

Department of Mathematics and Statistics Bylaws

Approved: 3/31/2003

These Bylaws provide the basis for faculty participation in the educational, research and service activities of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, consistent with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

All full-time faculty holding a faculty appointment in the Department are allowed to participate fully in making recommendations about the operation of the Department, except in those cases specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement that are reserved for Bargaining Unit Faculty (BUF) members. Staff members will participate, as non-voting members of the Department, on issues directly affecting their jobs (e.g. office procedures).

A. Departmental Faculty

The Departmental Faculty (henceforth, the “Faculty”) includes all full-time faculty members, except for the Department Chair, having the rank of instructor, lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor or professor. The Faculty hold regular meetings called by the Departmental Chair (henceforth, the “Chair”). Special meetings of the Faculty are held within ten working days of the receipt by the Chair of requests from at least seven members of the Faculty. Faculty meetings are chaired by the Chair and are run in accordance with Robert’s Rules of Order. Emeritus/Emerita faculty are invited to attend and participate in all appropriate departmental activities, but are not eligible to vote. Faculty whose primary appointments are in another department are not eligible to vote unless otherwise specified in the joint appointment agreement between their primary departments and the Department of Mathematics and Statistics.

The Faculty give advice and make recommendations regarding departmental policies and programs, consistent with the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The Faculty conduct much of their business through the committee structure outlined in these Bylaws. In particular, faculty appointments are handled by the Chair with the recommendation of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and Faculty Search Committees as detailed below. Certain matters may be regularly delegated to departmental committees, with the committees reporting back to the Faculty at Departmental Meetings. The Faculty retains the right to review committee recommendations to the Chair, except those personnel actions explicitly delegated by these Bylaws to the Steering Committee or Promotion and Tenure Committee.

B. Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of all tenured Bargaining Unit faculty and the Chair as a non-voting member. The Committee fosters and evaluates faculty scholarship, teaching, professional practice and service. The Committee is responsible for setting up annual evaluation subcommittees for untenured faculty, upon appointment, to guide them through the promotion and tenure process, to evaluate their record and report to the full Committee. Members of the Committee vote on all tenure cases but may not vote on recommendations for promotion to a higher rank than their own. All Committee votes must take place at duly convened meetings (announced in writing or by e-mail at least four working days in advance). A quorum consists of three-quarters of the Committee’s eligible voters. Members must be present to vote except absentee

ballots may be used when there is a conflicting regularly scheduled class or official university travel (or as otherwise specified in these bylaws). Each voter who is present may cast a yes vote, a no vote, or may choose not to cast a vote, i.e., abstain. Should a member of the committee, present and eligible to vote, fail to vote, this shall be construed as an abstention by that member. However, only yes or no votes are allowed on absentee ballots. A two-thirds affirmative vote (i.e. ($\frac{\text{\# yes votes}}{\text{\# of votes (yes or no) + \# of abstentions}} \geq \frac{2}{3}$) is necessary for a positive promotion or tenure recommendation. For new faculty to be appointed with tenure, a three-quarters affirmative vote (i.e. ($\frac{\text{\# yes votes}}{\text{\# of votes (yes or no) + \# of abstentions}} \geq \frac{3}{4}$) is necessary for a positive tenure recommendation.

Once the formal, written balloting begins, it will continue (without discussion) and end when there is a unanimous vote (i.e. ($\frac{\text{\# yes votes}}{\text{\# of votes (yes or no) + \# of abstentions}$) is zero or one), or when two consecutive votes yield identical ballot 'vectors' (# yes votes, # no votes, # abstentions), or if the third and fourth votes yield the same recommendation, or after the fifth vote. The last vote will be the one that will be reported. In the case of a negative vote on a candidate's promotion and/or tenure, the Committee must provide to the candidate an explanation of any specific criterion cited in Section H (or Section I) that is not met.

Every January, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will elect a tenured full professor from the bargaining unit as Committee chair. The Committee's chair is responsible for insuring that the required annual statement of progress toward promotion and tenure is conducted for all untenured Bargaining Unit Faculty, and for tenured assistant professors and associate professors, regarding their advancement toward promotion and/or tenure. The Committee's chair transmits the Committee's promotion and/or tenure recommendations to the Department Chair and to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

An annual statement by the Promotion and Tenure Committee will assess each untenured BUF member's progress towards tenure and promotion. An annual evaluation by the full professors on the Promotion and Tenure Committee will assess each tenured assistant and associate professor's progress toward promotion to the next rank, unless the member requests that the evaluation be conducted once every three years.

