

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

PROCEDURES, CRITERIA, STANDARDS, AND BYLAWS

Approved November 30, 2007

[Official document prepared by Faculty Personnel Services]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Preamble	1
II.	Role of Department Chair in Governance and Operating Methods	3
III.	Procedures for Development of Standards for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Professor Salary Adjustment	4
IV.	Criteria and Standards for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Professor Salary Adjustment	4
V.	Procedures for Determining Departmental Recommendations for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Professor Salary Supplement	13
VI.	Faculty Reductions	14
VII.	Selection of Department Chairperson	15
VIII.	Support for Professional Activities	17
IX.	Selection of New Tenure Track Faculty	18

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

I. Preamble

- A. Faculty holding tenured and tenure-track appointments of at least half-time in this Department have special responsibilities with regard to the operation and governance of the Department. Such faculty are referred to throughout this document by the term “regular faculty” as defined in the current *CMU/CMUFA Agreement (Agreement)*.
- B. All regular faculty are eligible to vote on modification of this document, participate in making a recommendation for the selection of a Chairperson and

new faculty, and make recommendations on sabbatical leaves. Recommendations on reappointment, tenure and promotion are made by those individuals specified in Section V of this document.

- C.** In addition to regular faculty, all individuals holding at least half-time temporary faculty appointments in the Department may vote on any other business and serve on departmental committees, other than the Personnel Committee (as defined in the “Department of Chemistry Internal Operating System” document dated May 1999). Such service is not required by the nature of their appointment. Persons holding honorary titles, such as Adjunct Faculty or Research Scientist, are specifically excluded from voting.
- D.** The rules contained in Robert’s Rules of Order shall govern all meetings of the Department in all cases to which they apply, and in which they are not inconsistent with Bylaws of the Department.
- E.** A printed or electronically distributed agenda and all materials relevant to decisions (action items) will be distributed at least two (2) full “working days” before a meeting. The term “working days” is defined as those days, exclusive of Saturday and Sunday, on which classes are scheduled and meet on the campus during the Fall or Spring terms. No faculty meetings in which decisions are to be made will occur on non-working days. Meetings will be held at regular times each semester when no chemistry classes are scheduled. A calendar of meeting dates will be made available at the beginning of each semester by the Chair.
- F.** Modification of these procedures or votes on personnel matters shall not be conducted without their inclusion in the agenda.
- G.** Business at a meeting shall be conducted by a quorum, unless designated otherwise. A quorum at a given meeting shall be defined as a majority (>50%) of faculty eligible to act on the agenda items as specified in I.B. and I.C. above. Faculty are expected to attend Department meetings and participate actively in the business of the Department. Votes can only be cast by those faculty physically present at the meeting with the following exception: in advance of a Department meeting, a faculty member who will be absent from the meeting for suitable reasons such as sabbatical, other University-approved leaves of absence (including FMLA), or attendance at a professional meeting may submit to the Department chair written votes on published action items along with their reason for absence. These absentee votes will be counted as long as the final motions are substantially the same as the agenda action items.
- H.** When not otherwise defined, the terms “faculty,” “Department,” and “departmental” refer to a quorum of the members as defined above. Unless otherwise specified, the terms “College” and “Dean” refer to the College of Science and Technology and the Dean of that college.

II. Role of Department Chair in Governance and Operating Methods

Supplemental to the duties as chair assigned by Central Michigan University, the chair shall serve the Department by assuming duties, in consultation with the faculty, which shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

