

Department of Physiology & Biophysics Bylaws

College of Science & Mathematics and School of Medicine

Approved: February 6, 2002

Section I. Introduction

These Bylaws

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

Abbreviations/terms: BUF = Bargaining Unit Faculty member; DPTC = Department Promotion & Tenure Committee; non BUF = Non Bargaining Unit Faculty; “Full-time” = full-time in P&B Department excluding joint and adjunct appointments; “SIC” = Service-Intensive Committee; “COSM” = College of Science & Mathematics; “SOM” = School of Medicine; “P&T” = promotion and tenure; “P&B” = Physiology & Biophysics

Purpose: The Department of Physiology & Biophysics Bargaining Unit Faculty seek to promote and sustain teaching (undergraduate, medical, and graduate) and scholarship, and to participate fully in the governance of the College of Science & Mathematics, the School of Medicine, and Wright State University. These Bylaws address standards, recognize merit, and reward successful performance in teaching, scholarship, and service as described herein.

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

A. Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Dismissal

1. Advice given by P&B Faculty in hiring of new faculty. P&B BUFs elect a numerical majority of the Search Committee members from among P&B BUFs AND make recommendations of candidates for on-site visits. The department chair selects the other members of the search committee and appoints its chair. Candidates selected by the department chair for an on-site visit will meet with available P&B faculty. The P&B Faculty as a whole will assess the qualifications of all applicants and will rank the candidates in a secret ballot at a department meeting; such rankings will be summed by the search committee so as to provide an overall recommendation to the department chair, which will include the faculty’s ranking of possible candidates with a written reason for the ranking. BUFs and non-BUFs report separately with BUF and non-BUF votes indicated separately. Those candidates whom the faculty find absolutely unacceptable at any level should be so indicated.
2. Dismissal of probationary faculty: The DPTC will request from the chair copies of all evaluations and other written information which form the basis of the allegation of deficient performance by a probationary P&B Bargaining Unit Faculty. The DPTC will be allowed full discussion of the dismissal case and will vote, in a secret ballot, on whether or not to recommend the dismissal of the probationary faculty. The DPTC’s recommendation must be written, with the vote tallied and majority reasons expressed, and will allow for the expression of minority opinions. The

written recommendation – listing majority and minority opinions - will be sent to the departmental chair and the deans' offices.

- B.** Promotion and Tenure: see IV.D.2. - Department P&T Committee
- C.** Professional Development and Mentoring of New Faculty: see IV.D.2. - Department P&T Committee
- D.** Teaching Assignments and Class Schedules, Including Overloads: see IV.D.1. – Curriculum Committee
- E.** Advice given by P&B Faculty in Naming of the P&B Chair. The Deans of the School of Medicine and College of Science & Mathematics formulate and administer the search committee. Normally, at least half of the committee membership is chosen from among P&B Bargaining Unit Faculty. The Deans appoint the committee chair. Candidates selected for an on-site visit will meet with available P&B faculty. BUFs and non-BUFs report separately with BUF and non-BUF votes indicated separately. BUF, Non-BUF, and Joint Appointees will rank the candidates in a secret ballot at a departmental faculty meeting; such rankings will be summed so as to provide an overall recommendation. The BUF and non-BUF will provide the deans' offices with a written recommendation for the naming of a department Chair. This recommendation will include the faculty's ranking of possible candidates for chair with a written reason for the ranking. Those candidates whom the faculty find absolutely unacceptable at any level should be so indicated.
- F.** Graduate and Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards: Recommendations regarding curriculum and academic standards are addressed by the Departmental Curriculum Committee.
- G.** Faculty Involvement in the Review of the P&B Chair: The SOM and COSM Deans formulate and administer the review. When the entire review is completed, each Bargaining Unit Faculty will receive a copy of the final report. Faculty may make recommendations to the deans about the review process and their role in it at any time.
- H.** Issues Affecting the Department: Issues affecting the department will be presented to the full-time department faculty at regularly scheduled departmental faculty meetings by the department chair and by BUFs, so that the recommendations or advice of the departmental faculty may be heard by the department chair. Such recommendations are made by a majority of voting BUFs.

