

Faculty Senate Minutes

Fargo, ND

North Dakota State University

November 19, 2018

I. Call to order 3:00 pm

II. Attendance

Dr. E. Gillam presiding and the following senators were present: B. Aly Ahmed, D. Bajwa, E. Conwell, A. Daigh, L. del Rio Mendoza, T. DeSutter, J. Dorfmeister, A. Dybing, J. Frenzel, A. Green, S. Haring, C. Hawley, R. Hearne, D. Johnson, J. Johnson, J. M. Jones, D. Katti, B. Klamm, M. Larson, K. Lepper, X. Li, Z. Liu, K. Lyman, M. McCourt, K. Nelson, K. Park, R. Pieri, K. Rodgers, F. Salajan, G. Sanders, K. Sassi, M. Selekwa (parliamentarian), K. Swanson, A. Wagner, T. Wahl, and A. Werremeyer.

Substitutions: Nicholas Bauroth for A. Andrianova, Fardad Azarmi for L. Jiang, Matt Smith for K. Riendl, and Justin Walden for M. Vosen Callens.

Absent: E. Berry, D. Pemstein, and M. Secor-Turner.

III. Adoption of agenda

MOTION (Klamm/Pieri): to adopt the agenda. MOTION CARRIED WITH UNANIMOUS CONSENT

IV. Approval of previous meeting minutes from October 8, 2018

MOTION: (Salajan/Bajwa): to approve the minutes from October 8, 2018. MOTION CARRIED WITH UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

V. Announcements

a. Dean Bresciani, President

- Governor's Task Force recommends having 3 boards – 1 for NDSU, 1 for UND and 1 for the 9 remaining colleges/universities. Recommendation will go to the state legislature to vote on.

b. Ken Grafton, Provost

- Been talking with dept. chairs and college deans about budget shortfalls and ways to deal with it. About 2/3 of the way through meeting with everyone on campus. Feedback has been good.

c. Erin Gillam, Faculty Senate President

- Ad hoc committees for modifying bylaws and allowing meetings to be closed. Most of members of the committee have been identified.
- Ad hoc committee to review the success of the general education program. Committee will be made up of one representative from each college. Could possibly meet the last week of this semester to set objectives as to what they would like to accomplish during their review.

d. Molly Secor-Turner, Faculty Senate President-Elect – not present

e. Amanda Booher, Staff Senate President – not present

f. Marissa Pacella, Student Body Vice President

- New Student lobbyist Mason Rademacher
 - Final Student Government meeting of the semester is Sunday, Dec. 2nd.
 - There is a revised Student Body Constitution and Student Government Code.
- g. Marc Wallman, VP Information Technology
- Multi-factor authentication – will be trying to get faculty enrolled by end of spring semester.
 - To enroll, go to ITS website <https://www.ndsu.edu/its/mfa/> then scroll down to Set Up Multi-Factor Authentication and click on the green bar, it will take you to a new page NDSU Account Management system where you can login with your NDSU electronic ID and password and then follow the instructions on the ITS webpage.
 - University System is starting up efforts to merge Blackboard again.

VI. Consent agenda

- a. UCC Report (**Attachment 1**)

MOTION (Pieri/Jones): to approve consent agenda. MOTION CARRIED WITH UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

VII. Unfinished Business

- a. Policy 352: Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation (**Attachment 2**)
- i. Attachment includes amendments approved at Sept and Oct FS meetings; for original changes presented at Sept 2018 FS meeting, see minutes from Sept or Oct meetings.

MOTION (Salajan/Wagner): to approve Policy 352. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 34-3-1. The following senators or their substitutes voted aye: B. Aly Ahmed, A. Andrianova, D. Bajwa, E. Conwell, A. Daigh, L. del Rio Mendoza, J. Dorfmeister, A. Dybing, J. Frenzel, A. Green, S. Haring, C. Hawley, R. Hearne, L. Jiang, D. Johnson, J. Johnson, J. M. Jones, D. Katti, B. Klamm, M. Larson, Z. Liu, K. Lyman, M. McCourt, K. Nelson, K. Park, K. Rodgers, F. Salajan, G. Sanders, K. Sassi, K. Swanson, M. Vosen Callens, A. Wagner, T. Wahl, and A. Werremeyer; the following senators or their substitute(s) voted nay: K. Lepper, R. Pieri, and K. Reindl; the following senators or their substitute(s) abstained: T. DeSutter.