- A.** Providing leadership in the area of teaching, research, scholarly publication, and proposal writing;
- B.** Providing leadership in the development of new programs and curricula to meet changing demands in the chemical sciences;
- C.** Assisting faculty in meeting professional goals;
- D.** Meeting annually with faculty to review progress toward personal and Department goals;
- E.** Facilitating scholarly activity on the part of faculty;
- F.** Maintaining resources for research and scholarly activity (space, instrumentation, support personnel, etc.);
- G.** Assuring that junior faculty receive appropriate mentoring;
- H.** Representing the faculty and the Department to external funding agencies;
- I.** Representing the Department to University administration;
- J.** Maintaining funding to support Department activities;
- K.** Representing the Department to the mid-Michigan scientific community and the Midland industries;
- L.** Maintaining equity in faculty workload distribution through assignment of faculty responsibilities (teaching assignments, advising responsibilities, committee appointments, college/university representation, etc.) in keeping with the *Agreement* where it speaks to faculty workload;
- M.** Administering the budget of the Department;
- N.** Assigning lecturers, part-time and temporary faculty, teaching assistants, office professionals, secretarial aides, laboratory aides, work study students, student instrumentation operators, etc. to their work responsibilities; and supervising such work duties either directly or indirectly;

- O. Directing the activities of P & A personnel, instrumentation technicians, stockroom personnel, managers of instrumentation facilities, glassblowers, and other technical and/or clerical support personnel;
- P. Maintaining a central office to support the work of the Department.

III. Procedures for Development of Standards for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Professor Salary Adjustment

Departmental decision-making with regard to the procedures by which faculty participate in formulating the Department's standards for reappointment, tenure, promotion and professor salary adjustment, and personnel procedural policies, including changes in them, shall be as follows:

- A. The Department or an individual may refer items in writing, including amendments to existing procedures, to the Personnel Committee for study. All items shall be directed to the chair of the Personnel Committee.
- B. The Personnel Committee shall report its recommendation on the referred items to the Department as a whole within one month of receipt.
- C. All items shall be discussed at a meeting of the Department held at least one week after notice of the meeting has been given, along with notice of the specific agenda items.
- D. Voting on all items shall be conducted as described in Section I.G. (above).

IV. Criteria and Standards for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Professor Salary Adjustment

The successful candidate for reappointment, tenure, and promotion must present evidence to demonstrate both the quantity and quality of her/his activities and achievements in each of the three areas mentioned in the *Agreement* (teaching, scholarship, and service). As faculty progress from reappointment, to tenure, and then to promotion to the level of Professor or Professor Salary Adjustment, expectations in each area will increase. Promotion will be based upon accomplishment since the last promotion. Candidates for tenure, promotion and professor salary adjustment must demonstrate a sustained productivity in each area. When judging achievement in each area, it is the candidate's overall performance in a given area that is evaluated.

Diverse Strengths. The Department recognizes that productive faculty careers may proceed along different paths at different times, possibly emphasizing one type of activity over others according to one's strengths. For this reason, a candidate may clearly exceed the standards for teaching while simply meeting the standards for scholarship, or vice versa. It is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate the superior nature of her/his activity and its value to the Department, college and university. "Superior"

performance is defined as clearly above the standard as described in the following Sections. Superior performance in the area of service does not reduce expectations in teaching and/or scholarly activity. Therefore, a candidate must display superior performance in either teaching or scholarship, or exceed the standard in both categories, to be tenured or promoted.

Time In Rank. In general, those activities since the candidate's initial appointment to CMU will be considered for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to Associate Professor. All achievements and accomplishments in the period of time since the last positive personnel decision (i.e., since the candidate's prior promotion or prior Professor Salary Adjustment) will be considered for a candidate applying for promotion to Professor or Professor Salary Adjustment.

(When information concerning bolded items in each Section below is not included in a reappointment, tenure, and promotion application, a satisfactory explanation must be provided in the accompanying narrative.)

A. Teaching

Description. The teaching standard in all personnel decisions is demonstration of high quality teaching. High quality teaching is considered to be of critical importance in evaluating faculty for personnel decisions. Some of the hallmarks of a successful teacher would normally include strong course organization, clearly defined learning objectives, a clear command of the subject matter, classroom presentations that enhance student interest and learning, fair and appropriate evaluations, and high rates of student success.

