

University of North Dakota
School of Medicine and Health Sciences
Department of Biomedical 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
Revised and approved by Department of Biomedical Sciences – June 13, 2018
Approved by School of Medicine and Health Sciences CPT – June 20, 2018

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	1
A. Mission Statement	1
B. Values Statement	1
C. Scholarship, Scholarly Teaching and Service in the Department of Biomedical Sciences	2
II. General Principles and Responsibilities	2
A. Faculty Responsibilities	2
B. Departmental Responsibilities	3
C. Department Chair Responsibilities.....	4
D. Committee on Promotion and Tenure (CPT) Composition and Responsibilities.....	4
E. SMHS Committee on Promotion and Tenure (CPT) Responsibilities.....	5
III. Title Series and Rank Characteristics	6
A. Faculty Appointments	6
1. Academic Faculty	6
2. Research Faculty	7
3. Teaching Faculty	7
4. Adjunct Faculty	7
5. Joint Faculty	8
6. Emeritus Faculty	8
B. Academic Faculty Ranks.....	8
1. Recognized Ranks	8
2. Criteria for Rank.....	8
3. Characteristics of Rank	8
C. Research Faculty Ranks.....	10
1. Recognized Ranks	10
2. Criteria for Rank.....	10
3. Characteristics of Rank	11
D. Teaching Faculty Ranks.....	12
1. Recognized Ranks	12
2. Criteria for Rank.....	12
3. Characteristics of Rank	13
E. Adjunct Faculty Ranks	14

1. Recognized Ranks.....	14
2. Criteria for Rank	14
3. Characteristics of Rank.....	15
F. Joint Faculty.....	16
G. Emeritus Faculty	16
IV. Faculty Appointments and Contracts.....	16
V. Faculty Evaluations	17
A. Initial Hiring of Faculty Members	18
B. Process for the Evaluation of Faculty.....	19
1. Schedule for Evaluation of Faculty.....	19
2. Evaluation Procedures.....	20
3. Departmental and School Evaluation Process	21
4. Evaluation Beyond the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.....	22
C. Appeals.....	23
D. Use and Disposition of Evaluation Documents and Process Confidentiality.....	23
VI. Promotion and Tenure Criteria.....	23
A. Academic Title Series	24
1. Scientist Scholar and Education Scholar.....	24
2. Clinician Scholar	25
B. Non-academic Title Series	25
1. Research Faculty	25
2. Teaching faculty	25
C. Procedure for Promotion	25
D. Procedure for Tenure.....	26
E. Timeline.....	26
F. Documentation.....	26

Appendices

Appendix I. Organization and Contents of the Evaluation Dossier	27
Appendix II. Tables with benchmarks for “Good”, “High” and “Outstanding” accomplishment expected for promotion and for the award of tenure (where applicable).....	30
Table I. Pre-Tenure Evaluation Schedule.....	19
Table II. Non-Tenure Track Evaluation Schedule.....	20
Table III. Post-Tenure Evaluation Schedule.....	20
Table IV. Promotion Criteria for a Scientist Scholar from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor.....	30
Table V. Promotion Criteria for a Scientist Scholar from Associate Professor to Professor.....	32
Table VI. Promotion Criteria for an Educator Scholar from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor.....	34
Table VII. Promotion Criteria for an Educator Scholar from Associate Professor to Professor.....	36
Table VIII. Promotion Criteria for Research Faculty from Assistant Research Professor to Associate Research Professor.....	38

Table IX. Promotion Criteria for Research Faculty from Associate Research Professor to Research Professor.....	39
Table X. Promotion Criteria for Teaching Faculty from Assistant Teaching Professor to Associate Teaching Professor	40
Table XI. Promotion Criteria for Teaching Faculty from Associate Teaching Professor to Teaching Professor	41
Appendix III Teaching Percent Effort Guidelines.....	42

Department of Biomedical Sciences

Guidelines for Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

I. INTRODUCTION

The Department of Biomedical 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 Biomedical 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 Biomedical Sciences value

- scholarly integrity,
- meaningful contributions to the knowledge base of the biomedical 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, Scholarly Teaching and Service in the Department of Biomedical Sciences

Scholarship: 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 Biomedical Sciences at UND SMHS. In accordance with the SMHS school-wide *Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*, the Department of Biomedical 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 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 Biomedical 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.

Scholarly Teaching: Because department faculty members are expected to engage in scholarly teaching it is important to distinguish this activity from the Scholarship of Teaching noted previously. Scholarly teaching is teaching that is constantly evolving and improving. Scholarly teachers establish clear goals for the course, focusing on what students will learn rather than the content they will "cover". They prepare adequately, and they research and use a variety of appropriate methods. They reflect on their own practice and invite critique on their teaching from students and peers, and administrators if appropriate. Their teaching results in significant student learning. (Adapted from: *Activities of Scholarly Teachers*. From The Centre for Discovery in Learning, University of Saskatchewan)

Service: Service includes contributions and activities that promote the general welfare of a department, the School, or the University. Service also includes activities that contribute to the development of a professional discipline, a professional society, or an outside agency or community. For all faculty members, regardless of appointment or rank, the concept of "service" includes displaying a collegial spirit of cooperation and avoidance of disruptive behavior. (Adapted from Emory University Faculty Handbook, Chapter 8: Service and Emory College of Arts and Sciences *Principles and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure*).

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 Biomedical 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 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 Faculty Handbook recognizes the uniqueness of individual faculty and the departments within which they serve by stating that the main responsibility for implementation of evaluation has been placed in the departments.

Accordingly, the Department of Biomedical Sciences will:

1. Develop procedures for evaluation of faculty for promotion, tenure and post-tenure performances according to the Guidelines.
2. Develop criteria and expectations of achievement for promotion from rank to rank, for the awarding of tenure, and for post-tenure performance.

Departmental criteria and expectations may be more rigorous but cannot be less rigorous than those described in the Faculty Handbook and Guidelines. The department may establish its own standards for the awarding of tenure as long as they are in conformity with the State Board of Higher Education (SBHE) tenure policies, the University Constitution, Senate By-laws and recognized University-wide interpretations as recorded in the Faculty Handbook.

