



DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY AND PHYSICS BYLAWS

1. INTRODUCTION

The Department of Chemistry and Physics at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga is to be governed by these bylaws. These bylaws are subject to all policies and provisions as set forth by the Faculty Handbook, the College of Arts and Sciences, the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, the UT Board of Trustees, and the laws of Tennessee. In the event of conflict the rules of the higher body takes precedence.

2. VOTING MEMBERSHIP

The voting membership of the faculty of the department shall be taken from the core faculty members holding the faculty rank of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Lecturer and Faculty Associate consistent with University Policy and if no policy specifies then as determined by the tenure track faculty.

3. DEPARTMENT MEETINGS

- 3.1. The Chemistry & Physics department head or designee will preside over meetings, cancel regular meetings as necessary, and call special meetings. The department head shall prepare and make available the agenda at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. The agenda will include items subject to a vote at that meeting.
- 3.2. Two-thirds of the voting membership shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.
- 3.3. The rules contained in Robert's Rules of Order, Revised, shall govern the organization in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with the bylaws.

4. DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY SEARCHES

- 4.1. All departmental searches will follow the *Faculty Handbook* and University policies and procedures.
- 4.2. The department head will appoint the chair of the Faculty Search Committee in consultation with the full voting faculty. The chair shall be tenured.
- 4.3. The Faculty Search Committee shall consist of:
 - 4.3.1. At least four departmental faculty with the majority of the committee members having substantive knowledge of the discipline in which the hire will be made and in which one committee member will be chosen from within the department but not in the discipline specific field.
 - 4.3.2. The committee will be diverse in terms of characteristics such as rank, gender, race/ethnicity, etc.
 - 4.3.3. When appropriate, additional individuals outside of the department may be added to the committee if the department head and committee believe the addition would

enhance the ability of the committee to assess candidate qualifications.

4.4. Advertising the position

4.4.1. The Search Committee in conjunction with the department head will examine staffing needs and construct a job posting reflecting the needs of the department.

The job posting will be distributed to the entire faculty for review.

4.4.2. Ads (after appropriate approvals) will be placed in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (required for all tenure-track openings), *Diverse* and *HigherEdJobs.com* by the Office of Equity and Diversity. Ads should be placed in one or more appropriate discipline oriented online sites or published magazines/journals. Ads may also be placed on free listservers by committee members. The Dean's Office will forward a copy of the ad to the Provost's Office for posting on the Academic Affairs Faculty Openings website.

4.4.3. All advertisements must include the University's approved Affirmative Action statement: *The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga is an equal opportunity/affirmative action/Title VI/Title IX/Section 504/ADA/ADEA institution.* Advertisements also must include the statement: *Screening of applicants will begin on (date) and continue until the position is filled.*

4.5. Candidate Review

4.5.1. Following university procedures and working with the Dean's office and the Office of Equity and Diversity, the faculty search committee reviews all applicant files, ranks applicants and recommends to the department head the top 6 or more for further review.

4.5.2. Upon approval by OED and the department head, the selected candidates will be offered an initial interview (either video or phone). All voting full-time faculty are invited to attend and are encouraged to provide feedback to the Search Committee. Only Search Committee member's rankings will be calculated in the final vote. After the initial interviews, the Search Committee Chair will compile the data and present the averaged rankings to the RTR committee, and the department head.

4.5.3. The department head then requests approval of the Office of Equity and Diversity and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences to contact the preferred candidate(s) and arrange for on-campus interviews.

4.5.4. All full time members of the department will be invited to observe the teaching demonstrations and/or research presentations given by the candidates, and will be invited to meet with each candidate. Following interviews, the department (full-time faculty and staff) will meet for discussion and then a vote by all tenure-track faculty will be taken for tenure track positions and by all full time faculty for non-tenure track positions.

5. DEPARTMENT HEAD SEARCH

5.1. All department head searches will follow the Faculty Handbook and University policies and procedures.

5.2. The Department Head Search Committee

5.2.1. The committee will be diverse in terms of characteristics such as program, rank, gender, race/ethnicity, etc. A minimum of 5, but no more than 7, faculty members from the Department should serve on the Committee. Tenured faculty will select the members of the committee within their discipline.

5.2.2. When appropriate, additional individuals outside of the department may be added to the committee if the Dean and the Committee believe the addition would enhance the ability of the committee to assess candidate qualifications. The majority of the

final committee members should be tenure-track faculty from our department.

- 5.3. The Search Committee in conjunction with the Chair of the Department Head Search Committee will examine staffing needs and construct a job posting reflecting the needs of the department. The job posting will be distributed to the entire faculty for review.
- 5.4. For both internal and external searches, standard search procedures will be utilized including interviews. Department Head Search Committee will recommend acceptable candidates to the faculty prior to submitting the nomination to the Dean. The Department Head Search Committee will then recommend a ranked list of acceptable candidates to the Dean.

