

# Department of Biological Sciences Bylaws

Approved: January 27, 2003

## **SECTION 1. 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 Wright State University.
2. are subject to and consistent with the Bylaws of the College of Science and Mathematics.
3. may be amended in accord with the CBA.

## **SECTION 2. DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE STRUCTURE**

### **2.1. Definition of voting members of the Department.**

Faculty recommendations for the governance of the Department will be conducted by all tenure-track and tenured faculty who are in the bargaining unit (Bargaining Unit Faculty=BUF) plus certain additional individuals. These additional individuals have substantial administrative (as director of a Program within the Department) or teaching (as Lecturer) duties in the Department and a fulltime position at Wright State University. They will be accepted annually (from start of fall quarter to start of fall quarter) as voting members by majority vote of all BUF present at a departmental meeting. These individuals can request that they be added to the list of voting faculty members or may be nominated by a BUF. They will have full voting rights on Departmental business except as noted below (the primary exceptions being matters of promotion, tenure, evaluation of BUF, and hiring). The Departmental Chair is excluded from all voting. For the rest of this document, "Department" will refer to BUF, these additional voting individuals, and the Departmental Chair.

### **2.2. Appointment of committee members**

The Faculty Development Committee (see below) will consist of all tenured BUF in the Department. Volunteers will fill other committees. The Department Chair also may appoint individuals, with their consent, to fill or balance committees (other than FDC). If several individuals wish to chair a committee the chair will be selected by majority vote of the Department members present at a scheduled faculty meeting when consistent with the CBA. Committee assignments will be made during spring quarter and will be for the following academic year.

### **2.3. Enactment of committee recommendations**

Committees are entitled to make most recommendations related to their purview, unless otherwise indicated in the CBA, without requesting input from the whole Department. Specific exceptions are given below. "Majority vote of the Department" means a majority vote of Departmental members present at a meeting in which the item is submitted for approval.

## **2.4. Committees and responsibilities**

### **2.4.1. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (FDC)**

This committee is concerned with matters of promotion and tenure, annual reviews of cumulative progress toward promotion, and professional development leaves. Because of the importance of these matters, they will be discussed in length later (Section 4). Note that this committee serves the role of the Promotion and Tenure Committee mentioned in the CBA.

### **2.4.2. UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE**

This committee is concerned with making recommendations about matters concerning undergraduate education, such as new course proposals, changes to the Department's undergraduate curriculum, and degree requirements for the different majors and tracks within the Department. Because of the importance of these three factors, majority vote of the Department is required for their recommendation. This committee considers other matters concerning undergraduate education. For example, it evaluates the use of placement tests.

### **2.4.3. GRADUATE COMMITTEE**

This committee is concerned with making recommendations about admitting graduate students, assigning them a teaching assistantship, allocating funds to support graduate travel or research, approving new graduate courses or curricula, monitoring the progress and other matters pertaining to graduate students. Recommendation of new courses or curricula requires majority vote of the Department. Members of this committee should be full members of the graduate faculty.

### **2.4.4. SEMINAR COMMITTEE**

This committee recommends speakers for a Departmental seminar series and organizes Departmental research presentations.

### **2.4.5. BIOLOGY PRESERVE COMMITTEE**

This committee provides advice to the Department Chair, to the Department and to the rest of the University on matters concerning the natural areas on campus, especially areas used for teaching and research.

### **2.4.6. GREENHOUSE COMMITTEE**

This committee advises the Department Chair on research and teaching operations in the Greenhouse.

### **2.4.7. LIBRARY COMMITTEE or REPRESENTATIVE**

This committee or representative serves as a liaison between the Department and the University libraries.

### **2.4.8. HONORS AND SCHOLARSHIPS COMMITTEE**

This committee makes recommendations about the various WSU honors programs as they affect our majors. It evaluates proposals and theses for Departmental honors. It also provides advice in distributing scholarship money.