3. Submit departmental standards and criteria and expectations for evaluation, promotion and tenure to the School CPT for review and approval. Prior to submission, the standards and criteria must be approved by a majority vote of all departmental academic faculty members, both tenured and non-tenured.

4. Independently evaluate each dossier submitted. Review and make recommendations on promotion using only the approved criteria established by the department.
5. Independently evaluate each dossier submitted. Review and make recommendations on the award of tenure using only the approved criteria established by the department.
6. Review and provide counsel regarding the credentials of individuals for appointment within faculty title series and rank.

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.

The Department Chair will inform the faculty member of the department deadlines for receipt and review of the evaluation materials. Following receipt of the written report from the Departmental Committee on Promotion and Tenure, the Department Chair will prepare a separate, independent 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. Departmental Committee on Promotion and Tenure (CPT) Composition and Responsibilities

As described in the *SMHS Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*, the departmental committee for evaluation, promotion and tenure must consist of a minimum of three faculty members, and all committee members must hold senior-level rank (i.e., associate professor or professor. For those evaluations that involve a tenure recommendation, the departmental committee will include all tenured faculty members in the department, excluding the chair, and must consist of a minimum of three tenured faculty members. In addition to departmental faculty members, departments may also choose to include outside faculty members in their evaluation committees, but such additional members must be at the level of associate professor or professor and approved by a majority vote of the departmental faculty members.

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.

CPT Committee for the Review of the Departmental Chair:

Departmental faculty will select up to two senior level faculty members from outside the department to serve on the BSCPT for the evaluation of the departmental chair.

Evaluation of the departmental chair will consider his or her academic title, rank, and performances in research/scholarly activity, teaching, and service. The evaluation will be based upon his or her percent of effort distributions; the dossier; and departmental and SMHS *Guidelines*. The chair's administrative performance is not to be addressed by the departmental or School Committees on Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure.

In addition, the Associate Dean for Medicine and Research will assist in the review. The Associate Dean will collect needed information (e.g., letters from external reviewers) and provide an independent evaluation as related to the chair's faculty appointment.

The BSCPT and Associate Dean evaluations will be forwarded to the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs.

E. SMHS Committee on Promotion and Tenure (CPT) Responsibilities

The SMHS CPT defines materials and documentation needed for probationary, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews. The SMHS CPT must base its evaluation and recommendations solely upon the information supplied by the faculty member and department; it is imperative that the faculty member supply all necessary data and

appropriate documentation. A fact cannot be assumed as known, if not stated. It is critical that promotion and the granting of tenure within the School be somewhat flexible because the unique needs of a community-based medical education system involve individuals who bring widely varying backgrounds, philosophies, skills, opportunities and needs into an academic setting. Notwithstanding such uniqueness, promotions and tenure are to be based on the consistency and quality of:

- Research/scholarly activities, including distinctive, peer accepted contributions to one's discipline or profession;
- Performances in teaching, including curriculum design, course development, content delivery, and assessment; and
- Service to the department, the School, the University, the profession, and society.

Faculty members' contributions to each of these areas may vary within the confines of a written job description and percent of effort distributions. However, it is essential that chairs and faculty alike be aware that excelling in only one aspect of academic responsibility may slow promotion (such as promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor) or may make promotion impossible (such as promotion from Associate to Professor).

III. TITLE SERIES AND RANK CHARACTERISTICS

Faculty titles and rank are initially determined at the time of appointment to the Department of Biomedical Sciences. In exceptional circumstances, faculty titles may be renegotiated at a later career stage. As most new faculty are expected to be hired as Scientist Scholars, appointment as an Educator Scholar 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 Biomedical Sciences coincide with descriptions listed in the SMHS *Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*.

1. Academic faculty

Faculty members with an academic appointment are expected to contribute to the mission of the Department in **all three areas** of research/scholarly activity, teaching,, 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*,:

Scientist Scholar

The Scientist Scholar designation is for faculty members with demonstrated excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge or new insights into existing knowledge in their discipline or area 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/or administration. Faculty members in this title series are engaged in research and scholarly activities 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 related to their discipline or area.

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

2. Research Faculty

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 ($\geq 80\%$) 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. Teaching Faculty

Teaching faculty are dedicated to supporting the teaching mission of the Department. These faculty members have a primary focus in teaching but may also contribute to other missions of the Department or School.

4. Adjunct Faculty:

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

5. Joint Faculty:

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 Biomedical Sciences are eligible for joint appointment in the Department of Biomedical Sciences.

6. Emeritus Faculty:

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 Faculty 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 Biomedical Sciences. Criteria for rank requested follow those of the University and SMHS (*Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*). Examples of benchmarks for professional accomplishments that are expected for promotion of faculty are found in Tables IV, V, VI and VII. The characteristics below are intended to be the usual characteristics and are not intended to exclude qualified candidates who possess equivalent training.

Instructor

Education:

- Earned Master's degree or equivalent training

Experience:

- Demonstrated potential as a teacher, researcher or both
- Engaged in professional development

Assistant Professor

Education:

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

Postgraduate training:

- 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.

Experience:

- 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

Education:

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

Postgraduate training:

- 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.

Experience:

- 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

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. The individual must have demonstrated a leadership role in departmental activities and/or the professional discipline.

Education:

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

Postgraduate training:

- 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.

Experience:

- 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
- Recognition of effectiveness in Departmental, School, and professional service

C. Research Faculty 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 educationally-related nature, and who meet the departmental criteria for the rank requested. The research faculty member may participate in the educational activities of the department and in professional service.

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 Biomedical Sciences. Criteria for rank requested follow those of the University and SMHS (*Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*). Examples of benchmarks of for professional accomplishments that are expected of faculty are found in Tables VIII-IX. 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

Education:

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

Postgraduate training:

- 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.

Experience:

- 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

Education:

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

Postgraduate training:

- 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.

Experience:

- 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

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

Education:

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

Postgraduate experience:

- 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.

Experience:

- 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. Teaching Faculty Ranks

1. Recognized ranks

Teaching Instructor
Teaching Assistant Professor
Teaching Associate Professor
Teaching Professor

2. Criteria for Rank

Individuals possessing appropriate degrees whose primary area of emphasis is teaching and teaching-related activities and who meet the departmental criteria for the rank requested. Teaching faculty members may participate in department research activities and in professional service.

