

Neuroscience, Cell Biology & Physiology

Approved: October 24, 2011

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. These Bylaws provide for faculty participation in the Department in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the American Association of University Professors - Wright State University Chapter (AAUP/WSU) and Wright State University. These bylaws may be amended in accord with the CBA.

SECTION 2. FACULTY CLASSIFICATIONS, RANKS, AND TRACKS

2.1. Professorial Faculty: engage in combined scholarly, teaching and service activities. These bylaws apply equally to all professorial faculty members, whether BUFM or BSOM appointments

2.1.1. Ranks: Assistant Professors, Associate Professors or Full Professors who are either:

- tenure track or tenured appointments. Except for the department chair, these faculty are identified as Bargaining Unit Faculty Members (BUFM)
- continuance appointments made through BSOM. These professorial faculty are not BUFM.

2.1.2. Tracks: Each current professorial faculty member adopts one of the following two tracks distinguished by the kind of scholarly activity; incoming faculty members have a track identified in their offer letters. Assistant Professors cannot change tracks during their probationary period; tenured professorial faculty can elect to change track assignment with approval of the department chair.

- **Professorial Research Track:** scholarly activity focused on research that generates discovery and advances knowledge in biological/biomedical sciences.
- **Professorial Educational Track:** scholarly activity focused on developing and implementing innovation and improved effectiveness in biological/biomedical education.

2.2. Department Chair: not classified as professorial faculty for procedural actions identified in these bylaws.

2.3. Non-Professorial Faculty

The department includes other types of faculty appointments, e.g. instructors and lecturers, research faculty, adjunct faculty, and visiting faculty. Their activities are not covered in these bylaws.

2.4. Definition of Voting Faculty

Each professorial faculty member has a single vote that he/she casts in making recommendations on department governance. These voting rights apply at departmental faculty meetings and, depending on the operating procedures determined by each committee, at other departmental committee meetings. Professorial faculty may vote to allow non-professorial faculty to vote on departmental

business, except on matters pertaining to reappointment, dismissal, tenure, promotion, and evaluation of professorial faculty.

SECTION 3. DEPARTMENT COMMITTEES

Three committees establish mechanisms for voting faculty to provide advice and recommendations in making policy and conducting departmental business.

3.1. Department Promotion and Tenure Committee (DPTC)

The DPTC will be composed of a chairperson, and five professorial faculty at the rank of Associate or Full Professor, with representation from both professorial research and educational tracks. Members will be elected by a simple majority vote of the professorial faculty and each will serve a term of 3 years. Terms of the Members will be staggered. Chair and vice-chair of the DPTC will be elected by a simple majority vote of the DPTC and will serve a term of three years. Terms of the chairperson and vice-chair of the DPTC will be staggered. The department chair will sit on the DPTC as a non-voting member.

The DPTC has ongoing roles in:

- evaluation and recommendation of professorial faculty regarding the cumulative progress toward tenure and, if requested, for promotion
- recommendations for or against tenure and/or promotion
- overseeing/performing peer review of teaching
- mentoring, consulting and otherwise facilitating professional development of faculty
- identifying and recommending faculty for university awards

The DPTC oversees the peer evaluation of teaching, which must include classroom visitation. All Assistant Professors will be evaluated annually. Peer evaluations will be performed by at least two Professorial Faculty on a rotating basis. Tenured Professorial Faculty undergoing peer evaluation will name one evaluator, and otherwise all evaluators will be chosen by the DPTC. Completed peer evaluations will be submitted to the DPTC, Annual Evaluation Screening Committee (AESC), and the department chair. The AESC will forward the report to the Professorial Faculty along with the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report letter.

3.2. Advisory Committee (AC)

The AC will be composed of a chairperson and four departmental faculty members (professorial and non-professorial). The Chair and Members will be determined by majority vote of the departmental faculty and each will serve a term of three years.

The AC will arrange meetings as it deems necessary to discuss matters of departmental policies and operations, including but not restricted to departmental resources, curriculum, personnel issues, assignment of duties, hiring faculty, etc. The AC will establish policies for its operation, including

procedures for electing a committee chair and members, rotating membership, forming subcommittees as needed, reporting to the faculty at large, formulating advice to the department chair, etc.