Standing subcommittees of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, appointed in the Spring (for duties starting Fall) by the Committee chair with the recommendation of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, are (i) the Professional Development Subcommittee, responsible for reviewing and recommending applications for professional development leaves (sabbaticals) in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, and for overseeing the peer teaching evaluation process (see G. 1. c. Peer Evaluation of Teaching), and (ii) the Scholarship Subcommittee, responsible for evaluating those research grant proposals which need to be forwarded to the college, and for evaluating proposals for the Visiting Scholars Program. Other similar responsibilities may be delegated to these subcommittees as appropriate.

C. Steering Committee

The Steering Committee consists of the Chair and six elected members. The Department Chair will chair the Steering Committee, but will serve as a non-voting member. All full-time faculty members are eligible to serve on the Steering Committee and to vote in the election of Steering Committee members. The election of Steering Committee members will be held every year during the Spring Quarter, at which time four positions will be contested. Each eligible voter will vote for at most one person on a list of eligible and willing candidates. To be elected a candidate must receive at least 1/6 of the votes cast. The winners will be the candidates with the most votes. The two candidates with the most votes will serve two-year terms, and the

other two winners will serve one-year terms. In the event of a tie or if an insufficient number of candidates receive at least 1/6 of the votes cast runoff elections will be held, as needed.

In the Spring Quarter, and at least ten days before the election of a new Steering Committee, the Chair will announce the date of the Steering Committee election. All Faculty who do not wish to be candidates on the Steering Committee ballot will inform the Chair and the current Steering Committee of this decision in writing, at least 24 hours before the election date. The names of all other Faculty will be included as candidates on the Steering Committee ballot.

The Steering Committee makes recommendations to the Chair for committee appointments, including chairs of committees (with the exception of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Statistics Program Committee), professional travel allocations, annual evaluations of Bargaining Unit Faculty, and other administrative issues brought to it by the Chair. Being a body elected to represent the department faculty, the Steering Committee functions as an advisory committee to the Chair on the full range of departmental issues.

The Chair will distribute an agenda to all full-time faculty and staff at least two working days prior to holding a meeting. However, the foregoing provision will not apply if the Chair needs to call a Steering Committee meeting with less than two days advance notice; but in that case, after the meeting, the Chair will instead distribute a list of topics that were discussed. The Chair will keep the Faculty informed in a timely fashion concerning travel allocations, travel allocation policies, committee assignments, and other recommendations of the Steering Committee as well as the chair's decisions about these recommendations.

D. Standing Committees

The other standing committees, appointed by the Chair with the advice of the Steering Committee, are the Applied Mathematics Program Committee, the Calculus Committee, the Colloquium Committee, the Computing Advisory Committee, the Curriculum Committee, the Graduate Committee, the Library Committee, the Mathematics Education Program Committee, the Statistics Program Committee, and the Undergraduate Committee. Each is charged with making recommendations through the Faculty to the Chair concerning specific aspects of the department's activities. The Chair coordinates the overlapping responsibilities of these committees.

The chair of each committee is responsible for ensuring communications from that committee to the Chair as well as to other committee chairs when activities overlap or are related.

1. Applied Mathematics Program Committee

The Applied Mathematics Program Committee makes recommendations concerning courses and undergraduate and graduate programs in applied mathematics. Programmatic changes recommended by this committee are subject to review by the Undergraduate or Graduate Committee before being submitted to the Faculty for recommendation to the Chair.

2. Calculus Committee

The Calculus Committee makes recommendations concerning the calculus sequence and prepares common final examinations as needed.

3. **Colloquium Committee**

The Colloquium Committee coordinates departmental colloquia and invitations to off-campus speakers.

4. **Computing Advisory Committee**

The Computing Advisory Committee monitors the hardware and software computing needs of the department's faculty and staff, and makes recommendations to the Chair regarding expenditures of departmental and other funds to meet these needs.

5. **Curriculum Committee**

The Curriculum Committee reviews those aspects of the undergraduate mathematics and statistics courses that are offered in large measure to meet the requirements of other departments or programs.

6. **Graduate Committee**

The Graduate Committee reviews the programs of study and the recruiting, advising and encouragement of graduate students in Mathematics and Statistics. It also recommends membership on the Graduate Faculty. It alerts the Applied Mathematics, Mathematics Education, and Statistics Program Committees to relevant issues it is considering.

7. **Library Committee**

The Library Committee advises the University Libraries on the acquisition of mathematics and statistics materials (monographs, serials, media, etc.)

8. **Mathematics Education Program Committee**

The Mathematics Education Program Committee reviews all aspects of the department's Mathematics Education program, including mathematics courses for Early and Middle Childhood Education majors. Faculty with appointments in the Departments of Mathematics and Statistics and/or Teacher Education, whose primary responsibility is mathematics education, are members of this committee. Programmatic changes recommended by this committee are subject to review by the Undergraduate or Graduate Committee before being submitted to the Faculty for recommendation to the Chair. It alerts the Applied Mathematics and Statistics Program Committees to relevant issues it is considering.