6. DEPARTMENT RANK, TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT

- 6.1. The Committee shall follow the procedures and timetable outlined in the Faculty Handbook and University policies and procedures documents.
- 6.2. Membership
 - 6.2.1. The departmental Rank, Tenure and Reappointment (RTR) Committee for granting tenure will consist of all tenured faculty. Tenured faculty on leave or sabbatical are eligible to sit on the committee but are not required to do so.
 - 6.2.2. The RTR Committee for promotion will consist of all faculty at or above the new rank being considered.
 - 6.2.3. The Chair of the RTR Committee will normally be the most senior faculty member by years of service at UTC. Alternatively the Head may appoint the next most senior faculty member by years of service at UTC to serve as Chair or ask the committee to vote to select a Chair.
- 6.3. Meetings and Candidate Review
 - 6.3.1. Meetings will be conducted by following Robert's Rules of Order.
 - 6.3.2. A quorum is required for actions to take place. Two-thirds of those eligible to vote shall constitute a quorum.
 - 6.3.3. At the organizational meeting, the Committee shall determine the list of candidates for reappointment, tenure and promotion and request dossiers from those candidates.
 - 6.3.4. Dossiers should be submitted to the committee chair to be disseminated to the members of the Committee. Electronic submission is strongly recommended. The Committee will also follow the department external review policies and procedures in evaluating the candidate.
 - 6.3.5. Upon completion of the dossier review, the Committee will call a voting meeting with a quorum present (two-thirds of the voting membership shall constitute a quorum). Voting shall be yes or no (abstentions shall be permitted) and shall be by written ballot. Proxy votes are to be submitted to the chair of the RTR committee prior to the meeting. The committee chair will tally the results and report them to the committee, the candidate, and the department head.

7. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

- 7.1. The Department will follow the Faculty Handbook and University policies and procedures for performance evaluation.
- 7.2. The criteria for EDO evaluations of Exceeds Expectations for Rank, Meets Expectations for Rank, Needs Improvement for Rank, and Unsatisfactory for Rank are provided in Appendix A and shall follow Faculty Handbook and University policy and procedure guidelines.
- 7.3. Specific department guidelines for EDO evaluations by rank and criteria can be found in Appendix A.

8. CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

- 8.1.** For tenure and/or promotion, the faculty member considered by the Committee shall meet the criteria presented in Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook.
- 8.2.** A tenure request by an Assistant Professor may be accompanied by a request for promotion to Associate Professor. A tenure request by an Associate Professor may be accompanied by a request for promotion to Full Professor.
- 8.3.** All faculty are subject to the College of Arts and Sciences External Review Policy. Please refer to the policy for guidelines and procedures.
- 8.4.** Reappointment: While a positive annual reappointment for a tenure track faculty member is a reflection of their progressing toward tenure and promotion and meeting annual expectations, it is no guarantee that those ultimate decisions will be positive unless the cumulative work over the appropriate period of years meets expected criteria.
- 8.5. Rank, Tenure, & Reappointment: Teaching, Research, Service, & Collegiality:**
 - 8.5.1. Teaching Requirement:**
 - 8.5.1.1. Established reputation as a good teacher as measured not only by traditional student evaluations but also by the quality of classroom materials and examinations, the up-dating and developing of courses, feedback from former students, and classroom visitations by faculty colleagues.
 - 8.5.1.2. Established reputation as a good academic advisor as measured by the quality of advise given, materials available for students, enthusiasm for advising duties, advising student groups.
 - 8.5.1.3. Established reputation as an effective director of research students as measured not only by the number of students participating but also by the quality of the guidance, i.e. providing direction and focus in laboratory work, being available for questions and supervision during student research, generating student interest and enthusiasm for scientific research, providing the opportunity for student presentations at regional or national meetings, supervision of honors research projects, serving on honors research committees.
 - 8.5.2. Research Requirement:**
 - 8.5.2.1. A strong commitment to research that shows a candidate's ability to establish a productive and original research program. Independent work and/or collaborative efforts with researchers either internal or external to the University are expected. Emphasis on involvement of undergraduate students in the individual's research program.
 - 8.5.2.2. The inclusion of UTC students as co-authors along with participation in the Undergraduate Research Program of the department are strongly encouraged. Clear evidence of external recognition of research and scholarship performed while at UTC. Four or more research presentations at major chemistry/physics conferences. Publication or acceptance of at least two major peer-reviewed research or scholarly works at current rank.
 - 8.5.2.3. Generation of one or more well-reviewed external grant proposal(s) as the PI, or as a significant Co-PI. It should be noted that RTR committee members are expected to carefully examine submitted external proposals in addition to giving thoughtful consideration to reviewers' comments regarding such proposals. Proposals and reviewers comments are to be included in the candidate's dossier. For external proposals where a candidate is not the PI a very clear description of their contribution to the proposal must be provided.
 - 8.5.2.4. Other measures of accomplishment may also be counted including serving as a panel reviewer for federal or private grant agency, serving as a member for nationally recognized committee, giving invited research lectures,

and writing books or book chapters, articles in science encyclopedias, and software. Candidates should exhibit clear evidence of a long-term interest and enthusiasm for research and publication as a high priority activity.

8.5.3. Service Requirement:

8.5.3.1. Clear evidence of dedication and commitment to the University as measured by participation and productivity in the normal operation of the Chemistry and Physics Department, service on university committees, participation in UTC ceremonies and candidate interviews.

8.5.3.2. Professional service as measured, for example, by participation in American Chemical Society (ACS) or the American Institute of Physics (AIP) activities, lectures/demonstrations at local schools, various industrial consultations.

8.5.4. Collegiality and Intangibles Requirement:

8.5.4.1. There is necessarily a substantial subjective component in the awarding of tenure. In this regard, the candidate should show dedication to the Department of Chemistry and Physics and to UTC.

8.5.4.2. The candidate must be a good citizen of the department and university, must interact well with students and faculty colleagues, and must serve as a good role model for students and a good representative of UTC.

