primary source of evidence about the course. This syllabus should be substantially the same as that received by the students enrolled in the course. The syllabus must
- clearly identify which one to two of the seven NDSU Undergraduate Learning Outcome(s) students will meet in the course (the first outcome chosen should correlate with the chosen category)
- describe the learning activities and assignments students will complete in order to demonstrate they have met the identified NDSU Undergraduate Learning Outcome(s), appropriate to the planned course delivery model (see DCE resources for guidance: http://www.ndsu.edu/dce/faculty_resources/getting_started/teaching_online).
- detail how student attainment of the Undergraduate Learning Outcome will be measured
- include the minimum information required by the NDSU Policy 331.1 and the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate https://www.ndsu.edu/fileadmin/policy/331_1.pdf.
- If the proposed course is also offered online or in a hybrid format, please submit all versions of the syllabus and appropriate documentation.

After approval, all General Education Course Syllabi and course web sites must identify the course as meeting General Education requirements and include the undergraduate learning outcomes for which each course is approved.

II. Submit a completed version of the General Education Course Template (see below, p. 3), unless the syllabus includes all of the Template sections in template order.

III. Outcomes Rubrics
To ensure that the course has been designed to achieve the Senate-approved Undergraduate Learning Outcomes for general education, please complete the outcomes rubric corresponding with each selected Undergraduate Learning Outcome. Substantial evidence for at least 60% of the outcome’s defining bullets will be needed for approval.

IV. Explanation (optional)
If desired, the department may submit an accompanying explanation describing the course or any aspect of the syllabus in more detail. The department may wish to include such things as the instructor's focus in the course, class size, or the frequency of offering.

Evaluation
The Committee will evaluate courses under the 2014 Process for Course Approval: “All NDSU General Education courses must meet at least 60% of the bulleted learning outcomes listed under GE Course Application Guidelines”
at least one and no more than two of the seven NDSU Undergraduate Learning Outcomes.” The course review checklist may be found on the General Education Faculty page with the other course application materials.

**Reminders:**
When a course is approved as meeting general education requirements, the department agrees to the following:

1. Instructors or departments will notify the General Education Committee when substantive changes are made in the intended Undergraduate Learning Outcome(s) for the course.

2. The instructor will participate in the scheduling and carrying out of assessment of the Undergraduate Learning Outcome(s) for the course.

3. Instructors and departments will provide evidence for student achievement of the appropriate Undergraduate Learning Outcome(s) in department annual and assessment reports.

4. Instructors should retain copies of all major course materials, including assignments and syllabi, for three years. Some of these materials may be requested by the Committee in periodic course re-evaluations.

5. The committee may require instructors to submit samples of student work for general education assessment and course recertification purposes, upon request.

6. Department chairs/heads are responsible for ensuring that syllabi and websites for all General Education courses continue to comply with General Education Guidelines.

For additional information or to submit electronic course packets, contact ndsu.gen.ed@ndsu.edu

**GENERAL EDUCATION NEW COURSE TEMPLATE**
(For courses seeking approval as meeting general education requirements)

Department: _________________ Course Prefix and Number: ___________

Course Title: __________________________________________________________

Instructor(s): ________________________________

Semester the course will be first offered for General Education: ____________

This form was completed by: ________________________________

Date: ________________________________

Campus phone #: _______________ E-mail: ________________________________
ITEMS TO BE INCLUDED: (Please use these headings as the template.)

1. Course Information
GE category(ies) for which you are submitting this course__________________________________________
Course title/number/credits______________________________________________________________
Bulletin description______________________________________________________________
Students for whom the course is intended (only if applicable)___________________________
(e.g., chemistry for students with good preparation in high school math and science Prerequisites
for courses shall be only other general education courses and may not exclude students from any
major other than that of the department offering the course)

2. Textbook(s)/Course Materials/Library Materials on Reserve (if required)
Please include at least the author, title, edition, publisher, and date for each required material.

3. Course and Undergraduate Learning Outcome(s)
List course and Undergraduate Learning Outcome(s) in measurable terms. The first selected
University Learning Outcome should match the chosen categories, where possible. Outcomes and
categories relate as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>Critical Thinking, Creative Thinking, and Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
<td>Natural and Physical Sciences OR Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Fine Arts</td>
<td>Human Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Determined by instructor, based on course content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness</td>
<td>Determined by instructor, based on course content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Perspectives</td>
<td>Diversity and Global Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>Diversity and Global Perspectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Student Activities to Promote the Undergraduate Learning Outcome(s) for this course
(Explain which student activities in your class (e.g., attending lectures, participating in discussions, reading and integrating perspectives and information, conducting experiments, etc.) promote the Undergraduate Learning Outcome(s) listed under number three. For example, which student activities included in the attachments refer to the outcome(s)? Please provide specific examples of student activities for each outcome and check to ensure they correspond with the completed Undergraduate Learning Outcome Rubric. If this course is also offered online or in a web-based format, please note this and indicate to what extent the student activities differ.

5. Student Workload
Briefly describe how the student workload for the course meets the standard Carnegie Credit Hour definition of two hours outside of class for every hour in class

6. Evaluation of the General Education Undergraduate Learning Outcome(s)
What methods of evaluation do you use to measure the Undergraduate Learning Outcome(s) (e.g., group project, in-class activities, midterm, final, quizzes/tests, papers, attendance, class participation, questions, discussions after class)? What criteria do you use to judge if students are meeting the Undergraduate Learning Outcome(s)? Please provide specific examples of evaluation methods and criteria for the outcome(s). Please link each example to the specific student activities noted under heading four for the outcome(s), and explain how each example provides evidence for the specific bulleted learning outcomes from the Undergraduate Learning Outcome in the Undergraduate Learning Outcome Rubric for the outcome. If this course is also offered online or in a web-based format, please note this and indicate to what extent the evaluation of the outcome(s) differs.

7. Schedule and Topics
(e.g., major assignments, exams/quizzes, projects, vacations, field trips or special activities, unless provided in attached syllabus)

For additional information, contact ndsu.gen.ed@ndsu.edu
Undergraduate Learning Outcome 1: Communication

For a course to meet Undergraduate Learning Outcome 1, student products should be substantial and should constitute at least 50% of the course grade. The course must require that students produce at least three pieces total. Those three assignments must include examples from two of the following categories: writing, oral presentations, or visual communication. Students should receive structured feedback and at least one revision should be required.

For course approval, the course must address 60% or more of the following outcomes for this category. Students will:

- Effectively communicate analysis, knowledge, understanding, expression and/or conclusions
  
  N/A
  
  No
  
  Yes

  Evidence:

- Skillfully use high-quality, credible, relevant sources
  
  N/A
  
  No
  
  Yes

  Evidence:

- Demonstrate appropriate conventions in a variety of communication situations
  
  N/A
  
  No
  
  Yes

  Evidence:

- Demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively with diverse audiences in a variety of contexts
  
  N/A
  
  No
  
  Yes

  Evidence:

- Other. Please specify. This item may augment the 3 (of 4) required bullets above.
  
  N/A
  
  No
  
  Yes

  Evidence: evidence from student activities in course; Revised 9/7/15; Expires

Evidence= evidence from student activities in course; Revised 9/7/15; Expires
Undergraduate Learning Outcome 2: Critical Thinking, Creative Thinking, and Problem Solving

For course approval, the course must address 60% or more of the following outcomes for this category. Students will:

| Explain the nature of evidence used for analysis | N/A | No | Yes |
| Evidence: | |

| Apply quantitative and qualitative methods to collect and analyze data | N/A | No | Yes |
| Evidence: | |

| Apply creativity and divergent thinking | N/A | No | Yes |
| Evidence: | |

| Evaluate the assumptions, evidence, and logic of competing views and explanations | N/A | No | Yes |
| Evidence: | |

| Identify methods of inquiry, approaches to knowledge, and their assumptions and limitations in multiple disciplines | N/A | No | Yes |
| Evidence: | |

| Evaluate, synthesize, and apply evidence to understand and address complex, real world problems | N/A | No | Yes |
| Evidence: | |

| Generate creative, reasoned, approaches or solutions to unscripted, real world problems | N/A | No | Yes |
| Evidence: | |

| Other. Please specify. This item may augment the 4 (of 7) required bullets above. | N/A | No | Yes |
| Evidence: | |

Evidence= evidence from student activities in course
Revised 9/7/15; Expires
Undergraduate Learning Outcome 3: Technology

For course approval, the course must address 60% or more of the following outcomes for this category. Students will:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Description</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use technology to enhance understanding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the social, aesthetic, and ethical implications of technological decisions</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze how technology evolves and shapes human experience</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply technology to demonstrate creativity and solve problems</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate how technology augments our experiences and understandings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other. Please specify. This item may augment the 3 (of 5) required bullets above.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence = evidence from student activities in course
Revised 9/16/15 Expires

NDSU Faculty Senate Minutes
Undergraduate Learning Outcome 4: Natural and Physical Sciences

For course approval, the course must address 60% or more of the following outcomes for this category. Students will:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analyze components and dynamics of natural and physical worlds</td>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop models to explain phenomena within the natural and physical worlds</td>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the role of scientific methods in the study of natural and physical worlds</td>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other. Please specify. This item may augment the 2 (of 3) required bullets above.</td>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence= evidence from student activities in course  Revised 9/16/15  Expires
Undergraduate Learning Outcome 5. Human Societies

For course approval, the course must address 60% or more of the following outcomes for this category. Students will:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify the nature and impact of aesthetic and creative activities in human experience</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze the interplay of self and society, particularly how social structures shape human experiences and how humans shape social structures</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze the components and dynamics of human societies in their artistic, cultural, and historical contexts</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply theories or research methods to understand human events, identities, artifacts, or social structures</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in a creative, aesthetic, or artistic activity</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other. Please specify. This item may augment the 3 (of 5) required bullets above.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence = evidence from student activities in course
Revised 9/16/15
Expires
Undergraduate Learning Outcome 6: Diversity and Global Perspectives

For course approval, the course must address 60% or more of the following outcomes for this category. Students will:

| • Identify how values and contributions of diverse societies provide contexts for individual experiences, values, ideas, artistic expressions, and identities | N/A | No | Yes |
| Evidence: | |

| • Identify the role diversity plays in the ability of biological organisms to adapt to a changing environment | N/A | No | Yes |
| Evidence: | |

| • Analyze how diversity contributes to and shapes solutions to challenges confronting the global community | N/A | No | Yes |
| Evidence: | |

| • Evaluate how diverse systems (both natural and human-made), technologies, or innovations emerge from, interact with, and affect various communities | N/A | No | Yes |
| Evidence: | |

| • Collaborate with others in diverse interpersonal, intercultural, or international settings | N/A | No | Yes |
| Evidence: | |

| • Other. Please specify. This item may augment the 3 (of 5) required bullets above. | N/A | No | Yes |
| Evidence: | |

Evidence = evidence from student activities in course

Revised 9/16/15  Expires
### Undergraduate Learning Outcome 7: Personal and Social Responsibility

For course approval, the course must address 60% or more of the following outcomes for this category. Students will:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Evidence:</th>
<th>Addressed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examine their own values, biases, and conclusions</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze the ethical basis for and implications of personal, professional, and civic decisions</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehend and demonstrate appropriate and healthy standards of personal and professional behavior</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify stewardship of the land and its people as integral to a landgrant university</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze how personal choices impact communities and the world</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in service learning</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other. Please specify. This item may augment the 4 (of 6) required bullets above.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence=** evidence from student activities in course

Revised 9/16/15; Expires
Overview and Guide to New GE Course Proposals

Chairs/Heads

The primary change
The GE committee voted to alter the course proposals forms to have all new or revised courses identify outcomes from the Senate approved University Learning Outcomes list instead of the old outcomes identified for GE.

