Indiana State University
Department of Chemistry and Physics
Bylaws and Governance Provisions
Approved February 23, 2023

Table of Contents

Article 1: Membership, Voting, and Bylaws

1.1 Membership

The *regular faculty* of the Department of Chemistry and Physics consists of those who hold tenured, tenure-track, or instructor appointments in Chemistry or Physics.

1.2 Voting and Voting Rights

Only the regular faculty of the Department have the right to vote. Voting is customarily indicated by a show of hands; however, a voting member may at any time direct the Chairperson to conduct a vote through a secret ballot. Ballots will be counted by the Recording Secretary and one other voting member (excluding the Chairperson). The Department Chairperson votes only in the event of a tie.

1.3 Amendment of Bylaws

Revisions to the Bylaws must be approved by a two-thirds majority of the regular faculty (excepting the Chairperson and any faculty member on an administrative appointment).

1.4 Partial Invalidity and Severability

Nothing in these Bylaws will be considered to be in conflict with University or College of Arts and Sciences policies. If any part of these Bylaws is deemed to be in conflict with published University, College or Faculty Senate policies, that part and only that part deemed to be contradictory will be considered null and void; all other parts and passages of these Bylaws will remain valid.

Article 2: Faculty Meetings

2.1 Quorum

A quorum at faculty meetings is defined as a majority of the regular Chemistry and Physics faculty. In computing this majority, those faculty members on leave, on full-time administrative appointment, and the Department Chairperson are excluded.

2.2 Program meetings

Matters concerning only one program (i.e., Chemistry or Physics) may be discussed by a subset of the faculty consisting of all the regular members of that program. An ad hoc recorder for meeting minutes will be appointed when necessary.

2.3 General Rules of Order

Faculty meetings will be conducted in conformity with *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised*. A copy of *Robert's Rules* will be kept in the Department office. Following consensus, local custom may prevail over some Robert's Rules provisions; however, a voting member can direct the Chairperson to observe a particular provision.

2.4 Approval

Subject to a quorum, a majority of the voting members in attendance is required to approve a motion. Votes will be tallied by the Recording Secretary along with one other regular member.

2.5 Frequency and Protocol

The Department Chairperson will convene at least three faculty meetings every semester. It is expected that one week's notice be given. At an early meeting departmental committees will be established for the academic year. At this time, committee chairs will be solicited. The Chairperson will distribute an agenda, the draft minutes of the previous meeting, and any supporting documentation to the regular faculty at least three days prior to a meeting. The Chairperson will endeavor to identify a regular meeting time during normal hours that does not interfere with assigned teaching schedules. All regular faculty members are expected to attend faculty meetings unless they are on sabbatical leave or are required to be elsewhere on official university business. It is considered normal practice for a faculty member to notify the Chairperson in advance if he or she cannot attend a meeting.

2.6 Minutes

The Recording Secretary is a regular member of the Chemistry or Physics faculty appointed by the Department Chairperson at the beginning of the Fall Semester, and serves for a period of one academic year. The Secretary records the minutes of faculty meetings and provides a draft minutes to the Chairperson, who reviews them for accuracy. The Secretary then distributes the draft minutes to regular faculty. Additions and corrections may be sent to the Secretary, who, if there are substantive revisions, provides a final draft at the next faculty meeting. After approval, the minutes are distributed to the faculty, and a copy is placed on file in the Department Office.

Article 3: Standing Committees and Other Service Assignments

The Department will have eight standing committees: (1) Curriculum Committee, (2) Personnel Committee, (3) Assessment Committee, (4) Chemical Instrumentation Committee, (5) Undergraduate Research Committee, (6) Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee, (7) Awards Committee, and (8) Safety Committee. At its first meeting of the calendar year, each committee will select a chairperson if one has not been agreed upon previously. All members of the regular faculty are eligible to serve on departmental committees.

3.1 Curriculum Committee

The Chemistry Curriculum Committee consists of at least four regular faculty members. One committee member will serve as chairperson. The Physics Curriculum Committee consists of all regular Physics faculty. The committees' responsibilities include (1) consideration and review of proposals for course/program changes including elimination,

(2) periodic review of the Catalog with respect to program content and description, and (3) consideration of other curricular matters brought before it by the faculty or the Department Chairperson.

The Department Chairperson will determine whether recommendations of the Curriculum Committee require a vote of the full (disciplinary) faculty, or will be sent forward directly from committee. It is expected that minor and noncontroversial changes in curriculum will not be an action item on the agenda at a full faculty meeting. The Curriculum Committee will maintain a record of decisions that affect curriculum at the catalog level and will forward this record to the Department Office.

