

1
2 Indiana State University
3 Department of Chemistry and Physics
4 Bylaws and Governance Provisions
5
6

7 **Article 1: Membership, Voting, and Bylaws**
8

9 1.1 Membership

10 The *regular faculty* of the Department of Chemistry and Physics consists of those who hold
11 tenured, tenure-track, or instructor appointments in Chemistry or Physics.
12

13 1.2 Voting and Voting Rights

14 Only the regular faculty of the Department have the right to vote. Voting is customarily
15 indicated by a show of hands; however, a voting member may at any time direct the
16 Chairperson to conduct a vote through a secret ballot. Ballots will be counted by the
17 Recording Secretary and one other voting member (excluding the Chairperson). The
18 Department Chairperson votes only in the event of a tie.
19

20 1.3 Amendment of Bylaws

21 Revisions to the Bylaws must be approved by a two-thirds majority of the regular faculty
22 (excepting the Chairperson and any faculty member on an administrative appointment).
23
24

25 **Article 2: Faculty Meetings**
26

27 2.1 Quorum

28 A quorum at faculty meetings is defined as a majority of the regular Chemistry and Physics
29 faculty. In computing this majority, those faculty members on leave, on full-time
30 administrative appointment, and the Department Chairperson are excluded.
31

32 2.2 Program meetings

33 Matters concerning only one program (i.e., Chemistry or Physics) may be discussed by a
34 subset of the faculty consisting of all the regular members of that program. An ad hoc
35 recorder for meeting minutes will be appointed when necessary.
36

37 2.3 General Rules of Order

38 Faculty meetings will be conducted in conformity with *Robert's Rules of Order Newly*
39 *Revised*. A copy of *Robert's Rules* will be kept in the Department office. Following
40 consensus, local custom may prevail over some Robert's Rules provisions; however, a
41 voting member can direct the Chairperson to observe a particular provision.
42
43

1 2.4 Approval

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

5
6 2.5 Frequency and Protocol

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

18
19 2.6 Minutes

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

28
29
30 **Article 3: Standing Committees and Other Service Assignments**

31
32 The Department will have nine standing committees: (1) Curriculum Committee, (2) Personnel
33 Committee, (3) Assessment Committee, (4) Chemical Instrumentation Committee, (5)
34 Undergraduate Research Committee, (6) Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee, (7)
35 Scheduling Committee, (8) Awards Committee, and (9) Safety Committee. At its first meeting of
36 the calendar year, each committee will select a chairperson if one has not been agreed upon
37 previously. All members of the regular faculty are eligible to serve on departmental committees.

38
39 3.1 Curriculum Committee

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

1 (2) periodic review of the Catalog with respect to program content and description, and (3)
2 consideration of other curricular matters brought before it by the faculty or the Department
3 Chairperson.
4

5 The Department Chairperson will determine whether recommendations of the Curriculum
6 Committee require a vote of the full (disciplinary) faculty, or will be sent forward directly
7 from committee. It is expected that minor and noncontroversial changes in curriculum will
8 not be an action item on the agenda at a full faculty meeting. The Curriculum Committee
9 will maintain a record of decisions that affect curriculum at the catalog level and will
10 forward this record to the Department Office.
11

12 3.2 Personnel Committee

13 The composition of the Personnel Committee depends on the rank of the faculty member
14 under review and the nature of the evaluation. The following subsets of the faculty serve
15 as the Committee:
16

- 17 A. All regular faculty evaluate non-tenure-track faculty.
- 18 B. All tenured faculty evaluate tenure-track faculty.
- 19 C. All senior instructors and tenured faculty evaluate candidates for promotion to
20 Senior Instructor.
- 21 D. All tenured faculty evaluate candidates for promotion to Associate Professor.
- 22 E. All full professors evaluate candidates for promotion to Full Professor.
23

24 The Committee receives, processes, and evaluates all applications for promotion. The
25 Committee also reviews reappointments for non-tenured faculty and evaluates the progress
26 of pre-tenure faculty toward tenure. The Committee will communicate the results of its
27 deliberations to the Chairperson in a timely fashion in consideration of deadlines.
28

