There are a few subtle differences between the notion of faculty and the expectation to become a “leader” in promotion to full professor. How can this be reconciled? What are these professional activities that become predominant for faculty members during the promotion process? 

I strongly support the inclusion of collegiality as an expectation. This is now covered by revised language regarding professional development. 

We should acknowledge and promote interdisciplinary work and internationalization and diversity of the curriculum.

P. 5, third bullet point, change “teaching and/or advising skills” to “teaching and advising skills.” Reasoning: not all faculty have advising responsibilities. Same suggested revision on p. 6 for Associate and Assistant bullets.

We disagree. Beginning the probationary period of a January hire in August implies a half-year period without tenure status.

We disagree. It's expected that this would be addressed within the leave agreement developed at the local level (dept, center, college) by the local policy and procedures. 

We disagree. Reforming the probationary period of a January hire in August implies a half-year period without tenure status. 

Specifying a flexible minimum is a national best practice, although not all universities use 7, some do use 5 years with a flexible minimum. The stature of journals is really a local issue, and thus perhaps not something this document should address.

There are several subtle differences to this notion of interdisciplinary and international engagement. The notion of “horizontal” interdisciplinary work is broad and inclusive, while “international” tends to focus on interacting with faculty and institutions from other countries. 

The document’s focus is on the criteria for achievement; it is a tool to assess performance rather than to evaluate and predict future performance within the current remit.
The document currently notes the need to tie evaluation to contract and workload expectations. The section referred to is a preface to sections meant to be read together in their totality.

The Provost could be tenured in a faculty appointment in, say, the Psychology Department, but cannot be tenured in the administrative position (that is, the administrator (other than the University President, who cannot be tenured) may be tenured in an academic unit, but may not be tenured in the administrative position). The Provost should be tenured in a faculty appointment, e.g., a Psychology Department, but cannot be tenured in the Provost position. The group believes this is consistent with SBHE 605.1.1.8.B and 605.1.2.1.e.e. However, the question is whether this is consistent with SBHE 605.1.2.1.e.b.

The document currently notes the need to tie evaluation to contract and workload expectations. The provost should be tenured in a faculty appointment, e.g., a Psychology Department, but cannot be tenured in the Provost position. The group believes this is consistent with SBHE 605.1.1.8.B and 605.1.2.1.e.e. However, the question is whether this is consistent with SBHE 605.1.2.1.e.b.

The document currently notes the need to tie evaluation to contract and workload expectations. The provost should be tenured in a faculty appointment, e.g., a Psychology Department, but cannot be tenured in the Provost position. The group believes this is consistent with SBHE 605.1.1.8.B and 605.1.2.1.e.e. However, the question is whether this is consistent with SBHE 605.1.2.1.e.b.
External reviewers should come from peer or better institutions (p.18). External reviews should be used at all levels of review including committees, Provost and President (p.18).

External reviewers should be given department and university standards for their reviews (p.19).

External reviews should be used at all levels of review including committees, Provost and President (p.18). External reviews should be used at all levels of review including committees, Provost and President (p.18). External reviews should be used at all levels of review including committees, Provost and President (p.18).
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External reviewers should be used at all levels of review including committees, Provost and President (p.18).

External reviews should be used at all levels of review including committees, Provost and President (p.18).

External reviews should be used at all levels of review including committees, Provost and President (p.18). External reviews should be used at all levels of review including committees, Provost and President (p.18).

II-C-4. External reviews. I strongly suggest deleting the second last paragraph. A candidate may secure additional external review letters, which may be included in promotion and tenure materials, provided the letters are included as part of the external review process. This can potentially destroy the integrity of the whole process. It is also a matter of who gets to see the external evaluations secured by the department, who makes the decision to include letters secured as part of the process, and who can see the opinions of the external reviewer. While the requirements for the internal evaluations suggest exclusion of friends and close associates, in the case of the external reviewers, it is unclear whether the rules are applicable to the letter's author or whether the letter's content can be evaluated as part of the external review process. This can potentially destroy the integrity of the whole process.

