University of North Dakota
School of Medicine and Health Sciences
Department of Basic Sciences

Guidelines for Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure
Approved by Department of Basic Sciences - June 6, 2014
Approved by School of Medicine and Health Sciences CPT - June 26, 2014

Table of Contents

Department of Basic Sciences

Guidelines for Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

I. INTRODUCTION

The Department of Basic Sciences at the University of North Dakota, School of Medicine and Health Sciences (SMHS) is committed to the education of medical students, graduate students, postdoctoral fellows and undergraduate students in accordance with the highest professional standards. The department will provide all students with a solid, well-rounded science education and state-of-the-art training in cutting edge basic sciences research and application, prepare them to be independent learners and thinkers, and instill in them the enthusiastic drive to achieve their goals and to be effective contributors to their profession and communities, with faculty members serving as role models for their students and trainees.

The department seeks to teach and promote interdisciplinary scientific interactions while instilling the highest level of scholarly integrity and excellence among the future leaders in education, biomedical research, academic medicine, and medical practice.

A. Mission Statement:

The mission of the UND Department of Basic Sciences is to
- Educate and train future generations of scientists, physicians, and other health care providers.
- Advance basic and translational biomedical science and education through scholarly activity.
- Use professional skills and knowledge in the service of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, the University of North Dakota, the people of state and nation, and the profession.

B. Values Statement

The faculty of the Department of Basic Sciences value
- scholarly integrity,
- meaningful contributions to the knowledge base of the basic sciences,
- commitment to staying current, knowledgeable and competent so that we can best contribute to the academy,
- the engagement of medical and undergraduate students in efforts to master the fundamentals of our disciplines as appropriate for their career path,
- mentoring of graduate students so that they become capable scientists who are ethical, knowledgeable, and technically-competent,
- generous sharing of our professional expertise with colleagues, the school, university, community, state, region, nation, and world, and
- the spirit of collegiality characterized by respect, cooperation, and accessibility.

C. Scholarship in the Department of Basic Sciences

The various dimensions of scholarship, which include teaching, discovery, integration, and application, encompass the diverse talents needed to accomplish the mission of the Department of Basic Sciences

at UND SMHS. In accordance with the SMHS school-wide *Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*, Section I.E, the Department of Basic Sciences adheres to the definition of scholarship proposed by Boyer (EL Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, Josey-Bass, 1990) that recognizes that legitimate scholarly and creative pursuits encompass the scholarship of discovery (generating new knowledge through basic research), the scholarship of application (building bridges between theory and practice), the scholarship of integration (elucidating connections between different discoveries), and the scholarship of teaching (evaluating the effectiveness of pedagogical approaches in promoting student learning).

The Department of Basic Sciences utilizes the following criteria to define the essential characteristics of scholarship:

- The faculty member's efforts result in a tangible product or output (hereafter referred to as "work")
- The work is made public and is available outside of the institution and region
- The work is subjected to external peer review and critique by other scholars in the field
- The work must be able to be reproduced and form a foundation to be built on by other scholars.

II. GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Faculty Responsibilities

Each faculty member should become familiar with the *University of North Dakota Faculty Handbook*, the SMHS *Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*, and the Department of Basic Sciences *Guidelines for Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* in order to fully understand the principles, responsibilities, process, and expectations associated with evaluation, promotion, and the award of tenure.

Each faculty member is expected to be active and productive in the areas of teaching and scholarly activities, and to contribute to his or her discipline and profession through service activities.

Minimal departmental standards have been established in Section V of the SMHS *Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*. While all faculty members will be evaluated according to criteria established in the general areas of teaching, scholarly activity, and service, it is recognized that some individuals may make greater contributions in certain areas in comparison to their colleagues and, consequently, may not share equal responsibility in all areas. Variability in talents and, therefore, expectations for productivity will be considered by both the faculty member and Chair in negotiating a faculty member's professional responsibilities. These responsibilities and contributions will be reflected in the Percentage of Effort Form completed and submitted annually for each individual and in the Tenure Plan completed and submitted annually for probationary faculty members.

B. Departmental Responsibilities

The principle responsibility for the implementation of the evaluation of individual faculty members resides in the department. The Department's *Guidelines for Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* are to

be considered supplemental to the guidelines found in the *University of North Dakota Faculty Handbook* and to the School of Medicine and Health Sciences (SMHS) *Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*.

C. Department Chair responsibilities

The Department Chair should be familiar with *UND Faculty Handbook* and the SMHS *Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure*. The Department Chair should adhere to the following principles of democratic administration:
1. Respect for individuals
2. Faith in the power of human intelligence to solve problems
3. The right of each individual affected by policy formation or alteration to have an equitable part in the determination of that policy
4. The right to act through his or her chosen representatives
5. The right to equality of opportunity
6. The exercise of fairness
7. The right of each individual to appeal decisions and actions affecting him or her and the right of the individual to be informed of avenues of appeal

In the exercise of these basic principles, the Department Chair should nurture an atmosphere of mutual trust and honesty based on good communication (*UND Faculty Handbook*, Section II-1.2).

The Department Chair will inform the faculty member of Department and Academic Affairs deadlines for receipt and review of the evaluation materials. Following receipt of the written report from the Department Committee on Promotion and Tenure, the Department Chair will prepare a separate evaluation recommendation of the faculty member. It is the responsibility of the Chair to inform the faculty member being evaluated in writing of results at each stage of their evaluation process.

D. Committee on Promotion and Tenure (CPT) Composition and Responsibilities

As described in Section IV of the SMHS *Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*, "The departmental committee will include all tenured faculty members in the department, excluding the chair." The Departmental CPT (BSCPT) will have two Co-Chairs. One will be appointed by the Department Chair, the other will be elected by BSCPT. All members of the BSCPT are eligible to serve as a Co-Chair, with the exception that a member may not serve as Co-Chair during a year in which that member is being evaluated for promotion or post-tenure review. The Co-Chairs will serve two year terms, with the start date for service alternating each year between the two positions.

The BSCPT will be responsible for:
1. Developing, reviewing, and revising departmental guidelines for evaluation, promotion, and tenure. Revisions will be submitted to the entire department faculty for approval prior to submission to the SMHS CPT for approval and implementation,
2. Evaluating the professional activities of the faculty members within the department as described in Sections IV and V of this document. The basis of the evaluation will be the materials presented in the evaluation dossier by the faculty member, and

3. If necessary, requesting additional information from faculty members if an evaluation dossier is deemed incomplete or requesting clarification regarding any apparent major inconsistencies or unclear information provided in a faculty member's dossier.

