

College of Health Professions
Standards for Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation

1. Introduction

This document sets forth the criteria to be used by the College of Health Professions, hereafter referred to as the "College," in the appointment of new faculty and in the recommendation of faculty for promotion, continued appointment, and tenure, in accordance with the policies of North Dakota State University and the State Board of Higher Education. These criteria will be used to evaluate probationary (tenure track), special appointment (non-tenure track), and tenured faculty. The following two paragraphs are excerpted from the NDSU Policy Manual, section 352.

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 high quality of a faculty member's contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarship (research and discovery), 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, the College, and its programs.

From the University's mission flows the expectation that each faculty member will make contributions of high quality in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. "Teaching" includes instruction both on- and off-campus. "Scholarship" refers to research and other creative endeavors that lead to significant advances in the acquisition or synthesis of new information and knowledge. These endeavors may be in the research laboratory, the classroom, or in the patient care setting. "Service" includes public service, service to the University, College and Department, and service to the profession.

Because of the University and the College missions, the quality and quantity of contributions in all three areas will be considered at the times of promotion and tenure. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate significant and sustained contributions, competence, and independence in all three areas; however, because of variations among faculty in strengths and/or responsibilities, faculty members are not expected to demonstrate equal levels of accomplishment in all areas. Collaboration with others in all three areas is recognized and encouraged; however, faculty members must demonstrate independence and leadership in their contributing area of expertise. As a result of collaboration with others, faculty members are expected to become a lead investigator or author and generate publications, grants, and presentations of their scholarship/new discoveries in their respective discipline. Expectations in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service will be based on the individual's position description. Each academic unit in the College of Health Professions will set a minimum, non-zero percentage commitment for each area (i.e., teaching, scholarship, and service) upon which (after approval by faculty in that academic unit) faculty will be evaluated for promotion and/or tenure. Each academic unit will create a procedural document, approved by faculty in that academic unit, that delineates faculty accomplishments in each area of evaluation that represent the median

expectations to successfully meet promotion and/or tenure standards at each rank, each type of faculty appointment, and general ranges of percentage commitments. The College of Health Professions Faculty Development Committee will subsequently create a procedural document that consistently and equitably merges the documents created and approved by each individual academic unit in the College, and which will be approved by all faculty in the College of Health Professions.

Faculty members are expected to provide sustained contributions to the overall mission of the Department, College, and University and maintain high standards of professional and ethical behavior in their work. A commitment to the College core values is expected, where honesty, integrity, and collegiality guide all interactions with students, faculty, staff, administration, and the public. Failure to meet this responsibility should be noted in periodic reviews of teaching, research, and service and may be addressed through the enforcement of other NDSU policies, such as Policy 151 Code of Conduct and Policy 326 Academic Misconduct.

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. As noted in NDSU Policy 352, "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." The format of portfolio materials must follow the NDSU Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Preparation. These guidelines are updated annually and are available on the Provost web site.

2. Promotion

Promotions are based on merit and are earned by achievement as evidenced by the faculty member's total contribution to the overall mission of the College. The performance record of a candidate for promotion will be evaluated in terms of the following criteria as they apply to the proposed rank: teaching, scholarship (research and discovery), and service.

While the College as a whole must excel in all of the above areas, individual faculty members may contribute in some areas more than others. Therefore, each department, with approval of the department Chair and Dean, must define permissible weights to be given to these roles and responsibilities for each department member. In evaluating the candidate's qualifications for promotion, the candidate's position description will be used to define priorities for each role, and evaluation must reflect those role priorities.

3. Criteria for Promotion

The candidate for promotion must demonstrate significant and sustained contributions to the College and demonstrate competence, independence, and evidence of high quality in the primary areas of evaluation including: teaching, scholarship (research and discovery), and service. Each candidate will be evaluated in each of the areas in proportion to the priorities assigned to his/her roles and responsibilities as a faculty member as defined by their position description.

3.1 Teaching (encompassing both instruction and advising) refers to the broad area of student-faculty interaction for educational purposes. A faculty member who excels in teaching is a person who engages students to learn; guides students to think purposely, independently, and critically; keeps informed about new developments in his or her specialty and related fields; strives continuously to broaden and deepen his or her knowledge and understanding; and continually contributes to improving the methods of teaching his or her subject matter. Peer evaluations of teaching content and methods are required.

(A) CRITERIA: In the areas of teaching, the following criteria apply to evaluation of contributions by a candidate for promotion and tenure review:

(A1) the effective delivery of instruction to and the stimulation of learning by students and/or clients;

(A2) the continuous improvement of courses or instructional programs;

(A3) the effective advising and mentoring of undergraduate and/or graduate students;

(A4) when it applies, the effective preceptorship and/or clinical supervision of students earning academic credit for these experiences.

