Bylaws of the

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I. Purpose

The general purpose of these bylaws, adopted by the Faculty of the College of Engineering, hereafter called the College, is to carry out its responsibilities in accordance with the Constitution and Bylaws of North Dakota State University Faculty Senate.

Specific purposes of these bylaws are to:

- Establish operational rules for faculty meetings in the College ~~of Engineering~~;
- Establish the responsibilities and related activities for the standing committees of the College;
- Facilitate the election of faculty representatives of the College
- Incorporate the promotion and tenure policy of the College

PART II. Organization and Rules of Operation for the College Faculty Meetings

Section 1. Policies

The Faculty is defined here as those who hold a half-time or greater appointment at the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, professor of practice, senior lecturer, instructor, or research faculty[1] from the following departments: ~~[List departments].~~[2]

1. Department of Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering
2. Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
3. Department of Computer Science
4. Department of Construction Management and Engineering
5. Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
6. Department of Industrial and Manufactural Engineering
7. Department of Mechanical Engineering

The Faculty shall determine College policies in the areas of ~~resident instruction~~curriculum, research and extension. The Faculty shall also make recommendations to the proper administrative authority in those areas of administration that are of continuing interest to the College. These policies shall be consistent with the policies of North Dakota State University.

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.83" + Indent at: 1.08"

Section 2. Terms of Office

a. The faculty Presiding Officer and Secretary of the College shall be elected officers ~~and shall not serve more than two consecutive years~~with ~~a~~ two-year terms and are ineligible to serve in the same function for two consecutive years after completion of their term of office.
b. Standing committee membership shall be for two years commencing with election. No member shall be elected to the same committee more than two consecutive terms (four years).
c. Special committees may be created by the majority vote of the College Faculty. Special committees or ad-hoc task groups shall function under the general rules of operation for committees as described in Part III, Section 2 of these Bylaws and shall be discharged upon the completion of their assigned duties.

Section 3. Elections

a. Nominations for all elected positions in the College shall be solicited by the Executive

[1] This is consistent with the definition of faculty from the NDSU Faculty Senate Constitution Article 3, Section 1,
[2] ~~This is consistent with the definition of faculty from the NDSU Faculty Senate Constitution Article 3, Section 1,~~

Committee in consultation with Department Chairs, and the nominations shall be distributed to the Faculty one week prior to elections.

b. ~~All elections shall be by written ballot.~~ Each Faculty member may vote for the total number to be elected to each committee or each position. A simple majority of the votes cast is required for election.
c. Faculty members unable to attend the election may cast their votes with the Secretary the day prior to an election. In the event of a repeat election, Faculty members absent from the originally scheduled election, forfeit their votes.
d. The University Senate positions shall be elected prior to March 15.
e. Vacancies due to a previously elected College Faculty member who is unable to fulfill responsibilities of an office or committee membership shall be filled at the next regular Faculty meeting in accordance with these Bylaws.

Section 4. Meetings

a. Regular meetings of the Faculty shall be held monthly during the academic year (August – May). In the event the College Secretary receives no requests from Committee Chairs for action items on the meeting agenda, and after consultation with the Presiding Officer, the meeting may be canceled by notification to all faculty.
b. In lieu of regular meetings or a need for a special meeting, items requiring a vote of the faculty may be submitted via e-mail by any committee with approval of the Executive Committee. Normally, such items will be non-controversial. The e-mail ballot or motion will clearly describe the issue and request an e-mail response to the Secretary within two working days unless otherwise specified. The requirements for approval will be a majority vote of 25% of the faculty with at least one vote from each department. A record of the final vote and a list of the faculty who submitted votes shall be maintained by the secretary until the results are published in the regular faculty meeting minutes.
c. A total of 25% of the Faculty, including at least one member from each department, shall constitute a quorum for business of the College. Approval of any motion requires favorable vote of a majority of the Faculty members present and voting at a meeting. Those Faculty present shall be listed in the minutes of the meeting.
d. ~~At the March meeting of each academic year, T~~the Executive Committee shall designate a Parliamentarian ~~from the Executive Committee~~. The Presiding Officer or any member of the College Faculty may ask the parliamentarian for a ruling on questions of procedure whenever doubt arises with respect to elections or other procedures.
e. Minutes of the College Faculty meetings shall be prepared by the Secretary and distributed to all Faculty members within one week after each meeting. Copies of the minutes shall be maintained ~~in the offices of~~by the Secretary and the College Dean.
f. The agenda for regular Faculty meetings shall be prepared by the Secretary and distributed to the Faculty of the College no later than the day before each meeting. Items may be placed on the agenda by written request to the Secretary by the Dean, Department Chairs, the committees of the College, or any member the College Faculty; the Secretary will make a final decision on what to put on the agenda. The order of business shall be as follows:
    1. Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting
    2. Announcements – Presiding Officer, Dean, Committee Chairs, Faculty
    3. Committee Reports
    4. Old Business
    5. New Business
    6. Adjournment
g. Special meetings of the College Faculty may be called by the Executive Committee as needed in to ensure conduct of College business as needed.