29 3.3 Assessment Committee

30 The Chemistry program and the Physics program each have an Assessment Committee. In
31 Chemistry, the Assessment Committee consists of at least two regular faculty members;
32 the Physics Assessment Committee is a committee of the whole. The Committees conduct
33 an annual review of learning outcomes of the program. This may necessitate collection of
34 data or samples of student work, with which faculty are expected to cooperate. After
35 analysis of the results, the committees also make recommendations for curriculum change
36 that would result in improved learning outcomes. The results are reported to the whole
37 faculty annually at a regular faculty meeting, as well as to the University Assessment
38 Coordinator.
39

40 3.4 Chemistry Instrumentation Committee

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

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

3 4 3.5 Undergraduate Research Committee

5 The Undergraduate Research Committee consists of at least three regular faculty members,
6 including at least one chemist and at least one physicist. The Committee will consider
7 issues and make recommendations regarding undergraduate research in the Department.
8

9 3.6 Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee

10 The Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee consists of three members, including at
11 least one tenured/tenure-track member of the Chemistry faculty and at least one
12 tenured/tenure-track member of the Physics faculty. The three members of the Committee
13 are elected by the members of the faculty who will undergo evaluation. Each faculty
14 member votes for three colleagues to serve on the Committee. The tenured/tenure-track
15 member of the Chemistry faculty receiving the most votes, the tenured/tenure-track
16 member of the Physics faculty receiving the most votes, and the member of the remaining
17 faculty receiving the most votes will serve together on this Committee.
18

19 3.7 Scheduling Committee

20 The Chemistry and Physics programs have separate Scheduling Committees. In
21 Chemistry, the Scheduling Committee consists of the Department Chairperson and two
22 regular faculty appointed by the Chairperson. In Physics, the Committee consists of the
23 Chairperson and a member of the Physics faculty. The Scheduling Committee has
24 responsibility for input into teaching assignments and course loads. The Chairperson
25 consults with the Committee as part of the process of submitting class schedules.
26

27 3.8 Awards Committee

28 The Chemistry and Physics programs have separate Awards Committees. In Chemistry,
29 the Awards Committee consists of academic advisors; the Physics Awards Committee is a
30 committee of the whole. These committees meet annually to collect information about
31 students eligible for scholarships and awards and determine allocations of available
32 funding for these awards.
33

34 3.9 Safety Committee

35 The Safety Committee consists of at least three members. Its responsibilities include
36 advising the Department on best practices and policies that will establish and sustain a safe
37 working environment in the teaching and research laboratories. The Committee will
38 periodically assess existing policies and laboratory working conditions to ensure that
39 measures are taken to minimize hazards.
40

41 3.10 Ad hoc Committees

42 The Chairperson may request that faculty serve on ad hoc committees as the need arises.
43

1 3.11 Other Service Assignments

2 The Chairperson solicits and appoints, with approval from the Personnel Committee,
3 faculty to serve in various capacities in the Department and the College. Faculty Search
4 Committees are appointed by the Chairperson, and follow procedures outlined in Article
5 5.
6
7

8 **Article 4: Policy Statements**
9

10 4.1 Nature of Laboratory Courses

11 Laboratory courses engage students in hands-on experiments involving direct manipulation
12 of materials. Computer simulations in these courses are acceptable when (1) the objectives
13 of a laboratory assignment are better achieved through simulation of data or processes than
14 through hands-on experimentation, (2) simulations reflect contemporary practice in the
15 discipline, (3) simulations augment hands-on experimentation, or (4) hands-on
16 experimentation is precluded by factors such as excessive cost or unacceptable risk of
17 injury.
18

19 4.2 Lecture/Lab Enrollment

20 A degree-seeking student who seeks to register for coupled lecture/laboratory courses is
21 required to register in both courses in the same term unless the student successfully
22 completed the lecture or laboratory in a prior term. A student who is currently enrolled in
23 coupled lecture/laboratory courses is required to drop both courses if he or she drops the
24 lecture. In certain circumstances, a student who is currently enrolled in coupled
25 lecture/laboratory courses can drop the laboratory while retaining the lecture if approved
26 by the Chairperson.
27
28

29 **Article 5. Guidelines for Hiring New Faculty**
30

31 5.1 Development Plans of the Department

32 The Department's teaching and curricular needs, along with the regular faculty's
33 perceived objectives of ensuring both broad-based coverage in research and scholarship
34 activity and, when appropriate, a focus on an area of extant strength, will be used to
35 determine the specialty in which a search for a new regular faculty member will be
36 conducted. The specialty will be approved by majority vote at a faculty meeting.
37