3.3. Annual Evaluation Screening Committee (AESC)

The AESC will be composed of four professorial faculty members each elected to a three-year term by a simple majority vote by the professorial faculty. The Chair will be elected by a simple majority of the AESC for a four-year term. Terms for the Chair and Members of the AESC will be staggered. The department chair will sit on the AESC as a non-voting member. For all Faculty Annual Evaluation Reports this committee will:

- evaluate merit scores proposed by each faculty member for concurrence with Bylaws criteria
- request additional information or clarification from faculty members
- recommend any change in merit scores
- report the results of this screening process to the department chair

3.4. Committee recommendations: Committees transmit recommendations to the department chair by mechanism(s) of their choosing, including but not restricted to written report, meeting requested with the department chair, and/or reporting at faculty meetings.

SECTION 4. FACULTY MEETINGS

A meeting of the professorial faculty will be called by the department chair or designee at least once each term (excluding Summer). Except in emergencies the department chair will announce the meeting date and circulate the Agenda at least one week before the meeting. Professorial faculty can add agenda items at any time preceding the meeting.

4.1. Voting at Faculty Meetings

A simple majority of the voting faculty will constitute a voting quorum and a simple majority of votes will constitute a majority vote of the department on motions subjected to voting, except as otherwise directed by the CBA, such as for bylaws amendments. Any voting faculty member may request voting by secret ballot.

SECTION 5. PROMOTION AND TENURE

5.1. Criteria relevant to each rank and track will be applied equally to professorial faculty members, whether BUFM or BSOM appointments.

5.2. Initiation and Time-Line of Promotion Process

Consult current versions of the CBA (for BUFM) and BSOM policies (for SOM only faculty) on tenure and promotion

5.3. Roles of Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee (DPTC)

- The DPTC will evaluate each candidate's achievements in relation to criteria established for promotion and/or tenure in these bylaws (**sect. 5.5 or 5.6**), culminating in a DPTC meeting to

- discuss, vote, and arrive at a recommendation either for or against promotion and/or tenure. The vote will be obtained from appropriate professorial faculty: Full Professors vote on promotion from Associate to Full Professor, while Associate and Full Professors vote on promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. In cases of tenure only, the vote will be obtained from appropriate professorial faculty: Full professors for votes on tenure for Full Professor. Recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure will be based on a simple majority of votes. The recommendation and relevant materials will be sent to the department chair who, together with the DPTC chair will discuss the recommendation with the candidate. Following this discussion, a candidate may ask the DPTC to reconsider its recommendation against promotion, and may appear before the committee to argue his/her case or to present further information. In a second and final deliberation the DPTC will take the candidate's appeal into consideration, vote and amend their recommendation as needed. The DPTC recommendation and a separate letter of evaluation from the department chair will be forwarded to the COSM Dean for transmittal to the College Faculty Development Committee, and to the BSOM Dean for transmittal to the School Faculty Development Committee.
- The DPTC will provide a Statement of Progress toward Tenure (separate from Annual Evaluation, **Section 6**) annually for untenured faculty on a tenure track and a statement of progress toward promotion when requested by professorial Associate Professors. To assist this evaluation the DPTC will ask the faculty member under consideration to provide them with (a) a curriculum vitae, (b) documentation of progress toward promotion in relation to **sects. 5.5 or 5.6**, and ask the department chair to provide them with (a) numerical (required of untenured faculty only) and written student evaluations, (b) peer evaluation of teaching. These evaluations will result in letters to the individuals with copies to the department chair detailing their progress toward promotion and/or tenure.

5.4. Performance Measures

5.4.1. Scholarship

Success in scholarship is recognized for faculty members directly credited both with publishing and presenting original findings and with obtaining extramural funding to support his/her scholarship. Additional achievements in scholarship include mentoring/training students and participating in a variety of professional scholarly activities.

