

PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

on

Evaluative Criteria, Procedures, and General Standards

for

Initial Appointment, Successive Appointment, Promotion, Tenure, and

Annual Review of Faculty

and

Appointment and Annual Review of Professional Staff

Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry

J. William Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences

University of Arkansas

This document governs departmental procedures in the selection, retention, promotion, and evaluation of faculty and in the selection and evaluation of non-classified staff effective July 1, 1996. It has been approved by the Faculty and Chairperson of the department and approved by the Dean of the J. William Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Chancellor, and the President of the University of Arkansas, as indicated by the signatures below.

These departmental policies are required to be consistent with and complementary to the policies and procedures of the college as set forth in the Fulbright College's Evaluative Criteria, Procedures, and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointment, Promotion, Tenure, and Annual Review of Faculty and Appointment and Annual Review of Professional Staff, those of the institution, as set forth in three campus policy statements, those on (1) University Professorships, (2) Distinguished Professorships, and (3) Evaluative Criteria, Procedures, and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointment, Promotion, Tenure, and Annual Review of Faculty and Staff, and a Board of Trustees Policy 405.1. In case of conflict, the Board Policy, the Campus policy, the College policy and the Department policy will have authority in that order. Copies of the campus document and board policy documents are published annually in the Faculty Handbook, but revisions occur regularly and care should be taken to consult the current document. A copy of the current Faculty Review Guidelines is also printed in the Faculty Handbook.

Signed:

Dan J. Davis, Chair, Department Chemistry/Biochemistry

Bernard L. Madison, Dean, Fulbright College of Arts & Sciences

Donald O. Pederson, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Daniel E. Ferritor, Chancellor

B. Alan Sugg, President

Preamble

This document states the criteria, procedures, and general standards for initial appointments, annual reviews of accomplishments, successive appointments, promotions, and the granting of tenure for all academic ranks

within the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry. This material is consistent with and supplements the corresponding material in the Faculty Handbook, and in the J. William Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences Personnel Document.

I. Criteria and Procedures for Initial Appointments

A. Criteria

General: Except in very limited cases as may be specifically designated in advance, the Ph.D. degree (or equivalent) is a minimum prerequisite for employment. Professional evaluations are always collected and must be firmly positive both in academic competence and professional responsibility. Transcripts and documentation of professional accomplishments are required. Initial appointments at all levels are generally made without the immediate granting of tenure. Should an advanced level initial appointment be made and a recommendation for the granting of tenure with that appointment be desirable and in the best interests of the Department and University, the case would require evidence of sustained excellent performance in both teaching and research in a previous academic position.

Assistant Professor: The Ph.D. degree is normally required for initial appointment to this academic rank. Additionally, two years of post-doctoral appointment in research are commonly expected. Candidates for this rank should exhibit potential for effective teaching and development of nationally competitive research programs.

Associate Professor: The Ph.D. degree, two years of post-doctoral experience, substantial university teaching and/or research experience, demonstrated research and teaching capability as shown by publications and major research grants and substantial evidence of effective teaching at the undergraduate and graduate level are generally required. When prior experience is in a position involving teaching, evidence of well above average teaching abilities is expected. Service to the employing institutions and to professional societies will also be considered.

Professor: Initial appointment to this rank is restricted to exceptional individuals who have clearly demonstrated outstanding capabilities in the area of chemistry. Minimal requirements for appointment will be such accomplishments as a national reputation, an exceptionally high quality of published research, a continued record of major research support or national or international awards, and substantial evidence of excellence in chemical education via effective teaching at the undergraduate and graduate level.

In addition to the above tenure-track ranks, the Department has the following definitions and criteria for nontenure track ranks.

Research Assistant Professor: A temporary rank used for short-term appointments for visiting scientists with comparable rank at other institutions, or for the appointment of non-tenure track faculty, supported by external grant funds, who will significantly enhance the research mission of the Department. The requirements for the non-visiting appointments are the Ph.D. degree, two years or more of postdoctoral experience, evidence of substantial research accomplishments documented by major grants or publications in peer-reviewed journals, and faculty approval. Reappointment for each subsequent year will require review by a committee appointed by the Chair, and will be contingent on evidence of substantial research accomplishments during the prior appointment as documented by major research grants and publications. A Research Assistant Professor will not have voting rights in Departmental faculty meetings, and will not serve as chairperson or member of M.S., Ph.D., or undergraduate Honors committees.

Research Associate Professor: A temporary rank used for short-term appointments for visiting scientists with comparable rank at other institutions, or for the appointment of non-tenure track faculty, supported by external grant funds, who will significantly enhance the research mission of the Department. The requirements for non-visiting appointments are evidence of substantial independent research accomplishment as documented by major independent research grants and publications in peer-reviewed journals, and faculty approval. Reappointment for each subsequent year will require review by a committee appointed by the Chair, and will be contingent on evidence of substantial research accomplishments during the prior appointment as documented by major independent research grants and publications. A Research Associate Professor will not have voting rights in Departmental faculty meetings, and will not serve as chairperson or member of M.S., Ph.D., or undergraduate Honors committees.