PART Ill. College Committees, General

Section 1. Membership

a. Standing committee membership shall consist of one Faculty member representing each of the departments of the College.
b. The College representative on a corresponding ~~University~~ Faculty Senate Standing Committee shall be one of the members of the College committee.
~~c. Student representation shall be limited to one undergraduate student for the Academic Affairs committee and one graduate student for the Graduate and Research Committee. Student members shall be elected by the Engineering Council.~~

Section 2. Committee Operational Rules

a. Individual standing committees may develop operational rules as needed to conduct their business in an orderly manner.
b. All committee meetings shall be open to the College Faculty, except for Promotion and Tenure Committee meetings. A Committee may move into an executive session by two-thirds vote. All committees shall keep minutes of their meetings; copies of these minutes shall be available to all Faculty of the College.
c. Each committee will submit its annual work plan for discussion at the first regular Faculty meeting in the Fall semester ~~and copies be handed to the Presiding Officer, Secretary, and Dean~~.
~~d. Each committee shall submit a written summary report yearly to the Faculty at the March meeting. A summary of the year's work shall be placed on permanent file kept by the Secretary and the Dean prior to the February Faculty meeting.~~

Section 3. Committee Meetings

Each standing committee shall meet ~~within 15 days of the elections~~by the end of the Spring semester for the purpose of selecting the committee chair, reviewing committee responsibilities, and formulating programs and directions for the following year.

Section 4. Membership Eligibility

All members of the College Faculty ~~with the rank of Assistant Professor or higher~~ are eligible for committee membership, except Faculty who serve in administrative capacities. Administrative ~~–~~ f~~F~~aculty are defined as Department Chairs, Interim Department Chairs, Associate Deans, and Dean. If a faculty member serving on a committee is appointed to an administrative position within the College, the affected faculty member's department will conduct an internal election prior the next regularly scheduled faculty meeting. The results of the election should be given to the Secretary who will ~~be able to make adjustments to~~ adjust College Committee lists.

Section 5. Service Limitations

Faculty members may serve on only one College committee. Exceptions may be necessary for membership required to maintain balanced departmental representation on committees.

Section 6. Review of Committee Charge

All committee responsibilities and activities are subject to review by the Faculty of the College.

PART IV. Standing Committee Responsibilities

Section 1. Executive Committee

The Executive Committee shall be comprised of the Presiding Officer, Secretary, and Chairs of standing committees of the College ~~and an undergraduate student representative elected by the Engineering Council~~.

The Chair of the committee shall be the elected Presiding Officer who will be responsible

for presiding at all regular Faculty meetings and to coordinate the meetings of the Executive Committee. In the event that the Presiding Officer cannot attend the meeting, he/she will appoint one member of the Executive Committee to conduct affairs of the committee and preside at College faculty meetings

The responsibilities of this Committee are to:

a. Assign problems and all matters brought by the Faculty, Administration or the Engineering council, to appropriate committees
b. Appoint special committees for the purpose of resolving specific problems; and to periodically review the progress of all committees.
c. Conduct annual reviews of the College Bylaws and if necessary propose revisions to improve these bylaws.
d. Solicit candidates for all elections of the College, including recommendations for University Senate and University Senate Committee membership
e. Prepare ballots and conduct college elections
f. Set meeting dates for the College.
g. Maintain complete records of elections~~,~~ and minutes of college faculty meetings~~, and annual reports by college committees (standing and ad-hoc)~~

Section 2. Academic Affairs Committee

Membership shall be one elected representative from each department in the~~-~~ College and the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs (ex-officio)~~.College and an undergraduate student representative elected by the Engineering Council~~.

The responsibilities of this Committee are to:

a. Define and distribute guidelines and timelines for submission of all course changes for timely review and inclusion in Spring and Fall course offerings;
b. Review proposals, changes, deletions, or additions for curriculum, course changes, and new programs. Upon unanimous approval by faculty members of the CoE AA Committee, such proposals and changes may be sent to the next level (CoE Dean) for approval. Should the Committee vote not be unanimous, the matter in question will be brought to the CoE Faculty Council for further consideration.
c. Review admission and academic standards for students and make recommendations for changes~~ to faculty~~;
d. Provide recommendations on all academic appeals filed from college programs in consultation with departments.
e. Provide the criteria for the College T~~t~~eachinge~~r of the Year~~ award~~s~~. Evaluate information provided to the committee for selection of award recipients. Recommendations for the awards will be reviewed with the Dean. Awards may not be given in every year.
f. Hear student appeals of academic sanctions. The CoE AA Committee shall serve as the Student Progress Committee (SPC) for the College. The SPC shall hear and decide upon student appeals in accordance with NDSU Policy 335, Code of Academic Responsibility and Conduct.

