

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES RELATED TO PROMOTION, TENURE, AND EVALUATION OF FACULTY

DEPARTMENT OF PLANT SCIENCES North Dakota State University Revised, September 2011

1. Introduction

The evaluation of faculty in the Department of Plant Sciences leading to promotion in rank and/or tenure as a faculty person is a fundamental responsibility of the faculty in the department. Because of the importance of these issues to faculty well-being, academic growth, and departmental integrity, it is imperative that the criteria, format, timelines, administrative functions and responsibilities, and procedures are clearly understood by all persons involved in this exercise. This document is intended to be the link between SBHE policies 350.3, 605.1 to 605.5, University Policy 352 "Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation" in the NDSU Faculty Handbook and the College of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Natural Resources (COA, FS, and NR) Policy and Procedures for Promotion, Tenure, Evaluations, Dismissals, Terminations, and Nonrenewals (hereafter, college policy).

2. Mission:

The mission of the Department of Plant Sciences is to teach the sciences of plant breeding and genetics, weed science, biotechnology, horticulture, sports and urban turfgrass management and cereal science, crop production and management; to perform basic and applied research in these areas to advance the field of crop, weed, and horticultural sciences; and to provide information to the public in the form of professional publications, extension bulletins, and programs.

General Objectives as Related to the Mission of the Department:

2.1 Teaching

- 2.1.1 Educate undergraduate students so they can: a) identify common and unique problems related to the science of plant production and propose remedial action, b) demonstrate critical thinking and effective communication skills, and c) evaluate the relationship between scientific principles and public policy.
- 2.1.2 Educate graduate students so they can: a) plan and conduct experiments, collect and analyze data, and summarize and interpret research results; b) develop an advanced level of critical thinking and communication skills; and c) independently identify research areas that advance the field of plant sciences, utilize or develop appropriate research methodology, and summarize and report results of their research.

2.2 Research

- 2.2.1 Develop, using traditional breeding and new methodologies, superior cultivars of agronomic and horticultural crops important or potentially important to the economy, quality of life, and the environment of North Dakota. Conduct basic research at both the whole plant and molecular level to expand knowledge of the structure and function of genetic resources, gene manipulation, and gene transfer among species. Develop and evaluate new techniques for application in applied and basic research programs.
- 2.2.2 Develop cost-effective strategies for annual and perennial weed control in crops, pastures and rangeland, lawns, and gardens with emphasis on biological controls and

other methods to minimize herbicide use. Study the basic biology of North Dakota's most troublesome weeds to help develop specific control strategies.

2.2.3 Develop and evaluate production practices for North Dakota crops, including traditional, minor, new, and alternative crops.

2.2.4 Develop and evaluate management practices for sports and urban turfgrass species for North Dakota

2.3 Extension

2.3.1 Provide producers of agricultural products and agribusiness with research-based information to achieve greater profitability, improved competitiveness, and increased sustainable crop production. Cooperate with the North Dakota Crop Improvement Association and county crop improvement organizations on information and education concerning newly released and adapted cultivars on a statewide basis. To work closely with commodity groups and other associations involved with plant science industries.

2.3.2 Provide producers of agricultural products, government agencies, and agribusiness with research-based information on cost effective control and management of weeds. Train and certify commercial and private pesticide applicators in North Dakota.

2.3.3 Provide horticultural information and research-based educational programs for the public, including home and commercial vegetable/fruit production, growing and management of herbaceous and woody landscape plants, nursery stock, tree care, and sports and urban turfgrass management. Provide information on the management and benefits of windbreaks, urban forests, and native woodlands to landowners, government agencies, and youth.

2.4 Service

Service is defined as work done or duties performed for others at all levels within the university and college. Also included are professional services to government, agribusiness, and professional associations at local, state, national, and international levels. Personal service donated to civic, church, charities, and other community organizations does not fall in the definition of service.

3. Procedures for Periodic Reviews of Faculty (NDSU Policy Manual 352.4)

In the implementation of Policy 352, Sections 1 and 2 are accepted as presented and are included as integral components of the departmental policy and guideline statement. Policy 352 Section 3 and the College Policy Section 10.1 direct the faculty of each administrative unit to develop a "statement of criteria for promotion and tenure."

