

## Nancy Hall

---

**From:** Eric Glendening  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2017 11:22 AM  
**To:** Nancy Hall  
**Subject:** RE: Department Review Guidelines  
**Attachments:** CHEM PHYS Bylaws April 2017.pdf

Nancy,

Attached is a copy of our most recently approved (April 2017) bylaws.

1. 6.3 describes the criteria for evaluating individuals who seek promotion to Senior Instructor.
2. Article 7 is our biennial review document.

Eric

---

**From:** Nancy Hall  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2017 10:48 AM  
**To:** Eric Glendening <[Eric.Glendening@indstate.edu](mailto:Eric.Glendening@indstate.edu)>  
**Subject:** Department Review Guidelines  
**Importance:** High

Good morning,

Please take a moment to review the attached P&T and Biennial review documents and then email me to confirm that they are the department's currently approved documents.

Additionally, is Section 6.3 of the bylaws still the currently approved document for senior instructor review? The department may wish to use the CAS criteria for Instructors (attached).

Many thanks,  
*Nancy*

Indiana State University  
Department of Chemistry and Physics  
Bylaws and Governance Provisions  
Last revised April 2017

**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, to Departmental Committee guidelines, and to the Department's Personnel Evaluation Criteria Document (including guidelines for tenure, promotion, and merit evaluation) must be approved by a two-thirds majority of the regular faculty (excepting the Chairperson and any faculty member on an administrative appointment).

**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 nine 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) Scheduling Committee, (8) Awards Committee, and (9) 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 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 decide whether decisions 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 Personnel Committee consists of all tenured faculty members. The Committee will follow the Department's policy regarding promotion and tenure decisions as set forth in Sections II-IV of the Department's Personnel Evaluation Criteria Document. In accord with this document, different subsets of the Committee act on promotion to the associate professor and full professor levels. The Committee will receive, process, and evaluate all applications for promotion and/or tenure. The Committee will also review reappointments for non-tenured faculty. 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. Each committee consists of two members of the regular faculty. 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 three faculty and will consider issues and make recommendations regarding undergraduate research in the Department.

### 3.6 Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee

The Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee will consist of four members, including at least one tenured/tenure-track member of the Chemistry faculty, at least one tenured/tenure-track member of the Physics faculty, and the Department Chairperson. The three members of the Committee, other than the Chairperson, are elected by the members of the faculty who will undergo evaluation. Each faculty member will vote 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 with the Chairperson on this Committee.

### 3.7 Scheduling Committee

The Chemistry and Physics programs have separate Scheduling Committees. In Chemistry, the Scheduling Committee consists of the Department Chairperson and two regular faculty appointed by the Chairperson. In Physics, the Committee consists of the Chairperson and a member of the Physics faculty. The Scheduling Committee has responsibility for input into teaching assignments and course loads. The Chairperson consults with the Committee as part of the process of submitting class schedules.

### 3.8 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.

### 3.9 Safety Committee

The Safety Committee consists of 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.

### 3.10 Ad hoc Committees

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

### 3.11 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 specific teaching and curricular needs, along with the perceived objectives of ensuring both broad-based coverage in research and scholarship activity and, when appropriate, a focus on an area of extant strength within the Department of Chemistry and Physics and related University units, will be used to determine the specialty in which a search for a new faculty member will be conducted.

### **5.2 Educational Background**

It is expected that the successful candidate will have a Ph.D. in Chemistry or Physics or a terminal degree in the area of the specialization sought, or a closely related discipline, from an internationally recognized institution. A record of publication in the scientific literature is essential. Postdoctoral experience is highly desirable. A history of, or direct knowledge of, grant application preparation is also highly desirable. More experienced applicants are expected to have a considerable publication record as well as a history of securing extramural funding for research/scholarship activities.

### **5.3 Teaching skills**

The candidate's commitment to both undergraduate and graduate education is essential, and the requisite communication skills must be made evident. Thus, during the

interview, the candidate will present a seminar through which both these skills and overall technical knowledge will be assessed.

#### 5.4 Collegiality

The candidate must also 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 discerned during the interview process and should be explicitly supported by letters of reference in the applicant's file.

#### 5.5 Research/Scholarship

The successful applicant will demonstrate a firm commitment to the educational and research activities of the Department. The candidate will have a convincing record of research training and accomplishments. Junior level applicants must have the potential to develop a productive research program with the goal of publishing research or scholarly articles in recognized journals and to attract extramural funding. Senior level applicants must provide a significant record of sustained accomplishments in educational and scholarly activities, as manifest by publications and extramural grants. These applicants must also show, where appropriate, considerable service experience on departmental and college-level committees.