Documentation. In order for the candidate to meet the Department standard for teaching, it is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate success in teaching by submitting a portfolio with sufficient evidence supporting her/his high quality teaching performance. The Department recognizes that the process of evaluating a candidate's teaching is difficult because learning is a two-way process that involves effort put forth by both the teacher and the learner. The fact that students and teachers have unique learning and teaching styles is an additional complicating factor. However, once a teacher has taught a number of Sections of a course, as well as a variety of courses, some trends can be seen in a teacher's ability to instruct and a reasonable evaluation of one's teaching can be accomplished.

Superior performance in teaching may be signaled by multiple measures of quality, some of which may include: portfolio documentation of course materials that display high levels of clarity, rigor, and innovation; demonstrably exceeding Department or college averages in student evaluations; demonstrably exceeding Department or national averages on standardized examinations (*vide infra*); documented achievement in mentoring students; favorable peer evaluations.

While multiple methods for evaluating teaching exist, for consistency and fairness in judging files, the following items should be included in a candidate's application materials unless there exists a compelling reason not to include them (*vide supra*): **SOS data, all SOS written student comments, grade distributions, course completion rates, and information documenting research student supervision.** The Department recognizes a candidate's right to use other means to demonstrate effective teaching, including but not limited to...

1. peer evaluation,
2. evidence of new course or pedagogy development,
3. evidence for having successfully taught a relatively wide variety of courses,
4. presentations given by a candidate's research students at professional meetings/workshops,
5. new pedagogical approaches used successfully,
6. short courses, and workshops attended that relate to improving one's teaching,
7. American Chemical Society (ACS) National Examinations,
8. success of students in subsequent chemistry courses,
9. pre- and post-tests that measure student learning, and
10. other measures, which are acceptable to evaluators at each level of review.

In judging one's teaching, some general guidelines will be applied to those bolded items that should be included in each file. When evaluating **SOS data**, the Department recognizes that students are usually not in a position to judge the subject matter competence of a faculty member. However they can judge other aspects of teaching such as organization, communication, student-teacher rapport, availability, enthusiasm, and whether they feel that the instructor's teaching helped them learn. Scores obtained on each of the questions for each course taught should indicate relatively positive levels of student satisfaction with the instructor's efforts. Scores that indicate student dissatisfaction may indicate problems and require explanation by the candidate. Likewise, a candidate's **SOS written student comments** should be generally favorable and significant criticisms contained therein should be addressed in the narrative. **Grade distributions** should not be uniformly high or low unless the instructor has a compelling reason for such an assignment. While extreme grade distributions can be accounted for by excellent or deficient performance by students, they may also

imply that an instructor either has unrealistic expectations or is not adequately teaching the material. Low **course completion rates** (i.e., high withdrawal or failure rates among those students remaining in the course following the drop and add period) may indicate problems with teaching methodology or course management. Candidates should also present **information documenting research student supervision (including outcomes as evidenced by publications and presentations with students)** so that effectiveness in teaching research students may be evaluated.

In presenting the foregoing supporting data, the candidate should document the protocols used for collecting the data. (For example, for SOS scores, what fraction of the students remaining in the course at the time of the survey actually completed it? For peer review, who conducted the review and under what conditions, i.e., prearranged or unannounced visits?)

The Department recognizes that ACS examinations must be administered according to the procedures prescribed by ACS in order for the results to be meaningfully compared to the national sample, or to any other sample obtained under the same conditions. At the same time, the Department recognizes that a faculty member may choose, for academically sound reasons, to administer an ACS examination under conditions different from the prescribed ones. The faculty member who does this understands that results so obtained cannot be meaningfully compared to results obtained under other conditions, and will be used for advisory purposes only in personnel considerations. In order for readers to assign proper weight to ACS examination results, the candidate must verify that the examination was administered under the ACS protocol. It is the candidate's responsibility to clearly specify in the narrative the conditions under which ACS standardized examinations are administered.