(B) EVIDENCE: A candidate demonstrates quality of teaching (encompassing both instruction and advising) by providing evidence and information from multiple sources such as:

(B1) The receipt of awards or special recognition including certification or licensing for teaching;

(B2) student, peer, and client evaluation of academic course materials, expertise, and ability to communicate knowledge;

(B3) 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;

(B4) the dissemination of best practices in classroom teaching and clinical instruction, including student preceptorship;

(B5) evaluation by advisees of the quality of graduate and undergraduate advising;

(B6) student-peer, and client evaluations of innovation in clinical instruction and/or preceptorship experiences, and ability to translate clinical knowledge into practice.

(B7) Evaluation of teaching should be conducted and interpreted consistent with NDSU Policy 332: Assessment of Teaching

(C) OTHER CONSIDERATIONS: Additional considerations include: degree of responsibility; scope of teaching, importance of teaching duties with regard to the mission of the College; exceptional responsibilities undertaken, assigned or voluntary; size and level of teaching load; number of clinical students precepted; participation in continuing education and/or distance education programs of the College. Significant teaching responsibilities must provide evidence of high quality.

3.2 Scholarship (research and discovery) is defined as any original work that is conducted and sufficiently documented by faculty such that it exemplifies excellence, innovation, and independence and is recognized by peers to have made a significant impact on and contributions to new knowledge. Excellence in scholarship

may be demonstrated and documented in one or more of the following areas: teaching, discovery, integration, and application.

The scholarship of teaching must demonstrate innovation, discovery, or experimentation in the classroom or clinical setting that enhances student learning.

The scholarship of discovery is the practice of research and represents the investigative tradition of academic life. The scholarship of discovery contributes to the realm of human knowledge and to the intellectual climate of the College and University.

The scholarship of integration is the giving of meaning and perspective to isolated information and fitting information into larger, more meaningful patterns. While it represents the synthesizing research traditions of academic life, it can also be affected through service and clinical practice.

The scholarship of application is the responsible application of professional knowledge to consequential problems in both preclinical and clinical arenas.

Principal criteria for the assessment of scholarship quality in all areas of teaching, discovery, integration, and application are

Primary

- a. High quality, peer-reviewed publications, especially with the candidate being a major contributing author
- b. Extramural grants (including contracts) especially with candidate being principal investigator in a peer-reviewed, openly competitive grant process

Secondary

- c. Presentation of papers at professional societal meetings
- d. Appointments to regional, national, and/or international advisory boards/committees and study sections
- e. Invited editorials, lectureships, and/or chairing of meeting sections particularly at the national and international level
- f. Election to Fellow status in professional societies
- g. Publication of non-peer reviewed sources
- h. Intramural Grantsmanship
- i. Activities relating to the review of grant proposals and manuscripts
- j. Consultantships
- k. If an expectation of employment is to support the graduate program, successfully attracting graduate students and mentoring them to completion of study within an appropriate time frame

3.3 Service refers to the work that a faculty member performs for the University, College, profession, and public that contributes to the welfare of others.

Principal criteria for the assessment of quality of service are

- a. Effectiveness in professional practice activity

- b. Active participation and demonstrated leadership in University governance and programs at the Department, College, and University levels
- c. Active participation in and demonstrated leadership of professional organizations and societies and other activities
- d. Demonstrated high quality in advising of student organizations
- e. Active participation in continuing and distance education programs of the College
- f. Active participation and demonstrated leadership in serving the public in a professional capacity
- g. Recognition by peers as an expert in his or her discipline
- h. Service as an exemplary role model

4. Procedural Guidelines for the Recommendation of Promotion and Tenure

4.1 Annual performance and mid-tenure reviews

The following procedures have been established and will be followed to provide faculty PTE candidates and administrators the opportunity to monitor and evaluate the candidate's progress in meeting the expectations of employment and the criteria for promotion and tenure. These procedures are intended to provide faculty constructive feedback to assist them in attaining their goals for promotion and tenure.

In implementing the PTE policy, the following procedures shall be used:

(A) Each faculty member of the College [tenured, probationary (tenure track, and special appointment (non-tenure track),] will be reviewed by March 8 of every year by his/her department chair according to the College policy on Annual Performance Review of Faculty. When requested by any party to the tenure or promotion process, including the candidate, formal feedback shall be provided to the individual by the Department PTE Committee, Department Chair, Dean, and College PTE Committee. The College PTE Committee shall conduct a mid-tenure review according to the College policy on Mid-Tenure Track Review for each tenure track candidate to provide feedback on the candidate's progress toward achieving promotion and tenure within the College.

(B) The Department Chair will be responsible for conducting annual performance reviews of faculty in their respective department and communicating their results to the individual faculty member.

