

Department of Earth & Environmental Sciences Bylaws

Approved by EES faculty on November 3, 2017 (8-0 BUFM approval vote of changes with support of Dept. Chair, David Dominic)

Approved by Faculty Governance Committee October 21, 2020

SECTION I. INTRODUCTION

These Bylaws provide for faculty participation in the operation of the department in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the American Association of University Professors - Wright State University Chapter and Wright State University. They are subject to and consistent with the Bylaws of the College of Science and Mathematics. Included are operational procedures for each departmental standing committee, as well as procedures and the criteria for Annual Evaluation and Promotion and Tenure.

SECTION II. PROCEDURES BY WHICH BARGAINING UNIT FACULTY GIVE ADVICE AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Dismissal

1. Faculty Appointment: Advice given by Faculty (here and elsewhere referring to full-time faculty) in hiring of new faculty. Bargaining Unit Faculty (BUFs) elect a numerical majority of the Search Committee members from among BUFs. Both departmental BUFs and the Search Committee make recommendations to the department chair about candidates to be interviewed. 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 faculty. The Faculty as a whole will assess the qualifications of all applicants interviewed 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 recommendation to the department chair, which will include the faculty's ranking of possible candidates with a summary of the discussion of 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. Faculty Reappointment: Faculty reappointment from another administrative unit to this department will occur only after the opinion of the full-time departmental faculty has been taken by secret ballot at a special department meeting. Successive votes will be taken, with discussion between, until identical results are obtained in two successive ballots. BUFs and non-BUFs report separately with BUF and non-BUF votes indicated separately. The faculty's recommendations will be presented to the dean, with a summary of discussion prior to the final vote.

3. Faculty Dismissal: In accordance with the CBA, the dismissal of probationary tenure-track faculty for deficient performance may be recommended to the dean by the Faculty Development Committee of the Department (see IIE1 below). The department chair will bring any such case before the Faculty Development Committee of the department for discussion at a special meeting. The person being considered for dismissal may attend only for the purpose of presenting his or her case orally or in writing, and may require that the chair be absent during the presentation (if oral). The Faculty Development Committee will discuss the case and will vote by secret ballot on whether or not to recommend dismissal. Successive votes will be taken, with discussion between, until identical results are obtained in two successive ballots. The Faculty Development Committee's recommendation will be sent to the department chair and dean, with a tally of the vote and a summary of the sense of the prior discussion, which may include any minority opinion.

B. Promotion and Tenure

1. Tenure-track Assistant Professor to Tenured Associate Professor: The department Faculty Development Committee will review the candidate's file. At a meeting convened for this purpose, the Committee will vote on whether it will recommend that the candidate should be promoted, based on its assessment of whether or not the candidate has met the criteria for promotion and tenure. Successive votes will be taken by secret ballot, with further discussion between, until identical results are obtained in two successive ballots. The Committee's recommendation, whose wording must be approved by the committee, will be forwarded to the department chair, the dean and the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of Science and Mathematics, with a tally of the vote and a summary of the prior discussion, including any minority opinions.

2. Tenured Associate Professor to Tenured Full Professor: The procedure is the same as that described in Section IIB1 above, except that, while the full Faculty Development Committee participates in the review and discussion, voting is restricted to those BUF who hold the rank of tenured full professor.

C. Professional Development and Mentoring of Untenured Faculty

If in the annual evaluation process and classroom visitations (see Section IV below), the chair and/or the FDC identifies one or more areas in which a faculty member needs to improve, a faculty mentor will be invited by the chair, with the advice of the Faculty Development Committee and in consultation with the faculty member, to help the faculty member improve.

D. Teaching Assignment Requests

Requests for specific teaching assignments may be made by faculty members to the department chair in writing in reasonable time to meet the Registrar's deadline for submissions to the schedule for the term in which the course is to be given. Requests for summer or overload teaching assignments may be made in the same way as those for regular teaching assignments.

E. Committees of the Department

The committees listed here are standing committees of the department and will conduct business prescribed by department bylaws or assigned by the department chair within the scope of their respective responsibilities. The chair or bargaining unit faculty may appoint additional *ad hoc* committees to meet specific temporary departmental needs.

1. Faculty Development Committee (FDC): This committee includes all tenured departmental bargaining unit faculty. The department chair is a non-voting member. The Faculty Development Committee elects its chair each year during Fall Semester, for a term that begins in January. Individuals may serve as chair for no more than two consecutive years.