B. Scholarly Activity

Description. Scholarly and creative activity within one's field is considered to be of critical importance in evaluating faculty for personnel decisions. Broadly defined, scholarship is systematic activity devoted to the creation of new knowledge and/or understanding in chemistry, biochemistry, chemical education, polymer science, materials science or other areas embraced by the Department. It encompasses original research in a sub-field of the discipline, as well as keeping abreast of new developments in the field. Active scholarship results in the faculty member maintaining a high level of expertise in the discipline. This expertise represents a valuable intellectual asset for students, the Department, and the broader university community.

Department standards require that the candidate be engaged in sustained, high-quality original scholarly work that results in significant contributions to the state of knowledge or understanding in chemistry or a chemistry-related field. The candidate's refereed publications provide primary evidence of productive

scholarly engagement. Scholarly and creative activity also includes presenting research results in appropriate venues, submitting competitive external grant proposals to support research, and, more generally, active participation in the discipline.

Documentation. In order for scholarly and creative activity to be evaluated, a candidate must provide within her/his portfolio evidence demonstrating accomplishments that address the *quality* and *quantity* of scholarly and creative activity while associated with CMU. The Department recognizes that the protocol of scholarship varies within the sub-disciplines of Chemistry but the candidate's portfolio narrative should clearly delineate any idiosyncrasies associated with her/his sub-discipline that would allow the reviewer to properly evaluate the quality of a candidate's publication and external funding record. When evaluating the number of publications or extramural funding proposals, the size and quality of the paper/proposal and the reputation of the journal or grant/contract funding agency will be given due weight. The candidate's portfolio narrative should clearly document the quality of the journals in question.

The portfolio should include *documented evidence* of activities demonstrating scholarly and creative activity such as:

1. Copies of publications accepted (includes those not yet in print) by refereed journals in which the candidate is a major author (with asterisk/star next to name or other accepted indicator)
2. Copies of publications accepted (includes those not yet in print) by refereed journals in which the candidate is a contributing author with a description of the significance of her/his contributions
3. Copies of proceedings publications
4. Copies of preprints
5. Copies of proposals/contracts submitted for internal competitions
6. Copies of proposals/contracts submitted to external entities
7. Copies of internal proposals/contracts funded
8. Copies of external proposals/contracts funded
9. Copies of patents and patent disclosures
10. Evidence of short courses and workshops attended that relate to scholarship

11. Evidence of presentations given by candidate at national/international professional meetings
12. Copies of honors and/or awards for research
13. Evidence of presentations given at workshops
14. Evidence of presentations given by candidate to other academic or industrial groups
15. Evidence of meetings attended
16. External review of scholarship
17. Evidence of professional consulting activities
18. Documentation of other relevant scholarly activities

Standards for Reappointment. *The standards used to assess performance are the same as those used for tenure (see below) with the understanding that the standards progressively approach the standards for tenure with time in rank.* To evaluate a candidate's promise, the Department will look for evidence of continuing development and growth of the faculty member during the pre-tenure years at CMU. In all cases, it is the candidate's responsibility to give sufficient evidence to establish the level and quality of her/his scholarly activity through documentary evidence.

Examples of scholarly activities that support a claim of promise early on in a candidate's career include, among others:

1. evidence of development of a research program, including adapting research activities to the CMU environment;
2. activity in a field that is promising or growing;
3. involvement in promising and productive collaborations;
4. participating in a grant-writing workshop;
5. application to external funding agencies requesting support for scholarly activities;
6. some publication requirements completed and evidence that others will be forthcoming;
7. presentation of CMU research achievements at professional conferences;

8. obtaining internal or external funding to support scholarly activities.

Standards for Tenure. The requirement is at least **three (3) distinct publications in refereed professional journals of acknowledged quality with the candidate as a major author.** It is expected that these publications will result from work conducted at CMU and will support the claim of the candidate as an independent investigator (e.g., one who has shown the capacity to pursue research separate from a doctoral or post-doctoral environment). Preprints or proceedings papers, though an important indication of scholarly productivity, do not count towards this requirement because they are expected to lead to full paper publications. ‘Distinct’ shall be taken to mean that the publications clearly describe different (though possibly related) works that are sufficiently complete to be published as separate papers (i.e., are not fragmentations of what could be a single paper). A quality journal is understood as one that would typically be carried in the reference collection of a research extensive institution.