3.1 Departmental PTE Committees

The guidelines and implementation will be managed by a five-member committee of tenured faculty, elected by all faculty in the department for a three-year term. Faculty members being considered for promotion and currently serving on the departmental Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation (PTE) Committee will absent themselves from the committee while their portfolio is being discussed, and their places will be taken by ad hoc members, to be selected by the faculty. A rotation of membership will lead to annual election of members. The committee will elect a chair that will be responsible for the management of the promotion and tenure process in the department, which includes:

- 3.1.1 Liaison with College PTE Committee and Policy 352 regarding notice and development of portfolios.
- 3.1.2 Maintain and provide for faculty ballots regarding promotion and tenure recommendations.
- 3.1.3 Monitor the mentoring process for new faculty. Mentors are chosen after the first six months of employment. At the request of the Head, the probationary faculty member provides two names of senior faculty as possible mentors. The Head makes the final decision and selects the mentor.
- 3.1.4 Prepare and send forward to the Dean of the College, College Committee, and Head evaluation(s) for promotion and/or tenure of departmental faculty.
- 3.1.5 Prepare and send forward to the Dean, College Committee, and Head the evaluation of the third-year portfolio.

3.2 Departmental PTE Policy (tenure-track faculty)

- 3.2.1 Completed portfolios for promotion and tenure are to be prepared by the candidates for Departmental PTE Committee evaluation and to be in the hands of the departmental committee by October 1st each year. Completed portfolios for the third-year review are to be completed by the candidates and be in the hands of the departmental committee by January 1 each year (see Table 1 below for complete timelines).
- 3.2.2 Departmental PTE Committee recommendations for tenure and promotion will be based upon a vote of the departmental faculty. The ballots cast for tenure must be from faculty with tenure and ballots for promotion must come from tenured faculty of rank higher than that of the candidate. A positive recommendation requires at least 75% approval of eligible voters. The Committee will prepare a letter of recommendation on behalf of the departmental faculty.
- 3.2.3 The committee will evaluate the third-year portfolios as prepared by the candidates. Early tenure and promotion would require 75% approval of eligible voters. Candidates for early tenure and promotion would need to meet ALL criteria for normal timelines for tenure and promotion (i.e., the same level of performance in a shorter time frame).

3.2.4 Each promotion and tenure recommendation will be based upon a job description that accurately describes what the individual is expected to do on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based according to the percentage of appointment in research, teaching, and extension. It is understood that ALL appointments have an obligation for service that contributes to the departmental and university mission.

3.2.5 For promotion to higher rank, the candidate must perform well in each area of appointment and in a substantial manner for Associate Professor, and distinguished for Professor. Substantial is characterized by documented personal efforts in the areas of appointment and indications of peer acceptance and approval by the department, university, and state clientele. Distinguished is characterized by not only documented personal efforts in the areas of appointment, but also indications of peer acceptance and approval across disciplines, the university, state, and regional boundaries. In other words, the rank of Professor represents a person distinguished by their professional growth in research, teaching, and service to a larger group of peers and clientele on a national and/or international scale. Each promotion and tenure recommendation will be based upon the individual's contribution to the mission of the department and university and will be determined by the following criteria:

Research Criteria:

3.2.5.1 The faculty member will demonstrate a continuing level of excellence to national and regional peers for basic and applied research that is original, novel, and unique to the discipline of interest.

3.2.5.2 To evaluate the research performance of the faculty member, the following documentation based upon the individual job descriptions would be appropriate:

3.2.5.2a Refereed/peer reviewed publications and abstracts, textbooks, case studies, and other forms of demonstration research.

3.2.5.2b Oral presentation of research, both voluntary and invited.

3.2.5.2c External funding success, e.g., submissions and awards.

3.2.5.2d Acceptance of products of research or innovative technology; a few examples include varieties, cultivars, plant germplasm, weed control, and crop production practices that enhance the quality of life and promote state economic development.

3.2.5.2e Participation on national, regional, and local research committees.

3.2.5.2f Application for a granting of Plant Variety Protection (PVP), use, or technology patents/trademarks.

3.2.5.2g National, regional, and state peers are to provide documentation of recognition regarding individual's contributions, e.g., letters and statements.

Teaching Criteria:

3.2.5.3 The faculty member will demonstrate continuing evaluation of course material, documents, and presentation methodology for classroom and/or non-classroom teaching.