3. Characteristics of Rank

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

Teaching Instructor

Education:

- Earned Master's degree or equivalent training

Experience:

- Significant teaching experience commensurate with a terminal degree
- Potential for effectiveness as a teacher

Teaching Assistant Professor

Education:

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

Postgraduate training:

- Faculty members with the Ph.D. degree or other terminal degree will be expected to have completed 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.

Experience:

- Demonstrated ability in teaching with good student and/or peer evaluations
- Potential for research productivity, i.e., publications including peer-reviewed articles and book chapters
- Potential for effectiveness in Departmental, School, and/or professional service

Teaching Associate Professor

Education:

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

Postgraduate training:

- Faculty members with the Ph.D. degree or other terminal degree will be expected to have completed 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.

Experience:

- Demonstrated record of excellence in teaching with excellent student and/or peer evaluations
- Demonstrated teaching productivity
- Potential to assume leadership roles in education and curriculum development
- Demonstrated scholarly productivity in the area of education
- Demonstrated regional/national reputation in education
- Demonstrated effectiveness in Departmental, School, or professional service

Teaching Professor

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

Education:

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

Postgraduate experience:

- Faculty members with the Ph.D. degree or other terminal degree will be expected to have completed 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.

Experience:

- Continued superior performance, achievement and recognition as a scholarly teacher
- Demonstrated sustained scholarly productivity in the area of education
- Demonstrated leadership roles in education and curriculum development
- Evidence of funding
- Demonstrated leadership in departmental activities and/or the professional discipline
- Recognition for continued contributions to the Department, School and Profession

E. Adjunct Faculty 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. The adjunct faculty member may be appointed from business, industry, research institutions, government or agencies, who are located in other academic institutions, from elsewhere in the University or from the community at large.

3. Characteristics of Rank

Adjunct Instructor

Education:

- Earned Bachelor's degree or equivalent training

Experience:

- Demonstrates potential as a teacher or researcher
- Engaged in professional development

Adjunct Assistant Professor

Education:

- Possession of a terminal degree for the profession

Experience:

- Demonstrated ability in clinical activity, teaching or research, depending on the proposed role as an adjunct faculty member

Adjunct Associate Professor

Education:

- Possession of a terminal degree for the profession

Experience:

- Demonstrated sustained role in departmental educational activities in ONE or more of the following areas: direct teaching; advising or mentoring; learner assessment; creation of educational materials
- Demonstrated evidence, through peer and learner evaluation, of high impact and quality teaching in departmental educational or research programs
- Demonstrated and sustained scholarly activity within his or her discipline and consistent with his or her role as an adjunct faculty member
- Local and regional recognition in the practice of clinical specialty (if applicable) Local and regional recognition in research (if applicable)
- Demonstrated effectiveness in departmental and professional service
- Teaching evaluations reflecting satisfactory performance by students, residents and other faculty members

Adjunct Professor

Education:

- Possession of a terminal degree for the profession

Experience:

- Demonstrated high impact, high quality and excellence in activities of direct teaching, advising or mentoring, learner assessment; creation of educational materials
- 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
- Demonstrated and sustained scholarly activity within his or her discipline and consistent with his or her role as an adjunct faculty member
- 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
- Demonstrated leadership in national and international organizations

F. Joint Faculty

Joint appointments reflect the contribution of the faculty member to the Department of Biomedical Sciences and may or may not be at the same rank as the appointment in the home department. Individuals possessing the criteria for rank as defined by the Department and who are willing to contribute to the missions of the School and the Department in one or more areas of research/scholarly activity, teaching and service may be eligible for a joint rank.

G. Emeritus Faculty

Emeritus status may be conferred upon retirement or after retirement to faculty pursuant to UND policies and procedures. An emeritus title will be equivalent to the rank at which the faculty member was appointed prior to retirement.

IV. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND CONTRACTS

Faculty appointments shall be probationary, tenured, or special (non-tenured) (SBHE Policy 605.1, 4). Probationary Appointments entail tenure-track contracts. Probationary contracts of the faculty of the School will be based on two criteria: source of funding and academic rank, i.e., in order for faculty members to be considered tenure eligible, they must:

1. Be initially (or subsequently) fully funded from State General Fund appropriations available for that individual's tenured salary, and
2. Carry a probationary academic faculty rank (instructor, assistant professor, associate professor or professor).

Probationary contracts may lead to a full-time tenured appointment. Early tenure (after four or five years) will be recommended only in exceptional cases. A probationary contract will not be granted for a period longer than six years, under normal circumstances. The term may be extended beyond six years

or the continuous service requirement may be waived in exceptional circumstances. If tenure is not granted and a seventh-year contract is issued, it must be terminal, unless an extension has been granted.

Special appointment contracts do not typically involve either tenure credit or status. However, they also do not exclude an opportunity for a tenured appointment: “The Board may, following review and recommendation made pursuant to the procedures established at an institution award tenure in exceptional circumstances, defined by the institution's procedures, to any person appointed to the faculty who has not met the eligibility requirements of subdivisions 3(b) and 3(c) of this policy, provided that the person has a documented record of outstanding achievement and consistent excellence in a discipline or profession gained through research, scholarly or professional activities, or service.” (SBHE Policy 605.1, 4biii). Faculty employed under a special appointment contract may be considered for tenure after six years of full-time continuous service based upon two criteria:

1. The availability of fully funded salaries from state general fund appropriations assigned to an academic salary budget in the department to which the faculty member belongs.
2. The faculty member carries an academic faculty rank (instructor, assistant professor, associate professor or professor) in that department.

The following types of special appointments do not involve tenure credit or status: courtesy adjunct appointments, research title appointments, teaching title appointments, clinical title appointments, visiting appointments, graduate teaching assistant appointments, postdoctoral fellowships and clinical appointments, appointments of retired faculty on special conditions, any initial appointment funded wholly or partially by other than state general funds, appointments clearly limited to a temporary association of normally no more than three years, special title appointments, lectureship appointments, part time appointments, or administrative or coaching positions. SBHE Policy 605.1, 4 b & c).