### **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. 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. 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. Engaging local, regional, or broader communities 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.

### D. External Referee Reports

Another component of the information used to evaluate candidates for recommendation for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor shall consist of comments provided by external referees. The candidate will furnish the names and addresses of at least four persons who may be called upon to comment on the candidate's tenure qualifications in regard to the Department's 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 tenure dossier.

## 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 and research/scholarship should show a sustained level of contributions to the academic mission of the Department. Evidence of significant curricular development (of lecture or laboratory courses) within the candidate's field of specialization is desirable. A pattern of ongoing professional growth through research publications, grant applications and other scholarly works, is expected. Additionally, a pattern of growth with respect to service to the candidate's Department, College, University, and profession is desirable.

Another component of the information used to evaluate candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor shall consist of comments provided by external referees. 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 Professor in regard to the department's 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 tenure dossier.

### 6.3 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 respect to teaching the candidate will be evaluated in terms of the same qualities and criteria associated with promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. 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.

### 6.4 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 Procedure and Criteria

The composition of the Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee is described in Article 3.6. After receiving the biennial performance evaluation reports and weights from the faculty, each member of the Faculty Performance Evaluation 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
above average	0.7
average	0.5
below average	0.3

poor	0.1
no contribution	0.0

The Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee will meet to discuss any gross discrepancies in their individual evaluations before any normalization and averaging is performed. Each Committee member will furnish brief, written comments regarding the evaluation of each faculty member in each category.

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 done an average performance 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 average 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 ranked 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 is 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 average if, through the submission of a biennial 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 ranking of poor in this category is associated with the case in which a person's biennial 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 performance 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 student presentations at local, regional, and national meetings.

### C. Service

All faculty members evaluated by the Faculty Performance Evaluation 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 departmental service activity. An average service performance corresponds to a reasonable level and quality of satisfactory work on Departmental, College, or University committees, or work on individually motivated projects. Poor performance 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 performance 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; successful attempts to engage the local community in constructive professional relationships.

### D. Computation of Category Ratings

Because the Faculty Performance Evaluation 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,  $\tilde{R}_i$ , is calculated from her/his raw rating,  $R_i$ , as

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

where  $R_{\text{ave}}$  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 four Committee members' evaluations of six faculty members in one category may be as follows:

Committee Member	I		II		III		IV		Mean $\tilde{R}_i$
	$R_i$	$\tilde{R}_i$	$R_i$	$\tilde{R}_i$	$R_i$	$\tilde{R}_i$	$R_i$	$\tilde{R}_i$	
1	0.90	0.78	0.80	0.67	0.80	0.69	0.70	0.65	0.70
2			0.70	0.58	0.60	0.52	0.70	0.65	0.58
3	0.50	0.43	0.40	0.33	0.50	0.43	0.50	0.46	0.41
4	0.30	0.26			0.30	0.26	0.50	0.46	0.33
5	0.40	0.34	0.40	0.33			0.30	0.28	0.32
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	0.54	0.50	0.49

A "mean  $\tilde{R}_i$ " value given in the last column is the average of the four (or three) 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 biennial review procedure, the effort of each faculty member in each category (teaching, research/scholarship, and service) will be characterized as "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations," or "does not meet expectations" based on the category ratings of this table.

#### 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 four semesters of the biennial 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:

Faculty Member	Teaching		Research/ Scholarship		Service		Overall Rating
	Rating	Weight	Rating	Weight	Rating	Weight	
1	0.70	100%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.70
2	0.58	60%	0.30	10%	0.80	30%	0.62
3	0.41	60%	0.60	30%	0.45	10%	0.47
4	0.33	80%	0.60	10%	0.71	10%	0.40
5	0.32	90%	0.00	0%	0.36	10%	0.32
6	0.63	80%	0.50	10%	0.18	10%	0.57

In accord with the University prescribed biennial review procedure, the overall performance of each faculty member will be characterized as “contributing exceptionally,” “contributing,” or “contributing below expectations” based on the overall rating.

A written digest of the Committee’s evaluation (without attribution) will be given by the Department Chairperson to each faculty member at the biennial professional review meeting.

## Article 8. 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):

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

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.