

Department of Anatomy Bylaws

Approved: June 9, 2003

Section I. Introduction

These Bylaws:

1. provide for faculty participation in the Department, in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement (CBA) between the American Association of University Professors – Wright State University Chapter (AAUP/WSU) and the Board of Trustees of Wright State University;
2. are subject to and consistent with the Bylaws of the College of Science and Mathematics;
3. may be amended in accordance with the current CBA;
4. include operational procedures for each departmental committee.

Terms used:

The term ‘bargaining unit faculty’ or ‘BUF’ is defined as those Department of Anatomy faculty included in the bargaining unit as defined in the current CBA.

The term ‘department faculty’ refers to all full-time faculty in the Department of Anatomy (tenured, tenure-track, SOM Continuance non-tenure-track and other non-tenure-track,) at any rank, excluding the Department Chair.

The term SOM-nonBUF is defined as full-time, non-tenure track School of Medicine faculty members who are not included in the bargaining unit as defined in the current CBA.

COSM = College of Science and Mathematics

SOM = School of Medicine

Section II. Faculty Committees

Several standing committees, as described below, will be formed. Committee members and committee chairs will be elected by the departmental faculty, unless otherwise indicated in these bylaws, and will serve for a period of two years. Terms of service will be staggered so that half of the committee members rotate each year. Nominations for committee membership shall be determined through voluntary department faculty participation, where this is feasible. If more than one faculty member wishes to fill an available committee position, that position will be filled by a simple majority vote of the department faculty. If voluntary participation fails to provide the needed number of nominees, the Department Chair will recruit committee nominees using a rotation basis where the faculty member who has the least current department, college and university service is recruited first, and the faculty member with the most current service is recruited last.

Ad hoc committees may be formed as needed.

A. Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC)

Purpose: With respect to the BUF, the PTC makes recommendations concerning Annual Evaluations, promotion and tenure, continuance in the SOM, and obtaining graduate status. PTC makes an annual statement on the cumulative progress of BUF toward promotion and/or tenure, and conducts peer teaching evaluations.

Membership: The committee shall consist of all tenuredBUF and SOM-nonBUF at the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor. The Chair of the PTC shall be elected by majority vote of the PTC members.

B. Faculty Development Committee

Purpose: to recommend means for the professional development and mentoring of probationary BUF to the Department Chair and make recommendations for Professional Development Leave for BUF.

Membership: The committee shall consist of three BUF at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, each with an excellent record in either teaching, research or service. A committee Chair will be elected by the committee members.

C. Graduate Committee:

Purpose: to make recommendations about graduate student admissions, graduate program curricula and academic standards and to review the progress of graduate students.

Membership: The committee shall consist of three departmental faculty with full graduate faculty status, including the Graduate Program Director who shall be Chair of the committee. The Graduate Program Director shall be appointed by the Department Chair.

D. Department Curriculum Committee

Purpose: to make recommendations about new course offerings, changes to current courses and teaching assignments.

Membership: The committee shall consist of three departmental faculty. A committee Chair will be elected by the committee members.

E. Departmental Resources Committee

Purpose: to provide recommendations to the Department Chair concerning priorities for departmental spending, space and other resource utilization.

Membership: The committee shall consist of three departmental faculty. A committee Chair will be elected by the committee members.

Section III. Procedures by which Bargaining Unit Faculty give advice and make recommendations

A. FACULTY APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT AND DISMISSAL

Faculty Appointment: When an open faculty position is to be filled, the BUF shall elect a numerical majority of Search Committee members from among the BUF. The Department Chair will select the remaining members of the Search Committee and select its chair. The department faculty may recommend members of the committee and make recommendations as to departmental needs in the areas of scholarship, teaching and service. These recommendations shall be made between the time a position is authorized and the recruitment advertisement is prepared. The search committee will review applications, rank them, and recommend to the Department Chair, candidates to be interviewed. The Department Chair will invite candidates for interview. Department faculty will be given the opportunity to meet with each candidate, individually or in groups. After the last interview for a faculty position, the departmental faculty will rank the interviewed candidates in a secret ballot at a departmental faculty meeting. The rankings will be summed to provide an overall ranking which will be presented, along with comments explaining the basis of the ranking, including strengths and weaknesses of each candidate, to the Department Chair and Deans. Candidates deemed by the faculty to be unacceptable will also be indicated, along with reasons why the candidate is unacceptable.

Faculty Reappointment: Faculty reappointment from an outside department to this department will only occur after the recommendation of the BUF and SOM nonBUF is sought in a secret ballot, to be taken at a departmental meeting. This recommendation will be presented to the Department Chair and Deans with the reason for the recommendation given (derived from discussion prior to the vote).