Section 3. Research and Graduate Committee

Membership shall be one elected member from each department in the College~~, a Graduate~~

~~Student appointed by the Dean,~~ and the Associate Dean for Research (ex-officio).

The responsibilities of this Committee are to:

a. Review all standards and policies for the College graduate programs for consistency and compliance with Graduate School requirements
b. Develop promotional materials for the graduate programs and graduate student research.
c. Review all graduate departmental evaluation reports prior to submission to the Graduate Council.
d. Promote research activities by the College Faculty and students.
e. Disseminate information on faculty and student research programs.
f. Provide the criteria for the ~~Researcher of the Year~~ College research awards. Evaluate information provided to the committee for selection of award recipients. Recommendations for the awards will be reviewed with the Dean. Awards may not be given in every year.

Section 4. Promotion, Evaluation, and Tenure Committee

Membership shall be one elected representative from each department in the College. Members of the College committee must be tenured faculty of the college.

The responsibilities of this Committee are to:

a. Establish and maintain the College Promotion and Tenure policies that are consistent with University guidelines for making recommendations for tenure, evaluation and promotion.
b. Ensure that College and departmental promotion and tenure guidelines are kept current and approved by faculty, Dean and Provost
~~c. Establish written appeals procedures for reconsidering any individual evaluation when such a review is requested. Act as a college level appeal board when a review is requested.~~
~~d.~~c. Provide recommendations concerning all College promotion and tenure candidates in accordance with the policies of the College on Promotion and Tenure.
~~e.~~d. Provide recommendations concerning decisions involving the non-renewal of probationary faculty appointments

PART V. Amendments/Revisions

Section 1. Amendment/Revisions Proposals

Amendments/Revisions to the College Bylaws may be proposed by any Standing Committee or by a petition signed by ten percent of the Faculty and presented to the faculty at a regularly scheduled meeting. The Secretary of the Faculty shall distribute the proposed changes to all members of the Faculty no later than nine days after the meeting.

Section 2. Amendment/Revision Balloting

The Faculty shall set a date for voting on the proposed changes, which shall be no sooner than the next regularly scheduled faculty meeting nor later than sixty days after the distribution is made to the Faculty. Faculty voting shall be by written ballot only. Opportunities for absentee voting shall be provided. The ballots for the proposed amendment/revision shall be counted by the Executive Committee. Proposed changes require approval by the majority of the ~~Faculty~~

~~members~~votes cast. Results shall be distributed to faculty and, if approved, the amendment/revision is effective immediately.

PART VI. Criteria and Procedures for Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

Section 1. Introduction

This document is intended to provide guidelines for making decisions regarding promotion and/or tenure of faculty in the College of Engineering (COE) in accordance with the Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation (PTE) Policies (Section 352 of the University and the North Dakota State Board of Higher Education Policies).

These guidelines identify specific factors that apply to the evaluation of COE faculty members in their scholarly performance and development of teaching, research and service responsibilities. Performance evaluations must utilize criteria which are clearly understood, and are consistent with the expectations of the Department, the College, and the University.

Section 2. Mission of the College

The detailed COE mission statement can be reviewed on the College webpage (www.ndsu.edu/coe/administration). Briefly, the College has a threefold mission of teaching, research, and service. The teaching mission of the College is to offer degree and certification programs in Engineering and Construction. The research mission of the College is to support and strengthen the instructional and public service function. The public service mission is to extend the instructional, research, and technological resources of the College throughout North Dakota, the nation, and the world.

Section 3. COE PTE Philosophy

a. Concept of Scholarship

The College expectations for faculty can be unified in the concept of Scholarship. Scholarship is defined as a "… creative, systematic, rational inquiry into a topic and the honest, forthright application or exposition of conclusions drawn from that inquiry. It builds on existing knowledge and employs critical analysis and judgment to enhance understanding"[3]. Scholarly work must be made public, must be available for peer-review and critique according to accepted standards, and must be reproducible to be built upon by other scholars. Developing and maintaining a Faculty of Scholars necessitates that the University be "not only a place of teaching, but also a place of learning"[4] for students and faculty alike.

The idea of Scholarship has evolved over time. In its earliest form, the role of the professoriate was to teach and scholarship was tied to that transfer of knowledge. After World War II, graduate education and research gained prominence and there was a

[3] Iowa State University COE Governance Document, 08 March 2012.

