

Department of Physics North Dakota State University Procedures and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

1 Preamble

This document describes the procedures and criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of Physics. Recommendations for promotion and tenure are based on evaluations by the Department Head and a Department Promotion Tenure and Evaluation (PTE) committee. The PTE committee consists of all tenured faculty who have been members in the Department of Physics for at least one year, excluding the Department Head and excluding applicants for promotion to Full Professor.

There are four different types of departmental evaluations, (i) annual performance evaluations of all faculty members, (ii) third-year pre-tenure evaluations, (iii) evaluation for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, and (iv) evaluation for promotion to Full Professor. Annual evaluations are prepared by the Department Head. All other evaluations are provided by both the Department Head and the PTE committee.

Annual performance evaluations are prepared each year for every faculty member. Faculty members in their third year of the probationary appointment usually undergo the third-year pre-tenure review. Exceptions for faculty with tenure credit apply according to the Policy and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Evaluation from the College of Science and Mathematics, Section 4.2. Procedures for extension of the probationary period (including the extension of the probationary period for childbirth or adoption) apply as regulated in NDSU's policy manual 352: Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation, Section 3.6. Exceptional academic accomplishments may warrant early promotion. Petitions for early promotion shall be initiated by Department Head, in accordance with NDSU's policy 352: Section 3.4.

2 Evaluation Procedures

2.1 Annual Faculty Performance Evaluations

The Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation encompasses the areas of instruction, research, and service. The Department Head will evaluate each faculty member based on the corresponding current position description on file. The annual evaluation is normally initiated by mid-January and completed by March 01.

Every mid-January each faculty member submits a Professional Activities Report to the Department Head. The report typically consists of one or two written pages and summarizes relevant activities from the previous one or two calendar years in the areas of instruction, research, and service. The report contains summaries of student evaluations. It may also include other professional and scholarly activities that do not fall directly into the categories of instruction, research, and service.

Submission and review of the Professional Activities Report is followed by individual meetings of the Department Head with each faculty member. The meetings typically take place in February.

They provide an opportunity for the faculty member and the Department Head to discuss performance issues of the previous year in research, teaching, and service. The meetings may also be used to review and, if necessary, revise the position description of the faculty member.

Prior to March 01, the Department Head prepares a letter for each faculty member, evaluating the performance of the previous calendar year in research, teaching, and service. For probationary faculty, any perceived deficiencies in progress towards promotion/tenure must be detailed in the annual evaluation letter. The letter is typically signed by both the faculty member and the Department Head. However, if a faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, the faculty member has the option of not signing the letter and preparing a written response within 14 calendar days. Annual letters of evaluations and, if applicable, faculty response letters are placed in the faculty member's file.

2.2 Third-year pre-tenure evaluations

Probationary faculty who participate in the third-year pre-tenure review process as coordinated by the College of Science and Mathematics are also evaluated by the Department PTE committee and by the Department Head. The third-year pre-tenure departmental evaluations are intended to let the candidate know how the Department views the candidate's progress towards tenure and promotion. If appropriate, suggestions are made on how to improve the candidate's case.

The central part of the third-year pre-tenure evaluation process is the documentation of the candidate's activities in a portfolio, prepared according to the NDSU guidelines for Promotion and Tenure. The portfolio also forms the basis of the departmental evaluations from the PTE committee and Head. Three weeks prior to the due date for submitting the portfolio to the College of Science and Mathematics, a single copy must be submitted to the Department.

The portfolio will be evaluated by the PTE committee and by the Department Head in a manner equivalent to the tenure and promotion process. Department Head and PTE committee may each request an additional meeting with the candidate to discuss the candidate's case. Letters of evaluation summarizing progress toward promotion and tenure are prepared by the PTE committee and Department Head. Both letters will be forwarded to the PTE committee of the College.

2.3 Evaluation for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor

The portfolio, which the candidate has prepared according to the NDSU guidelines for Promotion and Tenure, is made available to the Department Head and to the members of the PTE committee no later than September 15 of the academic year in which the candidate applies for tenure and/or promotion. This due date is one month prior to the due date for submitting the portfolio to the College of Science and Mathematics. The candidate will be evaluated by the members of the Department PTE committee and by the Department Head, each resulting in a letter of recommendation. The Department PTE committee and the Department Head may discuss and coordinate their letters if this best serves the interest of the Department. Departmental evaluations are prepared according to the guidelines which were provided to the candidate at the time of the candidate's appointment to the position.