#### 2.4.9. COMPUTER COMMITTEE

This committee makes recommendations about the use of the computer room located in the Biological Sciences building and replacement of equipment there. It also recommends how university funds for computers may be equitably distributed within the Department.

#### 2.4.10. SPACE AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

This committee advises the Department Chair on issues related to room use and major, shared equipment within the Department.

#### 2.4.11. PETITIONS COMMITTEE

This committee reviews and makes recommendations about petitions in which the student requests exceptions to departmental undergraduate requirements.

#### 2.4.12. MICROSCOPE COMMITTEE

This committee gives advice to the Department Chair on issues related to microscopes in the Department.

#### 2.4.13. EXERCISE BIOLOGY COMMITTEE

This committee gives advice to the Department Chair on issues related to the exercise biology program in the Department.

### **SECTION 3. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS BY DEPARTMENT CHAIR**

#### **3.1. Overview**

Faculty will be evaluated annually by the Department Chair based on the criteria given below. By the end of January, each BUF will submit to the Department Chair and the Chair of the FDC an "Activity Report," developed and circulated by the Department Chair, summarizing activity in teaching, scholarship, and service during the preceding calendar year. The FDC or Department Chair may request or the BUF member may submit additional information.

The Department Chair will rate service, teaching and research as described in the CBA. A maximizing algorithm will be used to assign weights within the following limits: teaching 30-50%, research 30-50%, and service 5-25%, with the total being 100%. The Chair may assign other weightings for faculty who formally buy out their teaching obligations through grant funds, who are on sabbatical, or who have unique work assignments that differ from those of other BUF. The chair may also depart from the standard weights and algorithm to allow for discipline pursuant to the CBA or to correct a pattern of substandard performance extending more than one year.

The criteria to be used by the Department Chair for the three areas of responsibility are given below. The categories for each area will be converted into an integer using the following equivalencies: 4="extraordinary," 3="outstanding," 2="meritorious," 1="adequate," and 0="unsatisfactory."

### **3.2. Research and Scholarship**

Scholarship and research contributions will be rated using publications, funding, and presentations. Publications may include scholarly books. The faculty member should explain whether a given book should count as primarily scholarship or primarily teaching or a combination of both. Both the quality and quantity of outputs determine the individual's rating each year. Some quantities are listed below as guidelines. However, qualitative assessment of an individual's accomplishments in order to determine a best fit rating will be expected for individuals who exceed some of the criteria for a given level but do not meet others.

#### *Extraordinary*

Extraordinary research activity can be documented through 3 or more peer-reviewed publications; new or continuing extramural, peer-reviewed, funded grants or contracts; and research presentations (typically >2 per year).

#### *Outstanding*

Outstanding research activity can be documented through two peer-reviewed publications; new or continuing extramural, peer-reviewed, funded grants or contracts; and two research presentations.

#### *Meritorious*

Meritorious research activity can be documented through one peer-reviewed publication; new, submitted, or continuing extramural, peer-reviewed, funded grants or contracts; and one research presentation.

#### *Adequate*

Research activity is taking place in the lab but there are no (or minimal) research products such as papers, grants, or presentations.

#### *Unsatisfactory*

Little or no research activity exists.

### **3.3. Teaching**

Indices of teaching effectiveness (contributions to the teaching mission of the Department) may include but are not limited to:

- Self-evaluation
- Student evaluation numbers for untenured BUF
- Written student comments from course evaluations

- Peer review (see section 4.2 below: the FDC will assign at least two faculty per year to peer-evaluate each bargaining unit faculty below the rank of tenured Professor) Course and program development
- Development of Web pages and use of multimedia
- Documented attempts to improve teaching through CTL mid-term evaluations and self-reflection
  
- Development of course materials
- Attendance at CTL professional development opportunities and external workshops
- Grants written to fund teaching equipment and the success of those grants
- Written materials that support teaching such as textbooks and laboratory manuals (see earlier comments about whether textbooks should count primarily for teaching, research or a combination of the two).
- Extra teaching or making a larger than normal contribution to Department teaching without additional compensation
- Supervision of student research. The candidate will document the supervision of research at the level of undergraduate, undergraduate honors, masters, doctoral and postdoctoral. Students will be named, and the candidate will define his or her role in supervision (major advisor, committee member, rotation supervisor etc). Effectiveness of research supervision will be evaluated by completion to appropriate degree and associated student accomplishments. The latter will be measured by publications of peer-reviewed articles, student research awards, subsequent placement in educational institution/industry etc.