What does this mean for applying:
- the process is still essentially the same, but all forms got updates to reflect the new outcomes
- because, in many cases, there are outcomes that line up well with the categories, the GE committee has required that the first chosen outcome line up with its related existing category, where possible, like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Categories</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>Critical Thinking, Creative Thinking, and Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
<td>Natural and Physical Sciences OR Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Fine Arts</td>
<td>Human Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Determined by instructor, based on course content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness</td>
<td>Determined by instructor, based on course content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Perspectives (must be paired with one of the first six categories)</td>
<td>Diversity and Global Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Diversity (must be paired with one of the first six categories)</td>
<td>Diversity and Global Perspectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- second selected outcomes can generally be any emphasized by the course
- the new forms will be posted online: https://www.ndsu.edu/facultysenate/gened/forms/

What does this mean for chairs and heads? A continuation of your roles in relation to the NDSU core curriculum.
- Please encourage your faculty to apply for general education course approval, where appropriate.
- Let them know that the forms are available online under General Education (Faculty) in the Directory (updates available soon).
- Support faculty in their assessment of the outcomes.
WHAT DO WE VALUE?
Dynamic Criteria Mapping and NDSU Capstone

A pilot reading of sample Capstone documents
General Education Committee, Fall 2015

CAPSTONE DOCUMENT COLLECTION

- Capstone instructors were asked to send sample documents that asked students to draw on research and provided a high, medium, and low sample, where possible from their sections.
WHAT IS DYNAMIC CRITERIA MAPPING?

- DCM is a process of assessment developed by Bob Broad in 2003 and used widely since.
- It involves readers reading documents for what they value, what they don’t value, and what’s missing to unearth evaluative criteria we care about.

MERITS OF DCM

- context specific
- draws on the knowledge of local stakeholders, particularly faculty
- can provide a baseline for the development of rubrics and tools that reflect local values and goals
GOALS OF OUR DCM

- get a sense of what’s going on in NDSU’s varied Capstone courses
- expose and document any shared values we have for these courses
- based on this increased knowledge, start to build a more consistent or coherent system of assessment

DCM PROCESS FOR OUR PILOT

- 6 pairs of readers were assigned 3 sets of documents to review prior to our 11-18 meeting
- As they reviewed the documents, they took notes on:
  - What they valued in the documents
  - What they didn’t value or found wanting
  - What seemed to be missing in the documents in terms of skills or aspects the readers expected to see there
  - Added for NDSU’s assessment: what are the obstacles to effective assessment? Can outsiders assess these documents in any way?
WHAT WE VALUED

- Claims supported by evidence
- Accurate references
- Variety (of skills, of documents, of addressed audiences)
- Awareness of scholarly conversation
- Synthesis
- Solid knowledge basis
- Effective summaries – abstracts and exec summaries of projects
- Audience accommodation
- Providing context for presenting knowledge
- Signposts

WHAT WE VALUED

- Critical thinking
- Clear organization
- Reflection on process/conclusion
- Analysis
- Rationales offered for decisions
- Mechanics of citation
- Design/presentation aesthetic
- “Professional” qualities
- Correctness (grammar and mechanics)
WHAT WE VALUED

- Fluidity
- Narrative or argument structure vs. collection of facts
- Effective execution of genre
- Disciplinary – tech knowledge
- Application of theory
- Technical language
- Both collaborative and individual work

WHAT WE DIDN’T VALUE

- Emotional/feeling language as evidence/argument
- References not credible – scholarly
- “Thin gruel” – not enough information or analysis
- Lack of granularity – specifics – evidence – synthesis
- Lack of nuance – Critical thinking
- Design (no white space) –
- Poor mechanics/Style
- Casual colloquial
- Inconsistency (of various kinds such as tone, style, design, citation, etc.)
WHAT WAS MISSING/UNDERREPRESENTED

- Application or implications
- Connection between the application and research

PROCESS & POSSIBILITIES

- Disciplinary experts can read more sensitively for certain aspects
- GE is defined by shared goals/outcomes
- Capstone vs. external site for assessment – separate from major?
  - Generic rubric might be helpful
  - 1 credit upper division course for portfolio collection? – external or cross disc.
  - Course/task (Portland State)
- Could create FLCs around outcomes – or capstones
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   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 ndsu.policy.manual@ndsu.edu. All suggestions will be considered, however due to policy format guidelines, they may not be possible. Thank you for your understanding!
SECTION 327
EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS, ACADEMIC DEANS, DIRECTORS AND DEPARTMENT CHAIRS AND HEADS

SOURCE: NDSU President
Faculty Senate

1. Introduction

North Dakota State University believes every university employee deserves regular evaluation of his or her professional duties as they relate to a formal job description and the university’s needs. This process should be transparent and constructive—honest, open, and forthright; including an acknowledgment of the employee’s achievements, as well as an assessment of his or her ability to match the university’s expectations, and a determination of areas needing improvement.

As this evaluation process pertains to the campus provost, full-time vice provosts, academic vice presidents who report to the provost, academic deans, full-time academic associate and assistant deans, directors of academic offices, and chairs and heads, directors, and other academic supervisory personnel. The evaluation process will include input from a variety of groups; faculty will play a major role in evaluation of academic administrators. It is expected that an evaluation will always emphasize areas of special achievement, while also identifying areas needing improvement. This should be a constructive and useful experience to be welcomed by the person being evaluated. It is a required part of an ongoing process designed to ensure that the person evaluated continues to meet both his or her own needs, as well as the needs of affected university publics.

2. Annual Review Timetables

Each administrator covered by this policy will be reviewed annually by the administrative supervisor to whom that person reports in accordance with Policy 167.

3. Comprehensive Review

All administrators covered under this policy will undergo a comprehensive review. Evaluation of deans, directors, and chairs will include input from a variety of groups. This document is designed to guide faculty, as they play a major role in evaluation of academic supervisors. It is expected that deans, chairs, and directors will be evaluated formally. The first comprehensive review will be completed by the end of the administrator’s third year of appointment. Subsequent reviews will occur at least every threefive years, to be completed by the end of the fifth year after the prior review. Interim reviews may be requested by the administrator or by the person to whom the administrator reports. If a review indicates substantial areas of concern or lack of performance, the next review will be completed within two years of that review. The college or department Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation (PTE) committee, supervising administrator, or the employee himself/herself may request an evaluation.

4. Common Review Criteria
Review criteria should be based on the administrator’s job description which may include, but are not limited to the following:

a) leadership, strategic planning and assessment;
b) administration and management;
c) commitment to institutional values including equity and diversity, academic freedom, and shared governance;
d) external relations;
e) service to the broad mission of the University.

The relative importance of evaluation areas will vary with position of the administrator; therefore some criteria above many not apply and others may be added.

5. Procedures

Reviews will be initiated by the administrator’s supervisor, and must be conducted according to the Comprehensive Review Procedures for Academic Administrators.

Review committees – consisting of tenured faculty, relevant administrators, and staff – will be formed in accordance with the Comprehensive Review Procedures. The review committee shall prepare a report summarizing its findings for submission to the supervisor.

As personnel matters, reviews and any materials generated during the review process are confidential. The supervisor will provide a summary of the review for public distribution.

II. Evaluation of academic deans and directors

Evaluation standards

While standards vary among colleges and divisions, the considerations below are designed to help guide Evaluation Committees in forming their evaluation.

4. Leadership. Promotes high standards for the unit in areas of scholarship, instruction, and outreach; communicates priorities, standards, and administrative procedures effectively; articulates a vision for the future; provides national and statewide visibility and recognition for the unit; contributes to the leadership of the university and effectively advocates for the university.

5. Planning. Works effectively with staff in identifying appropriate short-term and long-term goals, in setting priorities, and in focusing resources across all unit missions.

6. Administration and Management. Oversees the recruitment and appointment of highly qualified staff, provides support for the successful recruitment and retention of chairs, faculty and staff, manages the dean’s or director’s office effectively, shares governance with staff when appropriate, provides for effective budget management, works effectively with other colleges, makes decisions in a timely fashion.

7. Affirmative Action. Encourages diversity and implements mechanisms for attracting and retaining women and underrepresented groups; encourages respect for all persons in the unit.

8. Instruction. Coordinates and implements curricula as developed by the faculty.
9. Outreach. Promotes the service component of the unit’s mission, provides mechanisms for the successful delivery of outreach programs, is responsive to the needs of external constituencies.

10. Development. Within the context of the college, successfully works with the Development Foundation and other organizations in identifying and pursuing philanthropic support for the unit; develops public and constituency support for the unit.

11. Personnel Development. Supports and defends academic freedom; provides guidance, support and resources for faculty and staff development, particularly in promotion, tenure and evaluation.

12. Assessment. Effectively evaluates or assesses the units under his/her administration; acknowledges areas of excellence, and recommends areas where improvement is needed.

--- Evaluation Procedures

VI. The Office of the Provost initiates evaluations of these administrators. To ensure faculty involvement, the faculty of a college or unit must organize a committee consisting of full-time non-administrative faculty at the assistant professor, associate professor, or full professor level. Members of the Evaluation Committee are recommended to the Provost the college or unit’s PTE Committee, as appropriate under the evaluative charge of this group. However, members of the college’s PTE Committee cannot appoint themselves.

VII. The number of faculty on the committee may be flexible, but should total at least five. Evaluation Committee members should decide at an initial meeting the number of members constituting a quorum. A timetable should be set in consultation with the Provost or other senior administrative office to assure that the faculty evaluation material is ready in time to be included in the entire evaluation document.

VIII. The Evaluation Committee will propose a written evaluation form based upon the formal job description, dean’s statement of goals and accomplishments, and a statement of self-assessment. A draft of this proposed evaluation form will be made available to the dean/director, who will be invited to offer input before it is finalized. The final evaluation form will be used to solicit responses from faculty, chairs, peer administrators, and others including classified staff, students, recent graduates, and external constituencies, if appropriate.

IX. The Evaluation Committee will analyze the completed evaluation forms and prepare a committee evaluation report summarizing the findings for the Provost. Evaluation Committee members who do not agree with the majority report may append a dissenting report. If the Evaluation Committee believes the needs of the college or division have changed, it may recommend to the Provost that the position description be changed.
X. Upon receipt of the committee’s evaluation report, the Provost will also analyze and summarize the data. The Provost will then meet with the Evaluation Committee to determine consensus and discuss differences. The Provost will prepare a draft report of the final evaluation and provide it to the dean. The Provost will meet with the dean and discuss the findings of the Evaluation Committee. Following this meeting, a final evaluation report will be written and placed in the individual’s official personnel file. To ensure that the process remains open and positive, it is strongly suggested that the dean/director discuss this final evaluation report at a subsequent college or division faculty meeting.

XI. At any time, faculty or staff not on the committee, of course, may contact the Office of the Provost or other appropriate supervising officer directly with compliments or concerns relating to the person being evaluated.

II. Evaluation of chairs and heads

- Evaluation standards
  While standards vary among colleges and divisions, the considerations below are designed to help guide Evaluation Committees in forming their evaluation.

- Leadership. Promotes high standards for the unit in areas of scholarship, instruction, and outreach; communicates priorities, standards, and administrative procedures effectively; articulates a vision for the future; provides national and statewide visibility and recognition for the unit; contributes to the leadership of the university and effectively advocates for the university.

- Planning. Works effectively with staff in identifying appropriate short-term and long-term goals, in setting priorities, and in focusing resources across all unit missions.