Section III: Criteria for Evaluations, Promotions, and Tenure

III.A. Weights for teaching, research/scholarship, and service in the Annual Evaluation.

Weights (%) are determined for each Bargaining Unit Faculty using the outcome-based optimizing algorithm: given the evaluation scores for each category, the algorithm will determine the respective weights from the range of weights listed below such that the net resultant score is maximized.

The ranges of Weights For Teaching, Scholarship and Service shall be:

- a. Scholarship: 50 – 70%
- b. Teaching: 25 - 45%
- c. Service: 5 - 20%

This system would apply to all P&B Bargaining Unit Faculty unless the chair assigns a different weighting to allow for:

- a. unique work assignments that differ from those of other P&B Bargaining Unit Faculty members;
- b. discipline pursuant to Article 14; or
- c. correction of a pattern of substandard performance extending more than one year.

III.B. Criteria for evaluating teaching, research/scholarship, and service in the Annual Evaluation.

III.B.1. Criteria for Research

BUFs' research will be evaluated annually by the chair. The *window* of evaluation will be two years in duration; that is, bargaining unit faculty are evaluated annually for the totality of research activities over the immediate past two years.

Research of probationary Assistant Professor BUFs during the first two years of employment at Wright State University: Research accomplishments during 1-2 years at the previous position (viz., post-doctoral and faculty positions) may be used for research evaluation.

For research evaluation, a paper in *Nature*, *Science*, or *Cell* is counted as TWO papers published in any other journal.

Note on standards: In research/scholarship, the P&B Department faculty adopts high performance standards for Associate and Full Professors and high performance standards which are obtainable in a five-year period for Assistant Professors. Collaborative research accomplishments are regarded as a positive attribute; however, confirmation of scholarly independence must be present for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

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

III.B.1.a. ASSOCIATE and FULL PROFESSORS:

0 = "unsatisfactory" - Insufficient to achieve "adequate" (=1) level.

1 = "adequate": The faculty member had one peer-reviewed papers submitted (incl. book chapter; review article) OR one grant proposal submitted for competitive extramural or internal peer-review.

2 = "meritorious": The faculty member had one peer-reviewed paper published (incl. book chapter; review article) AND one paper submitted for peer-reviewed publication AND one grant proposal submitted to a nationally competitive funding source.

3 = "outstanding": The faculty member had two or more peer-reviewed original research papers published AND was funded for one of the two years from a competitive extramural peer-reviewed source AND one item from Table 1 - Accomplishment Lists A or B.

4 = "extraordinary": The faculty member had at least four peer-reviewed original research papers published AND continuous funding from a competitive extramural peer-reviewed national or international source for each of the two years AND two items from Table 1 - Accomplishment List A or B.

III.B.1.b. ASSISTANT PROFESSORS:

0 = "unsatisfactory" - Insufficient to achieve "adequate" (=1) level.

1 = "adequate": The faculty member had one peer-reviewed papers published AND one **internal** peer-reviewed grant proposal submitted.

2 = "meritorious": The faculty member had one peer-reviewed original research papers published AND submitted one grant proposal to a peer-reviewed extramural funding source.

3 = “outstanding”: The faculty member had two or more peer-reviewed papers published AND was funded for one of the two years from a competitive extramural peer-reviewed source AND one item from Table 1 - Accomplishment Lists A or B.

4 = “extraordinary”: The faculty member had at least three peer-reviewed original research papers published AND was funded continuously for the two years from a competitive extramural peer-reviewed national or international source AND two items from Table 1 - Accomplishment List A or B.

(Table 1: next page)

<i>Table 1: <u>Research Accomplishment List</u></i>	
<u>Accomplishment List A</u>	<u>Accomplishment List B</u>
Ad-hoc grant reviewer (national or regional funding agency)	Ad-hoc paper reviewer
Editorial board member	Gave invited extramural seminar
National research award	Extramural Ph.D. committee member
Grant review panel member	Candidate’s pre- or post-doctoral student(s) win a funded fellowship grant
Book editor	National/int’l. scientific society activity (including membership if such membership is based on professional achievements listed in a submitted CV)
Organizer of national or int’l. scientific research meeting	author of a peer-reviewed book chapter in a research specialty book not solely edited by the candidate
Adjunct professor for research activities at an institution more prestigious than WSU	author of an invited review article
Consultant for an active extramural project	
Gordon or equivalent conference invited speaker	

III.B.2. Criteria for Teaching:

Teaching for P&B BUFs in the research track will be evaluated annually. The *window* of evaluation will be one year in duration; that is, bargaining unit faculty are evaluated annually for the totality of teaching activities over the immediate past year.