5.4.1.1. Scholarly Publications Defined

For purposes of promotion in NCBP, scholarly publications meet **all** of the following three criteria:

- the publication provides new findings in biological/biomedical research or education(excludes review articles, opinion/position papers, policy manuals, which are credited in annual evaluation **sect. 6.4.1** but not for promotion)
- **AND** the faculty candidate (individually or in directing his/her trainees or staff) is responsible for generating a majority of the publication content from work performed at WSU or from their independent laboratory at a previous location
- **AND** the publication passed critical review by professionals in the field (defined here as “peer-review”)

5.4.1.1.1. Publication Equivalents

These include but are not limited to publication with known publishers of research monographs, book chapters, and professional books; tangible innovative items, such as patents and license agreements. Additional eligible equivalents are listed for Education Track in **sects. 5.5 and 5.6.**

5.4.1.2. Counting Scholarly Publications

5.4.1.2.1. Each publication defined in sect 5.4.1.1 will count “1” when the candidate is first or corresponding author or can establish that his/her efforts or laboratory were responsible for generating more than 50% of the publication’s content.

5.4.1.2.2. For promotion from Associate to Full Professor only and in either education or research track each publication defined in sect. 5.4.1.1.:

- will count “1/2” when the candidate contributes as an author (other than first or corresponding author) on a publication with a collaborator at Wright State University.
- will count “1/2” (up to a maximum of 4) when the candidate contributes as an author (other than first or corresponding author) with a collaborator outside WSU.

5.4.1.2.3. Probationary faculty may count a maximum of 2 collaborative publications (with each publication counting “1/2”) in cases where the faculty member is not listed as either the first or corresponding author

5.4.1.2.4. **5.4.1.2.4.** Publication equivalents will count as described in sects. 5.5. and 5.6. for specific ranks and tracks.

5.4.1.2.5. Track Specific Restrictions on Publication Count

- Publications focused on pedagogy will not count toward promotion of professorial faculty in the research track except as specified in sect. 5.4.1.2.6
- Publication focused on basic science will not count toward promotion of professorial faculty in the education track except as specified in sect. 5.4.1.2.6

5.4.1.2.6. One publication on pedagogy may be used as an equivalent substitution by members of the research track, and one publication on research may be used as an equivalent substitution by members of the educational track for promotion to any rank. If a publication from the other track was counted for promotion to Associate Professor, no additional such article may be counted for promotion to Professor.

5.4.1.3. Scholarly Presentations

Presentations at scientific or educational meetings by the faculty member of a scholarly seminar or poster based on work performed by the faculty member or his/her collaborators.

5.4.1.4. Extramural Funding of Scholarly Activities

Extramural funding through grants and contracts is eligible for consideration in promotion when the funding:

- was based on proposals that advance new knowledge or understanding in biological/biomedical research or education
- **AND** passed a competitive process of scholarly review by peers outside WSU, **AND** was based on work generated by the faculty member under consideration. The candidate **will** be given full credit (funding amount and time) when identified as Principal (Lead) or co-Principal Investigator. For collaborative grants in which the faculty member is listed either as an investigator, co-investigator or consultant, the credit toward promotion will equal the fraction of the total award reflected in the percentage of effort listed in the grant/contract proposal for all personnel in the individual faculty member's laboratory. The faculty member may request an equivalent for scholarly work accomplished on a grant without paid laboratory personnel (e.g. accomplished ¼ of specific aims on grant with a written amount of grant supply money).

No credit will be given either to the portion of grant funds assigned to Facilities and Administration (Indirect) costs or to no-cost extensions.

5.4.1.5. Scholarly Professional Activities include but are not limited to:

- serving as an ad-hoc grant reviewer for an extramural funding agency
- serving as a grant review panel member for an extramural funding agency
- serving as an Editorial Board member for a scientific or educational journal
- organizing a national or regional meeting
- ad hoc review for peer-reviewed journal
- presentation at national or international meetings
- developing fields of scientific research(e.g. technology transfer) or educational expertise (e.g. curricula, technology) outside WSU

Note: multiple activities within a single bullet category will only be counted once.

