Memorandum

To: PTE Working Group
From: Kathryn R.L. Rand, Dean, School of Law, on behalf of the Academic Deans
      Hesham El-Rewini, Dean, College of Engineering & Mines
      Gwen Halaas, Senior Associate Dean, School of Medicine & Health Sciences
      Cindy Juntunen, Dean, College of Education & Human Development
      Paul Lindesth, Dean, John D. Odegard School of Aerospace Sciences
      Gayle Roux, Dean, College of Nursing & Professional Disciplines
      Debbie Storrs, Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
      Margaret Williams, Dean, College of Business & Public Administration

Date: January 23, 2017
Re: Input on draft PTE provisions for Faculty Handbook

Thank you to the PTE Working Group for the good work on this important project. After meeting to discuss the draft, the deans had these questions and specific suggestions for revisions:

Tenure plans.

Ask the WG to consider providing more specific guidance on the content of tenure plans—what kinds of specifics should be included in an acceptable tenure plan?

Academic ranks, roles, responsibilities.

- p. 4, first para., omit “The proportion of these activities will vary in terms of the individual’s assigned distribution of effort.” Replace with, “Recognizing that individual faculty obligations may vary, care must be taken to ensure . . . .” Reasoning: this sentence stood out to deans as undermining the general applicability of the criteria in rank. Deans believe that each of the bullet point criteria in rank are necessary for promotion (that is, that “and” is implicit after each criterion). Percent effort relevant to determination of meeting each criterion, but percent effort should not undermine requirement of meeting each criterion.

- p. 4, first para., omit last sentence (“Decisions to award . . .”). Reasoning: deans are concerned that this sentence creates obstacle to lateral hiring.

- p. 4, second and fourth para., reconsider word choice of “summative” and “formative”; perhaps replace with “Promotion is, therefore, a recognition and reward for past accomplishment” and “Tenure is, therefore, an incentive and expectation for future success.” Reasoning: deans think that summative and formative make sentences less clear.

- p. 5, bullet points, replace “should” with “must” in first and second bullets. Reasoning: consistency and clarity with rest of provision. Same suggested revision on p. 6 for Associate and Assistant bullets.

- p. 5, third bullet point, change “teaching and advising skills” to “teaching and/or advising skills.” Reasoning: not all faculty have advising responsibilities. Same suggested revision on p. 6 for Associate bullet.
- p. 5, fourth bullet point, change “show effective leadership in service activities” to “show effective leadership in the UND and broader communities.” Reasoning: consistency with language used for Associate.

**Expectations and responsibilities.**

- p. 7, first para. The deans are supportive of including this statement of expectations with regard to professionalism and collegiality.

- p. 9, third para., add language to read “Evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching effectiveness must include significant student input drawn from all courses taught by the faculty member during the period under review.” Reasoning: clarify that student input must come from all courses taught by faculty member, not just select courses.

- p. 10, bottom para., change “annual position description” to “annual contract.” Reasoning: consistency of terminology; “contract” used consistently in following provisions.

**Promotion and tenure.**

- p. 16, first full para., question regarding “Beginning no later than an Associate Professor’s seventh year in rank”: is this too late to facilitate a faculty member’s successful promotion to full Professor? Should an earlier time be specified, such as “third year in rank”?

- p. 18, bottom para., reword to read “That is, if the candidate is seeking promotion to Associate Professor, then external reviewers generally should be either Associate or full Professors; if the candidate is seeking promotion to full Professor, then external reviewers generally should all be full Professors.” Reasoning: as written, provision seemed to disallow non-academic external reviewers, even though prior paragraph expressly allows “practicing professionals” as external reviewers. Thought changed wording to emphasize “generally” helped with clarity.

**Process for Making Tenure and Promotion Decisions.**

- p. 21, first full para., question regarding the necessity or desirability of the deans’ collective advice to the Provost. The deans are unsure whether this is necessary or desirable, and are open to omitting this step if deemed appropriate.

We hope this is helpful initial input. If it’s helpful to chat about any of these, please let me know. And thanks again to the PTE Working Group for their work on the draft provisions.