Research Professor: A temporary rank used for short-term appointments for visiting scientists with comparable rank at other institutions, or in exceptional cases for appointment of internationally recognized scientists, supported by external grant

funds, who will significantly enhance the research mission of the Department.

Other Ranks: Other ranks are as described in the Fulbright College Personnel Document.

B. Procedures for Recommendations of Initial Appointments

Tenure-track positions will be advertised nationally. Applications will be reviewed by an ad hoc search committee and other interested tenure-track faculty. The search committee and/or any individual faculty member may recommend candidates for interview to the entire tenure-track faculty, who will then review those files and decide whom to invite to campus for interviews. Following the interview process, the entire tenure-track faculty of the department will discuss and vote on recommendations for hiring.

II. Criteria and Procedures for Annual Performance Reviews and Recommendations for Reappointment

A. Criteria

Each faculty member shall be evaluated on the basis of achievements in the areas of teaching, research and scholarly activities, and academically-related service. In all areas, the quality of the achievement is evaluated and not the quantity alone.

Evidence of achievement in teaching may include, among other items:

Teaching materials such as course outlines, examinations, and supplementary materials.

Evidence of effectiveness in direction of research of undergraduate, graduate and postdoctoral students.

Evidence of participation in unit examination activities, such as written and oral examinations for honors or graduate degree candidates.

Student evaluations.

Peer evaluations.

Self evaluations.

Examples of evidence of quality in this area include outstanding classroom teaching, innovative teaching techniques, curricular and course development, strong student evaluations, grade distributions, enhancement of use of technology in teaching, competitive funding for education- and teaching-related projects, etc.

Evidence of achievement in research or scholarly activity may include, among other items:

Publications of papers, books, and similar items.

Evidence of research, either funded or unfunded.

Evidence of awards, including funding of research proposals by external agencies after competitive review.

Papers presented at professional meetings and seminars.

Technical reports on research projects completed or in progress.

Evidence of professional recognition by outside agencies, groups, or other individuals in the field.

Peer evaluations.

Self evaluations.

Examples of evidence of quality in this area include competitively funded research programs, publication of research results in prestigious journals, recognition of excellence by being requested to serve as manuscript reviewers for journals and proposals from funding agencies, invited seminars and presentations at scientific meetings.

Evidence of academically-related service activities may include, among other items:

Evidence of activities intended to enhance understanding of the University or activities intended to develop the service function of the University.

Evidence of involvement in the work of professional societies.

Evidence of committee activities at the University.

Evidence of participation in activities in connection with funding agencies.

Evidence of service to the public through consulting or other activities in the area of academic or professional competence of the faculty member.

Peer evaluations.

Self evaluations.

Examples of evidence of quality in this area include service on Departmental, College, and University committees beyond that expected at the Departmental level (special consideration is given to positions involving election or appointment to committees outside the Department), service to professional societies, special service contributions which contribute to enhancement of the Department, College, and University in the public eye, special contributions which enhance the teaching and research missions of the Department and the perception of the College, University, and public of those missions.

B. Procedures

1. Annual Review

A current resume and a comprehensive cumulative record of accomplishments is maintained in the departmental office for each faculty member, and is available at all times to the faculty member and the Department Chair. At the time of the annual review and the promotion/tenure review (see Section III) these documents are also made available to those doing the reviewing. Access by anyone at any other time shall be only with the express consent of the faculty member or as allowed by law. Faculty members are specifically requested to review and update these records periodically.

Early spring semester comprehensive reviews of the records of all faculty are made in connection with merit salary recommendations. The evaluations and the comments which accompany these evaluations are to be made available to the faculty member.

During the annual review the accomplishments of each faculty member in teaching, research, and service will be evaluated for the preceding calendar year. The ultimate responsibility for the evaluation lies with the Chair of the Department. Three peer review advisory committees will be established each year to evaluate faculty files and advise the Chair in this area: one for the review of faculty teaching accomplishments, one for the review of research accomplishments, and one for the review of service accomplishments. Each committee will consist of a chair (one of the three elected members of the Chair's Advisory Committee) and two additional faculty. All committee members will be provided the materials presented by individual faculty or collected by the chair and vice chair for consideration of accomplishments. All committee members will rank accomplishments individually, then meet to advise the chair. The Chair will use the input from these committees in developing the individual ratings given each faculty member. The Chair's ratings shall be reviewed by the Vice Chair of the Department for consistency and fairness. The final merit evaluation for each faculty are ultimately the responsibility of the Chair, and final decisions as to ratings are by that person.