The committee makes recommendations on all matters concerning promotion, tenure and Professional Development Leaves, and makes recommendations to the department chair about the annual evaluation of each individual BUF's performance. Independent of the Chair's annual evaluation, it shall provide each untenured BUF with an annual statement summarizing her or his progress toward tenure. It also shall provide each tenured BUF Assistant and Associate Professor with a statement summarizing cumulative progress to promotion to the next rank if requested. The Committee shares joint responsibility with the Chair for ensuring that peer evaluation of teaching is conducted each year. All BUF tenured associate and full professors may vote on the promotion and tenure of assistant professors. Only tenured professors may vote on the promotion of an associate professor. When the voting membership of the Committee for consideration of promotion at either level is less than three, the candidate shall be invited to nominate sufficient faculty members of appropriate rank outside the department. The Committee may then select from the candidate's nominee(s) or, if it should consider any of them unsuitable, select others of suitable rank and qualifications in their stead.

2. Undergraduate Studies Committee: This committee shall make recommendations on all matters concerning proposed new undergraduate courses and modifications to or elimination of existing courses or programs; academic standards for admission to the department's undergraduate courses and programs, and all other matters related to the undergraduate curriculum and undergraduate affairs including petitions for waivers of course requirements and substitutions of courses in degree programs. It shall in addition make recommendations concerning the allocation of scholarships and grants. The Undergraduate Studies Committee and its chair are appointed by the department chair, who is a non-voting member of the Committee.

3. Graduate Studies Committee: This committee shall make recommendations on all matters concerning proposed new graduate courses and modifications to or elimination of existing courses or programs; academic standards for admission to the department's graduate courses or programs; and all other matters related to the graduate curriculum and graduate affairs, including petitions for waivers of course requirements and substitutions of courses in graduate degree programs. It shall, in addition, make recommendations concerning the allocation of scholarships, stipends and other financial aid, as well as appointments to graduate assistantships and teaching assistantships. The Graduate Studies Committee and its chair are appointed by the department chair, who is a member of the Committee *ex officio* and does not vote.

F. Issues Affecting the Department: Issues that affect the department will be presented by the chair or by bargaining unit faculty members to the department faculty at regularly scheduled faculty meetings, for the advice and/or recommendations of the faculty, or only the bargaining unit faculty when indicated in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

SECTION III. DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES

A. Calling Meetings and Setting Agendas

Regular meetings of the faculty are called by the chair of the department. Items will be added to the chair's agenda at the request of faculty members, or the agenda will contain a standard item entitled "Faculty Issues," in which faculty members or the Chair may bring up matters of concern at the meetings. Special department meetings may be called by the chair or by petition of one-third of all full-time faculty members. The individual(s) calling the meeting will announce its purpose at least one week in advance. For unusual situations, emergency department meetings may be called by the chair. At the beginning of an emergency meeting a majority of the total bargaining-unit faculty must vote to proceed with the meeting or it will not be official.

B. Voting at Department Meetings

Except where prohibited by the collective bargaining agreement (CBA), each full-time faculty member shall have one vote on every motion, and a motion passes by the simple majority vote of those present. Voting will be open response unless a faculty member or the Chair requests a secret ballot. A quorum is the majority of the bargaining-unit faculty members. Action taken at a department meeting is not binding in the absence of a quorum. Any faculty member may submit a written absentee vote on a specific issue or delegate (in writing) another member to cast a proxy vote for him/her.

C. Advice Given by Departmental Faculty in the Naming of a Chair

The Dean, College of Science and Mathematics, appoints the search committee. Normally, at least half of the committee membership is chosen from among Geology Bargaining Unit Faculty. The Dean appoints the committee chair. Candidates selected for an on-site visit will meet with available faculty. BUFs and non-BUFs report separately with BUF and non-BUF votes indicated separately. BUF and non-BUF will rank the candidates separately in a secret ballot at a departmental faculty meeting; such rankings will be summed so as to provide an overall recommendation from each group. The BUF and non-BUF will provide the dean with written recommendations for the naming of a department Chair. This recommendation will include the faculty's ranking of possible candidates for chair with a summary of the discussion of the ranking. Those candidates whom the faculty find absolutely unacceptable at any level should be so indicated.

SECTION IV. CRITERIA AND PROCEDURE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY

A. Relative Weights for Teaching, Scholarship and Service

Teaching: 35 – 55%

Scholarship: 35 – 55%

Service: 10 - 30%

These weightings will be applied after the numerical evaluation (see Section IVB below) by an algorithm that maximizes the individual's overall score. This system applies to all Bargaining Unit Faculty unless the chair assigns and justifies a different weighting to allow for:

1. unique work assignments that differ from those of other departmental BUF members;
2. discipline pursuant to the CBA; or
3. correction of a pattern of substandard performance extending more than one year.