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

0 = “unsatisfactory” - there are significant deficiencies in teaching, which are confirmed by student evaluation data and class visitation of peers. The faculty member is unprepared for the teaching assignment, and/or teaches in a completely unorganized manner.

1 = “adequate”: The faculty member is prepared for his/her teaching, but student and peer evaluations suggest there is some evidence of a lack of communication between the teacher and some students; efforts were made to improve teaching effectiveness.

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

3 = “outstanding”: Same criteria as “meritorious” [2 = ...] above plus one of the following:

- a. The faculty member is regarded by other faculty members as a role model for excellent teaching techniques and insights, as evidenced from peer-evaluation by DPTC.
- b. (b) This faculty member provides exemplary training for students working on research projects in his/her lab, as judged by student comments and scientific accomplishment and by peer evaluation, particularly by thesis committee members.
- c. (c) The faculty member directs one or more MS (Master of Science) or BMS (Biomedical Sciences Ph.D. program) thesis students OR is a member of three or more MS or BMS thesis committees, OR directs 1 or more summer-trainee students from various outreach programs supported by either the School of Medicine or College of Science & Mathematics.
- d. (d) The faculty member develops and applies new pedagogical methods/programs/courses for teaching.

4 = “extraordinary”: Same criteria as “meritorious” [2 = ...] above plus two of the four items listed above under “3 = outstanding” ((a) – (d)).

III.B.3 Criteria for Service

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

Two types of intramural committee service are recognized: (1) normal, and (2) service-intensive (SIC); examples are given in Table 2 below; ad-hoc committees may be normal or SIC. Other recognized service includes: science-related extramural organizations (e.g., Nominating Committee of the American Physiological Soc.; officer in the Ohio Physiological Soc.; member of the Board – Cystic Fibrosis Ass’n.; member of an education-related committee of the Ohio Academy of Sciences, etc.). Service also includes being an SOM Course Director or Co-Director.

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

For Tenured BUF:

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

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

2 = “meritorious”: The faculty member regularly participates in service at the department, college, or university levels. The faculty member serves on at least two normal committees on one or more of these levels OR provides a significant level of service on at least one such committee (e.g., two years service).

3 = “outstanding”: The faculty member demonstrates a high level of service at the department, college, or university levels, or outside the university. This service should include *at least two* of the following:

- serving on a SIC committee;
- serving on two or more committees in the department, college or at university level or the equivalent;
- service as a reviewer for the purposes of peer evaluation/*review* or professional consultation;
- service as a departmental, college, or university program director, *or School of Medicine Course Director/Co-Director*;
- service to a community or professional organization.

4 = “extraordinary”: The faculty member performs some combination of "outstanding" activities in multiple areas of service and/or is able to demonstrate that service performed at the department, college, or university levels, or beyond the university, resulted in noteworthy accomplishments for the department, college, or university as a whole. Extraordinary service *shall* also include *at least one* of the following:

- serving as a chair of a SIC
- taking a leadership role in a *service-intensive* aspect of departmental, college or university governance;
- taking a leadership role in faculty governance, and/or in a professional, state or national organization;
- winning awards for professional service.

For Probationary BUF:

0 = “unsatisfactory” - Little or no service of any type was performed.

1 = “adequate”: The faculty member attends most departmental faculty meetings.

2 = “meritorious”: “adequate” criteria and the faculty member sits on 1 normal committee.

3 = “outstanding”: “adequate” criteria and the faculty member sits on 2 normal committees

OR

The faculty member sits on 1 normal committees AND has 1 extramural service activity

4 = “extraordinary”: “adequate” criteria and the faculty member sits on 3 normal committees OR 1 SIC;

OR

The faculty member sits on 2 normal committees AND has 1 extramural service activity.