8.5.4.3. A successful candidate for tenure must be able to contribute to continuing our department's role at UTC.

8.6. Promotion: Recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor may be linked to a recommendation for Tenure. Promotions to Associate and Full Professor reflect departmental expectations and also the guidelines in the document "Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for the College of Arts & Sciences."

APPENDIX A

ANNUAL EVALUATION (EDO)

In order to develop guidance for each EDO Rating for each Faculty Rank, lists of Meets and Exceeds Criteria for: (1) Instruction and Advising, (2) Research and Scholarship, and (3) Professional Service are provided. The lists are provided for guidance and not as absolute criteria for evaluation.

Guidelines for departments heads to use in identifying candidates for annual performance ratings of "Exceeds Expectations" are found in document *Annual Performance Evaluation of Faculty: "Meets Expectations" vs. "Exceeds Expectations"* found on the College of Arts and Sciences website

<http://www.utc.edu/college-arts-sciences/department-head-resources.php> (see Appendix B)

I. Instructor/Lecturer

Lecturer/Instructor normally carries no research expectations.

The Department Head may assign the Lecturer/Instructor specific duties required for the functioning of particular department operations.

To receive an EDO rating of **Exceeds Expectations**, the Instructor/Lecturer must complete the activities listed in Standard EDO Activities under the Instruction and Advising category. In addition, the Instructor/Lecturer must also be engaged in a number of items from the Exceptional EDO Activities list.

To receive an EDO rating of **Meets Expectations**, the Instructor/Lecturer must complete the activities listed in Standard EDO Activities under the Instruction and Advising category.

The Instructor/Lecturer will receive a rating of **Needs Improvement** if the individual fails to meet some of the items listed in the Standard EDO Activities under the Instruction and Advising category.

The Instructor/Lecturer will receive a rating of **Unsatisfactory** if the individual fails to meet a substantial number of the items listed in the Standard EDO Activities under the Instruction and Advising category.

II. Assistant Professor

To receive an EDO rating of **Exceeds Expectations**, the Assistant Professor must accomplish all of the activities listed in Standard EDO Activities under the Instruction and Advising category. The Assistant Professor must also present substantial activity in the categories of Research and Scholarship and Professional Service. Additionally, the Assistant Professor must accomplish a significant number of activities from the Exceptional EDO Activities list.

To receive an EDO rating of **Meets Expectations**, the Assistant Professor must accomplish all of the activities listed in Standard EDO Activities under the Instruction and Advising category. The Assistant Professor must also present considerable activity in both the categories of Research and Scholarship and Professional Service.

The Assistant Professor will receive a rating of **Needs Improvement** if the individual fails to meet items listed in the Standard EDO Activities under the Instruction and Advising category or if there is minimal activity in either Research and Scholarship or Professional Service.

The Assistant Professor will receive a rating of **Unsatisfactory** if the individual fails substantially to meet items listed in the Standard EDO Activities under the Instruction and Advising category or if there is extremely minimal activity in either Research and Scholarship or Professional Service.

III. Associate Professor

To receive an EDO rating of **Exceeds Expectations**, the Associate Professor must accomplish all of the activities listed in Standard EDO Activities under the Instruction and Advising category and must also present strong activity in the categories of Research and Scholarship and Professional Service. Additionally, the Associate Professor must present significant accomplishments from the Exceptional EDO Activities list.

To receive an EDO rating of **Meets Expectations**, the Associate Professor must accomplish all of the activities listed in Standard EDO Activities under the Instruction and Advising category. The Assistant Professor must also present strong activity in the categories of Research and Scholarship and Professional Service.

The Associate Professor will receive a rating of **Needs Improvement** if the individual fails to meet items listed in Standard EDO Activities under Instruction and Advising or if there is minimal activity in Research and Scholarship and Professional Service.

The Associate Professor will receive a rating of **Unsatisfactory** if the individual fails significantly to meet items listed in the Standard EDO Activities under the Instruction and Advising category or if there is extremely minimal activity in Research and Scholarship and Professional Service.

IV. Professor

To receive an EDO rating of **Exceeds Expectations**, the Professor must accomplish all of the activities listed in Standard EDO Activities under the Instruction and Advising category and must also present strong activity in the categories of Research and Scholarship and Professional Service. Additionally, the Professor must present significant accomplishments from the Exceptional EDO Activities list.

To receive an EDO rating of **Meets Expectations**, the Professor must accomplish all of the activities listed in Standard EDO Activities under the Instruction and Advising category. The Professor must also present strong activity in the categories of Research and Scholarship and Professional Service.

The Professor will receive a rating of **Needs Improvement** if the individual fails to meet items listed in Standard EDO Activities under Instruction and Advising or if there is minimal activity in Research and Scholarship and Professional Service.

The Professor will receive a rating of **Unsatisfactory** if the individual fails significantly to meet items listed in the Standard EDO Activities under the Instruction and Advising category or if

there is minimal activity in Research and Scholarship and Professional Service.