B. Criteria for Evaluation

A faculty member's evaluation is determined by the criteria below.

1. Teaching

Category i: Unsatisfactory (score 0). Failed to meet the criteria of any higher category.

Category ii: Adequate (score 1). 1. A pattern of student complaints validated, none serious. 2. Student evaluations generally neutral. 3. Marginally performs the teaching and advising duties assigned by the department chair. 4. Peer evaluation indicates faculty member teaches competently but without distinction. 5. Little or no updating of course materials. 6. Student research conducted under faculty member's supervision is of questionable quality.

Category iii: Meritorious (score 2). 1. Few valid student complaints, none serious. 2. Student evaluations are more favorable than not favorable. 3. Effectively performs teaching and advising duties assigned by the department chair. 4. Peer evaluation indicates that the subject matter is generally well presented. 5. Appropriate updating of course materials to follow changes in the field. 6. Student research prepared under the faculty member's direction is satisfactory.

Category iv: Outstanding (score 3). 1. Few or no valid student complaints. 2. Student evaluations are generally favorable. 3. Exceptional performance of teaching and advising duties assigned by the department chair. 4. Peer evaluation indicates the faculty member holds students' attention, and student participation shows insight and confidence. 5. Updates existing courses, showing familiarity with recent and current advances in the field and the ability to communicate them to

students. 6. Student research conducted under the faculty member's supervision resulted in a presentation at a national or regional meeting.

Category v: Extraordinary (score 4). 1. No valid student complaints. 2. Student narrative evaluations highly favorable and in some cases mention the faculty member as an exemplary teacher. 3. Exceptional performance of teaching and advising duties assigned by the department chair. 4. Peer evaluation indicates unusual effectiveness in teaching difficult material, and development of students' ability to think independently. 5. Existing courses are kept up to date as in Category iv above; and when opportunities arise, makes significant contributions to the development of new courses and of the department's various degree programs. 6. Student research prepared under the faculty member's supervision resulted in a refereed publication.

2. Scholarship

The department chair will evaluate scholarly activity, taking into account such tangible achievements as publications, funded and pending research proposals, presentations at national or regional meetings, technical reports, book chapters, invited lectures, maps, articles, books or monographs.

Category i: Unsatisfactory. A score of zero indicates little or no evidence of scholarly work with associated achievements in the past year and little or no evidence of work in progress.

Category ii: Adequate. A score of one indicates that scholarly work is occurring but with limited achievements.

Category iii: Meritorious. A score of two indicates clear evidence of on-going scholarly work, usually including at least one publication and funding from any source.

Category iv: Outstanding. A score of three indicates an active program of scholarly activity. This must include extramural funding, at least one publication in a reputable journal (or recognized outlet), and professional achievements, for example, presentations at national meetings.

Category v: Extraordinary. A score of four indicates a highly successful program of scholarly activity. This includes everything in the outstanding category but extends the accomplishments, for example, to having more than one external grant, or having a number of publications.

3. Service

The department chair will evaluate service, taking into account such things as committee memberships or chairs, visits to schools, student recruiting, lectures given to local organizations, book or manuscript reviews, reviews of proposals for granting agencies, office in professional organizations, editorial service to professional journals, service to public agencies, and other equivalent accomplishments.

Category i: Unsatisfactory. A score of zero indicates that the faculty member has little or no evidence of service performed for department, college, university or profession.

Category ii: Adequate. A score of one indicates a minimal level of service activity: attending faculty meetings and serving as a member of a committee with a minimal workload.

Category iii: Meritorious. A score of two indicates that the faculty member meets criteria for adequate and in addition, does service work on committees or in the community.

Category iv: Outstanding. A score of three indicates a very active service record. Substantial involvement in a number of standing and/or *ad hoc* committees is expected. If a particularly important single activity is very time consuming then it will be considered equal to multiple lesser activities.

Category v: A score of four (extraordinary) indicates strong evidence of service resulting in major accomplishment at some level (e.g., department, college, university, or profession). This should include specific achievements or involvement in a leadership role, such as chairing a major committee.

C. Procedure for Annual Evaluation

1. Submission of materials: By mid-February, each BUF will submit to the department chair and the chair of the Faculty Development Committee a report summarizing activity in teaching, scholarship and service during the preceding calendar year.