Tenure Appointments: Eligibility for tenure typically requires a probationary period of six years of continuous academic service to the School. A faculty member may be recommended for tenure by satisfying the criteria developed by the department, School, and University. The criteria shall include scholarly teaching; contribution to a discipline or profession through research; other scholarly or professional activities; and service to the institution and society.

If any individual is appointed to an academic (or) administrative position from outside the University, academic rank and/or tenure offered concurrently with or subsequent to such appointment will be determined only after recommendation of the department/college in which the rank is to be given. The criteria for rank and/or tenure for administrator-teachers, especially those relating to scholarly activity and service to students, will be similar to those regularly used in the department/college.

Emeritus Appointments: Emeritus status may be conferred upon retirement or after retirement to faculty or senior administrators or professionals pursuant to institution policies and procedures.

V. FACULTY EVALUATIONS

The major purpose of an evaluation is to help the faculty member improve his or her performance.

Faculty evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the guidelines established by the department, School, and University, keeping in mind the uniqueness of the individual's responsibilities and

departmental mission. Specifically, an evaluation should focus on the departmental and school criteria and the faculty member's accomplishments as related to his or her title, rank, and percent of effort distributions. Evaluations by departmental and School Committees on Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure address the faculty member's accomplishments in research/scholarly activity, teaching, and service; administrative components of a contract are not evaluated by committees on promotion and tenure. For joint appointments, evaluations will be conducted by the primary department with input from the secondary (joint) department if requested.

Procedures and guidelines for the evaluation of probationary, tenured, and special appointment faculty provide means whereby the performance of individual faculty members and their contributions to the department and University community may be equitably assessed and documented. An evaluation should commend faculty for outstanding performance and/or encourage faculty to strengthen weaknesses as well as improve in already strong areas.

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 Biomedical 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 Biomedical 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 Biomedical 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 "Does Not Meet Expectations" 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 pre-date 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: Probationary Evaluation Schedule

Year	Fall Semester	Spring Semester	Review level
1		X	Department CPT and Chair
2		X	Department CPT and Chair
3		X	Dept. CPT, Chair and UND SMHS CPT
4		X	Department CPT and Chair
5		X	Dept. CPT, Chair and UND SMHS CPT
6	X		Dept. CPT, Chair and UND SMHS CPT

Table II: Non-Tenure Track and Research Faculty Evaluation Schedule

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

Table III: Post-Tenure Evaluation Schedule

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

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 Education and Faculty 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 and School Evaluation Process

At the time an evaluation dossier is requested, the Department Chair will notify the BSCPT that a faculty member is to be evaluated. 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 Education and Faculty 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 Education 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 as "Does Not Meet Expectations", "Good", "High" or "Outstanding" 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 accomplishments of the faculty member 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 Education and Faculty Affairs. The Department Chair will prepare for each faculty member an independent 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 Education and Faculty Affairs. If the evaluation occurs in a year limited to Department review, the Department Chair will notify the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs in writing of the outcome of the Departmental review.

d. 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 Education and Faculty Affairs. The Office of Education and Faculty 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*.

4. 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 Education and Faculty Affairs; the Office of Education 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.

For promotions in rank for probationary or tenured faculty, the department chair provides all necessary documentation to the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs. After ensuring that the documentation is complete, the Office of Education 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.

For promotions in rank for faculty with Special Appointments, the department chair provides all necessary documentation to the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs. After ensuring that the documentation is complete, the Office of Education 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.

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,). 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. A faculty member may, in writing, withdraw a consideration of a promotion at any level of review.

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 evaluation files should be retained by the Department of Biomedical Sciences as well. A faculty member's evaluation files may be utilized only 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.

VI. 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 (special appointment [non-tenure] and 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 title series. 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 title series.

In judging the accomplishments of faculty members in the areas of research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service, the Department BSCPT will assign ratings of “Does Not Meet Expectations”, “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 (where applicable) as outlined in appended tables. It is possible to receive an evaluation of "Good", "High", or "Outstanding" in an area without achieving every listed example of a benchmark in the tables. In the end, a preponderance of evidence must be provided by the faculty member being evaluated to support a given evaluation.

For any faculty title series, promotion to associate professor and award of tenure (where applicable) will occur only if the candidate has demonstrated “Outstanding” accomplishment in their major area of effort (Research/Scholarly Activity or Teaching). In their second highest area of effort (Research/Scholarly Activity, Teaching or Service), the candidate’s accomplishment must be at least "High". In their third highest 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 “Outstanding” accomplishment in their major area of effort (Research and Scholarly Activity or Teaching). In their second highest area of effort (Research/Scholarly Activity, Teaching or Service), the candidate’s accomplishment must be at least "High" and in their third highest area of effort (Research and Scholarly Activity, Teaching or Service), the candidate’s accomplishment must be at least "Good".

Faculty members being evaluated but not requesting promotion (e.g., special appointment, post-tenure) are expected to demonstrate at least “Good” accomplishment in all areas of effort.

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.

The benchmarks listed in Tables IV-VII are applicable to evaluations of faculty members at any rank as a Scientist Scholar or Educator Scholar. 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 alternative means of demonstrating sufficient achievement must be discussed in advance with the Department Chair to determine their potential impact on evaluation decisions.

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*, for Clinician Scholars. For evaluation purposes, the Percentage of Effort forms will be taken into consideration in weighing the importance of each area to the overall evaluation.

B. Non-Academic Title Series

1. Research Faculty

The major criterion for promotion of Research faculty is demonstrated research productivity of a basic science, clinical science, or educationally-related nature and excellence in professional service. Teaching, if negotiated between the faculty member, Department Chair, and Principal Research Supervisor when applicable, will be considered towards promotion but is not required. If the faculty member is contributing to the Departmental teaching mission, then the criteria outlined for promotion in the Scientist Scholar title series 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 ratings of “Does Not Meet Expectations”, “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 Tables VIII-IX of this document.

2. Teaching Faculty

The major criterion for promotion of Teaching faculty is excellence in teaching, scholarly productivity in the area of education and effectiveness in professional service.

