

J. William Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences

Personnel Document Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry

Mission Statement

The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry at the University of Arkansas strives for excellence in research, teaching, and service in chemistry—the central science. We aspire to positions of leadership regarding the discovery of new scientific knowledge, the training of students, and the economic development of the State of Arkansas. We seek to recruit and retain diverse groups of the best faculty, students and staff to address the challenges of the future through interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research and education.

Personnel Committee

In general, the personnel committee is composed of all tenured and tenure-track faculty. Subsets of this committee will be selected based on the matter to be considered.

Tenure and Promotion: All tenured faculty members holding rank above the candidate under consideration shall serve. For example, promotion to associate professor will be considered by all faculty members holding the rank of associate professor and above.

Third Year Review: All faculty members holding rank above the candidate under consideration shall serve. For example, review of an assistant professor at the 3rd year of service will be considered by all tenured faculty members holding the rank of associate professor and above.

Annual Merit Evaluation: All tenured and tenure-track faculty members, except for the chair and vice-chair, are eligible to serve on a rotating basis. Each year a subset of the faculty shall be chosen by ballot of the tenured and tenure-track faculty to participate. This subset will consist of three subcommittees of three tenured or tenure-track faculty members each, one subcommittee for evaluation of teaching, one for research and one for service. No person may serve on more than one subcommittee per year. No person will be eligible to serve for more than two consecutive years on any of the subcommittees. No person will be eligible to serve on the same subcommittee in two consecutive years. The chair will provide to faculty a ballot showing those

eligible for each subcommittee based on the above criteria and the year of last service on each subcommittee for each faculty member. Faculty may request not to appear on the ballot because of off-campus duty assignment, sick leave, maternal or paternal leave, or other obligation but cannot ask to be removed from one or two particular subcommittee ballots while remaining on others. Election for each subcommittee will be held in turn, in an order to be determined by the chair, and will be conducted by email with two members of staff designated by the department chair counting the votes. Each faculty member, other than the department chair, can vote for up to three eligible candidates for the subcommittee up for election, including themselves if they are eligible. After tabulation the faculty members with the three largest vote totals will be selected for service, with the highest vote total serving as chair of the subcommittee. The department chair may vote for members of the evaluation subcommittees only at this stage and only in order to break a tie. After election of the first subcommittee, the department chair will announce the results and provide a new ballot showing those eligible for the remaining committees to be selected and designate the next committee to be voted on. This process will be repeated for the final subcommittee to be elected. The elections will be completed before the end of the fall semester. The hope is that the subcommittee make up will include approximately all faculty members in a three year period and that all non-tenured faculty will be likely to serve on two or three of the subcommittees before their sixth year. The vice-chair will serve in a non-voting advisory capacity on each committee.

Personnel Files

The department shall maintain, in electronic format, a personnel file for each faculty member. The files shall be duplicated in keeping with good computing practices to ensure that they will not be lost because of failure of the storage system. These files will contain significant communications between the chair and the faculty member and communications from the dean and the faculty member. It will contain all documents related to the initial hiring and appointment. It will also contain a record of communications involved in tenure and promotion with outside reviewers as well as the tenure/promotion documents assembled by each faculty member. The documents will be maintained by the chair and the appropriate office staff. Since the files can contain letters from outside reviewers access to the contents of the file will be

limited by the chair, consistent with and to the extent provided for by the campus personnel document provisions on outside reviewers.

Work Assignments

Normal work assignments will be based on a distribution of effort which involves 40% teaching, 40% research and 20% service. Assistant professors, prior to tenure and promotion, will have a reduced service load to allow them to focus on teaching and research.

Short term exceptions (one semester) to the normal work assignments may be made by the chair following a request by a faculty member. Such requests include, for example, a reduction in teaching to allow a faculty member to oversee a large multi-participant grant, to organize the submission of a large multi-participant grant or other administrative duties.

Long term exceptions to the normal work assignments should be made with the approval of the Dean and in consultation with the faculty member. An example would be an increase in the teaching work assignment and reduction in research to reflect a change in emphasis. Significant administrative duties such as serving as chair, vice chair or director of a program would also be reasons for an alteration of the basic work assignment. In these cases, documentation regarding expectations for tenure, promotion and merit evaluation will be developed as appropriate for each case.

Ultimately, faculty work assignments are a specific responsibility of the department chair. Assignments will be made by the chair based on the best interests and needs of the department and the institution as a whole.

Initial Appointment

General Criteria: 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 or other equivalent experience 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 receipt of 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.

University Professor: Appointment as University Professor is a special honor conferred only upon active faculty in recognition of an extended period of exemplary service in a spirit of collegiality to the University of Arkansas and a combination of service in their profession and to the public through their professional activities. Detailed criteria for this appointment are given in: "Academic Policy 1405.13: Guidelines for University and Distinguished Professor Appointments."

