DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY AND PHYSICS
FACULTY MEETING MINUTES
September 21, 2016


ABSENT: Sarah Gray and Gary Guillet (excused).

I. CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 12:00 on September 21, 2016 in Room 2016. Dr. Will Lynch presided.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The Minutes from August 11th, 2016 were approved as presented.

III. NEW BUSINESS

IV. OLD BUSINESS

A. Faculty Senate
The following items are the highlights of the last Faculty Senate Meeting:
1. Dr. Smith mentioned the spinning up of 2 committees, namely the Post Tenure Evaluation committee, which will be charged with looking at evaluation in general across the colleges and a Task Force that will be charged with looking into summer profit sharing.

2. Faculty Fair Compensation Bill. This bill was to pay faculty teaching lab courses based on contact hours over the summer but it was remanded. The Task Force Committee will now be looking into the summer profit sharing.

3. SmartEvals. SmartEvals is now being included in portfolios when a faculty member goes up for review.

4. New Faculty Hires Bill. The faculty salary survey committee that met last year included several recommendations in the report. And some of these will be presented this year as bills. The first bill has to do with contingent on funds. This bill addresses that new faculty should be brought in at market salary.

5. Timeframe for Student Evaluations in Summer Courses.
The faculty senate voted to open the evaluations after midterm and keep them open for two weeks.
6. Monitoring of Active Bills
The Senate President hopes to get assistance with developing a web list of active bills and creating a description and searchable function so that bills can be monitored more easily by Armstrong faculty.

B. CST Dean Search Up-date
The Search Committee will be meeting this coming Monday 26/2016. Currently there are 30 applicants and the committee will be working to bring down that number to 10. Once that is accomplished, the committee will be conducting interviews via skype and later on applicants will be invited to campus. So far it looks like campus interviews will take place before Thanksgiving.

C. General Chemistry Committee
1. Lab Manual
The committee was asked to consider producing a bound copy of the lab manual and selling it to create some additional revenue for the department. Dr. Lea Padgett contacted a sales representative to get an idea regarding pricing and options. Prices were obtained from Blue Door, which is the publishing company that currently provides the lab notebooks. Among the things discussed were means to sell the books and how to balance out costs to the students. One thing that the committee is not willing to do is to deal with selling through a mechanism other than the bookstore. It was suggested to contact Dr. Jason Beck from Economics since his department prints his textbook through the Armstrong Printing Office.

2. ACS Exams
The committee has ordered new evaluation copies of several general chemistry ACS exams. The exam that it is currently being used for CHEM 1212 does not meet everyone’s approval. The committee will review sample copies and make a decision regarding purchase of newer version by midterm.

For more details, please refer to Attachment #1.

D. Chemistry Curriculum Committee
The Committee proposed the creation of new course CHEM 3600 Polymer Chemistry effective Spring 2017 and changes in Program of Study for the four Departmental Majors.

The faculty voted unanimously in favor of the creation of course CHEM 3600 and its insertion as an option in the BA and the BS and as a requirement in the BA & BS.

Please refer to Attachment #2 for details regarding the creation of CHEM 3600 and the changes in Program of Study for the departmental majors.

E. Tenure & Promotion Document (First Reading)
Dr. Clifford Padgett proceeded to read the draft of the Tenure and Promotion document and the proposed changes. The faculty will not vote for any changes at this time since this
is just a first reading of the document. There will be a meeting to discuss the proposed changes in the short term.

Please refer to Attachment #3 for more details.

   i. Schedule Reminder for 2016-2017
Dr. Lynch reminded the faculty that the department is in the middle of tenure and promotion with Drs. Quillian and Weiland and promotion with Dr. Baird. After this the department will proceed with the retention of Drs. Davis and Shank. Later on in January 2017 the department will be dealing with a standard retention of everyone as well as the retention of Senior Lecturers.

   F. Hiring Request for the Department
The department had made four requests:
1. Dr. Feske’s line be converted to permanent Associate Dean
2. A new physics tenure track line, to compensate for the loss of the Conner line
3. A new biochemistry line to deal with rapid expansion of the program and
4. A new Instrument Technician line with the capacity to teach

Dr. Lynch was finally able to see the colleges’ prioritization list and none of the above requests were considered a priority at this time. If nothing changes, the department will proceed to do a search to replace Dr. Romano’s temporary position, most likely, in the spring.

   G. Spring 2017 and Summer 2017
The department will, hopefully, hire a Physics part-time instructor to teach the night course during the spring. For summer 2017 all the courses were accepted with the exception of the May mini-mester courses.

   H. Core D Comment and Feedback
Dr. Lynch informed the faculty that the History Department has shown interest in proposing a core D course, Geography 2xxx. The faculty decided to get more information regarding this, so Dr. Lynch will relay to the Dean that at the moment we are not too excited about this especially because it is a significant departure from where we are at this point.