V. Meets and Exceeds Criteria Lists

Instruction and Advising - Meets

- Display commitment to good teaching
- Provide quality instruction in all courses
- Prepare syllabi following UTC guidelines
- Administer courses according to syllabi
- Meet all sessions of the course
- Grade and return assignments promptly
- Maintain appropriate office hours
- Utilize appropriate instructional resources
- Assign grades fairly and per the syllabus
- Provide quality advising for assigned students
- Write letters of recommendation as requested
- Participate in textbook selection
- Attain satisfactory student/peer evaluations

Instruction and Advising - Exceeds

- Prepare new course materials
- Direct Departmental Honors Project
- Direct student research projects
- Prepare advising materials
- Write or revise text or lab manual
- Serve on academic advising body
- Participate in professional development activity
- Conduct extra help sessions for students
- Receive teaching/advising award
- Attain superior student/peer evaluations

Research and Scholarship - Meets

- Engage in research
- Read literature in discipline
- Prepare/submit article to refereed journal
- Prepare/submit a funding proposal
- Present a paper at professional meeting
- Develop new demo's or lab experiments
- Direct student research

Research and Scholarship - Exceeds

- Article accepted/published in refereed journal
- Author or Editor of a book
- Submit proposal, as a principal investigator, to an outside funding agency
- Present invited/refereed paper at prof. meeting
- Develop a new area of research
- Administer a funded research grant
- Receive national/international recognition
- Perform professional development activity
- Present invited seminar/lecture

Professional Service - Meets

Serve as member of professional organization
Serve on university committee
Serve on departmental committee
Engage in other professional service
Attend a professional meeting
Respond to inquiries from public
Participate in student recruitment
Support and assist colleagues
Attend graduation

Professional Service - Exceeds

Organize/chair session of professional meeting
Chair university committee
Engage in special service to department or university.
Serve as officer in professional organization
Serve on committee of professional org.
Organize/lead a professional workshop
Serve on Faculty Senate
Review manuscript or a book chapter for a journal/book
Review proposal for funding agency
Invited by journal to write book/article review
Coordinate student recruitment activities
Provide service to schools/community
Engage in special professional development
Provide professional consulting services
Serve as a writer/editor for standard tests

APPENDIX B

<http://www.utc.edu/college-arts-sciences/department-head-resources.php>

Performance Evaluation: Meets Expectations and Exceeds Expectations

Policy: College of Arts and Sciences

The following information aims to clarify the difference between EDO ratings of "Meets Expectations" and "Exceeds Expectations" as it outlines activities indicative of these ratings. Faculty are, of course, evaluated based on three performance criteria: teaching and advising; research, scholarship, and creative activities; and service to the University, profession, and community. The *Faculty Handbook* clearly links success in these areas to performance ratings by department heads. It is important to note, too, that collegiality is expected of all faculty.

College Statement on Collegiality: Collegiality requires the capacity to relate well and constructively with peers and members (faculty, staff, students and administrators) of our campus community. Collegial behavior and support for the common good, therefore, is highlighted by civility and respect for one another, particularly as we may disagree with one another from time to time. Even in our disagreement, we must work well with one another as we share in institutional and departmental goals and responsibilities.

Department Heads should seek corrective action when destructive behavior interferes with departmental goals and functions. If a lack of civility is negatively affecting the health and function of the department, the Department Head will be able to link collegiality (or the lack thereof) to the criteria used in evaluating annual performance—*i.e.*, teaching, research/scholarship, and service.

Faculty Handbook (Section 3.2.2.3: EDO Performance Ratings)

At UTC the evaluation of the professional responsibility of the faculty member focuses on three performance areas; teaching and advising¹; research, scholarship, and creative activities²; and professional service to the University, profession, and community.³

Among these obligations, teaching and advising are of highest importance at UTC. It is recognized, however, that research, and scholarly and creative achievement contribute significantly to good teaching and to the advancement of knowledge. It follows, then, that faculty members will be expected to be involved actively in research, scholarship or creative activity as well. Since, in its Mission Statement, the university specifies that a fundamental purpose of the institution is to serve the people of the community, state, and region it is expected that faculty members will contribute to this mission through University and professional service. See Appendices A-C for best practices pertaining to each of these three categories.

While the individual faculty member is expected to participate in each of the three areas, annual achievement will vary in accordance with the objectives established

¹ Includes such activities as: teaching, student advising, development of new courses, preparation of instructional materials or other activities designed to enhance educational and instructional quality.

² Includes such activities as: disciplinary research, development of creative art forms, grant development and administration, scholarly publications and presentations, and other activities related to the development and dissemination of new knowledge or art forms.

³ Includes such activities as: service through administrative and committee assignments, service to professional organizations, appropriate consulting, advisement or sponsorship of student activities, coordination of special departmental, school, college or university activities, and discipline- and university-related community services.

in conference with the academic department head. Lesser participation in one area should be counterbalanced by greater participation in others.

In the three areas of responsibility⁴ (teaching, research, and service), the academic department head will evaluate the faculty member's routine responsibilities established by the academic department, those defined in the Faculty Handbook chapter entitled "Faculty Responsibilities," and those identified on the Individual Objectives Sheet for the period being evaluated.

EDO Rating: Meets Expectations vs. Exceeds Expectations

College Guidelines for Standard and Exceptional Performance: The following are representative activities of the faculty, though not exhaustive, for the areas of: teaching and advising; research, scholarship, and creative activity; and service. Faculty are responsible for documenting specific activities and outcomes in each area. Department Heads are responsible for assessing performance in these areas. In doing so, Department Heads should think of faculty performance in terms of **quality, scope, and impact**. (For example, in the area of scholarship, refereed publications and monographs published with university presses should carry more weight than nonrefereed publications.) Similarly, Department Heads should be mindful that faculty performance is evaluated based on

1. appropriate objectives for the academic year, specifically objectives set by the faculty member and approved by the Department Head,⁵ and
2. a comparison with the performance of peers within the same department/program.

