Policies and Procedures for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure
Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology

These department-specific guidelines replace “Guidelines and Procedures for Evaluation and/or Re-evaluation of Tenured and Non-tenured Faculty for the University of North Dakota Medical School, Department of Biochemistry” (approved 4/9/81), and are informed by the following departmental Vision and Values Statements.

**Departmental Vision Statement** (Approved September 15, 2000)

The Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology will be recognized on-campus, regionally, and nationally, for the high-quality teaching, research, and service provided by its faculty. All faculty members will be adequately funded so that they can effectively pursue their research goals and mentor students. Each faculty member will publish regularly in peer-reviewed journals. The graduate program will be attractive to inquisitive students with superb abilities. Students who graduate from our program will be critical thinkers with excellent communication skills. They will be knowledgeable, technically competent, enthusiastic, and prepared to function in a variety of environments. Students at all levels (graduate, medical and undergraduate) will regard instruction and other assistance that they receive as being worthwhile because it is current, relevant, and useful. The department will be engaged in partnerships with others that result in mutually beneficial outcomes. All faculty, students, and staff will work as a team and to the best of their abilities to fulfill the department’s mission. Others will regard their interactions with members of the department as collegial, respectful, helpful, competent, and enthusiastic.

**Departmental Values** (Approved September 6, 2000)

Members of the faculty and staff of the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology value:

- our history, traditions, and past accomplishments
- staying current, knowledgeable and competent
- dedication to excellence in research and contributions to the knowledge base of our discipline
- assisting medical, graduate and undergraduate students in their efforts to learn the fundamentals of our discipline
- mentoring graduate students as they become creative, independent scientists who are ethical, knowledgeable, and technically competent
- providing professional expertise to the school, university, community, state, region, nation and world and
- maintaining a spirit of collegiality that engenders being accessible, respectful, helpful, and cooperative.
INTRODUCTION

The policies and procedures relating to faculty appointments and evaluation outlined below were revised by the faculty of the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology and approved August 2005.

Departmental procedures for the evaluation of faculty for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure performance are in accord with the UND School of Medicine and Health Sciences Committee on Promotion and Tenure Guidelines on Promotion and Tenure (Approved FAC 4/7/03). These in turn are in accord with the University of North Dakota Faculty Handbook (1998). It is the responsibility of individual faculty members to be familiar with both these documents. School-wide and university-wide interpretations are in force when specific policies are not addressed in these departmental policies and procedures.

This policies and procedures document describes the development and updating of a tenure plan designed to facilitate the junior faculty member’s professional development and meaningful contributions to the department mission. It describes how evaluations of a faculty member’s professional activities are to be conducted, including the criteria to be evaluated, hallmarks of accomplishments, and the timetable to be followed. The role of various individuals and committees who evaluate the faculty contributions are outlined. A detailed description of suggested organization and contents of the evaluation dossier is included.

TITLE SERIES AND RANK CRITERIA

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

The faculty of the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology are generally expected fall into one of the following three title series as described in Guidelines II A. 1:

Basic Scientist Scholar - The Basic Scientist Scholar designation is for faculty members with demonstrated excellence in the discovery of new knowledge through empirical research, are effective teachers and are actively involved in academic service.

Educator Scholar - The Educator Scholar designation is for faculty members with demonstrated excellence in teaching, educational leadership and curriculum development and administration. Faculty in this title series will be engaged in research and scholarly activities related to education and actively involved in service.

Research Faculty - The Research Faculty members are faculty who are dedicated to supporting the research mission of a department. Faculty in this series need not have
established an independent reputation in research. These faculty members are encouraged to be involved in teaching; however teaching is secondary to scholarship.

Listed below are expected characteristics of rank in the Basic Scientist or Educator Scholar series used for appointment or promotion to that rank in the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology. Criteria for rank requested follow those of the University and SMHS (Guidelines II. B. 3). Examples of hallmarks of professional accomplishments (good, high, and outstanding) expected of faculty in various circumstances are found in Table 1. The criteria below are intended to be the usual criteria and are not intended to exclude qualified candidates who possess equivalent training.

**Instructor**
- Earned Bachelor’s degree or equivalent training
- Demonstrates promise as a teacher
- Engaged in professional development

**Assistant Professor**
- Earned doctorate (Ph.D.).
- Faculty members with the Ph.D. will normally be expected to have completed a postdoctoral experience.
- Potential for effectiveness in teaching
- Potential for effectiveness in research and scholarly activity
- Potential for effectiveness in professional and community service

**Associate Professor**
- Earned doctorate
- Postgraduate training
- Consistent and marked effectiveness in teaching
- Research and scholarly activity appropriate quality and quantity for time in rank
- Local or regional recognition for scholarly activity
- Consistent and substantial contributions and service to his/her profession and school
- Demonstrated professional and community service

**Professor**
- Earned doctorate
- Postgraduate training
- The rank of professor is awarded on the basis of recognition for continued solid and superior performance and not simply on the basis of time in rank as associate professor.