Table 2 - Committee Type Examples:

<u>Normal</u>	<u>Service-Intensive (SIC)</u>
Departmental standing++ (Section IV.)	Lab. Animal Care & Use
College standing	Institutional Research Board
University standing (e.g., of the Faculty Senate, AAUP, etc.)	SOM Admissions
Ad-hoc	Ad-hoc (e.g., accreditation-related) Faculty Governance Committee

++ “standing”: as defined in applicable Bylaws

III.B.4. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Note: This lists the *MINIMUM* requirements to qualify. A candidate may fulfill these requirements at any time during the probationary period.

The candidate must have:

A. Research/scholarship:

1. Published papers: There are three options (1.a. – 1.c.):

1. a. Three peer-reviewed research papers - based on data generated while the candidate is employed at Wright State University where WSU is named as the candidate’s employer and for which the candidate is sole or corresponding author AND the candidate was funded as PI by two peer-reviewed grants from a nationally-competitive funding agency yielding a total of \$400,000 in direct costs (exception to 2.a.1. under ‘grant funding’ below);

OR:

1. b. Four peer-reviewed research papers based on data generated while the candidate is employed at Wright State University where WSU is named as the candidate’s employer and for which the candidate is sole or corresponding author

OR:

1. c. Four peer-reviewed original research papers including:

1. c.i. Three peer-reviewed research papers based on data generated while the candidate is employed at Wright State University where WSU is named as the candidate’s employer and for which the candidate is sole or corresponding author,

AND:

1. c.ii. One peer-reviewed research paper from either of the following classes:

- a) the candidate was employed by WSU and played an important role including active participation in the inception and/or design – as documented by the paper’s corresponding author - of the collaborative research project upon which the paper is based.
- b) the paper was published during the candidate’s previous position where the candidate was funded independently as a Research Assistant Professor or equivalent at WSU or elsewhere and was the sole or corresponding author.
- c) the paper was published during the candidate’s previous position where the candidate was a tenure-track probationary faculty member and the candidate was the sole or corresponding author.
- d) the paper was published during the WSU probationary period and was based upon data generated by the PI in a previous position as an independently-funded investigator.

2. Grant funding:

2. a. One or more research grants from one or more peer-reviewed nationally-competitive funding source(s) where the candidate is the principal investigator,

and

2. a.1: the cumulative total is \$200,000 (direct costs), except for Published papers - 1.a.above,

and

2. a.2 the grant(s) must have been of at least two years duration and funded at any time during the probationary period of Wright State University employment;

OR:

Only for NIH or any other national competitive grants which provide percentile scores

2. b. If the \$200,000 mark is not achieved:

2. b.1: A review score within the top 30th percentile or less is achieved and where the candidate is the principal investigator;

and

2. b.2: at least a total of \$50,000 in grant funding is obtained from any competitive peer-reviewed extramural funding agency (not incl. non-competitive Ohio Board of Regents funds) at any time during the probationary period and where the candidate is the principal investigator;

and

2. b.3: the candidate tried to achieve the \$200,000 level throughout the entire probationary period through peer-reviewed nationally-competitive funding sources.

3. Three or more letters from external evaluators where three or more of the letters state in effect that the candidate's research has made a positive contribution to the candidate's research field. Evaluators must be experts in the candidate's research area, and are not or have not been a mentor or a collaborator of the candidate.

4. The candidate is the principal investigator of a current nationally-competitive funded grant or of a submitted proposal for peer-reviewed nationally-competitive funded grant at the time of application. B. Teaching: Evidence of effective teaching, including but not limited to: overall positive student and peer evaluations (including course director letters) and evidence of effort including representative samples of teaching-related work product - such as handouts - and any other "multiple measures of teaching" deemed appropriate by the candidate, including clear, well-organized, and up-to-date class notes, constructive responses to student feedback in an effort to improve the presentation quality, and examples of student achievement.