   I. BS in Applied Science and Project Leadership Feedback
The Engineering Study Program is proposing a BS in Applied Science and Project Leadership. The only real impact to us is that this is going to require PHYS 3120. The department will need more time to discuss this matter.

   J. Pirate Preview October 8/2016
Dr. Lynch requested help with Pirate Preview that will take place on October 8 from 9:30am – 1:00pm. He will send an e-mail requesting help later on.

   K. Projections by Enrollment Management 2023
Part of the EMC planning is to increase enrollment to 8,000 students by the year 2023. The main concern is that there seems to be no faculty increase plan associated with the EMC enrollment increase plan.

L. MOWR in High Schools
For your information, part of the university's plan to increase enrollment is to get involved in MOWR (Move On When Ready). MOWR is a program whereby a high school student who gets a certain ACT score which qualifies him/her to attend ASU for free.

Currently there is a discussion to teach in High Schools (Windsor). SSU is apparently doing this at SAA and SHS. GCSU is beginning to do this as part of a diversity program they are running. They will teach CHEM on-line with a faculty member going to the lab.

V. OLD BUSINESS
A. Budget Up-date
Dr. Lynch reminded the faculty that the budget is in good shape.

VI. Announcements
A. Upcoming Dates
   i. Sept. 28 – Premed Meeting (noon)
   ii. Sept. 28 – Science on Tap (6 pm)
   iii. Sept. 30 – SAACS (noon)
   iv. Oct. 5 – UGA Pharmacy on Campus (5 pm)
   v. Oct. 7 – Elon Ison – NC State (noon)
   vi. Oct. 8 – Pirate Preview
   vii. Oct. 10 – Richmond Hill MS Visit
   viii. Oct. 12 – PCOM Pharmacy on Campus (5 pm)
   ix. Oct. 21 & 22 – Chemistry Alumni Event
   x. Oct. 28 – Country Day AP Class on Campus
   xi. Oct. 28 – Greg Tschumper – Univ. of Mississippi (Noon)

B. Students
The following are students who will be starting Pharmacy School in the fall:
Erica Awalt – Mercer University
Ben Jennings – South University
Kevin Obregon – South University
Jessica Latham – South University

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00pm.

cc: Dr. Delana Nivens, Interim Dean, College of Science and Technology
    Dr. Brent Feske, Interim Associate Dean, College of Science and Technology
### Summer Schedule 2017

**Discussion**
The committee recommends continuing to offer the availability of the complete sequence in the two four week sessions. Some students enrolled in the 8 week would not have been able to keep up with a faster pace, so this is also a good option. The second summer 1211 course had low enrollment, but the students were mostly Armstrong students instead of transients.

**Conclusions**
The recommendation will be to offer at least a first-half 1211 and a second-half 1212, plus a full (8 wk) 1211 and 1212. Ideally, there would also be a 1212 in the first half and a 1211 in the second half.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inform department head of recommendation</td>
<td>Lea</td>
<td>20 Aug 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Update on polymer grant

**Discussion**
Division of labor within the grant faculty regarding the general chemistry laboratory exercise. Gary and Mitch are writing the classroom activity and Cathy is working on the laboratory procedure with her research student. Nathaniel Shank is working on the organic part of the experiment that would produce the starting material for the gen chem experiment.

**Conclusions**
Cathy will keep us informed about the progress. Implementation is predicted for spring semester 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Textbook ALG grant

**Discussion**
Deadlines and review of the reviewer comments from previous submission. Assessment plan was the area most identified as needing work. Math had a successful proposal, so we should look at theirs. Maybe we should include some qualitative and some quantitative questions as examples of what we ask of the students on the surveys we propose.

**Conclusions**
We will be resubmitting at the beginning of September. Sections will be divided up among the four faculty authors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get copy of Math Grant from Michael Tiemeyer</td>
<td>Lea</td>
<td>19 Aug 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send Lea three possible survey questions</td>
<td>Cathy, Todd, Gary</td>
<td>17 Aug 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lab Manuals

**Discussion**
We were asked to consider producing a bound copy of our lab manual and selling it to create some additional revenue for the department. After discussing this, prior to the meeting, Lea contacted a sales rep to get an idea about pricing and options.

Prices were obtained from Bluedoor, which is a lab manual publishing company and the company that currently provides the laboratory notebooks. Also discussed were means to sell the books, and how to balance out costs to the students. If we sold the lab manual, we would stop requiring the laboratory notebook we use currently (which is all blank paper) and would have a combination product of printed and blank carbonless copy pages. With a $5 royalty to the department the price per semester (if done as separate books) would be $27 to the bookstore. We are not willing to deal with selling through a mechanism other than the bookstore, if that is even possible.
**Conclusions**  
Present to the department for further discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigate bookstore markups</td>
<td>Lea</td>
<td>15 Sep 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACS exams**

**Discussion**
Have ordered new evaluation copies of several general chemistry ACS exams. The currently used CHEM 1212 exam is not liked by several faculty.