The major criterion for promotion of Research Faculty is research productivity. Teaching and service activity, which is to be negotiated between the faculty member and department chair, will be considered toward promotion but is not required. Departmental criteria for rank requested follow those of the University and SMHS (Guidelines II. B. 3). Examples of
hallmarks of professional accomplishments are found in the Research and Scholarly Activity category of Table 1.

Research Assistant Professor
Demonstrated ability to conduct research and potential for establishing an extramural funded research program with extramural funding.

Research Associate Professor
Evidence of major involvement in an extramural funded research program of high quality and significance. The faculty member should have a significant publication record in peer reviewed journals.

Research Professor
Achieved recognition for scholarly activities including independent extramural funding, continued publication of high quality manuscripts in peer reviewed journals and evidence of continued research productivity and recognition by peers.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE DECISIONS

All faculty members are evaluated in the areas of research and scholarly activity, teaching, and professional and community service. The relative expected 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 tenure plan and the Percentage of Effort Form submitted annually. The effort forms will be taken into consideration in weighing the importance of each area to the overall evaluation. 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 (examples found in Table 1) will be of primary importance in tenure and promotion decisions for faculty in the Basic Scientist Scholar track and the Research Faculty tract. Teaching and service contributions will not be expected at the same level as the research and scholarly activities. Faculty in the Educator Scholar tract may be promoted based on outstanding accomplishments in teaching according to the examples in Table 1 with less emphasis on research and scholarly activity accomplishments. They may be promoted on outstanding accomplishments in educational scholarly activity also.

A. Basic Scientist Scholar and Educator Scholar Accomplishment Hallmarks

Basic Scientist Scholars and Educator Scholars will be evaluated in a manner that is consistent with their faculty title in the areas of research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service and according to the needs of the department. Individual performance of tenure track faculty should be judged in the context of resources and time made available to the faculty member to accomplish the goals as specified in his/her tenure plan. Promotion to associate professor will
occur only if 1) outstanding accomplishment is achieved in at least one of the areas, 2) high accomplishment is achieved in a second area, and 3) good accomplishment is achieved in the third area.

Advancement to full professor by either Basic Scientist Scholars or Educator Scholars requires sustained outstanding achievement in the appropriate area(s). Outstanding accomplishment in service is considered to be sufficient for promotion only under specific circumstances.

A minimum of good accomplishment is expected in all three areas for an individual faculty member not seeking promotion or tenure. Professional development plans will be instituted to address a chronically deficient performance.

The department recognizes examples of hallmarks of outstanding, high, and good accomplishment in the three areas evaluated as outlined in Table 1. The hallmarks are applicable to any faculty title. The purpose of the checklist is to provide a sense of the importance of specific activities based on previous experience of departmental senior faculty. Outstanding performance may be achieved by other means, but these should be discussed with the departmental chair to determine their potential impact on evaluation decisions. It is possible to receive an outstanding evaluation in an area without meeting all the hallmarks. In the end, a preponderance of evidence must support a given evaluation.

B. Research Faculty Accomplishment Hallmarks

The major criterion for promotion of Research Faculty is research productivity. Teaching and service activity, which is to be negotiated between the faculty member and department chair, will be considered toward promotion but is not required. Hallmarks of good, high and excellent in the research category from Table 1 apply.
Table 1: Examples of Hallmarks of Accomplishment for Basic Scientist Scholars and Educator Scholars in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research/Scholarly Activity</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active research/scholarly program</td>
<td>Active, independent research/scholarly program</td>
<td>Vigorous, productive, independent research/scholarly program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average publication rate of about 0.5 significant peer-reviewed articles per year.</td>
<td>Average publication rate of about one significant peer-reviewed article a year.</td>
<td>Average publication rate of more than one significant peer-reviewed article a year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of intramural support for research/scholarly program</td>
<td>Citation of publications by others in the field</td>
<td>Citation of publications by others in the field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at national/international meetings</td>
<td>Significant funding</td>
<td>Sustained, significant extramural funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful mentoring of graduate students</td>
<td>Presentations at national/international meetings</td>
<td>Invited presentations at national/international meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field</td>
<td>Successful mentoring of graduate students and/or peers</td>
<td>Successful mentoring of graduate students and/or peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active seeking of extramural funds</td>
<td>Recognition of the significance of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field</td>
<td>Recognition of the significance of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Significant contributions to the department’s formal teaching mission</td>
<td>Major contributions to the department’s formal teaching mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good student evaluations</td>
<td>Involvement in curriculum design, development, and implementation</td>
<td>Demonstrated skill in course administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of good quality of teaching through student performance on examinations</td>
<td>Excellent student evaluations</td>
<td>Leadership in curriculum design, development, and implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling of students into career paths related to the profession</td>
<td>Evidence of excellent quality of teaching through student performance on examinations</td>
<td>Outstanding student evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Participation in the service missions of the department, school and university</td>
<td>Active participation in the service missions of the department, school and university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership in professional organizations</td>
<td>Service on grant and/or program review panels</td>
<td>Leadership in the service missions of the department, school and university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewing of manuscripts for publication</td>
<td>Service on extramural grant and/or program review panels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active involvement in professional organizations</td>
<td>Regular reviewing of manuscripts for publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributions to the professional development of others</td>
<td>Leadership in professional organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant advancement of the professional development of others through mentoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INITIAL HIRING AND TENURE PLAN