- 3.2.5.4 Student, peer, and clientele evaluations of course material, documents, and presentation methodology will exhibit consistent or improving levels of excellence.
- 3.2.5.5 Demonstrated effective undergraduate and/or graduate student advising and mentoring.
- 3.2.5.6 To evaluate the teaching, advising, and mentoring performance of the faculty member, the following types of documentation would be appropriate:
 - 3.2.5.6a Course evaluations by students and enrolled persons.
 - 3.2.5.6b Peer review of educational course material, documents, and presentation styles.
 - 3.2.5.6c Client evaluation of extension workshops and other presentations.
 - 3.2.5.6d Participation in faculty development efforts.
 - 3.2.5.6e Innovative methodologies.
 - 3.2.5.6f Publications or public presentations concerning teaching and extension.
 - 3.2.5.6g Teaching and/or extension portfolios.
 - 3.2.5.6h Mentoring evaluations (student-faculty: special topics, clubs; faculty-faculty: team and/or interdisciplinary teaching).
 - 3.2.5.6i Evaluations by undergraduate students regarding the quality of advising.
 - 3.2.5.6j Exit interviews with graduate students regarding the quality of education and training received.

Service Criteria:

- 3.2.5.7 Service will be evidenced by committee membership and/or participation in the activities of professional societies, commodity groups, NDSU, the College, the Department of Plant Sciences, the State of North Dakota, USDA, and at the national level.
- 3.2.5.8 To evaluate the service performance of the faculty member, the following types of documentation would be appropriate:
 - 3.2.5.8a Awards for recognition and service on campus, community, and region.
 - 3.2.5.8b University service, including NDSU and all of higher education (NDUS).
 - 3.2.5.8c Service to profession/professional associates.
 - 3.2.5.8d Service to the public, e.g. field days, and special presentations.
 - 3.2.5.8e Client service.

3.3 Additional Evaluation Procedures:

- 3.3.1 Policy 352 and the college policy provides for the periodic review of all individuals employed by the university. The Department of Plant Sciences reaffirms that Section 4.0 of Policy 352 will be the departmental policy for review and evaluation of persons as described below:

- 3.3.1.1 Periodic reviews of faculty serve multiple functions. The reviews assist faculty members in assessing their professional performance, assist the administration with delineating areas to which particular effort should be directed to aid in improving the professional achievement of the faculty members, and contribute to the cumulative base upon which decisions about renewal, promotion, and tenure are made. In addition, periodic reviews may result in changes in responsibilities, modified expectations, and/or altered goals for performance.
- 3.3.1.2 The procedures for periodic reviews that are developed by each academic unit shall be reviewed and approved by the College PTE Committee, the Dean, and the Provost /Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA).
- 3.3.1.3 Every faculty member will be reviewed every year by the Head. Formal mid-probationary reviews are to be completed by the PTE Committee and forwarded to the Dean. When requested by any party to the tenure process, formal feedback shall be provided to the individual by the Head, Dean, college committee, and the Provost /Vice President of Academic Affairs.
- 3.3.1.4 Unless college or department procedures provide otherwise, the Head or head of the academic unit will be responsible for conducting the review and the communication of its results. Periodic reviews shall result in a written report to the faculty member being reviewed. The report shall state expectations and goals for the coming review period. For probationary faculty, the report shall include an assessment of the faculty member's progress toward tenure and recommendations for improvement. Should the periodic reviews indicate that a faculty member is not making satisfactory progress toward tenure, the report may include a recommendation for nonrenewal. In making a judgment on satisfactory 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.
- 3.3.1.5 The faculty member being reviewed shall have 10 days to respond in writing to the written report if the faculty member wishes to do so. The written report, and any written response from the faculty member, shall become part of the faculty member's official personnel file.