Faculty with Teaching 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 Teaching, Research & Scholarly Activity and Service. The BSCPT will assign ratings of “Does Not Meet Expectations”, “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 Tables X-XI of this document.

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 evaluation process. If the recommendation is negative, the faculty member must be informed in writing by the department Chair of the basis for the recommendation. A faculty member may, in writing, withdraw a consideration of a promotion at any level of review.

In addition to the procedure described above, eligibility for promotion will be reviewed for instructors in their fourth year in rank and assistant professors in their sixth 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. Any faculty member considering promotion is encouraged to have his or her dossier reviewed by the Departmental and School Committees on Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure at least one year prior to requesting the promotion to assist the faculty member in constructing and submitting a dossier for promotion that is complete and best represents his or her accomplishments.

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 Department of Biomedical Sciences will follow the procedures outlined in the SMHS CPT Guidelines. 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 by the department to the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs on or before November 15th.

F. Documentation

Documentation of the criteria for promotion and tenure will include the items listed in the appendices of the SMHS *Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*.

APPENDIX I

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 Education 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 research/scholarly activity, teaching, , 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
- Goals and Progression Plan for special appointment (non-tenure) and post-tenure 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.

APPENDIX II

TABLES WITH BENCHMARKS FOR “GOOD”, “HIGH” AND “OUTSTANDING” ACCOMPLISHMENT EXPECTED FOR PROMOTION AND FOR THE AWARD OF TENURE (WHERE APPLICABLE)

Table IV. Examples of benchmarks and rating for evaluation of a **Scientist Scholar** 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Working to establish active research/scholarly activity ● Peer-reviewed publications, in general averaging <0.5 papers/year ● Attendance at regional/national meetings ● Actively applying for intramural support for research/scholarly program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Active research/scholarly activity ● Peer-reviewed publications in general averaging 0.5-1 papers/year ● Pending patent application(s) ● Poster presentations at national/international meetings ● Recognition of research/scholarly activity by leaders in field ● Intramural support for research/scholarly program ● Actively applying for extramural support for research/scholarly program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Productive independent research/scholarly program ● Integral, independent contributions to collaborative work ● Peer-reviewed publications, in general averaging >1 papers/year ● A significant number of papers as corresponding author ● Patent(s) filed ● Extramural funding sufficient to support a productive research/scholarly program ● Invited/Selected oral presentations at national/international meetings ● Citation of publications by others in the field as evidenced by total citations or by an ‘h-index’ ● National recognition of the significance of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field
Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contributions to the Department’s teaching mission ● Positive student evaluations ● Peer and administrative evaluations of teaching indicating high quality and instructional content 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contributions to multiple student populations within the Department’s teaching mission ● Consistently positive student evaluations ● Peer and administrative evaluations of teaching indicating consistently high quality and instructional content ● Contributes to course design, development, and implementation ● Counseling of students into career paths related to the profession 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contributions that advance the Department’s teaching mission ● Consistently positive and, on occasion, exceptional student evaluations ● Peer and administrative evaluations of teaching indicating consistently high and, on occasion, exceptional quality and instructional content ● Leadership and/or contributions in course design, development, implementation, and design of program assessment ● Successful mentoring of students or trainees ● Advising students or trainees toward career paths related to profession

Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contributes to the service missions of the Institution ● Membership in professional organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contributes the service missions of the Institution at multiple levels ● Participation in professional organizations ● Occasional reviewing of manuscripts for publication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Leadership and/or demonstrated active participation in the service missions of the Institution ● Contributions to the professional development of others ● Regular reviewing of manuscripts for publication ● <i>Ad hoc</i> reviewing of grants for government agencies or foundations ● Advisor to student groups or organizations ● Active involvement in professional organizations
----------------	--	--	---

Table V. Examples of benchmarks and rating for evaluation of a **Scientist Scholar** 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Active research/scholarly activity ● Peer-reviewed publications, in general averaging 0.5-1 papers/year ● Attendance at national/international meetings ● Intramural support for research/scholarly program ● Actively applying for extramural support for research/scholarly program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Productive independent research/scholarly program ● Integral, independent contributions to collaborative work ● Peer-reviewed publications, in general averaging >1 papers/year ● A significant number of papers as corresponding author ● Patent(s) filed ● Extramural funding sufficient to support a productive research/scholarly program ● Invited/Selected oral presentations at national/international meetings ● Citation of publications by others in the field as evidenced by total citations or by a h-index ● National recognition of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Vigorous, productive, independent research/scholarly program ● Integral, independent contributions to collaborative work ● Peer-reviewed publication, in general averaging >2 papers/year ● A significant number of papers as corresponding author ● Patent(s) granted ● Extramural funding sufficient to support a vigorous, productive research/scholarly program ● Invited symposium and/or plenary speaker at national/international meetings ● Citation of publications by others in the field as evidenced by total citations or by an 'h-index' ● Invited reviews/book chapters ● International recognition of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field
Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contributions to the Department's teaching mission ● Positive student evaluations ● Peer and administrative evaluations of teaching indicating high quality and instructional content 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contributions that advance the Department's teaching mission ● Consistently positive and, on occasion, exceptional student evaluations ● Peer and administrative evaluations of teaching indicating consistently high and, on occasion, exceptional quality and instructional content ● Leadership and/or contributions in course design, development, implementation, and design of program assessment ● Successful mentoring of students or trainees ● Advising students or trainees toward career paths related to profession 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Significant contributions that advance the Department's teaching mission ● Consistently exceptional student evaluations ● Peer and administrative evaluations of teaching indicating consistently exceptional quality and instructional content ● Leadership in course design, development, implementation, and design of program assessment ● Successful mentoring and placement of students or trainees into career paths related to the profession ● Recognition within the school for high quality teaching

Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contributes to the service missions of the Institution ● Membership in professional organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Documented active participation in the service missions of the Institution ● Occasional reviewing of grants for government agencies or foundations ● Occasional reviewing of manuscripts for publication ● Involvement in professional organizations ● Advisor to student groups or organizations ● Contributions to the professional development of others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Leadership in the service missions of the Institution ● Regular reviewing of grants for government agencies or foundations ● Service on extramural grant and/or program review panels ● Regular reviewing of manuscripts for publication ● Leadership in professional organizations ● Significant advancement of the professional development of others through mentoring ● Advisor to student groups or organizations ● Editorial board membership
----------------	--	--	--