C. Service: Attendance at most department meetings and contribute to discussions; at least 1 year serving on at least 1 departmental, College of Science & Mathematics, School of Medicine, or any program committee.

III.B.5. Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

Note: This lists the *MINIMUM* requirements to qualify. A candidate may fulfill these requirements at any time subsequent to promotion to Associate Professor, i.e., a minimum time period at the rank of Associate Professor is not required. The following criteria apply to the *entire* period of employment at Wright State University, unless otherwise stated.

The candidate must have:

A. Research:

1. Fifteen peer-reviewed papers (where Wright State University is named as the candidate's employer and including those from probationary years), including papers published while the candidate was a non-tenure-track research-independent full-time Wright State University faculty member. Of these fifteen papers, eight papers must have been published since the promotion to Associate Professor (accepted for publication after 1 April of the year of promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure).
2. During the time period at the rank of Associate Professor, the applicant must have received: EITHER a research grant with funding for at least three years from a peer-reviewed nationally competitive funding source OR grants from peer-reviewed regional competitive funding source resulting in funding for at least a total of four years OR a combination of peer-reviewed national plus peer-reviewed regional grants resulting in funding for a total of at least four years. None of these grants shall have been used to fulfill the criteria of promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure (III.B.4), and all such funding shall have been awarded after 1 April of the year of promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure. These research grant criteria are fulfilled upon award and acceptance of such research grants.
3. At the time of application for promotion, the applicant must have either an active grant (see above) or a currently-submitted grant proposal to a nationally-competitive source.
4. Three or more letters from external evaluators of candidate's research, where three or more of the letters state in effect that the candidate's research has made a positive contribution to the candidate's research field. Evaluators must be experts in the candidate's research area, and are not or have not been a mentor or a collaborator of the candidate
5. Evidence of national/international reputation as represented by two of the following:
 - a. editorial board member for a research publication

- b. ad-hoc grant reviewer for a national research funding agency
- c. national or regional research grant review panel member
- d. national research award (e.g., the Lasker Award; Biophysical Soc.'s Cole and Dayhoff Awards)
- e. book editor (research &/or Physiology- &/or Biophysics-related)
- f. author of a peer-reviewed book chapter in a research specialty book not solely edited by the candidate
- g. national or international research symposium invited speaker
- h. organizer of national or international scientific research meeting
- i. Gordon or equivalent research conference invited speaker.
- j. A paper in Nature, Science, or Cell
- k. consultant (source of expertise) to a nationally-recognized company, corporation, or other commercial entity.

B. Teaching:

Evidence of effective teaching, including but not limited to:

1. Overall positive student and peer evaluations (including course director letters); information from student evaluation of teaching may be used as evidence.

And

2. Evidence of effort and achievement in teaching including representative samples of teaching-related work product - such as handouts - and any other "multiple measures of teaching" deemed appropriate by the candidate including clear, well-organized, and up-to-date class notes; constructive responses to student feedback in an effort to improve the presentation quality, and examples of student achievement.

And

3. Additional evidence of teaching may include: documentation of supervision of undergraduate, graduate, medical, and summer-program students as well as post-doctoral fellows in research projects, explaining what students learned and any presentations given; membership on Ph.D. dissertation and M.S. Thesis committees.

And

4. Evidence of leadership role of at least one year's duration, evidenced by one of the following: developed a new course (including a journal club, initiated by self or with one or more others); course director or co-director; participation in School of Medicine or College of Science & Mathematics curricular development (designing and implementing changes in the curriculum); membership on an SOM course "Steering Committee" monitoring an on-going course, assessing student learning, and initiating further modifications.

- C. Service: Professional service is evidenced by serving on at least one committee per year on average since last promotion (College of Science & Mathematics, School of Medicine, University, AAUP (when the function is service to the university), BMS, or any academic outreach program sponsored by the COSM or School of Medicine, with evidence documenting positive contribution) or extramural group (e.g., NIH Study Panel, American Heart Assn. Board) since the last promotion.

The DPTC considers outcomes in evaluating service. For committee work, the candidate is responsible for obtaining letters from committee chairs about the quality of the candidate's service on the given committee. If the candidate is chair of the service committee, DPTC will consider the committee's reports and accomplishments.