MOTION (Rodgers/Lepper): to amend section 5.2 of the policy to read (see **Attachment 3** from K. Rodgers). MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 37-1-1. The following senators or their substitutes voted aye: B. Aly Ahmed, A. Andrianova, D. Bajwa, E. Conwell, A. Daigh, L. del Rio Mendoza, T. DeSutter, J. Dorfmeister, A. Dybing, J. Frenzel, A. Green, S. Haring, C. Hawley, R. Hearne, L. Jiang, D. Johnson, J. Johnson, J. M. Jones, D. Katti, B. Klamm, M. Larson, K. Lepper, X. Li, Z. Liu, K. Lyman, M. McCourt, K. Nelson, K. Park, K. Rodgers, F.

Salajan, G. Sanders, K. Sassi, K. Swanson, M. Vosen Callens, A. Wagner, T. Wahl, and A. Werremeyer; the following senators or their substitute(s) voted nay: R. Pieri; the following senators or their substitute(s) abstained: K. Reindl.

b. Change to General Education revalidation timeline (**Attachment 4**)

MOTION (Sassi/Jones): to approve the revalidation timeline. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 29-8-1. The following senators or their substitutes voted aye: B. Aly Ahmed, A. Andrianova, E. Conwell, A. Daigh, T. DeSutter, J. Dorfmeister, J. Frenzel, A. Green, S. Haring, C. Hawley, R. Hearne, L. Jiang, D. Johnson, J. Johnson, J. M. Jones, B. Kamm, M. Larson, Z. Liu, K. Lyman, K. Nelson, K. Park, K. Reindl, K. Rodgers, F. Salajan, G. Sanders, K. Sassi, K. Swanson, A. Wagner, and A. Werremeyer; the following senators or their substitute(s) voted nay: D. Bajwa, L. del Rio Mendoza, A. Dybing, D. Katti, M. McCourt, R. Pieri, M. Vosen Callens, and T. Wahl; the following senators or their substitute(s) abstained: K. Lepper.

c. Planning and prioritizing Faculty Senate action for the year (**Attachment 5**)

- Policy 333 – Class attendance policy needs revision
- Do a Qualtrics survey to ask all faculty on campus what they feel is important for Faculty Senate to work on.
- Constituents should be encouraged to bring their topics of concern to the senators of their college and the faculty senate executive representative should bring to the executive committee meetings for discussion as well.

VIII. Adjourn

MOTION (McCourt/Aly Ahmed): to adjourn the meeting. MOTION CARRIED WITH UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The meeting adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Hoyt
Faculty Senate Secretary

**University Curriculum Committee Report
For Faculty Senate Meeting on November 19, 2018**

University Curriculum Committee recommendation				
The University Curriculum Committee is charged with ensuring that the NDSU curriculum, including General Education, complies with university policy and HLC accreditation standards. The UCC intends to ensure that courses approved for General Education in a given category achieve 100% of the core undergraduate learning outcomes for that general education (GE) category. The committee provides the attached rationale for this decision.				

Program Changes				
PhD – Biological Sciences – changing name of program to reflect program merge within the department				
B.S./B.A. – Criminal Justice – eliminating selective admission to the program; GPA requirement adjustment				
Minor – Criminal Justice – eliminating selective admission to the minor				
B.S. – Crop and Weed Sciences – adjusting option electives to accommodate changes in the Department of Biological Sciences				
MPH – Public Health; adding a Food Safety specialization				

Program Deactivation				
PhD – Botany – deactivating of program to reflect program merge within the department				

New Courses				
Subject	No.	Title		Effective Term
ADHM	280	Technology Applications for the Apparel Industry		Spring 2019
AGEC	343	Introduction to Commodity Trading		Spring 2019
MATH	839	Topics in Combinatorics and Discrete Mathematics		Fall 2019
MBA	731	Leading and Managing Teams		Spring 2019
NURS	880	Interprofessional Collaborative Practice		Spring 2019
PAG	215	Mapping of Precision Ag Data		Spring 2019