Using the indices of teaching effectiveness in a faculty member's annual report, the Department Chair will assign a qualitative rating, corresponding to one of the following categories:

*Extraordinary*

Teaches material in a manner that allows students to learn an exceptional amount of information or to attain an exceptional level of understanding of the material as demonstrated by student and peer evaluation, through student learning outcomes, and by some of the indices listed above. Evidence of extraordinary teaching includes but is not limited to the following:

1. active involvement and continuous revision of existing courses or development of a new course
2. excellent peer reviews and student or other feedback (note here and below that full Professors do not receive peer review) on both teaching style and content
3. documentation of exceptional supervision of research personnel including undergraduates (independent research and reading) and graduate students
4. recognition at college level or above for excellence in teaching

*Outstanding*

Teaches material in a manner that allows students to learn a substantial amount of information or to attain a substantial level of understanding of the material as demonstrated by student and peer evaluation and by some of the indices listed above. Evidence may include:

1. demonstration of a continuing improvement and updating of course material as exemplified through course syllabi
2. very good peer reviews and student or other feedback

#### *Meritorious*

Teaches material in a manner that allows students to learn a usual amount of information as demonstrated by student and peer evaluation and by some of the indices listed above. Evidence may include:

1. demonstration of a continuing improvement of course materials
2. good peer reviews and student or other feedback

#### *Adequate*

Teaches material with minimal course and syllabi modifications and with acceptable peer-reviewed classroom evaluations and student feedback. Peers or other feedback may note some problems.

#### *Unsatisfactory*

Unprepared for teaching assignment; one or more major problems identified from peer, student, or other feedback.

### **3.4. Service**

Service can occur in several ways. Some service may be internal to WSU, including committee work at the department, college and university levels. Some service may be to the community. Community activities count as professional service if they use knowledge and skills that are based on the individual's scientific background. Some service may be to professional organizations, including possibly:

- serving on review panels for federal agencies
- reviewing grants and manuscripts
- serving on editorial boards
- organizing symposia for national or international professional meetings
- consulting professionally
- serving as an officer in a professional association

#### *Extraordinary (tenured faculty)*

An individual's contributions are equivalent to at least two of the following activities:

- Service in a significant professional leadership role on the regional, state or national level; e.g. editor or associate editor for a scientific journal, heading a state or national committee with responsibility for submitting a written report of the committee findings. Service on a Program Review Panel for the NIH, NSF, or other national agency.
- Reviewing  $\geq 8$  peer-reviewed journal articles, grant proposals, or technical reports.

- Major leadership in the Department, college and/or university with successful implementation of changes.
- Significant community activities, e.g. with national government agencies.

*Outstanding* (tenured faculty) or *Extraordinary* ( untenured faculty)

An individual's contributions are equivalent to at least two of the following activities:

- Participation and contributions in professional organizations at the regional, state or national level.
- Reviewing  $\geq 4$  peer-reviewed journal articles, grant proposals, or technical reports.
- Successfully leading a major committee at the Department, college and/or university level.
- Significant community activities, e.g. with state and regional government agencies.

*Meritorious* (tenured faculty) or *outstanding* ( untenured faculty)

An individual's contributions are equivalent to at least two of the following activities:

- Some service to professional organizations.
- Reviewing  $\geq 1$  peer-reviewed journal article, grant proposal, or technical report.
- Participation in several Department, college and/or university committees.
- Some community activities, e.g. with local agencies.

*Adequate* (tenured faculty) or *meritorious* ( untenured faculty)

Active participation on more than two Departmental and/or college committees.