Distinguished Professor: Appointment as Distinguished Professor at the University of Arkansas is a special distinction that is reserved for those individuals who are recognized nationally and/or internationally as intellectual leaders in their academic disciplines as a result of extraordinary accomplishments in research, teaching, published works, creative activities in the arts or endeavors of similar merit in other venues. Detailed criteria for this appointment are given in: “Academic Policy 1405.13: Guidelines for University and Distinguished Professor Appointments.”

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

Research Assistant Professor: A 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. Reappointments 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 of a M.S. or Ph.D. student committee.

Research Associate Professor: A 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. Reappointments 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 of a M.S. or Ph.D. student committee.

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. A Research Professor will not have voting rights in departmental faculty meetings, and will not serve as chairperson of a M.S. or Ph.D. student committee.

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.

University and Distinguished Professors: Detailed criteria for these appointments are given in: “Academic Policy 1405.13: Guidelines for University and Distinguished Professor Appointments.” The candidate's file of supporting material, written evaluations from outside reviewers, any other relevant material shall be evaluated by the Department’s tenured and tenure-track faculty. After both meeting and voting independently of the chairperson, the Department’s tenured and tenure-track faculty shall make its recommendation and numerically recorded vote in writing and forward it to the chairperson.

Successive Appointments and Annual Review

Annual Review/Annual Merit Evaluation

During the early part of the spring semester comprehensive reviews of the records of all faculty are made in connection with merit salary recommendations. A current resume/CV and a

comprehensive cumulative record of accomplishments are maintained in the departmental offices for each faculty member and updated at this time. At the time of the annual review and the promotion/tenure review these documents are also made available to those doing the reviewing. Access by anyone at any other time shall be only with the consent of the faculty member or as allowed by applicable University policies. 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. A subset of the personnel committee described under Personnel Committee, Annual Merit Evaluations will provide input to the chair. All committee members will evaluate the accomplishments of each faculty member and the chair of the committee will collect the evaluations and submit them (anonymously) to the department Chair. The Chair will use the input from these committees in developing the individual ratings given each faculty member. The final merit evaluation for each faculty member is ultimately the responsibility of the Chair, and final decisions as to ratings are by the Chair. A copy of the results of the annual review of a faculty member must be provided to that faculty member and all faculty members will be invited to meet with the Chair to discuss the content of the annual merit evaluation before a final evaluation is submitted to the Dean.

An appeal of that content should be made to the Chair. If a faculty member is not satisfied with the results of appeals to the Chair, the Chair will call a meeting of the faculty members holding the rank of professor and above to discuss the evaluation (with the Chair absent). The faculty will summarize the findings in a letter to the Dean to accompany the Chair's final evaluation. The Chair will provide the Dean with a description of the problem and the Chair's evaluation of the faculty member.

Reappointment

During the spring, coincident with annual merit evaluation, the Chair will review the accomplishments of all non-tenured faculty members. If the Chair views the record as satisfactory, a recommendation for reappointment will be sent to the Dean of Fulbright College. If the record is questionable, the Chair will call a meeting of all of the tenured faculty members

to review the record. If the review indicates that reappointment would be inappropriate, the Chair and a representative of the faculty (if the faculty concurs) will provide the Dean with letters recommending that the faculty member not be reappointed. Before submitting the non-reappointment recommendation to the Dean, the chair shall meet with the faculty member to discuss all issues related to the review and the faculty member shall be provided a draft of the recommendation and an opportunity to provide a written response.

Evaluative 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.

The total evaluation score will reflect the percent effort of the faculty member in the areas of teaching, research, and service, and will be a weighted average of the individual scores in these areas. The expectations in each area will be adjusted based on the percent effort in that area.

The annual evaluation will take into account a sustained level of achievement, since a defined metric of achievement may not necessarily come in a single year.

Teaching: Teaching effectiveness will be judged through the following materials, as well as others:

1. University approved student evaluations such as the Purdue teaching evaluation forms.
2. Evidence of effectiveness in mentoring undergraduate and graduate student research. The names of students and projected dates of completion of degrees should be listed in the ARU.
3. Evidence of effectively teaching classes with relatively high enrollments.
4. Evidence of Teaching Awards.
5. Evidence of participation in undergraduate and graduate student thesis/dissertation committees.
6. Evidence of Course development, documented by teaching materials such as course

outlines, examinations, and supplementary materials

7. Evidence of performance of students, documented by scores on standardized exams, such as ACS exams.
8. Evidence of pursuit and acquisition of competitive funding for education and teaching related projects
9. Evidence of integration of new technology or techniques in teaching.

* Advising duties undertaken by instructional faculty falls here; for tenured and tenure-track faculty this falls under service.

The following guidelines will be used to develop numerical scores for Annual Merit Evaluations. Only integer values will be used in the final evaluation report, except for rare exceptions where a half integer score is more appropriate.

- **Scores of 0** (*does not meet expectations*) will be given when no evidence of teaching performance is presented for review. Other reasons include derelict performance such as not holding class, refusing a reasonable teaching assignment, or for performance well below average and indicated by such things as extremely low student evaluations or numerous and substantial complaints from students.
- **Scores of 1:** Minimally meets expectations as defined by the above criteria.
- **Scores of 2:** Meets expectations fully as defined by the above criteria.
- **Scores of 3:** Exceeds expectations as defined by the above criteria.