3.2 Personnel Committee

The composition of the Personnel Committee depends on the rank of the faculty member under review and the nature of the evaluation. The following subsets of the faculty serve as the Committee:

A. All regular faculty evaluate non-tenure-track faculty.
B. All tenured faculty evaluate tenure-track faculty.
C. All senior instructors and tenured faculty evaluate candidates for promotion to Senior Instructor.
D. All tenured faculty evaluate candidates for promotion to Associate Professor.
E. All full professors evaluate candidates for promotion to Full Professor.

The Committee receives, processes, and evaluates all applications for promotion. The Committee also reviews reappointments for non-tenured faculty and evaluates the progress of pre-tenure faculty toward tenure. The Committee will communicate the results of its deliberations to the Chairperson in a timely fashion in consideration of deadlines.

3.3 Assessment Committee

The Chemistry program and the Physics program each have an Assessment Committee. In Chemistry, the Assessment Committee consists of at least two regular faculty members; the Physics Assessment Committee is a committee of the whole. The Committees conduct an annual review of learning outcomes of the program. This may necessitate collection of data or samples of student work, with which faculty are expected to cooperate. After analysis of the results, the committees also make recommendations for curriculum change that would result in improved learning outcomes. The results are reported to the whole faculty annually at a regular faculty meeting, as well as to the University Assessment Coordinator.

3.4 Chemistry Instrumentation Committee

The Chemistry Instrumentation Committee consists of at least two regular faculty members of the Chemistry faculty. The Committee identifies needs, prioritizes requests for major equipment purchases, and reports to the Chairperson. The Chairperson solicits requests

from faculty for expenditures from the annual equipment allocation and the Committee assists in prioritizing these requests.

3.5 Undergraduate Research Committee

The Undergraduate Research Committee consists of at least three regular faculty members, including at least one chemist and at least one physicist. The Committee will consider issues and make recommendations regarding undergraduate research in the Department.

3.6 Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee

The Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee consists of three members, including at least one tenured/tenure-track member of the Chemistry faculty and at least one tenured/tenure-track member of the Physics faculty. The three members of the Committee are elected by the members of the faculty who will undergo evaluation in Year 3. Each faculty member votes for three colleagues to serve on the Committee. The tenured/tenure-track member of the Chemistry faculty receiving the most votes, the tenured/tenure-track member of the Physics faculty receiving the most votes, and the member of the remaining faculty receiving the most votes will serve together on this Committee. The Committee forms at the start of Year 3 of the triennial Faculty Performance Evaluation (FPE) cycle. Once constituted, the Committee remains intact for three years, including during Years 1 and 2 of the following FPE cycle. The Committee will assess faculty performance in Year 3 and provide the Chairperson its opinions regarding FPE matters that arise during the following Years 1 and 2, in accord with the University prescribed FPE procedure.

3.7 Awards Committee

The Chemistry and Physics programs have separate Awards Committees. In Chemistry, the Awards Committee consists of academic advisors; the Physics Awards Committee is a committee of the whole. These committees meet annually to collect information about students eligible for scholarships and awards and determine allocations of available funding for these awards.

3.8 Safety Committee

The Safety Committee consists of at least three members. Its responsibilities include advising the Department on best practices and policies that will establish and sustain a safe working environment in the teaching and research laboratories. The Committee will periodically assess existing policies and laboratory working conditions to ensure that measures are taken to minimize hazards.

3.9 Ad hoc Committees

The Chairperson may request that faculty serve on ad hoc committees as the need arises.

3.10 Other Service Assignments

The Chairperson solicits and appoints, with approval from the Personnel Committee, faculty to serve in various capacities in the Department and the College. Faculty Search

Committees are appointed by the Chairperson, and follow procedures outlined in Article 5.

Article 4: Policy Statements

4.1 Nature of Laboratory Courses

Laboratory courses engage students in hands-on experiments involving direct manipulation of materials. Computer simulations in these courses are acceptable when (1) the objectives of a laboratory assignment are better achieved through simulation of data or processes than through hands-on experimentation, (2) simulations reflect contemporary practice in the discipline, (3) simulations augment hands-on experimentation, or (4) hands-on experimentation is precluded by factors such as excessive cost or unacceptable risk of injury.

4.2 Lecture/Lab Enrollment

A degree-seeking student who seeks to register for coupled lecture/laboratory courses is required to register in both courses in the same term unless the student successfully completed the lecture or laboratory in a prior term. A student who is currently enrolled in coupled lecture/laboratory courses is required to drop both courses if he or she drops the lecture. In certain circumstances, a student who is currently enrolled in coupled lecture/laboratory courses can drop the laboratory while retaining the lecture if approved by the Chairperson.

Article 5. Guidelines for Hiring New Faculty

5.1 Development Plans of the Department

The Department's teaching and curricular needs, along with the regular faculty's perceived objectives of ensuring both broad-based coverage in research and scholarship activity and, when appropriate, a focus on an area of extant strength, will be used to determine the specialty in which a search for a new regular faculty member will be conducted. The specialty will be approved by majority vote at a faculty meeting.