4. Criteria and procedure for promotion in rank for Research Professorships

- 4.1 Typically, promotion cannot be achieved until the candidate has a minimum of five years in rank. The candidate should prepare a dossier similar to that of a tenure-track candidate, and include the following:
 - a. Original letter of hire with a job description that lists position responsibilities
 - b. Three letters of recommendation, one from the immediate supervisor and two within the university system
 - c. Documents that exhibit the productive efforts of the candidate in the areas of research and service (if applicable)

4.2 Departmental PTE Policy (Research Professorship faculty)

- 4.2.1 Completed portfolios for promotion are to be prepared by the candidates for Departmental PTE Committee evaluation and to be in the hands of the departmental committee by October 1st each year. Completed portfolios for the third-year review are to be completed by the candidates and be in the hands of the departmental committee by January 1 each year (see Table 1 below for complete timelines).
- 4.2.2 Departmental PTE Committee recommendations for promotion will be based upon a vote of the departmental faculty. The ballots for promotion must come from tenured faculty of rank higher than that of the candidate. A positive recommendation requires at least 75% approval of eligible voters. The Committee will prepare a letter of recommendation on behalf of the departmental faculty.
- 4.2.3 The committee will evaluate the third-year portfolios as prepared by the candidates. Early promotion would require 75% approval of eligible voters. Candidates for early promotion would need to meet ALL criteria for normal timelines for promotion (i.e., the same level of performance in a shorter time frame).
- 4.2.4 Each promotion recommendation will be based upon a job description that accurately describes what the individual is expected to do on an annual basis.
- 4.2.5 For promotion to higher rank, the candidate must perform well in research and in a substantial manner for Research Associate Professor, and distinguished for Research Professor. Substantial is characterized by documented personal efforts in the areas of appointment and indications of peer acceptance and approval by the department, university, and state clientele. Distinguished is characterized by not only documented personal efforts in the areas of appointment, but also indications of peer acceptance and approval across disciplines, the university, state, and regional boundaries. In other words, the rank of Research Professor represents a person distinguished by their professional growth in research and service to a larger group of peers and clientele on a national and/or international scale. Each promotion recommendation will be based upon the individual's contribution to the mission of the department and university and will be determined by the following criteria:

Research Criteria:

- 4.2.5.1 The research professor will develop an independent research program of regional, national, or international significance that is original, novel, and unique to the discipline of interest.
- 4.2.5.2 To evaluate the research performance of the faculty member, the following types of documentation based upon the individual job descriptions would be appropriate:
 - 4.2.5.2a Refereed/peer reviewed publications and abstracts, textbooks, case studies, and other forms of demonstration research.
 - 4.2.5.2b Oral presentation of research, both voluntary and invited.
 - 4.2.5.2c External funding success, e.g., submissions and awards.

- 4.2.5.2d Acceptance of products of research or innovative technology; a few examples include varieties, cultivars, plant germplasm, weed control, and crop production practices that enhance the quality of life and promote state economic development.
- 4.2.5.2e Participation on national, regional, and local research committees.
- 4.2.5.2f Application for a granting of Plant Variety Protection (PVP), use, or technology patents/trademarks.
- 4.2.5.2g National, regional, and state peers are to provide documentation of recognition regarding individual's contributions, e.g., letters and statements.

Service Criteria:

- 4.2.5.3 Service will be evidenced by committee membership and/or participation in the activities of professional societies at the local and national level.
- 4.2.5.4 To evaluate the service performance of the faculty member, the following types of documentation would be appropriate:
 - 4.2.5.4a Awards for recognition and service.
 - 4.2.5.4c Service to profession/professional associates.
 - 4.2.5.4e Client service.

4.3 Additional Evaluation Procedures:

- 4.3.1 Policy 352 and the college policy provide for the periodic review of all individuals employed by the university. The Department of Plant Sciences reaffirms that Section 4.0 of Policy 352 will be the departmental policy for review and evaluation of persons as described below with additions for departmental requirements:
 - 4.3.1.1 Periodic reviews of faculty serve multiple functions. The reviews assist faculty members in assessing their professional performance, assist the administration with delineating areas to which particular effort should be directed to aid in improving the professional achievement of the faculty members, and contribute to the cumulative base upon which decisions about renewal and promotion are made. In addition, periodic reviews may result in changes in responsibilities, modified expectations, and/or altered goals for performance.
 - 4.3.1.2 The procedures for periodic reviews that are developed by each academic unit shall be reviewed and approved by the College PTE Committee, the Dean, and the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA).
 - 4.3.1.3 Every faculty member will be reviewed every year by the Head. Formal three-year reviews are to be completed by the PTE Committee and forwarded to the Dean. When requested by any party to the promotion process, formal feedback shall be provided to the individual by the Head, Dean, college committee, and the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs.
 - 4.3.1.4 Unless college or department procedures provide otherwise, the Head or head of the academic unit will be responsible for conducting the review and the communication of its results. Periodic reviews shall result in a written

report to the faculty member being reviewed. The report shall state expectations and goals for the coming review period. Additionally, the report shall include an assessment of the faculty member's progress toward promotion and recommendations for improvement.

