Promotion, Tenure, & Evaluation

Proposed Updates to the Faculty Handbook
I. BACKGROUND
## A Brief History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2013-14</td>
<td>U Senate Discusses Various PTE-Related Issues; Solicits Input from College and University PTE Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>PTE Working Group Formed by Provost and University Senate Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015-Fall 2016</td>
<td>Revisions to UND Faculty Handbook Sections on PTE are Drafted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Solicit and Receive Input on Draft from President/Provost, Academic Deans, U Senate Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August/September 2017</td>
<td>Campus Input – Online and Open Campus Fora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td>Revise Proposed Faculty Handbook Changes Based on All Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1, 2017</td>
<td>Deliver Final Draft to U Senate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PTE Policy, Process, and Procedure: Issues Surfaced in AY 2013-14 by University Senate

- **Overall structure, consistency, alignment**
  - Lack of university-wide consistency is a problem
  - Meaning of faculty ranks should be more consistent across the university
  - Need better alignment between contract and evaluation percentages
  - Need better alignment between annual and promotion/tenure evaluations
  - Consideration should be given to promoting flexible faculty workloads

- **Specific issues**
  - Is a uniform approach to early tenure/promotion needed?
  - Should external reviews be required university-wide?
  - Supporting materials focus too little on teaching/service roles
  - Service is given too little weight in PTE process
  - Professionalism and collegiality need more attention in the process
PTE Working Group Mission

• **What?** Create a more clear, transparent, and robust framework to support faculty effort and success, advance university mission & reputation
  – Guiding principles
    • Clarity
    • Transparency
    • Consistency
    • Logical
    • Robust
    • Discipline-specific, local (as appropriate)

• **Why?** Existing Faculty Handbook PTE sections overdue for updating
  – Department, College rules of governance need systemic guidance

• **How?** Look at what we do now; NDUS policies & procedures; other universities like us; general best practices
Whom? PTE Working Group

- Emily Cherry, Theatre Arts
- Diane Darland, Biology
- Will Gosnold, Geology
- Gwen Halaas/Ken Ruit, Medicine & Health Sciences
- Birgit Hans, American Indian Studies
- Darlene Hanson, Nursing
- Margaret Healy, Educational Leadership
- Steve Light, Business & Public Administration
- Sima Noghanian, Electrical Engineering
- Mike Poellot, Atmospheric Sciences
- Kathryn Rand, Law
- Debbie Storrs, Arts & Sciences
- Chih Ming Tan, Economics
- Sean Valentine, Management
- Anne Walker, Teaching & Learning
- Ryan Zerr, Mathematics
II. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED REVISIONS
## Current Faculty Handbook

1. Responsibilities & Privileges
2. Personnel Information
3. Teaching Policies & Procedures

## Proposed Faculty Handbook

1. Promotion, Tenure, & Evaluation
   - Preface
   - Source Documents and Application
   - Department Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation Guidelines
     A. Generally
     B. Required Elements
   I. Academic Ranks, Roles, and Responsibilities
   II. Rules and Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Promotion, Tenure, & Evaluation
   III. Process for Making Tenure and Promotion Decisions
   IV. Sanctions, Terminations, and Grievances
2. Personnel Information
3. Teaching Policies & Procedures
Summary of Key Recommended Changes: Structure

• More integrated and coherent structure and organization than current FH
  – Logical organization makes transparent for easy reference
  – Source policies linked in
  – Promotion & tenure in one place, aligned

• Incorporates “Essential Elements” without need for external referencing
  – From patchwork implementation outside of FH to full integration into FH

• Makes clear the need for explicit connection between contract expectations and PTE standards
  – Logical flow from point of hire to expectations, evaluations, merit review, progression in rank
Summary of Key Recommended Changes: Faculty Ranks, Roles

• Gives much **clearer definitions of faculty ranks**
  – Associate and Full Professor expectations in rank so minimal and non-specific that they create moving target, inconsistencies
  – Expectations and recognition standards now laddered, as should be
  – Opportunity to develop, apply similar framework for Special Appointments, helping all

• Greater **explicit balance** between stated expectations for research, scholarly, and creative activity; teaching; and service
  – Definitions, examples now in framework