New Special Topics				
Subject	No.	Title		Effective Term
ACCT	499	Advanced Projects using Excel		Spring 2019

General Education Recommendations				
ECON 205 – Market Values – approval for Wellness and Global Perspectives				
ENGL 220 – Introduction to Literature – revalidation for Humanities and approval for Cultural Diversity				

Course Changes								
From:				To:				
Subject	No.	Title	Crs.	Dept	No.	Title	Crs.	Effective Term
AGEC/CFS/SAFE	452	Food Laws and Regulations	3	CFS	452	Food Laws and Regulations	3	Spring 2019
NURS	478	BSN Capstone	2	NURS	478	BSN Capstone	3	Spring 2020
NURS	701	Theoretical Perspectives of the Discipline	3	NURS	801	Theoretical Perspectives of the Discipline	3	Fall 2019
NURS	702	Ethics and Health Policy in Nursing	2	NURS	802	Ethics and Health Policy in Nursing	2	Spring 2019
NURS	704	Nursing Research/Evidence Based Practice	3	NURS	804	Nursing Research/Evidence Based Practice	3	Spring 2019
NURS	706	Health Care Delivery Systems, Financing and Informatics	3	NURS	806	Health Care Delivery Systems, Financing and Informatics	3	Fall 2019
NURS	814	Advanced Pathophysiology I	2	NURS	814	Advanced Pathophysiology Across the Lifespan I	2	Fall 2019
NURS	816	Advanced Pathophysiology II	2	NURS	816	Advanced Pathophysiology Across the Lifespan II	2	Spring 2019
NURS	835P	Practicum IV: FNP Role Integration	4-8	NURS	835P	Practicum IV: FNP Role Integration	6	Fall 2019
NURS	836P	Practicum V: FNP Role Integration	4-8	NURS	836P	Practicum V: FNP Role Integration	7	Fall 2019
NURS	850P	Family Primary Care: Specialty Practicum	2	NURS	850P	Family Primary Care: Specialty Practicum	3	Summer 2019
STAT	476	Actuary Exam Study II	1	MATH/STAT	476	Actuary Exam Study	1	Fall 2018
THEA	261	Advanced Acting	3	THEA	364	Advanced Acting	3	Fall 2019
THEA	278	Introduction to Design: Scenic Design	3	THEA	371	Introduction to Design: Scenic Design	3	Fall 2019

Changes in Prerequisites/Co-Requisites/Course Descriptions				
Subject	No.	Title	Prerequisite/Co-requisite/Description Change	Effective Term
CFS	452	Food Laws and Regulations	Prereq: none	Spring 2019