- 4.3.1.5 The faculty member being reviewed shall have 10 working days to respond in writing to the written report if the faculty member wishes to do so. The written report, and any written response from the faculty member, shall become part of the faculty member's official personnel file.

5. Criteria and procedure for promotion in rank for Professor of Practice

- 5.1 Typically, promotion cannot be achieved until the candidate has a minimum of five years in rank. The candidate should prepare a dossier similar to that of a tenure-track candidate, and include the following:
- a. Original letter of hire with a job description that lists course responsibilities
 - b. Three letters of recommendation from within the university system.
 - c. Documents that exhibit productive efforts of the candidate in the areas of teaching and service (if applicable).

5.2 Departmental PTE Policy (Professor of Practice faculty)

- 5.2.1 Completed portfolios for promotion are to be prepared by the candidates for Departmental PTE Committee evaluation and to be in the hands of the departmental committee by October 1st each year. Completed portfolios for the third-year review are to be completed by the candidates and be in the hands of the departmental committee by January 1 each year (see Table 1 below for complete timelines).
- 5.2.2 Departmental PTE Committee recommendations for promotion will be based upon a vote of the departmental faculty. The ballots cast for promotion must come from tenured faculty of rank higher than that of the candidate. A positive recommendation requires at least 75% approval of eligible voters. The Committee will prepare a letter of recommendation on behalf of the departmental faculty.
- 5.2.3 The committee will evaluate the third-year portfolios as prepared by the candidates. Early promotion would require 75% approval of eligible voters. Candidates for early promotion would need to meet ALL criteria for normal timelines for promotion (i.e., the same level of performance in a shorter time frame).
- 5.2.4 Each promotion recommendation will be based upon a job description that accurately describes what the individual is expected to do on an annual basis. The evaluation will be based according to the percentage of appointment in teaching. It is understood that ALL appointments have an obligation for service that contributes to the departmental and university mission.
- 5.2.5 For promotion to higher rank, the candidate must perform well in each area of appointment and in a substantial manner for Associate Professor of Practice, and distinguished for Professor of Practice. Substantial is characterized by documented personal efforts in the areas of appointment and indications of peer acceptance and approval by the department, university, and state clientele. Distinguished is characterized by not only documented personal efforts in the areas of appointment,

but also indications of peer acceptance and approval across disciplines, the university, state, and regional boundaries. In other words, the rank of Professor of Practice represents a person distinguished by their professional growth in teaching and service to a larger group of peers and clientele on a national and/or international scale. Each promotion recommendation will be based upon the individual's contribution to the mission of the department and university and will be determined by the following criteria:

Teaching Criteria:

- 5.2.5.1 The professor of practice will develop an independent teaching curriculum for the course(s) they are assigned and/or collaborate with other instructors for courses they teach or team teach.
- 5.2.5.2 The professor of practice will demonstrate continuing evaluation of course material, documents, and presentation for classroom and/or non-classroom teaching.
- 5.2.5.3 Student, peer, and clientele evaluations of course material, documents, and presentation methodology will exhibit consistent or improving levels of excellence.
- 5.2.5.4 To evaluate the teaching performance of the professor of practice, the following types of documentation would be appropriate:
 - 5.2.5.4a Course evaluations by students and enrolled persons.
 - 5.2.5.4b Peer review of educational course material, documents, and presentation styles.
 - 5.2.5.4c Participation in faculty development efforts.
 - 5.2.5.4d Innovative methodologies.
 - 5.2.5.4e Publications or public presentations concerning teaching and extension.
 - 5.2.5.4f Teaching portfolios.