Research: Evidence of achievement in research or scholarly activity will be judged by a faculty member's ability to develop and maintain an active, nationally recognized research program. To that end, the following, among others, are materials that will be considered:

1. Evidence of directing an effective and sustained research program including

- undergraduate, graduate and/or postdoctoral researchers.
2. Evidence of funding of substantial research grants by external agencies after competitive review.
 3. Evidence of publications in peer-reviewed journals and/or books.
 4. Evidence of filing new invention disclosures or provisional patents or receiving final adjudicated patents.
 5. Evidence of a sincere effort to secure external research funding.
 6. Evidence of papers presented at seminars and professional conferences and symposia.
 7. Evidence of professional recognition by outside agencies and professional organizations.

The following guidelines will be used to develop numerical scores for Annual Merit Evaluations. Only integer values will be used in the final evaluation report, except for rare exceptions where a half integer score is more appropriate.

- **Scores of 0** (*does not meet expectations*) will be given when no evidence of research or creative achievement is presented.
- **Scores of 1:** Minimally meets expectations as defined by the above criteria.
- **Scores of 2:** Meets expectations fully as defined by the above criteria.
- **Scores of 3:** Exceeds expectations as defined by the above criteria.

Service: Evidence of academically-related service activities appropriate for a faculty member rank may include, among other items:

1. Evidence of participation in activities in connection with funding agencies, such as serving on review panels.
2. Evidence of service on journal editorial boards.
3. Evidence of participation in reviewing manuscripts submitted in peer-reviewed journals.
4. Evidence of involvement in the work of professional societies.

5. Evidence of committee activities in the University, College or Department.
6. Evidence of service to the public through consulting or other activities in the area of academic or professional competence of the faculty member.
7. Evidence of academic advising, especially serving as a department undergraduate advisor.

The following guidelines will be used to develop numerical scores for Annual Merit Evaluations. Only integer values will be used in the final evaluation report, except for rare exceptions where a half integer score is more appropriate.

- **Scores of 0** (*does not meet expectations*) will be given when no evidence of service is presented for review. A rating of zero may also be given, for example, to faculty who refuse to carry out assigned duties or refuse to accept reasonable committee assignments.
- **Scores of 1:** Minimally meets expectations as defined by the above criteria.
- **Scores of 2:** Fully meets expectations as defined by the above criteria. Tenured faculty are usually expected to carry a higher service load than pre-tenure faculty.
- **Scores of 3:** Exceeds expectations as defined by the above criteria.

Promotion and Tenure

Third-Year Review

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 and will be made available to the tenured faculty. The tenured faculty will meet to review the material. Members of the mentoring committee are expected to participate in this meeting and to draft a report of the findings. The chair will independently develop a report of these findings and both will be presented to the Dean of Fulbright College and to the faculty member. These reports shall constitute the record of the pre-tenure review which will be placed in the faculty member's departmental

personnel file.

Promotion and Tenure Procedures

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 nominate the candidate and request letters from outside reviewers, although the faculty member may nominate himself or herself if he/she disagrees with the initial stage recommendation. The final department faculty and chair recommendations on the candidate's case are made only after external reviewer's letters and comments have been received and reviewed by the relevant groups.

Initial review

During the first semester of appointment a new faculty member will be assigned a mentoring committee. This mentoring committee will meet with the faculty member once during each semester, including the summer. The meetings will focus on assessing the faculty member's plans for the new semester and assessing the outcome of past semesters. The committee will prepare a report of these meetings and submit the report to the faculty member and to the chair. The report will be added to the faculty member's personnel file.

During the spring of the semester preceding the deadline for nomination for tenure and/or promotion, the Chair will review the accomplishments of all faculty members below the rank of full professor. Following these reviews, the Chair will discuss the nomination with faculty members who appear to meet the criteria for tenure and/or promotion. 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 meetings with the Chair for the purpose of providing advice on promotion, tenure, and reappointment recommendations. The mentoring committee's advice will be solicited by the Chair. If a nomination is appropriate, a meeting of the tenured faculty, in the case of promotion from assistant to associate professor, will be called to review the record and make a recommendation to proceed. If the faculty vote to proceed with the nomination, the process of selecting outside reviewers will be initiated. In the case of promotion from associate to professor,

only the faculty holding the rank of professor and above will meet.

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.

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 generally the same as those specified above for the 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, to the extent permitted by law, and access to them shall normally only be to the Department Chair and to those involved in the reviewing process.)

Reporting Procedure

At the conclusion of the tenure/promotion review, both the Chair and a representative of the faculty will detail recommendations to the Dean of Fulbright College as part of the faculty members tenure/promotion package. The record of the vote at the meeting of the reviewing faculty members must be provided in this package. 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. Individual faculty members, or any groups of faculty members, retain the right to communicate directly with the Dean on these matters.