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INTRODUCTION
The principal responsibility for the implementation of the evaluation of individual faculty members resides in the departments. Accordingly, the Department of Pharmacology, Physiology and Therapeutics developed its own procedures for the evaluation of its faculty for promotion, tenure and post-tenure performance. 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 Promotion and Tenure. Therefore, each Department faculty member has a specific responsibility for becoming familiar with each of these documents in order to fully understand the principles, responsibilities, process and expectations associated with evaluation, promotion and the award of tenure.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

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

B. Minimal departmental standards have been established in Section V of the SMHS Guidelines on 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 Anticipation of Percentage of Effort Form completed and submitted annually for each individual and in the Tenure Plan completed and submitted annually for probationary faculty members.

TITLE SERIES AND RANK CRITERIA

Faculty titles and rank are initially determined at the time of appointment to the Department of Pharmacology, Physiology and Therapeutics. In exceptional circumstances, faculty titles may be renegotiated at a later career stage. As most new faculty are expected to be hired into the Basic 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.

The faculty of the Department of Pharmacology, Physiology and Therapeutics are generally expected to fall into one of the three following title series as described in Guidelines II A. 1:

**Academic title series**

*Basic Scientist Scholar* - The Basic Scientist Scholar designation is for faculty members who focus on the discovery of new knowledge through empirical research. It is expected that faculty in this series teach effectively, and are actively involved in professional service.

*Educator Scholar* - The Educator Scholar designation is for faculty members who focus on teaching, educational leadership, and curriculum development/administration. Faculty in this title series will be engaged typically in research and scholarly activities related to education, but also may be involved in basic science research to a limited degree, as well as being actively involved in professional service.

**Research title series**

*Research Faculty* - The Research Faculty designation is for faculty who are dedicated to supporting the research mission of the Department. Faculty entering this series need not establish an independent reputation in research, but promotion within this series will require the development of an independent research program. These faculty members need not be involved in teaching.

**Characteristics of Academic Rank and Criteria for Appointment or Promotion in the Basic Scientist Scholar and Educator Scholar Tracks**

Listed below are expected characteristics of rank in the Basic Scientist Scholar or Educator Scholar series used for appointment or promotion to that rank in the Department of Pharmacology, Physiology and Therapeutics. Criteria for rank requested follow those of the University and SMHS (Guidelines II. B. 3). Guidelines for professional accomplishments that are expected of faculty in various circumstances are found in Table I. The criteria below are intended to be the usual criteria 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 other degree considered a terminal degree by the discipline
- Postgraduate training: Faculty members will be expected to have completed a postdoctoral experience in their area of specialization
- Potential for effectiveness in teaching
- Potential for effectiveness in scholarly and creative activity
- Potential for effectiveness in professional service

Associate Professor
- Earned doctorate
- Postgraduate training
- Consistent and marked effectiveness in teaching
- Scholarly and creative activity of appropriate quality and quantity for time in rank
- National recognition for scholarly activity
- Consistent and substantial contributions and service to the Department, School, University, and his or her profession

Professor
- The rank of Professor is awarded on the basis of documented recognition for continued superior performance, and not simply on the basis of time in rank as Associate Professor
- Earned doctorate
- Postgraduate training
- Recognition for continued excellence in teaching
- International recognition for continued scholarly activity of high quality and appropriate quantity
- Recognized for consistent and substantial contributions and service to the Department, School, University, and his or her profession

Characteristics of Academic Rank and Criteria for Appointment or Promotion in the Research Scientist Track

The major criterion for promotion of Research Faculty is research productivity. Teaching and service activity, which is to be negotiated between the faculty member and Department Chair, will be considered toward promotion, but is not required. Department criteria for rank requested follow those of the University and SMHS (Guidelines II. B. 3). Guidelines for professional accomplishments are found in the Research and Scholarly Activity category of Table II.