5.2 Educational Background

A candidate for a regular faculty position should have a Ph.D. in chemistry or physics or a terminal degree in a closely related discipline from an internationally recognized institution. An "all but dissertation" (ABD) candidate can be considered and provisionally offered a faculty position, but he/she must complete the terminal degree within twelve months of the initial appointment. A candidate for a temporary faculty position should have a master's degree in chemistry, physics, or a closely related discipline, or an undergraduate degree plus eighteen graduate-level credits in chemistry, physics, or closely

related disciplines. Faculty who do not have a terminal degree will generally be limited to teaching Foundational Studies lecture courses and 100-level laboratory courses.

5.3 Teaching Effectiveness

The candidate's commitment to undergraduate education is essential, and the requisite communication skills must be made evident. Thus, during the interview, the candidate will present a seminar through which these skills and overall technical knowledge will be assessed.

5.4 Collegiality

The candidate must evince a strong commitment to making contributions to the quality of academic life in the Department. This willingness and ability to participate in and contribute to such activities will be elicited during the interview process.

5.5 Research/Scholarship

The candidate for a tenured or tenure-track faculty position must exhibit a firm commitment to the undergraduate-focused research activities of the Department. The candidate should have a convincing record of research training and accomplishments, including publications in the peer-reviewed scientific literature. Postdoctoral experience is highly desirable. Junior-level candidates must show the potential to develop a productive research program with the goals of publishing research or scholarly articles in recognized journals, attracting extramural funding, and involving undergraduate students. Senior-level candidates must have a significant record of sustained accomplishments in educational and scholarly activities, as manifest by publications and extramural grants, and show considerable service experience on departmental and college-level committees.

5.6 Hiring Procedure

The following procedure will be used for all searches for regular faculty. The procedure by which temporary faculty are hired is at the discretion of the Department Chairperson, although faculty input is recommended. The procedure describes only processes internal to the Department, but all steps must be conducted in compliance with guidelines and procedures mandated by the Office of Human Resources.

A. Search Committee

The Department Chairperson will select the search committee chairperson, and together they will identify a potential search committee of regular faculty members, taking into consideration the teaching focus of the position under hire and, when appropriate, research expertise desired of candidates for the position. The committee should usually consist of 3-4 members in addition to the chairperson, and the slate should be reasonably diverse in terms of faculty rank, gender, and ethnicity. The slate will be discussed and the final composition of the search committee approved by majority vote at a faculty meeting. The search will be

conducted by the search committee, in consultation with the Department Chairperson.

B. Advertising the Position

The advertisement for the open faculty position will be developed by the search committee, in consultation with the Department Chairperson, and will specify the nature of the position along with required and desired qualifications.

C. Selection of Candidates to Interview

The search committee will review the pool of applicants and select candidates for phone and, ultimately, on-campus interviews. The Department Chairperson may review materials for all applicants and provide input to the search committee concerning the selection of candidates for either type of interview, but the committee is ultimately responsible for choosing candidates to interview. The committee will provide to the Department Chairperson the list of candidates selected for phone interviews and, later, for on-campus interviews.

Application materials, including letters of recommendation, may only be shared with non-search committee members of the Department for those candidates invited for on-campus interviews.

D. Phone and On-Campus Interviews

The search committee will conduct phone interviews, and the Department Chairperson may be invited by the committee chairperson to participate in these interviews if the committee desires.

The committee chairperson will plan and schedule the on-campus interviews. Prior to each on-campus interview, the candidate's CV and other application materials will be made available to all members of the Department. The committee chairperson should make an effort to enable as many faculty as possible to interact with each candidate during the interview, in settings such as meals, one-on-one or small-group meeting times, and travel to or from the airport. The chairperson should schedule the candidate's seminar at a time when as many faculty as possible can attend, and all faculty should make an effort to attend.

E. Recommendation for Hire

At the conclusion of the on-campus interviews, the committee chairperson will, in writing, solicit comments and feedback from the faculty and provide a means by which comments can be delivered anonymously. The committee chairperson, or full search committee, will also meet with the Department Chairperson to obtain his/her input. Taking into consideration the input from faculty and the Department Chairperson, the search committee will then rate each candidate as acceptable or not, and rank those deemed acceptable. The committee chairperson will inform the

Department Chairperson of the candidate recommended for hire (the highest ranking candidate). If the Department Chairperson disagrees with the committee's recommendation, an attempt must be made to reconcile the difference. If attempts at reconciliation do not lead to an agreement, a meeting of the Department Chairperson, committee, and Dean must be arranged to achieve a resolution.

The Department Chairperson, upon approval of the Dean, will offer the position to the candidate selected for hire. The Chairperson will, in consultation with the Dean, negotiate the terms of employment, including starting salary and, where appropriate, research startup package.

