The FORWARD Evaluation  
*Promotion to Professor Panel: Tips from Academic Deans*  
*September 25th, 2012*

**Attendance**  
- Fifty-eight individuals attended and 46 completed evaluations.  
  - 8 attendees were full professors, 28 were associate professors, 7 were assistant professors, and 3 were administrators.

**Quantitative Results from the Evaluation Form**

**My understanding of the process and criteria for promotion to full professor at NDU has improved after today’s panel.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I feel I have acquired new skills and/or information about applying for promotion to full professor at NDSU.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**As a result of my participation in this session, I will be able to implement new strategies in my own process of becoming a full professor.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I would recommend this panel discussion to others.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rate the overall quality of this panel.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form
1. What questions do you still have after attending this panel? Please list any topics related to the promotion process from associate to full professor that you would like to receive additional information about or items that need further clarification. Your suggestions will be used to structure future sessions on the promotion process to full professor.
   - Provostr’s expectations for promotion. College of Engineering and Architecture expectations.
   - Knowing when “the chili is ready”? (referring to Dean Peterson’s metaphor)
   - Is efforts to get grant enough? What was meant by character (Dean Ron Johnson said) was factored into the decision for full professor? How does one do “more and better” with no more resources and time?
   - What do deans do to foster a culture of scholarship that retains stars?
   - Training for dept heads on the evaluation process
   - The vagueness around the criteria of time and when to go up. I appreciate that the timeline is flexible, but a minimum or baseline would be useful.
   - It would be nice if administration tried to find out the concerns of associate professors and explored strategies for making positive change
   - Grantsmanship workshop would be good to have at some time during the year
   - How can we as faculty advocate for ourselves with the Provost. He’s making decisions with seemingly little feedback from Deans/chairs/faculty
   - We need to hear from the Provost himself instead of speculating on what his expectations and approach are
   - Chairs rule
   - Positive mentorship versus Competitive mentorship. Rank elements of portfolio success. Disproportional support of select faculty at the expense of others
   - Motivating Associates to want to become Full professors – what works?
   - How to find the time to do all that is expected?

2. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the panel you attended today?
   - Interaction and answers from Deans
   - Their attempt to explain the process
   - The perspective from Deans about the criteria of promoting to full professor
   - The expectations for full professor
   - I appreciated the comments from Dean Clark Johnson
   - Criteria important for promotion
   - Dean’s expectations for promotion to full professor
   - Insight and experiences of the deans
   - Dean Clark-Johnson pointing out the diversity in requirements and expectations. She was nuanced which was good!
   - Hearing various perspectives from a wide array of disciplines. Having said that, it was interesting that despite disciplinary differences, there were several common themes for what characteristics should be displayed by successful candidate
   - I had kind of decided to stop attending the promotion to full lunches because I had attended so many, but the Dean’s perspectives are new and useful, so I came.
   - It validated my expectations of administrators. Talking about the expectations of the Provost
   - Honest discussion about new Provost. Chuck Peterson’s points about what he learned talking to distinguished guest lecturers
   - Open/honest answers
   - Hearing the perspective of deans, across a wide array of disciplines
   - Q & A → honesty
   - Each shared 4-6 tips they felt were important for one to consider as they plan their action steps to be taken. These tips were very informative and useful.
   - It was interesting to hear the different Deans’ perspective on what’s important. One is time, one is reputation, each has a different idea of something that’s important, but not explicit.
   - Questions from audience
   - Success seems to be directly proportional to the desire of the faculty who care and are proactive. Now that a salary increase is finally added for promotion it is a race, despite good annual reviews.
• Their honesty. Communicating the direction of the university (‘more, better metrics’)

3. What is one tip that you got today that will be useful as you prepare to apply for promotion to full professor?
• To pursue leadership positions at NDSU, at college, and national organizations
• Talk about promotion often
• Seek advice from chairs or Deans about their expectations and how far you are from the promotion criteria
• Review the criteria carefully and talk to others for improvements
• To talk to the Dean to assess readiness
• The encouragement to meet with a Dean to pre-review one’s case to determine a good time to go up for full
• Check current document/criteria
• Focus on leadership
• To sit down with someone in your college who has recently been successful in moving up from Associate to Full
• Talk to people before going up
• Risk is valued when successful, but a promotional cost if not. Promotion is a very competitive environment.
• Feel free to meet with the Dean
• Follow the criteria for your department and college

4. How could the panel be improved to be more beneficial to you?
• Participation of Provost would be very beneficial
• Be more concise with answers so more points can be covered in the given time
• Get some print-out tips after luncheons.
• Not every dean needed to answer every question. Chuck and Ron needed to limit their answers so more questions from the audience could have been answered
• Deans were giving canned answers and were less open as compared to previous faculty panels. Also no science and engineering deans so information was limited. I think Deans are simply puppets in most cases to the Provost and often contribute little to the PTE process
• Start mentoring committee
• It would have been nice to hear from deans of CEA and CAFSNR
• Discussion improved after Deans got the audience’s questions
• Manage speaker time, especially in the case of different colleges, if one Dean gets lots more time than others, the Dean some came to hear will get shorted
• Focus on emerging trends in higher ed. What do they recommend for women in a male world
• Maybe a panel of those who have recently been promoted to Full
• More deans
• Invite the Provost for the next lunch
• Ask provost to be on the panel
• Handling expectations of promotions when the requirements change 5 years into effort. Contrary to what was implied upon hiring of Provost
• Represent all colleges
• Was great info
• Provide resources of applying for grants

5. Please provide any additional comments you have about today’s panel discussion and/or the FORWARD program in general below or on the back of this page.
• Very informational. Thanks!
• Any one panelist need not monopolize the time
• I am most nervous about the Provost’s perspective and fear his intervention in this process the most. Perhaps having him at one of these might be good
• Platitudes not concrete examples… makes me believe it’s very subjective
• I really liked writing questions instead of shouting them out
• Does ‘responsibility’ go beyond ROI (i.e., environment, health/wellness, etc.)
• Each college should have the same ‘common’ criteria – looks like some colleges (at least one I identified today) have no expectations AT ALL!!
6. Questions from the Audience

- Are standards for research productivity increasing at the college or university level this year, even if not formally?
- Any Dean, what will the Provost expect that would be different from the college?
- How will it be different with a new Provost?
- How does the nature of the appointment and/or % allocation of effort factor into your evaluation?
- What role do you see for a mentor in this process? Any advises for potential mentors?
- What is the role of mentoring Committees for Associate to Full Professor?
- As a dean, do you view Full Professorship as a prerequisite for being a Chair? If ‘no,’ why?
- Does your college have a post-tenure review process? If so, how does it work? Is it successful?
- Any Dean, would DCE money be considered like grants for bringing in resources?
- Any Dean, how evaluate if candidate has gotten good annual reviews and raises but no grants?
- At what stage in the process do you advise people to wait to go up for full and what is the mechanism or process for that?
- How do you evaluate scholarship among several, often quite disparate disciplines, in light of a single college PTE document?
- Explain the origin of the requirement for International service and scientific collaboration in order to be eligible for full professor promotion. Being enforced?
- All Deans, what are the barriers for women faculty in your college to achieving excellence?
- All Deans, what is the most unusual case you have worked with?
- How do you think about the balance between being a gatekeeper and an advocate for the faculty in your college?
- At what point and for what reasons would you disagree with a department’s recommendation?
- Have any of the deans given a favorable recommendation in fear of a lawsuit?
- What is considered the most effective way to measure scholarship in teaching?