Research Assistant Professor
- Earned doctorate or other degree considered to be the terminal degree by the discipline
Postgraduate training: Faculty members will be expected to have completed a postdoctoral experience in their area of specialization
Potential to develop research productivity, either as a principal investigator or in support of a principal investigator (i.e. publications including peer-reviewed articles, book chapters and invited reviews).
Potential for effectiveness in Department and professional service

**Research Associate Professor**
- Earned doctorate or other degree considered to be a terminal degree by the discipline
- Postgraduate training: Faculty members will be expected to have completed a postdoctoral experience in their area of specialization
- Demonstrated research productivity, either as a principal investigator or in support of a principal investigator (i.e. publications including peer-reviewed articles, book chapters and invited reviews).
- Demonstrated effectiveness in Department and professional service

**Research Professor**
- Promotion to Professor is expected to occur on the basis of documented recognition for continued solid and superior performance, and not simply on the basis of time in rank as Associate Professor
- Earned doctorate
- Postgraduate training
- Evidence of being an independent investigator with extramural funding and maintaining a research program of high quality and appropriate quantity
- Demonstrated contributions, leadership and superior service to the Department, School, University and his or her profession

**CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE DECISIONS**

All faculty members are evaluated in the areas of research and scholarly activity, teaching, and professional service. The Department Chair and the individual faculty member will agree mutually upon his or her contribution to each area and this will be reflected in the Tenure Plan and the Anticipated 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 Basic Scientist Scholar (guidelines found in Table I) and the Research Faculty (guidelines found in Table II) tracks. In general, it is expected that accomplishment in teaching will be of primary importance in tenure and promotion decisions for faculty in the Educator Scholar track (guidelines found in Table I).
A. Basic Scientist Scholar and Educator Scholar Accomplishment Guidelines

Basic 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 faculty should be judged in the context of resources and time made available to the faculty member to accomplish the goals as specified in his or her Tenure Plan.

The Department’s guidelines for three levels of faculty performance are described in Table I.

- The first level, "Meets expectations", signifies that the faculty member is performing at a level consistent with job expectations and thus is entitled to continued membership in the Department and continued employment at the School of Medicine & Health Sciences. Faculty members performing at a level below this will require remedial action so that their performance rises at least to the level of "Meets expectations". If their performance is not raised to the “Meets expectations” levels they will be subject to consideration of termination.
- The second level, "Exceeds expectations", signifies an enhanced level of performance that not only meets the expectations for continued employment, but qualifies the faculty member for consideration of promotion and/or tenure.
- The highest level, "Exemplary", signifies the highest level of faculty performance and achievement. "Exemplary" achievement should be the goal of every faculty member in this Department, although it is recognized that not every faculty member will achieve such a high level of performance.

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 at least “Exceeds expectations”. In their second most area of effort (Research/Scholarly Activity or Teaching), the candidate’s accomplishment must be at least “Exceeds expectations”. For service activities, the candidate’s accomplishment must be at least "meets expectations".

The three defined levels of departmental performance “Meets expectations”, “Exceeds expectations”, and “Exemplary” correspond to the School of Medicine & Health Sciences performance levels as outlined in the SMHS’ Guidelines in the following manner.

- Faculty performance that is at or above the level of “meets expectations” but not at the level of “exceeds expectations” corresponds to the “good” and “high” levels of performance as outlined in the School of Medicine & Health Sciences’ Guidelines. “Good” performance would consist of performance that meets the Department’s “meets expectations” criteria but does not substantively rise above that level. “High” achievement signifies faculty performance that is substantially above the Department’s “meets expectations” level but not quite at the level of the “exceeds expectations” stratum.
- “Outstanding” performance consists of those faculty members whose performance corresponds to the Department’s “exceeds expectations” level.
- Although the School of Medicine & Health Sciences’ Guidelines do not have a separate category to recognize the very highest level of faculty performance as indicated by the Department’s “exemplary” designation, faculty performance at the “exemplary” performance level would obviously be subsumed with the School of Medicine & Health Sciences’ “outstanding” level.

To ensure clarity and consistency, communications between the Department and the School will define a faculty member’s level of achievement using both Departmental and SMHS’ nomenclature. For example, “Dr. A is performing at the "meets expectations" ("good") level”; “Dr. B is performing at the "meets expectations" ("high") level”; “Dr. C is performing at the "exceeds expectations" ("outstanding") level”; and “Dr. D is performing at the "exemplary" ("outstanding") level". 
Promotion to Professor will occur only if the candidate has demonstrated, in their major area of effort (Research/Scholarly Activity or Teaching), accomplishment that is “Exemplary”. In their second most area of effort (Research/Scholarly Activity or Teaching), the candidate’s accomplishment must be at least "exceeds expectations". For service activities, the candidate’s accomplishment must be at least "meets expectations".