At the time of hire, the expectations of the position will be discussed with the new faculty member, and a written tenure plan will be developed and placed in that faculty member’s file. Individuals hired into non-tenure track position will have a similar letter of agreement placed in their file. The description will include information similar to that in Percentage of Effort Forms and will take into account the unique mission of the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology. The departmental chair will provide the new faculty member with copies of the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Policies and Procedures for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure, the School of Medicine and Health Sciences Guidelines on Promotion and Tenure and the University of North Dakota Faculty Handbook. At the time of hire, a tenure plan will be discussed. The tenure plan is designed to provide a clear statement of the nature of the effort to be made in the areas of research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service. The primary purposes of the tenure plan are to encourage faculty development and to assure accountability. The tenure plan will provide an individualized blueprint that aids in evaluating performance during annual pre-tenure and tenure reviews. The tenure plan is designed to describe the faculty member's goals in research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service, and to explain how these goals support the needs of the department, the SMHS and the university. Projections made in the tenure plan, when compared to the faculty member's progress and achievements, provide one basis for evaluating the faculty member's professional performance.

All probationary faculty tenure plans will be reviewed annually by the departmental chairperson and by the departmental Committee on Promotions and Tenure (CPT). The chairperson and tenured departmental faculty members have a special obligation to assist junior probationary faculty members in designing and following a tenure plan that will produce the scholarly and pedagogical growth and achievement needed to attain tenure. Tenure plans must be kept current. Changes that impact a faculty member's ability to follow a previously established plan, e.g., personal issues, receiving a large grant, increased teaching load, additional administrative responsibility, changes in criteria for evaluation, should be incorporated into a revision of the tenure plan as soon as possible, at least annually.

PROCESS FOR THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY

Policies and procedures for the evaluation of faculty in the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology provide the means to equitably document and evaluate the performance of individual faculty members. Evaluation instruments are the means whereby information is gathered. It is the responsibility of the evaluation committees or individuals to analyze the information gathered and evaluate the faculty member’s accomplishment against the criteria set by the department in this document. The major purpose of evaluation should be to help the faculty improve their performance and improve the quality of the department. An evaluation recommendation document should commend faculty for outstanding performance and/or encourage faculty to strengthen weaknesses as well as improve in already strong areas. In the case of post-tenure reviews, identification of performance that falls below the minimal
acceptable level shall be used as cause for professional development, assistance, career guidance, or remediation of the faculty rather than for applying punitive actions.

A. Schedule for Evaluation of Faculty

Faculty will be evaluated according to the time tables described in the *Guidelines on Promotion and Tenure* and summarized in Tables 2 – 4 below. An individual’s time in rank will be calculated from the July 1st nearest to the faculty member’s official state date, beginning with Year 1.

Definition of Evaluation Period

- Standard: from the time of last evaluation
- Promotion to Associate Professor and tenure: from the time of appointment
- Promotion to Full Professor: from the time of last promotion

### Table 2: Standard Pre-Tenure Evaluation Schedule

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

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

### Table 3: Standard Non-Tenure Track Evaluation Schedule

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

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

### Table 4: Standard Post-Tenure Evaluation Schedule

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

*Post-tenure
**Due to Academic Affairs December 1st
B. Evaluation Procedures

Initiation of Faculty Evaluation

The departmental chairperson will initiate the review process by requesting data from the individual to be evaluated. The individual will be given approximately one month to provide these materials which will be due in the departmental office approximately one month prior to the date that the evaluation (or summary thereof) is due in the Office of Academic Affairs. The materials required are listed later in this document.