Table VI. Examples of benchmarks and rating for evaluation of an **Educator Scholar** 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
Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributions to the Department's teaching mission • Positive student evaluations • Peer and administrative assessment of teaching indicate high quality and instructional content • Participation in intramural professional development activities in education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributions to multiple student populations within the Department's teaching mission • Evidence of effective teaching • Consistently positive student evaluations • Peer and administrative evaluations of teaching indicating consistently high quality and instructional content • Contributes to course design, development, and implementation • Mentoring of students into career paths related to the profession • Employs assessment methods aligned with course learning outcomes and instructional strategies • Participation in intramural and extramural professional development activities in education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributions that advance the Department's teaching mission • Evidence of effective scholarly teaching • Consistently positive and, on occasion, exceptional student evaluations • Peer and administrative evaluations of teaching indicating consistently high and, on occasion, exceptional quality and instructional content • Independently designs, develops and implements course(s) • Successful mentoring of students or trainees • Advising students and trainees toward career paths related to the profession • Employs assessment methods aligned with course learning outcomes and instructional strategies and uses assessment results to improve teaching • Actively contributes to intramural professional development activities focused on education • Evidence of teaching activities forming a basis for scholarship • Recognition within the school for high quality teaching
Research/Scholarly Activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working to establish active research/scholarly program • Actively applying for intramural support for research/scholarly program • Dissemination of research/scholarly activity at the school level • Attends local and regional meetings focused on education scholarship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active engagement in the scholarship of teaching and learning • Peer-reviewed publications, in general averaging >0.25 papers/year • At least one peer reviewed publication as corresponding author • Intramural support for research/scholarly program • Regional dissemination of research/scholarly work • Attends national meetings focused on education scholarship • Engages students in research/scholarly activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Productive independent research/scholarly program and/or integral, independent contributions to collaborative work • Peer-reviewed publications, in general averaging >0.5 papers/year • At least two peer reviewed publications as corresponding author • National dissemination of research/scholarly work • Funding sufficient to support a productive research/scholarly program • Presentations (poster or oral) at national meetings • Students presenting research/scholarly activities at national meetings • Emerging recognition beyond UND as an educator scholar

Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contributes to the service missions of the Institution ● Membership in professional organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contributes to the service mission of the Institution at multiple levels ● Participation in professional organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Leadership and/or demonstrated active participation in the service mission of the Institution ● Contributions to the professional development of others ● Occasional reviewing of manuscripts for publication ● <i>Ad hoc</i> reviewing of grants for government agencies or foundations ● Advisor to student groups or organizations ● Active involvement in professional organizations
----------------	--	---	---

Table VII. Examples of benchmarks and rating for evaluation of an **Educator Scholar** 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
Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contributions to multiple student populations within the Department's teaching mission ● Evidence of effective teaching ● Consistently positive student evaluations ● Peer and administrative evaluations of teaching indicating consistently high quality and instructional content ● Contributes to course design, development, and implementation ● Mentoring of students into career paths related to the profession ● Employs assessment methods aligned with course learning outcomes and instructional strategies ● Participation in intramural and extramural professional development activities in education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contributions that advance the Department's teaching mission ● Evidence of effective scholarly teaching ● Consistently positive and, on occasion, exceptional student evaluations ● Peer and administrative evaluations of teaching indicating consistently high and, on occasion, exceptional quality and instructional content ● Independently designs, develops and implements course(s) ● Successful mentoring of students or trainees ● Advising students or trainees toward career paths related to the profession ● Employs assessment methods aligned with course learning outcomes and instructional strategies and uses assessment results to improve teaching ● Actively contributes to intramural professional development activities focused on education ● Evidence of teaching activities forming a basis for scholarship ● Recognition within the school for high quality teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Significant contributions that advance the Department's teaching mission ● Portfolio of evidence demonstrating a track record of consistent and effective scholarly teaching ● Consistently exceptional student evaluations ● Peer and administrative evaluations of teaching indicating consistently exceptional quality and instructional content ● Leads program curricular changes based on assessment outcomes ● Successful mentoring and placement of students or trainees into career paths related to the profession ● Leadership in curriculum planning, design, implementation and evaluation ● Employs assessment methods aligned with course learning outcomes and instructional strategies and uses assessment results to improve teaching ● Actively contributes to professional development activities focused on education at a national level ● Evidence of teaching activities forming a basis for scholarship ● Formal recognition for high quality teaching through local, regional or national awards

Research/Scholarly Activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Active engagement in the scholarship of teaching and learning ● Peer-reviewed publications, in general averaging <0.5 papers/year ● Regional dissemination of research/scholarly work ● Intramural support for research/scholarly program ● Attends national meetings focused on education scholarship ● Engages students in research/scholarly work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Productive research/scholarly program and/or integral, independent contributions to collaborative work ● Peer-reviewed publications, in general averaging >0.5 papers/year ● At least two peer reviewed publications as corresponding author ● National dissemination of research/scholarly work ● Funding sufficient to support a productive research/scholarly program ● Presentations (poster or oral) at national meetings ● Students presenting research/scholarly activities at national meetings ● Emerging recognition beyond UND as an educator scholar 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Vigorous, productive, independent research/scholarly program ● Integral, independent contributions to collaborative work ● Peer-reviewed publications, in general averaging 1 paper/year ● Majority of peer-reviewed publications as corresponding author or reflecting the major area of interest ● National and international dissemination of research/scholarly work ● Extramural funding sufficient to support a productive research/scholarly program ● Invited presentations at national and/or international meetings ● Invited reviews/book chapters ● Students presenting research/scholarly activities at national and/or international meetings ● Recognition beyond UND as an educator scholar
Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contributes to the service missions of the Institution ● Membership in professional organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Documented active participation in the service missions of the Institution ● Occasional reviewing of grants for government agencies or foundations ● Occasional reviewing of manuscripts for publication ● Involvement in professional organizations ● Advisor to student groups or organizations ● Contributions to the professional development of others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Leadership in the service missions of the Institution ● Regular reviewing of grants for government agencies or foundations ● Service on extramural grant and/or program review panels ● Regular reviewing of manuscripts for publication ● Leadership in professional organizations ● Significant advancement of the professional development of others through mentoring ● Advisor to student groups or organizations ● Editorial board membership