Article 6. Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

6.1 Criteria for the Recommendation for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The two most significant criteria for evaluating the candidate for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are teaching effectiveness and research/scholarship productivity. The candidate must have documented evidence of consistent and satisfactory performance with respect to these two criteria. While effective teaching and productive research/scholarship are the primary criteria for tenure and promotion, it is also expected that the candidate will have been involved in service activities. Candidates who do not perform satisfactorily in these three domains should not expect a favorable recommendation for tenure and promotion.

A. Teaching

1. With respect to teaching the candidate will be evaluated in terms of:

   a. The ability to communicate ideas and concepts clearly and in ways that students understand;
   b. The ability to manifest a general sensitivity and responsiveness to the needs of students along with a pattern of seeking good rapport with students;
   c. The fulfillment of administrative responsibilities related to the candidate's teaching assignments.

2. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness will be based on the following components:

   a. Summaries and transcribed comments of the departmental Student Opinion Surveys of lecture and laboratory courses taught;
   b. Course syllabi, exams, grade distributions, and other relevant material and information;

c. Reports of classroom visits by tenured members of the Department. These visitations are to be arranged by the chairperson of the Personnel Committee;

d. Documentation of research opportunities for students sponsored by the candidate;

e. Documents or reports that might be in the possession of the Chairperson that are deemed to be relevant to the teaching performance of the candidate.

B. Research/Scholarship

1. It is expected that the candidate will have been actively engaged in research for the purpose of (a) improving his/her effectiveness as a teacher/scholar, (b) generating new knowledge, (c) developing skills that are commensurate with contemporary practices, and (d) actively involving students in collaborative research (i.e., providing experiential learning opportunities for students). An emphasis should be placed on the development of a reputation in the field of specialization, and this external visibility, whether through published articles or books or outside lectures, is considered to be an important component of the tenure evaluation by the Department.

2. Recognition will be given to the research contribution of the candidate whether made individually, made as a member of a group, or through supervision of student research. In the case of contributions made to a group effort, clear evidence of the candidate's unique and active role must be presented.

3. The primary basis for evaluating research/scholarship activity will be the quantity and quality of peer-reviewed publications. In this regard a sustained and reasonable level of productivity that is commensurate with available resources is expected. The candidate is expected to have three publications accepted in recognized peer-reviewed journals. In addition, either a fourth peer-reviewed publication or four student presentations at regional or national meetings (an average of one student presentation per year) is required. At least one peer-reviewed publication should include student coauthors. Other appropriate examples of productivity are presentations of talks, poster papers at professional meetings and seminars at other universities or institutions. Reports of research carried out by students, and published or written reports of new educational protocols for teaching lectures or laboratories are other components of productivity.

4. Ancillary documentation that is relevant to research/scholarship, and which should be used in tenure evaluation, consists of descriptions of intramural and extramural grant application, grants or contracts awarded, and their interim or final reports. Other material, such as referees' reviews of the candidate's manuscripts, proposals, books, etc. may be submitted.

C. Service

It is expected that the candidate will become involved in service activities. These activities should include service to the Department and typically to a lesser extent, service to the College and/or University. Academic advising is considered an important service contribution to the Department, College, and University. Service to the candidate's profession through activity in one or more professional societies, or service as a referee for professional publications and funding agencies are also viewed as highly desirable. Community engagement at the local, regional, or broader levels in various discipline-related ways is also a desirable form of service. For example, this may take the form of rendering expertise or services to external agencies, companies, or non-profit organizations, or participating in activities designed to educate the public about issues related to the candidate's profession.

6.2 Criteria for the Recommendation for Promotion to Professor

The same qualities and criteria associated with promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure are applied to promotion to the rank of Professor. In this case, however, the Department looks for evidence of the professional maturation of the candidate as a teacher, scholar and colleague. During the time period since promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate's record of teaching, research/scholarship, and service should show a sustained level of contributions in each of the three domains to the academic mission of the Department, College, and University.

A. Teaching

The evidence of substantial and effective teaching may include revisions which improve the quality of existing courses, major curricular development in lecture or laboratory courses, development of new courses, development of new experiments for existing laboratory courses, or providing undergraduate students with meaningful experiential learning opportunities. Sustained performance in teaching means the candidate consistently performs at a satisfactory level with regard to communicating ideas and concepts clearly in the classroom, manifesting a general sensitivity and responsiveness to the needs of students, and carrying out the administrative duties associated with all assigned courses. This information should be evident from student and peer evaluations. Excellence in teaching performance must be demonstrated by consistently favorable peer and student evaluations, and may include recognition of teaching by being nominated for and/or receiving a local, regional, or national teaching award.

B. Research/Scholarship

Substantial accomplishment and sustained performance in research/scholarship means that there has been a pattern of ongoing professional growth through research publications, grant applications, and other scholarly works. This pattern may be demonstrated by a subset of the following components. Excellence in

research/scholarship must be demonstrated by accomplishment of components 1-4 and either 5 or 6.