38 5.2 Educational Background

39 A candidate for a regular faculty position should have a Ph.D. in chemistry or physics or a
40 terminal degree in a closely related discipline from an internationally recognized
41 institution. An "all but dissertation" (ABD) candidate can be considered and provisionally
42 offered a faculty position, but he/she must complete the terminal degree within twelve
43 months of the initial appointment. A candidate for a temporary faculty position should

1 have a master's degree in chemistry, physics, or a closely related discipline, or an
2 undergraduate degree plus eighteen graduate-level credits in chemistry, physics, or closely
3 related disciplines. Faculty who do not have a terminal degree will generally be limited to
4 teaching Foundational Studies lecture courses and 100-level laboratory courses.

5 6 5.3 Teaching Effectiveness

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

11 12 5.4 Collegiality

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

16 17 5.5 Research/Scholarship

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

28 29 5.6 Hiring Procedure

30
31 The following procedure will be used for all searches for regular faculty. The procedure by which
32 temporary faculty are hired is at the discretion of the Department Chairperson, although faculty
33 input is recommended. The procedure describes only processes internal to the Department, but all
34 steps must be conducted in compliance with guidelines and procedures mandated by the Office of
35 Human Resources.

36 37 A. Search Committee

38 The Department Chairperson will select the search committee chairperson, and together
39 they will identify a potential search committee of regular faculty members, taking into
40 consideration the teaching focus of the position under hire and, when appropriate, research
41 expertise desired of candidates for the position. The committee should usually consist of
42 3-4 members in addition to the chairperson, and the slate should be reasonably diverse in
43 terms of faculty rank, gender, and ethnicity. The slate will be discussed and the final

1 composition of the search committee approved by majority vote at a faculty meeting. The
2 search will be conducted by the search committee, in consultation with the Department
3 Chairperson.
4

5 B. Advertising the Position

6 The advertisement for the open faculty position will be developed by the search committee,
7 in consultation with the Department Chairperson, and will specify the nature of the position
8 along with required and desired qualifications.
9

10 C. Selection of Candidates to Interview

11 The search committee will review the pool of applicants and select candidates for phone
12 and, ultimately, on-campus interviews. The Department Chairperson may review materials
13 for all applicants and provide input to the search committee concerning the selection of
14 candidates for either type of interview, but the committee is ultimately responsible for
15 choosing candidates to interview. The committee will provide to the Department
16 Chairperson the list of candidates selected for phone interviews and, later, for on-campus
17 interviews.
18

19 Application materials, including letters of recommendation, may only be shared with non-
20 search committee members of the Department for those candidates invited for on-campus
21 interviews.
22

23 D. Phone and On-Campus Interviews

24 The search committee will conduct phone interviews, and the Department Chairperson may
25 be invited by the committee chairperson to participate in these interviews if the committee
26 desires.
27

28 The committee chairperson will plan and schedule the on-campus interviews. Prior to each
29 on-campus interview, the candidate's CV and other application materials will be made
30 available to all members of the Department. The committee chairperson should make an
31 effort to enable as many faculty as possible to interact with each candidate during the
32 interview, in settings such as meals, one-on-one or small-group meeting times, and travel
33 to or from the airport. The chairperson should schedule the candidate's seminar at a time
34 when as many faculty as possible can attend, and all faculty should make an effort to attend.
35

36 E. Recommendation for Hire

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

1 recommended for hire (the highest ranking candidate). If the Department Chairperson
2 disagrees with the committee's recommendation, an attempt must be made to reconcile the
3 difference. If attempts at reconciliation do not lead to an agreement, a meeting of the
4 Department Chairperson, committee, and Dean must be arranged to achieve a resolution.
5

6 The Department Chairperson, upon approval of the Dean, will offer the position to the
7 candidate selected for hire. The Chairperson will, in consultation with the Dean, negotiate
8 the terms of employment, including starting salary and, where appropriate, research startup
9 package.
10

11 **Article 6. Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**

12 **6.1 Criteria for the Recommendation for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