III.B.6. Procedures for Annual Evaluation

- a. BUFs will be allowed to read or, if desired, copy the narrative portions of his/her student evaluations each quarter. In addition, Bargaining Unit Faculty can examine evaluation documents kept by the department.
- b. Submission of Materials for Annual Evaluation. Using a form provided by the department chair, each BUF will submit a summary of his/her accomplishments during the preceding two years in scholarship and service AND for the preceding year in teaching (January 1 to December 31st) and his/her requested teaching assignments and anticipated scholarly activities for the coming year in the first week of February to both the departmental DPTC committee (probationary and tenured BUF) as well as the department chair. BUFs can submit other materials (not called for on the form) that pertain to evaluation criteria, and these will be considered by the department chair and DPTC. The DPTC or the department chair may request additional materials or information. For peer evaluation of teaching, each faculty member must submit to the DPTC in the first week of February one copy of his/her course material, examination questions, summary statement on revisions to courses, and any other teaching-related material reflecting his/her teaching efforts. The DPTC will have access to the narrative parts of BUFs' student evaluations. The DPTC will maintain its own archive files of materials received by the DPTC.
- c. Annual Evaluation:
 - c.1. Annually, the DPTC will provide for each Bargaining Unit Faculty member rating values with justifications using the evaluation criteria (III.B.); these are recommendations to the department chair. They will be sent to the department chair with a copy to the individual Bargaining Unit Faculty. The department chair will consider the DPTC recommendations prior to evaluating each Bargaining Unit Faculty member.
 - c.2 Each BUF may review the individual rankings assigned for annual evaluation by the department chair and the reasons given for ranking. If the BUF agrees with the evaluation, he/she will sign a copy of the evaluation and return it to the department chair. If the BUF disagrees with the evaluation, he/she may prepare a rebuttal, which should be submitted to the chair. This rebuttal must be attached to the evaluation and forwarded to all entities which will see the annual evaluation. The BUF may also avail him/herself of the grievance procedure if the merit criteria are not used.

Section IV. Departmental Governance & Procedures

IV.A. Calling Meetings and Setting Agendas. Departmental faculty meetings are called by the department chair as needed, but at least once per quarter. A departmental faculty meeting may also be called by the chair of a departmental Committee (such as DPTC) or by petition of one-third of all department full-time faculty members. The individual(s) who called the faculty meeting will announce the purpose of the meeting and call for any additional agenda items from the department faculty and the department chair at least one week before the meeting. Faculty-requested items will be added to the agenda or the agenda shall contain a standard item titled "Faculty Issues" in which faculty may bring up issues of concern at the meeting. For meetings not called by the department chair, he/she may attend if his/her presence is requested by a majority of BUFs.

IV.B. Voting at Meetings. All full-time BUF and non-BUF except the department chair will have one vote at departmental meetings unless otherwise specified in these Bylaws. Voting will be by open response unless a faculty member requests a secret ballot for a particular issue. Faculty members must be clearly informed through the agenda that a vote will be required on particular items. Recommendations to the chair require a majority of voting BUFs.

IV.C. Naming of Committee members. Departmental committee membership, unless specifically addressed elsewhere in these bylaws, shall be determined through voluntary department faculty participation. If voluntary participation fails to fill committee membership, then a rotation basis shall be employed by the current committee chairs, where the BUF who has the least department service is recruited first, and the faculty member with the most department service is recruited last; probationary BUFs with less than three full years of employment at Wright State University are not included in this rotation system.

IV.D. Departmental Committees:

IV.D.1. Department Curriculum Committee (DCC): This committee shall be composed of two tenured departmental BUFs and makes recommendations. The committee is charged with an annual review of the course offerings and teaching assignments of the department, making recommendations about new course proposals, core or undergraduate course modifications, and possible elimination of specialty courses when the department no longer has the faculty expertise to teach the course.

The Department Curriculum Committee will review all faculty requests for their preferred teaching assignments and class schedules. The Committee will take into consideration faculty qualifications and experience, and forward written recommendations for teaching assignments and class schedules to the department chair at least six months in advance of the scheduled class(es).