5.4.2. Teaching

5.4.2.1. Teaching in academic courses/classes is judged effective by an overall positive record of available student and peer evaluations. Additional measures of teaching success include, but are not limited to teaching awards and unsolicited complimentary letters from course directors.

5.4.2.2. Training, mentoring, and supervising graduate students in biomedical science programs are achieved by:

- direction of a master's thesis or PhD dissertation
- membership on graduate student committees
- participation in graduate student training through special projects and techniques courses, lab rotations, scholarly paper direction or comprehensive examination administration.
- instruction of a student in experimental methods outside the classroom and over a period of at least one academic session
- special accomplishments of students/trainees, e.g. awards

5.4.3. Service Contribution

This component of faculty activity is measured by participation in service essential to the effective operation of the university, including but not limited to:

- regular attendance at departmental faculty meetings
- execution of departmental functions (e.g. overseeing seminar series, departmental annual report to COSM and BSOM, etc.)
- service on a committee in the NCBP Department, a Graduate Program, COSM, BSOM or the University

5.5. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

DPTC recommendation of a probationary Assistant Professor for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure requires that the candidate has established an independent and successful program in research or education scholarship (depending on track) and made positive contributions in teaching and service.

5.5.1. Professorial Research Track

Promotion in this track recognizes scholarly achievements in biological/biomedical research and requires that the candidate meet the following minimum criteria in scholarship, teaching, and service:

5.5.1.1. Scholarship

Candidates must have:

- produced at least **4 publications** as defined in **sect. 5.4.1.1 and 5.4.1.2**. A maximum of 1 of the 4 required publications may have equivalent substitution from 5.4.1.2.2
- **AND** obtained **extramural funding** (defined in **sect. 5.4.1.4**) amounting to at least \$200,000 total over a period of 36 months or more. Extramural funding must be active OR an extramural grant must be in the review process at the time of application for promotion.
- **AND** given evidence of **3 items** under Scholarly Professional Activity (**sect. 5.4.1.5**)
- **AND** received external letters from experts in the candidate's field of scholarship indicating that the candidate has established independent and productive scholarship that contributes new knowledge

5.5.1.2. Teaching

Candidates must have:

- met assigned teaching responsibilities
- **AND** established an overall positive record of student and peer evaluations
- **AND** engaged in student supervision, training, and mentoring as described in **sect. 5.4.2.2**

5.5.1.3. Service

Candidates must have:

- regular attendance at departmental faculty meetings
- **AND** given a combined total of at least three years of service on committees in the NCBP Department, graduate program, COSM, BSOM or University

5.5.2. Professorial Education Track

Promotion in this track recognizes scholarly achievements in biological/biomedical education innovation and development and requires that the candidate meet all of the following minimum criteria in scholarship, teaching, and service:

5.5.2.1. Scholarship

Candidates must have:

- produced at least **5 publications** as defined in **sect. 5.4.1.1. and 5.4.1.2.** A maximum of 2 of the 5 required publications may have an equivalent substitution from the following list:
 - publication equivalents defined in **sect. 5.4.1.1.1**
 - educational resources including, slide/video sets with speaker notes, computer-based instructional program, or sets of problem-based learning exercises or clinical cases
 - extramural funding as defined in **sect. 5.4.1.4.** amounts to at least \$25,000 total over a period of 24 months or more.
- **AND** evidence of **three items** under **Scholarly Professional Activity (sect. 5.4.1.5)**
- **AND** external letters from experts in the candidate's field of scholarship indicating that the candidate has established independent and productive scholarship that contributes new knowledge

5.5.2.2. Teaching

Candidates must have:

- met assigned teaching responsibilities
- **AND** established an overall positive record of student and peer evaluations
- **AND** engaged in student supervision, training, or mentoring as described in **sect. 5.4.2.2**
- **AND** served effectively for at least two years as a director of a course defined by the parent program as a "core" course **OR** created and taught a new course for at least 1 year **OR** the equivalent, e.g. developed substantial pedagogical materials adopted for use by other faculty.