III. TITLE SERIES AND RANK CHARACTERISTICS

Faculty titles and rank are initially determined at the time of appointment to the Department of Basic Sciences. In exceptional circumstances, faculty titles may be renegotiated at a later career stage. As most new faculty are expected to be hired into the Scientist Scholar track, appointment to the Educator Scholar track is likely to result from such a negotiated change. With respect to rank, the appointment document will outline criteria and a timetable for review/evaluation of professional accomplishments which, when favorable, results in promotion in rank.

A. Faculty Appointments

The types of appointments and employment contracts provided in the Department of Basic Sciences coincide with descriptions listed in Sections II and III in the SMHS *Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*.

1. Academic appointments

Faculty members with an academic appointment are expected to contribute to the mission of the Department in **all three areas** of teaching, scholarly achievement, and service. Academic appointments may be tenured, tenure-eligible, or non-tenured (i.e, special appointments), and are generally expected to fall into one of the three following title series as described in the SMHS *Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*, Section II.A.1:

Scientist Scholar

The Scientist Scholar designation is for faculty members who discover and disseminate new knowledge or new insights into existing knowledge and who are effective teachers and actively involved in academic or professional services.

Educator Scholar

The Educator Scholar designation is for faculty members who teach, provide educational leadership, curriculum development, and provide faculty development and administration. Faculty members in this title series are engaged in scholarly and creative activities related to education or teaching in their discipline or area and are actively involved in academic or professional services.

Clinician Scholar

The Clinician Scholar designation is for faculty who are involved in patient care, teaching, administrative service, academic or professional services, and who also contribute to scholarship and creative activities related to their areas.

Faculty members who actively contribute to the mission of the SMHS in **one or more primary area of teaching, scholarship or service may** have an appointment that is non-tenured in the following series:

2. Research Appointments

Research faculty members are dedicated to supporting the research mission of the Department. Faculty entering into this series need not have an established independent reputation in research. These faculty members have a primary focus in research (≥ 80%) but may also contribute to other Departmental or School missions. Responsibility outside of research and professional service will be negotiated with the Department Chair and the primary research advisor (if appropriate) prior to changes to the annual Percentage of Effort.

3. Adjunct Appointments:

Individuals from business, industry, research institutions, government or agencies, who are located in other academic institutions that enhance the educational, research, or service missions of the SMHS are eligible for adjunct appointment in the Department of Basic Sciences.

4. Joint Appointments:

Faculty who hold a primary appointment in another department or discipline at the SMHS or the University, and are contributing actively to teaching or research missions of the department of Basic Sciences are eligible for joint appointment in the Department of Basic Sciences.

5. Emeritus Appointments:

Retired faculty can be granted emeritus appointments within the department depending on the length and significance of their service to the institution and to the state of North Dakota, and/or their distinguished service and contribution to an academic discipline that is relevant to the department. Whereas, emeritus status does not include salary to the individual, it can be associated with privileges specified in the institution policies or procedures.

B. Academic Appointment Ranks

1. Recognized ranks

Instructor
Assistant Professor
Associate Professor
Professor

2. Criteria for Rank

The candidate must meet the departmental standards for the rank requested.

3. Characteristics of Rank

Listed below are expected characteristics of rank in the Scientist Scholar or Educator Scholar series used for appointment to that rank in the Department of Basic Sciences. Criteria for rank requested follow those of the University and SMHS (*Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* II.B.3). Examples of benchmarks for professional accomplishments that are expected for promotion of faculty are found in Tables IV and V. The characteristics below are intended to be the usual characteristics and are not intended to exclude qualified candidates who possess equivalent training.

Instructor
Earned Master's degree or equivalent training
Promise as a teacher
Engaged in professional development

Assistant Professor
Earned doctorate or degree considered to be a terminal degree by their discipline.
Faculty members with the Ph.D. degree or other terminal degree will be expected to have completed ≥ 2 years of postdoctoral training or equivalent appropriate to their area of specialization at the time of appointment.
Faculty members with the M.D. degree should have completed residency training to board eligibility, if appropriate. Others should be eligible for professional certification in their field, if such is available or applicable.
Demonstrated ability in research
Potential for research productivity, i.e., publications including peer-reviewed articles and book chapters
Potential to obtain independent extramural funding
Potential to demonstrate national reputation in research
Potential for effectiveness in teaching and mentoring
Potential for effectiveness in Departmental, School, and/or professional service

Associate Professor
Earned doctorate or degree considered to be a terminal degree by their discipline.
Faculty members with the Ph.D. degree or other terminal degree will be expected to have completed ≥ 2 years of postdoctoral training or equivalent appropriate to their area of specialization at the time of appointment.
Faculty members with the M.D. degree should have completed residency training to board eligibility, if appropriate. Others should be eligible for professional certification in their field, if such is available or applicable.
Demonstrated record of excellence in research
Demonstrated research productivity, i.e., publications including peer-reviewed articles and book chapters
Demonstrated ability to obtain independent extramural funding
Demonstrated national reputation in research
Consistent and marked effectiveness in teaching and mentoring
Demonstrated effectiveness in Departmental, School, and professional service

Professor

Promotion to Professor is expected to occur on the basis of documented recognition for continued superior performance and not simply on the basis of time in rank as Associate Professor. The individual must have demonstrated a leadership role in departmental activities and/or the professional discipline.

Earned doctorate or degree considered to be a terminal degree by their discipline.

Faculty members with the Ph.D. degree or other terminal degree will be expected to have completed ≥ 2 years of postdoctoral training or equivalent appropriate to their area of specialization at the time of appointment.

Faculty members with the M.D. degree should have completed residency training to board eligibility, if appropriate. Others should be eligible for professional certification in their field, if such is available or applicable.

Evidence of being an independent researcher with extramural funding and maintaining a research program of high quality and appropriate quantity

Demonstrated research productivity, i.e., publications including peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, and invited reviews

Significant and sustainable independent extramural funding

Demonstrated international reputation in research

Recognition for continued excellence in teaching and mentoring

Demonstrated effectiveness in Departmental, School, and professional service

C. Research Appointment Ranks

1. Recognized ranks

Research Assistant Professor
Research Associate Professor
Research Professor

2. Criteria for Rank

Individuals possessing appropriate degrees whose primary area of emphasis is research and research-related activities of a basic science, clinical science, or education, and who meet the departmental criteria for the rank requested.