With the latter point in mind, it is unreasonable to expect that ALL faculty in a single department or program may be nominated for the performance rating of "Exceeds Expectations." Department Heads, therefore, must be judicious in making such recommendations ("Exceeds Expectations") to the Dean. Likewise, the Dean will require that such recommendations be ranked. Finally, despite the fact that a faculty member may "counterbalance" a weaker area with strong performance in another area for the performance rating of "Meets Expectations," failure to meet expectations in any single area shall exclude a faculty member from being considered for the performance rating of "Exceeds Expectations."

EDO Activities: Meets Expectations vs. Exceeds Expectations

Teaching and Advisement

⁴ Faculty on sabbatical or other special assignment (e.g. educational leave, research leave) may not be active in each of the three areas during this assignment. With prior agreement, these faculty will be evaluated and, depending on performance, be eligible for a merit salary increment. In accordance with the Faculty Handbook statement, "leaves of absence are normally granted for no more than one year and are normally without university compensation." Faculty on non-academic leave without pay will not normally be evaluated, nor will they normally be eligible for merit salary increment for the year on leave.

⁵ *Faculty Handbook*, Section 3.2.2.1, Establishing Objectives: Since the objectives of the faculty are fundamental components of the EDO process, it is important that they be carefully prepared. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to clearly articulate specific objectives and to demonstrate how these relate to his or her professional development and responsibilities. It is the responsibility of the academic department head to provide an unambiguous review of the merit and quality of these objectives within the context of the disciplinary standards for the profession and the expectations of the faculty member specified in the letter of appointment.

Instructors, Lecturers, and Professorial Ranks: All faculty, regardless of rank or status (part time or full time), are expected to demonstrate commitment to good teaching, and they are expected to provide quality instruction in all courses. Unlike the other categories for performance evaluation, the category of teaching and advising carries *basic responsibilities*.

- Select teaching materials which are appropriate to the course description
- Select teaching materials that reflect current developments in the discipline or field
- Submit orders for course materials (*i.e.*, books, textbooks) upon request
- Prepare and submit upon request syllabi that follow UTC guidelines
- Specify in the syllabus a set of reasonable grading practices and follow them carefully
- Teach courses in accordance with the syllabus
- Meet classes as scheduled or, if it is necessary to be absent, notify the Department Head
- Hold office hours and be available to meet with students outside of regular class hours
- Demonstrate satisfactory teaching that encompasses and is informed by student & peer evaluation
- Submit midterm and final grades on time
- Share in the responsibility for advising students, according to departmental arrangements for advisement
- Write letters of recommendation when appropriate

Representative Activities for *Exceptional* EDO Rating

- Prepare new and innovative course materials
- Direct Departmental Honors Project(s)
- Direct student research project(s), independent studies or directed studies
- Prepare advising materials
- Participate in professional development activity
- Receive teaching and/or advising award
- Attain superior student and/or peer evaluations

Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities

Instructors and Lecturers: There are no research requirements for faculty appointed at the rank of Instructor or Lecturer. However, published or presented research, scholarship, and creative activity should be considered when present in performance evaluation. Occasionally, Instructors will have a contract that specifies that continuation of their appointment is dependent on the completion of the terminal degree.

Professorial Ranks: All faculty who hold the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor are expected to maintain a program of scholarly engagement in their discipline. Specific expectations for each faculty member are to be developed annually in consultation with the Department Head and included in the statement of EDO objectives. (Faculty should consult “Criteria for Tenure” in the *Faculty Handbook* for cumulative standards of evaluation.) Whether or not a particular activity meets or exceeds expectations depends on the quality, scope, and impact of the work.

Representative Activities for *Standard* EDO Rating

- Engage in research, scholarship, or creative activity
- Prepare/submit book review for publication
- Prepare/submit article or creative work for publication

- Participate or perform in juried exhibition
- Attend a professional conference
- Organize/lead a professional workshop
- Present paper at professional meeting (regional, national, international)
- Submit proposal to outside funding agency

Representative Activities for *Exceptional* EDO Rating

- Publish article
- Author or edit a book, collection, journal, or reference work
- Present paper at professional meeting (regional, national, international)
- Receive national/international recognition
- Develop and/or coordinate professional seminars, workshops, etc.
- Present/Perform invited work, exhibition, seminar, or lecture
- Organize, chair session, or serve as discussant at professional meeting
- Receive awarded grant
- Administer a funded research grant

Service to the University, Profession, and Community

Instructors and Lecturers: Faculty appointed at the rank of Lecturer are expected to provide departmental and university service through committee assignments or less formal arrangements developed in consultation with the Department Head and specified in the statement of EDO objectives.

Professorial Ranks: Faculty appointed at the professorial ranks are expected to provide departmental and university service through committee assignments or less formal arrangements developed in consultation with the Department Head and specified in the statement of EDO objectives. They are likewise expected to engage in community and professional service activities as may be appropriate *to the discipline*.