Faculty Dismissal: The decision to terminate any untenured Bargaining Unit Faculty member is made by the Deans, who will first consult with the department. The Department Chair should present recommendations for dismissal to the departmental PTC, discussing the reasoning behind these recommendations. The PTC will be allowed full discussion of the dismissal case and will vote, in a secret ballot, on whether or not to recommend dismissal of the probationary faculty. The committee's recommendation must be written, with the vote tallied and majority reasons expressed, and will allow for the expression of minority opinions. The written recommendation is made to the Department Chair and the Deans.

Graduate Faculty Status: The PTC will make recommendations concerning appointment of department faculty to the Graduate Faculty.

B. PROMOTION AND TENURE

1. **The BUF and SOM-nonBUF faculty have an ongoing role in the promotion and tenure process** that includes annual evaluation of a faculty member's cumulative progress toward tenure and/or promotion, mentoring and otherwise facilitating professional development of probationary faculty, and culminating in a recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion.
2. **Criteria for Promotion and Tenure of Bargaining Unit Faculty:**

The primary goals of the Department of Anatomy faculty are to instruct students in the anatomical sciences, to expand knowledge through scholarly activities, and to serve the university and its mission in the community. To accomplish these goals, each member of the faculty must support the mission through teaching, scholarship, and service activities. Faculty achievement in these areas is the criterion by which academic rank is established in this institution

a. **Definition of a Publication for Purposes of Promotion and Tenure**

For purposes of tenure and/or promotion, a publication is defined as the candidate being first or corresponding author of a peer-reviewed paper reporting original scientific research, published or in press, in a journal listed in the ISI Science Citation Index. In recognition of exceptional scholarship, one (and only one) paper published in a journal having an ISI Journal Citation Reports Impact Factor ≥ 15 will be counted as two publications for promotion to each rank.

b. **Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

The following are the minimum requirements for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. A candidate may fulfill these requirements at any time during the probationary period.

Teaching

The faculty member has met assigned teaching responsibilities in SOM, graduate and/or undergraduate classes (outside of any unforeseen illness or emergency).

and

The faculty member has participated in department graduate student training or Biomedical Sciences Ph.D. student training through special projects and techniques courses, lab rotations, thesis or dissertation direction, scholarly project direction or comprehensive examination administration.

and

Peer evaluation of teaching indicates any previous major problems in teaching have been resolved or show increasing improvement to an effective level and that the faculty member has kept course content current and has strived to improve presentation and other teaching materials.

and

Student evaluations have been positive overall and any problems have been resolved or are showing improvement.

Scholarly Activity - activities performed while at the Assistant Professor level

Publications

The faculty member has produced at least four peer reviewed research publications as indicated in III.B.2.a above, based on scholarly activity performed during the probationary period at Wright State University.

and

The faculty member makes a positive contribution to the field, confirmed by external letters of support.

and

The faculty member has been an author on two or more published abstracts presented by that faculty member or by his or her student or trainee at national meetings in the faculty member's field based on research performed during the probationary period at Wright State University.

Research Grants

The faculty member, as PI, has received funding on a major peer-reviewed grant from a nationally competitive external funding source with \geq \$200,000 in direct costs.

or

The faculty member, as PI, has received funding on multiple peer-reviewed external grants with combined direct costs of \geq \$200,000 and has continued to submit applications for major grants to nationally competitive funding sources.

or

The faculty member, as PI, has received funding of peer-reviewed external grants with combined direct costs \geq \$100,000 from external sources (excluding non-competitive Ohio Board of Regents funds) *and* has tried to attain, as PI, the \$200,000 level throughout the probationary period *and* has received, as PI, a review score in the top 30th percentile from the NIH or other nationally competitive funding program which provides percentile scores *and* has a pending application for a \geq \$200,000 peer-reviewed nationally competitive grant at the time of application for promotion and tenure.

Other Activities

The faculty member has demonstrated involvement in the scientific community and has achieved one or more of the following:

Extramural ad-hoc grant review for a nationally competitive research-funding agency

Nationally or regionally competitive research grant review study section member

Editor or Editorial Board member of a scholarly research journal

Ad-hoc manuscript review for a scholarly journal of national or international distribution

Officer or board member of an extramural scientific society

Invited extramural seminar presentation at a university or research institute

National meeting workshop presentation

National meeting session chair

Organizer of a major scientific research meeting

Sponsored fellowship award to students or researchers doing work in faculty member's lab

Consultation for a funded extramural project external to Wright State University or for a corporation

Internal or External award in recognition of scholarly activity

Service

The faculty member has regularly attended departmental faculty meetings and contributes to the discussion at these meetings

and

The faculty member has served on an average of at least one departmental committee per year of the probationary period, excluding the first academic year.

and

The faculty member has served on at least one COSM, SOM or university committee.

and

The faculty member has participated in at least one teaching or research community outreach program or has provided other significant service to the department, college or university.

c. Criteria for Granting of Tenure to Faculty Appointed, With a Probationary Period, at the Associate Professor Level

Teaching

The criteria for teaching are the same as those described for promotion and tenure to the Associate Professor level.