3. Characteristics of Rank

Listed below are expected characteristics of rank in Research title series used for appointment or promotion to that rank in the Department of Basic Sciences. Criteria for rank requested follow those of the University and SMHS (*Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* II.B.3). Examples of benchmarks of for professional accomplishments that are expected of faculty are found in Table VI. The characteristics below are intended to be the usual characteristics and are not intended to exclude qualified candidates who possess equivalent training.

Research Assistant Professor

> Earned doctorate or degree considered to be a terminal degree by their discipline.
>
> Faculty members with the Ph.D. degree or other terminal degree will be expected to have completed ≥ 2 years of postdoctoral training or equivalent appropriate to their area of specialization at the time of appointment.
>
> Faculty members with the M.D. degree should have completed residency training to board eligibility, if appropriate. Others should be eligible for professional certification in their field, if such is available or applicable.
>
> Demonstrated ability in research
>
> Potential for research productivity, i.e., publications including peer-reviewed articles and book chapters
>
> Potential to obtain independent extramural funding
>
> Potential to demonstrate national reputation in research
>
> Potential for effectiveness in Departmental, School, and/or professional service

Research Associate Professor

> Earned doctorate or degree considered to be a terminal degree by their discipline.
>
> Faculty members with the Ph.D. degree or other terminal degree will be expected to have completed ≥ 2 years of postdoctoral training or equivalent appropriate to their area of specialization at the time of appointment.
>
> Faculty members with the M.D. degree should have completed residency training to board eligibility, if appropriate. Others should be eligible for professional certification in their field, if such is available or applicable.
>
> Demonstrated record of excellence in research
>
> Demonstrated research productivity, i.e., publications including peer-reviewed articles and book chapters
>
> Demonstrated ability to obtain independent extramural funding
>
> Demonstrated national reputation in research
>
> Demonstrated effectiveness in Departmental, School, or professional service

Research Professor

> Promotion to Professor is expected to occur on the basis of documented recognition for continued superior performance and not simply on the basis of time in rank as Associate Professor. The individual must have demonstrated a leadership role in departmental activities and/or the professional discipline.
>
> Earned doctorate or degree considered to be a terminal degree by their discipline.
>
> Faculty members with the Ph.D. degree or other terminal degree will be expected to have completed ≥ 2 years of postdoctoral training or equivalent appropriate to their area of specialization at the time of appointment.
>
> Faculty members with the M.D. degree should have completed residency training to board eligibility, if appropriate. Others should be eligible for professional certification in their field, if such is available or applicable.
>
> Evidence of being an independent researcher with extramural funding and maintaining a research program of high quality and appropriate quantity
>
> Demonstrated research productivity, i.e., publications including peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, and invited reviews

Significant and sustainable independent extramural funding
Demonstrated international reputation in research
Demonstrated effectiveness in Departmental, School, and professional service

D. Adjunct Appointment Ranks

1. Recognized ranks

Adjunct Instructor
Adjunct Assistant Professor
Adjunct Associate Professor
Adjunct Professor

2. Criteria for Rank

Individuals possessing the appropriate degree for their profession from an accredited institution and who can demonstrate ability in clinical activity, teaching or research, depending on the proposed role as an adjunct faculty member.

3. Characteristics of Rank

Adjunct Instructor
Earned Bachelor's degree or equivalent training
Demonstrates promise as a teacher or researcher
Engaged in professional development

Adjunct Assistant Professor
Possession of a terminal degree for the profession
Demonstrated ability in clinical activity, teaching or research, depending on the proposed role as an adjunct faculty member

Adjunct Associate Professor
Possession of a terminal degree for the profession
Demonstrated evidence, through peer and learner evaluation, of high impact and quality teaching in departmental educational or research programs
Local and regional recognition in the practice of clinical specialty (if applicable)
Local and regional recognition in research (if applicable)
Evidence of service on committees (such as department, medical school, and University committees)
Teaching evaluations reflecting satisfactory performance by students, residents and other faculty members.

Adjunct Professor
Possession of a terminal degree for the profession
Demonstrated leadership roles in clinical activity, teaching or research, depending on the proposed role as an adjunct faculty member
Identification as a role model, teacher and leader in educational practices by learners, colleagues,

and peers

Evidence of leadership role in clinical practice in national and international specialty organizations

Evidence of service on committees (such as department, medical school, and University committees)

Teaching evaluations reflecting satisfactory performance by students, residents, and other faculty members

National or international recognition for clinical care, clinical or basic research, education, and/or service

E. Joint Appointment

Joint appointments reflect the contribution of the faculty member to the SMHS department and may not be at the same rank as the appointment in the home department.

F. Emeritus Appointment

Emeritus title will be the equivalent of the rank to which the faculty member was appointed prior to retirement.

IV. FACULTY EVALUATIONS

A. Initial Hiring of Faculty Members

At the time of hire, the Department Chair will discuss expectations of the position with the new faculty member, including expectations for percentage of effort in the areas of scholarly activity, teaching, and service and in accordance with the mission of the Basic Sciences department. This agreement will be documented with both parties indicating approval in writing and the resulting document will become part of the new faculty member's permanent record. The Department Chair will provide the new faculty member with copies of the Department of Basic Sciences *Guidelines for Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*, the SMHS *Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*, and the *University of North Dakota Faculty Handbook*.

Tenure Plans for Probationary Faculty. At the time of hire, a tenure plan will be developed by the Department Chair and the new faculty member. The tenure plan is designed to provide a clear statement of the nature of effort to be made in the areas of research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service during the faculty member's probationary period. The primary purposes of the tenure plan are to encourage faculty development and to assure accountability. The tenure plan will provide an individualized blueprint that will aid in evaluating performance during annual pre-tenure and tenure reviews. The tenure plan is designed to describe the faculty member's goals in research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service, and to explain how these goals support the needs of the Department, the SMHS, and the University. Projections made in the tenure plan, when compared to the faculty member's progress and achievements, provide one basis for evaluating the faculty member's professional performance. Tenure plans must be kept current and reviewed on an annual basis. Changes that impact a faculty member's ability to follow a previously established plan (e.g., personal issues, receiving a large grant, increased teaching load, or additional administrative responsibility) should be incorporated into a revision of the tenure plan as soon as possible, or at least annually.

B. Process For The Evaluation Of Faculty

Policies and procedures for the evaluation of faculty in the Department of Basic Sciences provide the means to document and equitably evaluate the performance of individual faculty members. It is the responsibility of the BSCPT and Department Chair to analyze the information gathered and evaluate the faculty member's accomplishment according to the guidelines set by the Department in this document.