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

IV.D.2. Department Promotion and Tenure Committee (DPTC): The DPTC is concerned with the professional development of all BUFs in the P&B Department. Membership: all tenured full-time departmental Bargaining Unit Faculty and the department chair (non-voting). For all DPTC deliberations, a majority is defined as a numerical majority of all voting-eligible BUF committee members. A quorum is defined as equal to TWO-THIRDS OF the number of all voting-eligible Bargaining Unit Faculty. A DPTC chair will be elected from among the voting-eligible BUF committee members.

DPTC major responsibilities are:

IV.D.2.a. Make recommendations to the department chair regarding the Annual Evaluation of BUFs and non-BUF as per Section III; all DPTC members assess each other independent of rank; the member under consideration is recused from consideration of his/her own case. The DPTC (all tenured BUFs for probationary faculty's evaluation or only full professor BUFs for associate professors' evaluation) will prepare written annual evaluation reports each year (*viz.*, Peer evaluation of teaching and Progress towards P&T letters as per CBA for probationary BUF) and either each year or once every three years (for tenured BUF, option chosen by the tenured BUF). All such evaluations will provide

an indication of the Bargaining Unit Faculty's progress towards promotion, promotion-with-tenure, or tenure.

IV.D.2.b. Professional Development: The DPTC will identify a subgroup of BUF who have demonstrated excellence in at least one of the following areas: teaching, scholarship and service. These faculty will constitute a departmental Faculty Development Help Resource. If the DPTC identifies an area in which a department faculty needs to improve or be mentored - such as teaching - the DPTC will assign an appropriate Resource member to meet with the faculty member and provide some suggestions to that faculty member which should result in improvement in that area (for example: classroom visits or review of video-tapes of lectures may lead to a suggestion of better organization of lecture notes). Resource BUF may be assigned to help different colleagues; BUF may request a change in assigned resource helper from the DPTC chair.

The DPTC will also make a recommendation for any faculty member seeking professional development leave, particularly noting if the leave would allow the faculty member to focus on improvement in an area previously shown to need improvement. After examining all pertinent information, the DPTC will vote on a recommendation, where a majority vote of the DPTC will determine the recommendation. Formal recommendation regarding a professional development leave must be written.

IV.D.2.c. Peer Evaluation of Teaching. The DPTC will be responsible for the peer evaluation of teaching for all BUFs in the department. For probationary faculty, the DPTC will provide for at least one classroom visit by at least two tenured P&B peers per calendar year. Peer evaluation will normally consist of a review of submitted course materials (III.B.10.) If a review of these materials indicates that there are significant problems in teaching, class visitation (1 to 3 class sessions) will be arranged by one or more members of the DPTC (including the Help Resource mentor). Course directors' statement(s) on the candidate's teaching may be sought additionally. A report on the class visitation will be reviewed by the DPTC and submitted to the department chair for the annual evaluation.

IV.D.2.d.(1). Recommendations for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure: DPTC deliberations shall be based solely upon departmental criteria (Section III); only tenured associate and full professors may participate.

External reviewer letters: The DPTC will review the list of external reviewers submitted by the candidate; the DPTC and candidate will reach agreement on the list composition. Eligible reviewers are extramural colleagues with academic rank (if applicable) at or above that of the candidate who are experts in the candidate's area of research. Mentors and collaborators shall not be eligible. Selected external reviewers will be asked in advance if they are willing and able to provide this service. Reprints of all relevant publications will be sent to each participating reviewer. DPTC summarizes external reviewers' comments to provide a statement about the quality and adequacy of a candidate's overall research record. In its report, the DPTC will note any external reviews which violate the instructions to reviewers.

The DPTC will review the candidate's promotion &/or tenure file, all annual evaluation results, and any internal or external letters of support.

If there are not at least four department faculty at the rank of associate professor or full professor, the candidate may suggest faculty at this rank in other departments who would be qualified to evaluate his/her file. The DPTC will consider such recommendations before making selections.