Scholarship

The expectations for scholarship are the same as those described for promotion and tenure at the Associate Professor level except that evidence of scholarship during the past 5 years will be considered, both during the probationary period at WSU and during previous appointments as a tenure track faculty member or as an independently funded research faculty member. Publication and funding pursuits, however, must be in evidence during the probationary period at WSU. The candidate must have been the first author or corresponding author of at least two peer-reviewed papers based on scholarly activity performed at Wright State during the probationary period and present evidence of having obtained or actively sought extramural funding from extramural nationally competitive funding sources during this period.

Service

The criteria for service are the same as those described for promotion and tenure to the Associate Professor level except that service activities during the past 5 years, both during the probationary period at WSU and during previous appointments, will be considered.

d. Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor with Tenure

The following are the minimum requirements for promotion to Professor. A candidate may fulfill these requirements at any time subsequent to promotion to Associate Professor.

Teaching

The faculty member has met assigned teaching responsibilities in SOM, graduate and/or undergraduate classes (outside of any unforeseen illness or emergency).

and

The faculty member has participated in department graduate student training or Biomedical Sciences Ph.D. student training through special projects and techniques courses, lab rotations, thesis or dissertation direction, scholarly project direction or comprehensive examination administration.

and

Peer evaluation of teaching indicates a continuing high quality of teaching.

and

The written comments from student evaluations have been positive overall.

Faculty hired at the rank of Professor, with a probationary period for tenure, can meet these requirements by documenting teaching activities during prior appointment at another institution.

Scholarly Activity

Publications

The faculty member produced (published or in press) a total of 15 peer-reviewed publications peer reviewed research publications as indicated in III.B.2.a above, based on research performed at Wright State University. Of these 15 papers, 8 papers must have been published since promotion to Associate Professor (i.e., accepted after April 1 of the year of promotion to Associate Professor) *and* two of these papers must have been published within the three years preceding application for promotion to Professor.

and

The faculty member makes a positive contribution to the field, confirmed by external letters of support.

and

The faculty member has been author on at least 8 published abstracts presented by that faculty member or by his or her student or trainee at national meetings in the faculty member's field.

For a faculty member hired at the rank of Associate Professor with tenure or granted tenure after a probationary period, the total number of papers required from work performed at Wright State University will be reduced by the number of papers from previous appointments which were counted in meeting the requirements for tenure.

For faculty hired at the rank of Professor, with a probationary period for tenure, requirements for total number of papers published and number of papers published since promotion to Associate Professor may be met by scholarly activity performed during previous appointments. Publication, however, must be in evidence during the probationary period at WSU. The candidate must have been the first author or corresponding author of at least two peer-reviewed papers based on scholarly activity performed at Wright State during the probationary period.

Grants

The faculty member has maintained a track record of success in external funding (as PI) through external competitive grants resulting in funding for at least three years with direct costs \geq \$200,000. None of these grants shall have been used to fulfill the requirements for promotion to Associate Professor, and all funding shall have been awarded after April 1 of the year of promotion to Associate Professor. These research grant criteria are fulfilled upon award and acceptance of such research grants. No-cost extensions of an originally qualifying award shall not count toward meeting the 3 years of required funding.

For faculty hired at the rank of Professor, with a probationary period for tenure, these funding requirements may be fulfilled by grants received during prior appointments. Funding pursuits, however, must be in evidence during the probationary period at WSU. The candidate must have obtained or actively sought extramural funding from extramural nationally competitive funding sources during this period.

Other Activities

The faculty member has achieved a national/international reputation in the scientific community by demonstrating two or more of the following activities after promotion to Associate Professor with tenure and while at Wright State University:

Extramural ad-hoc grant review for a nationally competitive research-funding agency

Nationally or regionally competitive research grant review study section member

Editor or Editorial Board member of a scholarly research journal

Four or more ad-hoc manuscripts reviewed for scholarly journals of national or international distribution

Officer or board member of an extramural national scholarly society

Gordon Research Conference (or research conference of similar stature)
invited speaker

National Society meeting or equivalent workshop presentation

National or international Society scholarly meeting symposium chair

Organizer of a major national or international scholarly meeting or
symposium

Scholarly consultant to a nationally-recognized company, corporation, or
other commercial entity.

National research award (e.g. the Lasker Award, Women in Neuroscience
Achievement Award, Biophysical Society Cole or Dayhoff Award)

For faculty hired at the rank of Professor, with a probationary period for tenure, this
requirement can be fulfilled with achievements during prior appointments.

Service

The faculty member has regularly attended departmental faculty meetings and
contributes to the discussion at these meetings

and

The faculty member has provided leadership to departmental committees.

and

The faculty member has served on several COSM, SOM or university committees (at
least one per year on average) and provided leadership for at least one of those
committees.

and

The faculty member has participated in several teaching or research community
outreach programs including media presentations and quotations or has provided
other significant service to the department, college or university.