1. Professional recognition at the national level.
2. A minimum of four publications in peer-reviewed journals of high quality, such as those associated with professional societies. The candidate should be the primary author on at least two of these publications. For coauthored publications, a letter from the corresponding author describing the contributions of the candidate should be provided.
3. Presentation of a seminar to an external academic or industrial/business audience.
4. At least three oral or poster presentations at regional or national scientific meetings for which the candidate is the primary author.
5. Submission as the principal or co-principal investigator of a least one external grant proposal to a national or federal agency. A resubmission of a grant is acceptable.
6. Procurement of funding internally, or from a regional or local agency, as the principle investigator.

C. Service

Sustained performance in service means the candidate has a record of active participation in service at the Departmental level which is maintained consistently over time. To be considered to have an active and substantive service record, the candidate must serve on multiple Departmental committees, and either have service roles at the College/University level or be an academic advisor. Academic advising is a valuable service contribution to the Department, College, and University. Academic advising of about 12 majors may be considered the equivalent of serving as an ordinary member on one departmental standing committee. Excellence in service must be demonstrated by taking a leadership role in service in at least two of the three levels (Department, College, or University) and by performing at least two of the following other highly desirable forms of service: 1) academic advising; 2) service to a professional organization at the local, regional, or national level; 3) service as a referee for professional publications or funding agencies; 4) service on an editorial board or performance of editorial duties for a professional or scholarly journal; and 5) community engagement in various discipline-related ways.

6.3 Candidates eligible for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor may choose to include in their promotion dossier comments on their research/scholarship provided by external referees. The candidate seeking external evaluation must inform the Chairperson at least two months prior to the date the dossier is due to the Department Committee. The candidate will furnish the names and addresses of at least four persons who may be called upon to comment on the candidate's qualifications for promotion to the rank of Associate

Professor or Professor in regard to the Department's research/scholarship criteria as stated above. The appropriate Department Personnel Committee will develop a list of four referees, of which at least two are of the candidate's choosing. It is intended that these referees be experts in the same field of research/scholarship as the candidate, and that referees from the professoriate be from comparable academic institutions (on the departmental level). These letters are to be regarded as confidential, but will become part of the candidate's promotion dossier.

6.4 Criteria for the Recommendation for Promotion to Senior Instructor

The primary criterion for evaluating the candidate for promotion to Senior Instructor is teaching effectiveness. The candidate must have documented evidence of sustained success in teaching over the candidate's period of employment at ISU. Evidence of significant curricular development (of lecture or laboratory courses) and/or attending teaching or other professional development workshops/conferences is desirable. With the exception of any requirement that the candidate has provided research opportunities to students, the evaluation of teaching effectiveness will be based on components associated with promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Evidence of achievement in research, scholarship, creative activity, and/or service is valued, but only required if such activities were contractual expectations of the Instructor.

6.5 Criteria for the Recommendation for Hiring Senior Faculty with Tenure

For candidates who seek tenure within the first year of hire, letters of recommendation will serve in lieu of external reviews. Likewise, the candidate's curriculum vita and application material will serve as the candidate's portfolio that will be evaluated by the personnel committee. The personnel committee will consist of all departmental faculty of the same rank or higher than the candidate.

Article 7. Faculty Performance Evaluation (FPE) Procedure and Criteria

7.1 Faculty subject to FPE and materials for review

All tenured faculty, including the Department Chairperson, senior instructors, and those instructors no longer subject to annual review, are subject to yearly faculty performance evaluation (FPE), on the basis of materials and documents in their Faculty Activity Database (FAD) portfolios covering the evaluation period. In Years 1 and 2 of the FPE cycle, all faculty members undergoing FPE should include documents in their FAD portfolio providing evidence of teaching effectiveness, which must include, but are not limited to, course syllabi and student evaluations for courses taught in the evaluation period. Research-active faculty must also provide evidence, such as published papers, manuscripts, grant proposals, posters, or talks, of research activity and also provide a short statement (100 words or less) summarizing research activities for the previous year. Faculty with service obligations should provide evidence of service. Only evidence and documents contained in the FAD may be used for evaluation, with the exception—when germane—of other information allowed by the FPE process specified by the Faculty

Senate. Faculty must upload documents and evidence by the deadline specified by the Faculty Senate.

7.2 Evaluation in Years 1 and 2 of FPE Cycle

In Years 1 and 2 of the FPE cycle, the Department Chairperson will review faculty. Tenured faculty will be evaluated in the domains of teaching effectiveness, research/scholarship, and service. Senior Instructors and Instructors will be evaluated on teaching effectiveness, and service, if also so obligated. Although research by instructors is welcome, it is not usually contractually required and will not be considered if not contractually required. For each faculty member, the Department Chairperson will make a finding of "meets expectations," or "does not meet expectations" in each domain. The results of the Chair's evaluations will be communicated in the time and manner as specified by the Faculty Senate.