During the annual performance review, the Department Chair will provide each faculty member with both verbal and written feedback regarding the individual faculty member's performance and where appropriate, progress toward achieving promotion and tenure including strengths and recommendations for improvement related to the areas of teaching, scholarship (research and discovery), and service. The annual performance review shall also state expectations and goals for the coming year review period. Should the annual performance reviews indicate that a faculty member is not making satisfactory progress toward tenure and/or promotion; the report may include a recommendation for non-renewal. Nonrenewal of probationary faculty prior to the sixth year shall be done in accordance with the College and University policies for nonrenewal of probationary faculty. In making a judgment on satisfactory progress, due consideration shall be given to the candidate's academic record, performance of assigned responsibilities as defined in his/her position description, and future potential to meet the criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

(C) The faculty member being reviewed shall have 14 days to respond in writing to the written

assessment of performance. The written report of the annual performance by the chair, and any written response from the faculty member, shall become part of the faculty member's official personnel file.

(D) For probationary faculty (tenure track), at the completion of the sixth year of service, the faculty member shall be notified in writing that he or she will either be awarded tenure or a one-year terminal contract for the seventh year of service.

(E) Promotion and tenure are two separate considerations. For example, a person may be eligible and acceptable for promotion and eligible but not acceptable for tenure. Circumstances may be such that a recommendation for postponing the granting of tenure may be in order. In such a case, the faculty member will be recommended for a special appointment position according to the guidelines of the State Board of Higher Education and NDSU. The Department Chair and Dean should meet with the candidate to discuss the basis of such a decision. This decision must be made before the process is initiated to evaluate the candidate's credentials for promotion and tenure.

4.2 Submission of portfolio

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure must submit a portfolio (following the current "NDSU Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Preparation" distributed by the Provost to their Department Chair for review by no later than August 15. Candidates are encouraged to include the section called "Statement of Accomplishment" as part of their portfolio. The Department Chair will forward the candidate's portfolio to the Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee by September 1. The Department PTE Committee will conduct a review and submit a written letter of evaluation of the candidate and recommendation to the department chair by no later than October 1, according to Department's PTE guidelines and university promotion and tenure guidelines distributed by the Provost.

Upon receipt of this information, the Department Chair will review and submit a written letter of evaluation of the candidate and recommendation to the College PTE Committee. The letters of evaluation from the Department PTE Committee and the Department Chair will be inserted in the candidate's PTE portfolio by the Department Chair. The Department Chair shall forward the candidate's PTE portfolio and all supporting documentation to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and to the Dean by no later than October 20. If necessary, the College PTE Committee may request additional information from the candidate, Department PTE Committee, Department Chair, and/or Dean. The College PTE Committee will inform all parties (candidate, Department Chair and Dean) what additional information is being requested prior to the information being collected. The candidate shall have 14 calendar days to respond in writing to the additional materials. Additionally, the faculty member's Department Chair may be invited to attend the initial meeting of the College PTE Committee to discuss the candidate's eligibility for promotion and/or tenure.

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 included in the portfolio for review at the next level.

The College PTE Committee and the Dean will independently evaluate the candidate based on the submitted portfolio in accordance with the University guidelines for promotion and tenure distributed by the Provost's office. Each will prepare a separate written letter of evaluation of the candidate, including

recommendations regarding the candidate's promotion and tenure and an explanation of the basis for the recommendations, that will be included in the candidate's portfolio. The College PTE Committee and Dean shall share their respective letters of evaluation with each other only after each has completed their independent evaluation of the candidate. The letters of evaluation from the College PTE Committee and Dean shall be sent to the Chair of the academic unit and the candidate. The Dean will forward these letters of evaluation, recommendations, and the candidate's portfolio to the Provost according to the PTE timeline.

All recommendations for tenure must be recommended by the President to the State Board of Higher Education for final approval by the Board (NDSU policy 350). Termination of a probationary or tenured appointment may occur only in accordance with the policies of North Dakota State University and the State Board of Higher Education (State Board Policy 605). Departmental supplemental information may be added to this document.

4.3 Letters of Evaluation from Outside Reviewers

Letters of evaluation from outside North Dakota State University are not required but may be considered. The purpose of seeking such letters is to accumulate credible documented evidence of a faculty member's qualifications and contributions to the profession related to their position responsibilities. Such letters should be objective evaluations from well qualified individuals. Solicited outside letters should provide specific evidence of achievement or competence by the candidate in a specific area, but should not include a recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure. Solicited outside letters should be limited to evaluation from leaders in the field and from scholars at comparable research universities (no more than three letters). Letters should not be solicited from co-authors, co-principal investigators, former professors/advisors, co-workers, or former students. Letters should generally be from tenured professors or individuals of equivalent stature outside of academia who are widely recognized in the field. The following process must be followed for soliciting letters of evaluation from outside reviewers:

(A) The faculty member will submit a list of names of potential outside reviewers who meet the above criteria to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will select individuals from this list or request additional names that are mutually agreed upon by the Chair and the candidate. The Department Chair will notify the candidate of the outside reviewers that have been selected.