Changes in Prerequisites/Co-Requisites/Course Descriptions (continued)				
Subject	No.	Title	Prerequisite/Co-requisite/Description Change	Effective Term
COMM	473	Case Study in Public Relations	Desc: Advanced study of applied public relations theory through intense case study analysis and research focused on organizations. Case studies from the Public Relations Society of America are used. Prereq: COMM 375 and restricted to Communication professional majors and minors	Spring 2019
MIS	479	Decision Support and Intelligent Systems	Desc: Information system support and modeling of the decision-making process via business data analytics techniques such as decision trees, neural networks, and machine learning are the primary focus of this course. The state-of-the-art technologies in business data analytics will be explored. Prereq: MIS 320	Spring 2019
NURS	801	Theoretical Perspectives of the Discipline	Desc: The course is designed to help the student analyze, critique and apply a variety of nursing theories, models and conceptual frameworks in advanced nursing practice. Incorporation of writing methods emphasized for professional development.	Fall 2019
NURS	804	Nursing Research/Evidence Based Practice	Desc: Exploration of methodologies of scholarly inquiry in nursing with an emphasis on the utilization of evidenced based practice in the advanced nursing practice role.	Spring 2019
NURS	812P	Assessment Practicum	Prereq: NURS 812	Summer 2019
NURS	816	Advanced Pathophysiology Across the Lifespan II	Desc: Builds on the context from NURS 814 with emphasis on normal cellular function, developmental changes and common physiological symptoms. Synergistic clinical manifestations and total body-mind responses to system alterations. Prereq: NURS 814	Spring 2019
NURS	833	Family Primary Care I: Assessment and Management	Prereq: NURS 812P, NURS 816	Fall 2019
NURS	833P	Family Primary Care: Residency I	Prereq: NURS 833	Fall 2019
NURS	834	Family Primary Care II: Assessment and Management	Prereq: NURS 833	Spring 2019
NURS	834P	Family Primary Care: Residency II	Desc: Students synthesize skills acquired in previous didactic and clinical courses, in particular NURS 833P, to provide diagnosis, treatment, and management of an increasingly varied group of clients. Prereq: NURS 833P	Spring 2019
NURS	835	Family Primary Care III: Assessment and Management	Prereq: NURS 834	Spring 2019
NURS	835P	Practicum IV: FNP Role Integration	Desc: Application of skills and clinical experiences in primary care. Didactic concepts are incorporated in the student's practice, supervised by a health care provider who has documented expertise in the area of specialization. History, physical examinations, and diagnostic analysis will be integrated into evaluation of clients. Prereq: NURS 834P	Fall 2019
NURS	836P	Practicum V: FNP Role Integration	Desc: Application of skills and clinical experiences in primary care. Didactic concepts are incorporated in the student's practice, supervised by a health care provider who has documented expertise in the area of specialization. History, physical examination, and diagnostic analysis will be integrated into evaluation of clients. Prereq: NURS 835P	Spring 2019
THEA	364	Advanced Acting	Prereq: THEA 161 and THEA 266	Fall 2019

Course Inactivations			
Subject	No.	Title	Effective Term
ADHM	356	Pattern Draping and Grading	Spring 2019

University Curriculum Committee Addendum
For Faculty Senate Meeting on November 19, 2018

New Courses			
Subject	No.	Title	Effective Term
ECON	205	Market Values	Fall 2019

Attachment 2

POLICY 352 including amendments that have already PASSED at
September and October Faculty Senate meetings

Blue text reflects changes to the policy proposed by the Faculty Senate
Ad Hoc Committee to Review Policy 352

Red text reflects changes approved at Faculty Senate

NOTE: This policy in its entirety has NOT passed Faculty Senate yet

North Dakota State University

Policy Manual

SECTION 352

PROMOTION, TENURE AND EVALUATION

SOURCE: NDSU President
NDSU Faculty Senate

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The promoting of faculty and awarding of tenure, and the prerequisite processes of evaluation and review, are of fundamental importance to the long-term ability of the University to carry out its mission. Promotion recognizes the quality of a faculty member's scholarship and contributions in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Promotion acknowledges that the faculty member's contribution to the university is of increasing value. Tenure assures academic freedom and enhances economic security for faculty members who show promise of sustained contributions in those three areas. Tenure aims to both recognize a candidate's potential long-term value to the institution as evidenced by professional performance and growth and to provide the expectation of continued employment. The decision to award tenure rests on criteria that reflect the potential long-term contribution of the faculty member to the purposes, priorities, and resources of the institution, unit, and program. With the individual autonomy derived from academic freedom and tenure comes the responsibility to create and/or maintain an ethical, respectful, and professional work climate for oneself, one's colleagues, one's students, and others with whom one relates professionally. Due to the emphasis on institutional purposes and priorities, tenure recommendations should be reviewed at department, college, and university levels.
- 1.2 From the University's mission flows the expectation that each faculty member will make contributions of high quality to the areas of teaching, research, and service. "Teaching" includes all forms of instruction both on- and off-campus. "Research" includes basic and applied research and other creative activities. "Service" includes public service, service to the University, college, and department, and service to the profession. Because of the University's mission, the quality and quantity of contributions in all three areas will be considered at the times of promotion and tenure. But, because of variations among faculty in strengths and/or responsibilities, faculty members are not expected to exhibit equal levels of accomplishment in all areas. Moreover, disciplines will vary with respect to the kinds of evidence produced in support of quality of contributions.
- ~~1.3~~ Colleges are responsible for ensuring that promotion and tenure evaluation criteria be aligned with official position descriptions. ~~All colleges are responsible for creating and enforcing a workload policy. Workload policies and procedures are documents that map percentage allocations of time across teaching, research, and service, as specified in a job description with actual job duties. Colleges are responsible for demonstrating congruency between the policy and its promotion and tenure requirements.~~
- 1.4 The policies and standards of each college should be congruent with the University's mission and its policies on promotion and tenure, and also should reflect the college's unique expectations of its faculty members. The policies and standards of academic units within

each college should be consistent with the missions of the University and college and their policies on promotion and tenure, and also should designate evidence of how faculty in the academic unit meet the expectations of the college and University.