7.3 Evaluation in Year 3 of FPE Cycle

In Year 3 of the FPE cycle, the FPE Committee will review faculty as detailed below. The Department Chairperson will independently review faculty, using criteria in the spirit of the requirements described in Articles 6 and 10. For each faculty member under review, the Committee and the Department Chairperson will independently make a finding of "meets expectations," or "does not meet expectations" in each domain. The Committee and Department Chairperson will then meet as stipulated by the University prescribed FPE procedure to discuss their evaluations and reconcile any differences. The results of the evaluations will be communicated in the time and manner specified by the Faculty Senate.

The composition of the FPE Committee is described in Article 3.6. After receiving the triennial performance evaluation reports and weights from the faculty, each member of the FPE Committee will independently develop numerical ratings for each faculty member for each of three categories (teaching, research/scholarship, and service).

Faculty will be evaluated in each of the above categories using the following rating scale:

excellent	0.9
very good	0.7
good	0.5
fair	0.3
poor	0.1
no contribution	0.0

The FPE Committee will meet to discuss any gross discrepancies in their individual evaluations before any normalization and averaging is performed.

The following guidelines will be used by the Committee members for the basis of their evaluations:

A. Teaching

A faculty member will be deemed to have made a good contribution in this category if she/he has done a generally satisfactory job in discharging her/his assigned teaching duties in lecture and laboratory courses. Thus, a person who has neither shown evidence of extra contributions or performance in that assignment, nor generated undue critical comments by faculty or students about her/his teaching responsibilities, will be rated as good in the teaching category.

A person who fails to meet the nominal assigned teaching responsibilities, or has been unwilling to redress previously identified problems or deficiencies in teaching methods or content, will be rated as poor in this category.

A person who shows an unusually strong commitment to teaching that is manifest by especially effective communication skills in the classrooms and/or laboratory, who makes a significant contribution to the development of the curriculum, such as updating extant courses or developing new courses, who institutes new teaching techniques, and/or who provides meaningful experiential learning opportunities for students will be rated as excellent in the teaching category.

B. Research/Scholarship

In this category, one seeks evidence of activity that leads to the creation of new knowledge or ideas. If a person has received a "reduced load" to foster such activity, the committee seeks reassurance that this time has been constructively spent. In this context, activity in research/scholarship will be considered good if, through the submission of a triennial report, a faculty member shows that that time has been used conscientiously, and that reasonable progress has been made in research or scholarship projects. Activity in these projects can be individual, collaborative, or with students.

A poor rating in this category is associated with the case in which a person's triennial report of research/scholarship activities fails to convince a Committee member that even a minimum amount of progress has been made in carrying out such projects.

An excellent rating in research/scholarship pertains to the situation in which considerable tangible evidence of productivity is presented. Examples of this evidence consist of the publication of research articles in primary research journals, the award of a research grant or contract, presentations of research at other universities or professional meetings, the publication of pedagogical material, the award of grants in support of original pedagogical projects, and/or student presentations at local, regional, and national meetings.

C. Service

All faculty members evaluated by the FPE Committee are expected to have contributed to the improvement of the quality of professional life at the University. Various forms of community engagement, e.g. contributions of a professional nature to the community, such as schools and industry, are also considered as appropriate service activities. Academic advising of students should be considered an important service activity. A good service rating corresponds to a reasonable level and quality of satisfactory work on Departmental, College, or University committees, or work on individually motivated projects. A poor rating pertains to the case in which a faculty member shows less than a minimal amount of service contributions during the evaluation period.

An excellent service rating corresponds to a faculty member's making outstanding contributions to the Department or University. Some examples include serving as chairperson of an important, highly visible committee, significant effort in recruiting undergraduate students, an activity that clearly results in the improvement of the overall quality of professional life in the Department or University, and/or successful attempts to engage the local community in constructive professional relationships.

D. Computation of Category Ratings

Because the FPE Committee members will have, in general, different standards, each member's raw evaluation ratings in each category will be normalized to ensure a common quantitative basis for comparison. The normalization of each Committee member's ratings is accomplished by dividing the evaluated faculty members' raw ratings in a particular category by 2.0 times the average rating in that category. That is, a faculty member's normalized rating, $\widetilde{R}_i$, is calculated from her/his raw rating, R_i, as

$$\widetilde{R}_i = \frac{R_i}{2R_{\text{ave}}}.$$

where R_{ave} is the average of the raw ratings over all faculty members. (Note that a raw rating of 0.0 is not included in the calculation of the average rating if the faculty member's weight in the category is 0%.)