Furthermore, the Department recognizes external grant and/or contract funding to be of central importance in establishing an active scholarly program. The candidate therefore, is required to **submit at least one competitive, external grant or contract proposal prior to the tenure decision to support research or teaching initiatives.** Competitive implies that the grant or contract proposal is subjected to independent, external peer-review and competes with other grant proposals for funding. Principal authorship of any significant, externally refereed and funded competitive grant or contract is the equivalent to a high quality journal article and is considered as such, up to a maximum of one substitution. That is to say, a funded, competitive external grant or contract of at least \$25,000 (or a combination of such grants and/or contracts totaling the same) may be substituted for up to a maximum of one of the required peer-reviewed journal publications. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide sufficient evidence (such as information about the funding agency, success rate for proposals, copies of proposals reviews, etc.) to establish that the grant is of a quality at least similar to that found in ACS-PRF and Research Corp. awards and equivalent to a refereed journal article. Additional grants and/or contracts may not be substituted for the remaining publication requirement(s).

The candidate is expected to demonstrate an independent, creative role in any collaborative research efforts included for evaluation in personnel decisions. In the case of a multi-authored publication or grant/contract proposal the candidate’s contribution is central to the evaluation of how that work counts towards the Department standards for scholarship. If the candidate’s contribution is substantial, that publication or grant/contract shall count as if the candidate were the sole author or grant/contract recipient. It is the candidate’s responsibility to provide documentary evidence regarding her/his level of contribution to the work. When the candidate’s contribution is judged to be less substantial, the value of the work toward meeting the standards in this area shall be correspondingly reduced.

Additionally, the candidate is expected to demonstrate promise, which includes potential for continued professional growth and development, and potential to contribute to the goals and objectives established by the Department. Some of the ways that a candidate may demonstrate promise include, but are not limited to, participation in activities that reflect on-going commitments to excellence in teaching, scholarship and service including more general participation in the profession. It is therefore required that the candidate **present research at national or international level professional conferences an average of once every other year**. It is the candidate's responsibility to give sufficient evidence of additional indicators of active participation in the profession.

Standards for promotion to Associate Professor. Excluding promise, the standards for promotion to Associate Professor are the same as those for tenure.

Standards for promotion to Professor or for Professor Salary Adjustment (PSA). The standards for promotion to Professor and for Professor Salary Adjustment are the same as those for promotion to Associate Professor, with the following changes:

1. The general expectation is that all faculty members will continue to develop in the area of creative and scholarly activity throughout their careers. Therefore, the candidate's scholarship must be sustained and show evidence of increased maturity, quality and visibility over time.
2. The candidate is expected to **present the results of her/his research activities at national or international level professional conferences an average of once per year**.

C. Service

Description. Service within one's field is considered to be important in evaluating faculty for personnel decisions. Broadly defined, service is systematic activity devoted to the functioning and well being of the Department, college, university and the profession. It may take many forms: committee service, committee leadership, professional service (e.g., reviewing manuscripts or proposals, organizing symposia, serving as an officer in a professional society, etc.), professional leadership, and many others. Active service is fundamental to the goals of the Department and to the mission of the university and requires that all faculty be actively engaged.

Documentation. In order for service activity to be evaluated, a candidate must provide within the portfolio evidence documenting accomplishments that address the *quantity* and *quality* of service. The candidate should demonstrate breadth and (with increasing rank and experience) leadership in service. A listing of service activities is insufficient. The role and contribution of the candidate in

each activity should be delineated. The candidate is expected to include in the narrative a clear summary of the nature and extent of contributions to each service activity listed. For promotion to Full Professor or Professor Salary Adjustment, significant leadership in some aspect of one's service record is required.

