

PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY AND BIOCHEMISTRY

**Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences
University of Arkansas**

Approved by the Faculty: January 5, 2022

Personnel Document
On Evaluative Criteria, Procedures and General Standards
for
Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments,
Annual and Post-tenure Review,
Promotion and Tenure

University of Arkansas
Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry

This document governs the Department in the selection, retention, promotion, granting of tenure to, and evaluation of faculty effective as of the date of the president's approval. It has been approved by the faculty of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, the Dean, the Provost, the Chancellor, and the President of the University of Arkansas, as indicated by the signatures below.

These policies are required to be consistent with the policies of the university as set forth in Board of Trustees policy 405.1 and in two campus policy statements: (1) Evaluative Criteria, Procedures and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Annual Review and Post-Tenure Review, Promotion and Tenure and (2) Guidelines on University and Distinguished Professors Appointments. In case of conflict, the board policy, the campus policy, the school, college, or library policy, and the department policy shall have authority in that order. Copies of these documents are available online, as referenced in the *Faculty Handbook*, at the UA web site <https://provost.uark.edu/faculty-handbook>.

It is the policy of the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville to provide equal employment opportunity to all qualified persons; to prohibit discrimination against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, sexual orientation, marital or parental status, veteran's status, or disability, and to promote the full realization of equal employment opportunity through a positive, continuing program of affirmative action.

APPROVALS

Matt McIntosh

03/11/2022

Chair

T. Shields

Date

03/11/2022

Dean

Date

Provost

Date

Chancellor

Date

President

Date

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 education of students, the fostering of creative thinking 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

A Unit Personnel Committee will be elected by eligible faculty members as defined by APS 1405.11. section IV.B.11.a. Elected committee members will serve two-year terms. Elections will be conducted annually to fill available vacancies. Committee membership will consist of five faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or higher, at least three of whom must be full professors.

In accord with APS 1405.11 section IV.B.11.c, if the unit has at least two non-tenure-track faculty eligible to serve, the Unit Personnel Committee will have at least one non-tenure-track faculty included among the five committee members. Non-tenure-track Unit Personnel Committee members shall not vote on the awarding of tenure or on the promotion of tenure track candidates. Associate professor committee members will not vote on promotion of candidates to full professor.

The personnel committee will consider the following cases.

- Third Year Review of tenure-track faculty.
- Tenure and Promotion of tenure-track faculty.
- Third Year Review of non-tenure-track faculty who are on a promotion path.
- Promotion of non-tenure-track faculty.

The Personnel Committee will provide evaluation for advancement to University Professor or Distinguished Professor. However, only tenured full professors may vote on candidates for University or Distinguished Professor.

Unit Peer Review Committee

An elected Unit Peer Review committee will advise the department Chair on the annual review of faculty performance. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members with more than three years of full-time service, except the chair and vice-chair, will stand for election to serve on a rotating basis. As per 1405.11 III. C 2.ii, "All fulltime tenure-track and non-tenure-track Unit faculty above the rank of assistant professor shall be eligible to serve on the Peer Review Committee. In addition, tenure-track and non-tenure track assistant professors, having successfully completed three academic years of service in the Unit, shall be eligible to serve." Each year a subset of the faculty shall be chosen by ballot of the eligible faculty to serve on the Unit Peer Review Committee. This elected faculty committee will consist of three subcommittees of three eligible faculty members, one subcommittee for evaluation of teaching, one for research and one for service. No faculty member shall serve on more than one subcommittee each year or on the same subcommittee for two consecutive years. No faculty shall serve for more than two consecutive years on any of the subcommittees. Members for each subcommittee shall be elected annually by the eligible faculty.

The vice chair will serve *ex officio* on each subcommittee for the purpose of safeguarding the integrity of the discussions and the topics under discussion.

The department Chair will provide to eligible voting 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 the others. Election for each subcommittee will be held in turn, in the order of teaching (first), research (second) and then service. Balloting will be conducted by email with two members of staff designated by the department chair to count the votes. Eligible faculty will submit three votes for three individuals to serve on each subcommittee. The respective faculty members with the largest vote totals will be selected for to serve, with the individual receiving the highest number of votes serving as the chair of the subcommittee. The department chair will vote for members of subcommittees only in order to break ties. After election of the first subcommittee, the department chair will announce the results and provide a new ballot showing those eligible for the remaining subcommittees and designate the next subcommittee membership vote. This process will be repeated until the final subcommittee is elected. The elections will be completed before the end of the fall semester.

Personnel Files

The department shall maintain, in electronic format, a personnel file for each faculty member. The files shall be duplicated in a separate storage system to ensure that they will not be lost because of hardware or software failures. These files will contain communications between the chair or the dean's office and the faculty member related to personnel matter. It will contain all documents related to the initial hiring and appointment. It will also contain a record of communications related to 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 may contain letters from outside reviewers, access to the file will be limited by the chair, consistent with and to the extent provided by the campus personnel document provisions on outside reviews.

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.

Modifications to the normal work assignments can be made by the chair 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) in chemistry or a related field 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 in chemistry or a related field 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." Initial appointment cannot be to University Professor.

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 (See 1405.111 for a discussion of non-tenure-track multi-year appointments).

Research Assistant Professor: A rank 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.

Research Associate Professor: A rank 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 are evidence of substantial independent research accomplishment as documented by major independent research grants and publications in peer-reviewed journals, and faculty approval.

Research Professor: A rank for the appointment of internationally recognized scientists, supported by external grant funds, who will significantly enhance the research mission of the department.

Lecturer: The department adopts II.D. of APS 1405.11.