13
14 The two most significant criteria for evaluating the candidate for tenure and promotion to the rank
15 of Associate Professor are teaching effectiveness and research/scholarship productivity. The
16 candidate must have documented evidence of consistent and satisfactory performance with respect
17 to these two criteria. While effective teaching and productive research/scholarship are the primary
18 criteria for tenure and promotion, it is also expected that the candidate will have been involved in
19 service activities. Candidates who do not perform satisfactorily in these three domains should not
20 expect a favorable recommendation for tenure and promotion.
21

22 **A. Teaching**

23
24 1. With respect to teaching the candidate will be evaluated in terms of:
25

- 26 a. The ability to communicate ideas and concepts clearly and in ways that students
27 understand;
- 28 b. The ability to manifest a general sensitivity and responsiveness to the needs of students
29 along with a pattern of seeking good rapport with students;
- 30 c. The fulfillment of administrative responsibilities related to the candidate's teaching
31 assignments.
32

33
34 2. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness will be based on the following components:
35

- 36 a. Summaries and transcribed comments of the departmental Student Opinion Surveys of
37 lecture and laboratory courses taught;
- 38 b. Course syllabi, exams, grade distributions, and other relevant material and information;
- 39 c. Reports of classroom visits by tenured members of the Department. These visitations are
40 to be arranged by the chairperson of the Personnel Committee;
- 41 d. Documentation of research opportunities for students sponsored by the candidate;
42

1 e. Documents or reports that might be in the possession of the Chairperson that are deemed
2 to be relevant to the teaching performance of the candidate.
3

4 B. Research/Scholarship 5

6 1. It is expected that the candidate will have been actively engaged in research for the purpose of
7 (a) improving his/her effectiveness as a teacher/scholar, (b) generating new knowledge, (c)
8 developing skills that are commensurate with contemporary practices, and (d) actively involving
9 students in collaborative research (i.e., providing experiential learning opportunities for students).
10 An emphasis should be placed on the development of a reputation in the field of specialization,
11 and this external visibility, whether through published articles or books or outside lectures, is
12 considered to be an important component of the tenure evaluation by the Department.
13

14 2. Recognition will be given to the research contribution of the candidate whether made
15 individually, made as a member of a group, or through supervision of student research. In the case
16 of contributions made to a group effort, clear evidence of the candidate's unique and active role
17 must be presented.
18

19 3. The primary basis for evaluating research/scholarship activity will be the quantity and quality
20 of peer-reviewed publications. In this regard a sustained and reasonable level of productivity that
21 is commensurate with available resources is expected. The candidate is expected to have three
22 publications accepted in recognized peer-reviewed journals. In addition, either a fourth peer-
23 reviewed publication or four student presentations at regional or national meetings (an average of
24 one student presentation per year) is required. At least one peer-reviewed publication should
25 include student coauthors. Other appropriate examples of productivity are presentations of talks,
26 poster papers at professional meetings and seminars at other universities or institutions. Reports
27 of research carried out by students, and published or written reports of new educational protocols
28 for teaching lectures or laboratories are other components of productivity.
29

30 4. Ancillary documentation that is relevant to research/scholarship, and which should be used in
31 tenure evaluation, consists of descriptions of intramural and extramural grant application, grants
32 or contracts awarded, and their interim or final reports. Other material, such as referees' reviews
33 of the candidate's manuscripts, proposals, books, etc. may be submitted.
34

35 C. Service 36

37 It is expected that the candidate will become involved in service activities. These activities should
38 include service to the Department and typically to a lesser extent, service to the College and/or
39 University. Academic advising is considered an important service contribution to the Department,
40 College, and University. Service to the candidate's profession through activity in one or more
41 professional societies, or service as a referee for professional publications and funding agencies
42 are also viewed as highly desirable. Community engagement at the local, regional, or broader
43 levels in various discipline-related ways is also a desirable form of service. For example, this may

1 take the form of rendering expertise or services to external agencies, companies, or non-profit
2 organizations, or participating in activities designed to educate the public about issues related to
3 the candidate's profession.

6 6.2 Criteria for the Recommendation for Promotion to Professor

7
8 The same qualities and criteria associated with promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with
9 tenure are applied to promotion to the rank of Professor. In this case, however, the Department
10 looks for evidence of the professional maturation of the candidate as a teacher, scholar and
11 colleague. During the time period since promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate's record
12 of teaching, research/scholarship, and service should show a sustained level of contributions in
13 each of the three domains to the academic mission of the Department, College, and University.