For faculty hired rank of Professor, with a probationary period for tenure, this
requirement can be fulfilled with achievements during prior appointments.

3. Annual Evaluation of Progress Toward Promotion and Tenure

The Annual Statement of Progress Toward Tenure and/or Promotion: Annual evaluation of progress toward tenure and/or promotion of the faculty by the PTC is separate from the Annual Evaluation by the Department Chair. Each bargaining unit faculty member will submit an updated curriculum vitae, a summary of his/her accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and service to the PTC and the Department Chair as outlined in section III.C.2.c. (Submission of Materials for Annual Evaluation). For bargaining unit faculty below the rank of Tenured Professor, these activity summaries, along with the peer evaluation of teaching (Section III.C.2.b.) will be used by the PTC to evaluate progress toward promotion and tenure. Faculty at the rank of tenured Associate Professor may request in writing to be evaluated for progress toward promotion only every three years. Based on the submitted summary of accomplishments and peer teaching evaluation, as well as the criteria for promotion, the PTC will provide the faculty member and the Department Chair a statement summarizing his/her progress toward tenure and/or promotion. These reports shall be delivered to the faculty members and Department Chair by March 1.

4. **Professional Development and Mentoring:**

If the PTC identifies an area in which a BUF needs to improve, such as teaching or grantsmanship, the Faculty Development Committee will be charged with meeting with the faculty member and providing some suggestions which should result in improvement in that area. A report of these interactions with a summary of suggestions made should be sent to the PTC and Department Chair. Members of the committee will also make a recommendation to the Department Chair concerning any BUF seeking professional development leave from the department, particularly noting if the leave would allow the faculty member to focus on an area previously shown to need improvement or cultivate a particular strength of the faculty member.

5. **Recommendation for Promotion and Tenure:**

a. **Submission of materials**

The process for granting promotion and/or tenure to a bargaining unit faculty member must be initiated either by the department PTC or by the faculty member. The member must submit a written request to the Department Chair, with a copy to the department PTC, by October 1. The candidate must then submit a complete promotion and tenure document, consistent with that described in the CBA to the department PTC and to the Department Chair by the deadline established by the college. The candidate and the PTC shall establish a list of individuals from whom letters of evaluation will be solicited, and the PTC is responsible for soliciting the evaluations from that list. At least three letters of evaluation, from peers external to the university, and who are not present or past collaborators or mentors of the candidate, are required for all promotion and/or tenure decisions.

b. **Tenure-track Assistant Professor to Tenured Associate Professor:**

The PTC is charged with making recommendations for promotion and tenure. If there are not at least four tenured BUF at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, the candidate and PTC will develop a list of mutually agreeable tenured BUF at this rank in other departments who would be qualified to evaluate the candidate. The PTC will

appoint additional members from this list to bring the total of tenured BUFS to four. The department PTC will review the candidate's promotion file including the external letters of evaluation (which shall be used to show a positive contribution to the field) and any internal letters of support. The chair of the PTC will summarize the reasoning behind the committee's recommendation in a written letter. The recommendation shall include an evaluation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness based in part on peer evaluation. The letter will include the finalized results of a secret ballot. Balloting will occur, with further discussion between balloting, until identical results are obtained in two successive ballots, at which time the results are finalized. Faculty will be expected to abstain from voting only if: (1) there is a conflict of interest, or (2) the faculty member is serving on the COSM and University promotion and tenure committees, such that voting in the department would allow him or her more than two votes on the same person. The recommendations of the PTC should normally be consistent with the committee's annual written evaluations. If the recommendation is not consistent with these evaluations, then the committee shall explain the reasoning for this difference in the written recommendation. The PTC will review and approve the letter summarizing the vote and the reasoning for the vote before it is added to the promotion and tenure file. The Department Chair's letter will also be added to the promotion and tenure file at this time. The candidate must be informed in writing of the recommendation of the department PTC 10 days before the file is submitted to the COSM Promotion and Tenure Committee and SOM Faculty Development Committee, and will be permitted to add a rebuttal letter to the file.

c. Tenured Associate Professor to Tenured Professor:

The procedures for voting are similar to that described for tenure-track Assistant Professor to tenured Associate Professor, above, but the group of faculty voting will be restricted to those who hold the rank of Professor. If the PTC Chair is not a Professor, the Professors will select a chair from among themselves. If there are not at least three tenured BUF at the rank of Professor, the PTC, after consulting the candidate, will develop a list of tenured bargaining unit faculty at this rank in other departments who would be qualified to evaluate the candidate. The PTC will appoint additional members from this list to bring the total of tenured BUFS to three. The procedure is the same in all other regards as that described for promotion to Associate Professor.

C. CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION OF BARGAINING UNIT FACULTY BY THE CHAIR

1. Evaluation Criteria:

a. Relative Weights For Teaching, Scholarship and Service

The department recognizes that faculty members devote different proportions of their overall effort to teaching, scholarship and service. Weights (%) for each category of activity will be determined by an outcome-based algorithm in which the net resultant score is maximized. Ranges of weights for teaching, scholarship and service shall be:

Teaching: 30 - 60%

Scholarship: 30 - 60%

Service: 10 - 20%

This system would apply to all BUF unless the Department Chair assigns a different weighting to allow for:

1. unique work assignments that differ from those of other BUF;
2. discipline pursuant to Article 14 of the CBA; or
3. correction of a pattern of substandard performance extending more than one year.

b. **Criteria for Teaching:**

Teaching for BUF will be evaluated annually. The window of evaluation will be one year in duration; that is, bargaining unit faculty are evaluated annually for the totality of teaching activities over the immediate past calendar year.

The rating values (0 - 4), categories, and the associated criteria for each one-year evaluation period are:

0 = “unsatisfactory” - There are significant deficiencies in teaching, which are confirmed by student and peer evaluations. The faculty member misses scheduled teaching sessions, is unprepared for the teaching assignment, and/or teaches in a completely unorganized manner.

1 = “adequate”: The faculty member is prepared for his/her teaching, but student and peer evaluations suggest there is evidence of a lack of communication between the teacher and student, problems with currency of content, or ineffective use of teaching materials. Efforts were made to improve teaching effectiveness.

2 = “meritorious”: The faculty member teaches in a manner which allows the students to be fully engaged with the subjects presented, as evidenced by departmental or other peer review sources including course directors. Material is up-to-date (as appropriate to the course). Faculty member consistently works to improve teaching effectiveness. Both student and peer evaluations are positive with only minor criticisms.

3 = “outstanding”: Same criteria as “meritorious” above and accomplished one item from the following list

Major advisor for a BMS student or Anatomy Masters student (thesis option) or member of three or more Masters or BMS thesis committees

Course director for an Anatomy Masters “core course” or BMS “core course”

Course director for a team-taught School of Medicine course

Development of course materials (print resources such as lab manuals and note packs, and electronic media such as computer programs or web sites) that support the class. This specifically refers to new materials or significant revision of materials, beyond that typically done to maintain currency in content. These materials are developed specifically for classes at WSU.

Internal or External award in recognition of teaching

Other activities which significantly contribute to the teaching mission of the department, college, school or university. This includes, but is not limited to: teaching resident review courses; teaching Continuing Medical Education courses; more than the typical involvement in graduate seminar, special topics, techniques course and scholarly projects.

4 = “extraordinary”: Same criteria as “meritorious” above plus two of the items listed above under “outstanding”.

c. **Criteria for Scholarly Activity**

Scholarly activity will be evaluated annually. The window of evaluation will be two years in duration; that is, bargaining unit faculty are evaluated annually for the totality of scholarly activity over the immediate past two years. Assistant Professors, during the first two years of employment at Wright State University, may use accomplishments during 1-2 years at the previous position (i.e., post-doctoral and faculty positions) for scholarly activity evaluation.

Definition of a Publication for Purposes of Annual Evaluation

The department faculty places high value on the establishment of Assistant Professors as productive independent researchers. In accord with the requirements for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, publication is defined for purposes of Annual Evaluation as being first or corresponding author of a peer-reviewed paper reporting original scientific research, published or in press, in a journal listed in the ISI Science Citation Index. In recognition of exceptional scholarship, any paper published in a journal having an ISI Journal Citation Reports Impact Factor of ≥ 15 will be counted as two publications. In recognition of the value of collaborative work, papers on which the faculty member is an author, but not first or corresponding author will count as 1/2 of a publication.

In the annual evaluation of faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, who were hired and granted tenure before January 2003, publication is defined as authorship of any one of the following:

1. a peer-reviewed paper reporting original scholarly activity in a scientific discipline or medical education published in a journal listed in the ISI Science Citation Index. In recognition of exceptional scholarship, any paper published in a journal having an ISI Journal Citation Reports Impact Factor of ≥ 15 will be counted as two publications.
2. an externally published textbook or lab manual
3. a significant body of externally distributed educational resources such as photos, videos, animations and similar media
4. a significant externally distributed computer-based instructional program

For categories 1, 2, 3 or 4, in recognition of the value of collaborative work, papers and educational print publications on which the faculty member is an author, but not first or corresponding author will count as 1/2 of a publication.

To be credited for categories 3 or 4, the faculty member shall submit, to both the department chair and the P&T committee, the body of work along with a statement describing the effort represented by the work, evidence of external distribution (such as web server access data or CD distribution list), any peer review or user feedback available and the results of any educational assessment. The chair and the P&T committee will independently assess the work based on the criteria below. The P&T committee will recommend to the department chair its assessment of this work for the faculty member's annual evaluation.