II-C-5. External reviewers. I strongly suggest deleting the second last paragraph. A candidate may secure additional external review letters, which may be included in promotion and tenure materials, provided the letters are included as part of the external review process. This can potentially destroy the integrity of the whole process. It is also a matter of who gets to see the external evaluations secured by the department, who makes the decision to include letters secured as part of the process, and who can see the opinions of the external reviewer. While the requirements for the internal evaluations suggest exclusion of friends and close associates, in the case of the external reviewers, it is unclear whether the rules are applicable to the letter's author or whether the letter's content can be evaluated as part of the external review process. This can potentially destroy the integrity of the whole process.

II-C-6. External reviews. I strongly suggest deleting the second last paragraph. A candidate may secure additional external review letters, which may be included in promotion and tenure materials, provided the letters are included as part of the external review process. This can potentially destroy the integrity of the whole process. It is also a matter of who gets to see the external evaluations secured by the department, who makes the decision to include letters secured as part of the process, and who can see the opinions of the external reviewer. While the requirements for the internal evaluations suggest exclusion of friends and close associates, in the case of the external reviewers, it is unclear whether the rules are applicable to the letter's author or whether the letter's content can be evaluated as part of the external review process. This can potentially destroy the integrity of the whole process.

II-C-7. External reviews. I strongly suggest deleting the second last paragraph. A candidate may secure additional external review letters, which may be included in promotion and tenure materials, provided the letters are included as part of the external review process. This can potentially destroy the integrity of the whole process. It is also a matter of who gets to see the external evaluations secured by the department, who makes the decision to include letters secured as part of the process, and who can see the opinions of the external reviewer. While the requirements for the internal evaluations suggest exclusion of friends and close associates, in the case of the external reviewers, it is unclear whether the rules are applicable to the letter's author or whether the letter's content can be evaluated as part of the external review process. This can potentially destroy the integrity of the whole process.
Promotion of special appointees should require adoption and application of appropriate departmental and University standards (p.19).

We certainly advocate Performance Improvement Plans, when necessary. And we should explicitly state that termination is possible if individuals do not show improvement as outlined in the plan (p.15).

There should be some clear statement regarding the timing, phasing in, or “grandfathering” of current faculty.

Special appointments are “teaching” positions. They should not carry an expectation for research (p.7).

Tenure plans should be written and signed by both parties (p.14).

I strongly disagree with several aspects of the input provided by President Kennedy and Provost DiLorenzo. First, when did “special appointments” become “teaching positions”? Our non-tenure track faculty conduct research and participate in service, and both of those are highly beneficial to the department.

Third, SBHE policy allows for tenure credit; why would we not give it for lateral hires?

No revision. The group does not think that an implementation timeline should be included in the draft document. Departments will conduct a meaningful mid-point review in line with the purpose and requirements of the document. Departments might use the mid-point review to sustain or adopt promotion, tenure, and evaluation standards and processes that are consistent with the University standards in the draft document.

No revision. The group believes that the School of Medicine and Health Sciences requires revision of any draft provisions in order to sustain or adopt promotion, tenure and evaluation standards and processes that are consistent with the University’s research enterprise. The group further believes that the duties assigned to special appointment faculty are best determined by the Department and College/School.

No revision. The group supports the PTE Working Group’s plans to recommend further work in specific areas, including special appointments (including non-tenure-eligible clinical faculty). The group believes the current draft adequately addresses this concern.

No revision. The group notes that the section on Annual Review includes a provision that “Successes, Problems, and Challenges” be included in the annual review. The group believes that the annual review section in the draft should reflect the same, given that annual reviews shall include “reflection of performance based upon mutual agreed upon development plans or goals.” The group believes the written and signed tenure plan is most important to provide clarity about what should be included in a tenure plan. The group was not sure whether a signed tenure plan was defined as a written plan that is signed.

No revision. The group’s reading of SBHE 605.1 is that post-docs fall under the category of special appointment faculty, which includes “Graduate teaching assistants.” This makes sense given that post-docs fall under the category of graduate students (SBHE 605.1). The group believes that the requirement for the rank of Professor should be part of the annual review process” (II.C.1, p.16) are desirable in this provision.