[4] C. Wegener, "Liberal Education and the Modern University", 1978 citing D. Gilman, Launching of a University and Other Papers, New York: Dodd Mead & Co., 1906.

greater shift toward the scholarship of discovery of knowledge. More recently, the view of Scholarship has been broadened further to include the Scholarship of Integration, Scholarship of Application, and Scholarship of Teaching[5]. Because faculty members make up a mosaic of talents, it is important to recognize the diversity of scholarship in each of these areas. Faculty must be scholars as they carry out their responsibilities in teaching, research, and service.

Formatted: Superscript

Some examples of Boyer's Scholarship:[6]

The Scholarship of Discovery

- Search for new knowledge
- Traditional definition of scholarship
- Discovery of new information and new models
- Sharing discoveries through scholarly publication

The Scholarship of Integration

- Integration of knowledge from different sources
- Presenting overview of findings in a resource topic
- Bringing findings together from different disciplines to discover convergence.
- Identifying trends and seeing knowledge in new ways.

The Scholarship of Application

- Discovering of ways that new knowledge can be used to solve real world problems.
- Design of a system, product, or process.
- "New intellectual problems can arise out of the very act of application."

The Scholarship of Teaching

- Search for innovative approaches and best practices to develop skills and disseminate knowledge.
- Teaching, advising, mentoring.

The qualities of a Scholar are defined as:

1. *Integrity* –Scholars must be truthful and fair in presenting their work.
2. *Perseverance* –Scholars must be curious, exhibit a reasonable level of productivity, and seek to perfect their work over a lengthy period.
3. *Courage* –Scholars must be able to risk disapproval in the name of truthfulness, and must be willing to take on difficult work in the spirit of answering original and important questions.

b. Process Overview

The major investment made by a college is in the hiring of its faculty members; development of faculty as scholars must be the central focus of faculty annual reviews to make the best use of that investment. The COE PTE process is designed to encourage

[5] Boyer, E.L., Scholarship Reconsidered –Priorities of the Professoriate, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.

[6] http://www.northeastern.edu/cpsfacultycentral/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Defining-Scholarship-with-Boyers-Four-Areas-of-Scholarship-Explored-and-the-New-Digital-Scholarship-A-Faculty-Conversation.pdf

academic well-being and continuous improvement in all facets of faculty scholarship.

To this end, the College PTE expectations are based on the demonstration of Scholarship. The PTE process requires that multiple evaluations are conducted over several years, and are performed by a variety of professional colleagues. The intent is to provide regular, unbiased feedback to enhance the scholarly development of all faculty members.

The PTE process must be used to develop the Scholar in a fair, transparent, and open manner. Annual reviews by Department leadership are the foundation of the process. This process takes place in the spirit of honest and constructive feedback in the development of the Scholar. The leadership may include the Department Chair (or Head) and the Department PTE Committee. Multiple evaluations help provide the Scholar with more constructive feedback and reduce the likelihood of a negative decision later in the PTE process. If the PTE process is carried out faithfully by all parties throughout the pre-tenure period, the final outcome of the process should never be a surprise to the Scholar.

Each department has its own specific needs. Each faculty member within a department has different interests and expertise. These varying needs, interests, and expertise must be blended together to achieve the department goals. The faculty member, together with the Chair/Head, should develop a job description and goals that support programs of excellence in the College.

c. Assessment Elements

In the book, "Scholarship Assessed", Glassick et al. lay out clear assessment guidelines and the ideas expressed herein are borrowed heavily from this work[7]. Scholarship of a faculty member's body of work will be assessed based on evidence provided by the faculty member that addresses the following six criteria:

Formatted: Superscript

1. Clear goals – Does the scholar clearly state the basic purpose of the work, define realistic and achievable objectives, and identify important problems in the field?
2. Adequate preparation – Does the scholar demonstrate understanding of the existing scholarship in the field, utilize necessary skills and tools in the work, and integrate the necessary resources to move the project forward?
3. Appropriate methods – Does the scholar effectively use appropriate methods, and modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?
4. Significant results – Does the scholar achieve the stated goals, make a consequential contribution to the field, and open additional areas for further exploration?
5. Effective presentation – Is the scholar's work presented with clarity and integrity, with a suitable style and effective organization, and in appropriate forums to communicate to intended audiences?
6. Reflective critique – Does the scholar use a critical self-evaluation, based on an appropriate breadth of evidence, to improve the quality of work?

It is the responsibility of faculty members to explain how the above elements of scholarship are present in their teaching, research, and service responsibilities. A major

[7] Glassick, C.E., Huber, M.T., and Maeroff, G.I., Scholarship Assessed- Evaluation of the Professoriate, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1997.

focus, therefor, will be the narrative that describes scholarly development.