The major purpose of evaluation should be to help the individual faculty members improve their performance, as well as improve the quality of the Department. An evaluation recommendation document should recognize faculty strengths and identify areas of weakness. In the case of post-tenure reviews, identification of performance that falls below the level of "Good" in the categories of scholarly activity, teaching, and service will be used as cause for professional development, assistance, career guidance, or remediation of the faculty member rather than for applying punitive actions.

For pre-tenure, post-tenure, and special appointment evaluations, faculty members must be informed promptly in writing and given adequate notice if new standards are adopted by the BSCPT and approved by the SMHS CPT. In all cases, a faculty member undergoing evaluation or seeking advancement should be assured the opportunity to provide information regarding expectations that predate changes in criteria that would affect their evaluation or promotion. For pre-tenure faculty only, if evaluation criteria are changed at any time during the probationary period, a tenure candidate may elect to be evaluated by the criteria in effect at the time of their initial appointment. That decision rests entirely with the tenure candidate and does not require additional approval by any committee or administrative official.

Contract provisions will be reviewed and, when appropriate, objectives may be revised as a part of the faculty member's periodic evaluations. However, faculty members cannot be evaluated on criteria or guidelines that were not in place during the period for which they are being evaluated.

1. Schedule for Evaluation of Faculty

Faculty will be evaluated according to the time tables described in the SMHS *Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* and summarized in Tables I - III below. An individual's time in rank will be calculated from the July 1st nearest to the faculty member's official start date, beginning with Year 1.

Table I: Pre-Tenure Evaluation Schedule

Year	Fall Semester	Spring Semester	Review level
1		X	Department CPT
2		X	Department CPT
3		X	UND SMHS CPT
4		X	Department CPT
5		X	UND SMHS CPT
6	X		UND SMHS CPT

<div align="center">**Table II:** Non-Tenure Track and Research Faculty Evaluation Schedule</div>

Year	Fall Semester	Spring Semester	Review Level
1 - 6		X	Department CPT
9, 12, ...		X	Department CPT
Promotion	X		UND SMHS CPT

<div align="center">**Table III:** Post-Tenure Evaluation Schedule</div>

Year	Fall Semester	Spring Semester	Review Level
3, 9, ...		X	Department CPT
6, 12, ...		X	UND SMHS CPT
Promotion	X		UND SMHS CPT

2. Evaluation Procedures

a. Initiation of Faculty Evaluation

Faculty evaluation materials are due in the Department office two months prior to the date that the evaluation (or summary thereof) is due in the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members will be given sufficient notice in advance to prepare their dossiers. The materials required are listed in Appendix I of this document.

b. Definition of Terms:

- *Evaluation dossier:* A complete set of documents compiled by the faculty member that describe the professional activities of that faculty member.

- *Evaluation recommendation:* A written summary of findings and recommendations compiled by the Department Chair and a written summary by the BSCPT, both of which are based on the evaluation dossier.

- *Evaluation file:* A collection of documents including the evaluation dossier, Department evaluation recommendations, and other documents that comprise the complete ongoing evaluation process, including recommendations from the SMHS CPT and the Dean of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.

- *Goals and Progression plan:* Describes the goals and activities of faculty members in research, teaching, and service that are to be achieved prior to the next post-tenure evaluation.

- *Tenure plan*: Describes the goals and activities of probationary faculty members in research, teaching, and service that are to be achieved in the progression towards promotion and tenure.

3. Departmental Evaluation Process

At the time an evaluation dossier is requested, the Department Chair will notify the BSCPT of the need for evaluating a faculty member. The Department Chair will request the evaluation dossier based on the general evaluation schedules in Tables I-III. The evaluation materials will be due in the Department office two months prior to the date that the evaluation (or summary thereof) is due in the Office of Academic Affairs.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to prepare a complete evaluation dossier according to the format described in Appendix I. The BSCPT will receive the dossier at least two months prior to the date on which the materials are due in the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs. The BSCPT will review the dossier, provide written evaluations and recommendations, and forward the documents to the Department chair.

a. Assignment of Review Responsibilities
For each evaluation conducted, the BSCPT Co-Chairs will identify an evaluation subcommittee that will be responsible for conducting the initial review of the faculty member's dossier. The subcommittee will be composed of three members of the BSCPT.

b. Evaluation process for probationary, post-tenure, and special appointment evaluations
Following receipt of the faculty member's dossier, the evaluation subcommittee will be charged to consider and discuss the evaluation materials. Following appropriate deliberation, the evaluation subcommittee will draft a summary report that rates the faculty member's performance in the areas of scholarly activity, teaching, and service, with explanations for how the ratings were determined, and provide recommendations.

The draft summary report from the evaluation subcommittee will be submitted to the BSCPT for revision and approval. Approval will require a majority vote of BSCPT members. Following approval of the draft report, the BSCPT Co-Chairs will produce a final evaluation report that will be communicated to the departmental chair and the faculty member being evaluated. In the event of a marked divergence of opinion among the BSCPT members regarding the contributions of the faculty being evaluated, a minority opinion/recommendation may be submitted in a separate document as a part of the final evaluation report.

Periodic evaluations will not be necessary for emeritus appointments.

c. Evaluation by the Department Chair
The BSCPT will return the Committee's signed recommendation and all copies of the evaluation dossier to the Department Chair at least one month prior to the date on which the materials are due in the Office of Academic Affairs. The Department Chair will prepare for each faculty member an evaluation separate from that of the BSCPT. The Department Chair will inform the faculty member of the BSCPT's recommendation and the Chair's recommendation within one week of their submission to the Office of Academic Affairs. If the evaluation occurs in a year limited to Department review, the Department Chair will notify the Office of Academic Affairs in writing of the outcome of the Departmental review.

4. Evaluation by the SMHS CPT

If the evaluation is in a year requiring SMHS CPT review, in addition to review by the Department, the Department Chair will submit the complete evaluation dossier, plus the recommendations of both the Department CPT and the Department Chair to the Office of Academic Affairs. The Office of Academic Affairs will ensure completion of the evaluation process through the SMHS CPT according to the *Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*. The SMHS CPT will review the dossier and recommendations of the Department CPT and advise the Dean of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences whether evaluations are consistent with Department and SMHS Guidelines and the *UND Faculty Handbook*.

5. Evaluation Beyond the School of Medicine and Health Sciences

Evaluations and recommendations regarding tenure and promotion of probationary faculty members to Associate Professor and promotion of tenured faculty members to Professor are initiated by a written recommendation from the department chair to the Dean of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.