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

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

2.2.1 TEACHING

- 2.2.1.1 CRITERIA In the areas of teaching (as defined above), the following criteria apply to evaluation of contributions by a candidate for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review:
 - 2.2.1.1.1 The effective delivery of instruction to and the stimulation of learning by students and/or clients;
 - 2.2.1.1.2 the continuous improvement of courses or instructional programs;
 - 2.2.1.1.3 the effective advising and mentoring of undergraduate and/or graduate students.
- 2.2.1.2 EVIDENCE 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 defines above), the following criteria apply to evaluation of contributions by a candidate for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review:
 - 2.2.2.1.1 contributions to knowledge, either by discovery or application, resulting from the candidate's research, and/or
 - 2.2.2.1.2 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 contributions to fostering a campus climate that supports and respects faculty, staff, and students who have diverse cultures, backgrounds, and points of view;
- 2.2.3.2.6 effective management or improvement of administrative procedures or programs;
- 2.2.3.2.7 contributions to knowledge as editors of scholarly publications, or service on editorial boards, juries, or panels;
- 2.2.3.2.8 contributions to the operation of 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. Expectations for faculty in Professor of Practice and Research Professor positions may differ from those for tenure-line faculty.
- 3.2. A statement of promotion, tenure, post-tenure, and evaluation criteria specific to each college shall be developed by the Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation (PTE) committee of the college in consultation with the Dean and approved by the faculty of the college. The faculty of each department shall also develop a statement of criteria for promotion, tenure, post-tenure, and evaluation that shall be reviewed and approved by the college PTE committee

and the Dean to assure consistency with the college promotion, tenure, post-tenure, and evaluation criteria. The college and departmental statements, and any subsequent changes, shall be reviewed and approved by the Provost assure consistency with University and State Board of Higher Education (SBHE) policies.

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

3.4. Faculty Hired Without Previous, Relevant Experience

For a faculty member without previous academic-relevant experience, eligibility for tenure requires a probationary period of six years. Evaluations for promotion to Associate Professor and granting of tenure will ordinarily be conducted concurrently. However, exceptional academic accomplishments may warrant early promotion prior to the completion of the six years of the probationary period. Petitions for early promotion shall be initiated by department heads/chairs, and not by faculty members themselves.

3.5 Faculty Hired with Previous Relevant Experience

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

3.5.2 A probationary faculty member with relevant professional/academic experience may be given credit toward tenure and promotion when this is negotiated as a provision in the original contract. The Department PTE Committee recommends to the Department Chair/Head the maximum number of years of tenure credit offered.

There are two options:

- 3.5.2.1 Faculty may be hired with one to three years of tenure credit. For each year of tenure credit awarded, one year shall be subtracted from the tenure application deadline. For example, given one year of credit, promotion and tenure application would be due in the fifth year of service;

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

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

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

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

3.6 Extension of Probationary Period

At any time during the probationary period but prior to the sixth year (or prior to the year in which the portfolio is due), a faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period not to exceed a total of three years based on institutional, personal or family (pertaining to a child, spouse/partner or parent, as described in NDSU Policy 320) circumstances, personal illness or disability, which, according to reasonable expectations, impede satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure. Faculty given promotion and tenure credit are also eligible for this extension. Faculty members are encouraged to request probationary period extension as soon as they recognize the need for extension. Written notification to the Provost must be submitted within one year of the beginning of the event for which the extension is requested and approved prior to July 1 of the year in which the tenure/promotion portfolio is due. A faculty member who submits an extension request during the academic year in which they are to undergo third year review must successfully undergo third-year review and renewal before any extension can take effect. The request must be in writing and will be submitted to the Provost who will review the request and will approve or deny the request. Denial of an extension may be appealed under NDSU Policy 350.4, however, appeals will not be granted for requests that are submitted outside the required timeline for extension.

