A meeting of the Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation Working Group was held on February 26, 2016. Steve Light and Ryan Zerr presided. Members present included Emily Cherry, Diane Darland, Will Gosnold, Gwen Halaas, Darlene Hanson, Sima Noghanian, Mike Poellot, Debbie Storrs, Kathryn Rand, Chih Ming Tan, Sean Valentine, and Anne Walker.

1. **Welcome & Approval of Minutes**
   a. The February 8, 2016 meeting minutes were approved.

2. **Updates [standing item: informational]**
   a. Status of three initiatives: Annual PTE process; Essential Elements; Working Group
      i. Steve provided an update on the three PTE initiatives at the Provost’s Priorities Update on February 24.
   b. Communications

3. **Draft Faculty Handbook progress update [discussion]**
   a. Ryan and Steve emailed the Working Group the subgroup assignments for drafting the *Faculty Handbook*. The subgroups are listed below.

4. **Collegiality and professionalism [discussion]**
   a. The Working Group discussed the importance of including language about collegiality and professionalism in the draft *Faculty Handbook*.
   b. The Working Group considered the following questions:
      i. Are collegiality and professionalism a general expectation, or a required and measurable criteria?
      ii. Would this be a standalone topic within the *Faculty Handbook* or would it be woven into teaching, research, and service?
      iii. Where is the connection between UND policy and campus culture?
   c. Ryan and Steve will draft professionalism/collegiality language for discussion by the Working Group and incorporation in the draft *Faculty Handbook*.

5. **Next meeting [discussion of whether to meet as subgroups or committee of whole]**
   a. Monday, March 7 at 10:00 AM in Twamley Hall, Room 305
      i. Subgroups may meet during the March 7 meeting time at 10:00 AM.
         Twamley 305 will be open. The Working Group will not meet during this time. The next meeting is on Friday, April 1, at 9:00 in Twamley 305.
Threshold or Framing Questions to Consider

- Identified as general expectation vs. required & measurable criterion for P&T
  - How would each be operationalized in the probationary and PTE process?
- Stand-alone criterion vs. incorporated into teaching, research, and service
  - How would each be operationalized in the probationary and PTE process?

Some UND Resources to Consider

From the **UND Code of Conduct**
“The University of North Dakota (University/UND) is committed to ethical and professional conduct. The University’s leadership expects that each individual performing any activities on behalf of UND will adhere to those standards in the performance of her/his duties.”

From the **UND School of Law Policy for Faculty Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation**
“[T]eaching, research, and service, broadly defined, are the three basic expectations of each faculty member. In fulfilling these expectations, faculty should aspire to meet the highest standards of professionalism and respect as well as to create an environment within the law school that facilitates the law school’s educational mission and each colleague’s professional development.” This provision is later described as setting out “the faculty member’s derivative responsibilities to promote the law school’s educational mission, the highest standards of professionalism and respect, and an institutional environment conducive to professional growth.”

Example from College of A&S
“The college asked A&S departments to consider adding collegiality to their TRP documents. The exact suggestion appears below. Some incorporated it, perhaps with some modification, and some did not.

1. Consider adding something on professionalism in your departmental PTE document. Example: “The Department of X values the many facets of professional behavior that each faculty member must demonstrate to effectively conduct his/her teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service and administrative responsibilities, including active participation in departmental functions. Effective and conscientious communication is perhaps the most important facet of professional behavior because it significantly impacts on the cohesive operation of the department. It is important in teaching, research, service and administration, and it will be evaluated in the context of all of these categories. Effective communication is difficult to document in a curriculum vitae or reflective statement because it must be demonstrated continuously and often in an ad hoc manner to students, fellow faculty members, staff, and other university personnel. Accordingly, professional behaviors will be assessed by the departmental evaluation committee and chair based on their collective knowledge and experience with the
faculty member being evaluated. If a problem becomes apparent and consistent, the departmental evaluation committee will solicit and document additional input from the relevant constituencies (staff, students, administrators, or other faculty).”

Subgroups for Faculty Handbook

- Outline Item II: Academic appointments, roles, and responsibilities. **This section will be completed by Chih Ming, Darlene, Debbie, Will, and Mike.**
- Outline Item III: Hiring & onboarding. **This section will be completed by Kathryn, Gwen, and Will.**
- Outline Item IV: Annual review. **This section will be completed by Diane, Emily, Anne, Sima, and Birgit.**
- Outline Item V: Promotion and Tenure Policies AND Outline Item VII: Promotion and Tenure Procedures. **These sections will be completed by Sean, Margi, Kathryn, Diane, Emily, Anne, and Sima.**
- Outline Item VI: Expectations in rank. **This section will be completed by Chih Ming, Darlene, Debbie, Will, and Mike.**