15 A. Teaching

16
17 The evidence of substantial and effective teaching may include revisions which improve the
18 quality of existing courses, major curricular development in lecture or laboratory courses,
19 development of new courses, development of new experiments for existing laboratory courses, or
20 providing undergraduate students with meaningful experiential learning opportunities. Sustained
21 performance in teaching means the candidate consistently performs at a satisfactory level with
22 regard to communicating ideas and concepts clearly in the classroom, manifesting a general
23 sensitivity and responsiveness to the needs of students, and carrying out the administrative duties
24 associated with all assigned courses. This information should be evident from student and peer
25 evaluations. Excellence in teaching performance must be demonstrated by consistently favorable
26 peer and student evaluations, and may include recognition of teaching by being nominated for
27 and/or receiving a local, regional, or national teaching award.

29 B. Research/Scholarship

30
31 Substantial accomplishment and sustained performance in research/scholarship means that there
32 has been a pattern of ongoing professional growth through research publications, grant
33 applications, and other scholarly works. This pattern may be demonstrated by a subset of the
34 following components. Excellence in research/scholarship must be demonstrated by
35 accomplishment of components 1-4 and either 5 or 6.

- 37 1. Professional recognition at the national level.
- 38 2. A minimum of four publications in peer-reviewed journals of high quality, such as those
39 associated with professional societies. The candidate should be the primary author on at least
40 two of these publications. For coauthored publications, a letter from the corresponding author
41 describing the contributions of the candidate should be provided.
- 42 3. Presentation of a seminar to an external academic or industrial/business audience.

- 1 4. At least three oral or poster presentations at regional or national scientific meetings for which
2 the candidate is the primary author.
- 3 5. Submission as the principal or co-principal investigator of a least one external grant proposal
4 to a national or federal agency. A resubmission of a grant is acceptable.
- 5 6. Procurement of funding internally, or from a regional or local agency, as the principle
6 investigator.

7 8 C. Service 9

10 Sustained performance in service means the candidate has a record of active participation in
11 service at the Departmental level which is maintained consistently over time. To be considered
12 to have an active and substantive service record, the candidate must serve on multiple
13 Departmental committees, and either have service roles at the College/University level or be an
14 academic advisor. Academic advising is a valuable service contribution to the Department,
15 College, and University. Academic advising of about 12 majors may be considered the
16 equivalent of serving as an ordinary member on one departmental standing committee.
17 Excellence in service must be demonstrated by taking a leadership role in service in at least two
18 of the three levels (Department, College, or University) and by performing at least two of the
19 following other highly desirable forms of service: 1) academic advising; 2) service to a
20 professional organization at the local, regional, or national level; 3) service as a referee for
21 professional publications or funding agencies; 4) service on an editorial board or performance of
22 editorial duties for a professional or scholarly journal; and 5) community engagement in various
23 discipline-related ways.
24

25 6.3 Candidates eligible for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor may choose
26 to include in their promotion dossier comments on their research/scholarship provided by external
27 referees. The candidate seeking external evaluation must inform the Chairperson at least two
28 months prior to the date the dossier is due to the Department Committee. The candidate will
29 furnish the names and addresses of at least four persons who may be called upon to comment on
30 the candidate's qualifications for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor in
31 regard to the Department's research/scholarship criteria as stated above. The appropriate
32 Department Personnel Committee will develop a list of four referees, of which at least two are of
33 the candidate's choosing. It is intended that these referees be experts in the same field of
34 research/scholarship as the candidate, and that referees from the professoriate be from comparable
35 academic institutions (on the departmental level). These letters are to be regarded as confidential,
36 but will become part of the candidate's promotion dossier.
37

38 6.4 Criteria for the Recommendation for Promotion to Senior Instructor 39

40 The primary criterion for evaluating the candidate for promotion to Senior Instructor is teaching
41 effectiveness. The candidate must have documented evidence of sustained success in teaching over
42 the candidate's period of employment at ISU. Evidence of significant curricular development (of
43 lecture or laboratory courses) and/or attending teaching or other professional development

1 workshops/conferences is desirable. With the exception of any requirement that the candidate has
2 provided research opportunities to students, the evaluation of teaching effectiveness will be based
3 on components associated with promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Evidence of
4 achievement in research, scholarship, creative activity, and/or service is valued, but only required
5 if such activities were contractual expectations of the Instructor.