3.6.1 Extension of Probationary Period for Childbirth or Adoption

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

3.6.2 Extension of Probationary Period for Personal Illness or Disability

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

3.6.3 Extension of Probationary Period for Institutional Circumstances

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

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

- 3.6.4.1 Notification of extension of the probationary period due to childbirth or adoption may be initiated by the faculty member, the Department Chair/Head, or the Dean of the college.
- 3.6.4.2 Request for extension of the probationary period due to personal or family circumstances, personal illness or disability shall be initiated by the faculty member. In the case of requests involving disability or illness, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide appropriate documentation to adequately demonstrate why the request should be granted.
- 3.6.4.3 Request for extension of the probationary period due to institutional circumstances may be initiated by the faculty member, the Department Chair/Head, or the Dean of the college.
- 3.6.4.4 Faculty members may inform their Department Chair/Head and/or Dean of the college of their request if they wish to do so, but they are not required to do so.
- 3.6.4.5 Extension of the probationary period requests shall be submitted to the Provost using the Request for Probationary Period Extension form.
- 3.6.4.6 Once an extension of the probationary period request is approved, the faculty member, Department Chair/Head, and the Dean of the college will be notified in writing by the Provost. If the request is denied, the faculty member will be notified in writing by the Provost.

3.6.5 Confidentiality

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

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

Related Policies and Procedures:

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

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

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

- 3.7 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 While faculty in Professor of Practice and Research Professor positions are not eligible for tenure, promotion through ranks is encouraged and is based on time in rank and satisfactory evaluations of assigned responsibilities. An application for promotion is initiated via a departmental recommendation and follows the same procedure and submission deadlines as for tenure-line faculty. Faculty in such positions are eligible to apply for promotion from assistant to associate after the completion of five years in rank.
- 4.6 Unless college or department procedures provide otherwise, the department chair or head of the academic unit will be responsible for the conduct of the reviews and the communication of their results. Periodic reviews shall result in a written report to the faculty member being reviewed. The report shall state expectations and goals for the coming review period. For probationary faculty, the report shall include an assessment of the faculty member's progress toward tenure and recommendations for improvement. Should the periodic reviews indicate that a faculty member is not making satisfactory progress toward tenure, the report may include a recommendation for nonrenewal. In making a judgment on satisfactory progress toward tenure, due consideration shall be given to the candidate's academic record, performance of assigned responsibilities, and potential to meet the criteria for promotion and tenure at the end of the probationary period.
- 4.7 Colleges and departments shall develop specific post-tenure review policies appropriate to their faculty. Annual reviews of tenured faculty shall include an evaluation of the faculty member's performance relative to the current position description. For Associate Professors, annual reviews must include specific recommendations to strengthen the case for promotion. Annual reviews of Professors must recognize and reinforce areas of strength, as well as discuss areas of weakness and recommend improvements. Should the annual reviews indicate that performance of a faculty member is unsatisfactory under the standards for post-tenure review, the report shall include a recommendation for appropriate remedial action.
- 4.8 The faculty member being reviewed shall have 14 days to respond in writing to the written report if the faculty member wishes to do so. The written report, and any written response from the faculty member, shall become part of the faculty member's official personnel file.

5. COMPOSITION OF PTE COMMITTEES

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

5.3 Prior to commencement of deliberations, the chair of any PTE committee must have received PTE committee training within the last three years, provided through the Office of the Provost. ~~Faculty members and administrators being considered for promotion may not be involved in any candidate review and recommendation process, including the selection of external reviewers, while under consideration.~~ Nonadministrative faculty members who have applied for promotion and/or tenure may not be involved in the review and recommendation process of any candidate. Administrators who have applied for promotion may not be involved in the review and recommendation process of any candidate where there may be an actual or apparent conflict of interest. A candidate may provide input concerning selection of external reviewers if allowed by department and college policies.