- If the body of work is substantial and of high quality, this would normally be equivalent to one publication.
- If the work described above has been utilized by external academic departments with positive feedback on the educational value of the work, this would normally count as an additional publication, but credit for the additional publication may be awarded some time later when documentation of external use and positive feedback is complete.
- If the work described in the first bullet has been assessed by educational research and demonstrated to have a significant positive effect on student learning, this would also normally be equivalent to an additional publication, but credit for the additional publication may be awarded some time later, when the assessment is complete. If the results of this assessment are later published in a traditional publication, this publication equivalent will no longer apply (the same work may only be credited once for a publication).
- For multi-author works, the department chair and the P&T committee will independently consider the relative effort of each author and will award publication equivalents proportionately.

Thus, the body of work may count as one publication in itself, the results of the educational assessment may count as a second publication, and the use by external departments with positive feedback may count as a third publication. If the work is not deemed of sufficient quantity to merit a publication, it may be resubmitted for consideration in a subsequent year.

For traditional publications, the date of manuscript acceptance will be used to determine the year of publication. For software and electronic media, the release date (the date when the material becomes externally available) shall be used to determine the year of publication.

Rating system

The rating values (0 - 4), categories, and the associated criteria for each two-year evaluation period are:

0 = “unsatisfactory”: Insufficient to achieve “adequate” level.

1 = “adequate”: The faculty member had one eligible publication *or* one initial submission or resubmission with improved score (if applicable) of a grant proposal to an external or internal source as PI or CoPI.

2 = “meritorious”: The faculty member had one publication *and* submission or resubmission with improved score (if applicable) of a grant proposal to an external source as PI or has a funded external grant *and* accomplished one item from the following list:

Extramural ad-hoc grant review for a nationally competitive research-funding agency

Nationally or regionally competitive research grant review study section member

Editor or Editorial Board member of a scholarly research journal

Ad-hoc manuscript review for a scholarly journal of national or international distribution

Officer or board member of an extramural scientific society

Invited extramural seminar presentation at a university or research institute

National meeting workshop presentation

National meeting session chair

Organizer of a major scientific research meeting

Consultation for a funded extramural project external to Wright State University or for a corporation

Internal or External award in recognition of scholarly activity

Authorship of two or more abstracts presented at national meetings

Authorship of a peer-reviewed scholarly review article or book chapter

3 = “outstanding”: The faculty member had two or more publications *and* was funded for one of the two years from an external source as PI or CoPI *and* accomplished two items listed under “meritorious”.

4 = “extraordinary”: The faculty member had at least three publications and continuous funding from an extramural source, as PI or CoPI, for each of the two years and three items listed under “outstanding”.

d. **Criteria for Service**

Service merit for Bargaining Unit Faculty will be evaluated annually. The window of evaluation will be two years in duration; that is, bargaining unit faculty are evaluated annually for the totality of service activities over the immediate past two years. For probationary faculty, service in the first year will be evaluated over that single year; service in the second year will be evaluated over the past two years.

Certain committee service is recognized to involve a major time commitment. Service on the following committees will be considered the equivalent of service on two committees:

Lab. Animal Care & Use Committee
SOM Admissions Committee
SOM or COSM Faculty Development Committee
SOM Faculty Curriculum Committee
WSU Institutional Review Board

The rating values (0 - 4), categories, and the associated criteria for each two-year evaluation period are:

0 = “unsatisfactory” : The faculty member provides little or no evidence of service performed for the department, COSM, SOM, University, or the profession.

1 = “adequate”: The faculty member participates in service at the department level by serving on a committee and attending department business or faculty meetings.

2 = “meritorious”: The faculty member regularly participates in service at the department level and serves on at least one committee at the college or university level.

3 = “outstanding”: The faculty member demonstrates a high level of service at the department, college, or university levels, or outside the university. For probationary faculty, this service should include at least one from the following list and for tenured faculty, at least two from the following list:

Service on two or more committees at the college or university level

Service as chair of a college or university level committee

Service in faculty governance (e.g. Faculty Senate)

Participation in teaching or research programs for pre-college students (such as Horizons in Medicine, Mini-Med School, Summer Science Apprenticeship Program, etc.)

Service in community outreach - community service project, speaker for community group, or other activity in which you represent the department, college, school, university, or profession.

Directorship of the department graduate program

Directorship of the Anatomical Gift Program

Internal or External award in recognition of service

Other activities which significantly contribute to the service mission of the department, COSM, SOM or university. This includes, but is not limited to: more than the usual level of service on graduate student advisory committees; maintenance of shared departmental equipment or resources.

4 = “extraordinary”: The faculty member demonstrates an especially high level of service at the department, college, or university levels, or outside the university. For probationary faculty, this service should include at least two of the items listed for “outstanding” and for tenured faculty, at least four of those items.