6 7 6.5 Criteria for the Recommendation for Hiring Senior Faculty with Tenure 8

9 For candidates who seek tenure within the first year of hire, letters of recommendation will serve
10 in lieu of external reviews. Likewise, the candidate’s curriculum vita and application material will
11 serve as the candidate’s portfolio that will be evaluated by the personnel committee. The personnel
12 committee will consist of all departmental faculty of the same rank or higher than the candidate.
13

14 15 **Article 7. Faculty Performance Evaluation (FPE) Procedure and Criteria** 16

17 7.1 Faculty subject to FPE and materials for review

18 All tenured faculty, including the department chairperson, senior instructors, and those
19 instructors no longer subject to annual review, are subject to yearly faculty performance
20 evaluation (FPE), on the basis of materials and documents in their Faculty Activity Database
21 (FAD) portfolios covering the evaluation period. In Years 1 and 2 of the FPE cycle, all faculty
22 members undergoing FPE should include documents in their FAD portfolio providing evidence
23 of teaching effectiveness, which must include, but are not limited to, course syllabi and student
24 evaluations for courses taught in the evaluation period. Research-active faculty must also
25 provide evidence, such as published papers, manuscripts, grant proposals, posters, or talks, of
26 research activity and also provide a short statement (100 words or less) summarizing research
27 activities for the previous year. Faculty with service obligations should provide evidence of
28 service. Only evidence and documents contained in the FAD may be used for evaluation, with
29 the exception—when germane—of other information allowed by the FPE process specified by
30 the Faculty Senate. Faculty must upload documents and evidence by the deadline specified by
31 the Faculty Senate.
32

33 7.2 Evaluation in Years 1 and 2 of FPE Cycle

34 In Years 1 and 2 of the FPE cycle, the department chairperson will review faculty. Tenured
35 faculty will be evaluated in the domains of teaching effectiveness, research/scholarship, and
36 service. Senior Instructors and Instructors will be evaluated on teaching effectiveness, and
37 service, if also so obligated. Although research by instructors is welcome, it is not usually
38 contractually required and will not be considered if not contractually required. For each faculty
39 member, the department chairperson will make a finding of “meets expectations,” or “does not
40 meet expectations” in each domain. The results of the chair’s evaluations will be communicated
41 in the time and manner as specified by the Faculty Senate.
42

43 7.3 Evaluation in Year 3 of FPE Cycle

44 In Year 3 of the FPE cycle, the FPE Committee will review faculty as detailed below. The
45 department chairperson will independently review faculty, using criteria in the spirit of the

1 requirements described in Articles 6 and 8. For each faculty member under review, the
2 Committee and the department chairperson will independently make a finding of “meets
3 expectations,” or “does not meet expectations” in each domain. The Committee and department
4 chairperson will then meet as stipulated by the University prescribed FPE procedure to discuss
5 their evaluations and reconcile any differences. The results of the evaluations will be
6 communicated in the time and manner specified by the Faculty Senate.

7
8 The composition of the FPE Committee is described in Article 3.6. After receiving the triennial
9 performance evaluation reports and weights from the faculty, each member of the FPE Committee
10 will independently develop numerical ratings for each faculty member for each of three categories
11 (teaching, research/scholarship, and service).

12
13 Faculty will be evaluated in each of the above categories using the following rating scale:
14

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

15
16 The FPE Committee will meet to discuss any gross discrepancies in their individual evaluations
17 before any normalization and averaging is performed.