Annual reviews and critical feedback to the faculty member throughout the PTE process must also address the six criteria noted above. In addition, the annual review must address a broader view of the faculty member's work by addressing the following two questions.

1. Is the current cumulative body of work appropriate for the field and for the stage of development of the Scholar?
2. Is there an appropriate progression and improvement of the faculty member's scholarship?

Section 4. University Expectations

University Policy (Section 352) recognizes teaching, research, and service as the three areas in which faculty are expected to contribute towards the mission of the University. The quality and quantity of contributions in all three areas will be considered at the time of promotion and tenure. Contributions and forms of supporting evidence will vary according to discipline. The performance evaluation of a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure shall also be based upon the individual's job description and work load over the time period under review.

Consistent with University Policy (Section 352), it is within the authority of the NDSU administration to grant credit toward early promotion or tenure when substantial, relevant experience has been documented in the original letter of appointment (hiring contract). Probationary-period faculty are encouraged to take full advantage of the customary six-year period to demonstrate continuing effectiveness with the context of NDSU. PTE committees for the Department and the College are bound to evaluate the faculty member based on the original letter of appointment and the candidate's job description. Evidence of achievement in the areas of teaching, research, and service shall be evaluated based on a level of documented activity in all areas equivalent to that expected from six-years of service at NDSU.

Collegiality, as defined by University policy, enhances the ability to be effective in teaching, research and service. A basic expectation of all faculty is to contribute to collegiality in the College by being ethical, courteous, helpful, and respectful in all aspects of professional conduct.

Section 5. Department Expectations

Specific expectations unique to the Department may be articulated in the Department tenure and promotion documents. The College PTE Committee shall use these Department guidelines for promotion and tenure. The effort expectation in teaching, research, and service should be outlined in the candidate's job description and any modifications that have occurred during the performance period.

The Department of Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering (ABEN) is required to meet the expectations and requirements set forth by both CAFSNR and COE. The COE PTE Committee evaluates faculty from the ABEN on their scholarship of teaching in engineering courses and scholarship of service but not scholarship of research.

Section 6. College Expectations for Teaching, Research, and Service

a. Teaching

Teaching scholarship refers to the broad area of student/faculty interaction for educational purposes. Teaching encompasses not only classroom activities but the full range of activities which result in educational and professional development of students. Teaching scholarship may include outreach and extension educational programs directed primarily toward clientele outside of the university. The College expects each faculty member to be a competent teacher and advisor who cares about student learning and is a knowledgeable and skilled communicator.

The faculty member should provide a personal narrative with a portfolio of evidence to demonstrate competency as a scholarly teacher and advisor. The personal narrative should highlight the following with regards to the faculty member's teaching responsibilities: clear and appropriate goals, adequate preparation, use of appropriate methods, significant results, and effective presentation. The narrative should also integrate a reflective critique of the scholar's own work highlighting changes that have been made in teaching methods along with the motivations for, and results of, those changes. The narrative should synthesize the scholar's body of teaching responsibility with reference to supporting evidence outlined below. It is important to note that a compilation of evidence is not sufficient, in and of itself, to demonstrate scholarly teaching competency. Rather, that evidence must be integrated in a cohesive narrative.

Criteria for tenure, promotion, and maintenance of rank

1. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor: For promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, the faculty member shall demonstrate scholarly teaching competency. This competency should be demonstrated through an organized narrative, as outlined above. The faculty member shall be a proficient instructor for all courses taught. "Proficient" means knowledgeable in the subject(s) taught, effective in communication, and competent in assessing student learning. The faculty member shall also be a proficient advisor to all assigned undergraduate and graduate students.
2. Tenure: An applicant for tenure is expected to meet the same criteria for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. In addition, the faculty member should demonstrate long-term potential value to the Department, College, and University based on scholarly teaching that aligns with the institutional mission.
3. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor: For promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, the faculty member shall demonstrate a continued progression of scholarly teaching and participation in curriculum development. The expectation for promotion to Full Professor is that the faculty member demonstrates a significantly higher level of achievement and recognition than for promotion to Associate Professor. Integration of new models for student learning and integration of research into the instructional of students is particularly encouraged. The responsibility is on the faculty member to explain the progression in teaching scholarship in the reflective narrative as outlined above.

4. Full Professor: Full Professors are expected to maintain their work as teaching scholars by continuing to improve the transfer of knowledge using the principles of Scholarship outlined above.