- Administration and Management. Oversees the recruitment and appointment of highly qualified staff, provides support for the successful recruitment and retention of faculty and staff, manages the department office effectively, shares governance with staff when appropriate, provides for effective budget management, works effectively with other departments, makes decisions in a timely fashion.

- Affirmative Action. Encourages diversity and implements mechanisms for attracting and retaining women and underrepresented groups; encourages respect for all persons in the unit.

- Instruction. Coordinates and implements curricula as developed by the faculty.

- Outreach. Promotes the service component of the unit’s mission, provides mechanisms for the successful delivery of outreach programs, is responsive to the needs of external constituencies.

- Development. Within the context of the (college) unit, successfully works with the Development Foundation and other organizations in identifying and pursuing philanthropic support for the unit; develops public and constituency support for the unit.
Personnel Development. Supports and defends academic freedom; provides guidance, support and resources for faculty and staff development, particularly in promotion, tenure and evaluation.

Assessment. Effectively evaluates or assesses the units under his/her administration; acknowledges areas of excellence, and recommends areas where improvement is needed.

Evaluation Procedure for chairs and heads

1. Chairs also must be evaluated at least once every three years, with the dean of the college or the director of the unit initiating the evaluation process. The dean, in conjunction with the department faculty, will form an ad hoc committee consisting of at least three faculty members.

2. This ad hoc committee chair will propose a written evaluation form based upon the chair’s formal job description, statement of goals and accomplishments, and a statement of self-assessment. A draft of this proposed evaluation form will be made available to the chair, who will be invited to offer input before the document is finalized. The final evaluation form will be used to solicit response from faculty, peer administrators, and others including classified staff, students, recent graduates, and, if appropriate, external constituencies.

3. The ad hoc committee will analyze the completed evaluation forms and prepare a report summarizing the findings for the dean. Evaluation Committee members who do not agree with the majority report may append a dissenting report. If the Evaluation Committee believes the needs of the department or unit have changed, it may recommend to the dean that the position description be changed.

4. Upon receipt of the report from the Evaluation Committee, the dean will also analyze and summarize the data. The dean will then meet with the ad hoc committee to determine consensus and discuss differences. The dean will prepare a draft report and provide it to the chair. The chair will meet with the dean regarding the report. Following this meeting, a final report will be written and placed in the individual’s official personnel file. To ensure that the process remains open and positive, it is strongly suggested that the chair discuss this evaluation at a subsequent department faculty meeting.

5. At any time, faculty or staff not on the committee, of course, may contact the deans’ office or other appropriate supervising officer directly with compliments or concerns relating to the person being evaluated.

HISTORY:
New July 1990
Amended April 1992
Amended January 1995
Amended January 1996
Amended February 1997
COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW PROCEDURES
ADAPTED FROM SECTION 327
EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

1. Introduction

In addition to annual review, full-time academic administrators are subject to comprehensive review in their third year of initial appointment and at least once every five years thereafter. The comprehensive review process for academic administrators follows the guidelines described below.

2. Evaluation of Provost, Vice Provosts, and Academic Vice Presidents

a) Initiating evaluation. Reviews will be initiated by the administrator’s supervisor. A review committee will be formed, consisting of tenured faculty, relevant administrators and staff.

b) First meeting. At the review committee’s first meeting, members will select a committee chair; the chair must hold a tenured faculty appointment. The committee chair’s duties are to call meetings and facilitate the work of the committee. The committee will also select a records keeper from the committee members to take minutes, to archive documents, and will determine the number of members constituting a quorum.

c) Timetable. A timetable shall be set in consultation with the immediate supervisor or other senior administrative office to ensure that the evaluation material is ready in time to be included in the administrator’s evaluation report.

d) Evaluation form and other input. The review committee will adapt a standard evaluation form based on the administrator’s job description, goals, and the relevant review criteria that apply in this context. A draft of the adapted evaluation form will be made available to the administrator, who will be invited to offer input before it is finalised. The final evaluation form will be used to solicit anonymous responses from peer administrators, deans, chairs/heads, and appropriate faculty, staff, students, and other constituents. Additional input from interviews or other solicited/contributed materials may be considered. Both the review committee and the immediate supervisor can access information assembled as part of the review process.

e) Review committee report. Based on the summarized findings of the solicited responses and other input, and the administrator’s statement of goals and accomplishments and a self-assessment, the review committee will write an evaluation report for submission to the supervisor. Review committee members who do not agree with the majority report may append a dissenting report. If the review committee believes
the needs of the university or division have changed, it may recommend that the position
description be changed. The chair of the review committee will meet with the immediate
supervisor regarding the review committee’s report.

f) **Supervisor report and action plan.** An evaluation report will be written by the
immediate supervisor, accompanied by an action plan to address any performance
concerns, needed improvements or changes in position responsibilities. The supervisor
will meet with the administrator to review the evaluation report and action plan. The final
supervisor’s report and action plan will be placed in the administrator’s personnel file.

g) **Other avenues for feedback.** At any time, individuals not on the review committee
may contact the review committee or appropriate immediate supervisor directly with
comments or concerns relating to the person being evaluated.

### 3. Evaluation of Academic Deans

#### a) Initiating evaluation.** The Office of the Provost initiates evaluations of academic
deans (including dean of the graduate school and dean of libraries).

#### b) Forming the review committee.** To ensure faculty involvement in evaluation of
college deans, members of the review committee are recommended to the provost by
the college or unit’s PTE committee. Members of the PTE committee cannot appoint
themselves as a group. The review committee must consist of full-time non-
administrative faculty, as well as relevant staff and other constituents. The number of
faculty on the committee may be flexible, but should total at least five, including at least
three tenured faculty members and two full professors. Assistant professors may serve,
as long as the tenured faculty minimum is met. To ensure constituent involvement in
evaluation of the dean of the graduate school and the dean of libraries, members of the
review committee are recommended to the provost by the executive committee of the
faculty senate. The review committee must consist of tenured faculty and relevant
administrators and staff. A majority of any review committee shall be comprised of
faculty.

#### c) First meeting.** At the review committee’s first meeting, members will select a
committee chair; the chair must hold a tenured faculty appointment. The committee
chair’s duties are to call meetings and facilitate the work of the committee. The
committee will also select a records keeper from the committee members to take
minutes, to archive documents, and will determine the number of members constituting a
quorum.

#### d) Timetable.** A timetable shall be set in consultation with the provost or other senior
administrative office to ensure that the evaluation material is ready in time to be included
in the administrator’s evaluation report

#### e) Evaluation form and other input.** The review committee will adapt a standard
evaluation form based upon the dean’s job description, goals, and the relevant review
criteria that apply in this context. A draft of the adapted evaluation form will be made
available to the dean, who will be invited to offer input before it is finalized. The final
evaluation form will be used to solicit anonymous responses from faculty, chairs/heads,
peer administrators, and others including classified staff, students, recent graduates, and
external constituencies. Additional input from interviews or other solicited/contributed
materials may be considered. Both the review committee and the provost can access information assembled as part of the review process.

f) **Review committee report.** Based on the summarized findings of the solicited responses and other input, and the dean’s statement of goals and accomplishments and a self-assessment, the review committee will write an evaluation report for submission to the provost. Review committee members who do not agree with the majority report may append a dissenting report. If the review committee believes the needs of the college have changed, it may recommend to the provost that the position description be changed. The chair of the review committee will meet with the provost regarding the review committee’s report.

g) **Provost’s report and action plan.** An evaluation report will be written by the provost, accompanied by an action plan to address any performance concerns, needed improvements or changes in position responsibilities. The provost will meet with the dean to review the evaluation report and action plan. The provost’s final evaluation report and action plan will be placed in the dean’s, official personnel file.

h) **Other avenues for feedback.** At any time, individuals not on the committee may contact the review committee or provost with comments or concerns relating to the person being evaluated.

4. **Evaluation of Chairs and Heads**

   a) **Annual feedback.** Systematic written feedback from faculty, staff, and others is to be collected and summarized annually as input to the dean’s annual evaluation of chairs or heads. The process for annual feedback may be determined by the department.

   b) **Initiating evaluation.** The dean of the college or director of the unit initiates review of chairs and heads. The dean, in conjunction with the department faculty, will form an ad hoc review committee consisting of at least three full-time non-administrative faculty members, at least two of whom are tenured, and other appropriate stakeholders. The majority of the review committee shall be comprised of faculty.

   c) **First meeting.** At the review committee’s first meeting, members will select a committee chair; the chair must hold a tenured faculty appointment. The committee chair’s duties are to call meetings and facilitate the work of the committee. The committee will also select a records keeper from the committee members to take minutes, to archive documents, and will determine the number of members constituting a quorum.

   d) **Timetable.** A timetable shall be set in consultation with the dean to ensure that the evaluation material is ready in time to be included in the administrator’s evaluation report.

   e) **Evaluation form and other input.** The review committee will adapt a standard evaluation form based upon the chair or head’s job description, goals, and the relevant review criteria that apply in this context. A draft of the adapted evaluation form will be made available to the chair or head, who will be invited to offer input before it is finalized. The final evaluation form will be used to solicit anonymous responses from faculty, peer administrators, and others including classified staff, students, recent graduates, and, if
appropriate, external constituencies. Additional input from interviews or other solicited/contributed materials may be considered. Both the review committee and the dean can access information assembled as part of the review process.

f) Review committee report. Based on the summarized findings of the solicited responses and other input, and the chair or head’s statement of goals and accomplishments and a self-assessment, the review committee will write an evaluation report for submission to the dean. Review committee members who do not agree with the majority report may append a dissenting report. If the review committee believes the needs of the department or unit have changed, it may recommend to the dean that the position description be changed. The chair of the review committee will meet with the dean regarding the review committee’s report.

g) Dean’s report and action plan. An evaluation report will be written by the dean, accompanied by an action plan to address any performance concerns, needed improvements or changes in position responsibilities. The dean will meet with the chair or head to review the evaluation report and action plan. The final dean’s report and action plan will be placed in the chair or head’s official personnel file.

h) Other avenues for feedback. At any time, individuals not on the review committee may contact the review committee or deans’ office or other appropriate supervising officer directly with comments or concerns relating to the person being evaluated.