Instructor: The department adopts II.D. of APS 1405.11.

Teaching Assistant Professor: The department adopts II.D. of APS 1405.11.

Teaching Associate Professor: The department adopts II.D. of APS 1405.11.

Teaching Professor: The department adopts II.D. of APS 1405.11.

Visiting appointments: Short-term appointments at any of the above ranks may be made, when appropriate, for international experts or visiting scientists with comparable rank at other institutions.

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.

Initial tenure-track appointments at a level of associate professor or full professor will follow the guidelines of the Fulbright College personnel document.

For initial appointments of non-tenure-track faculty, the department adopts II.D. of APS 1405.11.

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. The department chair is responsible to initiate the process (1405. III. B. 11). At the time of the annual review, a current resume/CV and a comprehensive cumulative record of accomplishments for each faculty member are made available to the elected annual review subcommittees. Access 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 for the preceding calendar year will be evaluated by the Unit Peer Review subcommittees. The ultimate responsibility for the evaluation lies with the Chairperson of the Department. Elected subcommittee members will evaluate the accomplishments of each faculty member. The subcommittee chair will collect the evaluation recommendations and submit them (anonymously) to the department Chair. The Chair will use the input from these subcommittees in developing individual ratings given for 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 those of the Chair.

The results of the annual peer evaluation shall be made fully available to the individual faculty member and those conducting the review prior to delivering the results to the Dean's office. The chair must meet with tenure-track faculty to discuss the content of the annual merit evaluation. Meetings with other faculty who received satisfactory evaluation are optional, but a record must be kept to indicate the faculty who waived a meeting.

An appeal of annual evaluation should be made in writing to the department Chair. If a faculty member is not satisfied with the results of the appeal to the Chair, the Chair will call a meeting of faculty members holding the rank of professor and above to discuss the evaluation (with the Chair absent). This ad hoc full-professor faculty group will summarize 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 issues and the Chair's evaluation of the faculty member. This appeal process is also governed by 1405.11 III. B. 12 and 13.

Reappointment

During the spring, coincident with annual merit evaluation, the Chair will review the accomplishments of all non-tenured faculty members. The Chair will make a recommendation regarding reappointment or non-reappointment of each tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty member only after considering the written report of the unit committee conducting the annual peer review.

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 the elected Unit Peer Review Committee to review the record. If the review indicates that reappointment would be inappropriate, the Chair and a representative of the Unit Peer Review Committee faculty 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. Non-reappointment procedures for TT faculty are governed by 405.1. IV.B and the non-reappointment procedures for NTT faculty with multi-year appointments are governed by 1405.111. III. E

Evaluative Criteria

Faculty members, based on their work assignments, will 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.

A 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 accrue within 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. Examples would include mixed records of teaching effectiveness or addressing the needs of students.
- Scores of 2: Meets expectations fully as defined by the above criteria. Examples would include effective teaching, mentoring and course development.
- Scores of 3: Exceeds expectations as defined by the above criteria. Examples could include evidence of teaching awards, extraordinary student achievements or innovation that may advance the state of the art.

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. Examples include low levels of published manuscripts and few if any attempted applications for competitive external grants.
- Scores of 2: Meets expectations fully as defined by the above criteria. Examples include published manuscripts and evidence of applications for competitive external grants.
- Scores of 3: Exceeds expectations as defined by the above criteria. The faculty member has established a sustained record of publishing in high-level journals and maintaining competitive extramural funding to support ongoing research.

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. Example activities will include national professional service and service to benefit the department and the University of Arkansas.
- Scores of 3: Exceeds expectations as defined by the above criteria. Examples include outstanding service the University of Arkansas and to national organizations such as professional societies and granting agencies.

Annual Review/Annual Merit Evaluation for non-tenure-track faculty.

The department adopts II.D. of APS 1405.11.

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 elected Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee will meet to review the material. Members of an individual faculty mentoring committee are expected also to participate in this meeting and to draft a report of the findings. Members of the Personnel Committee and mentoring committee also may consult with other tenured faculty members. The department Chair will independently develop a report of findings. Both Personnel Committee and Chair findings 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. The department follows 1405.11. III. D and 1405.111. III. D.

Promotion and Tenure Procedures

Candidates for promotion and tenure may request consideration and a solicitation of letters from external reviewers during the spring semester of an academic year. The evaluation process then will take place over the summer and fall months of the year according to schedules and deadlines established by the University guidelines. The department follows 1405.11 Section IV.

Mentoring Committees

During the first semester of appointment a new faculty member will be assigned a mentoring committee in consultation with the faculty member. This mentoring committee will meet with the faculty member once during each semester. 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.

Promotion and Tenure Review

In selecting external reviewers, the Department follows 1405.11. IV). Shortly before the deadline for submitting promotion and advancement to tenure recommendations to the Dean, a comprehensive promotion/tenure review, is carried out for all faculty members being considered for promotion and/or advancement to tenure. These reviews are conducted by the elected Personnel Committee, in consultation with other faculty above the rank of the candidate, as appropriate, following the Faculty Review Guidelines (Review Form for Promotion and/or Tenure) and letters from outside peer evaluators obtained 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 Personnel Committee will detail recommendations to the Dean of Fulbright College as part of the faculty member's tenure/promotion

package. The record of a vote from the Personnel Committee must be provided in this package. Should the Chair make a recommendation divergent from that of the Personnel Committee, or should the opinions within any of the advisory groups be significantly divided, it is the responsibility of the Chair to clearly state these facts to the individual faculty member, to the Personnel Committee and other faculty 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.

Post-Tenure Review

The Department adopts the post-tenure review procedures defined in APS 1405.11 III. E.