Supporting Evidence

Although the narrative serves as the primary basis for documenting teaching scholarship, that narrative must be supported by documented evidence. The following are primary examples of supporting evidence that can be referenced to demonstrate teaching and advising scholarship:

- Peer and/or other professional evaluations of: course content, teaching methods, improvement of instructional programs, and course or program assessment
- Student evaluation of teaching effectiveness including summary data for all required Student Rating of Instruction questions
- Summaries of feedback from student evaluations of advising
- Presentations at regional and national meetings on innovative instructional and assessment techniques
- Other documentation of innovative methods to evaluate student learning
- Course development including faculty or administrative evaluation
- Supervision of theses and dissertations
- Active involvement in accreditation activities

The following are secondary examples of supporting evidence that can be referenced to demonstrate teaching and advising scholarship:

- Receipt of awards or special recognition for effective teaching
- Receipt of awards or special recognition for advising students and/or organizations
- Offering or contributing to continuing education courses and workshops including evaluation of course content and delivery
- Participation in professional development related to improving teaching effectiveness

b. Research

Research scholarship includes activities that focus on discovery and integration related to a scholar's defined area(s) of study. Such areas may include foundational science, applied engineering, or instructional pedagogy.

Faculty members should provide a personal narrative with a portfolio of supporting evidence demonstrating scholarly research competency in their area(s) of expertise. The personal narrative should highlight the following with regards to the faculty member's research program: clear and appropriate goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, and effective presentation. The narrative should also integrate a reflective critique of the scholar's own work which informs future scholarly activities. The narrative should synthesize the scholar's body of work with reference to supporting evidence outlined below. It is important to note that a compilation of evidence is not sufficient, in and of itself, to demonstrate scholarly research competency. Rather,

that evidence must be integrated in a cohesive narrative.

Criteria for tenure, promotion, and maintenance of rank

1. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor: For promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, faculty members shall demonstrate scholarly research competency in their area(s) of expertise. This competency should be demonstrated through an organized narrative, as outlined above.
2. Tenure: An applicant for tenure is expected to meet the same criteria for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. In addition, the faculty member should demonstrate long-term potential value to the Department, College, and University based on a scholarly research program that aligns with the institutional mission.
3. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor: For promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, the faculty member shall demonstrate a continued progression of scholarly work and research leadership. The expectation for promotion to Full Professor is that the faculty member demonstrates a significantly higher level of achievement and recognition than for promotion to Associate Professor. The responsibility is on the faculty member to explain the research progression and leadership in the reflective narrative as outlined above.
4. Full Professor: Full Professors are expected to maintain their work as research scholars by continuing to search for new knowledge through the principles of scholarship outlined above.

Supporting Evidence

Although the narrative serves as the primary basis for documenting scholarship, that narrative must be supported by documented evidence. The following are primary examples of supporting evidence that can be referenced to demonstrate scholarship of research:

- External peer evaluations of faculty scholarly research contributions such as evaluations of research proposals and reviews of manuscripts (required)
- Pursuit and success in obtaining external funding to support scholarly research goals
- Publication of original work related to the individual's scholarly goals in books and refereed archival publications appropriate to the scholarly field
- Effective direction of graduate students toward completion of dissertations and theses
- Invited technical presentations at national and international conferences
- Collaborative investigations with industrial partners
- Registration of patents
- Establishment of campus infrastructure to serve as a platform to support scholarly research goals

The following are secondary examples of supporting evidence that can be referenced to demonstrate scholarship of research:

- Publications of original work related to the individual's scholarly goals in non-

refereed conference proceedings
- Presentation of original work related to the individual's scholarly goals at regional, national, or international conferences
- Externally requested technical reports
- Awards or other recognition within the faculty member's discipline for research accomplishments
- Participation in multidisciplinary and intercollegiate research activities

The following are examples of supporting evidence that may be used to demonstrate research leadership:

- A strong record of publication citations
- Invitations to speak at national or international meetings
- Holding leadership positions on national committees
- Developing or directing national collaborative research programs

c. Service

The scholarship of teaching and research has received considerable attention, but teaching and research are not the only expectations of faculty members. The faculty are also expected to engage in campus governance, and to serve their profession and broader society as NDSU employees. Scholarly service involves the same critical and reflective components that faculty apply to teaching and research: clear and appropriate goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and critical reflection.

The faculty member should provide a personal narrative with a portfolio of supporting evidence to demonstrate a scholarly approach and contributions in service activities. The personal narrative should highlight the faculty member's personal role and scholarly contributions to the service activities. The narrative should also include a reflective critique of the service activities of the faculty member. It is important to note that compilation of evidence alone is not sufficient. Rather, that evidence must be integrated in a cohesive narrative pointing to the growth and active participation in scholarship of service.

