

Department of Physics Bylaws

Approved: May 21, 2003

Amended: January 15, 2004

Organization and Procedure

Physics Department faculty (here and elsewhere referring to all full-time faculty excluding the department chair) participate in governance through providing advice and recommendations in a Departmental Meeting of the faculty and through recommendations of departmental committees. The standing department committees are: Faculty Development Committee, Undergraduate Studies Committee, Graduate Studies Committee, Budget Committee, and Engineering Physics Program Committee. The constitution and function of these is described below. Ad Hoc committees may be appointed by the bargaining unit faculty at a Department Meeting or by the department chair as needed.

Faculty Participation in Governance

The Departmental Meeting is the venue in which the faculty considers academic policy and advises the chair on its implementation. It also provides a forum for common discussion of matters of departmental concern.

The department chair shall call a meeting of the Physics Department faculty at least once a quarter (except for the summer). A Departmental meeting may be called by the chair of the department, the chair of a departmental committee (such as Faculty Development Committee) or by petition of one-third of all department full-time faculty members. The individual(s) who call a meeting will announce the purpose of the meeting and call for any additional agenda items from the department faculty before the meeting. Faculty requested items will be added to the agenda or the agenda shall contain a standard item titled "Faculty Issues" in which faculty may bring up issues of concern at the meeting. The agenda and associated documents should be distributed to the faculty at least one working day in advance of the meeting. The department chair may, but need not, attend a faculty meeting called by others.

Whenever possible the recommendations of the Department faculty will be made by unanimous consent. When a vote is necessary, all full time faculty members except for the department chair will have one vote at a departmental meeting. However, only BUFM may vote on certain issues as indicated in the CBA. A quorum is defined as half of the Department faculty to conduct business. Recommendations of the faculty are made by a majority vote of those eligible to vote. Voting will be open response unless a faculty member eligible to vote requests that the voting for a particular issue use secret ballots.

Department Standing Committees

Committee membership, unless specifically addressed elsewhere in these bylaws, shall be named by the Physics department chair and shall be determined through voluntary department faculty participation where this is feasible. Effort shall be made to recruit the faculty member who carries the least department and college service first, and the faculty member who carries the most department service is recruited last. Except for the

Faculty Development Committee, the chair of the Physics Department shall appoint the chairs of the departmental committees with consideration given to balancing the service load of the department faculty.

Department Undergraduate Studies Committee. This committee shall be composed of at least two departmental faculty members, the department lab manager as a voting member, and the department chair as a non-voting member. The committee is charged with reviewing the course offerings of the department and recommending new course proposals, modification of prescribed course content, elimination of courses, and recruiting Physics majors. The committee reviews scholarship requests and senior project proposals. This committee acts as the petition committee for students. The recommendations of this committee shall be reviewed by the full departmental faculty for a vote before a final recommendation is made.

Graduate Studies Committee. This committee shall be composed of the Physics Department chair as non-voting member and at least 2 graduate faculty members from the department. The committee is responsible for reviewing the graduate courses and curriculum. This committee recruits graduate students, and recommends admission of any new graduate student into one of the various degree programs offered by the department. The committee chair is also charged with reviewing the progress of the department's graduate students once a year and presenting this report at a department meeting.

Department Budget Committee. This committee shall be composed of at least two tenured department faculty members and the Physics Department chair as a non-voting member. This committee is charged with reviewing the annual department budget and expenditures, and advising the chair on prioritization of expenditures for the department. Based on a previous year's expenditures, the committee may recommend to the department chair changes to amounts allocated to a particular item in the department's budget. The committee may obtain departmental financial information by requesting copies of reports of departmental accounts.

Engineering Physics Program Committee. This committee consists of the department chair (non-voting) plus three faculty members with applied physics interest including the Program Director, who is named by the Physics department chair, plus equivalent appointees from the Electrical Engineering Department. The chair of EE is the non-voting chair of this committee. This committee is charged with curricular oversight of the Engineering Physics Program, recommending approval and providing oversight for the senior design projects of Engineering Physics Majors, and recruiting Engineering Physics majors. The recommendations of the committee go to the EE department chair unless they affect courses offered by the Physics Department.