5. Evaluation of Associate or Assistant Deans and Directors

a) Annual feedback. Systematic written feedback from faculty, staff, and others is to be collected and summarized annually as input to the dean’s annual evaluation of associate or assistant deans and directors. The process for annual feedback may be determined by the college.

b) Initiating evaluation. The supervising dean initiates the evaluation of associate or assistant deans and directors. The dean, in conjunction with the department faculty, will form an ad hoc review committee consisting of at least three full-time non-administrative faculty members, at least two of whom are tenured, and other appropriate stakeholders based on the individual’s job description. The majority of the review committee shall be comprised of faculty.

c) First meeting. At the review committee’s first meeting, members will select a committee chair; the chair must hold a tenured faculty appointment. The committee chair’s duties are to call meetings and facilitate the work of the committee. The committee will also select a records keeper from the committee members to take minutes, to archive documents, and will determine the number of members constituting a quorum.

d) Timetable. A timetable shall be set in consultation with the immediate supervisor or other senior administrative office to ensure that the evaluation material is ready in time to be included in the administrator’s evaluation report.

e) Evaluation form and other input. The review committee will adapt a standard evaluation form based on the administrator’s job description, goals, and the relevant evaluation criteria that apply in this context. A draft of the adapted evaluation form will be
made available to the administrator, who will be invited to offer input before it is finalized. The final evaluation form will be used to solicit anonymous responses from members of groups impacted by or involved with the work of the associate/assistant dean or director (such as faculty, staff, peer administrators, deans, chairs/heads, students, and other constituents). Additional input from interviews or other solicited/contributed materials may be considered. Both the review committee and the immediate supervisor can access information assembled as part of the review process.

f) Review committee report. Based on the summarized findings of the solicited responses and other input, and the administrator’s statement of goals and accomplishments and a self-assessment, the review committee will write an evaluation report for submission to the dean. Review committee members who do not agree with the majority report may append a dissenting report. If the review committee believes the needs of the university or division have changed, it may recommend that the position description be changed. The chair of the review committee will meet with the dean regarding the review committee’s report.

g) Dean’s report and action plan. An evaluation report will be written by the dean, accompanied by an action plan to address any performance concerns, needed improvements or changes in position responsibilities. The dean will meet with the administrator to review the evaluation report and action plan. The final dean’s report and action plan will be placed in the administrator’s personnel file.

h) Other avenues for feedback. At any time, individuals not on the review committee may contact the review committee or appropriate immediate supervisor directly with comments or concerns relating to the person being evaluated.
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SECTION: Policy 151: Code of Conduct

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: The previous language was vague and ambiguous, such as what the requirements to be collegial and positive entailed. As a result, unfortunate misinterpretations of policy could adversely affect employment. The new language focuses on professional conduct with clearer guidance.
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   This portion will be completed by Mary Asheim.
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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 ndsu.policy.manual@ndsu.edu. All suggestions will be considered, however due to policy format guidelines, they may not be possible. Thank you for your understanding!
1. Introduction and Application.
   This Code of Conduct governs the State Board of Higher Education and its members and establishes minimum standards for all NDUS officers and employees. The Board and entire NDUS are committed to uphold the highest ethical and professional standards. All Board members and NDUS officers and employees must, at all times, comply with all applicable laws, regulations, policies and procedures. Activities that achieve results unlawfully or in violation of applicable policies or procedures or by unethical behavior - including, but not limited to, payments for illegal acts, indirect contributions, rebates, or bribery - are not tolerated and must be reported. All conduct must meet or exceed minimum standards established by law.

2. General Conduct.
   The Board supports an environment that is free of discrimination or harassment. All Board members, officers and employees are expected to conduct themselves in a businesslike manner. Unlawful consumption of alcoholic beverages or use of illegal drugs, being at work while under the influence of alcohol or drugs, disruptive behavior, gambling, unauthorized use of public property or resources and other unauthorized activities that disrupt the efficient and economical administration of the NDUS, are prohibited. Violation of applicable laws or policies governing possession and use of alcoholic beverages or drugs, including the Drug Free Workplace Act, SBHE Policy 615 or applicable system office or institution policies, are prohibited. Likewise, sexual or other harassment (including actions contributing to a hostile work environment) in violation of federal or state law or SBHE Policy 603.1, is prohibited.

   Officers and employees are expected to uphold the values of honesty, respect, integrity and trust. In addition, when interacting with one another and the public, all are expected to behave in a professional, collegial, cordial, civil, positive, respectful and ethical manner.

   All NDSU personnel are subject to the rules and policies of North Dakota State Board of Higher Education, NDSU, and their respective department or unit. NDSU expects all University personnel to be aware of, and comply with, NDSU’s policies and procedures that apply to them, and requires those reporting to them to do the same. Employees are expected to uphold the values of honesty, respect, integrity, and trust.

   NDSU requires all employees to act professionally in their interactions with others including:
   
   A. Following training and job specific requirements as stated in the employee’s job description or appointment letter,
   
   B. Respecting the value, creativity, and diversity of all persons, which includes diversity of opinions and professional approaches to doing things. (See Policy 100: Equal Opportunity and Non-discrimination Policy and Policy 325: Academic Freedom for guidance.)
C. Contributing to an environment of respectful and productive working relationships with those with whom the person interacts, and

D. Making good faith efforts to resolve differences constructively.

3. Conflicts of Interest.
All Board members, officers and employees are expected to perform their duties conscientiously, honestly, and in accordance with the best interests of the NDUS. All Board members, officers and employees must comply with applicable federal and state laws. Board members, officers and employees may not unlawfully use their position or the knowledge gained as a result of their position for private or personal advantage. All Board members, officers and employees are responsible for their own actions. Any individual who has concerns or questions regarding a perceived or potential conflict or regarding application or interpretation of federal or state law or SBHE policy is encouraged to communicate with a superior or with legal counsel.

3.1 Conflict of Interest – Contracts.
An officer of the North Dakota State Board of Higher Education authorized to sell or lease any property or make any contract in the officer’s official capacity is subject to the provisions of N.D.C.C. Section 12.1-13-03 and may not be interested in any such sale, lease or contract.

Pursuant to N.D.C.C. Section 48-02-12, employees of the Board may not have any interest in a public construction or repair contract.

An employee of the Board may not have an interest in any contract involving the expenditure of public or institutional funds entered into by the institution that the employee serves or by the Board unless:

a. N.D.C.C. Sections 12.1-13-03 and 48-02-12 do not apply; and

b. The contract is approved by the institution’s chief financial officer or, if the employee in question is the chief financial officer or president of an institution or an officer of the Board, by the Board, following full disclosure of the employee’s interest.

All employees involved in projects receiving federal funds shall consult applicable federal laws and regulations and comply with conflict of interest rules which may govern federal grants or other sponsored agreements.

An officer or other employee who violates this policy is subject to dismissal or other disciplinary action.

Employees of NDSU authorized (including delegated authority) by Policy 712 to enter into contracts on behalf of the University must sign the North Dakota State University Conflict of Interest Disclosure Statement. All other employees will be provided notice about this Policy but need only sign the statement if they have a conflict. Notices and collection of statements shall be administered by the Purchasing Office.

Employees have an obligation to act in the best interests of NDSU. Any direct or indirect personal or financial interest which could create a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest in any agreement, transaction or relationship must be disclosed by the employee by completing and signing the North Dakota State University Conflict of Interest Disclosure Statement and submitting it to the employee’s supervisor. This includes but is not limited to the disclosure of privately owned assets being used or otherwise commingled
with state assets and participation in any foundation, business or public entity which may create a conflict with an employee’s obligations to NDSU. See also NDSU Policy 152: External Professional Activities.

4. Outside Activities and Employment.
Board members, officers and employees share responsibility for good public relations, especially at the community level. Their readiness to help with religious, charitable, educational, and civic activities brings credit to the NDUS and is encouraged. However, officers and employees must comply with applicable federal and state laws, policies in Section 611 of the SBHE Manual and related system office and institution policies. At all times, employees must avoid outside activities that create an excessive demand upon their time and attention, thus depriving the NDUS of their best efforts in fulfilling their job duties or that create a conflict of interest, or an obligation, interest, or distraction that interferes with the independent exercise of judgment in the NDUS’ best interest.

5. Relationships with Clients and Suppliers; Conflicts of Interest.
Board members are not NDUS employees and may have other full or part-time employment and other professional, civic and personal responsibilities and activities, in addition to their part-time service as Board members. Nevertheless, Board members must be familiar with and comply with applicable laws governing conflict of interest that apply to Board members and should strive to avoid other activities that create an obligation, interest or distraction that interferes with the independent exercise of judgment in the best interest of the NDUS. They should avoid investing in or acquiring a financial interest for their own accounts in any business organization that has a contractual relationship with the NDUS or NDUS institution, or that provides goods or services to the NDUS, if such investment or interest could influence or create the impression of influencing their decisions in the performance of their duties.

Excluding on de minimus contributions, such as purchase of a meal at reasonable value as part of a conference or other event with no conditions attached to such purchase and as permitted under applicable federal and state laws, Board members, officers and employees may not accept favor of any person or organization with whom or with which the NDUS or NDUS institution has, or is likely to have, business dealings. Similarly, Board members, officers and employees may not accept any other preferential treatment under circumstances that because of their position with the NDUS, the preferential treatment may influence or be perceived as influencing their official conduct. Board members, officers and employees may not receive payment or compensation of any kind from any source for NDUS duties and responsibilities, except as authorized under applicable law or NDUS pay policies. Specifically, the acceptance of "kickbacks" or commissions in any form from vendors, suppliers or others is prohibited.

7. NDUS Funds and Other Assets
Board members, officers and employees who have access to NDUS fund and other assets in any form must follow the prescribed procedures for recording, handling, and protecting money and other assets as detailed in applicable NDUS procedure manuals or other explanatory materials. Any person who has information concerning possible fraud or dishonesty shall immediately report such information to a superior or to legal counsel.

Board members, officers and employees responsible for spending or approving expenditure of NDUS funds or incurring any reimbursable expenses must comply with all applicable laws and policies and use good judgment on behalf of the NDUS to ensure that good value is received for every expenditure. NDUS funds and all other assets are for NDUS purposes only and not for personal use or benefit. NDUS or other public equipment, supplies and other property or assets
8. NDUS Records and Communications.
Accurate and reliable records of many kinds are necessary to meet NDUS legal and financial obligations and to manage the affairs of the NDUS. NDUS books and records must reflect in an accurate and timely manner all business transactions. Board members, officers and employees responsible for accounting and recordkeeping must fully disclose and record all assets and liabilities and exercise due diligence in enforcing these requirements. Board members, officers and employees must not make or engage in any false record or communication of any kind, whether internal or external, including, but not limited to, false expense, attendance, enrollment, financial, or similar reports and statements, or false advertising, deceptive marketing practices, or other misleading representations.

Board members, officers and employees must take care to separate their personal roles from their NDUS positions when communicating on matters not involving NDUS business. They may not use NDUS identification, stationery, supplies, and equipment for personal or political matters. When communicating publicly on matters that involve NDUS business, Board members, officers and employees may not represent that they speak for the NDUS, unless that is one of their duties or they are otherwise authorized to do so. When dealing with anyone outside the NDUS, including public officials, Board members, officers and employees must take care not to compromise the integrity or damage the reputation of the NDUS or any institution.

10. Prompt Communications.
In all matters involving communication with NDUS students, customers, suppliers, government authorities, the public and others, Board members, officers and employees must endeavor to make complete, accurate, and timely communications and respond promptly and courteously to all proper requests for information and complaints.

11. Privacy, Confidentiality and Open Records.
Board members, officers and employees must at all times comply with applicable laws, regulations and SBHE policies concerning privacy, confidential records, access to open records and records retention.

12. Reporting Suspected Violations; Procedures for Investigating Reports.
Officers and employees shall report suspected violations of this Code to their superior, some other senior manager or administrator or legal counsel. In addition, the NDUS shall maintain a fraud hotline and suspected violations may be reported by use of that hotline. Any officer or employee who makes a report in good faith shall be protected against retaliation of any kind; any officer or employee who retaliates or attempts retaliation in response to a good faith report shall be subject to dismissal or other discipline. Failure to report known or suspected violations is in itself a violation and may lead to dismissal or other disciplinary action.

Board members who have information concerning a possible violation of this Code or are uncertain about application or interpretation of any legal requirement should report the matter to the chancellor, legal counsel or the attorney general.

Alleged violations of this Code involving NDUS officers or employees shall be investigated by the appropriate NDUS officer. All officers and employees shall cooperate in investigations of alleged violations. A violation of this Code is cause for dismissal or other appropriate disciplinary action, in addition to any criminal or other civil sanctions that apply.
Institution Codes.
The NDUS office and each NDUS institution shall adopt and implement a Code of Conduct consistent with this Code and Committee of Sponsoring Organization of the Treadway Commission (COSO) Standards. NDUS office and institution codes shall include:

a. A Statement of the organization's values;

b. The people or groups of people affected;

c. A brief description or list of key behaviors that are accepted and not accepted;

d. How to identify and resolve conflicts of interest;

e. How to report violations and to whom;

f. Consequences of violating the Code;

g. Consequences of failure to report known or suspected violations; and

h. How reports will be investigated.