The portfolio should include documented evidence of service activities such as:

1. Service on departmental committees.
2. Leadership on departmental committees.
3. Service on college or university committees.
4. Leadership on college or university committees.
5. Other leadership roles within the college or university.
6. Reviewing grant proposals or manuscripts submitted to professional journals.
7. Service on the editorial board of professional journals.
8. Professional service to state or national agencies.
9. Leadership roles in professional societies – local, regional, national, international.
10. Service on external curricular/evaluation bodies.
11. Student recruitment activities.
12. Advising a professional student group.
13. Major/minor advising in chemistry and related areas.
14. Providing science outreach to elementary/secondary schools.
15. Providing workshops for teachers.
16. Guest lecturing in other departments/institutions.
17. Receiving an external grant award to support service activities.
18. Other relevant activities that can be documented.

V. Procedures for Determining Departmental Recommendations for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Professor Salary Adjustment

The procedures followed by the Department of Chemistry and individual candidates in personnel matters must conform to the current *Agreement*. Candidates are required to be familiar with the Sections of the *Agreement* that deal with reappointment, tenure, and promotion policies including relevant dates.

- A. The Department chair shall notify the Department prior to the contractual date applications for personnel matters (reappointment, tenure, or promotion) are due in the Department office. Such notification will include the names of candidates for reappointment and/or tenure. For any promotion, the individual shall be responsible for requesting in writing that consideration for promotion be given in order to initiate action. Such requests are to be addressed to the chair of the Personnel Committee, who will inform the entire faculty of the schedule for review.
- B. The communication from the chair described in V.A. is advisory only and shall serve as written reminder in order to afford the candidate an opportunity to submit materials in writing that document the candidate's achievements in the areas required for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, as appropriate (Section IV, above).
- C. The Personnel Committee shall have the responsibility of receiving materials and presenting them to the appropriate recommending body (see below) of the Department on matters of reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Materials, once submitted, may not be changed by the candidate without a request for such by the recommending body (as described below). The Personnel Committee shall be obliged to accept and present to the appropriate recommending body all printed materials presented by the candidate and by any member of the recommending body. Materials submitted by individuals other than the candidate shall conform to the guidelines specified in the *Agreement* that speak to this issue. In particular, no anonymous material shall be placed in the file and all material submitted must represent documented evidence that addresses how the candidate has or has not met the Department standards for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. All evidence not submitted by the candidate and used in making recommendations concerning reappointment, tenure, or promotion shall be shared with the candidate normally two weeks before the Department recommendation is made. The candidate shall be provided an opportunity to address such evidence.
- D. The membership of a recommending body shall consist of all tenured chemistry faculty members except the candidate under consideration. Faculty members currently or previously related by family or marriage, or who have or have had a personal relationship which would make it difficult to make an unbiased recommendation, shall not be involved in personnel discussions or

recommendations affecting that faculty member. The chair of the Personnel Committee or a designated member of the recommending body shall act as chair of the recommending body.

- E. Within seven days after receipt of the candidate's materials, the membership of the recommending body shall review the materials, and convene to discuss them. If the recommending body wishes the candidate to address errors of fact or to respond to specific questions, the chair of the body shall make the request to the candidate and the discussion may be postponed for up to seven (7) days to allow the additional information to be added to the file. Materials submitted by individuals other than the candidate will be treated as described in V.C. above. No new information shall be presented by individuals other than the candidate after this point, and only by the candidate at the request of the recommending body. The Department recommendation shall be reached by vote as described in Section I.G. (above). The candidate shall be informed of the departmental recommendation by the chair of the recommending body within two (2) days after completion of balloting.
- F. The chair of the recommending body shall have the responsibility for preparing the final departmental recommendation and forwarding it to the Department chair, together with all materials used to reach the decision, unchanged from those present at the time of the Department's recommendation vote. The departmental recommendation will contain a systematic evaluation of the candidate's record according to university policy. The department chair will complete the remainder of the transmittal form and may attach an independent evaluation. A copy of the Departmental recommendation, including any separate recommendation from the chair, shall be given to the candidate and to the chair of the recommending body no later than the time it is forwarded to the dean. The candidate may submit a written clarification or rebuttal of the Departmental and/or chair recommendations, and this statement shall be attached to the department's recommendation at the next level. All materials used to reach the decision together with the recommendations will be forwarded to the Dean's office by the Department chair.