9. **Undergraduate Committee**

The Undergraduate Committee oversees the programs of study and the recruiting, advising and encouragement of undergraduate students majoring or minoring in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics.

E. The Statistics Program Committee

Faculty whose primary appointments are in statistics are delegated, through the Statistics Program Committee, to review, evaluate and recommend statistics programs and courses in coordination with other appropriate departmental committees as specified below.

The Statistics Program Committee concerns itself with the development, needs, and course and programmatic changes in statistics, including statistics service courses and undergraduate and graduate programs in statistics. The Committee is chaired by a tenured Associate Professor or Professor appointed by the Chair after consulting with the Committee. The Committee includes all professorial rank statistics faculty and the Director of the Statistical Consulting Center. Programmatic changes recommended by this committee are subject to review by the Undergraduate and/or Graduate Committees, and likewise service course changes recommended by this committee are subject to review by the Curriculum Committee, before being submitted to the Faculty for recommendation to the Chair.

The Director of the Statistical Consulting Center, in consultation with the Statistics Program Committee, makes recommendations to the Chair concerning policies of the Statistical Consulting Center, its organizational structure, and its functions in support of statistics programs.

F. Other Departmental Committees and Assignments

1. Faculty Search Committees

When permission to fill a faculty position has been granted, the Steering Committee will recommend the composition of a Search Committee for the position to the Chair in a timely fashion. The Chair appoints the committee, names its chair and informs the Faculty of its members.

Faculty will have opportunities to review the files of all applicants and make their opinions known to members of the Search Committee and/or the Chair. Faculty will also be provided with opportunities, should they so desire, to meet all candidates brought to campus for interviews.

2. Advice on Naming of Chairs and Acting Chairs

When a search for the Departmental Chair, or an Acting Chair appointed to serve for more than one academic year, is underway (either internal or external), a majority of search committee members will be Bargaining Unit Faculty Members elected by the Bargaining Unit Faculty in the department.

Faculty will have opportunities to review the files of all applicants and make their opinions known to members of the Search Committee. Faculty will also be provided with opportunities, should they so desire, to meet all candidates brought to campus for interviews. After the interviews, the Faculty will meet to discuss the candidates and to vote on the candidates' acceptability and the Faculty's preferences.

The Faculty will provide the Dean 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 finds unacceptable should be so indicated. In addition, the Faculty on the search committee may invite the Dean to a meeting to discuss the candidates and the Faculty's ranking of the candidates.

3. **Review of the Department Chair**

Members of the Department may be asked by the Dean of the College to serve on a committee to review the Chair. These individuals will serve on this committee unless they can show a conflict of interest or some circumstance that would prevent them from fully participating. These individuals will follow the instructions provided by the Dean in developing and administering an anonymous performance evaluation questionnaire sent to the Department faculty. A majority of the Department BUF may also request the Dean of the College to call for a review of the Chair.

4. **Other Committees**

The Faculty may establish ad-hoc committees, or recommend that the Chair do so, and the Chair may establish ad hoc committees, as needed.

G. Annual Evaluations: Criteria and Procedures for Annual Evaluation of Departmental Bargaining Unit Faculty

Teaching, Scholarly and Service Activities to be used in the Annual Evaluation

Subsections 4, 5 and 6 (of section G) below list teaching, scholarly and service activities used in the Annual Evaluation. Note that some activities can be classified in more than one of the activity categories, depending on the exact nature of the activity. Consequently, these have been listed in more than one category below, and Bargaining Unit Faculty may choose to include these on their annual activity reports in the category of their own choosing, with the understanding that in no cases can an activity be listed more than once, or be given credit more than once, in different categories on any annual activity report.

1. **Introduction and Sources of Information**

An annual evaluation of the Bargaining Unit Faculty member will take place according to the procedures outlined in this section.

a. **Annual Activity Report**

Each Bargaining Unit Faculty member will submit an annual activity report documenting professional activity in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service for the previous year; the annual activity report will list activities undertaken in a single calendar year. A Bargaining Unit Faculty member may include a statement and any relevant materials in the annual activity report to describe methods and activities used in teaching courses throughout the year, and likewise other evidence to further illustrate the record in teaching, scholarship, and service.

b. **Student Evaluation of Teaching**

Student evaluation of teaching will be done in accordance with the CBA.

c. **Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

- a. for untenured Bargaining Unit Faculty members

Each year, the Professional Development Subcommittee (PDS) of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will arrange for classes taught by all untenured Bargaining Unit Faculty members (except those who have been denied tenure in their final probationary year and are in their terminal year) to be visited by tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty members.