2. Procedures for Annual Evaluation.

a. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Bargaining Unit Faculty will be provided a summary of the numerical and narrative portions of their student evaluations each quarter. In addition, BUF may by request examine these student evaluation documents (University Student Evaluation of Instruction forms) kept by the department.

b. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The departmental PTC will be responsible for the peer evaluation of teaching. Peer evaluation of all BUF shall be conducted each year by the PTC. Evaluations are to be conducted during a course in which the faculty member has a major teaching and/or course directorship responsibility. If the faculty member’s teaching role in that course involves both lecture and laboratory or small group teaching, evaluations should involve both venues. Evaluations are to be conducted separately by two members of the PTC. If

combined lecture and laboratory/small group teaching are to be evaluated, each venue may be evaluated by a single evaluator. The assignment of evaluators should rotate among the faculty so that faculty are not evaluated by the same peers every year. When evaluating faculty in a team taught course, faculty should be evaluated only on those items over which they have direct control. Prior to classroom visits, the faculty member should submit to the PTC any materials required for peer teaching evaluation such as course syllabi or handout materials and provide access to any online course materials.

Evaluations will use the form presented in the Appendix. The evaluation will rate the faculty member on a wide variety of criteria related to both teaching materials and classroom/ laboratory performance. In addition to a 5-point scale for each item, specific comments are encouraged. In particular, if an item is rated below 3, a statement describing the deficiency will be included. A summary narrative will be submitted along with the evaluation form. This written statement (signed by the evaluation team) should outline the faculty member's role in the course and emphasize the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses in each teaching venue.

Once all of the faculty members have been evaluated, the PTC will meet, review the rating forms and write a summary of each faculty member's teaching performance, noting strengths and weaknesses. As each member of the PTC is reviewed, they will excuse themselves from the meeting. The summary statement, along with the completed peer evaluation forms will comprise the peer teaching evaluation used for promotion and tenure recommendations and the Annual Merit Review by the Department Chair. The peer evaluation process shall be complete by February 1. A report of each faculty member's peer evaluation will be forwarded to the Department Chair, and will be used for the PTC annual evaluation of progress toward promotion and tenure and for the Department Chair's Annual Evaluation.

c. Submission of Materials for Annual Evaluation.

Using a form provided by the Department Chair, each BUF will submit to the Department Chair and the PTC, by February 1, a summary of his/her accomplishments during the preceding two years (January 1 to December 31st) in scholarship and service and for the preceding year in teaching. Faculty members may submit other materials (not called for on the form) that pertain to evaluation criteria, and these will be considered by the Department Chair and PTC. The PTC or the Department Chairman request additional materials or information.

d. Evaluation Reports

For each BUF, the PTC will recommend a rating value with justification using the evaluation criteria; these recommendations are to the Department Chair. They will be sent to the Department Chair with a copy to the individual BUF. The Department Chair will assign integer rankings for teaching, scholarly activity and service based on the stated criteria and after considering the PTC recommendations. From these rankings, an overall ranking will be calculated using an outcome-based algorithm in which the net

resultant score is maximized. The Department Chair will inform the BUF of their rankings and the reasons for these rankings. Prior to writing the annual evaluation, the Department Chair may hold individual meetings with any or all faculty to discuss their professional activities and their activity report. Such a meeting would be voluntary on the part of the BUF.

If the faculty member agrees with the evaluation, he/she will sign a copy of the evaluation and return it to the Department Chair. If the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, he/she may prepare a rebuttal, which should be submitted to the Department Chair. This rebuttal must be attached to the evaluation and forwarded to all entities which will see the annual evaluation. The faculty member may also avail him/herself of the grievance procedure if the criteria for evaluation in these bylaws are not used.

D. Teaching Assignments and Class Schedules

The Department Curriculum Committee will review all faculty requests for their preferred teaching assignments and class schedules. The faculty will work to accommodate the majority of the requests in developing their recommendation, taking into consideration faculty qualifications and seniority as well as needs of the curriculum, and forward their written recommendations for teaching assignments and class schedules to the Department Chair at least six months in advance of the scheduled classes.

If a faculty member wishes to teach an overload course, he/she should so indicate in writing to the Department Curriculum Committee, identifying the course or courses which he/she wishes to teach. The Department Curriculum Committee will make recommendations to the Department Chair about such requests for overload teaching and how it would impact the faculty member's research program.

E. Graduate Curriculum and Academic Standards

The Graduate Committee will review all proposed new department graduate courses and suggested modifications to existing graduate courses. The academic standards for admission into the department's graduate programs and courses will be developed by the Graduate Committee for recommendation to the Department Chair and appropriate College and Graduate School committees.

F. Undergraduate Curriculum

The Department Curriculum committee will make recommendations concerning new undergraduate course offerings and modifications to existing undergraduate courses.