Table VIII. Examples of benchmarks and rating for evaluation of **Research Faculty** for promotion from **Research Assistant Professor** to **Research 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer review publications in general averaging <1 papers/year • Demonstrated ability to conduct research/scholarly activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer review publications in general averaging 1 paper/year • Demonstrated ability to conduct research/scholarly activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer review publications in general averaging >1.5 papers/year • Demonstrated ability to conduct independent research/scholarly activity • Demonstrated ability to conduct collaborative research/scholarly activity • Regular submission of grant proposals for extramural funding • Demonstrated ability to mentor undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or postdoctoral fellows • National recognition of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field • Invited/Selected oral presentations at national/international meetings
Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership in professional organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in professional organizations • Occasional reviewing of manuscripts for publication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active involvement in professional organizations • Regular reviewing of manuscripts for publication • Occasional reviewing of grants for government agencies or foundations

Table IX. Examples of benchmarks and rating for evaluation of **Research Faculty** for promotion from **Research Associate Professor** to **Research 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer review publications in general averaging 1 paper/year • Demonstrated ability to conduct research/scholarly activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer review publications in general averaging >1.5 papers/year • Demonstrated ability to conduct research/scholarly activity • Demonstrated ability to conduct collaborative research/scholarly activity • Regular submission of grant proposals for extramural funding • Demonstrated ability to mentor undergraduate students, graduate students and/or postdoctoral fellows • National recognition of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field • Invited/Selected oral presentations at national/international meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer review publications in general averaging >2 papers/year • Demonstrated ability to conduct independent research/scholarly activity • Demonstrated ability to conduct collaborative research/scholarly activity • Demonstrated extramural funding • Demonstrated ability to mentor undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or postdoctoral fellows • International recognition of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field • Invited/Selected oral presentations at national/international meetings
Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in professional organizations • Occasional reviewing of manuscripts for publication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active involvement in professional organizations • Regular reviewing of manuscripts for publication • Occasional reviewing of grants for government agencies or foundations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership in professional organizations • Regular reviewing of manuscripts for publication • Regular reviewing of grants for government agencies or foundations • Editorial Board membership

Table X. Examples of benchmarks and rating for evaluation of **Teaching Faculty** for promotion from **Teaching Assistant Professor** to **Teaching 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
Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributions to the Department's teaching mission • Positive student evaluations • Peer and administrative assessment of teaching indicate high quality and instructional content • Participation in intramural professional development activities in education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributions to multiple student populations within the Department's teaching mission • Evidence of effective teaching • Consistently positive student evaluations • Peer and administrative evaluations of teaching indicating consistently high quality and instructional content • Contributes to course design, development, and implementation • Mentoring of students into career paths related to the profession • Employs assessment methods aligned with course learning outcomes and instructional strategies • Participation in intramural and extramural professional development activities in education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributions that advance the Department's teaching mission • Evidence of effective scholarly teaching • Consistently positive and, on occasion, exceptional student evaluations • Peer and administrative evaluations of teaching indicating consistently high and, on occasion, exceptional quality and instructional content • Independently designs, develops and implements course(s) • Successful mentoring of students or trainees • Advising students or trainees toward career paths related to the profession • Employs assessment methods aligned with course learning outcomes and instructional strategies and uses assessment results to improve teaching • Actively contributes to intramural professional development activities focused on education • Evidence of teaching activities forming a basis for scholarship • Recognition within the school for high quality teaching
Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership in professional organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in professional organizations • Occasional reviewing of manuscripts for publication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active involvement in professional organizations • Regular reviewing of manuscripts for publication • Occasional reviewing of grants for government agencies or foundations

Table XI. Examples of benchmarks and rating for evaluation of **Teaching Faculty** for promotion from **Teaching Associate Professor to Teaching 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
Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contributions to multiple student populations within the Department's teaching mission ● Evidence of effective teaching ● Consistently positive student evaluations ● Peer and administrative evaluations of teaching indicating consistently high quality and instructional content ● Contributes to course design, development, and implementation ● Mentoring of students into career paths related to the profession ● Employs assessment methods aligned with course learning outcomes and instructional strategies ● Participation in intramural and extramural professional development activities in education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contributions that advance the Department's teaching mission ● Evidence of effective scholarly teaching ● Consistently positive and, on occasion, exceptional student evaluations ● Peer and administrative evaluations of teaching indicating consistently high and, on occasion, exceptional quality and instructional content ● Independently designs, develops and implements course(s) ● Successful mentoring of students or trainees ● Advising students or trainees toward career paths related to the profession ● Employs assessment methods aligned with course learning outcomes and instructional strategies and uses assessment results to improve teaching ● Actively contributes to intramural professional development activities focused on education ● Evidence of teaching activities forming a basis for scholarship ● Recognition within the school for high quality teaching- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Significant contributions that advance the Department's teaching mission ● Portfolio of evidence demonstrating a track record of consistent and effective scholarly teaching ● Consistently exceptional student evaluations ● Peer and administrative evaluations of teaching indicating consistently exceptional quality and instructional content ● Leads program curricular changes based on assessment outcomes ● Successful mentoring and placement of students or trainees into career paths related to the profession ● Leadership in curriculum planning, design, implementation and evaluation ● Employs assessment methods aligned with course learning outcomes and instructional strategies and uses assessment results to improve teaching ● Actively contributes to professional development activities focused on education at a national level ● Evidence of teaching activities forming a basis for scholarship ● Formal recognition for high quality teaching through local, regional or national awards
Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Participation in professional organizations ● Occasional reviewing of manuscripts for publication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Active involvement in professional organizations ● Regular reviewing of manuscripts for publication ● Occasional reviewing of grants for government agencies or foundations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Leadership in professional organizations ● Regular reviewing of manuscripts for publication ● Regular reviewing of grants for government agencies or foundations ● Editorial Board membership

Appendix III
Biomedical Sciences Teaching Percent Effort Guidelines
Approved 7/3/18

On April 16, 2018, the Department Chair charged a taskforce composed of Jane Dunlevy, Sarah Sletten, Bryon Grove, and John Shabb, to develop easy-to-apply departmental percent effort guidelines. The group subsequently held five two-hour sessions to reach the following consensus. The *Provost's Guidelines for Completing Page 2 of Faculty Contracts* was used as a benchmark.