Each peer reviewer shall prepare a written report and submit it to the PDS with a copy to the Department Chair. These reports together shall constitute the peer evaluation of teaching. In addition, they shall be used as noted in section G.1. d. and in the teaching portion of section H.

- b. for all Bargaining Unit Faculty members

The Chair may ask, or the Steering Committee may recommend that the Chair ask, a tenured Bargaining Unit faculty member to observe a faculty member in one or more classroom situations. Members whose classes are to be observed will be given advance notice, but they may or may not be told the dates on which the observations will occur.

Likewise, a faculty member may request observations of his/her classroom activities by a tenured faculty member. The member may provide the Chair with the names of at least three persons, one of whom will normally be chosen by the Chair. Requesting members may or may not be told the dates on which the observations will occur.

Each faculty member engaging in such a classroom observation shall prepare a written report and submit it to the Department Chair and to the observed faculty member. The Steering Committee (which shall have access to these reports) shall use all such reports from a given calendar year to inform its recommendation to the Chair regarding teaching performance for that year (see G. 1. d.). The Chair shall use all such reports from a given calendar to inform his or her evaluation scores in teaching (see G. 1. d.).

- d. **Chair and Steering Committee Review**

Both the Chair and the Steering Committee will examine the current annual activity reports. The Chair and at least one other member of the steering committee will examine the student evaluations of teaching and the peer evaluation of teaching (when available as provided in G.1.c.), access to both of which will also be provided to the full Steering Committee. In addition, they will examine the previous annual activity report (for those faculty who have been with the department long enough) for the purpose of evaluating activities which take more than a year to complete, and for other explicitly stated reasons listed below.

The Bargaining Unit Faculty Members on the Steering Committee will make recommendations to the Chair regarding the performance of Bargaining Unit Faculty in

teaching, scholarship, and service. Informed by these recommendations, the Chair will conduct the annual evaluations and assign evaluation scores for teaching, scholarship, and service.

The Chair will make available in the department office the evaluation scores in teaching, scholarship and service, by name, within five working days of having determined the scores. Should the Chair make any changes to these scores, he/she will inform all Bargaining Unit Faculty members that a change has been made.

2. **Relative Weights for Teaching, Scholarship and Service**

For all Bargaining Unit Faculty the weights may vary according to the following criteria, with exceptions noted elsewhere in this document:

- a. Weight for teaching must be between 35% and 50%
- b. Weight for scholarship must be between 35% and 50%
- c. Weight for service must be between 15% and 30%
- d. Weights must sum to 100%

Weights will be chosen from the above ranges that will maximize the individual's overall score. If more than one choice of weights will maximize the overall merit score, then among those choices the Chair will assign the weights that are proportionally closest to 40% for teaching, 40% for scholarship, 20% for service. This system will apply to all Bargaining Unit Faculty in the department unless the chair assigns a different weighting to allow for one or more of the following:

- a. unique work assignments that differ from those of other Bargaining Unit Faculty;
- b. discipline pursuant to the contract; or
- c. correction of a pattern of substandard performance extending more than one year.

A written explanation will be given to the Bargaining Unit Faculty member who is assigned a weighting that does not maximize the member's overall score or that uses weightings outside the above ranges.

2. **Criteria for Evaluation**

In accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, in each category (teaching, scholarship, and service), a faculty member will be assigned a score of 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 by the Chair.

- a. Teaching

The score for teaching will reflect the faculty member's effort and accomplishments for the period of the calendar year in which the teaching was performed. Some faculty members receive an atypical teaching load (e.g. sabbatical, administrative responsibilities, teaching load reductions for AAUP service, overload, etc.). In general, an atypical teaching load does not affect the teaching score or the weights. A faculty member who has no teaching for the

period being evaluated (e.g. a PDL coinciding with the calendar year) will normally have a weight of zero percent for teaching for that year.

- i. A score of zero indicates major problems with teaching. For example, the faculty member may fail to meet classes for no compelling reason, the faculty member is often unprepared for teaching responsibilities, serious teaching problems exist as verified from substantiated complaints from students, or the faculty member fails to comply with written standards present in departmental syllabi for conducting a course in such a way as to have severely detrimental consequences for the quality of the course.
- ii. A score of one indicates that the faculty member is minimally fulfilling teaching responsibilities (meeting classes and evaluating student's work for assigning grades) but based on peer evaluations (when available as provided in G. 1. c.) and comments written by students on the University Student Evaluation of Instruction form, the faculty member is only moderately successful in helping students learn course material.
- iii. A score of 2 indicates that the faculty member is doing an effective job teaching with no apparent major problems as evidenced by peer evaluations (when available as provided in G. 1. c.) and comments written by students on the University Student Evaluation of Instruction form. The faculty member meets classes at assigned times, holds regular office hours, provides students with feedback on progress, states appropriate grading policies at the beginning of the course, and generally conforms to the teaching responsibilities listed in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
- iv. To merit a score of 3, the faculty member must satisfy the criteria for a score of 2. In addition, the member must satisfy at least one of the following additional criteria, or the equivalent.
 - a. The member is engaged more actively than the vast majority of faculty in course development, course maintenance, and other teaching activities found in G. 4. below.
 - b. In nearly all sections taught by the member, comments written by students on the University Student Evaluation of Instruction form are highly favorable and almost uniformly so.
- v. To merit a score of 4, the faculty member must satisfy the criteria for a score of 2. In addition, the faculty member must satisfy at least one of the following additional criteria, or the equivalent.
 - a. The member satisfies both the criteria listed under iv. a-b.
 - b. The member has received a college-wide or university-wide teaching award during the period under review.