2. Peer Evaluation of Teaching: The department chair will arrange for suitably qualified BUF to evaluate the teaching of untenured bargaining unit faculty members. Faculty evaluators must be tenured BUFs. They are appointed by the department chair with the advice of the Faculty Development Committee. The evaluation may include, but is not limited to, a review of the course syllabus and study of the narrative portion of student evaluations. The numerical portion of the student evaluation will be reviewed only for probationary faculty. The evaluation of untenured faculty must include at least two classroom visits. As a part of the evaluation process, each faculty evaluator will prepare a report for the Chair, for the Faculty Development Committee, and the person being evaluated.

3. Evaluation by the Chair and Its Review by the Faculty Member: After considering the recommendations of the Faculty Development Committee (I.I.E.1) and in accordance with the CBA, the Department Chair conducts an annual evaluation of each faculty member. The Chair provides a written evaluation with a numerical score for the areas of teaching, research and scholarship. Included in the Chair's evaluation of all untenured BUFs is a statement about the peer evaluation of the individual's teaching effectiveness (CBA). Each faculty member may review the evaluation and the scores assigned for his or her annual evaluation and may ask the chair to further clarify the reasons for the assignment. If the faculty member agrees with this evaluation, he or she will sign a copy of it and return it to the department chair. If the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, he or she may prepare a signed rebuttal and submit it to the chair normally within two weeks. This rebuttal shall be attached to the evaluation and forwarded to all entities that receive the annual evaluation.

SECTION V. CRITERIA AND PROCEDURE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE OF DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY

A. General Statements

1. Publications: For the purposes of this document, "publication" is defined as a high-quality peer-reviewed article describing original research in a journal of national or international distribution published in the candidate's field of study. The nature of the publication must be scientific. However, BUFs hired as Science Educators may also publish in peer-reviewed science education journals. "Peer-reviewed" is defined as having undergone a critical examination by professionals in the field before being accepted for publication. Peer-reviewed publications must be based on research generated in the candidate's independent research program subsequent to tenure-track appointment at WSU and have WSU listed as the candidate's affiliation.

Collaborative publications will be counted provided that the candidate played a significant role in the inception, design and implementation of the research.

2. Extramural Funding: Extramural funding includes monetary awards from governmental funding agencies, businesses, foundations, or trusts whether the funds are provided to support research or an important academic mission of the department. Contributions "in kind," such as equipment, software, products, services, supplies, or materials are considered extramural funding. Graduate student support in the form of externally supported research assistantships or internships will be credited to the faculty member as extramural funding. Support for research includes situations in which money is not exchanged, provided the candidate can document such arrangements support research activities. Extramural funding obtained in collaboration with faculty members within the Department, other departments, or other colleges and universities will be counted towards extramural funding requirements, provided that the candidate is either (1) the principal investigator, or (2) the co-principal investigator who has played a major role in obtaining the funding and is a central figure in the implementation of any project that the funding supports.

B. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The candidate must accomplish all of the following.

1. Teaching

- a. Peer evaluation, including classroom visits is positive.
- b. Student evaluation reflects effective teaching and indicates that there are no serious deficiencies and that previous deficiencies have been corrected.
- c. Candidate has worked to improve his or her courses.
- d. Candidate has successfully developed a new course or courses if called upon to do so.

e. Candidate has been reliable in meeting assigned classes (barring illness), and is available during office hours as indicated by the CBA.

f. Candidate has participated in supervising graduate students and/or serving on graduate student committees, and has shown effectiveness in doing so.

2. Scholarship

Associate Professor is the rank assigned to those who have demonstrated intellectual excellence in their research and an independent and coherent substantive research program. Over the probationary period, candidates must show that they can conduct independent research. They must have a record of publications based on work done at WSU to make a contribution to knowledge in their area. These requirements are met by:

Publishing peer-reviewed articles (including papers accepted for publication) and receiving extramural funding in one of the numerical combinations specified in the table below. One map that has been through a review similar to that required for a journal article may substitute for one of the required journal articles. The map must be an original contribution published by a recognized independent professional agency, such as a state or U.S. Geological Survey. The order of the authors' names is of no significance. It is expected that each of the co-authors will have played a significant role in the inception, design and implementation of the research.

Peer-reviewed journal articles from the candidate's research at WSU.	Extramural funding
4	\$75,000
5	\$50,000
6	\$25,000

· External letters from individuals in the candidate's area of expertise positively assessing the quality of the candidate's research work are required. At least three such letters are to be obtained from a list developed by the Faculty Development Committee. These individuals cannot be research collaborators or scientific mentors of the candidate. The list of researchers from which the referees are drawn by the FDC should be agreed upon mutually by the FDC and the candidate. All external letters received must be forwarded with the promotion document.