Department of Biomedical Sciences teaching percent effort includes any formal administration or instruction of credit-bearing course work as listed in the UND catalog and approved by the Department Chair. This includes scheduled teaching and individualized instruction as defined in the *Provost's Guidelines*. Individualized instruction is further expanded to account for the special needs of the medical curriculum. Percent effort is calculated based on 2000 hours (calendar year).

Activities excluded from percent effort teaching calculation

- Mentoring of undergraduate students, graduate students, or postdoctoral trainees, not tied to faculty advisory committee activity or academic credit in which you are the instructor of record.
- Formal instruction outside of UND.
- Writing letters of recommendation for undergraduate students, graduate students or post-docs.

Scheduled instruction

- Graduate/undergraduate
 - Course percent effort: 3.3% per course credit of instruction.
 - Effort should be appropriately divided for team-taught courses.
 - Class size adjustment: Base % + 0.01% per student credit hour.
 - New course development (first two years): 2 x base %.
- Medical curriculum (percent effort takes into account review of material, preparation, revision, exam questions, addressing student queries, review with students, etc.)
 - Lecture percent effort: 0.5% per lecture.
 - Lab percent effort: 0.5% per two hours of lab.
 - New lecture: 1.5% per lecture.
 - Facilitation: 6% effort per block.

Other instruction

- Graduate/Undergraduate individualized instruction
 - Graduate advising: As major advisor, 5% per graduate student per calendar year (~15 credits); As a graduate advisory committee member, percent of effort is calculated as documented hours per calendar year..
 - Undergraduate mentoring: 0.33% per student credit hour.
- Medical curriculum (eg. unscheduled instruction, remediation assessment, PCL case development).
 - Percent of effort is calculated as documented hours per calendar year..
- General instructional development (eg. Revising course to incorporate evidence-based teaching practices)
 - Percent of effort is calculated as documented hours per calendar year..

Examples of how to apply the guidelines

Example 1: Dr. Smith teaches 10 medical lectures in Block 1 and facilitates in Block 2. She also is the primary advisor of one graduate student, and contributes one sixth of the instruction of module 1 of BIMD 501, which typically enrolls 5 students. She typically mentors one undergraduate in her lab through three credits of BIMD 494. What is her base percent effort in teaching?

- Medical lecture: $10 \times 0.5\% = 5\%$ effort
- PCL facilitation: $1 \times 6\% = 6\%$
- Thesis advising: $1 \times 5\% = 5\%$
- *BIMD 501 lecture: $10\% / 5 = 2\%$
- Undergraduate mentoring: $0.33\% \times 3$ student credit hours = 1%

*BIMD module 1 is one-half of a six-credit course. The standard number of contact hours for a 3-credit course is 45 hours. Therefore, Dr. Smith's 2% effort is equivalent to 8 contact-hours plus 32 hours of preparation time. Dr. Smith's percent effort is 19%.

Dr. Smith estimates that she will devote about 20 hours of her time to participate in developing a new case for Block 2. She also wants to apply the class size adjustment to her BIMD 501 teaching. How will this change her percent effort?

- BIMD 501 lecture class size adjustment: $2\% + (5 \text{ students} \times 3 \text{ credits} \times 0.01\% / 5) = 2.03\%$
- PCL case development adjustment: $20/2000 \times 100 = 1\%$

Dr. Smith's adjusted teaching percent effort is 22%.

Example 2: Dr. Abu Haidar has 100 contact hours of gross anatomy lab in the medical curriculum. He needs six hours of prep time for every two hours of lab. He also devotes an equal number of hours providing unscheduled, individualized gross anatomy instruction for medical students. What is Dr. Abu Haidar's teaching percent effort?

- Scheduled medical laboratory instruction: $0.5\% \times 50$ lab sessions = 25%
- Individualized instruction: $100 \text{ hours} / 2000 \times 100 = 5\%$

Dr. Abu Haidar's percent teaching effort is 30%.

Dr. Abu Haidar plans to teach 10 new lectures in the medical curriculum. How does this change his percent teaching effort?

- New medical lecture: $10 \times 0.5\% \times 3 = 15\%$

Dr. Abu Haidar's new percent teaching effort will be 45%.

Dr. Abu Haidar may apply the same percent effort to these new lectures in a second year.

Example 3: Dr. Xi teaches a three-credit undergraduate class in the Fall of each year with an enrollment of 100. She also is the instructor of record for two sections of a companion two-credit laboratory course with a total enrollment 60. What is her base percent effort?

- Three-credit course: 10%
- Two-credit course: 6.7%

Dr. Xi's base percent effort is 16.7%.

Dr. Xi wants to apply class size and section adjustments and she plans to introduce active learning into a component of her lecture course. She estimates that she will devote 40 hours to create new instructional materials. What is her adjusted percent effort?

- Class size adjustments:
 - Three-credit course: $10\% + 0.01\% \times 100 \times 3 = 13\%$
 - Two-credit course: $6.7\% + 0.01\% \times 60 \times 2 = 7.9\%$
- Section adjustment: $6.7\% \times 0.25 = 1.7\%$
- Instructional development: $40 \text{ hrs} / 2000 = 2\%$

Dr. Xi's adjusted percent effort is 24.6%

Dr. Xi wants to add a new section to her laboratory course. She has a choice to add it to the fall semester when she teaches the other two sections, or to the spring semester. Assuming no enrollment change, how will her choice affect her increase in percent teaching?

- Same-semester 2-credit section addition: $6.7\% * 0.25 = 1.7\%$
- Different-semester 2-credit section addition: 6.7%