5.5.2.3. Service

Candidates must have:

- regular attendance at departmental faculty meetings

- given a combined total of at least three full years of service on committees in the NCBP Department, graduate program, COSM, BSOM or University

5.6. Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

This highest professorial faculty rank requires that the candidate has established a productive and self-sustaining program that advances biological/biomedical scholarship in research or education. There must be evidence that the candidate is recognized nationally and/or internationally as a leader in his/her chosen field of scholarship. The candidate must also have established a strong record of leadership and participation in teaching and service at Wright State University.

5.6.1. Professorial Research Track

Promotion in this track recognizes excellence in biological/biomedical research and requires that the candidate meet all of the following minimum criteria in scholarship, teaching, and service.

5.6.1.1. Scholarship

The candidate must have:

- produced (published or in press) a total of 15 publications as defined in **sects. 5.4.1.1. and 5.4.1.2** since the beginning the probationary period. At least 10 of these 15 publications must be published during the period following promotion to Associate Professor. A maximum of 2 of the 10 required publications may have an equivalent substitution from the list in **sect.5.4.1.1.1**
- **AND** obtained **extramural funding (sect. 5.4.1.4)** amounting to (a) a total of at least \$200,000 over a minimum period of 48 months **OR**(b) a total of at least \$300,000 over a minimum period of 36 months. No credit will be given to funding counted toward promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. Extramural funding must have been active within the five-year period preceding the CBA deadline to apply for promotion to Full Professor
- **AND** give evidence of Scholarly Professional Activity (**sect. 5.4.1.5**), including but not limited to **at least 2** of the following accomplishments since promotion to Associate Professor:
 - Member of a review committee evaluating nationally competitive research grants/contracts
 - Editor or Editorial Board member of a scholarly journal
 - Editor or co-Editor of a book
 - Officer or board member of an extramural national scholarly society
 - Five or more invited extramural seminar presentations
 - Symposium chair at the meeting of a national or international scholarly society
 - Organizer of a major scientific meeting
 - Provided peer-review of an average of two journal manuscripts per year

Note: multiple activities within a single bullet category will only be counted once.

- **AND** received external letters from experts in the candidate's research field must indicate that the candidate has made recognized contributions to his/her field over the five-year period preceding the CBA deadline to apply for promotion to Full Professor

5.6.1.2. Teaching

Candidates must have:

- met assigned teaching responsibilities
- **AND** established an overall positive record of student and peer evaluations
- **AND** participated as a thesis or dissertation director for at least two students in biomedical sciences graduate programs, either doctoral or masters degree
- **AND** given evidence of leadership in teaching for at least two years' duration by having:
 - directed or co-directed a course
 - **OR** participated in COSM or BSOM curricular development
 - **OR** had membership on a BSOM course "Steering Committee"

5.6.1.3. Service

The candidate must have:

- regular attendance at departmental faculty meetings
- **AND** served as a member of an average of at least two committees per year in the NCBP Department, a Graduate Program, COSM, BSOM, or the university
- **AND** served as the chair of a departmental or university committee

5.6.2. Professorial Education Track

Promotion in this track recognizes excellence in biological/biomedical education and requires that the candidate meet all of the following minimum criteria in Scholarship, Teaching, and Service.

5.6.2.1. Scholarship

The candidate must have:

- produced (published or in press) a total of **10 publications** as defined in **sects. 5.4.1.1. and 5.4.1.2.**, not including publications counted toward promotion to Associate Professor. A maximum of 4 of the 10 required publications may have an equivalent substitution from the following list:
 - publication equivalents defined in **sect. 5.4.1.1.1**
 - educational resources including, slide/video sets with speaker notes, computer-based instructional program, or sets of problem-based learning exercises or clinical cases