The rating of a faculty member in a given category is the average of the normalized ratings of the Committee members (Committee members do not evaluate themselves.) For example, the three Committee members' evaluations of six faculty members in one category may be as follows:

Committee Member	I		II		III		
Faculty member	R_i	$\tilde{R}_i$	R_i	$\tilde{R}_i$	R_i	$\tilde{R}_i$	Mean $\tilde{R}_i$
1	0.90	0.78	0.80	0.67	0.80	0.69	0.71
2			0.70	0.58	0.60	0.52	0.55
3	0.50	0.43	0.40	0.33	0.50	0.43	0.40
4	0.30	0.26			0.30	0.26	0.26
5	0.40	0.34	0.40	0.33			0.34
6	0.80	0.69	0.70	0.58	0.70	0.60	0.63
Mean	0.58	0.50	0.60	0.50	0.58	0.50	0.48

A "mean $\tilde{R}_i$" value given in the last column is the average of the three (or two) normalized ratings determined by the Committee members. These "mean $\tilde{R}_i$" values serve as category ratings for the faculty members undergoing review.

In accord with the University prescribed FPE procedure, the effort of each faculty member in each category (teaching, research/scholarship, and service) will be characterized as "meets expectations" or "does not meet expectations" based on the category ratings of this table. The Committee will determine, after reviewing the mean ratings for all faculty, the threshold value for meeting expectations in each category.

E. Weights and Computation of Overall Ratings

The Committee calculates an overall rating for each faculty member. This value is a weighted-average of the category ratings for the faculty member's teaching, research/scholarship, and service. The faculty member selects her/his own weights, subject to the following constraints:

1. The sum of a faculty member's weights must equal 100%.

2. The teaching weight is nominally a calculated quantity equal to the average number of equivalent hours taught over the six semesters of the triennial evaluation period divided by 15. As approved by the College, each contact hour in lecture is one equivalent hour, each contact hour in laboratory is three-quarters equivalent hour, and each 75 minutes in a workshop experience is one equivalent hour. Up to 20% of the calculated teaching weight (equal to three equivalent hours) can be

shifted to research/scholarship or service. Because teaching is the primary mission of the Department, the teaching weight must equal or exceed 30%.

3. The research/scholarship weight can be any value between 20% to 60%. Lower weights are allowed for tenured/tenure-track members of the faculty if her/his teaching weight exceeds 60%. In this case, her/his research/scholarship weight must equal or exceed one-half of the difference between 100% and her/his teaching weight. There is generally no research/scholarship expectation for an instructor, so her/his weight in this category may be 0%, although higher weights can be selected if desired.

4. The service weight can be any value between 20% and 40%. Lower weights are allowed, subject to the three constraints listed above.

Exceptions to these constraints must be approved by the Chairperson, and potentially by the Dean of the College. Exceptions will only be considered when special circumstances arise, such as sabbatical leaves, research buyouts, and reassigned time for the College or University.

For example, overall ratings for six faculty members may be evaluated as follows:

	Teaching		Research/ Scholarship		Service		
Faculty Member	Rating	Weight	Rating	Weight	Rating	Weight	Overall Rating
1	0.71	100%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.71
2	0.55	60%	0.30	10%	0.80	30%	0.60
3	0.40	60%	0.60	30%	0.45	10%	0.47
4	0.26	80%	0.60	10%	0.71	10%	0.34
5	0.34	90%	0.00	0%	0.36	10%	0.34
6	0.63	80%	0.50	10%	0.18	10%	0.57

A faculty member must undergo triennial review to be considered for merit pay. Merit pay recipients will be chosen based on the overall rating, but only faculty who are meeting expectations in all relevant categories will be eligible for merit pay. Based on the overall ratings of these faculty, the Committee will identify a select group of faculty (but no more than a third of the faculty) who contributed exceptionally in the previous triennium, and the merit pay pool will be divided equally among them. When three or more faculty are recognized for exceptional contributions, it is recommended that at least one be an Instructor. However, this is left to the discretion of the Committee, contingent upon the merits of the eligible faculty in a given triennium.

Article 8. Triennial Review of the Department Chairperson.

The Department Chairperson's performance will be evaluated triennially, as consistent with University and College procedures. An ad hoc "Triennial Review of the Chairperson Committee" will be established.

8.1. Any regular member of the department faculty can serve on this committee. The committee will consist of four faculty members: one Instructor, one Assistant Professor, one Associate Professor, and one Full Professor. Committee members will be elected by the faculty. At least one committee member must be a physicist.

8.2. The chairperson of the Personnel Committee will prepare a ballot. All regular faculty will vote in each of the following categories on the ballot.

- Category I: All Physics faculty: one physicist will be chosen from among all the regular faculty, of all ranks, in the physics program;
- Category II: Chemistry Instructors;
- Category III: Chemistry Assistant Professors;
- Category IV: Chemistry Associate Professors;
- Category V: Chemistry Full Professors.