b. Scholarship

The scores for scholarship are based on a list of scholarly activities listed in part 5 of this section. The Steering Committee and the Chair will consider the quality of scholarly work. For example, the reputation of journals, length of publications, and venues at which lectures are given, can be used to assess quality. Co-authorship is another factor the Steering Committee and the Chair will use in assessing a member's contribution. In evaluating the

contribution of co-authors, it will be assumed absent other information that co-authors share equally in the credit for their work (that is, each author will receive full credit for the work).

- i. A score of 0 indicates little or no evidence of scholarly work in the last two years and there is little or no evidence of work in progress at the time of evaluation.
- ii. A score of 1 indicates that the faculty member is pursuing scholarly activities but that the scholarly work has not entered the publication (or equivalent) process. For example, acceptable evidence for this purpose is an item in the current annual activity report from those under 5b, 5c, 5d, or 5e below, or giving a talk in a departmental research seminar, or equivalent evidence provided by other aspects of the record.
- iii. A score of 2 indicates evidence of on-going scholarly activity. An example of acceptable evidence for this purpose is at least one item in the current annual activity report under 5a, or equivalent evidence provided by other aspects of the record.
- iv. A score of 3 indicates a very active ongoing research program as evidenced by several activities from part 5. An example of acceptable evidence for this purpose is at least two scholarly works in the current annual activity report (items under 5a), in addition to giving talks at conferences or other institutions, or equivalent. Another example is at least one paper under 5a in the current annual activity report of very high quality, plus at least two other items from 5a, 5b, 5c, or 5d, in addition to giving talks at conferences or other institutions, or equivalent.
- v. A score of 4 indicates a very successful ongoing research program. An example of acceptable evidence for this purpose is several scholarly publications in the current annual activity report under 5a, at least one of which is in a premier journal, and in these publications, the faculty member must either be sole author or must report playing a substantial role. The publication of a scholarly book in addition to other scholarly activities will normally merit a score of four. Also, an external (neither WSU nor WSU Foundation) research grant funded in which the faculty member is a Principal Investigator will normally provide evidence for a score of extraordinary.

c. Service

The score for service will reflect the faculty member's effort for the period of the calendar year in which the service is expected.

- i. A score of 0 indicates that the faculty member has little or no evidence of service performed for the department, college, university, or for her/his profession, at a level necessary for a higher score.
- ii. A score of 1 indicates that the faculty member has a minimal level of departmental activity consisting of attending department faculty meetings and serving on a committee that rarely meets, or the equivalent.
- iii. A score of 2 indicates that the faculty member is engaged in several service activities as listed in section 6 and plays an active role in at least one – or the equivalent. To merit a 2, an untenured faculty member is not expected to perform service at the same level as a tenured member; for example, untenured faculty are not expected to play a leadership role in service activities, nor to be assigned to as many department committees as tenured members, nor to participate in extra-departmental service.

- iv. A score of 3 indicates a very active service record. Faculty should have a substantial involvement in many service activities from the list in section 6. However, if a faculty member has been engaged in a very time consuming or critically important service activity, then a rating of three may be warranted with only a few service activities reported.
- v. A score of 4 indicates strong evidence of service resulting in major accomplishments for the department, college, university, or the faculty member's profession. Some examples include serving as an editor to an appropriate journal, or being elected to high office in a national or international professional organization. Also, an extraordinary rating is justified for faculty members who have been actively engaged in a number of service activities in a leadership role from the list in section 6.

4. **Teaching Activities**

- a. Course coordination
- b. Course or curriculum development
- c. Writing or revising lab manuals, syllabi, or other course materials
- d. Assessment
- e. Developing a new course
- f. Developing a new major, minor, or concentration of study at Wright State University
- g. Developing a new graduate program
- h. Serving on comprehensive exam committees
- i. Serving as a graduate program director
- j. Coaching students for the Putnam exam (or other such academic competitions)
- k. Teaching a challenging or time consuming course for the first time (or the first time in years)
- l. Performing other teaching-related activities not appropriately reported elsewhere
- m. Receiving a college-wide or university-wide teaching award

Teaching Activities cross-listed with Scholarly Activities

- n. Textbooks published (or chapters therein).
- o. Scholarly work relating to teaching that has been accepted for publication
- p. Invited talks about teaching
- q. Contributed talks about teaching
- r. Teaching grants submitted, pending, or funded
- s. Participation in teaching related conferences, seminars, short courses, or workshops

Teaching Activities cross-listed with Scholarly Activities and Service Activities

- t. Supervising research done by students, including, but not limited to:
 - Serving on Master's and Ph.D. committees
 - Serving as thesis or graduate project advisor
- u. Refereeing research publications, research grant proposals, etc.
- v. Serving as a reviewer for Mathematical Reviews, or other such publications

Teaching Activities cross-listed with Service Activities

- w. Advising students

5. Scholarly Activities

In this section, the term research is to be broadly interpreted to include the more general notion of scholarship.

This section lists several activities that are considered as scholarly activities for the purpose of evaluating a faculty member's scholarship. With the exceptions noted, activities for which a faculty member receives external compensation (not counting nominal honoraria or coverage of expenses) shall not be credited to the member. One such exception is a royalty from a publication (including but not limited to texts, lab manuals, software, and instructional materials).

- a. Peer-reviewed publications to include research papers, scholarly papers relating to teaching, monographs, or books (or chapters in books or articles therein). For each item not previously reported as published, the annual activity report should list its history: dates of submissions, revisions, acceptance, and publication. Credit will be given for an item accepted for publication without need for further revision.
- b. Items submitted for publication and technical reports
- c. Non-trivial, substantive, revision of items under b. previously submitted
- d. Publications as in a. but not subject to peer review
- e. Invited talks about research at conferences, professional meetings, other institutions, or other departments at Wright State University
- f. Contributed talks about research at conferences or other venues
- g. Research grants submitted
- h. Research grants funded
- i. Participation in research seminars (either presenting a talk or organizing a seminar)
- j. Participation in short courses, workshops, conferences and other meetings pertaining either to research or to professional practice for mathematics educators
- k. Professional practice for mathematics educators
 - Professional development programs for in-service teachers, school administrators, and university faculty (including but not limited to institutes, workshops, seminars, classroom visitation).
 - Assessment of effectiveness of professional development programs, including pre- and post-test results, participant questionnaires, and other forms of soliciting and analyzing feedback from participants.
 - Development of curricula and materials. Such items must have been published in a peer reviewed publication or adopted elsewhere to count as scholarship.
 - Development and assessment of programs, courses, and instructional materials for pre-service and in-service teachers.
 - Field-testing curricular materials (original or otherwise) in school (pre-college), undergraduate, and graduate classrooms.

- l. Other research-related activities not appropriately reported elsewhere.

Scholarly Activities cross-listed with Teaching Activities

- m. Teaching textbooks published (or chapters therein)
- n. Scholarly work relating to teaching that has been accepted for publication
- o. Invited talks about teaching
- p. Contributed talks about teaching
- q. Teaching grants submitted, pending, or funded
- r. Participation in teaching related conferences, seminars, short courses, or workshops

Scholarly Activities cross-listed with Teaching Activities and Service Activities

- s. Supervising research done by students, including, but not limited to:

Serving on Master's and Ph.D. committees

Serving as thesis or graduate project advisor

- t. Refereeing research publications, research grant proposals, etc.
- u. Serving as a reviewer for Mathematical Reviews, or other such publications

6. Service Activities

- a. Professional practice including consulting, reviewing curricular materials (e.g. texts), serving as an expert witness.
- b. Supervising or evaluating student teaching
- c. Holding an office in, or providing service to, a professional organization.
- d. Department committees (indicate if ordinary member or chair or other special role)
- e. College committees (indicate if ordinary member or chair or other special role)
- f. University committees (indicate if ordinary member or chair or other special role)
- g. Attending commencement (see the Collective Bargaining Agreement)
- h. Faculty governance posts (e.g., faculty senate, Faculty President, etc.)
- i. Evaluation of peers (including adjuncts)
- j. Community service (judge at a science fair, visiting scientist at a school, etc.)
- k. Recruiting students
- l. Acting as a resource for media or government agencies
- m. Organizing department seminars
- n. Organizing a conference or a session at a conference
- o. Editorial board or similar duty for scholarly journals, conference proceedings, or the equivalent.
- p. Other service-related activities not appropriately reported elsewhere.

Service Activities cross-listed with Teaching Activities and Scholarly Activities

- q. Supervising research done by students, including, but not limited to:

Serving on Master's and Ph.D. committees

Serving as thesis or graduate project advisor

- r. Refereeing research publications, research grant proposals, etc.
- s. Serving as a reviewer for Mathematical Reviews, or other such publications

Service Activities cross-listed with Teaching Activities

- t. Advising students

7. Rebuttal

A faculty member who disagrees with the Chair's evaluation may send a written response to the Chair. This rebuttal shall be stapled to the original evaluation, forwarded to all other entities which receive a copy of the evaluation, and kept on file.

H. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

To merit promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure, an Assistant Professor must, during the probationary period, establish and maintain a quality research program, demonstrate teaching effectiveness, and contribute to the operation of the Department. A positive recommendation for promotion and tenure by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee represents that body's collective judgment that the candidate has met these goals. The criteria presented below will govern deliberations and form the basis of recommendations. Teaching and scholarship will be valued most highly; service is important but should not be pursued to the detriment of teaching and scholarship.

Teaching

The candidate must have established a reliable record in effectively meeting all teaching responsibilities. Recent evaluations (peer and student) should indicate overall effectiveness, with no indication of major problems.

A candidate's teaching record may be strengthened by additional evidence of excellence in teaching, such as teaching awards and letters from students, or contributions related to the instructional program such as course and program development.

Each candidate for promotion and tenure must produce a summary of his/her student evaluation numbers as part of the formal promotion and tenure document. Copies of all classroom visit reports from the most recent calendar year shall be placed in the candidate's Promotion and Tenure document. The candidate may include additional testimonials, solicited or unsolicited, student evaluation comments, or other documents related to teaching, in the promotion and tenure document.

Research/Scholarship

Candidates must present evidence of an independent ongoing research/scholarship program at Wright State University. It is expected that the candidate will have at least the equivalent of five quality peer-reviewed articles published, or accepted for publication, since coming to Wright State and attributed to Wright State, in appropriate journals. At least one of those five articles should have been singly authored. In cases of joint authorship, where the candidate's contribution to a collaborative work was that of substantial co-author, the work will be counted as the equivalent of a similar single-authored work. At their discretion, either the Committee or the candidate may solicit additional letters from co-authors to establish the candidate's contribution to the co-authored work.

Quality is determined based on such factors as the reputation of the journals and the comments of external reviewers. These external reviewers must be experts in the candidate's field and not be, or have been, a mentor or collaborator. For candidates in mathematics education, the publications may involve a broad range of scholarship that reflects documented quality professional practice. Documentation must be provided for articles accepted for publication. Acceptance indicates that no further revisions are required.

The candidate should have regularly attended conferences and presented talks to appropriate audiences.

The candidate should have made continuing attempts to obtain funding by the submission of extramural, peer-reviewed, grant proposals, typically every other year, if not funded with multi-year grant support.

A candidate's research record may be strengthened by a strong overall research record, superior evaluations by external reviewers, significant funded research proposals, a record of invited talks, a strong record of professional practice,* or comparable evidence of high quality research/scholarship activity.

* Professional practice refers to efforts by the faculty to use their expertise to help clients from within or outside the university. Professional practice should enhance the candidate's overall research/scholarship program.

The candidate must provide the Promotion and Tenure Committee copies of all publications and manuscripts listed on the vita in the candidate's promotion and tenure document.

Service

During the probationary period, the candidate is expected to attend faculty meetings and serve on at least one committee per academic year.

Further contributions to the department, as well as any service to the college, the university, and the profession will be accorded appropriate credit (but cannot offset deficiencies in teaching or research)

Timeframe

The process for considering a candidate for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure will begin no later than the spring preceding the final probationary year at Wright State. A candidate with a clearly well-established and sustained overall research record, as evidenced by a superior publication record, significant funded research proposals, a record of invited talks, or a strong record of professional practice (as explained above), combined with strong outside letters and a superior teaching record, may merit promotion and tenure during any year preceding the final probationary year (a so-called “early promotion”).

I. Promotion to the Rank of Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor will be granted for a cumulative record of strong performance in teaching, research/scholarship, and service. A candidate’s entire work will be evaluated. Promotion requires that the candidate has assumed a responsible role in the functioning of the university. A positive recommendation for promotion by the subcommittee of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee composed of the full professors, represents that body’s collective judgment that the candidate has met these goals. The criteria presented below will govern deliberations and form the basis of recommendations.

Teaching

The candidate must have demonstrated a serious commitment to teaching. Student evaluations should indicate overall effectiveness. Classroom visits should confirm that the candidate is an asset in the classroom.

The candidate must also present evidence of significant contributions to the instructional program, such as course development, program development, involvement with the undergraduate program, and work with graduate students.

The Professional Development Subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will arrange for classroom visits, reports from which will be placed in the candidate’s promotion document. The candidate may include additional testimonials, solicited or unsolicited, or other documents related to teaching, in the promotion document.

Research/Scholarship

Candidates must have an active, well-established, research/scholarship program, as evidenced by both recent performance and the full scholarly record. A candidate will not be considered for promotion unless the equivalent of a total record of at least 15 quality, peer-reviewed, articles have been published, or accepted for publication without need for further revision, with at least 5 of these since the promotion to associate professor and at least 3 of these in the five years preceding consideration for promotion. At least four of those 15 articles should have been singly authored. In cases of joint authorship, where the candidate’s contribution to a collaborative work was that of a substantial co-author, the work will be counted as the equivalent of a similar single-authored work. At their discretion, either the Committee or the candidate may solicit additional letters from co-authors to establish the candidate’s contribution to the co-authored work.

The quality of the overall record is determined by such factors as the reputation of the journals, evidence of national or international recognition of the candidate's work, and the comments of external reviewers. These external reviewers must be experts in the candidate's field and not be, or have been, a mentor or collaborator. For candidates in mathematics education, the publications may involve a broad range of scholarship that reflects documented quality professional practice.

Documentation must be provided for articles accepted for publication. Acceptance indicates that no further revisions are required. The many kinds of evidence of national or international recognition include, but are not limited to, an invitation to speak at a meeting of an appropriate professional organization, publication of a paper in a recognized, peer reviewed journal, and a letter of reference from a recognized expert.

The vita should indicate that the candidate has continued to regularly attend conferences and present talks to appropriate audiences.

The candidate should have submitted at least two extramural grant proposals, or received multi-year funding, in the years following promotion to the rank of associate professor.

A case for promotion before the end of six years in rank requires an exceptionally strong overall research record, as evidenced by papers accepted in prestigious journals, a record of invited talks, significant research/scholarship funding, or comparable indication of consistent, very high quality research/scholarship activity.

Service

A candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor must present evidence of significant and ongoing service contributions to the discipline, Department, College or University. Examples include chairing committees, contributing in a substantial way to the productive work of committees, or assuming responsibility for significant professional activity such as organizing a conference.

Timeframe

The full professors will normally review a candidate's record in greater detail for promotion to the rank of Professor beginning four years after promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

J. Tenure only at Rank of Associate Professor and Professor

To be eligible for tenure, a faculty member already at the Associate Professor or Professor rank must demonstrate the level of accomplishments defined above for promotion to those respective ranks. The candidate may freely use evidence from Wright State and from previous positions, academic and non-academic where appropriate, to demonstrate ongoing effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service. All candidates must submit at a minimum full curriculum vitae describing in detail their teaching, scholarship, service, and other relevant academic experiences.

K. Summer Teaching

In cases where the number of Bargaining Unit Faculty Members wanting to teach Summer courses in a particular summer is more than the number of courses available, the following procedure will be adopted in the assignment of these classes.

1. Each bargaining unit faculty member wishing to teach that summer will be given a numerical score which is the sum of the following three components:
 - a. Number of credit hours taught the previous summer.
 - b. One half the number of credit hours taught the summer two years ago.
 - c. One fourth the number of credit hours taught the summer three years ago.
2. The scores determine a ranking of faculty for teaching summer courses. The ranking determines a prioritized order of who gets to teach (lower score equals higher priority), but not which courses are taught. Ties in ranking will be broken by order of the number of years of service in the Department (more years of service equals higher priority). Any further ties will be handled by the Chair, in consultation with the faculty members involved.
3. After all BUFM's on the ranked list have been assigned a Summer course, and if there are courses remaining, then the procedure repeats.

L. Amendments to the Bylaws

Amendment of these Bylaws will be by the procedure indicated in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

An automatic review of these Bylaws by the Faculty occurs the year following approval of a new Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Any proposed change or amendment to the Bylaws must be communicated to the Faculty at least ten working days in advance of meeting or voting on the amendment.

Prior to any formal vote by the department's Bargaining Unit Faculty to approve a proposed amendment to the Bylaws, the Faculty will meet to discuss the proposed amendment. At this meeting, no substantive changes to the text, other than editorial changes, may be made. After discussion, the Faculty will cast an advisory vote on the amendment. Following the meeting and advisory vote, and regardless of the outcome of the advisory vote, a mail ballot will be sent to the Bargaining Unit Faculty containing (i) the text of the amendment, (ii) the outcome of the advisory vote, and (iii) check-off spaces to allow approval or rejection of the amendment. This mail ballot constitutes the formal vote by the Bargaining Unit Faculty. Bargaining Unit Faculty will have at least three working days following distribution of the ballots to return them. Majority approval by the Bargaining Unit faculty and approvals by the Dean and the Faculty Governance Committee are required for passage of the amendment.