- **AND** extramural funding as defined in **sect. 5.4.1.4**, amounting to at least \$25,000 total over a period of 2 or more years not including funding counted toward promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. Extramural funding must have been active within the previous 5 years.
- **AND** given evidence of Scholarly Professional Activity (**sect. 5.4.1.5**), including **at least 2** of the following accomplishments since promotion to Associate Professor:
 - Member of a review committee evaluating nationally or regionally competitive education grants/contracts
 - Editor or Editorial Board member of a scholarly journal
 - Editor or co-Editor of a book
 - Officer or board member of an extramural national scholarly society
 - 5 invited extramural seminar presentations
 - Symposium chair at the meeting of a national or international scholarly society
 - Organizer of a major scientific meeting
 - Provided peer-review of an average of two journal manuscripts per year
- **AND** received external letters from experts in the candidate's field of education must indicate that the candidate has made recognized contributions to his/her field during the five-year period preceding the CBA deadline to apply for promotion to Full Professor

5.6.2.2. Teaching

Candidates must have:

- met assigned teaching responsibilities
- **AND** established an overall positive record of student and peer evaluations
- **AND** participated as a thesis or dissertation director for at least two students in biomedical sciences graduate programs, either doctoral or masters degree (participation as the director of 5 scholarly papers required for Masters degree is considered the equivalent of being the thesis or dissertation director for one student)
- **AND** given evidence of leadership in teaching for at least two years' duration by having directed or co-directed at least two courses **OR** developed and taught at least one new course **OR** the equivalent, e.g. developed substantial pedagogical materials adopted for use by other faculty.

5.6.2.3. Service

The candidate must have:

- regular attendance at departmental faculty meetings
- **AND** served as a member of an average of at least two committees per year in the NCBP Department, a graduate program, COSM, BSOM, or the university
- **AND** served as the chair of a departmental or university committee

SECTION 6. ANNUAL EVALUATION

6.1. Submission of Materials for Annual Evaluation.

Each professorial faculty member will submit to the AESC (**sect. 4.3**) and to the department chair a completed Annual Evaluation Form, in which the faculty member applies these bylaws to propose and justify self-assigned annual merit scores. These forms will be submitted by a date determined by the AESC and department chair, with the faculty given at least two weeks to prepare materials for submission. Faculty members may submit other materials that pertain to evaluation criteria, and these will be considered by the department chair and AESC. The AESC or the department chair may request additional materials or information from the faculty member.

6.2. Evaluation Reports

The department chair will evaluate each faculty member's annual evaluation report together with the AESC screening report (**sect. 4.3**) and assign numerical scores according to evaluation criteria specified in these bylaws. The department chair will then inform each BUFM of their rankings and the reasons for these rankings.

6.3. Relative Weights for Teaching, Scholarship and Service

The weighting system identified in Table 1 will apply to all Professorial Faculty unless the Department Chair assigns a different weighting to allow for: (a) unique work assignments or (b) discipline pursuant to the CBA or (c) correction of a pattern of substandard performance extending more than one year. Otherwise weights will be adjusted within the given ranges so as to maximize the individual's overall annual score.

Table 1: Relative weights in scholarship, teaching and service activity assignments for Professorial Research and Education Track Faculty

Activity Category	Professorial Research Track Faculty	Professorial Education Track Faculty
Scholarship	45-75%	35-60%
Teaching	20-40%	35-50%
Service	5-15%	5-15%

6.4. Annual Evaluation Criteria for Professorial Faculty (Research and Education Tracks)

6.4.1. Scholarship Criteria

Faculty members are evaluated annually for their scholarly activities over the past two calendar years. The ratings and associated criteria are given in Table 2.

Table 2: scores for various combinations of publications, funding, and professional activity for both research and educational track professorial faculty

**for annual evaluation only, publications meeting criteria in sect. 5.4.1.1 may include position/opinion/commentary/response articles, review articles, policy manuals, case studies, conference proceedings on which the faculty member appears as author. # excluding Professional Development funds provided through CBA

Score Options	Publications** (sects 5.4.1.1, 5.4.1.2)	Extramural Grants (sect 5.4.1.4)	WSU Funding#	Professional Activity (sect. 5.4.1.5)
<u>Score 4</u> Extraordinary	≥ 4	Funding for any portion of the 2 years		≥ 3 items
	≥ 3	Continuous Funding for the 2 years		≥ 3 item
<u>Score 3</u> Outstanding	≥ 2	Funding for any portion of the 2 years		≥ 2 items
	≥ 1	Continuous Funding for the 2 years		≥ 2 items
<u>Score 2</u> Meritorious	≥ 1	Funding for any portion of the 2 years		≥ 1 item
<u>Score 1</u> Adequate	1 entry in any of these 3 categories			
<u>Score 0</u> Unsatisfactory	No entry in any of these 3 categories			