G. Advice given by Departmental Faculty in Naming of the Department Chair

The Deans of the COSM and SOM formulate and administer the search committee. Normally, at least half of the committee membership will be chosen by Anatomy Department BUF. The Deans appoint the committee chair. Candidates selected for an interview will meet with available Anatomy department faculty. The department faculty will provide the Deans with a written recommendation for the naming of a Chair. This recommendation will include the faculty's ranking of possible candidates

for Chair with a written reason for the ranking. Those candidates whom the faculty find absolutely unacceptable at any level may be so indicated.

H. Faculty Involvement in the Review of the Department Chair

When the Department Chair is to be formally reviewed pursuant to the CBA, the department faculty may meet and comment on the process of their involvement in the Chair review. These will be presented as recommendations to the COSM and SOM Deans. The Deans formulate and administer the review. When the entire review is completed, each Bargaining Unit Faculty will receive a copy of the final report.

I. Faculty Recommendations for Departmental Resource Allocation

Annually, the Departmental Resources Committee will request from the university copies of all year-end reports of departmental accounts. All recommendations issued by this committee will be shared with the department faculty and the Department Chair.

Annually, prior to the beginning of the winter quarter, the Departmental Resource Committee will:

1. Review the distribution and disbursement of department funds (past and anticipated)
2. Assess the extent to which the previous year's committee recommendations were followed
3. Seek suggestions and comments from the department faculty at large concerning disbursement of department funds, allocation of space and use of other department resources such as shared equipment.
4. Make recommendations to the Department Chair for the allocation of department funds, space and other resources for the coming year. Department faculty shall receive copies of all such recommendations.

J. Issues Affecting the Department:

Issues which affect the department will be presented by the Department Chair and by faculty members to the faculty at regularly scheduled departmental faculty meetings, so that the recommendations or advice of the departmental faculty may be heard by the Department Chair. Faculty may give advice or make recommendations by a majority vote of department faculty attending, except on issues where this would be in conflict with the CBA.

Section IV. Procedures for Departmental Meetings

A. Calling Meetings and Setting Agendas.

A Departmental Meeting may be called by the Department Chair or by the chair of a departmental committee (such as Promotion & Tenure Committee) or by petition of one-third of all department faculty members or of one-third of all BUFs. Except in special circumstances, the individual(s) calling the meeting will announce the purpose of the meeting and call for any additional agenda items from the department faculty at least one week before the meeting. Faculty requested items will be added to the agenda or the agenda shall contain a standard item titled "Faculty Issues" in which faculty or the

Department Chair may bring up issues of concern at the meeting. The Department Chair may, but need not, attend meetings that he/she didn't call.

B. Voting at Departmental Meetings.

A simple majority of the department faculty will constitute a quorum. All department faculty members will have one vote at a departmental meeting. Voting will be open response unless a faculty member or the Department Chair requests that the voting for a particular issue use secret ballots.

Section V. Review and Amendment of Department Bylaws

The department bylaws will, at minimum, be reviewed whenever a new collective bargaining agreement between the University and WSU-AAUP becomes effective. A review will also be instituted whenever a majority of the BUF request, by vote, an interim review. Any amendments resulting from a review of the bylaws are subject to the approval process specified in the CBA.

Appendix

Peer Evaluation Criteria

The following Statements will be rated on a 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree). An option of 'Not Applicable' will be included. This option should be used for example in a team-taught course, for items over which only the course director has control

Instructor organization:

The instructor is prepared and organized for class.

The instructor is knowledgeable about the content to be covered.

Learning goals, objectives and requirements of the class are stated in distributed notes or at the beginning of class.

The instructor uses class time effectively.

Content:

The instructor's statements are knowledgeable and accurate to the standards of the field.

The content presented is at the appropriate level for the class.

Basic and clinical science information is appropriate for the class.

Presentation skills:

The instructor is enthusiastic about the subject matter.

The instructor effectively explains difficult concepts.

The pace of the presentation is appropriate for the content.

Rapport with students:

The instructor effectively deals with student's concerns.

The instructor provides timely and adequate feedback to students.

The instructor encourages student questions.

The instructor effectively handles student's questions.

The instructor provides the opportunity for active participation where appropriate.

The instructor maintains a positive learning environment.

Instructional strategies and materials:

The instructor uses presentation slides, overheads, etc. appropriate for the content.

The presentation materials are easy to see and read.

The use of presentation materials is at an appropriate pace for comprehension.

The instructor uses models or other physical demonstration where appropriate.

As appropriate, the instructor makes class presentation materials available to the students via handouts, class notes or online.

The instructor uses computer-aided instructional resources that are appropriate for the course content and level.

The instructor uses computer-aided instructional resources effectively.

Class note packs or handouts are correlated with the presentation in terms of organization and content.

Picture and diagrams in notes or handouts are legible and comprehensible.