Definition of Evaluation Terms

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

Evaluation recommendation: A written summary of findings and recommendations compiled by the departmental chair or CPT that is based on the evaluation dossier.

Evaluation file: A collection of evaluation dossiers, departmental evaluation recommendations, and other documents that comprise the complete ongoing evaluation process, including recommendations from the UND SMHS CPT and the dean of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.

Evaluation period: The time period since the last evaluation as formally scheduled according to this document. For individuals going up for promotion in rank (assistant to associate or associate to full professor) this is the time period since the last promotion, or since hire in the case of tenure and promotion review.

Responsibilities and Composition of the Departmental Committee on Promotion and Tenure

The departmental CPT shall be responsible for evaluating the professional activities of the faculty member. The basis of the evaluation will be materials presented in the evaluation dossier by the faculty member, other evidence, especially any requested or volunteered letters of evaluation, and personal observations by members of the CPT. The departmental CPT may request additional information from the faculty member if the evaluation dossier is deemed incomplete. The committee is obligated through its chair, to request clarification regarding any apparent major inconsistencies or unclear information provided in the dossier.

The departmental CPT will include all tenured faculty members in the department, excluding the chair, and must consist of a minimum of three tenured faculty members. In the event that fewer than three tenured faculty reside in the department, tenured faculty members will be recruited from other UND departments and must be approved by a majority vote of all departmental faculty members. The departmental CPT will select a committee chair to assign review responsibilities, to moderate the CPT deliberations, and ensure completion of the
written evaluation recommendation. The CPT chair will also be responsible for communicating the results of the CPT deliberations to the departmental chair.

Responsibilities of the Departmental Chair

The departmental chair shall inform the faculty member of departmental and Academic Affairs deadlines for receipt and review of the evaluation materials, and formally request the evaluation materials at appropriate times. They shall prepare an independent evaluation recommendation of the faculty member. It is the responsibility of the chair to inform faculty members in writing of results at each stage of their evaluation process.

Departmental Evaluation Process

At the time of formal request for the evaluation dossier, the departmental chair also notifies the department CPT of the need for evaluation of the faculty member. The departmental chair and CPT determine the actual receipt and review dates. The departmental chair formally requests evaluation dossier based on the general evaluation schedules in Tables 2 - 4. The individual will be given approximately one month to provide these materials which will be due in the departmental office approximately one month prior to the date that the evaluation (or summary thereof) is due in the Office of Academic Affairs.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to prepare a complete evaluation dossier according to the format described later. The faculty member will submit a specified number of copies of the dossier to the departmental chair. The departmental CPT is given at least one week to review the dossier before meeting to discuss it and develop written recommendations. A simple majority of the CPT membership must agree with and sign the recommendations before they can be forwarded to the departmental chair. In the event of a marked divergence of opinion among the CPT members regarding the contributions of the faculty being evaluated, the committee may submit both majority and minority opinions or recommendations.

The departmental CPT returns the committee’s signed recommendation and all copies of the evaluation dossier to the departmental chair. The departmental chair completes an independent evaluation recommendation of the faculty member. The departmental chair informs the faculty member of the departmental CPT recommendation and the chair’s recommendation within one week of their completion. If the evaluation occurs in a year limited to departmental review, the departmental chair notifies in writing the Office of Academic Affairs of the outcome of the departmental review.

Evaluation by the SMHS CPT

If the evaluation is in a year requiring SMHS CPT review, in addition to review by the department, the departmental chair submits the requested number of copies of the complete evaluation dossier, plus the recommendations of the departmental CPT and the departmental
chair to the Office of Academic Affairs. The Office of Academic Affairs will ensure completion of the evaluation process through the SMHS CPT according to the *Guidelines on Promotion and Tenure*. The SMHS CPT will review the dossier and recommendations of the departmental CPT and advise the dean of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences whether evaluations are consistent with departmental and SMHS guidelines and the UND *Faculty Handbook*.

**Evaluation Beyond the School of Medicine and Health Sciences**

Evaluations and recommendations regarding tenure and promotion to associate professor and promotion to professor are made as described above through the level of the dean of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences. Those recommendations are then acted upon by the president of the University of North Dakota, the chancellor, and the North Dakota State Board of Higher Education. The departmental chair notifies the faculty member of recommendations at each subsequent step of the evaluation process.

**C. Appeals**

All formal appeals of evaluation should be made in accordance with the same “due process” procedures as provided for in cases on non-renewal of probationary faculty in North Dakota State Board of Higher Education Regulations on Non-renewal, Termination or Dismissal of Academic Staff (excerpted from the Faculty Handbook (Section II-8.1.1)).