For recommendations of tenure, the department chair collects the documentation and submits the evaluating committee's recommendation to the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs; the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs submits the material to the SMHS CPT; the SMHS CPT committee advises the Dean on whether the materials comply with the *Guidelines* and Faculty Handbook. The Dean forwards the decision to the President. The President submits the final recommendation to the State Board of Higher Education. (Section VII.D, SMHS CPT Guidelines)

For promotions in rank for probationary or tenured faculty, the department chair provides all necessary documentation to the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs. After insuring that the documentation is complete, the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs submits the material to the SMHS CPT; SMHS CPT recommends an action to the Dean; the Dean submits his/her decision to the President. The President approves or disapproves the recommendation of the Dean. (Section VI.E, SMHS CPT Guidelines).

For promotions in rank for faculty with Special Appointments, the department chair provides all necessary documentation to the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs. After insuring that the documentation is complete, the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs submits the material to the SMHS CPT; SMHS CPT recommends an action to the Dean; the Dean submits his/her decision to the Vice-President for Health Affairs. The Vice-President for Health Affairs approves or disapproves the recommendation of the Dean. (Section II.5.3, UND Faculty Handbook).

The faculty member being evaluated will be informed in writing of the results of the evaluation by the departmental committee, the departmental chair, the SMHS CPT, and the Dean, as appropriate (SMHS CPT Guidelines, Section III.C). After each recommendation is made, the candidate for promotion must be informed of said recommendation and must be given access to the promotion file in order to review the recommendation and respond, if desired, in the form of a written statement, to any material in his or her promotion file (Section II.5.3.B, UND Faculty Handbook).

C. Appeals

All formal appeals of evaluation should be made in accordance with the same "due process" procedures as provided for in cases on non-renewal of probationary faculty in North Dakota State Board of Higher Education Regulations on Non-renewal, Termination or Dismissal of Academic Staff.

D. Use and Disposition of Evaluation Documents and Process Confidentiality

The Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs is the office of record of the faculty member's personnel file, which includes the evaluation files. A copy of the evalution files should be retained by the Department of Basic Sciences as well. A faculty member's evaluation files may be utilized only by the procedures described and by the personnel identified in Section III-3.2.IV of the UND Faculty Handbook.

> **Faculty Handbook, Section III, Item3.2, IV.** The Academic Personnel Action Files may be utilized by the following personnel under these conditions:
>
> A. The individual may review his/her own file at any time that the custodian is available to withdraw it from the file. The review must be by appointment with and in the presence of the custodian, and file returned to the custodian upon its completion.
> B. The dean and/or the department chairperson may review an individual file, but again it must be done in the vicinity of the repository.
> C. Provision shall be made in colleges/departments for the utilization of the Academic Personnel Action Files in the University-wide review procedures for academic personnel decisions.
> D. In all cases, the person or persons requesting an individual file to be utilized for whatever purpose shall sign the Control Card for that file, both when receiving it from and returning it to the custodian, noting the date/time of each. The Control Card will be maintained in the file repository at all times (excluding when it is being signed).

All reviews of faculty are confidential personnel matters. Neither issues arising nor contents of the evaluation file relating to a faculty review are to be discussed or disseminated outside of meetings of the BSCPT. When a review has a specific outcome (e.g., a decision to promote and/or tenure), the outcome is communicated to the Department by the Chair at the appropriate time.

V. PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA

All faculty members are evaluated in the areas of research and scholarly activity, teaching, and professional service. In judging the accomplishments of faculty, the *quality* and *consistency* of scholarly activity, teaching, and service will be the primary bases for evaluation.

The Department Chair and the individual faculty member will agree mutually upon their contribution to each area and this will be reflected in the Tenure Plan (pre-tenure) and Goals and Progression Plan (post-tenure) and the Percentage of Effort Form submitted annually. It is recognized that there is a wide spectrum of activities within any given faculty title and that these activities will change with time. In general, it is expected that accomplishments in research and scholarly activity will be of primary importance in tenure and promotion decisions for faculty in the Scientist Scholar and the Research

Faculty tracks. In general, it is expected that accomplishment in scholarly teaching and education research in the scholarship of teaching and learning will be of primary importance in tenure and promotion decisions for faculty in the Educator Scholar track.

A. Academic Title Series

1. Scientist Scholar and Educator Scholar

Scientist Scholars and Educator Scholars will be evaluated in a manner that is consistent with their faculty title in the areas of research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service, and according to the needs of the Department. Individual performance of tenure track and tenured faculty will be judged in the context of resources and time made available to the faculty member to accomplish the goals as specified in their Tenure Plan or Goals and Progression Plan.

The contribution of individual faculty members to each area will be mutually agreed upon by the departmental chair and individual faculty member and reflected in the Percentage of Effort forms submitted annually. For evaluation purposes, the Percentage of Effort forms will be taken into consideration in weighing the importance of each area to the overall evaluation.

In judging the accomplishments of faculty members in the areas of research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service, the Department BSCPT will assign rank scores of "Good", "High", or "Outstanding" to these areas based upon the preponderance of evidence supplied in the candidate's dossier that addresses the evaluation benchmarks used to assess promotion and tenure as outlined in Tables IV and V. It is possible to receive an evaluation of "Good", "High", or "Outstanding" in an area without achieving all goals in the guidelines. In the end, a preponderance of evidence must be provided by the faculty being evaluated to support a given evaluation.

Promotion to associate professor and awarding of tenure will occur only if the candidate has demonstrated, in their major area of effort (Research/Scholarly Activity or Teaching), accomplishment that must be "Outstanding" as described in Table IV. In their second most area of effort (Research/Scholarly Activity, Teaching or Service), the candidate's accomplishment must be at least "High". In their third area of effort (Research/Scholarly Activity, Teaching or Service), the candidate's accomplishment must be at least "Good".

Promotion to Professor will occur only if the candidate has demonstrated, in their major area of effort (Research and Scholarly Activity or Teaching), accomplishment that is "Outstanding" as described in Table V. In their second most area of effort (Research/Scholarly Activity, Teaching or Service), the candidate's accomplishment must be at least "High" and in their third area of effort (Research and Scholarly Activity, Teaching or Service), the candidate's accomplishment must be at least "Good" in the rank being sought.

The benchmarks listed in Tables IV and V are applicable to evaluations of faculty members at any rank in the Academic Title Series. Tenured faculty will be expected to meet the minimal expectations of their rank to remain in good standing within the department. Professional development plans will be instituted by the Department Chair when faculty members do not meet the minimum expectations within these areas. Recognizable performance may be achieved by other means, but these must be

discussed in advance with the Department Chair to determine their potential impact on evaluation decisions.