Representative Activities for *Standard* EDO Rating

- Attend commencement
- Attend university and college-wide faculty meetings
- Maintain active membership in professional organization(s)
- Organize/chair a professional workshop or conference panel
- Participate in student recruitment, *e.g.*, Fall Visitation Day, meet w/ prospective students
- Participate in retention activities, *e.g.*, First Year Reading Experience activities, "First Class" meetings, Freshman Academic Success Tracking (FAST) program, *etc.*
- Participate in departmental activities, *e.g.*, faculty meetings; awards banquets; alumni receptions
- Respond in a timely manner to queries from the public or community
- Review grant proposals for campus or regional funding agencies
- Support and assist colleagues
- Serve on departmental committee(s)
- Serve on university committee(s)

Representative Activities for *Exceptional* EDO Rating

- Marshal or otherwise participate in commencement

Chair time-intensive, departmental or university committee
Coordinate student recruitment activities
Engage in special service to department or university, *e.g.*, SACS review process,
Strategic Planning
Organize a professional conference (regional or national)
Provide ongoing service to local schools/community
Provide professional consulting services
Review manuscript(s) for a journal or press
Review grant proposal(s) for a major funding agency, *e.g.*, NSF, NEH, *etc.*
Serve as officer in professional national or international organization
Serve on committee of professional national or international organization
Serve on Faculty Senate or other time-intensive university committees

Approved and adopted by A&S Department Heads on February 5, 2014

APPENDIX C

<http://www.utc.edu/college-arts-sciences/resources/faculty-resources.php>

PROMOTION and TENURE

Guidelines and Policies for the College of Arts & Sciences

This guide, provided by the Office of the Dean in the College of Arts and Sciences, is intended to assist candidates as they prepare a dossier for promotion and/or tenure review. The guidelines that follow offer more specific language than that found in the *Faculty Handbook* (Chapter 3.2.3 "Standard Dossier Format"):

Faculty members being considered for reappointment, promotion in rank or tenure will be asked to submit a dossier which is standard to the extent that it describes the way in which the faculty member has met each of the respective criteria as listed in this Handbook.

*The dossier should include a preface that must contain a **Curriculum Vita (CV)** describing the candidate's education and experience (both prior to coming to UTC and while at UTC) and a **one page executive summary** of the same. In addition, the preface may contain a **summary of EDO evaluations**. The dossier should be divided into the three distinct components based on the performance areas outlined in the EDO: teaching and advising; research, scholarship, and creative activities; and professional service to the University, profession, and community.*

*The respective divisions of this dossier should include all documentation for and evidence of activities related to teaching, research, and service in which the faculty member has engaged since his/her initial appointment at UTC. A **teaching philosophy** and a record of **Student Ratings of Faculty (for a minimum of five years)** must be included in the dossier. Other materials should be included at the discretion of the individual faculty member, and, if possible, on the advice of the academic department's Rank, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee. See Appendix A-C [of the Faculty Handbook] for information pertaining to appropriate activities in each of these three categories. **(emphasis added)***

All faculty eligible for tenure and/or promotion are urged to familiarize themselves thoroughly with Chapter 3 <<http://www.utc.edu/faculty-senate/pdfs/ch3handbook.pdf>> of the *Faculty Handbook*. This guide does not in any way modify current tenure and promotion policy. Its sole purpose is to assist candidates and department heads in the preparation of documents which may be as informative and helpful as possible. In the end, candidates are responsible for the content and organization of their dossier. It is worth noting, therefore, that good documentation supports and clarifies; it does not obscure. An effective dossier provides what is needed but avoids volume for its own sake. Thus, this guide offers suggestions from which to select; it is not a rigid format to be followed.

NOTE: Candidates are asked to provide different "folders" for both tenure review and promotion review—*i.e.*, one for tenure review and one for promotion review. These folders are not duplicate copies of the dossier. Folders stay with University Records. The dossier, on the other hand, is returned to the candidate after review. Thus, when a candidate seeks both tenure and promotion, s/he will prepare two folders that are included in the same dossier, one folder for tenure and one for promotion. See "Tenure Folder Check List" and "Promotion Folder Check

List" on the Dean's website: <http://www.utc.edu/college-arts-sciences/forms.php>

COLLEGIALITY

In addition to the three main criteria for tenure and promotion – teaching and advising; research, scholarship, and creative activity; and service – faculty should be mindful that collegiality in an integral part of the health and well-being of any department. Collegiality (or the lack thereof), therefore, tends to impact effectiveness in the three main criteria for tenure and promotion. It follows, then, that collegiality (or the lack thereof) impacts the assessment of performance. For that reason, faculty should be mindful of the College of Arts and Sciences' "Statement on Collegiality":

Collegiality requires the capacity to relate well and constructively with peers and members (faculty, staff, students and administrators) of our campus community. Collegial behavior and support for the common good, therefore, is highlighted by civility and respect for one another, particularly as we may disagree with one another from time to time. Even in our disagreement, we must work well with one another as we share in institutional and departmental goals and responsibilities.

TEACHING & ADVISING

Documentation should attest to the quality of the candidate's teaching. Such documentation may take many forms.