VI. Faculty Reductions

In a case in which reductions in the number of regular faculty are necessary (other options for reductions as specified in the current *Agreement* having been exhausted) departmental recommendations on such reductions will be made in accordance with the guidelines described in the current *Agreement*. Specifically, programmatic needs and length of university service are to be the primary considerations used to arrive at recommendations of layoffs of regular faculty. When these considerations are met the following options will be exercised in the order indicated:

- A. To leave unfilled the requisite number of faculty vacancies existing or expected as a result of natural attrition, e.g., retirement, resignation, etc.

- B. Not to reappoint untenured faculty members serving in tenure track positions.
- C. Not to reappoint tenured faculty members.

In situations when Items B or C must be considered, the chair in consultation with the Personnel Committee will make a determination of which areas are most crucial to the health and long-term goals of the Department and make a recommendation to the Dean based on the considerations described above.

VII. Selection of Department Chairperson

- A. The chairperson of the Department shall be recommended from among the tenured and tenure track members of the Department faculty, or, in unusual circumstances, from external sources, to serve for a specified term, normally three years. The chair may serve successive terms.

Normally, during the fall semester of the year immediately preceding that in which the term of the chair expires, the Personnel Committee shall consult with the dean's office regarding the advisability of an internal or external search. If the search is to be internal, the chair of the committee will notify, in writing, all Department members of the impending vacancy. All tenured and tenure track faculty are eligible to serve and are encouraged to consider the opportunity to provide leadership to the Department. Interested candidates shall declare their interest in writing to the Personnel Committee within two (2) weeks of notification.

Two weeks following the notification of vacancy, a list of those to be considered shall be distributed to the faculty. A questionnaire, drafted by the Personnel Committee and approved by the Department, will be given to each candidate. The candidates shall have two weeks to respond to the questionnaire, and to place on file with the Personnel Committee an up-to-date curriculum vitae and the completed questionnaire. The questionnaires and curricula vitae shall remain on file in the Department office for one (1) week following the closing date for filing these materials. Members of the Department, as well as the Dean of the College, shall be notified by the Personnel Committee and urged to review these materials during that time.

Within one week following the closing date for inspection of these materials, the chair of the Personnel Committee shall draw lots to determine the order in which candidates shall be interviewed by the Department. These interviews shall take place during the week following determination of order. Within one week following the interviews, the Department shall recommend a chair by secret ballot in the following manner.

The names of all candidates shall appear on the ballot in alphabetical order and one ballot shall be given to each eligible member of the Department. Members shall cast votes for each candidate either affirmative or negative. (An affirmative vote is taken to mean that the voter approves of the candidate as a potential chair; hence, one may wish to vote affirmatively – or negatively – for all the candidates.) Balloting shall be conducted as described in Section I.G. (above) and completed within 48 hours.

Those eligible faculty not physically present due to sabbatical, FMLA, other University-approved leaves of absence, attendance at a professional meeting, or other professional activity will be given an opportunity to vote electronically whenever practicable within the specified timeframe. It shall be the responsibility of the absent faculty member to provide accurate contact information and to respond to communications in a timely manner. The voting body will have the final right to determine when an absent colleague has failed to meet these responsibilities, thus rendering her/his participation impracticable.

After this ballot is cast, the names of all candidates who receive affirmative votes from a majority of the voting members shall be voted on by a second ballot. Balloting shall be completed within 48 hours. Each member shall vote for the candidate of her/his choice or shall abstain. Affirmative votes by a majority of voting members shall be required for election. Abstentions therefore have the same effect as negative votes.