A minimum of "meets expectations" is expected in all three areas for an individual faculty member not seeking promotion or tenure. Professional development plans will be instituted by the Department Chair when faculty members do not meet these minimum expectations.

The Department recognizes guidelines for accomplishments in the three areas evaluated as outlined in Table I. The guidelines are applicable to any faculty in the Academic Title Series. The purpose of Table I is to provide guidelines for specific activities. 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. It is possible to receive an evaluation of "meets expectations", "exceeds expectations", or "exemplary" in an area without achieving all goals in the guidelines. In the end, a preponderance of evidence must support a given evaluation.
Table I: Examples of Accomplishment for Basic Scientist Scholars and Educator Scholars in the Department of Pharmacology, Physiology and Therapeutics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research/Scholarly Activity</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Active research/scholarly activity</td>
<td>• Active, independent research/scholarly program</td>
<td>• Vigorous, productive, independent research/scholarly activity program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Average publication rate of 1 peer-reviewed article per year</td>
<td>• Average publication rate of 1.5 peer-reviewed articles per year</td>
<td>• Average publication rate of 2 or more peer-reviewed articles per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attendance at national/international meetings</td>
<td>• Significant extramural funding</td>
<td>• Sustained, significant extramural funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Successful mentoring of graduate students</td>
<td>• Presentations at national/international meetings</td>
<td>• Invited presentations at national/international meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognition of research/scholarly activity by leaders in field</td>
<td>• Successful mentoring of graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, technicians, and/or peers</td>
<td>• Successful mentoring of graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, technicians, and/or peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of intramural support for research/scholarly program</td>
<td>• Citation of publications by others in the field</td>
<td>• Citation of publications by others in the field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Active seeking of extramural funds</td>
<td>• National recognition of the significance of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field</td>
<td>• National recognition of the significance of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission</td>
<td>• Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission</td>
<td>• Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of effective teaching through student evaluations and student performance on examinations</td>
<td>• Involvement in curriculum design, development, and implementation</td>
<td>• Demonstrated skill in course administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Counseling of students into career paths related to the profession</td>
<td>• Evidence of effective teaching through student evaluations and student performance on examinations</td>
<td>• Leadership in curriculum design, development, and implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Active counseling of students into career paths related to the profession</td>
<td>• Effective teaching of undergraduate students, graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, technicians, and/or peers</td>
<td>• Formal recognition of teaching excellence through local/national awards and student performance on examinations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Participation in the service missions of the Department, School and University</td>
<td>• Active participation in the service missions of the Department, School, and University</td>
<td>• Leadership in the service missions of the Department, School and University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Membership in professional organizations</td>
<td>• Ad hoc reviewing of submitted grants</td>
<td>• Service on extramural grant and/or program review panels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Active involvement in professional organizations</td>
<td>• Reviewing of manuscripts for publication</td>
<td>• Regular reviewing of grants for funding organizations and manuscripts for publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contributions to the professional development of others</td>
<td>• Leadership in professional organizations</td>
<td>• Leadership in professional organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Significant advancement of the professional development of others through mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Significant advancement of the professional development of others through mentoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For non-tenure track faculty (i.e., those with a special appointment, as defined in the Faculty Handbook, section 8.1.1, paragraph 4c), 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 Table 1 with emphasis placed on research, teaching, and service as stipulated by the terms of their appointment and subject to modification by the Department Chair.
B. Research Faculty Accomplishment Guidelines

For Research Faculty members, criteria, documentation of research productivity, and examples of scholarly activity for consideration for promotion are described in the SMHS Guidelines on Promotion and Tenure, Section VI.A.4. The Department recognizes that scholarly activity must be ongoing and continuous, and promotion to the ranks of Associate Research Professor and Research Professor must be based on recognition for excellence. Table II provides guidelines for accomplishment in rank that may be negotiated by a faculty member and the Department Chair at the time of appointment. They also may be used by the Department Chair, and the Department CPT as a guide for evaluation of a Research Faculty member for promotion to Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor.