No revision. The group believes that the reference to SBHE policy in the draft was sufficient to indicate that the group had knowledge of the policy. The group did not think that the requirement to submit a written professional development plan was necessary or desirable to be included in the annual review. The group believes that the requirement for the rank of Professor should be part of the annual review process” (II.C.1, p.16) are desirable in this provision.

No revision. The group thought that the reference to SBHE policy in the draft was sufficient to indicate that the group had knowledge of the policy. The group thought that the requirement to submit a written professional development plan was necessary or desirable to be included in the annual review. The group believes that the reference to SBHE policy in the draft was sufficient to indicate that the group had knowledge of the policy. The group thought that the requirement to submit a written professional development plan was necessary or desirable to be included in the annual review.

No revision. The group thought that the reference to SBHE policy in the draft was sufficient to indicate that the group had knowledge of the policy. The group thought that the requirement to submit a written professional development plan was necessary or desirable to be included in the annual review.

No revision. The group disagrees that it is appropriate to limit special appointment faculty to teaching positions. The group believes that special appointment faculty can and should contribute to the institution’s research, service, and teaching missions.

No revision. The group believes that the School of Medicine and Health Sciences requires revision of any draft provisions in order to sustain or adopt promotion, tenure and evaluation standards and processes that are consistent with the University standards in the draft document.

No revision. The group believes that the reference to SBHE policy in the draft was sufficient to indicate that the group had knowledge of the policy. The group thought that the requirement to submit a written professional development plan was necessary or desirable to be included in the annual review.
The faculty member's failure to return a signed contract or other document indicating acceptance of contract terms by July 20 constitutes a resignation resulting in termination of employment, effective July 20, except for good cause shown by the faculty member or unless the institution has granted an extension. Prior to the end of the spring semester each year, institutions shall provide notice to faculty summarizing the process and deadlines for contract renewal, including information on extending deadlines to accommodate faculty who may be traveling or not able to readily receive and respond to communications during summer months. The draft provision includes a provision by which a faculty member may request an extension of the July 20 deadline; the group believes this is an improvement over prior UND policy and practice. While changes to UND practices or policies may be desirable, these are outside the scope of the PTE provisions.

No revision. While the group agrees with the points made in these comments, the provision merely reflects current SBHE policy. SBHE policy 605.1 provides, in part: "The faculty member's failure to return a signed contract or other document indicating acceptance of contract terms by July 20 constitutes a resignation resulting in termination of employment, effective July 20, except for good cause shown by the faculty member or unless the institution has granted an extension. Prior to the end of the spring semester each year, institutions shall provide notice to faculty summarizing the process and deadlines for contract renewal, including information on extending deadlines to accommodate faculty who may be traveling or not able to readily receive and respond to communications during summer months." The draft provision includes a provision by which a faculty member may request an extension of the July 20 deadline; the group believes this is an improvement over prior UND policy and practice. While changes to UND practices or policies may be desirable, these are outside the scope of the PTE provisions.

No revision. While the group agrees with the points made in these comments, the provision merely reflects current SBHE policy. SBHE policy 605.1 provides, in part: "The faculty member's failure to return a signed contract or other document indicating acceptance of contract terms by July 20 constitutes a resignation resulting in termination of employment, effective July 20, except for good cause shown by the faculty member or unless the institution has granted an extension. Prior to the end of the spring semester each year, institutions shall provide notice to faculty summarizing the process and deadlines for contract renewal, including information on extending deadlines to accommodate faculty who may be traveling or not able to readily receive and respond to communications during summer months." The draft provision includes a provision by which a faculty member may request an extension of the July 20 deadline; the group believes this is an improvement over prior UND policy and practice. While changes to UND practices or policies may be desirable, these are outside the scope of the PTE provisions.

Revision to replace "annual position description" with "annual contract" for consistency within PTE provisions. The group does not see places where re-ordering would improve clarity.