18
19 The following guidelines will be used by the Committee members for the basis of their evaluations:
20

21 A. Teaching
22

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

28
29 A person who fails to meet the nominal assigned teaching responsibilities, or has been unwilling
30 to redress previously identified problems or deficiencies in teaching methods or content, will be
31 rated as poor in this category.
32

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

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

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

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

7
 8
 9 where R_{ave} is the average of the raw ratings over all faculty members. (Note that a raw rating of
 10 0.0 is not included in the calculation of the average rating if the faculty member's weight in the
 11 category is 0%.)
 12

13
 14 The rating of a faculty member in a given category is the average of the normalized ratings of the
 15 Committee members (Committee members do not evaluate themselves.) For example, the three
 16 Committee members' evaluations of six faculty members in one category may be as follows:
 17

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

18
 19 A "mean \tilde{R}_i " value given in the last column is the average of the three (or two) normalized ratings
 20 determined by the Committee members. These "mean \tilde{R}_i " values serve as category ratings for the
 21 faculty members undergoing review.
 22

23 In accord with the University prescribed FPE procedure, the effort of each faculty member in each
 24 category (teaching, research/scholarship, and service) will be characterized as "meets
 25 expectations" or "does not meet expectations" based on the category ratings of this table. The

1 Committee will determine, after reviewing the mean ratings for all faculty, the threshold value for
2 meeting expectations in each category.

3 4 E. Weights and Computation of Overall Ratings

5
6 The Committee calculates an overall rating for each faculty member. This value is a weighted-
7 average of the category ratings for the faculty member's teaching, research/scholarship, and
8 service. The faculty member selects her/his own weights, subject to the following constraints:

- 9
10 1. The sum of a faculty member's weights must equal 100%.
- 11
12 2. The teaching weight is nominally a calculated quantity equal to the average number of
13 equivalent hours taught over the six semesters of the triennial evaluation period divided by 15. As
14 approved by the College, each contact hour in lecture is one equivalent hour, each contact hour in
15 laboratory is three-quarters equivalent hour, and each 75 minutes in a workshop experience is one
16 equivalent hour. Up to 20% of the calculated teaching weight (equal to three equivalent hours)
17 can be shifted to research/scholarship or service. Because teaching is the primary mission of the
18 Department, the teaching weight must equal or exceed 30%.
- 19
20 3. The research/scholarship weight can be any value between 20% to 60%. Lower weights are
21 allowed for tenured/tenure-track members of the faculty if her/his teaching weight exceeds 60%.
22 In this case, her/his research/scholarship weight must equal or exceed one-half of the difference
23 between 100% and her/his teaching weight. There is generally no research/scholarship expectation
24 for an instructor, so her/his weight in this category may be 0%, although higher weights can be
25 selected if desired.
- 26
27 4. The service weight can be any value between 20% and 40%. Lower weights are allowed,
28 subject to the three constraints listed above.

29
30 Exceptions to these constraints must be approved by the Chairperson, and potentially by the Dean
31 of the College. Exceptions will only be considered when special circumstances arise, such as
32 sabbatical leaves, research buyouts, and reassigned time for the College or University.

33
34 For example, overall ratings for six faculty members may be evaluated as follows:
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

Faculty Member	Teaching		Research/ Scholarship		Service		Overall Rating
	Rating	Weight	Rating	Weight	Rating	Weight	
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. 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.

1
2 Normal teaching loads are nine equivalent hours for research-active T/TT faculty, twelve
3 equivalent hours for non-research-active T/TT faculty, fifteen equivalent hours for instructors, and
4 five equivalent hours for a chairperson with the following caveats:

- 5
6 • The standard load for untenured faculty is 7-9 equivalent hours to support a research-
7 intensive period of activity. This load generally corresponds to a two- or three-course
8 teaching assignment.
- 9
10 • The chemistry and physics programs each receive a 3 equivalent hour teaching load
11 reduction per year, distributed across faculty who administer the College Challenge
12 program.
- 13
14 • Equivalent hours for courses with exceptionally large enrollments (>130 students) are
15 double counted.
- 16
17 • Faculty who teach courses with required workshops receive 1 equivalent hour credit for
18 each 75-minute workshop.
- 19
20 • Teaching loads for faculty who carry a significant service load or other special assignment
21 may be reduced.
- 22
23 • Teaching loads for faculty affiliated with the Center for Science Education are established
24 by the Coordinator for Science Education.

25
26 For purposes of assigning teaching load, research-active faculty are defined as engaging in three
27 or more of the following activities in their discipline during any three-year period:

- 28 • Publish in recognized peer-reviewed journals and books;
 - 29 • Present research or pedagogical work at recognized regional or national meetings;
 - 30 • Provide research experiences for students that lead to student presentations at regional or
31 national meetings;
 - 32 • Seek support from external agencies for research and/or research infrastructure.
- 33