A copy of the results of the annual review of a faculty member must be provided to that faculty member and all faculty will be invited to meet with the chair to discuss the content of the annual merit evaluation. Faculty members who do not desire such a meeting must waive this meeting in writing on a form to be distributed at the time the evaluations are distributed. An appeal of that content should be made to the chair. If faculty are not satisfied with the results of appeals to the chair, they can carry their complaints to the elected members of the Chair's Advisory Committee which shall act as a Personnel Committee in these circumstances.

The Chair's Advisory Committee consists of the vice chair and three elected members. The three are elected as follows: each year, immediately before the start of the fall semester, a ballot which includes the names of all tenured and tenure track faculty members is distributed to all faculty. The faculty names are separated into two approximately equal lists based on length of service. Faculty are requested to vote for one in each list. Those votes are tallied and the two winners are announced in a second ballot which lists the remaining names. Faculty vote a final time to select the third member.

2. Reappointment

During the summer or early fall, the Chair will initiate a review of the accomplishments of all nontenured faculty members. A committee consisting of all tenured faculty will review the progress of each individual toward fulfilling the requirements for tenure, and will advise the chair regarding recommendations for reappointment. Satisfactory progress toward an eventual positive recommendation for tenure is required for reappointment.

3. Right of Appeal

A recommendation by the Chair for non-reappointment of a faculty member may be appealed by that faculty member. See Section IV of this document.

4. Pre-tenure review

The pre-tenure review will be conducted as specified in the Fulbright College Personnel Document.

At the beginning of the sixth semester of service, the faculty member to be reviewed shall provide documentation regarding teaching, research, and service contributions to the Chair. The materials presented shall be the same as required in making a case for promotion and/or tenure. These materials will be reviewed by an ad-hoc committee consisting of the tenured members of the Chair's Advisory Committee plus up to three additional tenured faculty designated by the Chair.

After the ad-hoc review committee completes its evaluation, it shall prepare a written report to the Chair. The committee's report shall then be considered by a meeting of the tenured faculty of the Department. Following this meeting, the Chair will prepare a written report and meet with the faculty member being reviewed to discuss the results and recommendations of the pre-tenure review. The Chair's final report shall constitute the record of the pre-tenure review, which will be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file. The Chair's final report shall also be submitted to the Dean.

III. Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

A. Criteria for Promotion

Promotion is a distinct honor and promotion recommendations shall be based primarily upon the accomplishments of the individual while in the most recent rank. Length of service in rank is not a factor and no minimum time in rank is required before a faculty member is eligible for promotion. However, except in the most unusual situations, promotion recommendations will be limited to the next higher rank.

The normal, annual review of accomplishments and the promotion/tenure review as described below are the fundamental procedures in considering candidates for promotion with the modification that peer evaluations by established external persons recognized for their expertise will be mandatory and will be considered in developing the promotion recommendation. Procedures for securing such evaluations will conform to the guidelines developed by the J. William Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences.

The criteria for promotion are a strong record in teaching and research and a satisfactory record in academically-related service. If the individual is a member of the graduate faculty, he/she must excel in research to a level of distinction appropriate to the rank.

B. Criteria for Tenure

The criteria for the granting of tenure are similar to those outlined above for promotion. Additionally, the potential for long term or sustained productivity must be high.

C. Procedures for Promotion and Tenure.

Candidates for promotion and tenure are evaluated in a two-stage process. In the initial stage, the candidate's record is evaluated to determine if the tenured faculty or Full Professors (depending on the level of promotion) feel the record is strong enough to put the candidate forward and request letters from outside reviewers. The final decision as to whether the candidate's case will be supported is made only at a second meeting after external reviewer's letters and comments have been received and reviewed by the relevant groups.

1. Initial review

Faculty who are being considered for promotion/tenure should up-date their vita prior to the time of the initial review. During the summer or early in the fall semester, the Chair will initiate an annual review of the accomplishments of all faculty members below the rank of full professor using the records mentioned in the preceding paragraph and all other pertinent material available. These reviews must be held early enough so that deadlines for notifying faculty members that they are being considered for promotion and/or advancement to tenure can be met in a timely fashion. All faculty members are invited to express individually to the Chair, either formally or informally, any opinions regarding their colleagues either for the Chair's individual consideration or, if the faculty member requests, for presentation to these meeting with the Chair for the purpose of providing advice on promotion, tenure, and reappointment recommendations.

At least one meeting of all tenured faculty members is held to review the professional accomplishments of all non-tenured faculty members for the purpose of advising the Chair upon reappointment (see section II) and on whether each non-tenured faculty member should be considered for tenure. This meeting will also consider promotion recommendations from the Assistant Professor to the Associate Professor level. Decisions regarding recommendations regarding the promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor are made by the meeting of the full Professors described in the following paragraph. Should a faculty member disagree with the recommendation of the Chair and the tenured faculty regarding the advisability of seeking promotion and/or tenure in a given year, that faculty member has the right to initiate the promotion and/or tenure process.