The NDUS office and each institution shall require that each new employee review the Code of Conduct and sign a statement certifying the employee has read and agrees to comply with the Code. Further, all benefited employees are required to annually certify in writing that they have read and are in compliance with the Code of Conduct.

Resources and Related Policies:

NDSU Policy 100: Equal Opportunity and Nondiscrimination Policy
NDSU Policy 110: Employment of Relatives
NDSU Policy 100.1: Nondiscrimination of the basis of Disabilities and Reasonable Accommodation
NDSU Policy 112: Pre-employment and Current Employee Criminal Record Disclosure
NDSU Policy 151: Conflict of Interest
NDSU Policy 151.1: External Activities and Conflicts of Interest
NDSU Policy 152: External Professional Activities
NDSU Policy 155: Alcohol and Other Drugs: Unlawful and Unauthorized Use by Students and Employees
NDSU Policy 160: Political Activities of University Employees
NDSU Policy 161: Fitness for Duty
NDSU Policy 162: Sexual Harassment Policy
NDSU Policy 162.1: Consensual Relationships
NDSU Policy 169: Employee Responsibility and Activities: Theft and Fraud
NDSU Policy 169.1: Employee Misuse of Property Reports - - Protections
NDSU Policy 190: Employee Responsibility and Activities: Intellectual Responsibility
NDSU Policy 323: Selection of Textbooks and other Curricular Materials
NDSU Policy 326: Academic Misconduct
NDSU Policy 345: Research Involving Human Subjects
NDSU Policy 340.1: Coursepacks
NDSU Policy 400: Purchasing - General Policies
NDSU Policy 406: Surplus Property
NDSU Policy 505: Property, Plant and Equipment
NDSU Policy 700: Services and Facilities Usage
NDSU Policy 700.1: Use of University Name
NDSU Policy 700.2: Taking Equipment Off-Campus
NDSU Policy 700.3: Personal Use of State Property
NDSU Policy 710.1: Web Advisory Board
NDSU Policy 712: Contract Review
NDSU Policy 718: Public/Open/Restricted Records
NDSU Policy 823: Financial Disclosure - sponsored Projects
NDUS Policy 603.3: Nepotism
NDUS Policy 611.2: Employee Responsibility and Activities: Intellectual Responsibility
NDUS Policy 611.4: Employee Responsibility and Activities: Conflict of Interest
NDUS Policy 611.9: Selection of Textbooks and Other Curricular Materials
NDUS Policy 803.1: Purchasing Procedures
Conflict of Interest Form
NDSU Consulting Authorization Request Form
NDSU Fraud Hotline
AAUP Statement of Professional Ethics
NDSU Research Foundation
N.D.C.C. Ch. 12.1-13 (See section 12.1-13-03: Public servant's interest in public contracts.)
N.D.C.C. Ch.48-01.2: (See section 48-01.2-08: Officers must not be interested in contract.)
N.D.C.C. Ch. 44-04: (See section 44-04-09: Nepotism.)
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SECTION: 337 Examinations and Grading Grade Appeals Board
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SECTION 337 EXAMINATIONS AND GRADING
GRADE APPEALS BOARD

SOURCE: NDSU President Faculty Senate Policy
The Grade Appeals Board purpose and membership are established in Part XI of the Faculty Senate Bylaws.

GRADE APPEALS BOARD PROCEDURES AND PREREQUISITES FOR APPEAL:
1. The Board may be utilized only after the student has exhausted all possible appeal routes within the college offering the course involved. Each individual college will be expected to specify such appeal routes, but the following guidelines should be adhered to as closely as possible and will apply in the absence of any specialized procedures.

The academic freedom of instructors is acknowledged in this policy and as such, the evidence for overturning a grade assigned by an instructor must be overwhelming and clearly demonstrate that the instructor used inappropriate or irrelevant factors in determining a course grade. Situations in which a student might consider an appeal include but are not limited to the following:
- perceived violations of the grading policy, as stated in the course syllabus
- other violations of NDSU policy pertaining to student grading
- influence of irrelevant factors such as race, sex, or personal animosity
- erroneous grading (e.g. mathematical error)
- inequitable grading
- medical or other hardship that 1) could justify either a course grade of "incomplete" or exemptions from specific grading components in the grade computation, and 2) was communicated with the instructor in a timely manner when the issue(s) arose.

Grade assigned as a result of Policy 335 processes; Code of Academic Responsibility and Conduct may not be appealed using this policy and its processes.

a. A student who disputes an assigned grade may initiate a request for a change of a grade with the instructor within fifteen (15) instructional days of the first day of the semester immediately following the semester in which the grade was awarded. For Spring Semester courses, the request must be made within fifteen (15) instructional days of the start of Fall Semester, if the student is not enrolled for a Summer term but is enrolled in Fall Semester.

An appeal is deemed formally initiated when the student presents the Grade Appeal Form to the instructor. The Grade Appeal should also include the following as supplementary material:
- the course syllabus including grading procedures
- the grade originally assigned and the requested grade change
- the justification for the proposed grade change based on the specific disputed criterion (e.g. an assignment, project, or exam grade) and the grading system outlined in the course syllabus.

The instructor must date and initial the form at that point. Within five (5) instructional days, the instructor shall inform the student, via NDSU email, of his/her decision, record the steps taken to resolve the appeal and the decision on the Grade Appeal Form, date and sign the Form, and then return the Form to the student. If the appeal is approved, the
form along with a memo and/or Grade Reporting Form indicating the new grade shall be returned to Registration and Records. If the appeal is denied by the instructor, the Form is returned to the student to proceed to the next level if desired.

b. If there is an unsatisfactory decision at the instructor level, the student must consult may present the appeal to the department chair/head and the dean or a designated college committee, proceeding from one level to the next only after an unsatisfactory decision of the conflict at that level. In the event that within five (5) instructional days. The chair/head should return his/her decision on the appeal to the student. If the instructor is also the department chair/head or dean, he or she need only be consulted in the capacity of instructor. The student shall have five (5) instructional days following and the appeal may be continued at the college level.

c. If an unsatisfactory outcome of the appeal to continue with the appeal decision is rendered at the next department level, the student may proceed to the college dean within five (5) instructional days.

d. At each stage, the individual considering the appeal shall inform the student and instructor of his/her decision within five (5) instructional days, record the steps taken to resolve the appeal and the decision on the Grade Appeal Form, and date and sign the Form.

e. The instructor must be informed of all proceedings in Section b above by the person in charge at the level.

f. Both the instructor and the student shall have the right at any time during the proceedings to call a meeting of all persons involved in submitting and considering the appeal and, optionally, to invite the Board to send an observer to that meeting.

g. In the event that the instructor is no longer employed by North Dakota State University, or is on leave from the University, the instructor may designate another faculty member from within the department to represent his/her interest in the grade appeal. If the instructor is no longer employed by North Dakota State University, or is not available to designate a substitute, the department chair/head shall represent the absent faculty. If the department head cannot act impartially, a substitute shall be designated by the dean.

2. In the event of an unsatisfactory decision within the college level, the student may submit a formal written appeal to the Grade Appeals Board Chair. Such an appeal shall be made within fifteen (15) instructional days after conclusion of the college proceedings as stated above.

3. In a college dean or a department chair/head, with approval of the college dean, may change a grade without the instructor’s approval in extraordinary circumstances (such as. Such circumstances include avoiding a clear injustice or mistake, e.g., a clear mathematical error, violation of policy, or instructor leaves, refused to respond to inquiries about the grade, there is a mathematical error or violation of the syllabus, and after the procedures in Subsection 1 above have been completed, a department head, with approval of the dean of the college, can change a grade without the instructor’s approval). In such cases, a note of record explaining the basis for the decision and the new grade shall be filed with the Registrar. An instructor can appeal such a grade change to the Grade Appeals Board pursuant to this Policy. Colleges can adopt procedures to implement this subsection. (Note: The purpose of this...
provision is to avoid compelling the student to go through the formal appeal to the Grade Appeals Board where the outcome is certain and clear in the student’s favor.)

4. The Grade Appeals Board Chair will handle appeals that proceed to that level.

5. In case of student appeal to the Grade Appeals Board, the Chair will send a copy of the appeal document to the instructor within ten (10) instructional days. The instructor will have fifteen (15) instructional days to respond directly to the Board Chair with any additional information regarding the student's appeal.

6. The Board Chair will then distribute copies of the appeal document and the instructor's response to all Board members and the instructor within five (5) instructional days. If a Board member is unable to participate in the proceedings, his or her alternate will act for the member.

7. Each Board member (or alternate) must inform the Board Chair in writing within five (5) instructional days indicating whether there is a need to hold a meeting to discuss the appeal. If all at least two-thirds of the members indicate that the student has not made a legitimate case for appeal, the appeal is denied and the student is notified, through NDSU email, within five (5) instructional days of the Board's decision. Otherwise, the Chair will schedule a meeting of the Board within ten (10) instructional days.

8. A quorum for the meeting will consist of at least 50% of the faculty members and at least 50% of the student members. At this meeting, the Board will then vote to decide whether to hold a hearing based on the evidence presented by the student and instructor. A hearing will be scheduled within fifteen (15) instructional days if a simple majority of members present vote to hold a hearing. If the appeal is denied, the Board Chair may provide a brief explanation for the decision.

9. If the Board decides to hear the appeal, it shall provide the instructor and student with a copy of any written statement provided to the Board by the other party.

10. If an appeal is made by the instructor of the course against the grade change instituted by the chair/head or the dean, the instructor will have recourse to the same procedures outlined for student appeal in 337.7.8.9.

HEARING PROCEDURES

   a) If the Board decides to hear an appeal, it shall designate from among its total membership a panel of seven members to hear the appeal. Four members of the panel shall be chosen by lot by the Board Chair from the faculty membership of the Board, and two additional members of the panel shall be chosen by lot by the Board Chair from the student membership of the Board. The seventh member of the panel shall be the Board Chair, who shall serve as a non-voting moderator of the hearing panel. In order to avoid any conflict of interest, a board member who believes that he/she may not be able to hear a case fairly shall recuse himself/herself and shall be replaced by his/her alternate. Additionally, both the student and the instructor shall be informed of the members slated to serve at the hearing. The student and the instructor shall each have one peremptory challenge to remove a board member from service on the hearing
panel. A challenged board member shall be replaced by his/her alternate. In the event that a challenged board member is an alternate, another member of the board shall be chosen by lot to serve on the hearing panel. The word "Board" shall be used hereafter in these hearing procedures to describe the seven-member hearing panel so elected, or the full Board, in the event it decided to hear an appeal of a hearing panel decision.

b) All hearings are normally open only to those people who are part of the proceedings, unless otherwise arranged by prior mutual written agreement between the student, instructor, and Board Chair. Because the hearing involves non-directory academic record information, as defined by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, it is not open to the public and the content may not be further disclosed without explicit written consent of the student involved.

c) The student, the instructor, and the Board, each shall have the right to be assisted during Board procedures by an advisor or other counsel who may observe the proceedings and advise his/her party. Unless allowed by the Board Chair, the advisor/counsel will not be permitted to address the Board or witnesses.