5.43 The department and college PTE committees' reviews and recommendations are part of a process of peer review. Thus, faculty holding academic administrative appointments, including those with interim status, are not eligible to serve. ("Academic administrative appointment" includes appointments as President, Provost, Vice President or Provost, Associate or Assistant Vice President or Provost, Dean, Associate or Assistant Dean, Department Chair or Head, Associate, Assistant or Vice Chair or Head, and any other administrators who supervise and/or evaluate other faculty.) Center or Program Directors who do not supervise and/or evaluate other faculty are eligible to serve.

5.54 A college PTE committee member who has voted on the promotion/tenure of a candidate in the department PTE committee shall be recused from the vote by the college PTE committee. In such a case, college policy shall determine whether the committee member may or may not deliberate with the committee on the candidate.

5.65 Faculty members, including administrators, who participate in the PTE process shall be recused from deliberations and decisions regarding a candidate if there is a past or current relationship that compromises, or could have the appearance of compromising, a faculty member's judgment with regard to the candidate. The following list, while not exhaustive, illustrates the types of relationships that constitute a conflict of interest:

- A family relationship
- A marital, life partner or dating/romantic/intimate relationship
- An advising relationship (e.g., the faculty member having served as the candidate's PhD or postdoctoral advisor)
- A direct financial interest and/or relationship
- Any other relationship that would prevent a sound, unbiased decision

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

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 according to the PTE Timeline published by the Office of the Provost:
https://www.ndsu.edu/fileadmin/provost/PTE/PTE_Timeline.pdf
- 6.2 In the absence of an approved extension, faculty who do not submit a tenure portfolio during their final probationary year, or who withdraw a submitted tenure portfolio, shall receive a one-year terminal contract for the following year.
- 6.2.1 After the deadline for submission of the portfolio to the Dean's office, as stated on the PTE timeline, the information that may be added to the portfolio is limited to
- a) Recommendations by the evaluating units considering the portfolio at that time;
 - b) the candidate's response to those recommendations;
 - c) any materials requested by the evaluators.
- 6.2.2 Candidates may petition the college Dean and PTE committee to add additional materials after the deadline. The Dean and PTE committee must both agree to the addition in order for additional material to be added.
- 6.2.3 Any additional materials added to the portfolio must pertain to information or material already in the portfolio, such as pending publications or grant proposals.
- 6.3 Unsolicited individual faculty input is limited to the department level of review.
- 6.4 Recommendations and any other materials collected as part of the evaluation process at the department, college, and university levels must be added to the candidate's portfolio before being sent forward to the next level of review. At the time that any written materials are added to the candidate's portfolio, copies of the added material must be sent to the candidate for review. The candidate shall have 14 calendar days to respond in writing to the additional materials. Any response from the candidate to such materials must be in writing and must be included in the portfolio for review at the next level.
- 6.5 Allegations of misconduct discovered after the deadline for submission of the portfolio to the Dean's Office that could be detrimental to a candidate's case (e.g. academic misconduct) shall be handled through the appropriate University policy and mechanisms. In such cases, the PTE process will be suspended 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.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.5"

- 6.7 The College PTE Committee and the College Dean shall separately and independently review and evaluate the candidate's portfolio without discussion or communication.
- 6.8 The college PTE Committee shall prepare a written report, including recommendations and an explanation of the basis for them, that shall be included in the candidate's portfolio. The report and recommendations shall be submitted to the Provost according to the PTE Timeline. A copy shall be sent to the Dean, the chair or head of the academic unit, and the candidate.
- 6.9 The College Dean shall also prepare a separate written report, including recommendations and an explanation of the basis for them that shall be included in the candidate's portfolio. The Dean shall forward the report and recommendations, and the portfolio of the candidate, to the Provost according to the PTE Timeline. A copy of the Dean's report shall be sent to the College PTE committee, the chair or head of the academic unit, and the candidate.
- 6.10 The Provost shall review the candidate's materials and the recommendations of the Department, College PTE Committee, and College Dean, and shall solicit input from a nonvoting advisory committee consisting of a faculty representative from each College PTE Committee, selected by the Provost with attention to diversity. The Provost shall submit a recommendation to the President in writing, including an explanation of the basis for it, by the deadline established in the PTE guidelines. Copies of the Provost's written recommendation shall be sent to the candidate, the Department Chair/Head, the College Dean, and the Department and College PTE Committees.
- 6.11 When appropriate, the President shall then make the final recommendation to the SBHE for tenure. When appropriate, the President shall notify the candidate of promotion or denial of promotion.
- 6.12 In the case of joint appointments, the primary responsibility for the review rests with the department and the college that hold the majority or plurality of the appointments. Such department or college shall solicit input from the other units holding the remainder of the appointment as appropriate to the allocation of effort. This input from other units which shall be included in the portfolio.
- 6.13 When evaluating faculty participating in interdisciplinary programs, the primary department may solicit input from the director of the interdisciplinary program as appropriate to the allocation of effort.