- Student evaluations and EDO evaluations. *Candidates may wish to ask their department head to review student evaluations over a period of years and write a summary which describes any evident trends. In addition, if the evaluations point to problems which have been resolved, the department head may wish to add an explanatory comment.*
- Representative syllabi and/or assessments of course planning and structure with regard to courses taught. *Candidates may include syllabi of courses taught for the first time and/or syllabi of courses taught for the first time by a new pedagogical method or a new delivery system (viz. online). Candidates may wish to annotate such syllabi in order to make clear those elements which they believe document their commitment to effective teaching.*
- Peer or department head observations of classroom teaching. *Candidates may invite their department head, a faculty mentor, and/or department colleagues to observe their classroom teaching. It is reasonable, of course, to expect the observer to provide a written evaluation of observed strengths and weaknesses, along with justification of the evaluation. Because all departments in the College have departmental bylaws, candidates should follow departmental bylaws for teaching observations.*
- Performance of students with regard to any appropriate outcomes measures (departmental examinations, external tests, etc.). *Candidates may ask their department head to provide comparative student outcome results, if available. Or candidates are invited to discuss with their department head any means by which they may be better able to document student outcomes in their courses.*
- Awards for teaching excellence. *Candidates may wish to document nominations for*

- and/or receipt of prestigious teaching awards. Effective documentation of such honors often depends on frank assessment by the department head of their relative significance.*
- Participation in professional development activities related to teaching. *Such activities may include both those candidates have attended individually and those candidates have attended with colleagues, e.g., the Instructional Excellence Retreat.*
 - Participation in on-campus, regional, or national curriculum development activities.
 - Teaching philosophy. (As noted in the *Faculty Handbook*, this is a separate document that is to be included in the dossier.) *During the reappointment process each faculty member provides a statement of teaching philosophy which usually evolves over time.*
 - Development and promulgation of innovative teaching materials and/or innovative teaching methods. *Candidates may elect to include in the dossier examples of innovative teaching materials or narrative accounts of innovative teaching methods. It is good practice to discuss such content with colleagues and/or with the department head. It is likewise good practice to provide context for and explanation of those materials and methods. Candidates may ask their department head and/or colleagues to review this content in order to determine the appropriateness or necessity of such materials.*
 - Committee service directly related to the improvement of teaching.
 - Receipt of instructional or curricular grants from external agencies (with information for each citation regarding title of project and nature of the accomplishments). *Determining whether individual grants are better reported under teaching or research is not always easy. Candidates must not, however, "double report" this grant information. A brief note in one section indicating where fuller documentation of an activity may be found offers a means of avoiding this problem.*
 - Research and refereed publication in pedagogy. *The comment above on where to report is relevant here also.*

SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH, and CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Documentation should attest to the quality of the candidate's scholarship, research, or creative activity. Such documentation may take many forms, but it should ALWAYS be clear what type of publication is included in the CV, *i.e.*, monograph, edited collection, review essay, peer reviewed article, individually-authored article, poem, screen play, *etc.*

- Books and monographs published (with bibliographic information for each citation). *Including works not published in an attempt to make the dossier appear stronger in fact weakens the dossier. Candidates may describe unpublished works as "work in progress" and seek independent evaluation of such work, however. If candidates are not providing copies of the publications themselves, complete and accurate citation information MUST be in the CV, including number of pages. Custom-published works merit inclusion, but care should be taken to distinguish such books from those which go through the traditional vetting, *i.e.*, peer review, process.*

- Articles published in refereed scholarly journals (with bibliographic information for each citation). *Published statements of editorial policies provide effective documentation regarding the "refereed" status of a publication. Candidates may also include information about the acceptance rate of journals in which their articles appear.*
- Reviews of books and monographs in your field.
- Other articles. *Articles published through less formal processes (e.g., in academic newsletters, community bulletins, etc.) may offer valuable documentation of research. However, distinguishing clearly between refereed and non-refereed publications can enhance the credibility of the dossier. In general, candidates must take care not to mix genres of publications (e.g., including a poem or a column from a local newspaper among articles). Including a brief, one-page review among peer reviewed/refereed articles weakens the dossier.*
- Commissioned Research. *Candidates may have conducted research in the discipline as part of a commissioned project and published the results. Be sure that any such efforts that result from paid consulting are so identified. Distinguishing clearly between research and scholarly or creative efforts for which a candidate is paid and those conducted independently will enhance the credibility of the dossier.*
- Scholarly notes, reviews of scholarly books, etc. (with bibliographic information for each citation).
- Scholarly presentations (with information for each citation regarding the title of the presentation, the name of the organization sponsoring the meeting, the site of the meeting, and the date of the meeting). *Correspondence with meeting organizers and program materials often will emphasize the competitive nature of the program for which a candidate is selected. Less formal presentations may offer valuable documentation of research or may be included more appropriately under the categories of "Teaching" or "Service." Distinguishing clearly between refereed and non-refereed presentations can enhance the credibility of the dossier.*
- Receipt of basic research grants from external agencies (with information for each citation regarding the title of the project, the agency from which the grant was obtained, and the term of the grant).
- Authorship of grant proposals. *Candidates may be the Principal Investigator and likely the lead author on individual and/or group grants. Even when the grant has an instructional or service orientation, the basic work of authoring a grant proposal, particularly where it requires significant investigation, can itself be considered a contribution to research or creative activity.*
- Citations of research, scholarship, or creative activity in other works published. *Even a modest reference may suggest the influence of a candidate's work on his/her field.*
- UTC awards, grants, fellowships, etc. for research, scholarship, and creative activity.
- External awards, grants, fellowships, etc. for research, scholarship, and creative activity. *Do not neglect to mention modest grants from local foundations, state agencies,*

organizations, etc., so long as the received support indicates recognition of your professional expertise.