Table IV. Examples of benchmarks and ratings for evaluation of **Scientist Scholars** and **Educator Scholars** for promotion from **Assistant Professor** to **Associate Professor**. An individual need not achieve every benchmark in order to achieve a given rating, but the preponderance of evidence should support the rating assignment.

	GOOD	HIGH	OUTSTANDING
Research/Scholarly Activity	• Working to establish active research/scholarly activity • Peer-reviewed publication, in general averaging <0.5 per year • Attendance at regional/national meetings • Mentoring of graduate students • Actively applying for intramural and extramural support for research/scholarly program	• Active research/scholarly activity • Peer-reviewed publication rates in general averaging 0.5-1 manuscript per year • Pending regular patent application(s) • Attendance at national/international meetings • Successful mentoring of graduate students • Recognition of research/scholarly activity by leaders in field • Evidence of intramural support for research/scholarly program • Active seeking of extramural funds	• Active research/scholarly program demonstrating independence or independent contributions to collaborative work • Peer-reviewed publication rates, in general averaging over 1 manuscript per year • Regular patent(s) granted • Significant extramural funding • Presentations at national/international meetings • Successful mentoring of graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, technicians, and/or peers • Citation of publications by others in the field • National recognition of the significance of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field
Teaching	• Contributes to Department's formal teaching mission • Evidence of effective teaching through student evaluations and student performance on examinations	• Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Evidence of effective teaching through student evaluations and student performance on examinations • Involvement in course design, development, and implementation • Evidence of improvement in teaching effectiveness through student evaluations as well as other mechanisms including well defined direct assessment procedures • Counseling of students into career paths related to the profession	• Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Leadership in course design, development, and implementation • Evidence of excellent quality of teaching through various mechanisms other than student evaluations, including well defined direct assessment procedures • Excellent student evaluations • Involvement in curriculum development/implementation and design of program assessment • Effective teaching of undergraduate students, graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, technicians, and/or peers • Demonstrated success in the placement of students into career paths related to the profession • Evidence of scholarship of teaching including publication of case studies and other teaching materials

Service	• Participation in the service missions of the Department • Membership in professional organizations	• Participation in the service missions of the Department, School and University • Membership in professional organizations	• Leadership in the service missions of the Department, School, and University • *Ad hoc* reviewing of submitted grants • Reviewing of manuscripts for publication • Active involvement in professional organizations • Contributions to the professional development of others

Table V. Examples of benchmarks and ratings for evaluation of **Scientist Scholars** and **Educator Scholars** for promotion from **Associate Professor** to **Professor**. An individual need not achieve every benchmark in order to achieve a given rating, but the preponderance of evidence should support the rating assignment.

	GOOD	HIGH	OUTSTANDING
Research/Scholarly Activity	• Active research/scholarly activity • Peer-reviewed publication, in general averaging 0.5-1 manuscripts per year • Attendance at national/international meetings • Successful mentoring of graduate students • Recognition of research/scholarly activity by leaders in field • Evidence of intramural support for research/scholarly program • Active seeking of extramural funds	• Active research/scholarly program demonstrating independence or independent contributions to collaborative work • Peer-reviewed publication, in general averaging over 1 manuscript per year • Pending regular patent application(s) • Significant extramural funding • Presentations at national/international meetings • Successful mentoring of graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, technicians, and/or peers • Citation of publications by others in the field • National recognition of the significance of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field	• Vigorous, productive, research/scholarly activity program demonstrating independence or independent contributions to collaborative work • Peer-reviewed publication, in general averaging over 2 manuscripts per year • Regular patent(s) granted • Sustained, significant extramural funding • Invited presentations at national/international meetings • Successful mentoring of graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, technicians, and/or peers • Citation of publications by others in the field • Invited reviews/book chapters • International recognition of the significance of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field
Teaching	• Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Evidence of effective teaching through student evaluations and student performance on examinations • Involvement in course design, development, and implementation • Evidence of improvement in teaching effectiveness through student evaluations as well as other mechanisms including well defined direct assessment procedures • Counseling of students into career paths related to the profession	• Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Excellent student evaluations • Evidence of excellent quality of teaching through various mechanisms other than student evaluations, including well defined direct assessment procedures • Involvement in curriculum design, development, implementation, and program assessment • Effective teaching of undergraduate students, graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, technicians, and/or peers • Counseling of students into career paths related to the profession	• Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Outstanding student evaluations • Evidence of excellent quality of teaching through various mechanisms other than student evaluations, including well defined direct assessment procedures • Success in obtaining extramural training grants • Leadership in curriculum design, development, implementation, and program assessment • Demonstrated skill in course administration • Formal recognition of teaching excellence through local/national awards and student performance on examinations • Successful placement of students into career paths related to the profession

Service	• Participation in the service missions of the Department, School and University • Membership in professional organizations	• Active participation in the service missions of the Department, School, and University • *Ad hoc* reviewing of submitted grants • Reviewing of manuscripts for publication • Active involvement in professional organizations • Contributions to the professional development of others	• Leadership in the service missions of the Department, School and University • Service on extramural grant and/or program review panels • Regular reviewing of grants for funding organizations and manuscripts for publication • Leadership in professional organizations • Significant advancement of the professional development of others through mentoring

2. Clinician Scholar

The Clinician Scholar track recognizes faculty with an important commitment to active participation in the development, deliverance and oversight of the health sciences curricula, patient care, as well as sharing his/her clinical practice for the purpose of pre- and postdoctoral training. The types of scholarly activity may include clinical research, basic science research, or educational research. The level of scholarly activity expected for faculty in the Clinician Scholar track will be determined according to departmental guidelines.

Criteria for appointment and promotion of Clinician Scholars will follow the criteria set forth in the SMHS *Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*, Section VI.A for Clinician Scholars.

B. Non-Academic Title Series

1. Research Faculty

The major criterion for promotion of Research Scientist faculty is demonstrated research productivity and excellence in professional service. Teaching, if negotiated between the faculty member, Department Chair, and Principle Research advisor when applicable, will be considered towards promotion but is not required. If the faculty member is involved in the Departmental teaching mission then the criteria outlined for promotion in the Scientist Scholar track will be applied.

Faculty with Research appointments will be evaluated in a manner that is consistent with their faculty title and reflective of their percent of effort in the areas of Research & Scholarly Activity and Service. The BSCPT will assign rank scores of "Good", "High", and "Outstanding" to these areas based upon the preponderance of evidence supplied by the candidate in their evaluation dossier that addresses those promotion criteria outlined in Table VI of this document.