(B) Letters of evaluation from outside reviewers will be solicited by the Dean or Department Chair. The Dean or Department Chair will send letters to each outside reviewer soliciting a formal letter of evaluation of the faculty member. The letters sent to outside reviewers soliciting an evaluation must contain statements pertaining to the following: (a) under North Dakota law the candidate has a right to review all material in the promotion and tenure file. A copy of each letter is sent to the candidate; and (b) no recommendation is to be made for or against promotion and/or tenure. A representative form letter (see sample letter Appendix A) should be used by the Dean or Chair as a guideline. The letter sent by the Dean or Department Chair to the outside reviewers should also contain the following information about the faculty member: a copy of the faculty member's current position description, vita, and where appropriate copies of publications.

(C) Letters of evaluation from outside reviewers are not to be solicited by the faculty member, but will be added to the portfolio by the Dean or Department Chair. To receive consideration in the PTE process, letters of evaluation from outside reviewers must be solicited, inserted, and part of the completed faculty member's portfolio which is submitted by the Department Chair to the College PTE Committee. No letters of evaluation from outside reviewers will be accepted or considered once the College PTE Committee review process has been started.

5. Policy and Procedures for Post-tenure Review (PTR)

The granting of tenure does not relieve the faculty member of his or her obligations to fulfill all assigned job duties. Annual job performance reviews of faculty rest with the Department Chair and the process by which faculty are reviewed on an annual basis. Additionally, Section 350.3 of the NDSU Policy Manual details the circumstances, policies and procedures under which a faculty (tenured or otherwise) member may be terminated.

Upon request of the faculty member, Dean or Chair, a faculty member with tenure can be requested to be evaluated by post-tenure review. Unless requested by the faculty member, this review cannot be done more frequently than every 3 years. This review should address the quality of the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service, consistent with the faculty member's job description. Ideally, the review shall result in recommendations for enhancing performance and provide a plan for future development. The department chair initiates the process by notifying the faculty member that materials for the review are due by August 15. Materials will include an abbreviated promotion portfolio and this includes: updated CV, current job description, annual performance review, and a statement of accomplishment in the three areas (see Section F in Policy 352). The materials will be reviewed by the Departmental PTE committee and the College PTE committee. A letter summarizing the outcome of each committee will be sent to the faculty member with a copy to the Chair, Dean and Provost.

Faculty members may use the currently established grievance process to resolve any improper use of PTR documents. Concomitantly, participation in PTR is viewed as a necessary component of successfully completing one's job duties. Faculty members who fail to participate in the post-tenure review process in a timely and professional fashion are subject to sanction via the annual review process and NDSU Policy 350.3. The review does not change the university's commitment to academic freedom, or the circumstances under which tenured faculty can be dismissed from the university.

5.1 Mid Tenure Track Review

The College of Health Professions Policy 1.03 Standards for Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation directs the College Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee to conduct a mid-tenure review for each tenure track candidate. The department chairs will identify tenure-track faculty in his/her department, who are approaching completion of the mid-probationary period (usually three years). During the annual evaluation process, the chairs will ask these candidates to prepare and submit the mid-tenure portfolio to the chair of the PTE committee, on or before October 1. If necessary, the PTE committee may request additional information from the candidate, the chair, and the dean. By November 1, the committee will generate a written assessment report regarding progress toward promotion and tenure within the college, which may also include a recommendation regarding tenure credit for prior service. Copies will be distributed to the candidate, the department chair, and the dean of the college. A copy will be retained in the candidate's personnel file. The structure and content of the mid-tenure portfolio is presented in Policy 1.03.1

Revision approved by the Provost, October 22, 2021

Revision approved by the Faculty, February 17, 2021, October 20, 2021

Revision approved by the Faculty, May 1, 2019

Revision approved by the Provost,

Revision approved by the Faculty, September 26, 2014

Revision approved by the Provost, December 26, 2013

Revision approved by the Faculty, October 24, 2013
Revision approved by the Provost, November 15, 2010
Revision approved by the Faculty, April 15, 2009
Revision approved by the Provost, November 15, 2006
Revision approved by the Faculty, November 8, 2006
Revision approved by the Provost/VPAA 10/31/03; by the Faculty 11/12/03.
Revision approved by Faculty, September 17, 2003
Revision approved by Faculty February 12, 2003
Approved by V.P. Academic Affairs September 9, 1997
Revision approved by Faculty April 30, 1997
Housekeeping: 12/3/14; 4/29/15