8.3. The highest vote-getter in Category I will represent the physics program and their academic rank on the committee. For example, if the highest vote getter in Category I is an Assistant Professor, then that person will represent the physicists and the Assistant Professors, regardless of the vote in the category of the chemistry Assistant Professors.

8.4. The highest vote-getter in each of Categories II through V will also serve on the committee, with the exception of the Category already "taken" by the physicist. This procedure ensures that the committee consists of one member from each rank and includes one physicist.

8.5. The committee will follow the College's procedure for reviewing the Chairperson.

Article 9. Sabbatical Oversight Committee

9.1. Procedures for sabbatical leave applications are detailed in the University Policy Library, with additional guidance from the College of Arts and Sciences. A faculty member wishing to apply for sabbatical must notify the Department Chairperson by September 15 of the year prior to the academic year during which the requested sabbatical is to begin and submit an application to the Department Chairperson by the university-specified deadline in the fall semester.

9.2. Upon receipt of the application, the Department Chairperson will notify the chairperson of the Personnel Committee that a Sabbatical Oversight Committee (SOC) must be formed. The SOC will consist of three tenured faculty members: one person chosen by the applicant, one person chosen by the chairperson of the Personnel Committee, and one person chosen by lot from the remaining tenured faculty members. The chairperson of the SOC will be designated by the chairperson of the Personnel Committee.

9.3. If the applicant has previously been on sabbatical, the applicant's final report to the dean from the previous sabbatical must also be provided by the applicant to the SOC upon its formation. As directed by university policy, the committee must then review the proposal and provide a written recommendation to accept or reject the proposal. The SOC review must use the same criteria that the Department Chairperson will use: the overall quality of the proposal, how the proposal contributes to the overall professional development of the applicant, and how the proposal contributes to the mission of the Department. Additionally, the SOC will read the final report from the previous sabbatical and factor into its recommendation whether the candidate had made sufficient use of the opportunities provided by the previous sabbatical. Although all efforts should be made to provide a unanimous recommendation, split votes are acceptable. In the event of a split decision, the SOC's report will describe the reasons for the split decision. The written recommendation must be provided to the Department Chairperson by the university-specified deadline.

9.4. If the recommendations of the SOC and the Department Chairperson differ, then the Department Chairperson and the SOC must meet to attempt to reconcile the difference. If no reconciliation can be achieved, then the Department Chairperson and SOC will issue recommendations with disparate findings to the applicant. Both reports will be forwarded to the Dean by the deadline established by university policy.

Article 10. Faculty Teaching Loads

Teaching loads in the Department reflect the mission of providing robust degree programs in chemistry and physics, preparing students to pursue careers as scientists, engineers, teachers, and health professionals, and contributing to the scientific literacy of students through the Foundational Studies Program. Teaching loads are established to ensure that the Department can deliver a schedule of courses that adequately supports this mission and reasonably addresses the demand for seats in majors and non-majors courses. Teaching loads are also set to ensure that faculty members have sufficient opportunity to maintain a scholarly agenda as described in Article 6.

Our programs use an "equivalent load" to measure the teaching effort of its faculty. This load is calculated by adding the number of contact hours in lecture (N) to three-quarters of the number of contact hours in laboratory (L):

$$\text{Teaching equivalent load} = N + \tfrac{3}{4} L$$

Thus, a typical three contact hour chemistry laboratory would therefore contribute 2.25 "equivalent hours" to the instructor's load, and a two contact hour physics laboratory would contribute 1.5 equivalent hours. Faculty teaching loads measured in equivalent hours can be compared directly to credit hour loads taught by faculty in disciplines that are less laboratory-intensive.

Normal teaching loads are nine equivalent hours for research-active T/TT faculty, twelve equivalent hours for non-research-active T/TT faculty, fifteen equivalent hours for instructors, and five equivalent hours for a chairperson with the following caveats:

- The standard load for untenured faculty is 7-9 equivalent hours to support a research-intensive period of activity. This load generally corresponds to a two- or three-course teaching assignment.

- The chemistry and physics programs each receive a 3 equivalent hour teaching load reduction per year, distributed across faculty who administer the College Challenge program.

- Equivalent hours for courses with exceptionally large enrollments (>130 students) are double counted.

- Faculty who teach courses with required workshops receive 1 equivalent hour credit for each 75-minute workshop.

- Teaching loads for faculty who carry a significant service load or other special assignment may be reduced.

- Teaching loads for faculty affiliated with the Center for Science Education are established by the Coordinator for Science Education.

For purposes of assigning teaching load, research-active faculty are defined as engaging in three or more of the following activities in their discipline during any three-year period:

- Publish in recognized peer-reviewed journals and books;
- Present research or pedagogical work at recognized regional or national meetings;
- Provide research experiences for students that lead to student presentations at regional or national meetings;
- Seek support from external agencies for research and/or research infrastructure.