- Recitals, art exhibitions, creative writing, dramatic performances, *etc.* (with information for each citation regarding publication, sites, dates, and whether the activity was invited or juried, local, regional, national or international). *Candidates should explore means of obtaining reactions that go beyond local notoriety. Competition judges, for example, may provide evaluations that may be used in the dossier.*
- Critical reviews of the candidate's recitals, art exhibitions, creative writing, *etc.* *Candidates may ask their department head to invite critics to observe their work.*
- Other creative work. *Candidates should not cite activities and interests which have no relation to their academic assignment; however, candidates should not neglect any which reflect on their expertise. Similarly, while a candidate's documentation should emphasize activities consistent with their current assignment, candidates may wish to include as well activities which promise some expansion of their areas of competence.*
- Electronic publication. *Scholarly work is scholarly work, regardless of the medium in which it is published. As is the case with print publications, candidates must be careful to contextualize and identify their published works as peer-reviewed/refereed or not. That is, the same care must be given to citation and documentation for electronic publications that we have come to expect for print publications.*
- External assessments of research, scholarship, or creative activity. External peer review is a process whereby academic peers across the country provide input to tenure and promotion committees, department heads, deans, and provosts with regard to their appraisal of a candidate's creative or scholarly achievement within their discipline. It is difficult, if not impossible, for a reviewer to evaluate the teaching or the service of a candidate from afar, so external reviewers assess only a candidate's scholarly and/or creative works. *(See "External Review Process" information at the end of this document.)*

SERVICE

Supporting documentation should attest to the quality of the service performed by the candidate consistent with a) his or her professional expertise and b) his or her role in the University community. Such documentation may include the following.

- Receipt of public service grants from external agencies (with information for each citation regarding title of project, the granting agency, and the term of the grant).
- Successful completion of external public service assignments (with information for each citation regarding title of project and the nature of the accomplishments).
- External assessments of candidate's public service activity.
- UTC awards and grants for public service activity.
- Citations of public service in works of research or scholarship.

- External awards, grants, fellowships, *etc.* for public service activity.
- Service in campus governance (with information for each citation regarding offices held, assignments completed, *etc.*).
- Assessments of institutional service. *Candidates may request of committee chairs and colleagues written evaluations of the candidate's contributions to a committee in instances where such contributions exceed the norm.*
- Other committee service (college, departmental, *etc.*). *In documenting committee service, you should distinguish between appointments which required a major investment of time and energy and those which required only your occasional presence. Cite any distinctive accomplishments of the committees on which you served actively and describe your contributions to those accomplishments.*
- Public service expressive of candidate's professional expertise. *Although candidates should not cite activities which have no relation to their academic assignment, candidates should not neglect any activities which reflect their expertise. Similarly, while documentation should emphasize activities consistent with the candidate's current assignment, candidates may wish to include activities which promise some expansion of their expertise.*

EXTERNAL REVIEW POLICY

External peer review is a process whereby academic peers across the country may provide input to tenure and promotion committees, department heads, deans, and provosts with regard to their appraisal of a candidate's creative or scholarly achievement within their discipline. It is difficult, if not impossible, for a reviewer to evaluate the teaching or the service of a candidate from afar.

The College of Arts and Sciences External Review Policy will take effect on September 1, 2013. This is a broad and flexible policy for the departments within the College. Should departments wish to do so, they may submit to the Dean for approval, external review policies that are more refined or more rigorous than the policy listed below. This policy is in effect for any tenure-track faculty member hired after September 1, 2011. This policy is effective immediately for any tenured faculty member seeking promotion.

External Review Process

Prior to October 15th in the year that a faculty member applies for either tenure or promotion, the faculty member will provide the Promotion and Tenure Committee (or the equivalent) a single portfolio (or in the case of a digital portfolio, a DVD or CD-ROM) documenting creative activity and/or research.

The faculty member will provide a list of potential external reviewers, no fewer than four, that the Committee will review. Each potential reviewer should be identified by name, title, institution, accompanied by a brief rationale for his/her selection.

The Committee will choose at least two reviewers from the faculty member's list. The Committee will then generate a list of potential external reviewers, no fewer than four, that the faculty member will review. Each potential reviewer should be identified by name, title, institution, accompanied by a brief rationale for his/her selection. From the Committee's list, the candidate will choose no fewer than two reviewers. No fewer than four external reviewers remain at this point.

By November 1st, the chair of the Committee, with the Department Head*, will solicit via email a minimum of four and a maximum of seven external reviewers using a “neutral” template letter supplied by the College. Should some of the selected reviewers decline, the Committee would go back to the two lists and continue the process until at least THREE reviewers agree to submit an external review of the candidate's materials. Reviewers will then be mailed the candidate's scholarship portfolio and be asked to supply two things: 1) a one-to-two page letter of evaluation, and 2) a copy of their curriculum vitae by no later than January 15th.

Reviewer Selection Guidelines:

- Reviewers should be tenured and at or above the rank that the candidate seeks.
- Reviewers should be at a peer institution, an aspirant peer institution, or an institution that is universally recognized as excellent.
- Reviewers should not have had a working relationship with the candidate (dissertation director, chairperson, co-author, etc.)
- Reviewers should not be in contact with the candidate about the review process from the time that they accept the external review assignment. The candidate should also not attempt to contact the external reviewer.

External reviews will be delivered directly to the chair of the Committee. At minimum, the faculty member's dossier should include two reviewer recommendations. Should fewer than two external reviews be returned, the chair of the Committee will note the efforts made to solicit reviewers and their reviews. The chair must document the fact that only one external review was returned. The single external review, however, will not be included in the candidate's materials.

* In the event that the Department Head is him/herself being evaluated for tenure or promotion, the cover letter will be sent by the chair of the Committee and the Dean of the appropriate College.

FLOW CHART FOR EXTERNAL REVIEW PROCESS