2. Evidence. Because this is an educational hearing, formal rules of evidence do not apply. Every effort will be made to allow all reasonable and relevant information to be presented for the Board's consideration.

a) The Board shall allow an initial presentation by the student and then by the instructor involved, after which it may call on such other witnesses as it deems necessary. In order to be able to accomplish this, the Board shall have the authority to compel the appearance or testimony of essential witnesses from the NDSU academic community.

b) Hearsay evidence is permitted; the members of the Board may consider such evidence and assign it any weight appropriate by each individual Board member.

c) An absolute right of cross-examination is not granted under this policy. All questions will be directed through the Board Chair. The Board Chair will allow all relevant and reasonable questions to be placed to either party or their witnesses, but retains the right to exclude questions that are redundant or irrelevant to determining responsibility. Persons answering questions will be given reasonable latitude by the Board Chair to respond to those questions fully.

d) Either party or their witnesses before the board will be permitted to elaborate on written documents previously submitted to the board in their oral presentations to the board.

e) Parties planning to bring exhibits to a hearing must generally provide copies of those exhibits to the other parties and the members of the board three (3) instructional days prior to the hearing to allow for a review of exhibits and the development of any pertinent questions. The Board Chair may permit deviations to this time restriction so long as the other party has sufficient time to prepare an adequate response.
f) The Board Chair shall have the right to exclude from the hearing and the record any unreliable, biased or redundant evidence.

g) On questions requiring academic expertise, the Board shall rely heavily on the testimony of other members of the department involved, or throughout the NDSU academic community.

h) In reaching a decision the board shall consider only information produced at the hearing and will evaluate the information using the "more likely than not" standard of proof. The burden of proof shall be on the student to establish that his/her grade should be changed, or on the instructor that the original grade should be retained.

i) All hearings of the board will be recorded up to the point of the board's deliberations necessary to render a decision. A copy of the recording shall be retained in the Office of the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs for a period not less than three (3) years. The board will allow controlled access to the record for review or transcription by either the student or the instructor.

3. Hearing outline.

a) The Board Chair will call the meeting to order and will introduce the members of the board and their function within the University community.

b) The Board Chair will describe the general outline of the hearing and read the evidentiary rules to the board. The Board Chair will read the following honesty statement.

"The University expects that all information presented in this hearing will be true and correct to the best of each person's knowledge. If a student willfully provides false information, he/she will be in violation of NDSU's Code of Student Behavior. As a result, he/she may be subject to disciplinary action. Dishonest behavior by any faculty or staff member will be reported to that person's supervisor for any necessary disciplinary action." All potential witnesses will be advised of this honesty statement in advance.

c) The Board Chair will excuse witnesses from the room at this point.

d) The Board Chair will introduce the student/instructor who will present the appeal and any evidence.

e) The Board Chair will introduce the instructor/student who will respond to the student's/instructor's appeal and present any additional evidence.

f) The student or the instructor will be allowed to present witnesses, who will be allowed to make statements and may be asked questions by the student, instructor, and/or members of the Board. Questions by both parties must be directed to the Board Chair, who will then determine if the question is relevant to the proceeding, ask if the respondent understands the question, and request a response. At the Board Chair's discretion, questions may be placed directly between parties. Permission to address parties may be withdrawn by the Board Chair at any time.

g) The instructor or the student will be allowed to present witnesses, who will be allowed to make a statement and may be asked questions by the student, instructor and/or members of the Board. Questions by both parties must be directed to the Board Chair, who will then determine if the question is relevant to the proceeding, ask if the respondent understands the
question, and request a response. At the Board Chair's discretion, questions may be placed
directly between parties. Permission to address parties may be withdrawn by the Board Chair at
any time.

h) The board may compel the attendance of any essential witnesses from the NDSU academic
community to present testimony. Such witnesses will be allowed to make a statement and may
be asked questions by the student, instructor, and/or members of the board. Questions by both
parties may be directed to the Board Chair, who will then determine whether the question is
relevant to the proceeding, ask whether the respondent understands the question, and request
a response. At the Board Chair's discretion, questions may be placed directly between parties.
Permission to address parties may be withdrawn by the Board Chair at any time.

i) Final questions will be permitted by the members of the board, who may question either party
and/or their witnesses.

j) The student shall have an opportunity to make a closing statement.

k) The instructor shall have an opportunity to make a closing statement.

l) Both parties and their witnesses will be dismissed for deliberations by the Board and recording
will stop at this point. Only board members, the Board Chair, and the Board's counsel/advisor (if
designated) may be present during deliberation.

m) The voting members of the Board will determine, by two-thirds majority vote, if the
student's/instructor's appeal should be granted. If the student's/instructor's appeal is granted,
the Board Chair shall propose upholding the instructor's original grade, in case of instructor's
appeal, -or a revised grade, in case of student appeal. A second vote shall then be held to
determine by simple majority/two-thirds majority vote whether the original or
original, proposed, or alternate grade be accepted by the Board. The grade determination
process shall be repeated until the board either approves a grade by a simple-two-thirds majority
in case of student appeal, or sustains the original grade in case of instructor's appeal. All votes
shall be conducted by secret ballot.

n) The Board Chair will send a written notice of the board's findings to the student, instructor,
department head, and dean within ten (10) instructional days of the hearing. If the board votes
to change the student's grade, notice shall also be sent to the University Registrar regarding the
grade change. If the original grade is retained, the relevant parties, including the Registrar, will
be notified. The written notice shall include an explanation of the board's rationale in making its
decision and a signed copy of the Grade Appeal Form attesting to the board's decision.

4. The Board may not release any information about its investigation to anyone but the parties
directly involved. All Grade Appeals information is confidential and may not be disclosed in whole
or in part except as provided under the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) or other
applicable law or policy.

APPEAL
Either the student or the instructor may request within fifteen (15) instructional days of a hearing panel decision, that the full Board hear an appeal from the decision, citing the material error(s) of process or procedure that could have affected the outcome by the hearing panel that would justify a new hearing. Appeals of outcome are not permitted. The Board shall meet to consider such a request, but no voting member of the hearing panel shall be eligible to vote on granting a new hearing. Instead, alternate members shall replace those Board members who served on the hearing panel. If a majority of the full Board votes to accept the appeal, it shall proceed to hold a hearing in accordance with the hearing procedures above, again using alternate members in place of those who served on the hearing panel. The Board Chair shall serve as a non-voting moderator at the appeal hearing, and a two-thirds vote by secret ballot of the full Board shall be required to uphold the student's appeal and approve a change in grade, or to uphold the instructor's appeal and approve a grade change to what was originally posted. A separate simple majority vote shall determine what the student's new grade shall be. The decision of the Board is final.
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SECTION 350.4
BOARD REGULATIONS ON HEARINGS AND APPEALS

SOURCE: SBHE Policy Manual, Section 605.1, 605.2, 605.3, 605.4

1. A faculty member may request a hearing with the Standing Committee on Faculty Rights by filing a written notice, accompanied by a specification of the reasons or the grounds upon which the appeal is based, with the Committee chair or senior member of the Committee and the institution's president. The institution shall have twenty-one calendar en business days from receipt by the president of the notice and specifications to file a response with the Committee Chair or senior member of the Committee and the faculty member.

2. The Committee shall appoint, at the expense of the institution according to institution procedures, a hearing officer with authority to conduct pre-hearing meetings, supervise exchange or collection of information, advise the Committee or and preside over the hearing. The faculty member, the institution and their representatives shall comply with all reasonable directives and requests of the hearing officer appointed by the Committee. The institution shall provide necessary clerical support for the Committee, and upon request, for the hearing officer.

3. The Committee or the hearing officer shall hold a pre-hearing meeting or meetings in order to (a) simplify the issues, (b) effect stipulations of facts, (c) provide for the exchange of documentary or other information, or (d) achieve such other appropriate pre-hearing objectives as will make the hearing fair, effective, and expeditious. The faculty member, the institution and their representatives shall participate in pre-hearing meetings upon request and comply with the directives of the Committee or the hearing officer. ("Discovery" is defined as the exchange or collection of information.) Discovery shall be informal and formal depositions or interrogatories for the purposes of discovery are not permitted, except with agreement of the parties.

4. The Committee or the hearing officer shall serve written notice of hearing on the faculty member and the president or their representatives at least twenty-one calendar days prior to the hearing.

5. The faculty member and the institution may stipulate to a decision on the basis of the written statements, in which case the Committee shall make its decision on that basis.

6. During the proceedings the institution and the faculty member are entitled to have an administrative or academic advisor and counsel of their choice and at their own expense. Proceedings concerning the appointment or removal of a faculty member may, pursuant to N.D.C.C. Section 15-10-17, be closed, unless the faculty member requests that the proceedings be open, in which case the proceedings shall be open. Proceedings not concerning the appointment or removal of a faculty member, including proceedings concerning discipline not involving dismissal, shall be open.

7. A verbatim transcript of the hearing or hearings shall be made at the institution's expense and shall be accessible to both parties. A party shall be provided a copy of the record, or part of the record, upon request, at the institution's expense.
8. The findings of fact, conclusions and the decision shall be based solely on the evidence received by the Committee. In cases brought under NDSU Policy 350.3(4) section 605.3(4), the faculty member has the burden of persuasion to prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the action violated the faculty member's rights; in cases appealed pursuant to NDSU Policy 350.3 section 605.3(8) or (9), the burden of proof that grounds for the institution's action exist shall rest with the institution and be satisfied only by clear and convincing evidence in the record considered as a whole.

9. The Committee may admit any evidence which is of probative value in determining the issues or if the interests of justice will best be served by admitting the evidence. Every reasonable effort shall be made to obtain the most reliable evidence available. The Committee shall grant adjournments to enable either party to investigate evidence as to which a valid claim of surprise is made. Deliberations by the Committee will be conducted without the hearing officer, although the hearing officer may be consulted by the Committee on procedural matters only.

10. The faculty member shall be afforded an opportunity to obtain necessary witnesses and documentary or other evidence. The institution shall cooperate with the Committee in securing witnesses and making available documentary and other evidence. The faculty member and the institution shall have the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses. Testimony may be taken by deposition, including deposition by telephone, or witnesses may testify by telephone, facsimile, video or other electronic means, upon agreement of the parties or, absent an agreement, upon request of a party and determination by the Committee or hearing officer that such use does not substantially prejudice the rights of any party. Affidavits may be received into evidence upon stipulation of the parties.

11. The Committee's shall generate a written report with its findings of fact, conclusions and recommendations, (collectively the “Committee's Decision”). The Committee's Decision shall be forwarded to the faculty member and the chair/head of the faculty member's department which, with supporting reasons, shall be reported to the institution's president and the faculty member or the faculty member's representative. Within twenty-one calendar days after receipt of the Committee's Decision, the chair/head of the faculty member's department shall submit to the president a copy of the Committee's Decision along with her/his written position either consenting to the Committee's Decision or disputing the committee's Decision. In drafting her/his response, the chair/head will consult with the department as she/he determines appropriate. After receipt of this material with supporting reasons, shall be reported, in writing, to the institution's president and the faculty member or the faculty member's representative. If the institution's action was a notice of dismissal and if the Committee concludes that adequate cause for dismissal has been established, but that a lesser penalty would be more appropriate, it may so recommend with supporting reasons. The president shall make a decision and provide written notice of the decision, including findings of fact and reasons or conclusions based on the hearing record and the Committee’s recommendations, to the Committee, and the faculty member, the Provost, the appropriate dean and chair/head within twenty-one calendar days of receiving the report. The faculty member or Committee may, within ten-fourteen calendar days of the decision, submit a written response to the decision, to which the president may reply.

12. The decision of the president is final.

HISTORY:
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North Dakota State University
Policy Manual

SECTION 713
RECORDS MANAGEMENT

SOURCE: NDSU President

I. POLICY and PURPOSE

A. The policy and purpose for Records Management is to

1. Comply with all applicable state, and federal laws and regulations, specifically North Dakota Century Code 54-46, and the North Dakota State University Records Retention Schedule found on the NDSU Records Management Website.
2. Establish an efficient University-wide records management system for maintaining, identifying, retrieving, preserving and destroying records through the use of best practices and standards and according to North Dakota Century Code and all applicable federal laws.
3. Ensure that records are adequately protected and/or preserved.
4. Ensure that all records that are no longer needed or of no value are destroyed at the appropriate time.
5. Preserve University history.
6. Limit liability to the University.