Criteria for tenure, promotion, and maintenance of rank

1. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor: For promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, the faculty member shall demonstrate scholarly participation and growth in service at the University and to the Profession. This activity should be demonstrated through reflective narrative, as outlined above. Active and meaningful participation in Department, College and/or University committees is required to achieve the rank of Associate Professor unless hiring at this level. Consistent and appropriate service to the Profession and participation in professional societies is also required.
2. Tenure: An applicant for tenure is expected to meet the same criteria for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. In addition, the faculty member should demonstrate long-term potential value to the Department, College, and

University based on scholarly service activity that aligns with the institutional mission.

3. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor: In addition to those requirements for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, the faculty member must demonstrate a continued progression in breadth and depth of scholarly service and outreach activities. The expectation for promotion to Full Professor is that the faculty member demonstrates involvement in significantly higher levels of service activities than required for promotion to Associate Professor. Leadership in professional activities and/or public service in one's area(s) of expertise is required for promotion to Full Professor.
4. Full Professor: Full Professors are expected to maintain their work in scholarship of service through thoughtful and active participation in Department, College, and University governance as well as broader service to the Profession and community.

Supporting Evidence

The following activities are primary examples of supporting evidence that can be used to demonstrate scholarship of service:

- Institutional service at the level of Department, College and/or University such as faculty governance, formulation of policies, and administrative responsibilities.
- Service to technical, professional, and scholarly societies such as participating in committee activities, organizing and/or chairing conferences, reviewing manuscripts and proposals, and serving as an editor or on the editorial board of journals.
- Service to local/state/national agencies or the general public in the context of the faculty member's discipline.
- Service to the public could include discipline-related outreach to local government, businesses, schools, or other community groups.
- Leadership roles in any of the above service categories.
- Involvement in educational and/or research and/or professional outreach.
- Contributions to fostering a campus climate that supports and respects faculty, staff, and students who have diverse cultures, backgrounds, and points of view.

The following activities are secondary examples of supporting evidence that can be used to demonstrate scholarship of service:

- Non-remunerative consulting in one's area(s) of expertise
- Service to public and private organizations in areas outside the faculty member's specific discipline (e.g. fraternal organizations, community-based organizations) but done in the capacity as an NDSU faculty member.
- Faculty mentoring

The following are examples of supporting evidence that may be used to demonstrate leadership in service activities:

- Taking leadership roles on committees at any level
- Developing or directing collaborative outreach programs

- Developing and/or running university-wide governance initiatives

Section 7. Procedures

a. Tenure and Promotion

The College will follow the detailed PTE Procedures as outlined and defined in NDSU Policy 352 Section 6. For probationary faculty, the basis for review of the candidate's portfolio and any recommendations on promotion and/or tenure shall be the promotion and tenure guidelines and criteria of the department which were provided to the candidate at the time of the candidate's appointment to the position. The Department Chair/Head has the responsibility to provide to the appointee these documents along with a position description, contract, or other document that constitutes a tenure or work plan. Tenured candidates for promotion to professor shall be evaluated by the criteria in effect at the time of application.

b. Evaluation

The Chair/Head will meet with each faculty member annually to conduct annual reviews. The purpose will be to review the job description for each faculty member, review accomplishments since the last review, review cumulative progression toward promotion, and to collaboratively define expectations for accomplishments for the next review cycle. The Department PTE Committee participates in the third-year process by providing the Department Chair/Head a brief written evaluation of probationary faculty progress. The faculty member's expectations should be aligned with the Department's goals and needs, the interests and expertise of the faculty member, and the general evaluation criteria listed above.

1. Probationary Faculty

According to University policy and specific Department guidelines, the probationary faculty member will prepare summaries of teaching, research, and service progress and accomplishments for each year. The summary and an updated, cumulative curriculum vita will be provided to the Department Chair/Head to be used for annual review and for setting goals for the upcoming year. The Department Chair/Head and the individual probationary faculty member will establish objectives and review the job description on an annual basis. The summary and an updated, cumulative curriculum vita will be also provided to the Department PTE committee.

The Chair/Head and the Department PTE Committee will each provide a performance report to the probationary faculty member as feedback for tenure and promotion purposes. These reports should include an assessment of the faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion. Assessments should be rated as acceptable, improvement plan required (marginally meeting expectations), or unacceptable (non-renewal). In making a judgment on minimum progress toward tenure, due consideration shall be given to the candidate's academic record, performance of assigned responsibilities, and potential to meet the criteria for promotion and tenure at the end of the probationary period.

If either the Chair/Head or the Department PTE committee recommends an improvement plan, the faculty member will meet with both the Chair/Head and PTE committee to

discuss the review and the required areas of improvement. The faculty member will write an improvement plan based on this feedback and the plan should be reviewed and signed by all parties. The signed plan and a summary of progress made towards the plan must be included in the following year's annual review.