Subsequent meeting(s) of the Professors is (are) held to review the professional accomplishments of all instructors, Assistant Professors, and Associate Professors and to advise the Chair upon recommendations for reappointment and whether each person considered should be informed that he or she is being considered for promotion and/or advancement to tenure.

In addition to this advice on recommendations for promotion and/or advancement to tenure, these two advisory bodies frequently suggest specific comments regarding either outstanding or deficient performance to be transmitted to a faculty member for whom no action other than reappointment is recommended that year.

If the annual review results in a non-reappointment recommendation or a recommendation for dismissal, the procedures specified in the most recent college document and the Faculty Handbook will be followed.

2. Second Review

Shortly before the deadline for submitting promotion and advancement to tenure recommendations to the Dean, a second more comprehensive promotion/tenure review is carried out for all faculty members being considered for promotion and/or advancement to tenure. The procedures for these promotion/tenure reviews

are exactly the same as those specified above the for initial reviews, it being noted that more detailed information is to be available, including information following the Faculty Review Guidelines (Review Form for Promotion and/or Tenure), and letters from outside peer evaluators obtained subsequent to the initial fall review in accordance with the procedures of the College. (These letters from outside peer evaluators shall be confidential, as allowed by law, and access to them shall normally only be to the Department Chair and to those involved in the reviewing process.)

3. Reporting Procedure

At the earliest possible time after the initial review described above, the Chair will make available to each faculty member below the rank of full professor a written summary of the comments and advice of the advisory groups as well as the Chair's recommendations and comments regarding promotion and/or tenure. A copy of the review group's written recommendations is also provided if they differ from the Chair's. Any written response to the summary or written comments upon the recommendations shall be included in the faculty member's departmental file.

For each faculty member being considered for promotion and/or advancement to tenure, at the earliest possible time after the second promotion/tenure review mentioned above, the Chair schedules a meeting to discuss comments and advice of the

advisory groups, the Chair's recommendations and comments, and whether or not that person is being recommended for promotion/tenure.

The Chair will report to the Dean by submitting his or her recommendations regarding reappointment, tenure and promotion along with appropriate supporting information and statements of the positions of the advisory groups. In addition, the Chair may inform the Dean of outstanding or deficient performance of a faculty member even if no specific recommendation is being made that year other than reappointment.

Should the Chair make a recommendation divergent from the majority opinion of any of the advisory bodies, or should the opinions within any of the advisory groups be significantly divided, it is the responsibility of the Chair to clearly state this fact to the individual faculty member, to the advisory groups, and in any recommendations to the Dean.

In promotion/tenure review cases written statements of the views of the advisory groups will normally accompany the Chair's recommendation to the Dean. Individual faculty members, or any groups of faculty members, retain the right to communicate directly with the Dean on these matters.

4. Right of Appeal

A negative recommendation by the Chair regarding promotion and/or tenure for non-reappointment of a faculty member may be appealed by that faculty member. See Section IV of this document.

5. Schedule of Events

Within 30 days of beginning employment - faculty members advised in writing by the Chair of criteria, procedures and instruments of evaluation.

Within 4 weeks of any changes in criteria, schedules, procedures or instruments the Chair informs in writing all faculty of these changes.

Early in the fall semester - initial fall reviews of all faculty members eligible for promotion/tenure scheduled early enough so that deadlines for notifying faculty members that they are being considered for promotion and/or tenure can be met in a timely fashion. Although exact dates vary from year to year, a typical time table of relevant deadlines is given below.

September 15 - deadline for Chair to notify those faculty members being considered for promotion and/or tenure that year, and to notify all faculty of the schedule being followed.

October 1 - deadline for faculty member to submit written request for nomination for promotion and/or tenure to the Chair.

Prior to November 1 - Second fall review of those being considered for promotion/tenure.

November 1 - deadline for Chair to forward all written recommendations to the Dean.

Early in the Spring Semester - Annual review of all faculty as part of the merit salary evaluations.

IV. Right of Appeal

Should an individual faculty member disagree with the Chair's recommendation regarding reappointment, promotion, or tenure, that individual may appeal to the appropriate faculty advisory body as described in section C.1., above. If still not satisfied, the faculty member may submit a request directly to the Dean, informing the Chair of this action, and may accompany this request with such documents, statements, and reference material as he or she judges to be appropriate. It is then incumbent upon the Chair to submit a response to the Dean along with all written statements by the advisory bodies and all other pertinent documents. The time table for such appeals shall be as described in the most recent Faculty Handbook.