Table II: Examples for accomplishment in rank in the Research Faculty series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research/Scholarly Activity</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Active research program</td>
<td>• Active, independent research program</td>
<td>• Vigorous, productive, independent research program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Average publication rate of 1 peer-reviewed article per year.</td>
<td>• Average publication rate of 1.5 peer-reviewed articles per year.</td>
<td>• Average publication rate of 2 or more peer-reviewed articles a year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of intramural support for research program</td>
<td>• Significant extramural funding</td>
<td>• Invited reviews/book chapters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attendance at national/international meetings</td>
<td>• Presentations at national/international meetings</td>
<td>• Sustained, significant extramural funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Successful mentoring of graduate students</td>
<td>• Successful mentoring of graduate students</td>
<td>• Invited presentations at national/international meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Active seeking of extramural funds</td>
<td>• Citation of publications by others in the field</td>
<td>• Successful mentoring of graduate students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• National recognition of research by leaders in the field</td>
<td>• Citation of publications by others in the field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• International recognition of research by leaders in the field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INITIAL HIRING AND TENURE PLAN

At the time of hire, the expectations of the position will be discussed with the new faculty member and placed in the new faculty member’s file. The description will include information similar to that in the Anticipated Percentage of Effort Forms and will take into account the unique mission of the Department of Pharmacology, Physiology and Therapeutics. The Department Chair will provide the new faculty member with copies of the Department of Pharmacology, Physiology and Therapeutics Policies and Procedures for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure, the School of Medicine and Health Sciences Guidelines on Promotion and Tenure, and the University of North Dakota Faculty Handbook. At the time of hire, a Tenure Plan will be discussed. The Tenure Plan is designed to provide a clear statement of the nature of the effort to be made in the areas of research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service. 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 aids 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.

The Tenure Plans of all probationary faculty will be reviewed annually by the Department Chair and by the Department Committee on Promotions and Tenure (CPT). The Chair and tenured Department faculty have a special obligation to assist junior probationary faculty members in designing and following a Tenure Plan that will produce the growth and achievement needed to attain tenure. Tenure Plans must be kept current. 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, additional administrative responsibility, changes in criteria for evaluation) should be incorporated into a revision of the Tenure Plan as soon as possible, and at least annually.

PROCESS FOR THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY

Policies and procedures for the evaluation of faculty in the Department of Pharmacology, Physiology and Therapeutics provide the means to document and equitably evaluate the performance of individual faculty members. Evaluation instruments are the means whereby information is gathered. It is the responsibility of the Department CPT and Department Chair to analyze the information gathered and evaluate the faculty member's accomplishment against 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 minimal acceptable level (i.e., "meets expectations") shall be used as cause for professional development, assistance, career guidance, or remediation of the faculty rather than for applying punitive actions.

A. Schedule for Evaluation of Faculty

Faculty will be evaluated according to the time tables described in the Guidelines on Promotion and Tenure and summarized in Tables III - V 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 III: Pre-Tenure Evaluation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Review level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Due to Academic Affairs December 1st for tenure and promotion consideration

Table IV: Non-Tenure Track Evaluation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Review Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 12, ...</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>X**</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Academic Affairs review upon request
** Due to Academic Affairs December 1st

Table V: Post-Tenure Evaluation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year*</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Review Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3, 9, ...</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 12, ...</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>X**</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Post-tenure
** Due to Academic Affairs December 1st

B. Evaluation Procedures

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. The materials required are listed later in this document.

Definition of Evaluation 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 the Department CPT that is 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 UND SMHS CPT and the Dean of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.

**Responsibilities and Composition of the Department Committee on Promotion and Tenure**

The Department CPT will be responsible for evaluating the professional activities of the faculty member. The basis of the evaluation will be the materials presented in the evaluation dossier by the faculty member. The Committee may request additional information from the faculty member if the evaluation dossier is deemed incomplete. The Committee is obligated, through its Chair, to request clarification regarding any apparent major inconsistencies or unclear information provided in the dossier.