*Adequate* ( untenured faculty)

Participation on 2 Departmental committees.

*Unsatisfactory*

Few or no service activities exist.

### **3.5. Evaluation by the Department Chair**

As indicated in the CBA, the Department Chair conducts an annual written evaluation of every BUF and gives each a copy of his/her evaluation, including the Chair's rating of teaching, research and service. For clarity of understanding the Department Chair may provide an opportunity for the Chair and the faculty member, voluntarily for both, to meet to discuss the annual Activity report before the annual evaluation is written. The BUF who disagrees with the Department Chair's evaluation may send a written response to the Department Chair. This rebuttal should be stapled to the original evaluation, forwarded to all other entities that receive a copy of the evaluation and kept on file (see CBA).

## **SECTION 4. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA**

### **4.1. Membership**

As indicated in the CBA, the Department Chair conducts an annual written evaluation of every BUF and gives each a copy of his/her evaluation, including the Chair's rating of teaching, research and service. For clarity of understanding the Department Chair may provide an opportunity for the Chair and the faculty member, voluntarily for both, to meet to discuss the annual Activity report before the annual evaluation is written. The BUF who disagrees with the Department Chair's evaluation may send a written response to the Department Chair. This rebuttal should be stapled to the original evaluation, forwarded to all other entities that receive a copy of the evaluation and kept on file (see CBA).

### **4.2. Report on cumulative progress and teaching by FDC**

Independent of the Department Chair's annual evaluation, each year the FDC will evaluate the cumulative progress of individuals toward promotion and tenure. The FDC also provides peer feedback to individuals with suggestions for improving their contributions to the Department and their professional stature. This feedback includes the peer evaluation of teaching required by the CBA to be considered in the Department Chair's annual evaluation. The main vehicle for these two functions is a written report from the FDC to the faculty member.

During the beginning of fall quarter the FDC Chair will assign subcommittees for annual reviews of the individuals' contributions to the Department and their progress toward promotion and/or tenure. The whole committee will review all Assistant Professor BUF in the Department. In addition, it may, at its discretion, review other individuals with substantial teaching roles in the Department, such as shared faculty with primary appointments in other departments. The Professors will evaluate the Associate Professors. Tenured Professors will not be evaluated explicitly by the FDC. Instead, the FDC Chair will provide input to the Departmental Chair in the latter's evaluations of the other Professors. The Department Chair will select another Professor to provide input on the FDC Chair. The subcommittees selected to evaluate new faculty also will serve to mentor those new faculty.

The committees will evaluate progress toward promotion and/or tenure by examining the individual's entire record, including annual reports prepared by the faculty member and/or updated faculty curricula vita. During the year, members of the subcommittees also will conduct peer evaluations of teaching for the people they are to evaluate. Their teaching evaluations will be given to the person reviewed, the Department Chair, and the FDC Chair. Each BUF with a rank of Assistant or Associate Professor must be evaluated in at least two classroom visits per year from peers.

These evaluations will result in letters to the individuals with copies to the Department Chair detailing their progress toward promotion and/or tenure. For Assistant and Associate Professors, progress toward promotion in teaching, research and service, both individually and together, will be evaluated and the conclusions stated. The criteria for evaluating these activities will be described later, under standards for promotion.

The FDC chair will write these letters, usually based on the draft letters written by the subcommittees, and approved by the FDC committee.



## **4.3. Promotion and tenure**

### **4.3.1 PROCEDURES FOR RECOMMENDING CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE**

In the spring quarter the previously assigned subcommittees of the FDC (see section 4.2) will report to the full committee for individuals ranked Assistant Professor and to the Professors for individuals ranked Associate Professor. At that time a subcommittee may recommend that certain individuals be considered for promotion to the next rank. The subcommittee of appropriate rank (Professors to determine promotion to Professor, full FDC to determine promotion to Associate Professor) can agree or disagree with continuing the process of promotion. Decisions will be made by majority vote of the total, relevant committee membership based on the criteria given below. Voting will continue, with interspersed discussion, until two consecutive votes yield identical results. If the decision is made to prepare a promotion and tenure document the subcommittee will work with the candidate to prepare that document in accordance with the CBA. If the decision is made that the FDC will not prepare a document, the individual may prepare his or her own document in accordance with guidelines in the contract. The result of the spring meeting may be a decision to wait until fall to put together the document. The FDC committee of appropriate rank will vote on the final document during the fall quarter.

### **4.3.2. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE**

#### **4.3.2.1. Overview**

To warrant tenure a faculty member needs to demonstrate during the probationary period that he or she has met the Department criteria given below and related to the Department's missions of research, teaching, and service. The establishment of a sustained, independent research program should be demonstrated. Contributions to research will be evaluated by demonstrated success in publishing research in peer-reviewed journals, including some of national and international readership, on a regular basis and in gaining recognition for the quality of the candidate's scientific output from scientific peers. Contributions to teaching will be evaluated by demonstrated skill in helping students learn. Contributions to service activities will indicate the individual's willingness and ability to contribute to the successful operation of the Department and other professional entities. The FDC will evaluate the quality and adequacy of the candidate's overall record for promotion based on these criteria.

#### **4.3.2.2. Research scholarship**

##### **4.3.2.2.1. Overview**

Recommending that a candidate receive tenure is a statement by the FDC that the individual has demonstrated sustained productivity. Productivity (as defined by grant submissions and funding, presentations, and publications) should demonstrate the establishment of an independent research program at WSU. The categories listed below provide evidence used to make this evaluation. Some qualitative assessment may be required for individuals who exceed some of the criteria but do not meet others.

#### 4.3.2.2.2. Publications, Presentations Published

##### research scholarship

The requirement for published research scholarship is four high-quality, peer-reviewed publications describing original research in a journal of national or international distribution published in the candidate's field of study, excluding book chapters and review articles. These articles should be published or in press (officially accepted by the journal and subject to no more revisions) by fall of the year when the candidate is to be considered for promotion (typically, the sixth year at WSU). The four papers must document work from the probationary period at Wright State and have Wright State listed as the candidate's institutional affiliation. In the case of collaborative research, the FDC must determine (by means it chooses) that the candidate played a major role in the inception, design and implementation of the research. A paper for which the candidate has played such a role will be counted as one of the four required. Peers and external reviewers will evaluate publications partly by content, length of articles, and quality of the journal. Only faculty hired in the capacity of "Science Educator" may include pedagogical papers in the total amount.

An exception to the criterion that four publications must have been done at WSU may be made for candidates who can document that they had an independent research program before coming to WSU. Documentation could involve records of independently obtained funding, independent publications, or titles such as Assistant Professor or Research Assistant Professor. For these individuals one prior, independent publication may be combined with three from WSU to total the four papers required for tenure.

##### Presentations

- Candidates will present an average of at least one paper/poster at a state or national meeting yearly. Invited seminars at other institutions, corporations and federal agencies or other departments at WSU are also considered as signs of the candidate's professional stature and recognition.
- Invited symposium papers at international/national meetings, keynote addresses, and plenary lectures are viewed very favorably.
- Sometime during the probationary period, the candidate is expected to present a research seminar to the Department.

#### 4.3.2.2.3. Grants and Contracts

The following constitute minimal extramural funding standards for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure:

- Two or more years of extramural support funded since joining WSU awarded by the end of the probationary period. Faculty who join with a

transferable grant will be given credit for the time and amount of the grant that they bring with them.

- Funding sufficient to establish and maintain a productive independent research program awarded.
- A position of PI (or the equivalent) for the funding awarded.
- Sustained and continuing attempts to obtain funding while not funded and to maintain funding when funded.
- Total funding awarded during the probationary period (including moneys transferred into WSU from pre-existing grants) for
  1. at least \$50,000 in Total Direct Cost (TDC) from a peerreviewed competition(s) of a national extramural funding agency or agencies that also funded the accompanying Indirect Costs at the full-rate of WSU, OR
  2. at least \$75,000 in TDC from recognized extramural funding agencies and/or sources such as business, government, or
  3. foundations that may not provide Indirect Costs at the full-rate of WSU, OR
  4. at least \$75,000 in TDC from extramural sources by a combination of a & b.

In the case of collaborative grants the candidate should justify that his/her share of the total funding is equivalent to the criteria above

#### 4.3.2.2.4. Outside Letters

Letters from at least five external referees will be used to evaluate the quality of the scholarship including merit of the research, quality of journals, and competitiveness of funding agencies.

#### 4.3.2.3. Teaching

Candidates should have established a record of effectiveness in the classroom and demonstrated attempts to continuously improve the quality of their teaching. Typically, during their time at WSU, the candidate will have developed at least one new course and/or have greatly modified other courses already listed in the WSU catalog. Some of the indices listed above for the Department Chair's annual evaluations may be used to demonstrate teaching effort and success, including student and peer evaluations. The candidate will present a summary of formal classroom materials and supervision of student independent projects and/or research.

#### 4.3.2.4. Service

Although service is not considered to be as important a criterion for promotion to Associate Professor as are research and teaching, it is still required. Candidates should have demonstrated their contribution to the effective operations of the Department. The normal requirements for internal service are to attend Departmental

faculty meetings and to participate actively on 1-2 Departmental committees per year.

#### 4.3.3. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

##### 4.3.3.1. Overview

Promotion to the rank of Professor indicates that the individual's research is characterized by steady, continued productivity and national and international reputations, confirmed by external reviewers. The individual also has achieved a leadership position in terms of teaching and service, the latter both internal and external to WSU.

##### 4.3.2.2. Research scholarship

Candidates should have established a sustained independent research program with international reputation documented through such means as publication in international peer-reviewed journals, symposium presentations, keynote addresses and invitations to write scholarly reviews.

Candidates should have published at least 15 high-quality peer-reviewed publications in the candidate's field where WSU is named as the candidate's employer. These 15 publications include those from the candidate's probationary years at WSU except that 8 peer-reviewed papers since the previous promotion are required. Up to two book chapters or review articles published after promotion to Associate Professor may count toward this publication requirement. For multi-authored publications the FDC must determine (by means it chooses) that the candidate played a major role in the inception, design and implementation of the research. If the candidate did play such a role the paper will count as one of the 15 required. During the five years before promotion the candidate should have three peer-reviewed publications. Only faculty hired in the capacity of "Science Educator" may include pedagogical papers in the total amount.

Following are the minimum standards for extramural funding:

- Two or more years of extramural support funded as a faculty member at WSU since promotion to Associate Professor.
- Funding sufficient to sustain a productive research program.
- Stature as PI (or its equivalent) for the funding awarded.
- Sustained and continuing attempts to obtain funding while not funded and to maintain funding when funded.
- A cumulative total of extramural funds, funded at anytime since promotion to Associate Professor, of at least \$75,000 in Total Direct Cost from recognized extramural funding agencies and/or sources such as business, government, or foundations. These funds must be different from funds used to justify promotion to Associate Professor.

In case of collaborative funding the candidate will include those funds obtained for her or his own research in the totals above.

#### 4.3.3.3. Teaching

Minimally candidates should have established themselves as effective teachers with a demonstrated interest in continuously improving the quality of their instruction. Student and peer evaluations will be used to help judge teaching effectiveness. Usually the individual has shown a leadership role in a major instructional area within the Department.

#### 4.3.3.4. Service

For this promotion candidates would be expected to have undertaken significant service to the profession through such means as service on panels of funding agencies and on editorial boards, reviewing manuscripts and grants, officer positions in professional associations, and organizing symposia. Typically they should have demonstrated a leadership role in service activities within the Department, college and/or university.

#### 4.3.2.5. Outside Letters

Letters from at least five external referees will be used to evaluate the quality of the scholarship including merit of the research, quality of journals, and competitiveness of funding agencies. These letters should be from researchers who are not or have not been mentors or collaborators of the candidate. The FDC and the candidate should agree upon the list of researchers from which the referees are drawn.

### 4.3.4. GRANTING OF TENURE FOR INDIVIDUALS HIRED WITHOUT TENURE AS ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OR PROFESSOR

Individuals hired without tenure at the level of Associate Professor or Professor will be given the length of their probationary period (as specified in the CBA) to meet the requirements given below.

#### 4.3.4.1 Research scholarship

For a candidate hired at the rank of Associate Professor without tenure who desires to be tenured at the rank of Associate Professor, the criteria specified in Section 4.3.2.2 (e.g. career totals of at least four peer-reviewed publications and extramural grant support of \$50,000 or \$75,000) apply with the following additions. At least one of the required high-quality peer-reviewed publications needs to acknowledge WSU as the candidate's employer. At least \$20,000 of the required total in external funds needs to be awarded since coming to WSU or transferred to WSU.

For a candidate hired at the rank of Professor without tenure who desires to be tenured, the criteria specified in section 4.3.3.2 (e.g. career totals of 15 publications,

at least 8 since last promotion, and extramural grant support of \$75,000 since last promotion) apply with the following additions. At least one of the required high-quality peer-reviewed publications needs to acknowledge WSU as the candidate's employer. At least \$20,000 of the required total in external funds needs to be awarded since coming to WSU or transferred to WSU.

#### 4.3.4.2 Teaching

Candidates for tenure with either rank should have demonstrated teaching effectiveness at WSU as indicated in sections 4.3.2.3 for Associate Professor and 4.3.3.3 for Professor.

#### 4.3.4.3 Service

In the case of an individual hired at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor without tenure, the criteria specified in the previous sections (4.3.1.4 for Associate Professor; 4.3.2.4 for Professor) will be applied over the candidate's academic career. Emphasis will be placed on the continuation of and/or the development of a strong service record while at WSU.

### **4.4. Professional development leaves and faculty awards**

When appropriate the FDC will nominate individuals for university awards. In Fall Quarter or when appropriate the FDC will review any applications from BUF for professional development leaves (PDL). Such issues may be handled by circulation of paperwork; they may not require a formal meeting. If several individuals request PDLs then a formal meeting may be necessary to evaluate their requests.

### **4.5. Restriction of tenure**

Tenure will be awarded only to individuals with the rank of Associate or full Professor.

## **SECTION 5. OTHER PROCEDURES**

### **5.1. Faculty appointment, reappointment and dismissal**

#### 5.1.1. FACULTY APPOINTMENT

The Department Chair determines the search committee for a new faculty member, the chair of the search committee, and the procedures followed by the committee. BUF will constitute the majority of the committee. The search committee will review applicants for the position and will present the Department Chair (copies to BUF) with a list of candidates recommended to be invited for interviews. After the candidates chosen to be invited by the Department Chair are interviewed, a recommendation to the Departmental Chair of the preferred candidates in rank order (with reasons for the ranking) will be made by majority vote of the Bargaining Unit Faculty Members.

#### 5.1.2. FACULTY REAPPOINTMENT

Faculty reappointment is the transfer of faculty from one program or department within the university to another. Faculty reappointment from an outside department to this Department will occur only after the recommendation, by a majority vote, of the Department faculty is sought in a secret ballot, to be taken at a Departmental meeting. This recommendation will be presented to the Dean with the reason for the recommendation given.

### 5.1.3. FACULTY DISMISSAL BEFORE END OF PROBATIONARY PERIOD

The decision to terminate an untenured BUF before the end of the probationary period will be made by the Dean who shall first consult with tenured Department BUF. The Department Chair and/or the Dean will present the recommendation and the reasons for dismissal to the Departmental FDC. The FDC 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 FDC'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 will be sent to the Chair and the Dean's office.

## 5.2. Course changes

Proposals to modify or add courses will first be made to the Undergraduate

Curriculum Committee or to the Graduate Committee. If those proposals are recommended within the committee they will be presented to the whole Department for voting. Only graduate faculty will vote on graduate courses. A majority of the eligible voters attending the Department meeting is required to recommend course approval.

## 5.3. Assigning summer teaching

If the number of BUF who would like to teach exceeds the number of available courses a lottery will be used to determine the order in which qualified BUF are offered a course. Each BUF will be offered one course before any is offered a second course. Where there are not sufficient numbers of second courses, a lottery will be used to decide the order in which BUF will be offered second courses. If lotteries are used, BUF denied teaching opportunities in one year will be given priority the following year.

## 5.4. Scheduling faculty meetings and setting agendas

Faculty meetings will be held at the discretion of the Department Chair or at the request of any three members of the Department. These meetings should occur no less than once per quarter during the academic year. Any Departmental member may place an item on the agenda to be discussed. The Department Chair may attend a faculty meeting not called by her/him.

## 5.5. Procedures by which faculty give advice and make recommendations in selecting Department Chairs

### 5.5.1. APPOINTMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR

The procedures by which the BUF in the Department give advice regarding the appointment of the Department Chair are as follows:

1. If the Chair's position is vacant or filled by an Acting Chair or the Dean anticipates a vacancy, then to select the Department Chair the Dean will appoint a departmental chair search committee and its chair, at least a majority of whose members will be BUF from and selected by the Department.
2. When a candidate is to be interviewed publicly, the search committee shall arrange for the following:
  - a. The candidate's application in full (vita, letter of application, letters of recommendation if any, etc.) shall be available for examination by BUF in the department.
  - b. One or more public forums will be held at which BUF in the Department can meet the candidate.
  - c. The search committee shall distribute a secret advisory ballot to BUF members in the Department. The ballot may include any items chosen by the search committee.  
However, the ballot shall include at least the following for each candidate:
    - i. the question "Is [name of candidate] acceptable to you for appointment to the position of Chair?" with answers "Yes' or "No." ii. an opportunity to comment upon the candidate; iii. an opportunity to rank the candidates; iv. clear instructions for return of the ballot.
3. The search committee will transmit to the Dean the names of candidates acceptable to a majority of the BUF of the Department and other information as appropriate. The search committee may provide to the Dean its recommendations, including a ranking of the candidates and summary results of the survey of department BUF. The Dean will consider this information before appointing a Chair.
4. The Dean (or the Provost) will announce and explain the appointment to the Department BUF.

#### 5.5.2. APPOINTMENT OF AN ACTING DEPARTMENT CHAIR

If an Acting Chair is to be appointed to serve for more than 12 consecutive months then the procedures by which the BUF in the Department give advice regarding appointment of the Acting Chair are as follows:



1. The Dean will provide the Department BUF with a list of one or more candidates and an opportunity for the BUF to meet each candidate.
2. All BUF shall have the opportunity to vote on the acceptability of each candidate, either in a secret vote conducted in a meeting of the Department BUF called for this purpose, or by distributing a secret advisory ballot to all BUF in the Department. Ballots should include the following for each candidate:
  - i. the question "Is [name of candidate] acceptable to you for appointment to the position of Acting Chair?" with answers "Yes" or "No."
  - ii. an opportunity to comment upon the candidate;
  - iii. an opportunity to rank the candidates;
  - iv. clear instructions for the return of the ballot.
3. The chair of the FDC will transmit to the Dean the names of candidates acceptable to the majority of BUF of the Department and other information as appropriate. The Dean will consider this information before appointing an Acting Chair to serve for more than one year.
4. The Dean (or the Provost) will announce the appointment to the Department faculty.

#### **5.6. Bylaws: procedures for approval and amendment**

Any BUF in the Department may bring alternatives to the present bylaws forward. A majority vote of the Department BUF and approval from the Dean and the Faculty Governance Committee are required to effect the change.