• Incorporates **accepted but unlisted expectations**, allowing for **unit-specific determinations** of workload, value, accountability
  – Expands one paragraph(!) on **scholarship** to include categories, examples
  – Incorporates mention of **SoTL** as a form of research, scholarly, and creative activity
  – Makes **service category robust**, eliminates confusion with “societal concern”
  – Incorporates broad expectations regarding **professionalism and collegiality**
  – Explicit mention of **“Administrative Leadership”**
    • Allows and encourages faculty, departments, colleges/schools to determine explicit expectations, PTE weighting of Administration, rather than leaving out
Summary of Key Recommended Changes: Validations of Process Integrity

• **Clear “philosophy statements” on purpose of promotion & tenure**
  – *Promotion is viewed as summative*: reward for past accomplishment
  – *Tenure is viewed as formative*: incentive and expectation for future success

• Explicit and detailed language about *extending the tenure clock*

• **Clearly disallows the possibility of tenure without promotion** to Associate Professor

• **Clear statement on no second chance** if a try at early tenure is unsuccessful

• Mention of *need to “strive” for promotion* as an Associate Professor, and progress is part of annual review starting in seventh year

• **Required external review** for promotion and tenure decisions
  – Validation of quality that will be developed, implemented at College/School and Department level
III. SPECIFIC EXAMPLE: EXPECTATIONS IN RANK
## Example: Expectations in Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Faculty Handbook</th>
<th>Proposed Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Professor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Recognition for teaching excellence</td>
<td>✓ “Significant, sustained, and quality accomplishments beyond those justifying the rank of Associate Professor.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Recognition for scholarly and/or creative accomplishment</td>
<td>✓ Scholarly Activity: forefront of discipline, national visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Recognition for leadership within his or her profession</td>
<td>✓ Teaching: advanced level of performance, leadership in course/curriculum development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Recognition for demonstrated spirit of concern for society</td>
<td>✓ Service: sustained and significant at all levels of the institution or profession, effective leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Current Faculty Handbook

**Associate Professor**

- Marked teaching effectiveness
- Scholarly and/or creative accomplishment
- Substantial contribution to his or her profession
- Demonstrated spirit of concern for society

### Proposed Revision

**Associate Professor**

- “Significant, sustained, and quality accomplishments beyond those justifying the rank of Assistant Professor.”
- Research: Significant, demonstrating potential for national visibility and distinction
- Teaching: Markedly effective, with commitment to maintain a high-level of teaching effectiveness
- Service: Substantial and effective contribution at all levels of the university or profession, willingness and potential to be a leader
## Example: Expectations in Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Faculty Handbook</th>
<th>Proposed Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Effective as a teacher</td>
<td>✓ Research: threshold level of qualification and achievement, promise consistent with eventual promotion to Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Scholarly and/or creative endeavor</td>
<td>✓ Teaching: Effective teaching ability and willingness to contribute to departmental instructional needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Active in his or her profession</td>
<td>✓ Service: Willingness and interest in providing service at all levels of the university or profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Spirit of concern for society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. GENERAL EXAMPLES: FACULTY ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES
Research, Scholarly, Creative Activity

• Broadly construed, as appropriate for each discipline, and including:
  – Creating and adding to knowledge
  – Expansion of ideas, theories, principles
  – Improvement and/or facilitation of the application of knowledge
  – Scholarship of teaching and learning
  – Creative activity through performances, composition, directing, design, exhibitions
Teaching and Advising

- **Demonstrated effectiveness** and contributions to the institution’s instructional needs
- Utilization of *best practices and appropriate pedagogical technique*
- Ongoing development
- Includes *advising, direction of graduate studies*, and contributions to curricular design
Focus on Service/Leadership

• *Expectation of service* in support of shared governance, professional needs, and benefit of society

• *University citizenship* is of paramount importance
Administrative Leadership

• Explicit acknowledgment that many academic careers involve administrative roles that are crucial to the proper functioning of the university

• Expectation that departmental guidelines specify how administrative roles will be evaluated and how they may affect the path to promotion
## Current/Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August/September 2017</th>
<th>Campus Input – Online and via Open Campus Fora</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td>Revise Faculty Handbook Changes Based on Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1, 2017</td>
<td>Deliver Final Draft to U Senate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If New Faculty Handbook Language is Adopted in Fall 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2018</th>
<th>Departments and colleges begin alignment with new FH language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 18-19 and AY 19-20</td>
<td>PTE reviews based on “old” policies and guidelines unless departments/colleges choose more quickly to adopt new expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 20-21 and forward</td>
<td>All PTE reviews based on new policies and guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>