If either the Chair/Head or the Department PTE Committee make a recommendation for non-renewal, their reports (recommendations) shall be submitted to the COE for review by the Dean and the College PTE committee. The four recommendations shall then be submitted to the Provost. The non-renewal process shall be carried out according to NDSU Policy Section 350.3.

For third year reviews, the probationary faculty member will complete the evaluation documents defined by the current NDSU Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Preparation including all annual evaluations by the Chair/Head and Department PTE committee. Completed portfolios will be submitted for review by the Department Chair/Head, Department PTE Committee, the COE Dean, and the COE PTE committee.

At the beginning of the last year of the probationary period, both the Department PTE Committee and the Department Chair/Head will evaluate the applicant's record and submit individual recommendations for tenure/promotion to the College PTE Committee and the COE Dean by November 1.

Comment [A1]: The date may be set varying each year by University

2. Tenured Faculty

Consistent with the Scholarship development model of the COE PTE process, tenured faculty members will periodically present a portfolio for review to encourage continued growth in teaching, research, and service. Portfolios will be reviewed by Department and College PTE Committees and will be used to provide constructive feedback. Associate Professors will submit a portfolio for review every four years after achieving rank and Professors will submit a portfolio every six years after achieving rank. The portfolio should consist of an updated CV, and narratives describing scholarly development in the areas of teaching, research, and service as outlined in Section 6, above, and the annual performance reports provided by the Department Chair/Head. Faculty are encouraged to use appendices to include other documentation that will help the committees understand the faculty member's progression of scholarship and provide appropriate feedback. Such documentation may include external reviews of research, manuscript or grant proposal review comments, peer reviews of teaching, or documentation of professional service activity and accomplishments. Feedback will be returned to the faculty member and the Department Chair/Head as a reference for continued annual evaluations.

c. Recommendations

When a faculty member from a Department in the COE is evaluated for promotion and/or tenure, the evaluations by both the Department PTE Committee and the Chair/Head shall be forwarded to the Dean and the College PTE Committee.

The Dean of the College of Engineering and the College PTE Committee will independently prepare recommendations in compliance with the University Policy (Section 352). The Dean and the College PTE Committee will send their final recommendations along with the individual's application to the Provost by January 5 for final disposition.

Comment [A2]: The date may be set varying each year by University

Early Promotion and Tenure

For a faculty member without prior relevant experience, eligibility for tenure requires a probationary period of six years. In this case, evaluations for promotion to Associate Professor and granting of tenure are conducted concurrently. Within this probationary period, faculty members who have demonstrated exceptional academic accomplishments may apply for early promotion (without tenure) prior to the completion of the six years of the probationary period. Petitions for early promotion shall be initiated by Department Heads/Chairs, and not by faculty members themselves.

A faculty member with relevant professional /academic experience at the time of initial NDSU appointment may be awarded credit toward tenure. Awarded credit must be stated in the original hiring contract. There are two options:

1. Faculty may be given one to three years of tenure credit (maximum allowed) and then would apply for promotion and tenure prior to the sixth year of academic service. For example: given one year of credit, the promotion and tenure application would be due in the fifth year of service; given three years of credit, the promotion and tenure application would be due in the third year of service.
2. A new faculty appointee who is eligible for award of probationary credit may elect a full six-year probationary credit with the option of applying for promotion and/or tenure at any time following three years of academic service.

In either option, failure to achieve tenure will lead to a terminal year contract.

d. Extension of Probationary Period

According to NDSU Policy 352 Section 3.6, a faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period not to exceed three years based on institutional, family, or personal circumstances. The request may be made any time during the probationary period prior to the sixth year (or prior to the year in which the portfolio is due). Written notification to the Provost must be submitted within one year of the beginning of the event for which the extension is requested and approved prior to July 1 of the year in which the tenure/promotion portfolio is due. A faculty member who submits an extension request during the academic year in which they are to undergo third year review must successfully undergo third-year review and renewal before any extension can take effect. The request must be in writing and will be submitted to the Provost who will review the request and will approve or deny the request. Denial of an extension may be appealed under University Policy 350.4.

Section 8. Changes

In those instances, where the COE Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Procedures and Criteria must be modified, the COE PTE Committee will make the proposed changes and forward those changes to COE faculty council. The proposed changes are to be shared with faculty at least ten (10) business days prior to voting at a College Faculty Meeting. The modified document, as approved by the College Faculty, will be forwarded first to the COE Dean, and then to the Provost, for their approvals. Upon approval, faculty will be informed of approved changes to the policy.

_____ _____

Chair, College PTE Committee Date

_____ _____

Dean, College of Engineering Date

_____ _____

Provost Date