II. SCOPE

This policy applies to all records, including all University information and University resources, regardless of format, whether in paper, electronic, microfilm, (e.g., microfilm, microfiche, magnetic tapes, USB flash drive, CD/DVD ROM), electronic mail, or other electronic medium.

1. The medium. The North Dakota Century Code (NDCC 54-46-02) defines a record as a "document, book, paper, photograph, sound recording or other material, regardless of physical form or characteristics, made or received pursuant to law or in connection with the transaction of official business." For records description and series, see the Records Retention Schedule. A “State Record” is further defined as “a record of a department, office, commission, board, or other agency, however designated, of the state government.”

III. OBJECTIVE
The objective of the Records Management policy is to assist and provide guidance to the University entities in managing records throughout the lifecycle of the record, i.e., from creation or receipt, during use, and the maintenance stage, and final disposition. Various records produced in the course of University business must adhere to federal and state laws/regulations including access, storage, retention and disposal.

IV. APPLICABILITY

This policy applies to anyone who creates, disseminates, stores, manages, destroys and/or has access to NDSU records of any type, classification or description. This includes all NDSU employees and students who have access to records and any external entities, such as vendors whose purpose may be to provide storage space or destruction services for records.

V. RELATED POLICIES AND APPLICABLE STATE LAW

Standards, guidelines and procedures will follow and adhere to all policies and laws listed but not necessarily limited to:

1. North Dakota Century Code 54-46;
2. NDUS Policy 1901.2.1, Data Classification Standard;
4. NDUS 1912.2, Student Records – Directory Information
5. NDUS 1912.3, Employee Personal Information;
6. NDSU Policy 713.1, Litigation Hold; and

VI. RECORDS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM OVERSIGHT

A. The Records Management Task Force Advisory Committee will be responsible for Records Management policy, standards, guidelines, processes and procedures. The task force advisory committee is comprised of:

1. The NDSU Chief Information Security Officer who serves as the Director of Records Management (co-chair);
2. Associate Director for the NDSU Library (co-chair);
3. One A faculty member appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee;
4. Two unit records coordinators appointed by the Staff Senate Executive Committee;
5. The University provost and the vice presidents or their designees;
6. An archivist from the University Archives;
7. An attorney appointed to NDSU or a designee; and
   Assistant Attorney General assigned to the University or designee
   The NDSU Chief Information Technology Security Officer who serves as the
   Director of Records Management (co-chair)
8. One A Student Government member appointed by the Student Government President.
   Associate Director for the NDSU Library (co-chair)
9. If any task force Advisory Committee member is unable to attend a scheduled
   meeting, a proxy may be sent in their place.
10. Policy amendments/changes and standards and guidelines to be reviewed and approved by the Assistant Attorney General prior to submission for publishing

B. The NDSU Director of Records Management reports to the Vice President for Information Technology. The role of Director of Records Management will include:
   Reports to the Vice President for Information Technology.
   The role of Director of Records Management will include:

   • 1. Coordinating retention, preservation and destruction processes and procedures for University records in accordance with this Policy and University Records Management procedures and practices;
   • 2. Assisting the Assistant Attorney General with coordinating efforts to comply and respond to any issued Litigation Hold Notices and public records requests in a timely manner;
   • 3. Ensuring that all Unit Records Coordinators (URCs) appointed by University units receive ongoing training and education;
   • 4. Collecting and compiling annual disposal records as submitted by the URCs and reporting those metrics/statistics to the State’s Records Management office;
   • 5. Investigating and reporting on any potential non-compliance to the Unit Administrator and Assistant Attorney General; the Vice President for Information Technology if applicable, and where appropriate and needed, recommend and require remediation to ensure compliance;
   • 6. Maintaining an up-to-date list of Unit Records Coordinators (URCs) and their contact information;
   • 7. Sharing information as needed and relevant to the Records Management Task Force, and the URCs, and;
   • 8. Providing current and updated information on the records management Web site;
C. The NDSU Records Management Coordinator is:

1. Is appointed by the Vice President for Information Technology;
2. Assists the Director of Records Management and Records Management Advisory Committee as needed;
3. Serves as the liaison between the URCs and the Director of Records Management;
   Works with the Director of Records Management;
   Assists the Task Force and the Director of Records Management as needed.

D. NDSU Unit Records Coordinators are appointed by their respective department heads and their role includes:

   - Appointed by their respective department heads.
   - Their role will include
     - Providing assistance to faculty, staff and administrators in their units for retention, preservation and destruction of their unit’s records in accordance with this Policy’s procedures and practices, institutional requirements, and state and federal laws.
     - Serve as the liaison between their unit and the Director of Records Management and the Records Management Task Force
     - Completing continuing education and training on annual basis
     - Submitting records disposal forms to the Director of Records Management as required by policy and state law
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   - Is this a federal or state mandate? X Yes □ No
   - Describe change: Policy has been updated and rewritten to separate policy from procedures and to accurately reflect current changes in NDSU governance and policy regarding litigation hold.
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   - Office/Department/Name and the date submitted: Information Security/Records Management, Theresa Semmens, CISO & Director, Records Management
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SECTION 713.1
LITIGATION HOLD

SOURCE: NDSU President
ND Office of Risk Management

A “litigation hold” is the process in which documents, electronic information and other such materials are preserved pending a reasonably foreseeable litigation. A litigation hold is also known as a “preservation order,” where an organization’s document destruction process is suspended to preserve required documents for a pending litigation.

Potential threats of litigation can be a receipt of a summons or complaint; the filing of an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) charge; formal notice of investigation, the receipt of a subpoena; or even a verbal communication of the intent to sue. Once an employee receives any of the above, they should immediately inform their supervisor and the Attorney assigned to NDSU. The Attorney assigned to NDSU will then determine if the situation warrants a litigation hold for documents, and if so, implement procedures for a pre-litigation hold notice. A pre-litigation hold notice is one where no lawsuit has actually been filed yet, however, the university is preserving documentation in case litigation procedures are started. If litigation has been filed, the Attorney assigned to NDSU will send out a post-filing of litigation notice. Once a litigation hold notice has been issued, no documents pertaining to the litigation shall be destroyed until the litigation hold notice has been released by the Attorney assigned to NDSU.

Documents pertaining to a litigation hold include, but are not limited to:

- Paper originals, drafts, and copies.
- Word processing documents.
- E-mail and e-mail attachments.
- Calendars and planners.
- Spreadsheets and databases.
- Instant messages.
- Network logs.
- PowerPoint presentations.
- Manuals, publications, bulletins, and pamphlets.
- Graphic files.
- Voicemail (if a message manager program is available to save voicemails).
- Information on the website.
- Text messages.

A notice of litigation hold should:

- Identify the person(s) who are likely to have relevant information, and communicate a preservation notice to those persons;
- Communicate the preservation notice in a manner that is comprehensible and timely;
- Be in written form;
- Clearly define what information is to be preserved and how the preservation should be undertaken; and
Once the litigation hold notice has been implemented, the university employees who have received the notice should then immediately suspend any and all deletion or destruction of electronic or paper documents relevant to the litigation; preserve any new documentation that pertains to the litigation; and preserve existing documentation. If a university employee separates his or her employment from the university during a litigation hold process, the supervisor should then take possession of and retain such records and documents, and notify the Attorney assigned to NDSU of the change in custody.

Only when the threat of litigation is over will the Attorney assigned to NDSU issue a release of litigation hold on the relevant documents. Such documents are not to be deleted or destroyed until such release is given by the Attorney assigned to NDSU, and at that time any document destruction will be in compliance with NDSU’s records management policy.

To assist in understanding the legal hold process, refer to the following documents:
- Anticipation of Litigation and Legal Holds
- Litigation Hold Procedures
- Litigation Holds and Preservation of Evidence
- Litigation Hold Checklist
- Destruction Hold Notice
- NDSU 713: Records Management

Documents and information related to pending or reasonably foreseeable litigation may not be deleted or destroyed. Once a litigation hold is in place, the documents and information must be kept until the litigation hold has been removed; upon removal, the retention and destruction of documents and information will be in compliance with NDSU Policy 713, Records Management.

I. Definitions

| **Litigation Hold** | A written directive to preserve documents and information for pending or reasonably foreseeable litigation. Litigation is reasonably foreseeable upon receipt of a summons or complaint, the filing of an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) charge, the filing of a complaint with the North Dakota Department of Labor, formal notice of investigation, receipt of a subpoena, receipt of a Notice of Claim filed with the North Dakota Office of Management and Budget, verbal communication of the intent to sue, or any other communication which would lead a reasonable person to believe that litigation was a credible probability. |
| **Public Employee** | Includes any individual who has applied for employment, is employed, or has been employed by a public entity. |
| **N.D.C.C. 44-04-17.1** |  |
| **Employee** | Includes all persons whose office or employment is held by virtue of any appointment or employment however made, other than an election by the voters of the state, whether or not such office or employment is created by an act of the legislative assembly. |
| **N.D.C.C. 54-06-01** |  |

II. Imposition of Sanctions
Failure to follow and comply with this policy is subject to sanctions that can include, but is not limited to, a formal notice placed in the employee's personnel file up to termination of employment.

III. Section 713.1 LITIGATION HOLD PROCEDURE

A. When an employee is made aware of a threat of litigation or when an employee believes that litigation is reasonably foreseeable, the employee will immediately inform his/her supervisor who will contact the director of records management. The Director of Records Management will contact the attorney assigned to NDSU. The attorney assigned to NDSU will determine if the situation warrants a Litigation Hold.

B. If litigation has been commenced, the attorney assigned to NDSU will issue a Litigation Hold. Once a Litigation Hold has been issued, documents and information pertaining to the litigation or potential litigation shall not be deleted or destroyed.

C. A Litigation Hold will:

1. Identify the employees who are likely to have documents and information relevant to the litigation or potential litigation;
2. Be communicated in writing to the identified employees in a comprehensible and timely manner;
3. Clearly define what information is to be preserved and how the preservation will be undertaken; and
4. Be reviewed periodically and, if necessary, be reissued or amended.

D. Employees who receive a Litigation Hold will:

1. Immediately suspend the deletion or destruction of documents and information relevant to the litigation, including any automated processes that may affect the deletion or destruction of documents and information;
2. Preserve existing records relevant to the litigation or potential litigation;
3. Preserve new records that pertain to the litigation or potential litigation; and
4. Provide any additional assistance that may be required to preserve the relevant documents and information.

E. If an employee subject to a Litigation Hold separates employment from NDSU, the employee's supervisor will take possession of and retain the documents and information subject to the Litigation Hold and notify the Director of Records Management of the change in custody of the documents and information.

F. When the litigation has ended or is no longer foreseeable, the attorney assigned to NDSU will remove the Litigation Hold. Upon removal of the Litigation Hold, the retention and destruction of documents and information will be in compliance with NDSU Policy 713: Records Management.