**for annual evaluation only, publications meeting criteria in sect. 5.4.1.1 may include position/opinion/commentary/response articles, review articles, policy manuals, case studies, conference proceedings on which the faculty member appears as author.

excluding Professional Development funds provided through CBA

Additional Scoring Options

- Add 1 point total for extramural grant(s) receiving a peer-review score better than 25th percentile or the equivalent
- Add 1/2 point total for extramural grant(s) submitted
- Add 1/2 point total for articles submitted for peer-reviewed publication

6.4.2. Teaching Criteria

The window of evaluation will be one year: faculty members will be evaluated annually for their teaching activities over the past calendar year. The ratings and associated criteria are:

- **unsatisfactory – score 0 points:** There are significant deficiencies in teaching, which are confirmed by available student and peer evaluations. The faculty member misses scheduled teaching sessions, is unprepared for the teaching assignment, and/or teaches in an unorganized manner. The faculty member who serves as a course director is unwilling to respond to critiques of the course by students and/or faculty, where those critiques have been previously deemed by the DPTC and department chair to require remedial action.
- **adequate – score 1 point:** The faculty member is prepared for his/her teaching, but available student and peer evaluations indicate that teaching was ineffective in some but not all aspects. The faculty member made significant efforts to improve if negative student or peer comments were received about teaching effectiveness in the previous year.
- **meritorious –score 2 points:** 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. For non-probationary faculty, the faculty member is an effective course director for at least one course (BSOM or a graduate program) if assigned.
- **outstanding – score 3 points:** Same criteria as “meritorious” **AND 3 items** from **sect. 6.4.2.1**
- **extraordinary – score 4 points:** Same criteria as “meritorious” **AND 4 items** from **sect. 6.4.2.1**

6.4.2.1. Items used to assess outstanding and extraordinary teaching may include the following or their equivalents:

1. major advisor for a graduate student
2. committee member for three or more Masters or BMS PhD students
3. director of a scholarly project for a Masters student
4. mentor for a postdoctoral student
5. course director for
 - a Master’s degree course
 - **OR** one or more BMS courses
 - **OR** one or more team-taught School of Medicine courses

- **OR** one of the large BSOM courses (e.g. CaTOS, Human Structures, Medical Neuroscience)
 - **OR** one of the Graduate courses (e.g. Human Physiology, Human Neurobiology) defined by the parent program as a “core” course – each will be credited with two items.
6. internal or external award in recognition of teaching
 7. creation of a new science course for the department, BMS program, or university
 8. documented preparation of new teaching materials (at least five new lecture hours or the equivalent, e.g. laboratory material)
 9. major revision of materials for an existing course (with major revisions for at least 10 hours of lectures or the equivalent)
 10. peer evaluation of teaching materials and student comments indicate that the faculty member is an outstanding teacher
 11. outreach mentoring involving teaching in laboratory or presentation to group. Examples of outreach programs include STREAMS, Horizons in Medicine, MiniMed School

6.4.3. Service Criteria

The window of evaluation will be two years in duration; that is, faculty members are evaluated annually for the totality of service activities over the immediate past two calendar years.

