Identify up to 3 aspects of the draft PTE sections of the UND Faculty Handbook, and/or any of the feedback to the draft posted to date, that you think support excellence at UND.

> Thank you for including language which requires an external review process. This will standardize this as a requirement
> Outside Reviewer
> It is shameful that THE most important policy for faculty gives us less than tweet-length to provide feedback. Insulting
> Section B.3. Teaching and Advising: Advising need further clarification.
> Use cascade section header, e.g., I.A.2.a
> A rare example of constructive engagement on this campus which has a reasonably acceptable end product. Kudos!
> Please create an index of contents at the beginning of the document.
> The document overall is mostly clear and promotes high performance by the faculty.
> Section 1 on "Academic Ranks, Roles, and Responsibilities" reads very well. The clear delineations for faculty ranks is well-written, with structured, tiered progression but loose enough for departmental specificity. The text for "service" is particularly refreshing, acknowledging the heavy load of collaborative work UND faculty do within the systems of shared governance on campus to make it more visible in promotion and evaluation. Great work, PTEWG authors!
> Will help make sitting on a SCoFR hearing less onerous, but educating faculty on PTE needs to be priority.
> Use headings, sub-headings, item numbers etc. in the index
> It is probably a good thing to introduce external review across the board for UND faculty, but it presents challenges. One big question will be compensation - will the external reviewers receive monetary compensation for completing this work? Will there be criteria established for determining who (and how) those are to be executed? Who will bear the responsibility of determining that selection and process?
> Is Post Doc considered special appointments?
> Which style of writing requires pages numbers to be buried on the bottom left with a long, winding title?
> Very glad to see collegiality mentioned, and that this will be the standard policy: "Under no circumstances will tenure be held by a faculty member at the rank of Assistant Professor".
Identify up to 3 aspects of the draft PTE sections of the UND Faculty Handbook, and/or any of the feedback to the draft posted to date, that you would like to see added or changed in the draft to support excellence at UND.

> why single blind evaluation letters?” given the fact that we are an open records state and individuals up for T & P have an opportunity for rebuttal and cannot fully do that if they have not see the external evaluator letters.
> Why are there consequences if faculty don’t return contract by date, but no consequences to UND if not sent out on time?
> Outside reviewer chosen by Department, especially for specialties (Avit, SPSt, ATSC) peer schools don’t have these dept
> There should be some clear statement regarding the timing, phasing in, or "grandfathering" of current faculty.
> More characters in the box for comments. Having only 120 characters is less than a tweet!
> Does the policy, as written, preclude hiring tenured faculty? Should details about that be included?
> "For faculty on contracts covering the traditional academic year, the University shall, not later than June 30 each year, provide notice of renewal terms through a written contract and/or LOU to be signed by both parties." Why send out contracts at a time of year when faculty are not under contract? If you want faculty to read and sign contracts, send them out before May 15th. Also, why expect them back during the summer when faculty are not under contract? I suggest changing the dates.
> l-A-1-a: In all research universities I know the research performance (assuming that teaching and service are fully satisfactory) is the most important factor in promotion to full professor rank. The statement in the current draft overall defines the expectations from a candidate to be a researcher/scholar visible at national level. However, it is still vague. Is publishing a few national journals is enough to state that the faculty is visible at national level? I would suggest adding to this paragraph something like: A candidate for promotion to Professor rank should demonstrate research productivity beyond that expected from an Associate Professor and have a strong record of publications in well established, reputable research journals/outlets after receiving the rank of Associate Professor. The latter is important because of the current onslaught by the thousands of predatory pseudojournals (I have many hundreds in my spam list). Obviously, each of them claims to be peer-reviewed.
> Page 8 - ought not translation be included in the final bullet, quoted here? (although "may include, but not limited to" is included in the introductory lines): "Within the field of writing, a creative contribution or artistic endeavor could include composition of prose, fiction, drama, or poetry and the publication or presentation of such compositions."
> I don’t think I’ve ever received my contract by June 30th. If faculty can be terminated for failure to return contract on time, then shouldn’t UND pay a fee to the faculty member if they don’t get contract out by 6/30?
> "The faculty member’s failure to return a signed contract or other document indicating acceptance of contract renewal terms by July 20 (or by the extended deadline as approved by the Dean) constitutes a resignation that, at the University’s discretion, may result in immediate termination of employment, except for good cause shown by the faculty member (SBHE
"So you will terminate a full professor if a contract gets lost in the mail? This seems excessive. Also, you are requiring faculty to complete an action while they are not under contract . . . that is quite contradictory. I suggest deleting this section, or significantly changing it.

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 as permitted. These additional documents, however, cannot be used as substitutes for the letters secured and evaluated as part of the external review process. This can potentially destroy the integrity of the whole procedure. I can see a scenario when 3-4 external evaluations secured by the department are lukewarm or mildly negative and several letters secured by a candidate are overwhelmingly positive. That can sway the opinion of the committee. While the requirements for the external evaluators suggest exclusion of friends and close collaborators, this paragraph does the opposite. In our department, we also had a case when a candidate secured several internal letters of support. I think the policy should specify that evaluations/letters of support from within UND should not be allowed.

One of the elements President Kelley included in his initial charge for this group was the "post tenure review" process. Why was that matter dropped in this document?

Is the time-in-rank for associate to full professor a national best practice, or is that an additional hurdle that will further inhibit those less likely to make the leap to full?