Balloting will occur, with further discussion between balloting, until identical results are obtained in two successive ballots, at which time the results are finalized. A DPTC member will recuse him/herself if 1) there is a conflict of interest or 2) the faculty member is serving on the college or school and University P&T committees, and wishes to vote on both upper-level committees. The DPTC will review and approve the decision letter, which includes the finalized vote of a secret ballot and summarizes the reasoning for the vote; the P&T recommendation letter is forwarded to the chair and made part of the candidate's P&T file. The P&T file is made available to the candidate by the chair (CBA) for the 10-day examination period and then forwarded to the COSM and School of Medicine P&T Committees.

IV.D.2.d.(2): Recommendations for promotion from Tenured Associate Professor to Tenured Full Professor: The procedures for assessment and voting are similar to that described above, but the group of departmental faculty voting will be restricted to those Bargaining Unit Faculty who hold the rank of tenured full professor. If the DPTC chair is not a full professor, a committee chair will be elected from among the P&B Bargaining Unit Faculty participants. If there are not at least three DPTC members at the rank of full professor, the candidate may recommend one BUF at this rank in other departments who would be qualified to evaluate his/her file; any additional required extra-departmental full professors will be recommended by a majority of the DPTC. All extra-departmental full professors must be approved by a majority of the DPTC. All evaluators will review and approve the P&T recommendation letter, which includes the finalized vote of a secret ballot and summarizes the reasoning for the vote; the P&T recommendation letter is forwarded to the chair and made part of the candidate's P&T file. The P&T file is forwarded to the COSM and School of Medicine P&T Committees and made available to the candidate by the chair (as per CBA).

IV.D.3. Graduate Committee: This committee shall be composed of the Director of Graduate Education (appointed by the department chair) and two other members (full-time P&B BUF or non-BUF, not including joint-appointees) selected by the departmental faculty; committee members will choose a committee chair. Members will serve for a three-year term which may be renewed only once; no Bargaining Unit Faculty may serve more than 2 consecutive terms. The Graduate Committee will present recommendations to P&B Faculty regarding:

- a. all policies (including thesis vs. non-thesis supported work) of the department's MS program
- b. the performance of the GTA (MS student)
- c. student removals from the program
- d. special award recipients from MS students
- e. MS program assessments
- f. applicant approval process: application files are voted upon by BUF and non-BUF faculty involved in graduate education
- g. final approval of MS applicants

The Graduate Committee will forward all recommendations approved by the department faculty as recommendations to the department chair.

IV.D.4. Department Budget Committee (DBC): This committee shall be composed of at least three members (full-time BUF or non-BUF, not including joint-appointees) selected by the departmental faculty; committee members will choose a chair. Committee membership will be 3-year terms (staggered to maintain continuity).

Annually by 1st August, the DBC will request from the university copies of all year-end reports of departmental accounts. All reports issued by this committee will be shared with department faculty and department chair.

Annually prior to the beginning of the winter quarter, the DBC will:

- a. Review the distribution and disbursement of department funds (past and anticipated)
- b. Assess the extent to which the previous year's committee recommendations were followed
- c. Seek suggestions and comments from the department faculty at large
- d. Review and make recommendations to the department chair on any faculty proposals for department funds.
- e. Issue recommendations to the department chair for the spending of department funds for the coming year; department faculty shall receive copies of all such recommendations.

The DBC also may choose to make recommendations about additional compensation for any P&B Bargaining Unit Faculty for exceptional cases (including the possibility of a Bargaining Unit Faculty leaving WSU for a better-paying position elsewhere). The member being considered for such additional compensation is recused from consideration of his/her own case. Such recommendations are submitted to the chair (with copy to the deans).

IV.D.5. Department Bylaws Committee: These Bylaws may be revised at any time subsequent to their initial adoption. The departmental BUFs shall constitute a committee of the whole to convene, draft, and recommend by majority vote any changes to these Bylaws. This committee can be convened by any BUF; the committee will choose a convention chair and conduct proceedings as it deems appropriate. A meeting quorum requires a majority of departmental BUF; votes are determined by a majority of P&B BUFs. The proposed Bylaws amendments are submitted to the COSM and School of Medicine deans and to the Faculty Governance Committee for their approval .