Score based on Service List (see below **sect. 6.4.3.1**)

unsatisfactory – score 0 points: The faculty member provides little or no evidence of service performed for the department, COSM, BSOM or WSU.

adequate – score 1 point: The faculty member regularly attended faculty meetings **AND** achieved at least 1 point (0 points for probationary faculty) from service list

meritorious –score 2 points: The faculty member regularly attended faculty meetings **AND** achieved at least 2 points (1 point for probationary faculty) from service list

outstanding – score 3 points: The faculty member regularly attended faculty meetings **AND** achieved 3 points (2 points for probationary faculty) from service list

extraordinary – score 4 points: The faculty member regularly attended faculty meetings **AND** achieved at least 4 points (3 points for probationary faculty) from service list

6.4.3.1. Points in Service for Annual evaluation

- member of a departmental, graduate program, COSM, BSOM or university committee (each committee counts 1 point)
- chair of a departmental, graduate program, COSM, BSOM or university committee (each position counts 1 point)
- non-committee service for departmental functions, e.g. overseeing seminar series, departmental annual report to COSM and BSOM, etc. (each service counts 1 point)

Service on any one of the following committees will score 3 points in service:

- LACUC, IRB, or IBC Chair
- BSOM Medical Admissions Committee

Service on any one of the following committees will score 2 points in service:

- BSOM or COSM Faculty Development Committee
- BSOM or COSM Faculty Curriculum Committee
- WSU Institutional Review committees, e.g. LACUC, BSC, IRB
- time-intensive university committees, e.g. Faculty Senate

6.5. Annual Evaluation for Probationary (untenured) Professorial Faculty

In their first three years in the NCBP department, these faculty members typically focus effort on developing scholarship (weighting = 60-100% of the annual activity assignment). The balance of effort will be given to teaching based on arrangement with the department chair and in consideration of the faculty member's track (Research or Education); no service is required in the first three years, with the exception of attending faculty meetings.

6.5.1. Scholarship

Probationary faculty members will be evaluated annually for the activities over the past 2 calendar years. The ratings and associated criteria for the first two complete calendar years at WSU are:

- **unsatisfactory – score 0 points:** the faculty member achieves none of the items in **sect. 6.5.1.1**
- **adequate – score 1 point:** the faculty member achieves 1 of the items in **sect. 6.5.1.1**
- **meritorious –score 2 points:** the faculty member achieves 2 of the items in **sect. 6.5.1.1**
- **outstanding – score 3 points:** the faculty member achieves 3 of the items in **sect. 6.5.1.1**
- **extraordinary – score 4 points:** the faculty member achieves 4 of the items in **sect. 6.5.1.1**

After the first two years at WSU, the scholarship criteria are in 6.4.1.

6.5.1.1. Points in Scholarship for Annual evaluation

- constructing a functioning laboratory as evidenced by data generation

- training students or staff in performing experiments and related tasks in the laboratory
- submission of an abstract based on data collected in your WSU laboratory to an extramural scholarly organization
- submission of an extramural grant/contract
- submission of an intramural grant
- submission of a publication
- participation in at least one item under Scholarly Professional Activities, **sect. 5.4.1.5**

Note: multiple activities within a single bullet category will only be counted once.

6.5.2. Teaching

Probationary faculty members will be evaluated annually for the totality of teaching activities over the past calendar year. The ratings and associated criteria are:

- **unsatisfactory – score 0 points:** There are significant deficiencies in teaching, which are confirmed by student and peer evaluations. The faculty member misses scheduled teaching sessions, is unprepared for the teaching assignment, and/or teaches in an unorganized manner.
- **adequate – score 1 point:** The faculty member is prepared for his/her teaching, but student and peer evaluations indicate some deficiency. The faculty member made significant efforts to improve negative student or peer comments received about teaching effectiveness in the previous year.
- **meritorious –score 2 points:** The faculty member’s instruction is effective as evidenced in both student and peer evaluations that are positive with only minor criticisms.
- **outstanding – score 3 points:** Same criteria as “meritorious” above **AND 1 item** from **sect. 6.4.2.1.**
- **extraordinary – score 4 points:** Same criteria as “meritorious” above **AND 2 items** from **sect. 6.4.2.1.**

6.5.3. Service

Criteria for probationary faculty service are included in **6.4.3.**

SECTION 7. REVIEW and AMENDMENT OF DEPARTMENT BYLAWS

The department bylaws will be reviewed at minimum whenever a new collective bargaining agreement between the Wright State University and WSU-AAUP becomes effective. Any amendments resulting from a review of the bylaws are subject to the approval process specified in the CBA.