Other Procedures

Faculty Appointment

Physics Bargaining Unit Faculty Members (BUFM) elect a numerical majority of the Search Committee members from among Physics Department BUFM and makes recommendations of candidates for on-site visits through the Search Committee to the Department chair. The Department chair selects the other members of the search committee and appoints its chair. Candidates are selected for an on-site visit by the department chair. Available department faculty will have an opportunity to meet each candidate selected for visit. The Department Faculty as a whole will assess the qualifications and will rank the candidates in a secret ballot at a department faculty meeting; such rankings will be summed by the search committee so as to provide an overall faculty recommendation included with the Search Committee's recommendations. The faculty

recommendation will include the faculty's ranking of candidates with a written reason for the ranking. Those candidates whom the faculty find absolutely unacceptable at any level will be so indicated.

Faculty Reappointment. Faculty reappointment from an outside department to the Physics Department will only occur after the recommendation of the departmental bargaining unit faculty is sought in a secret ballot, to be taken at a departmental meeting. This recommendation will be presented to the chair with the reason for the recommendation given (derived from discussion prior to the vote).

Teaching Assignments and Class Schedules, Including Summer and Overloads. Bargaining Unit Faculty may decline summer or overload teaching. If a faculty member is willing to teach a summer or overload course, he or she may indicate such in writing in a timely fashion, identifying the course or courses which he or she prefers to teach. If the number of bargaining unit faculty who want to teach summer courses exceeds the number of courses available, the chair shall institute a rotation system.

Faculty Involvement in the Review of Chairs. Upon the announcement of a review of the chair of the Department of Physics by the Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics, the Department faculty shall comply with the Dean's review policy and thereby assist the Dean in his or her review. Upon conclusion of the review the Physics Department FDC will survey the faculty on its view of the effectiveness of the review. Upon receipt of a request from the Dean for comments on the performance of the chair of the Physics Department, the chair of the FDC will remind the Physics Department Faculty of the importance of feedback to assist the chair in improved administration.

Faculty Development Committee

The Faculty Development Committee (FDC) makes recommendations regarding promotions, tenure, professional development leaves, leaves of absence and graduate faculty status. The Faculty Development Committee makes recommendations to the Department chair for annual evaluations, advises faculty members concerning their readiness for promotion and/or tenure through cumulative progress reports and mentors new faculty. The Committee consists of all tenured bargaining unit physics faculty of Associate and Full Professorial rank. The department chair is a non-voting member of the FDC. A chair shall be elected by the committee in a meeting held each year during the first week in April and shall elect a representative to the College FDC.

Promotion and Tenure

Any faculty member of the department considered for promotion and/or tenure shall submit the required materials to the chair of the FDC. The chair of the FDC shall request the necessary letters of reference from a list of referees agreed to 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. A letter from the committee will be prepared which summarizes its evaluation of the candidate's record, its recommendations and its reasoning which will explicitly address the applicable criteria for promotion and tenure found in these bylaws. The letter will also contain the final vote of the committee. The chair of the Department will provide a separate letter of recommendation and will not participate in the vote of the committee or in drafting the committee's letter. All members of the FDC will vote on all levels of promotion.

Faculty Dismissal of Probationary Faculty

The chair or the Dean should present his or her recommendation for dismissal of the bargaining unit faculty to the FDC, including the reasoning behind this recommendation. The faculty will be allowed full discussion of the dismissal case and will vote by secret ballot on whether or not to recommend dismissal of the probationary faculty member. The recommendation of the FDC 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 Dean.

Professional Development Leave

Applications for Professional Development Leave shall be evaluated by the FDC, and a priority score shall be assigned if more than one candidate requests leave. The written recommendations from the FDC as well as the chair shall be forwarded to the dean.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The FDC will be responsible for the peer evaluation of teaching for all bargaining unit faculty in the department. Peer evaluation will normally consist of a review of submitted course materials. For probationary faculty, peer evaluation will include at least one classroom visit by a voting member of the FDC each calendar year. If a review of these materials or unusual student complaints indicates that there are significant problems in teaching, class visitation (1 to 3 class sessions) by one or more members of the FDC will be arranged by the FDC. A written report of the peer evaluation, including any classroom visitation reports, will be reviewed by the FDC and then sent to the BUFM and submitted to the department chair for the annual evaluation.

Cumulative Statement of Progress

The annual FDC evaluation is based on the faculty member's Annual Report, the current CV, peer teaching evaluations, and other pertinent material the FDC may request. All FDC members assess each other independent of rank; the member under consideration is recused from consideration of his/her own case. The evaluation is to assess teaching, scholarship and service for the current year as a recommendation to the chair and cumulatively as a statement of progress toward promotion and/or tenure of the faculty member as indicated in the CBA. In the case of deficiencies, the report needs to be specific and should outline the committee's expectations for a given performance area.

General Criteria for Promotion

Publications

Published research scholarship must be sufficient to demonstrate the establishment of a sustained independent research program. This must be demonstrated by publication of research articles in peer reviewed, established and respected journals in science or mathematics. Faculty hired as science educators may also publish in pedagogical journals. Only publications that are published as from WSU will be considered.

Journal articles count towards promotion only if they are substantial and appear in archival, internationally recognized, technical journals (or, for faculty hired as science educators, pedagogical journals) that include a

formal, rigorous review process. The external reviewers will be asked to evaluate whether the candidate's research articles meet these criteria. Articles labeled as submitted may also be included, and, if they are accepted for publication prior to the due date for submitting P&T documents to the college, may be listed as in press for final submission to the college.

External Review

External letters of evaluation from individuals in the candidate's area of professional expertise are required. Three such letters are to be obtained from a list generated by the FDC. The list can include, but need not be limited to, names suggested by the candidate. The candidate and the FDC should agree on the final list of external reviewers. All external letters must be forwarded with the promotion document. Reviewers must be experts in the candidate's field and cannot be or have been a mentor or collaborator of the candidate

Grants and Contracts

External funding is expected of all members of the faculty. Funding sufficient to establish and maintain a productive and sustained research program must be obtained. The candidate must have made sustained and continuing attempts to obtain funding while not funded and to maintain funding when funded. External funding is defined here to consist of any support from outside WSU which contributes to and advances the candidate's scholarly production. This can consist of funding from national extramural funding agencies, business, government, foundation or in-kind support such as equipment or software donated to the candidate. Other funding of the candidate's scholarship, such as summer faculty programs or contracts providing monetary support for equipment and personnel, even though not through WSU, are identifiable support for the candidate if documented.

Teaching Criteria

Performance is acceptable if the faculty member has met assigned teaching responsibilities (outside of any unforeseen illness or emergency); if the faculty member's recent student and peer evaluations are mostly favorable; and if the faculty member provides evidence of curriculum development, laboratory development, instructional innovation, and student advising, demonstrates competence with classroom and laboratory instruction, is well prepared for his or her teaching assignment, communicates the material effectively, administers classrooms and laboratories punctually and consistently, and is available to students.

While it may be difficult to define acceptable teaching, the symptoms of unsatisfactory teaching tend to be more obvious. These include (but are not limited to):

- Missed classes (without informing the Department Chair or without adequate explanation)
- Missed advising appointments (without adequate explanation)
- Persistent, legitimate student complaints
- Erratic classroom behavior
- Failure to keep appropriate office hours or otherwise be available to students and advisees
- Failure to respond appropriately to reasonable student questions or complaints
- Irresponsible or unprofessional conduct with students

Documented evidence of some of these symptoms within two years of the candidate's promotion is grounds for denying promotion and/or tenure.

Service Criteria

An acceptable rating requires that the candidate compile a record of regularly and effectively serving the needs of the Department, College, or University through participation in recruiting and retaining students, and through participation in Department, College, and University committees as assigned or as opportunities arise. In addition, an expected record includes some evidence of serving the professional community.

Service

The criteria for service are the same as those described for promotion and tenure to the Associate Professor level except that service activities during the past 5 years, both during the probationary period at WSU and during previous appointments, will be considered. Emphasis will be placed on the continuation of and/or the development of a strong service record while at WSU

1. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Candidates must meet both the general criteria above, and specific criteria listed below.

1. 6 journal articles published and extramural funding greater than \$25,000.

Or

2. 5 journal articles published and extramural funding greater than \$50,000.

Or

3. 4 journal articles published and extramural funding greater than \$75,000.

Or

4. 3 journal articles published and extramural funding greater than \$300,000.

A publication record which does not meet these criteria fails to document the establishment of an independent research program, which is required. In the case of collaborative research, the exact nature of involvement must be clearly specified and will be evaluated by the external reviewers when possible to determine if the candidate played a significant enough role in the inception, design and implementation of the research for an article to count as one of those required. A publication coauthored with one of the BUFM's students is credited fully to that BUFM. A similar determination will be made about how to count extramural funding where the candidate is Co-PI but not the PI of a funded grant.

2. Criteria for Promotion to Professor

To be promoted to the rank of professor the individual's research must be characterized by continued productivity and development of a national or international reputation. The individual also is expected to have achieved a leadership position in terms of teaching and service, the latter both internal and external to WSU.

In addition to journal publications and external funding, the following measures of scholarship (or their equivalents) indicate the establishment of a national or international reputation which is expected for promotion to full professor.

- Book on a topic in one's field published by reputable publisher.
- Invited presentation or paper at national or international meeting.
- Significant book chapter in one's discipline published by reputable publisher
- Editor of a book in one's discipline published by reputable publisher
- Reviewed proceedings of national or international conferences
- Broadly distributed and used teaching materials or texts.
- Organization and participation in conferences and meetings.

Candidates are expected to have achieved one or more of these since the previous promotion.

Candidates must have published 15 articles of scholarship since the beginning of the probationary period as assistant professor, with at least 10 since the previous promotion. During the 5 years before the promotion, the candidate must published 3 or more articles, as indication of a sufficiently sustained research program. The candidate must demonstrate extramural support for his or her research at a minimum level of \$100,000 in extramural funding awarded since the previous promotion.

In addition to satisfying the general teaching criteria, the candidate must document 5 or more favorable teaching achievements such as those below since the last promotion. In addition the candidate must have been the major advisor for at least one graduate thesis or dissertation. Favorable teaching achievements include:

- Making major modifications to a course
- Effectively supervising independent study projects and honors projects.
- Effectively integrating new technologies into classroom instruction.
- Measurable and documented student achievement beyond the norm
- Serving as a major advisor for a completed master's thesis
- Attracting funds for laboratory equipment to support teaching.
- Participation in college or university curricular development (designing and implementing changes in the curriculum)
- The equivalent

It is expected that each 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 and may include, among others:

- 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.

The candidate must document service to the college, university or professional activity at a minimum average of 1 per year.

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

Teaching

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

Scholarship

The expectations for scholarship are the same as those described for promotion and tenure at the Associate Professor level except that evidence of scholarship and funding during the 5 years prior to application for tenure will be considered, both during the probationary period at WSU and during previous appointments as a tenure track faculty member or as an independently funded researcher. Publication and funding pursuits during the probationary period at WSU must be sufficient to demonstrate continuation of the research program the candidate established prior to beginning at Wright State.

The candidate must meet the specific criteria listed below:

0. 3 journal articles with WSU listed as the employer

OR

1. 2 journal articles with WSU listed as the employer, and at least \$10,000 of the required total of external funding must be awarded since coming to WSU or transferred to WSU.

OR

2. 1 journal article with WSU listed as the employer, and at least \$20,000 of the required total of external funding must be awarded since coming to WSU or transferred to WSU.

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

Teaching

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

Scholarship

The expectations for scholarship are the same as those described for promotion at the Professor level except that evidence of scholarship and funding will be considered, both during the probationary period at WSU and during previous appointments as a tenure track faculty member or as an independently funded researcher. Publication and funding pursuits during the probationary period at WSU must be sufficient to demonstrate continuation of the research program the candidate established prior to beginning at Wright State. The candidate must publish at least one peer-reviewed publication after coming to the department with WSU listed as the employer, and at least \$20,000 of the required total of external funding must be awarded since coming to WSU or transferred to WSU.

Service

The criteria for service are the same as those described for promotion to the Professor level except that service activities, both during the probationary period at WSU and during previous appointments, will be considered. Emphasis will be placed on the continuation of and/or the development of a strong service record while at WSU.

Annual Evaluation of Bargaining Unit Faculty

1. General Criteria

All Bargaining Unit faculty members shall be evaluated annually by the department chair, utilizing the annual report filled out by the faculty member and the summary recommendations from the FDC. In the month of January each faculty member will fill out an activity report and return the completed form to the department chair and the FDC chair. The FDC or Chair may request additional information, and faculty may include additional information.

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 specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement: 0 = unsatisfactory, 1 = adequate, 2 = meritorious, 3 = outstanding and 4 = extraordinary. The criteria used to arrive at these ratings are to be uniformly applied for all evaluations and are listed below in section 2. The overall score 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 provided in the table below, unless changed by the department chair 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.

Normal Weight Factor Ranges by BUFM Academic Rank

Weight Category	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Teaching:	0.4 – 0.5	0.3 – 0.6	0.3 – 0.6
Research:	0.4 – 0.5	0.3 – 0.6	0.3 – 0.6
Service:	0.0 – 0.2	0.1 – 0.4	0.1 – 0.4

The Department chair may assign other weights in the case of:

- A. Unique work assignments that differ from those of other faculty members;
- B. Discipline pursuant to Article 14 of the CBA;
- C. Correction of pattern of substandard performance extending more than one year;

2. **Specific Criteria**

If multiple measures are required to achieve a certain level of performance, these measures may be from the same category.

A. **Teaching**

Factors used in rating teaching performance include effectiveness of in-class teaching; teaching of workshops and continuing education courses; student advising; serving as major advisor for M.S. theses; serving on thesis committees; supervising senior projects, honors and independent study projects; supervising post-doctoral 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 teaching performance. Examples of teaching problems include:

- The faculty member is poorly 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.
- Failure to respond adequately to reasonable student questions or complaints related to course or course material
- Irresponsible or unprofessional conduct with students

Adequate

The faculty member in this category performs satisfactorily based on student evaluations and peer review of the relevant teaching materials. 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.
- Mostly positive student feedback
- Overall positive assessment by peers.

Meritorious

The faculty member has met the requirements for adequate performance, and also has achieved at least two measures such as those listed below as 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 or Ph.D. dissertation committee of student graduating during that year.
- Effectively supervising independent study projects and honors thesis students.
- Effectively integrating new technologies into teaching.
- Effectively supervising graduate student or post doc.
- Measurable and documented student achievement beyond the norm.
- Overwhelmingly positive student or peer feedback.

Outstanding

The faculty member has met the requirements for meritorious performance, and also has achieved at least one measure such as those listed below 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

Extraordinary

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

B. Scholarship

Factors used in rating the scholarship performance include submission of journal articles to peer-reviewed journals of acknowledged stature; acceptance of submitted articles; acceptance of proceedings, book chapters, technical reports, etc.; submission and award of patents; invitation to give lectures, conference presentations, seminars; submission of research proposals; funding of research proposals; funding support for students, post docs, or faculty in the faculty member's research or teaching programs.

Unsatisfactory

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

Adequate

Research progress is indicated by documenting at least one measure listed above

Meritorious

Research performance in the meritorious category can be demonstrated by at least three measures and must include one from below.

- Publication of a journal paper in a peer-reviewed journal.
- Receiving funding for support of faculty member's research and/or teaching. (if not already counted for teaching)

Outstanding

Research performance in the outstanding category can be demonstrated by at least four measures and must include two from below.

- Publication of a journal paper in a peer-reviewed journal
- Receiving funding for support of faculty members research and/or teaching. (if not already counted for teaching)

Extraordinary

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

C. Service

Factors used in rating the service performance include membership in department, college, program and university committees; chairing a committee; 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, participation in state level initiatives, providing service to K-12 community.

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 attendance and participation at the department faculty meetings is expected.
- Fulfilling individual responsibilities to the department, including effective service on department committees
- Participation in student advising and representative functions vital for the department

Meritorious

The faculty member has met the requirements for adequate performance, and has achieved at least two measures such as listed below as 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 professional conference
- Holding an office in a professional organization
- Reviewing an article for a journal
- Serving as a guest speaker for area business, government or community organization
- Providing expertise to K-12 community
- Participate in relevant state or national level initiatives

Outstanding

The faculty member has met the requirements for meritorious performance, and has achieved at least one measure such as those listed below as evidence for outstanding performance:

- Effectively serving as an editorial board member or associate editor for a professional journal
- Effectively serving as an officer in a professional conference
- Organizing a conference workshop or panel for a professional conference
- Holding positions of leadership in professional organizations
- Effectively chairing a college or university committee
- The equivalent

Extraordinary

The faculty member must demonstrate service activities that exceed requirements for outstanding performance. Extraordinary performance will be based on demonstration of leadership roles in several service activities and the outcome of these activities.