Procedures for evaluation by the PTE committee: The PTE committee will meet as necessary to discuss the candidate's case. The PTE committee may also request a meeting with the candidate and/or with other faculty. Once the deliberations are completed, a ballot is circulated among all members of the Department PTE committee with the possible response of "yes" or "no" to the

question of recommending tenure and/or promotion. The resulting recommendation of the Department PTE committee will be in favor of tenure and/or promotion if at least 75% of its members vote “yes”. In case the PTE committee consists of fewer than four members, 66% will be sufficient for a favorable recommendation. In case of a negative recommendation, the candidate has 14 calendar days to appeal the recommendation and request a second ballot. Prior to the second ballot the candidate may present his case to the PTE committee. The Department PTE committee will prepare a letter of evaluation with its recommendation and forward the letter to the Dean. The Department PTE committee may decide to explicitly include the voting percentage and, if applicable, whether the vote resulted from a second ballot.

Procedures for evaluation by Department Head: The Department Head may request a meeting with the candidate, the PTE committee, and/or with other faculty members. The Department Head will prepare a letter of evaluation, which will be forwarded to the Dean.

2.4 Promotion to Full Professor

The strongest case can be made when the candidate has demonstrated exceptional achievements in one or more of the areas of instruction, research, and service. Evaluations and other documentation should show excellence or signs of continued improvement in all three areas of responsibility. Performance in research, teaching, and service should be significantly beyond that required for promotion from assistant to associate professor. The candidate is expected to have demonstrated an increase in assumed and designated responsibilities, growth in expertise and capability, and evidence of regional and/or national scope of activities and scholarship.

Procedures for evaluation by the PTE committee and Department Head: The departmental evaluation for promotion to Full Professor follows the procedure outlined in Section 2.3 of this document. The PTE committee does not include the candidate who applies for promotion to Full Professor.

3 Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

Candidates will be judged according to their past, continuing, and projected contributions to the overall programs of the Department, College, and University. Evidence of accomplishment in the areas of research, instruction, and service will be evaluated.

Teaching criterion: The candidate has demonstrated high quality of instruction and competence as instructor in all courses taught.

Evidence may include the following: peer and student evaluations; honors, awards, and recognition for teaching excellence; participation in workshops, seminars, or other training to improve teaching; active membership in professional teaching organizations; activities in curriculum/program/course development; student/participant evaluations; success in advising; success in directing graduate student academic programs; recruitment/retention activities; success in work with student organizations; and success in providing enhanced educational opportunities for individuals at remote locations.

Research criterion: The candidate has established a competitive and independent research program.

Evidence must include a regular and sustained record of publications in peer reviewed journals. Additional evidence may include the following: presentations of research results at national or international meetings; invitations to meetings and conferences; invitations to give seminars/colloquia at other institutions; invited review articles; honors, awards, recognition for research; success in directing graduate student research; supervising post-doctoral fellows; supervising undergraduate research projects such as the Senior Project (Physics 489); contributions in collaborative projects.

Faculty must solicit funds (and/or other resources) to support their scholarly activities. Evidence for grantsmanship may include: a list of grants obtained with indication of the portion available to the faculty member; list of submitted, but unfunded proposals, possibly with review reports attached; attraction of research students (graduate and/or undergraduate students) with scholarships, fellowships, or self-procured funding; list of in-kind services solicited and gained for research purposes; and indications of how grants are leveraged to pursue larger research goals.

Service criterion: The candidate has demonstrated collegiality in the Department, contributed to service to the profession, and participated in the governance of the University, College, and Department.

Evidence for participation in the governance must include serving in at least one departmental or college or university committee. Additional evidence may include: assigned or assumed institutional responsibilities; participation in events that promote the Department, College and/or University; contributions to efforts or events that encourage or require inter-unit collaboration; leadership/participation in “all-campus” events; and representation of the Department, College, or University to the public. Evidence for service to the profession may include: work on professional society committees; contributions to joint works (compendia, regional publications, etc.); referee for journals; referee for granting agencies; and editor for disciplinary publications.

4 Non-renewal of Probationary Faculty

Pursuant to University Policy 350.3.1, the Department Head may, at any time during a faculty member’s probationary period, open a discussion within the Department for non-renewal of that member’s appointment. The discussion will be initiated by a letter from the Department Head to the faculty member in question, stating the reason for non-renewal. Subsequently, the Department Head will call one or more meetings that will be attended by the Department Head and the faculty member in question. All tenured/tenure-eligible faculty may attend the meeting and participate in the discussion. The Department Head shall give significant consideration to these meetings in his/her final decision of recommending early termination of the probationary appointment. Deadlines for notice of non-renewal as stipulated in University Policy 350.3.1, must be followed.

5 Procedure for Revising this Document

This document will be reviewed annually by the tenured faculty of the department, at which time revisions may be suggested and discussed. Revision to the document may also be initiated by the Department Head as required to address specific needs. All potential revisions will be discussed and voted on by the Department Head and all tenured faculty who have been members in the Department of Physics for at least one year. A two-third majority is required to approve revisions.

History: Revision 1 approved 03/03/09. Original version 04/27/06.