**D. Use and Disposition of Evaluation Documents and Process Confidentiality**

Following completion of all steps of the evaluation procedure, up to and including review by the SMHS CPT and the dean, the file shall be closed. The contents of the evaluation file are then to be made available only to the dean of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, the Executive Associate Dean, the chair of the department and the faculty member. The departmental chair is the dean’s designated custodian of the faculty member’s evaluation file. A copy of the evaluation file is retained by Academic Affairs. Should the dean or the executive associate dean of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences request access to the original evaluation file, they must do so in writing to the chair. The written request will be included in the file and the faculty member in question will be notified of the request. A faculty member may have access to their evaluation file at any time upon request.

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

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

The following list is provided as a guide to the assembly of the evaluation dossier. Each item must be addressed even if it is not an activity that was undertaken during the period of evaluation. Under such circumstances, indicate “None,” or “Not Applicable.”

- Cover page. The cover page should state the evaluation period, the name and rank of the submitting faculty member, and a table of contents.
- Self evaluation. A two to three page self evaluation should include:
  - a synopsis of activities in areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity and service since the last evaluation period
  - highlights of perceived strengths and weaknesses
  - responses to any recommendations made in the previous departmental CPT evaluation and
  - objectives for the upcoming evaluation period.
- Most recent departmental evaluation recommendations.
- Job description and annual Percent Effort Forms for each year of employment since the last evaluation period. These forms should also include brief job descriptions.
- Research or scholarly activity summary. Included a list of the following of 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
  - 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 departmental chair as such and reflected on the annual Percentage of Effort Form.

- Teaching activity summary
  - Formal instruction, listing course numbers, role in course, enrollment, contact hours (and estimated preparation time for lectures), small group facilitation and laboratories
  - Informal instruction
    - Seminars, tutorials, and independent studies. Include description of activities and student enrollment
    - Graduate research. List students advised graduate committees on which served, and thesis defenses held during the evaluation period.
  - Curriculum/professional development. Describe any new courses designed, revision of existing courses, or graduate or undergraduate program development roles.
  - Teaching administration, with description of responsibilities. Include course directorships, PCL block directorship, and other.
  - Student evaluations of instruction. The University requires that effective teaching be documented by evaluation from at least 3 different sources, one of which must be from students. All student data must be offered voluntarily. Summary statements should succinctly and objectively describe the composite results of student evaluations. The original composite evaluation data, when available should be included, but inclusion of individual student evaluation forms is optional.
    - The UND Student Assessment of Teaching forms (USAT) or other student feedback tools may be used
    - For medical lectures and facilitation, student feedback data provided from the Office of Medical Education should be included.
    - Other documents reflecting direct evaluative student input. This may be in the form of student testimonials as part of a teaching award, or other forms of public recognition by students of teaching/advising excellence.
  - Peer/supervisor teaching evaluation letters
  - Professional development in education. List workshops and conference attended and wherever possible, identify changes or innovations which 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) done 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 and community 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 chairperson will solicit at least three letters of recommendation asking for opinions regarding the candidate's contributions to his/her discipline and profession. The strongest letters will be from scholars who are recognized experts in the field of expertise of the candidate who can give informed, objective review of the contributions of the candidate. Letters from former advisors, while acceptable, are discouraged to avoid the appearance of conflict of interest. In all cases, evaluators should be encouraged to clearly state their relationship to the candidate.
  - Peer/supervisor teaching evaluation letters
  - Letters from chairs of committees on which the candidate has served or from senior committee members. If the candidate is the chair of the committee, a letter from an appropriate official who is familiar with the responsibilities of the chair and performance of the candidate
  - Other evaluative letters as appropriate

- Other Supporting documents. Extra documentation for special areas that were not adequately addressed in other parts of the dossier. Examples may include:
  - Letters of thanks from individuals documenting specific service acts
  - Reviews/scores of submitted but unfunded grant applications
  - Letters from editors/reviewer critiques for submitted, but unpublished, manuscripts

- Publication reprints/preprints
Minutes of Faculty Meeting
October 28, 2005

A faculty meeting was held at 1 pm on Friday, October 28, 2005. The following BMB faculty members were present: Detke, Foster, Homandberg, Milavetz, Miyagi, Ray (L), Sukalski, and Vaughan.

The purpose of the meeting was to review the revised version of the “Policies and Procedures for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure” document. The document was reviewed and discussed. Two minor corrections were made. A motion was made by Vaughan, seconded by Detke to approve the revised document. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned.