

Department of Biomedical, Industrial and Human Factors Engineering Bylaws

Approved: February 10, 2003

Amended: June 24, 2010

1. Introduction

The bylaws of the Department of Biomedical, Industrial and Human Factors Engineering establish procedures for participation of the faculty of the department in the governance of the department.

These bylaws are consistent with the Bylaws of the College of Engineering and Computer Science and with the Agreement between Wright State University and the Wright State University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (the Agreement).

2. Membership of Department Faculty

The department faculty include

- the department chair
- full-time bargaining-unit faculty members holding their primary appointment in the department;
- affiliate faculty members, who hold their primary appointment in another academic unit and who provide substantial contributions to the department;
- full-time lecturers and instructors holding their primary appointment in the department;
- adjunct faculty members.

Only full-time bargaining-unit faculty with primary appointment in the department vote on issues unless specified differently.

3. Faculty Appointments

When the need arises to hire new faculty members, an ad-hoc search committee will be appointed by the department chair. The majority of the committee will be department bargaining-unit faculty members elected by the department faculty. The majority requirement may be waived by the bargaining unit faculty. All of the department faculty members must be given the opportunity to provide input on the candidates. The committee assists with the search and provides the department chair with a ranked list, including a short rationale, of up to three candidates chosen for the position to be filled. In the case of hiring a person at the rank of full professor, the full professors of the department shall make a separate recommendation.

The faculty will make recommendations to the department chair concerning the appointment and periodic review of all affiliate and adjunct faculty members, although circumstances might arise making it necessary for the department chair to hire an adjunct faculty member before a faculty recommendation can be received.

4. Faculty Involvement in Department Governance

The faculty participate in the department affairs through Faculty Meetings and through committees.

5. Faculty Meeting

The purposes of the Faculty Meeting are 1) to provide the opportunity to disseminate information 2) to provide a mechanism to allow the chair to obtain opinions and recommendations from the faculty on department business, policies and procedures.

In cooperation with the Dean and the Faculty Governance Committee, the faculty are responsible for establishing and maintaining department bylaws in accordance with the current Agreement, including criteria and standards for tenure and promotion; they may provide recommendations regarding policies and procedures, searches for positions, new program development and program discontinuance, structure and appointment of committees, budget priorities and guidelines.

Participants of the Faculty Meeting include all department faculty members. The department chair runs the Faculty Meeting but does not vote. Voting members include full-time bargaining-unit faculty members, lecturers and instructors, except as otherwise specified in the Agreement. A Faculty Meeting must be called at least once per month, excluding December and the summer quarter months. The department chair establishes the agenda after requesting input from the faculty and distributes it at least two days prior to the meeting. A Faculty Meeting will also be called if at least 50 percent of the faculty members request such a meeting, in which case the faculty members will establish and distribute the agenda.

The department chair shall make the department budget and expenditure information available to all faculty members on request.

If the department chair chooses not to follow faculty recommendations, he/she must provide the faculty with a written response in a timely manner. In such cases, the faculty have the option to discuss the matter with the dean.

Meeting minutes and information related to faculty recommendations are to be maintained by the department chair.

6. Academic Program Committees

There are two Academic Program Committees in the department: the Biomedical Engineering Program Committee (BPC) and the Industrial and Human Factors Engineering Program Committee (IPC). Each of these committees is made up of all faculty members in the department who teach courses and advise students in the respective undergraduate and graduate programs and of the department chair as a non-voting member. Voting rights are extended to lecturers and instructors. These committees make recommendations related to their specific academic programs on curriculum, teaching assignments, class schedules, student petitions and

any other areas of concern to the faculty or requested by the chair. The meetings are chaired by the department chair as a non-voting member or by a faculty member designated by the department chair in the case where the department chair's discipline is not in the area of the specific program. This faculty member may carry the title of Program Director.

7. Faculty Development Committee (FDC)

The Department FDC makes recommendations pertaining to faculty personnel matters in the department, e.g. appointment, promotion, tenure, dismissal, mentoring of new faculty members etc.

7.1. Organization

The Faculty Development Committee consists of all tenured faculty members of the department. The department chair is also a member of the FDC but does not vote. One of the full professors (or an associate professor if no full professors are available), but not the chair of the department, is elected to be the chair for a two-year term. The committee chair calls and runs the meetings and drafts, for review by the committee, the necessary letters and reports as foreseen elsewhere in these bylaws. Except for promotion and tenure cases, voting on new business can occur during the same meeting the business was introduced, provided that all pertinent material was distributed to the members of the FDC at least two business days before the meeting.

Faculty members vote on promotion issues only for candidates at the lower rank (i.e. associate and full professors vote for promotion of assistant professors to associate professors; full professors vote for promotion of associate professors to full professors). All tenured faculty members vote on tenure issues, using the pertinent criteria. Faculty members vote on dismissal issues only for candidates at the same or lower rank.

The membership of the FDC for any tenure or promotion case must include at least three voting faculty members. If there are not enough department faculty members available at the appropriate rank, tenured bargaining unit faculty members from other engineering departments must be appointed temporarily to the FDC. Such appointments shall be made by the dean in cooperation with the current members of the FDC and the candidate whose case is at hand.

All members of the FDC, with the exception of the candidate under consideration, take part in the deliberations concerning promotion, tenure and dismissal, but only members at the appropriate ranks vote.

7.2. Promotions and Tenure

Any bargaining-unit faculty member of the department considered for promotion or tenure shall submit the required materials as set forth by the Agreement. The chair of the FDC shall request the necessary letters of reference from a list of referees agreed upon jointly by the candidate and the FDC. Once the candidate has signed off on the document as being complete and the letters of reference have been received, the FDC shall discuss the matter and vote by secret ballot. The outcome of the vote and a summary of the assessment are then added to the file of the candidate.

7.3. Faculty Dismissal

If a faculty member is considered for dismissal, the FDC shall discuss the matter and shall vote by secret ballot. The outcome of the vote and a summary of the deliberations is then submitted to the dean for consideration of further action. The department chair shall write a separate letter to the dean with his/her own recommendation.

7.4. Periodic FDC Evaluation

All untenured faculty members shall be evaluated yearly by the FDC with respect to their progress towards obtaining tenure. During the third year, a full review shall be done wherein the candidate prepares a submission similar to that required for actual promotion and tenure with the exception of the letters of reference. Tenured associate professors shall be evaluated, if they request it, with respect to their progress to the rank of full professor. Such a request must be submitted as described in the Agreement.

The FDC evaluation is based on the candidate's Annual Report, the current CV and other pertinent material the FDC may request (e.g. peer teaching evaluations, chair's previous annual evaluations etc.). The report is to assess teaching, scholarship and service both for the current year and cumulatively as they pertain to promotion and tenure. In the case of deficiencies, the report needs to be specific and should outline the committee's expectations for a given performance area. The candidate has the right to request clarifications and to submit a written rebuttal to the FDC evaluation, and this rebuttal shall be kept with the candidate's file. Such a rebuttal must be submitted within two weeks of receiving the FDC evaluation.

8. Ad-Hoc Committees

The department chair or a majority of faculty members may establish ad-hoc committees when needed. The composition and selection of an ad-hoc committee is the responsibility of the individual(s) who established it with input from the department faculty.

9. Conduct of Business

9.1 Faculty Meeting

The Faculty meetings shall be conducted according to Robert's Rules of Order. New business brought up will be voted on at the following meeting under "Unfinished Business". Voting on New Business cannot take place at the current meeting unless a Suspension of Rules is passed. The quorum to vote on business shall be 50% of all faculty members entitled to vote, except if specified differently in these bylaws. Only faculty members present can cast votes. A faculty member participating in the deliberations through a conference call is considered present.

9.2 Committees

9.2.1 Committee Chair

The committee chair is responsible for calling a meeting, setting the agenda and conducting the meeting.

9.2.2 Rules of Order

Robert's Rules of Order are not required for committee meetings. Items brought up during the meeting may be dealt with immediately and are passed by a simple majority. At least three faculty members must be present during a committee meeting in order to vote on any issues.

10. Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

The purpose of this section is to specify the criteria governing consideration for promotion and tenure and thereby assist faculty members in setting and achieving their academic goals. A further objective is to help faculty members prepare evidence of performance in teaching, scholarship and service for promotion and tenure consideration.

Because of the choices that each faculty member must make as he or she strives to achieve academic excellence, no faculty member's academic performance will exactly parallel that of his/her colleagues. Individual differences will be taken into account, but, at the same time, adherence to the highest professional standards in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service is expected.

10.1. Teaching

A primary mission of the BIE Department is to educate engineers of recognized quality. Teaching includes the traditional classroom instruction as well as

- advising students;
- serving as major advisor for Ph.D. dissertations, M.S. theses and M.S. projects;
- serving on thesis and dissertation committees;
- supervising senior design, honors, independent study and summer projects;
- developing courses, laboratories and experiments;
- integrating new technologies in courses;
- attracting funds for laboratory equipment to support teaching.

The quality of teaching must be demonstrated in appropriate ways. Student evaluations of classroom teaching represent a part of the overall assessment of the instructional process. Whereas the limitations of the student evaluations are understood, they can be a valuable tool in assessing the teaching process. Other examples include review of syllabi, peer review (classroom visits), letters of support from alumni.

Evaluations should be considered as a whole over a period of time, i.e., individual evaluations are less indicative than is the trend. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide persuasive evidence of instructional effectiveness.

10.2. Scholarship

Scholarship includes activities that utilize a faculty member's expertise to contribute to his/her academic discipline, related disciplines and to the wider society. A spirit of inquiry is the essential core of every academic institution. Research supports this spirit in a very direct fashion and is also interwoven with the process of stimulating learning. Thus, quality research is to be highly valued in determining promotion and the granting of tenure. Every promotion and tenure document should include evidence that the candidate is productive in independent research.

Primary indications of quality normally include but are not limited to the following:

- publication of research results and of extended scientific and engineering reviews in peer-refereed journals of acknowledged stature (such as primary journals of professional societies and those recognized by peers in the candidate's discipline as high-quality journals), so that the results become a part of the archival literature;
- development of tangible innovative items, such as patents, license agreements etc.;
- ability to attract funds, particularly from sources external to the university, to support research efforts of the candidate and to support graduate students;
- publication with known publishers of research monographs, book chapters and professional books;
- positive evaluations of scholarship by reviewers external to the university;
- teaching innovations such as development of a laboratory, publication of textbooks and educational publications;
- development of hardware and computer software that are used beyond Wright State University.

Secondary indications of quality are:

- refereed conference proceedings;
- invited presentations, workshops and seminars at other universities or research institutes;
- presentations at conferences with subsequent publication in proceedings;
- preparation and submission of grant proposals for funding;
- technical communications, communications on ongoing research, book reviews;
- serving as a major adviser on Ph.D. dissertations and M.S. theses.

In the assessment of the candidate's contribution to multi-author publications, a majority of required publications needs to list the candidate or the candidate's supervised student as the primary author. Concerning the candidate's funding from collaborative grants, the amount going to the candidate is considered in assessing the level of funding obtained. A majority of required funding must come from research grants as compared to equipment grants (in-kind donations of equipment are not considered grants).

The external reviewers are preferably people of recognized stature within the candidate's discipline, e.g. fellow of professional association, member of one of the national academies, editor or associate editor of a journal. They should not have worked closely on common research projects with the candidate previously. A minimum of three letters of reference needs to be submitted; the maximum number of letters is six. All letters received must be included in the submission.

10.3. Service

Since committees are a vital part of the university's faculty governance, it is expected that each bargaining unit faculty member will participate in service activities, which include service on committees or in other leadership positions at the department, college or university level. Other forms of service to the university community and to the community at large are also important as they relate to the application of the faculty member's knowledge in his/her professional field.

Significant participation external to the university in appropriate professional, technical and educational activities is important for the development of faculty members. Such activities should be documented in every promotion and tenure submission and may include, among others:

- organization of and participation in conferences and meetings;
- service as editor, as associate editor or on the editorial board for national or international journals;
- service to state, national and international organizations as related to professional responsibilities;
- solicited reviews of manuscripts and research proposals;
- service in professional associations;
- collaboration with other institutions on teaching or research projects.

10.4. Expectations for Promotion and Tenure

10.4.1. From Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

The criteria outlined in this section pertain to the promotion from assistant to associate professor and to the award of tenure at the rank of associate professor. Normally, an assistant professor will be considered for promotion to associate professor with tenure during his or her sixth year at Wright State University. Consideration for the award of tenure to an untenured associate professor will generally occur during his or her third year at Wright State University. The criteria refer to the candidate's record over the five years prior to submitting the promotion and tenure document, which may include time at another academic or research institution before joining Wright State University, if such record contributes to establishing an independent research portfolio.

The career accomplishments of the candidate must show clear evidence of successful teaching, independent scholarly contributions to the discipline and a minimum involvement in the area of service.

Levels of performance are described without a predicate for teaching and service; in these areas, they represent minimal expectations. In the area of scholarship, publications and funding are described as *adequate*, *good* or *outstanding*. A candidate can compensate an *adequate* with an *outstanding*, but requires an average of at least *good* to be promoted.

Consideration for promotion to the rank of associate professor is not normally given before the candidate has spent at least 3 years in a tenure-track faculty position. In such a case of early promotion, the candidate must have displayed outstanding performance in both publications and external funding.

10.4.1.1. Teaching

Consistently positive student and peer evaluations or an improving trend is a key aspect of the candidate's performance with respect to teaching. If problems are identified, major effort in solving these problems with subsequent improvement needs to be demonstrated. This can take place by participating in activities offered by the Center for Teaching and Learning, the College Teaching Committee or outside resources as well as by requesting help from peers in the department, college and university. The evaluation of teaching must result in mostly positive evaluations by students and minimal criticisms by peers. The following additional factors contribute to a positive evaluation of teaching: development of new courses and laboratories, integration of new technologies into the teaching process, receipt of teaching awards.

In the area of research instruction, supervision of 4 Master's students with thesis to completion is the expected norm. Two years of supervision of a Ph.D. candidate (after qualifying milestone) or 3 completed Honors projects or 18 credit hours of independent study projects count the equivalent of one Master's student. Supervision of one Ph.D. student to completion counts as three Master's students.

10.4.1.2. Scholarship

Adequate performance is demonstrated by the publication of 6 high-quality archival journal papers, good performance by 8 and outstanding performance by 12 high-quality archival journal papers. In the area of funding, external grant funding of \$100,000, which includes 6 quarters of graduate student support, is considered adequate; external grant funding of \$200,000, which includes 8 quarters of graduate student support, is considered good, and external grant funding of \$300,000, which includes 16 quarters of graduate student support, is considered outstanding.

One awarded patent counts the equivalent of one journal publication up to a maximum of two patents. Two high-quality book chapters or proceedings can substitute for one journal paper up to a maximum of two journal papers. Other indicators for scholarship as listed in 10.2 can substitute for some of the above criteria to define the level of performance if these indicators reflect equivalent accomplishments.

10.4.1.3. Service

Involvement in student advising, open houses and other representative functions are vital for the department. The candidate is expected to volunteer for some of these activities on a regular basis and represent the department in various committees as assigned by the chair.

10.4.2. Associate Professor to Professor

The criteria outlined in this section pertain to the promotion from associate professor to professor. The criteria refer to the candidate's total record, which may include time prior to joining Wright State University.

The career accomplishments of the candidate for promotion to professor must show clear evidence of consistently high levels of teaching, nationally or internationally recognized scholarly contributions to the discipline and a leadership role in the area of service.

Levels of performance are described without a predicate for teaching and service; in these areas, they represent minimal expectations. In the area of scholarship, publications and funding are described as *good* or *outstanding*. A candidate needs at least one *good* and one *outstanding* performance level to be promoted. In the submitted document, the candidate must provide a section explaining the quality of the contributions to teaching, scholarship and service.

Consideration for promotion to the rank of professor is not normally given before the candidate has spent at least 5 years at the rank of associate professor. In the case of early promotion, the candidate must have surpassed the expectations in teaching, displayed outstanding performance in publications as well as external funding and demonstrated superior involvement in service to the university or the profession.

10.4.2.1. Teaching

The evaluation of teaching must result in mostly positive evaluations by students and minimal criticisms by peers. The following additional factors contribute to a positive evaluation of teaching: development of new courses and laboratories, integration of new technologies into the teaching process, receipt of teaching awards.

In the area of research instruction, supervision of 10 Master's students with thesis to completion is the expected norm. Supervision of one Ph.D. student to completion is required. Each completed Ph.D. student counts for 3 Master's students, and 3 completed Honors projects or 18 credit hours of independent study projects count for one Master's student.

10.4.2.2. Scholarship

Good performance is demonstrated by:

- the publication of 18 high-quality archival journal papers, including 9 since the last promotion and 5 during the preceding 5 years.
- external grant funding of \$500,000 with 20 quarters of graduate student support, including \$250,000 of funding and 10 quarters of graduate student support since the last promotion, and \$125,000 of funding and 5 quarters of graduate student support during the preceding 5 years.

Outstanding performance is demonstrated by:

- the publication of 25 high-quality archival journal papers, including 13 since the last promotion and 7 during the preceding 5 years.
- external grant funding of \$1,000,000 with 40 quarters of graduate student support, including \$500,000 of funding and 20 quarters of graduate student support since the last promotion, and \$250,000 of funding and 10 quarters of graduate student support during the preceding 5 years.

At least one substantial grant must be from a national competitive funding source. One awarded patent counts the equivalent of one journal publication up to a maximum of two patents. Two high-quality book chapters or proceedings can substitute for one journal paper up to a maximum of two journal papers. Other indicators for scholarship as listed in 10.2 can substitute for some of the above criteria to define the level of performance if these indicators reflect equivalent accomplishments.

10.4.2.3. Service

Continued involvement in the activities of the department through student advising, open houses and other representative functions is expected. Participation in 10 committee years at the college or university level is the minimum, of which some must be at the university level. The candidate must demonstrate involvement on the national or international level through participation in committees of professional societies. The candidate must demonstrate a substantial impact of the service contributions to the university and the profession. Examples are leadership on committees within the university and professional societies, organization of professional conferences, editorship or associate editorship of journals etc.

Other equivalent activities as listed in 10.3 can substitute for some of the above criteria of performance.

11. Teaching Assignments

Teaching includes classroom teaching, laboratories, student advising, new course development, student projects, graduate student supervision etc. Before the department chair assigns teaching responsibilities, the faculty members may indicate their wishes as to course preferences and teaching times.

12. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Teaching represents a multifaceted activity, which can be evaluated in many different ways. An important way of evaluating teaching is the evaluation through peers. Such a peer evaluation shall be an integral part of the periodic evaluation provided by the department FDC to untenured faculty members and to other faculty members as specified below.

The department faculty shall elect one faculty member as the coordinator for peer teaching evaluation at the first faculty meeting of the academic year. The evaluation tools to be used include class-room visits; assessment of syllabus, homework, tests, handouts etc.; grading practice, laboratory experience etc.

Peer teaching evaluation shall be performed by an ad-hoc committee of at least three faculty members appointed by the department chair with input from the teaching evaluation coordinator. One committee member shall be appointed as the chair, who shall draft the necessary reports for review of the whole committee. Individual ad-hoc committees shall be assembled for each faculty member to be evaluated by classroom visits; if no classroom visits are planned, a single ad-hoc committee shall usually perform the evaluations based on other components of peer-teaching evaluation.

In the case of classroom visits, the committee chair shall obtain a list of all class meetings for the current quarter from the faculty member to be evaluated, with the classes indicated where a classroom visit is not conducive to evaluation (guest speaker, exams etc.). Each committee member will choose one classroom visit, which does not overlap with another member's already planned visit. These peer visits are unannounced and need to cover the whole class period. When all visits are completed, the committee shall meet and discuss the observations. The committee chair shall then set up a meeting with the faculty member who was evaluated and convey the impressions of the committee. After receiving the written report from the committee chair, the evaluated faculty member may ask for clarifications or submit a rebuttal within two weeks, which must be attached to the teaching evaluation report.

Classroom visits shall be used for untenured faculty members at least twice, for tenured faculty members at the level of associate professor at least once at the current rank. The second visit for untenured faculty members shall normally be within one year before the submission of the promotion and tenure documents. Individual faculty members may request additional evaluations by classroom visits whenever desired.

13. Annual Evaluation

13.1. General Criteria

All faculty members shall be evaluated annually by the department chair. This is done primarily based on the annual report filled out by the faculty member and on the peer teaching evaluation, if any.

The faculty members shall be evaluated separately in teaching, scholarship and professional service. After evaluation of each of the three areas, the department chair shall assign a numerical rating between 0 and 4 as foreseen in the Agreement: 0 = unsatisfactory, 1 = adequate, 2=meritorious, 3=outstanding and 4=extraordinary. The criteria used to arrive at these ratings are to be uniform for all evaluations and are listed under 13.2. The composite average rating is then calculated based on an optimization of the three relative weighting factors to provide a maximum composite rating for the individual faculty member. The relative weighting factors must be constrained within the following ranges: 20%-70% for teaching, 20%-70% for scholarship and 10%-50% for service, unless changed for one of the reasons below. The department chair shall convey the evaluation including the assigned scores and weights to the faculty member in writing.

Under the following circumstances, the department chair may assign weights without using the optimizing algorithm or being constrained by the usual range of relative weights:

- a. unique work assignments that differ from those of other faculty members;
- b. disciplinary action against the faculty member;
- c. substandard performance extending over more than one year.

13.2. Specific Criteria

If multiple measures are required to achieve a certain level of performance, these measures may be from the same category. For example, if two additional measures are necessary from the list: i) publication of one journal article, ii) external grant of \$100,000 and iii) three quarters of graduate student support, publication of two journal articles would fulfill the requirement.

Scholarship and service criteria call for three-year averages. New bargaining unit faculty members who have been employed at Wright State University for less than two full years will be evaluated for their accomplishments in the past year only. After two full years at Wright State University, they will be evaluated using averages of those first two years.

13.2.1. Teaching

Factors used in rating teaching performance include effectiveness of in-class teaching; teaching of distance-learning courses; teaching of workshops and continuing education courses; student advising; serving as major advisor for Ph.D. dissertations and M.S. theses; graduating M.S. students with thesis and Ph.D. students; serving on thesis and dissertation committees; supervising senior design, honors and independent study projects; supervising projects of medical residents; supervising postdoctoral fellows; developing new courses and laboratories, integrating new technologies in courses and attracting funds for laboratory equipment to support teaching.

Unsatisfactory

The faculty member does not meet the requirements of an adequate level of in-class teaching performance. Unsatisfactory performance often leads to a significant number of student complaints. Examples of in-class teaching problems include:

- the faculty member does not seem prepared for classroom activities;

- the faculty member does not return examinations and assignments in a timely manner, does not manage the classroom well or is not available to students;
- on a regular basis, the faculty member shows up late for class, dismisses class early or does not show up for class at all;
- on a regular basis, the faculty member is not available during office hours.

Adequate

The faculty member in this category performs satisfactorily based on student evaluations and review of the relevant teaching materials. Adequate performance in teaching is represented by only few negative comments by students and, if available, an overall positive assessment by peers. Performance at an adequate level of teaching is typically demonstrated through:

- meeting with the class at scheduled times unless there are extenuating circumstances;
- being available during posted office hours unless there is an unavoidable conflict;
- being prepared for the classroom;
- keeping course content current.

Meritorious

Assuming the faculty member has met the requirements for adequate performance, at least two measures such as those listed below represent evidence of meritorious teaching:

- preparing a course that the faculty member is teaching for the first time;
- making major modifications to a course;
- serving on master's thesis and dissertation committees of students graduating during that year;
- effectively supervising independent study projects and honors thesis students;
- effectively integrating new technologies into classroom instruction.

Outstanding

Assuming the faculty member has met the requirements for meritorious performance, at least two measures such as those listed below represent evidence for outstanding teaching:

- co-authoring at least one journal article with students;
- attracting funds for laboratory equipment to support teaching;
- serving as a major advisor for a completed master's thesis or doctoral dissertation.

Extraordinary

The faculty member must demonstrate teaching activities that exceed expectations for outstanding performance.

13.2.2. Scholarship

Factors used in rating the scholarship performance include submission of journal articles to peer-reviewed journals of acknowledged stature; acceptance of submitted articles; submission and acceptance of abstracts, proceedings, book chapters, reports etc.; submission and award of patents; invitation to give lectures, conference presentations, seminars, medical grand rounds; submission of research proposals; funding of research proposals; support of students in the faculty member's research program. Similar to the promotion and tenure criteria, one awarded patent equals one journal article.

Unsatisfactory

The faculty member does not meet the requirements of an adequate level of performance in scholarship as outlined below.

Adequate

Research progress may be indicated by documenting an average of at least one of the following measures per year over the past three years:

- publication of a technical paper in a technical conference or a book chapter;
- submission of a journal paper for a peer-reviewed journal;
- submission of a research proposal to an external agency.

If the faculty member has had no external research support during the year, there must be documentation about submission of a research proposal to an external agency. This proposal must be for a major grant from a national source with the faculty member as the leading investigator.

Meritorious

Research performance in the meritorious category is demonstrated by an average of at least two measures per year over the past three years such as those listed below:

- publication of a technical paper in a peer-reviewed journal;
- initial funding of a research grant;
- three quarters of graduate student support.

Outstanding

Assuming the faculty member has met the requirements for meritorious scholarship, an average of at least two additional measures per year over the past three years such as those listed below represent evidence of outstanding performance:

- publication of at least one additional journal article;
- external research grants and contracts exceeding \$100,000 in total costs per year;
- an additional three quarters of graduate student support.

Extraordinary

The faculty member must demonstrate research activities that exceed expectations for outstanding performance.

13.2.3. Service

Factors used in rating the service performance include membership in department, college, program and university committees; chairmanship in committees; participation in student recruitment efforts; active participation in professional societies and their committees; organization of scientific conference sessions, chairmanship of conference sessions; review of scientific articles and grant proposals; editorship of scientific journals; lectures to community groups.

Unsatisfactory

There is little or no service activity demonstrated by the faculty member in the annual activity report. The faculty member does not meet the requirements of an adequate level of performance.

Adequate

The faculty member demonstrates all of the following in the area of service:

- regular and timely attendance at the department faculty meetings;
- fulfilling individual responsibilities to the department, including effective service on department committees;
- participation in student advising, open houses and other representative functions vital for the department.

Meritorious

Assuming the faculty member has met the requirements for adequate performance, an average of at least three measures per year over the past three years such as those listed below represent evidence for meritorious performance:

- effectively serving on college or university committees;
- effectively chairing an active department committee;
- effectively serving as an advisor for a student club;
- serving as a session chair in a national conference;
- holding an office in a local or professional organization;
- reviewing for a journal;
- serving as a guest speaker for area business, government or community organization.

Outstanding

Assuming the faculty member has met the requirements for meritorious performance, an average of at least two measures per year over the past three years such as those listed below represent evidence for outstanding performance:

- effectively serving as an editorial board member or associate editor for a professional journal;
- effectively serving as a track chair in a national conference;
- organizing a conference workshop or panel for a national conference;
- holding positions of leadership in community or professional organizations.

Extraordinary

The faculty member must demonstrate service activities that exceed expectations for outstanding performance. Extraordinary performance requires demonstration of leadership roles in several service activities and appropriate outcome of these activities.

14. Appointment of Department Chair

The dean initiates the search for department chairs. Each member of the department faculty must be given the opportunity for input into the search process. The search committee shall solicit the faculty members' input either orally or in writing. At the completion of the search process, the faculty members shall vote on the preferred ranking of the candidates. The result of this vote must be included in the search committee's report to the dean.

15. Evaluation of Department Chair

The dean initiates the formal evaluation of the department chair based on university and college guidelines. If an extra-ordinary evaluation of the department chair is desired, the department faculty may, by a two-thirds majority, request such an evaluation from the dean.

16. Maintenance of Department Bylaws

Modifications to the Department Bylaws may be made as needed and require a majority of all bargaining unit department faculty members to pass as well as the approval of the dean and the Faculty Governance Committee. Department Bylaws shall be reviewed by the faculty members at least once every 5 years.