Table VI. Examples of benchmarks and ratings for evaluation of **Research Faculty** for promotion from **Assistant Professor** to **Associate Professor**. An individual need not achieve every benchmark in order to achieve a given rating, but the preponderance of evidence should support the rating assignment.

	GOOD	HIGH	OUTSTANDING
Scholarly & Creative Activity	• Laboratory research resulting in an average of less than 1 publication per year • Demonstrated ability to conduct collaborative research. • Demonstrated potential to establish collaborative intramural and extramural funding. • Demonstrated ability to mentor graduate and postdoctoral students	• Laboratory research resulting in an average of 1 publication per year. • Pending regular patent application(s). • Demonstrated ability to conduct independent research. • Demonstrated ability to conduct collaborative multi-disciplinary research. • Demonstrated ability to establish independent extramural funding. • Demonstrated ability to independently mentor graduate and postdoctoral students. • Demonstrated national research reputation.	• Laboratory research resulting in an average of more than 1.5 publications per year. • Regular patent(s) granted. • Demonstrated ability to conduct independent and sustainable research. • Demonstrated ability to conduct collaborative and sustainable multi-disciplinary research. • Demonstrated ability to establish independent and sustainable extramural funding • Demonstrated ability to independently mentor graduate and postdoctoral students • Demonstrate ability to place graduate and postdoctoral students into academic/industry related profession positions as a result of mentoring. • Demonstrated international research reputation.
Professional Service	• Actively engaged in professional societies. • Demonstrated participation in publication review.	• Actively engaged in professional societies. • Demonstrated participation in publication review. • Demonstrated participation in local and national grant review process. • Invited to give national seminars on research expertise. • Chair research symposium at national meetings.	• Actively engaged in professional societies. • Demonstrated participation in publication review. • Demonstrated participation in local and national grant reviews. • Invited to give national and international seminars on research expertise. • Chair research symposium at national and international meetings.

Table VII. Examples of benchmarks and ratings for evaluation of **Research Faculty** for promotion from **Associate Professor** to **Professor**. An individual need not achieve every benchmark in order to achieve a given rating, but the preponderance of evidence should support the rating assignment.

	GOOD	HIGH	OUTSTANDING
Scholarly & Creative Activity	• Laboratory research resulting in an average of 1 publication per year. • Pending regular patent application(s). • Demonstrated ability to conduct independent research. • Demonstrated ability to conduct collaborative multi-disciplinary research. • Demonstrated ability to establish independent extramural funding. • Demonstrated ability to independently mentor graduate and postdoctoral students. • Demonstrated national research reputation.	• Laboratory research resulting in an average of 2 or more publications per year. • Regular patent(s) granted. • Demonstrated ability to conduct independent and sustainable research. • Demonstrated ability to conduct collaborative and sustainable multi-disciplinary research. • Demonstrated ability to establish independent and sustainable extramural funding • Demonstrated ability to independently mentor graduate and postdoctoral students. • Demonstrated international research reputation.	• Laboratory research resulting in an average of 3 or more publications per year. • Invited reviews/book chapters • Regular patent(s) granted. • Demonstrated ability to conduct independent and sustainable research. • Demonstrated ability to conduct collaborative and sustainable multi-disciplinary research. • Sustained, significant extramural funding • Demonstrated ability to independently mentor graduate and postdoctoral students • Demonstrate ability to place graduate and postdoctoral students into academic/industry related profession positions as a result of mentoring. • Demonstrated international research reputation.
Professional Service	• Actively engaged in professional societies. • Demonstrated participation in publication review. • Demonstrated participation in local and national grant review process. • Invited to give national seminars on research expertise.	• Actively engaged in professional societies. • Demonstrated participation in publication review. • Demonstrated participation in local and national grant reviews. • Invited to give national and international seminars on research expertise. • Chair research symposium at national meetings.	• Leadership roles in professional societies. • Membership on editorial or review board for journals in area of research expertise. • Chair of local and national grant review panels. • Invited to give national and international seminars on research expertise. • Chair research symposium at national and international meetings.

2. Non-Tenure Track Faculty

For non-tenure track faculty (i.e., those with a special appointment, as defined in the *UND Faculty Handbook*), the Department Chair will provide yearly to the faculty member a letter outlining performance expectations and a plan for promotion from rank to rank and/or a tenure track position. Faculty with special appointments are expected to perform in accordance with the guidelines set forth in Tables IV, V, or VI with emphasis placed on research, teaching, and service as stipulated by the terms of their appointment and subject to modification by the Department Chair.

C. Procedure for Promotion

The faculty member desiring promotion, the BSCPT, or the department chair can initiate a request for promotion. Because of the close and frequent professional association between the faculty member and the department Chair, appropriate consideration should be given to the Chair's recommendation at all stages of the reviewing process. If the recommendation is negative, the faculty member must be informed in writing by the department Chair of the basis for the recommendation.

In addition to the procedure described above, eligibility for promotion will be reviewed for instructors in their fourth year in rank, assistant professors in their sixth year in rank and associate professors in their seventh year in rank whenever promotion to the next rank has not been recommended earlier. The time periods specified are not intended to indicate normal or usual time spent in a particular rank prior to promotion. Promotion may occur at an earlier time; however, promotion after less than three years in rank will require clearly superior performance in all areas and/or unique circumstances. The benchmarks for evaluation of promotion should be the same regardless of when such a review occurs.

An individual's time in rank will be calculated from the July 1st nearest to the faculty member's official start date.

D. Procedure for Tenure

Granting of tenure in the Basic Sciences Department will follow the procedures outlined in the SMHS CPT Guidelines, Section VII. Tenure reviews will take place in the Fall semester. The faculty member being reviewed for promotion and tenure in the same academic year may submit the same supporting materials for both processes.

Probationary faculty should be provided with a Tenure Plan from the Departmental Chair at the time of their initial appointment that outlines the expectations required for the granting of tenure, as described earlier in this Section.

As with promotion, an individual's time in rank will be calculated from the July 1st nearest to the faculty member's official start date.

Time spent on leave of absence or sabbatical leave will be considered in decisions involving tenure and promotion. This determination will be made prior to authorization for the leave.

E. Timeline

All required documentation for promotion and tenure reviews should be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs on or before November 15th.

F. Documentation

Documentation of the criteria for promotion and tenure will include the items listed in Appendix I and the forms listed in Appendix II and III of the SMHS *Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*.