If a second ballot is required, it shall be conducted between the two candidates receiving the largest number of votes, or among three or more candidates if necessitated by a tie vote. If necessary, this process shall be followed by a third ballot. In case of an impasse, i.e., three consecutive ballots in which no candidate receives a majority, the search will be reopened.

If no internal candidates are selected, the Personnel Committee will recommend whether to include external candidates. If such a recommendation is made, and if the Department assents by majority vote, a new chairperson may be sought externally. To be recommended for appointment, the same procedure shall be followed as outlined above for internal candidates.

Recommendations of the Department are subject to approval by the Dean and the Provost.

- B.** The faculty of the Department, excepting the chairperson, shall meet annually during the month of April to discuss the chairperson's performance for the purpose of providing formal feedback from the members of the Department to the chairperson. The discussion shall be based upon the duties of the chairperson as assigned by both the University and the Department. The Personnel Committee shall submit to the chairperson within one week a letter summarizing her/his strengths and weaknesses as enumerated by those in attendance. Within two

weeks of receipt of the letter, the chairperson shall submit a response to the Department in writing. Both documents shall be shared with the Dean in keeping with the *Agreement*.

VIII. Support for Professional Activities

- A.** The Department of Chemistry strongly supports faculty sabbatical leaves and encourages eligible faculty to participate. The Personnel Committee shall evaluate proposals for sabbatical leave on the basis of consistency with university policy, qualification of applicant to complete project, and value of leave to Department, and bring recommendation to the Department. The Department recommendation shall be reached by vote as described in Section I.G. (above).
- B.** The Department of Chemistry strongly supports other types of professional leaves, including those supported by grants and contracts. In order to coordinate the impact of these activities with other Department activities, any person planning to request a professional leave, from all or part of regular teaching duties, is to inform the Department chair of this intention according to the temporal guidelines published for sabbatical leaves. In cases where this is not possible, the chair is to be informed at the time the application is made.

When the professional leave requested is other than a sabbatical leave, the person is to present, in lieu of the material found in a sabbatical application, a letter of intent which must include, as appropriate:

1. a brief synopsis of the study;
 2. the geographical location at which the study is to be carried out;
 3. the source, date, and duration of the requested support;
 4. requested release time;
 5. request for other Department resources; and
 6. an invitation letter from an external agency, if applicable.
- C.** Although untenured faculty are not eligible for sabbatical leaves, they do qualify for support of their activities by the Department. This support includes, but is not limited to, receiving travel funds and use of departmental facilities and monies for research and instructional purposes.

IX. Selection of New Tenure Track Faculty

- A.** Whenever a new tenure track faculty position is to be requested the disciplinary specifications, if any, shall be determined by the tenured and tenure track faculty. The request with rationale shall then be submitted to the Dean.

- B.** The Department Chair shall notify the Personnel Committee as soon as possible if a search for a tenure track position is authorized. The committee shall write a job specification and advertisement for departmental approval. If approved and agreed to by the Dean, Faculty Personnel Services, and the Affirmative Action office, the advertisement shall be placed, and the committee shall receive the applications. The committee shall compose a list of the most qualified applicants and submit these names for departmental action. After review, the tenured and tenure track faculty shall select from the entire pool of applicants those who, with the approval of the Dean and Faculty Personnel Services, shall be invited to campus for interviews. Following completion of the interviews, each candidate will be voted as “acceptable” or “unacceptable” by written ballot. Any candidate who fails to receive “acceptable” votes from a majority of those voting is eliminated from further consideration. The faculty shall select by written majority ballot a candidate from among those voted “acceptable” to be recommended to the Dean (see Section I.G., above). If none of the initially interviewed candidates is found to be acceptable, the search may be continued with additional interviews. The rank and salary offer for the candidate chosen shall be negotiated between the candidate and the Dean in consultation with the Department Chair.