7. APPEALS

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

8. DOCUMENT RETENTION

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

HISTORY:

Amended	May 13, 1974
Amended	February 10, 1975
Amended	December 12, 1988
Amended	May 14, 1990
Amended	April 1992
Amended	December 12, 1994 (Effective date July 1, 1995)
Amended	June 1997
Amended	November 2000
Amended	October 2001
Amended	October 2007
Amended	July 2008
Housekeeping	February 14, 2011
Amended	October 11, 2011
Amended	June 19, 2014
Amended	October 19, 2015
Amended	January 27, 2016
Amended	April 11, 2016
Amended	September 8, 2016
Amended	April 12, 2017
Housekeeping	April 19, 2017
Amended	March 29, 2018

Policy 352, Section 5.2 – Edits by K Rodgers

Only tenured faculty members who have completed three years of full-time appointment with the University and who have attained the rank of associate professor or above are eligible for service with full voting rights on a college or department PTE Committee. When reviewing applications for promotion of Professors of Practice or Research Professors, PTE committees are encouraged to solicit advisory input from Associate/Full Professors of Practice or Research Professors. If allowed by department and college policies, PTE committees may include representation from Associate/Full Professors of Practice or Research Professors holding terminal degrees. Voting rights for Professors of Practice or Research Professors on applications for promotion shall be determined by the respective colleges or departments. **Only in such cases where unit policy allows** **can** Professors of Practice or Research Professors **who hold positions in the evaluating unit shall be granted have** full voting rights on applications for promotion of Professors of Practice or Research Professors, respectively.

How often are General Education courses evaluated?

Courses that have been approved for the General Education program are required to be evaluated every five years to ensure that learning outcomes are being met as indicated. In late summer/early Fall 2018, departments will receive a list of courses due for evaluation. New courses can also be proposed in fall semesters for evaluation and approval, and new courses are encouraged to help keep the program up to date and to help fill demand in required categories/outcomes. Currently highest demand is for D, G, S.

When are proposals evaluated by the UCC?

Submission procedures of proposals for General Education new courses or revalidation of courses is only open in fall semester. ~~The UCC will continue to evaluate all submitted courses that flow to them by the end of fall semester.~~ General Education courses that are being revalidated will have until February 15 of the spring semester. If a course due for evaluation is not submitted, it will be automatically removed from the General Education course list in the next issue of the [Bulletin](#).

- **Search committee process**
 - Faculty invest a large amount of time and then have little input on the final decision
 - Not always clear how committees are formed and if this is following Faculty Senate bylaws.
 - RELEVANT POLICIES: 300, 304
- **How can long-terms plans for NDSU be mapped out into policy?**
 - What does that process look like for individual faculty? Individual departments?
 - Can we generate excitement around common themes?
- **Graduate student insurance**
 - Perhaps not feasible given current funding climate, but can we work with student government to draft policy to be ready to go if things get better?
- **Interaction with local legislators**
 - In the past, Saturday meetings were held between faculty and local legislators
 - Attempt to implement something like this for the upcoming session?
- **Increased interaction between faculty governance and student governance**
- **Increasing clerical work for faculty**
 - How does use of programs, such as Digital Measures, become a part of faculty responsibilities
 - Would prefer greater administrative transparency and faculty input on these things
 - RELEVANT POLICIES: 320, 321, 325
- **General morale on campus is low**