ORGANIZATION AND CONTENTS OF THE EVALUATION DOSSIER

The evaluation dossier is the source of information on which evaluation recommendations for promotion and tenure are based. The evaluation dossier should therefore be complete, informative and concise. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to assemble and organize the required documentation. Annual Department reports and academic record supplements provide a useful resource, but are not substitutes for a complete dossier. The Department CPT may request additional information from the faculty member if the evaluation dossier is deemed incomplete and will request clarification regarding any major inconsistencies or unclear information. The faculty member, however, determines the final content of the evaluation dossier.

The following list is provided as a guide to the assembly of the evaluation dossier. Each item must be addressed even if it is not an activity that was undertaken during the period of evaluation. Under such circumstances, indicate "None," or "Not Applicable."   A checklist is available from the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs.

- Cover page. The cover page should state the evaluation period, the name and rank of the submitting faculty member, and a table of contents.
- Self-evaluation. A two to three page self-evaluation should include:
  - A synopsis of activities in areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service since the last evaluation period. The candidate should discuss his or her role in major collaborative work in the synopsis.
  - Highlights of perceived strengths and weaknesses.
  - Responses to any recommendations made in the previous Department CPT evaluation.
  - Objectives for the upcoming evaluation period.
- Most recent evaluation and recommendations from the Department Chair and Department CPT.
- Job description and annual Percentage of Effort Forms for each year of employment since the last evaluation period. These forms should also include brief job descriptions.
- Tenure plan for probationary faculty
- Annual evaluations, including goals
- Research or scholarly activity summary. Include a list of the following for the current evaluation period:
  - Published or in-press articles, designating them as peer-reviewed, non-peer reviewed, or invited.
  - Submitted manuscripts. Include status of review.
  - Published abstracts.
  - Patents.
  - Other intellectual property associated with scholar activity (e.g. trademarked, copy right, etc. material).
  - Presentations given and meetings attended.
    - Invited talks, indicating venue (local, regional, national, international)
    - Poster presentations, indicating venue
    - Oral presentations, indicating venue
    - Attendance at scientific meetings
  - Funding Information
    - Current grant support

- - - Grants completed during the evaluation period
    - Pending grant support
    - Grants submitted but not funded
  - Research administration, including activities that further the research and scholarly activities of others locally, regionally, or nationally. These activities are distinct from professional service as described below, and must be approved by the Department Chair as such and reflected on the annual Percentage of Effort Form.
- Teaching activity summary
  - Formal instruction, listing course numbers, role in course, contact hours (and estimated preparation time for lectures), small group facilitation and laboratories
  - Informal instruction
    - Seminars, tutorials, and independent studies. Include description of activities.
    - Graduate research. List students advised, Faculty Advisory Committee service, and thesis defenses held during the evaluation period.
  - Curriculum/professional development. Describe any new courses designed, revision of existing courses, or graduate or undergraduate program development roles.
  - Teaching administration, with description of responsibilities. Include course directorships, PCL block directorship, and other.
  - Student evaluations of instruction. The University requires that effective teaching be documented by evaluation from at least three different sources, one of which must be from students. All student data must be offered voluntarily. Summary statements should succinctly and objectively describe the composite results of student evaluations. The original composite evaluation data, when available, should be included, but inclusion of individual student evaluation forms is optional.
    - The UND Student Assessment of Teaching forms (USAT) or other student feedback tools may be used.
    - For medical lectures and facilitation, student feedback data provided from the Office of Medical Education should be included.
    - Other documents reflecting direct evaluative student input. This may be in the form of student testimonials as part of a teaching award, or other forms of public recognition by students of teaching/advising excellence.
  - Peer/supervisor teaching evaluation letters
  - Professional development in education. List workshops and conference attended and wherever possible, identify changes or innovations that were instituted as a result of the professional development activity.
  - In addition to the above, faculty in the Educator Scholar track may wish to provide more extensive documentation of teaching activity in the form of a teaching portfolio. This could include
    - Reflective statements on teaching
    - Syllabi, descriptions of class activities, writing assignments, tests, videotapes
    - Evidence of scholarly activity related to teaching
    - Evidence of student learning or performance such as student work samples, test results, etc.
    - Evaluation(s) conducted by educator peers based on formal observation of classroom teaching, review of teaching materials, portfolios, or observation of other teaching, related work (in graduate committees, curriculum planning sessions, etc.).

- Professional service summary. Service should encompass all relevant aspects at the level of the Department, School of Medicine and Health Sciences, University, community, and profession. (Do not list service activities that are unrelated to professional training.) Pertinent inclusions may be:
  - Committees and task forces
  - Peer review activities
  - Membership and involvement in professional societies
  - Consultations and other administrative responsibilities
  - Lay presentations
- Evaluative letters by peers or supervisors should be included as appropriate.
  - In the cases of evaluations for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and Professor, candidates must submit a list of not less than five individuals from peers outside the University of North Dakota to the Chair of the Department to serve as references. These persons should not be former mentors or collaborators of the faculty member being evaluated. From this list, the Chair will solicit at least three letters of recommendation asking for opinions regarding the candidate's contributions to his or her discipline and profession. The most important letters will be from scholars who are recognized experts in the field of expertise of the candidate who can give informed, objective review of the contributions of the candidate. Letters from former advisors are discouraged to avoid the appearance of conflict of interest. In all cases, evaluators should be encouraged to clearly state their relationship to the candidate.
  - The Department supports both independent and collaborative work. It is incumbent that the dossier show evidence of the candidate's specific contributions to major collaborative efforts. Letters from referees who collaborate with the candidate should address the particular contribution of the candidate in the collaboration, as well as the significance of the sequence of authors on collaborative publications. There is an expectation that the candidate will be able to continue original, high-quality research following tenure, even if the earlier collaboration ends. It is very useful for the dossier to detail the particular contributions of the candidate on collaborative grants.
  - Peer/supervisor teaching evaluation letters
  - Letters from chairs of committees on which the candidate has served or from senior committee members. If the candidate is the chair of the committee, a letter from an appropriate official who is familiar with the responsibilities of the chair and performance of the candidate.
  - Other evaluative letters as appropriate, including letters solicited by the departmental chair that are not included in the candidate's list of references
  - All letters by scholars outside of UND that are solicited by either candidate or departmental chair, and any updated versions of said letters, will be included in the dossier .
- Other supporting documents. Extra documentation for special areas that were not adequately addressed in other parts of the dossier. Examples may include:
  - Letters of thanks from individuals documenting specific service acts.
  - Reviews/scores of submitted but unfunded grant applications.
  - Letters from editors/reviewer critiques for submitted, but unpublished, manuscripts.
  - Publication reprints/preprints.