Service Criteria (if appropriate):

- 5.2.5.5 Service will be evidenced by committee membership and/or participation in the activities of professional societies, NDSU, the College, the Department of Plant Sciences, the State of North Dakota, and USDA, at the national and international level.
- 5.2.5.6 To evaluate the service performance of the professor of practice, the following types of documentation would be appropriate:
 - 5.2.5.6a Awards for recognition and service on campus, community, and region.
 - 5.2.5.6b Department of Plant Sciences service, including NDSU, all of North Dakota higher education, and North Dakota University Systems (NDUS).
 - 5.2.5.6c Service to professional societies.
 - 5.2.5.6d Service to the public.
 - 5.2.5.6e Service to student groups

5.3 Additional Evaluation Procedures:

- 5.3.1 Policy 352 and the college policy provides for the periodic review of all individuals employed by the university. The Department of Plant Sciences reaffirms that Section 4.0 of Policy 352 will be the departmental policy for review and evaluation of persons as described below with additions for departmental requirements:
- 5.3.1.1 Periodic reviews of faculty serve multiple functions. The reviews assist faculty members in assessing their professional performance, assist the administration with delineating areas to which particular effort should be directed to aid in improving the professional achievement of the faculty members, and contribute to the cumulative base upon which decisions about renewal, promotion, and tenure are made. In addition, periodic reviews may result in changes in responsibilities, modified expectations, and/or altered goals for performance.
 - 5.3.1.2 The procedures for periodic reviews that are developed by each academic unit shall be reviewed and approved by the College PTE Committee, the Dean, and the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA).
 - 5.3.1.3 Every faculty member will be reviewed every year by the Head. Formal mid-probationary reviews for tenure-track faculty and three-year reviews for research professors and professors of practice are to be completed by the PTE Committee and forwarded to the Dean. When requested by any party to the promotion process, formal feedback shall be provided to the individual by the Head, Dean, college committee, and the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs.
 - 5.3.1.4 Unless college or department procedures provide otherwise, the Head or head of the academic unit will be responsible for conducting the review and the communication of its results. Periodic reviews shall result in a written report to the faculty member being reviewed. The report shall state expectations and goals for the coming review period. The report shall include an assessment of the faculty member's progress toward promotion and recommendations for improvement. Should the periodic reviews indicate that a faculty member is not making satisfactory progress toward promotion; the report may include a recommendation for nonrenewal. In making a judgment on satisfactory progress toward promotion, due consideration shall be given to the candidate's academic record, performance of assigned responsibilities, and potential to meet the criteria for promotion at the end of the review period.
 - 5.3.1.5 The faculty member being reviewed shall have 10 working days to respond in writing to the written report if the faculty member wishes to do so. The written report, and any written response from the faculty member, shall become part of the faculty member's official personnel file.

6. Procedure of Evaluation and Forwarding of Dossier for all Faculty:

Once the dossier is ready for review, copies of the dossier will then be available to the Plant Sciences faculty for review and for secure vote. Copies will also be available to the department chair and the Plant Sciences PTE committee for review. The results of the voting will then be summarized by the Department of Plant Sciences PTE Committee, and together with the evaluations of the chair and department PTE committee, will be forwarded to the College PTE committee and dean for further action.

7. Recommendation for Nonrenewal of a Probationary Faculty member:

- 7.1 A recommendation for the nonrenewal of a faculty member can be initiated at any time by either the Head or the PTE Committee as decided by a departmental vote.
- 7.2 In all nonrenewal considerations both the Head and PTE Committee will forward to the Dean their review and recommendation.
- 7.3 All recommendations are then forwarded to the Provost/VPAA and then on to the president for final action.

8. Timeline for Reviews - as Modified From the College Policy.

Table 1. Timeline for annual reviews of tenure track probationary faculty, the third year review process, and the promotion and tenure application process (shaded or blank areas indicate no participation).

Tenure Year July 1-June 30	Date on Which Review must be Completed or Results Submitted to Following Locations				
	Due to Head by:	Completed by Dept. PTE Committee	Submitted to Dean	Submitted to CAFSNR PTE Committee	Submitted to Provost/VPAA*
1 (letter)			Feb. 10		
2 (letter)			Feb. 10		
3 (packet)**	Jan. 1	Jan. 31	Feb. 1	Feb. 8	May 1
4 (letter)			Feb. 10		
5 (letter)			Feb. 10		
6 (portfolio)	Oct. 1	Oct. 31	Nov. 1	Nov. 8	Jan. 15

* Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA)

**Follow Part I of the NDSU Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure to prepare the Third Year Review

9. Expected Outcome:

That this exercise of self-governance and evaluation as described in this policy for the Department of Plant Sciences in concert with the parent Policy 352 to be viewed as a positive development experience not only professionally, but also personally.