The Department CPT will include all tenured (UND) faculty members in the Department (excluding the Chair, cross-appointees, and adjunct faculty) as well as no more than two tenured faculty members from other Departments at UND (not restricted to the SMHS). The Department CPT must consist of a minimum of three tenured faculty members. In the event that fewer than three tenured faculty reside in the Department, additional tenured faculty members will be recruited from other Departments at UND. Outside tenured faculty will be nominated by the Department Chair, but must be approved by a majority vote of the Department faculty. The Department Chair will select the CPT Chair. The CPT Chair will assign review responsibilities, moderate the CPT deliberations, and ensure completion of the written evaluation recommendation. The CPT Chair will also be responsible for communicating the results of the CPT deliberations in writing to the Department Chair at least two weeks prior to the date on which the materials are due in the Office of Academic Affairs.

**Responsibilities of the Department Chair**

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 CPT, 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.

**Departmental Evaluation Process**

At the time an evaluation dossier(s) is(are) requested, the Department Chair will notify the Department CPT of the need for evaluating faculty member(s). The Department
Chair will request the evaluation dossier based on the general evaluation schedules in Tables III - V. These 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 later. The faculty member will submit the specified number of copies of the dossier to the Department Chair (PPT office staff will be available for photocopying). The Department CPT will have at least one month to review the dossier before meeting to discuss it and develop written evaluations and recommendations. A simple majority of the CPT membership must agree with and sign the recommendations before they can be forwarded to the Department Chair. In the event of a marked divergence of opinion among the CPT members regarding the contributions of the faculty being evaluated, the CPT may submit majority and minority opinions/recommendations.

The Department CPT will return the Committee's signed recommendation and all copies of the evaluation dossier to the Department Chair at least two weeks 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 Committee. The Department Chair will inform the faculty member of the Department CPT 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 in writing the Office of Academic Affairs of the outcome of the Departmental review.

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 submits the requested number of copies of 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 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.

Evaluation Beyond the School of Medicine and Health Sciences

Evaluations and recommendations regarding tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Professor are made as described above through the level of the Dean of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences. Recommendations are subsequently acted upon by the President of the University of North Dakota, the Chancellor, and the North Dakota State Board of Higher Education. The Department
Chair notifies the faculty member of recommendations at each subsequent step of the evaluation process.

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 (excerpted from the Faculty Handbook, Section II-8. 1. 1).

D. Use and Disposition of Evaluation Documents and Process Confidentiality

The contents of the evaluation file are to be made available only to the Dean of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, the Executive Associate Dean, the Chair of the Department and the faculty member. The Department Chair is the Dean's designated custodian of the faculty member's evaluation file. A copy of the evaluation file is retained by Academic Affairs. Should the Dean or the Executive Associate Dean of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences request access to the original evaluation file, they must do so in writing to the Chair. The written request will be included in the file and the faculty member in question will be notified of the request. A faculty member may have access to his or her evaluation file at any time upon request.

All reviews of faculty are confidential personnel matters. Issues relating to reviews are not to be discussed outside of meetings of the Department CPT. No information about the substance of the review may be communicated, either formally or informally, to those ineligible to participate in the decision. When a review has a specific outcome (e.g., a decision to promote and/or tenure), the outcome is communicated to the Department (including staff and students) by the Chair at the appropriate time. No contents of the evaluation file may be disseminated either before or after a review has been completed.

ORGANIZATION AND CONTENTS OF THE EVALUATION DOSSIER

The evaluation dossier is the primary 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 shall 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."

♦ 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:
  o a synopsis of activities in areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service since the last evaluation period
  o highlights of perceived strengths and weaknesses
  o responses to any recommendations made in the previous Department CPT evaluation and
  o 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.

♦ Research or scholarly activity summary. Include a list of the following for the current evaluation period:
  o Published or in-press articles, designating them as peer-reviewed, non-peer reviewed, or invited.
  o Submitted manuscripts. Include status of review.
  o Published abstracts
  o Patents
  o 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
  o Funding Information
    ▪ Current grant support
    ▪ Grants completed during the evaluation period
    ▪ Pending grant support
    ▪ Grants submitted but not funded
  o 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
  o Formal instruction, listing course numbers, role in course, contact hours (and estimated preparation time for lectures), small group facilitation and laboratories
  o 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 3 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, while acceptable, 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.
  - 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.

♦ 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