No revision. While the group agrees with the points made in these comments, the provision merely reflects current SBHE policy. SBHE policy 605.1 provides, in part: "The faculty member's failure to return a signed contract or other document indicating acceptance of contract terms by July 20 constitutes a resignation resulting in termination of employment, effective July 20, except for good cause shown by the faculty member or unless the institution has granted an extension. Prior to the end of the spring semester each year, institutions shall provide notice to faculty summarizing the process and deadlines for contract renewal, including information on extending deadlines to accommodate faculty who may be traveling or not able to readily receive and respond to communications during summer months." The draft provision includes a provision by which a faculty member may request an extension of the July 20 deadline; the group believes this is an improvement over prior UND policy and practice. While changes to UND practices or policies may be desirable, these are outside the scope of the PTE provisions.

No revision. While the group agrees with the points made in these comments, the provision merely reflects current SBHE policy. SBHE policy 605.1 provides, in part: "The faculty member's failure to return a signed contract or other document indicating acceptance of contract terms by July 20 constitutes a resignation resulting in termination of employment, effective July 20, except for good cause shown by the faculty member or unless the institution has granted an extension. Prior to the end of the spring semester each year, institutions shall provide notice to faculty summarizing the process and deadlines for contract renewal, including information on extending deadlines to accommodate faculty who may be traveling or not able to readily receive and respond to communications during summer months." The draft provision includes a provision by which a faculty member may request an extension of the July 20 deadline; the group believes this is an improvement over prior UND policy and practice. While changes to UND practices or policies may be desirable, these are outside the scope of the PTE provisions.

No revision. While the group agrees with the points made in these comments, the provision merely reflects current SBHE policy. SBHE policy 605.1 provides, in part: "The faculty member's failure to return a signed contract or other document indicating acceptance of contract terms by July 20 constitutes a resignation resulting in termination of employment, effective July 20, except for good cause shown by the faculty member or unless the institution has granted an extension. Prior to the end of the spring semester each year, institutions shall provide notice to faculty summarizing the process and deadlines for contract renewal, including information on extending deadlines to accommodate faculty who may be traveling or not able to readily receive and respond to communications during summer months." The draft provision includes a provision by which a faculty member may request an extension of the July 20 deadline; the group believes this is an improvement over prior UND policy and practice. While changes to UND practices or policies may be desirable, these are outside the scope of the PTE provisions.

No revision. While the group agrees with the points made in these comments, the provision merely reflects current SBHE policy. SBHE policy 605.1 provides, in part: "The faculty member's failure to return a signed contract or other document indicating acceptance of contract terms by July 20 constitutes a resignation resulting in termination of employment, effective July 20, except for good cause shown by the faculty member or unless the institution has granted an extension. Prior to the end of the spring semester each year, institutions shall provide notice to faculty summarizing the process and deadlines for contract renewal, including information on extending deadlines to accommodate faculty who may be traveling or not able to readily receive and respond to communications during summer months." The draft provision includes a provision by which a faculty member may request an extension of the July 20 deadline; the group believes this is an improvement over prior UND policy and practice. While changes to UND practices or policies may be desirable, these are outside the scope of the PTE provisions.

No revision. While the group agrees with the points made in these comments, the provision merely reflects current SBHE policy. SBHE policy 605.1 provides, in part: "The faculty member's failure to return a signed contract or other document indicating acceptance of contract terms by July 20 constitutes a resignation resulting in termination of employment, effective July 20, except for good cause shown by the faculty member or unless the institution has granted an extension. Prior to the end of the spring semester each year, institutions shall provide notice to faculty summarizing the process and deadlines for contract renewal, including information on extending deadlines to accommodate faculty who may be traveling or not able to readily receive and respond to communications during summer months." The draft provision includes a provision by which a faculty member may request an extension of the July 20 deadline; the group believes this is an improvement over prior UND policy and practice. While changes to UND practices or policies may be desirable, these are outside the scope of the PTE provisions.

Revision to replace "annual position description" with "annual contract" for consistency within PTE provisions. The group does not see places where re-ordering would improve clarity.

Revision to replace "annual position description" with "annual contract" for consistency within PTE provisions. The group does not see places where re-ordering would improve clarity.
Why are there consequences if faculty don't return contract by date, but no consequences to UND if not sent out on time?

Renewal of contracts should be based on a formal annual evaluation (p.12).

Getting a contract returned by August 15th appears to be too late to find a replacement (p.12).

There appears to be a presumption of nonrenewal if we don't get contracts back.
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