· Presentation of research results

a. Four or more presentations at national or regional meetings, with abstracts published in conference proceedings, or

b. Participation as a contributor at two specialized meetings in the candidate's field of research (Gordon Conferences, Penrose Conferences, etc.) or

c. A combination of any parts of (a) and (b) that are equal to at least one of them.

3. Service

Candidate must achieve the following:

- a. Attend departmental faculty meetings and participate in discussion.
- b. Serve on at least one departmental committee.
- c. Serve on at least one college committee or university committee.
- d. Perform significant service beyond the University. Examples include visiting schools in the region, giving talks to local organizations, serving on advisory boards, reviewing manuscripts for a journal, reviewing external research proposals, serving on a thesis committee at another university, chairing a session at a national or regional meeting, leading a field trip in conjunction with a meeting, etc.

C. Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

The candidate must accomplish all the following.

1. Teaching

- a. Candidate is considered an effective teacher, according to student and peer evaluation.
- b. Candidate has continuously improved his or her courses.
- c. Candidate has successfully developed new courses when called upon to do so.
- d. Candidate has been reliable in meeting assigned classes (barring illness), and is available during office hours, as indicated in the CBA.
- e. Candidate has participated in supervising graduate students and/or serving on graduate student committees, and has shown effectiveness in doing so.
- f. Candidate shows ability to co-ordinate activity in one of the department's major fields of instruction if requested by the chair.

2. Scholarship

Faculty are expected to maintain an ongoing record of productive scholarship. Candidates for promotion will be expected to have an established a research program based at Wright State University, under their own direction, although it may be collaborative.

These requirements are met by:

- Fifteen or more peer-reviewed publications authored or co-authored by the candidate, with Wright State University named as the candidate's employer, and including those from probationary years at Wright State University, at least three having appeared within the five years immediately prior to submission of the application, and at least 8 after the promotion to associate professor. Up to two maps, book chapters or review articles, or a combination of any two, published after promotion to Associate Professor may count toward the publication requirement for promotion. Maps must meet the same criteria as for promotion to Associate Professor. In addition, two of the articles published can be pedagogical in nature. For faculty hired as science educators, two of the published articles may be pure non-pedagogical Earth and/or environmental science research. The order of the authors' names is of no significance in this context.

- External letters from individuals in the candidate's area of expertise positively assessing the quality of the candidate's research work are required. At least three such letters are to be obtained from a list developed by the Faculty Development Committee. These individuals cannot be research collaborators or scientific mentors of the candidate. The list of researchers from which the referees are drawn by the FDC should be agreed upon mutually by the FDC and the candidate. All external letters received must be forwarded with the promotion document.

- \$75,000 in extramural funding since promotion to Associate Professor

- Presentation of research results

- a. Ten or more presentations at regional, national or international meetings, with abstracts published in conference proceedings, or

- b. Participation as a contributor at four specialized meetings in the candidate's field of research (Gordon Conferences, Penrose Conferences, NATO Advanced Study Institutes, etc.), or

- c. Any combination of parts of (a) and (b) above that are equal to at least one of them.

- Evidence of a national reputation

Establishment of a national reputation in the candidate's area of research beyond that required for promotion to Associate Professor is essential. Indicators include a publication record and an ongoing research program supported by extramural funding as indicated above. In addition, evidence of a national reputation will include two accomplishments from the following list:

- a. Appointment to the editorial board of a respected scientific journal.

- b. Appointment to a grant review committee of a national or statewide granting agency.

- c. Chairing or organizing a session at a national meeting.

- d. Invitation to present at a national professional symposium in the candidate's field.
 - e. Consultation by a nationally recognized corporation or federal agency for expert advice.
 - f. Holding national or regional office in a professional society.
 - g. Awards or special recognition from a respected professional society.
 - h. Other activity or recognition that is equivalent to the foregoing.
3. Service (since promotion to Associate Professor)
- a. Candidate attends departmental faculty meetings and participates in discussion.
 - b. Candidate has regularly and effectively served on at least two departmental committees.
 - c. Candidate has served at least three years on college committees or university committees.
 - d. Candidate has performed significant service to the scientific community, such as manuscript review for a journal, review of research proposals, service on thesis committees at other universities, chairing sessions at national or international meetings, etc.

SECTION VI. AMENDMENTS

These bylaws may be amended by a majority vote of the total bargaining unit faculty, and the approval of the Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics and the Faculty Governance Committee. A final faculty vote on an amendment may not be taken at the faculty meeting at which the amendment was first introduced.