G. Records subject to a Litigation Hold include, but are not limited to:
   Paper originals, drafts and copies
   Electronic records
Email and email attachments
Calendars and planners
Instant messages
Network, computer and application logs
Slide presentations
Manuals, publications, bulletins and pamphlets
Graphic files and electronic images
Voicemail
Website information, pages, etc.
Text messages
Video files
Audio files
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SECTION: Section 352 3.5 – Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation: Faculty Hired with Previous Relevant Experience

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: Process for hiring into tenure line position at a negotiable faculty rank with tenure is clarified; process for awarding tenure credit to probationary faculty hires is clarified; operationalization of tenure credit in evaluation process is clarified.
   - Version 2 contains Matt Hammer’s recommended changes to Section 3.5 (in blue)

2. This policy change was originated by (individual, office or committee/organization):
   - Office/Department/Name and the date submitted: ad hoc Committee of the Faculty Senate for Review of Policy 352 – V1 submitted 9-22-2015 by Karen Froelich; V2 submitted 12/22/15 by Alan Denton
   - Email address of the person who should be contacted with revisions: alan.denton@ndsu.edu

   This portion will be completed by Mary Asheim.

   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 ndsu.policy.manual@ndsu.edu. All suggestions will be considered, however due to policy format guidelines, they may not be possible. Thank you for your understanding!
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. 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 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.

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 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;

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 defined above), the following criteria apply to evaluation of contributions by a candidate for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review:
2.2.2.1 contributions to knowledge, either by discovery or application, resulting from the candidate's research, and/or

2.2.2.2 creative activities and productions that are related to the candidate's 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 presentation of scholarly or professional papers, and publication of books 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. effective management or improvement of administrative procedures or programs.

2.2.3.2.6 contributions to knowledge as editors of scholarly publications, or service on editorial boards, juries, or panels;

2.2.3.2.7 contributions to the operation of state or federal agencies.

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.

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 to assure consistency with University and State Board of Higher Education (SBHE) policies.

3.3. For probationary faculty, the basis for review of the candidate's portfolio and any recommendations on promotion and/or tenure shall be the promotion and tenure guidelines and criteria of the academic unit which were provided to the candidate at the time of the candidate's appointment to the position. 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 candidates for promotion to professor shall be evaluated by the criteria in effect at the time of application.
3.4. 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 hiring contract. The Department PTE Committee recommends to the Department Chair/Head the maximum (from one to three) years of tenure credit offered. Tenure recommendations and recommendations for appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor for new hires (administrators or faculty with prior experience) are made by the respective Department and the College PTE Committee. The process of review is initiated by the Chair/Head.

There are two options:

3.5.2.1 Faculty may be hired with given one to three years (maximum allowed) 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 three one quality publications shall be required in a three-year period 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 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:


NDSU HIPAA Security Procedures- see http://www.ndsu.edu/general_counsel/hipaa/

Authorization for Release of Information:

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

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 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.

4.6 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.

4.7 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 election to a college or department PTE Committee. Faculty members being considered for promotion may not serve while under consideration.

5.3 The department and college PTE committees' reviews and recommendations are part of a process of peer review. Thus, faculty holding administrative appointments, including those with interim status, are not eligible to serve. (“Administrative appointment” includes appointments as President, Vice President, Associate or Assistant Vice President, Dean, Associate or Assistant Dean, Department Chair or Head, Associate, Assistant or Vice Chair or Head, or Director of an academic unit.)

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 shall 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 no later than November 1.

6.2 After November 1, 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.

6.2.1 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.

6.2.2 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 and must be included in the portfolio for review at the next level.

6.5 Allegations of misconduct discovered after November 1 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 until the allegations are resolved. 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 by January 5. 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 by January 5. 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
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.
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NDGEC’s proposed change to 403.7

Current Policy

SUBJECT: 400s: Academic Affairs EFFECTIVE: November 19, 2009
Section: 403.7 Common General Education Requirement and Transfer of General Education Credits

1. The following common general education requirement applies to all Associate of Arts, Associate of Science and Bachelor’s degrees, except the BAS degree at University System institutions:

General Education Area
Minimum Required
Lower Division Semester
Hours
Communications 9
Arts & Humanities 6
Social Sciences 6
Mathematics, Science & Technology 9
Institutional Specific (must be chosen from one of the following four categories: communication, social sciences, arts and humanities, and/or mathematics/science & technology) 6
Total 36

2. Within the stipulated general education areas, each institution shall indicate in its catalog and other student advisement materials the institution’s courses approved for general education. University System institutions may establish program and institution specific general education requirements in addition to the requirement stated in subsection 1.

3. General education courses accepted by any University System institution count upon transfer toward the general education requirement at all institutions in one of the following ways:

A. A student is deemed to have completed the lower division general education requirement of the institution to which the courses are transferred if the general education course work meets the general education requirement of the institution from which the student transfers and satisfies the common general education requirement stated in subsection 1. Students completing Associate in Science and Associate in Arts degrees at system campuses meet the lower division general education requirements identified in subsection 1.

B. Receiving institutions may also choose to grant general education requirement completion by combining the transferred general education courses from multiple institutions, based on the requirements listed above in subsection 1.

C. In all other cases, general education courses from the areas in subsection 1 apply to the appropriate general education requirement of the institution to which the courses are transferred and the number of credits required to complete the general education requirement in each area is determined by the policies of the institution to which the courses are transferred; or

D. Pursuant to guidelines established by the Chancellor for the acceptance of Advanced Placement (AP), College Level Examination Program (CLEP), International Baccalaureate (IB) and DANTES Subject Standardized Tests (DSST) scores for academic credit.

4. Articulation agreements between the North Dakota University System and other institutions may enable the transfer of general education credits as a completed unit pursuant to guidelines established by the Chancellor.

Reference: NDUS Procedure - 403.7.2 403.7.3
NDGEC’s Proposed Policy Revision

SBHE Policies

SUBJECT: 400s: Academic Affairs EFFECTIVE: November 19, 2009

Section: 403.7 Common General Education Requirement and Transfer of General Education Credits

1. The following common general education requirement applies to all Associate of Arts, Associate of Science and Bachelor's degrees, except the BAS degree at University System institutions:

General Education Area

Minimum Required

Lower Division Semester

Hours

Communications 9
Arts & Humanities 6
Social Sciences 6
Mathematics, Science & Technology 9

Institutional Specific (must be chosen from one of the following four categories: communication, social sciences, arts and humanities, and/or mathematics/science & technology)

6

Total 36

2. Within the stipulated general education areas, each institution shall indicate in its catalog and other student advisement materials the institution's courses approved for general education. University System institutions may establish program and institution specific general education requirements in addition to the requirement stated in subsection 1.

3. General education courses accepted by any University System institution count upon transfer toward the general education requirement at all institutions in one of the following ways:

A. A student is deemed to have completed the lower division general education requirement of the institution to which the courses are transferred if the general education coursework meets the general education requirement of the institution from which the student transfers and satisfies the common general education requirement stated in subsection 1. Students completing Associate in Science and Associate in Arts degrees at system campuses meet the lower division general education requirements identified in subsection 1.

B. Receiving institutions may also choose to grant general education requirement completion by combining the transferred general education courses from multiple institutions, based on the requirements listed above in subsection 1.

C. In all other cases, general education courses from the areas in subsection 1 apply to the appropriate general education requirement of the institution to which the courses are transferred and the number of credits required to complete the general education requirement in each area is determined by the policies of the institution to which the courses are transferred; or
D. Pursuant to guidelines established by the Chancellor for the acceptance of Advanced Placement (AP), College Level Examination Program (CLEP), International Baccalaureate (IB) and DANTES Subject Standardized Tests (DSST) scores for academic credit.

E.

4. Articulation agreements between the North Dakota University System and other institutions may enable the transfer of general education credits as a completed unit pursuant to guidelines established by the Chancellor.

5. Upon review and recommendation for approval by the North Dakota General Education Council and the Academic Affairs Council and with the approval of the NDUS Chancellor, an NDUS institution may offer an alternative general education program, providing it includes all of the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes approved by the North Dakota General Education Council and it totals at least 36 semester credits.

A. Any credits earned for general education at a University System institution or any participating GERTA institution under an approved alternative general education program will be accepted for general education credit by all University System institutions or all participating GERTA institutions.

B. A student is deemed to have completed the lower division general education requirement of the institution to which the courses are transferred if the general education course work satisfies an alternative general education program approved under subsection 5. Students completing Associate in Science and Associate in Arts degrees at system campuses meet the lower division alternative general education program approved under subsection 5.

C. Alternative general education programs approved under section 5 may also choose to grant general education requirement completion by combining the transferred general education courses from multiple institutions.

D. General education courses from an alternative general education program, approved under subsection 5, apply to the appropriate general education requirement of the institution to which the courses are transferred. Credit required for completing any alternative education program should be consistent with each General Education Area specified in subsection 1 or each of the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes approved by the North Dakota General Education Council, either by including credits from courses in each area of subsection 1 or by aligning outcomes achieved to each General Education Area.

E. Alternate general education programs are permitted to accept scores for academic credit as outlined in the Chancellor’s guidelines for acceptance of Advanced Placement (AP), College Level Examination Program (CLEP), International Baccalaureate (IB) and DANTES Subject Standardized Tests (DSST) scores for academic credit.

Reference: NDUS Procedure - 403.7.2 403.7.3

History:
Amendment SBHE Minutes, September 18, 2008.
Amendment SBHE Minutes, December 18, 2008.
Amendment SBHE Minutes, November 19, 2009.

FAQs Regarding Proposed Revisions to SBHE Policy 403.7: Common General Education Requirement and Transfer of General Education Credits (GERTA)

Recommendations by the ND General Education Council, approved unanimously by that group.

1. What is the ND General Education Council (NDGEC)?
The NDGEC is a grass-roots advisory group with representatives from all NDUS institutions, as well as the private and tribal colleges, who meet to share best practices and discuss ways to support general education in the state. Members are faculty, staff, and administrators. The group’s constitution can be found here: http://www.ndus.edu/uploads/resources/2515/constitution-of-the-nd-general-education-council.pdf

2. What is the goal of this proposed revision?
The goal is to allow a pilot program in which an NDUS institution can develop an approved alternative general education program “providing it includes all of the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes approved by the North Dakota General Education Council [written communication, oral communication, quantitative literacy, critical & creative thinking, and breadth of knowledge] and it totals at least 36 semester credits.”
   a) The revision allows the general education of an NDUS campus to focus on what students actually learned, not just on what courses they took.
   b) Our regional accreditor (the Higher Learning Commission) and our various specialized accreditors (ABET, AACSB, NCATE, etc.) similarly ask us to provide evidence of what our student learn, not just the courses they take.

3. Why is this revision needed?
   a) The present General Education Areas in SBHE 403.7 restrict innovation, allow limited institutional autonomy, and focus on traditional disciplinary categories rather than broader learning outcomes such as critical thinking, integrated learning, etc.
   b) The revision allows for much greater flexibility so that a campus could create a general education program that is most suited to its particular mission.

4. What is unchanged?
   a) The seamless transfer among NDUS institutions is still guaranteed.
   b) No NDUS institution will be required to revise its general education.

5. What is procedure for an action like this? How does a proposal from the NDGEC move forward?
   SBHE policy changes are subject to review and recommendation by the Academic Affairs Council, the Chancellor’s Cabinet, and the Chancellor. The SBHE approves revisions to SBHE Policy.

6. What is the NDSU Faculty Senate being asked to do?
   Because of its commitment to transparency and open communication, the NDGEC informed the Council of College Faculties (CCF) about this proposal. CCF is asking all of the Senates to weigh in on whether they think it’s a good idea to support NDGEC’s recommendation for a more flexible state policy regarding general education that allows campuses to orient their general education toward national outcomes, yet still retains the transfer agreement. The response of each faculty senate and CCF is important, but the next step is in the hands of the Academic Affairs Council.

7. Can the NDSU Faculty Senate suggest revisions?
   Certainly. As noted in 5, there will are multiple points at which any proposed policy can be revised.
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