**Conclusions**
Review sample copies and make decision regarding purchase of newer version(s) by midterm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum  
9/15/16  

To: Dr. Will Lynch  
Head, Department of Chemistry and Physics  

From: Dr. Todd Hizer  
Chair, Chemistry Curriculum Committee  

Re: Proposed new course and changes in Program of Study for the four Departmental majors  

The Committee proposes two action items:  

1. **Create the following course:**  
   
   **CHEM 3600 Polymer Chemistry**  
   
   Prerequisite: CHEM 2101  
   
   Fundamental principles in polymer chemistry. Topics include but are not limited to the history of polymers and macromolecules and their impact on modern society, preparation of polymers from both a conceptual and mechanistic perspective, molecular/bulk-chemical and physical properties of polymers, characterization, disposal, and breakdown of polymers, and biopolymers (e.g. DNA, RNA, proteins, polysaccharides).  

   **Rationale:** This course is being created to partially satisfy new mandated guidelines issued by the American Chemical Society to include more coverage of polymer concepts in the ACS-certified B.S. degree. Compliance with this mandate is necessary to retain the ACS certification. This course will required of students earning the ACS-certified B.S. in Chemistry, and will serve as an elective course to those earning a B.S. or B.A. in Chemistry, a B.S. in Biochemistry, or individuals seeking a minor in chemistry.  

   **Effective Term:** Spring 2017  

   **CURCAT:**  
   Major Department: Chemistry and Physics  
   Can Course be repeated for additional credit? No  
   Maximum Number of Credit Hours: 2  
   Grading Mode: Normal  
   Instruction Type: Lecture  
   Course Equivalent: None  

2. **Make the following changes to the Programs of Study for the four departmental majors**
(A) Under the Program for the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Chemistry –
Add CHEM 3600 to the list in Area B, Major Field Courses, Approved upper-
division electives.

(B) Under the Program for the degree of Bachelor of Science in Chemistry –
Add CHEM 3600 to the list in Area B, Major Field Courses, 9 hours from:

(C) Under the Program for the degree of Bachelor of Science in Biochemistry –
Add CHEM 3600 to the list in Area B, Major Field Courses, 7 hours of approved
upper division chemistry or biochemistry courses.

(D) Under the Program for the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Chemistry –
(i) Add CHEM 3600 to the list in Area B, Major Field Courses
(ii) Change “Three courses from:” to “Two courses from:”

We anticipate receiving an e-copy of the Program of Study pages and presenting Item 2 in a
more formal fashion at the Department meeting on Wednesday.
The Department of Chemistry and Physics supports the Mission Statement of Armstrong State University and the Philosophy and Goals of the College of Science and Technology, in accordance with University regulations as outlined in the Armstrong State University Faculty Handbook. The major focus of faculty effort and resources is on quality undergraduate instruction, and service is considered a responsibility of employment. The pursuit and support of scholarly activities are professional obligations of every tenure-track faculty member. Professional development, through participation in discipline-related activities, is expected of all faculty.

Diversity is important to a dynamic and well-rounded department. For tenure-track and tenured faculty members, quality undergraduate teaching is paramount, and the individual faculty member may choose how to allocate resources between scholarship and service providing that satisfactory performance is achieved in all areas. Activity in both scholarship and service is required, and in matters of promotion, scholarship shall be given more weight than service. In consultation with the department head, faculty members may decide the focus of their activities within the long-range needs of the department, college and university.

The following are the categories of full-time faculty members. Tenure-Track faculty include Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors. These faculty have professional obligations of teaching, scholarship, service and professional development. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are instructional faculty who are not eligible for tenure. Their appointments include teaching, service and professional development obligations. Employees who are hired as Limited Term Faculty have the title of Instructor.

I. Suggested Professional Activities

Following is the suggested professional activities list developed by the department to aid in the evaluation of teaching, scholarship, service and professional development activities. These activities are in accordance with those outlined in the current version of the Armstrong State University Faculty Handbook (105.2.3 Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation) Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion as well as the College of Science and Technology Guidelines for Retention, Pre-Tenure Review, Promotion, Tenure and Post-Tenure Review (hereafter referred to as CST Guidelines). This list is an evolving entity, and presents representative items in general order of importance. It is by no means intended to be comprehensive. Categories are ranked according to the workload and resources required for activities within each area. Evaluation procedures will provide greater reward for success in higher categories and take into account total workloads of individual faculty members.

I.A. TEACHING
Teaching effectiveness will be the most important single factor in all evaluations. Teaching includes all work that involves the use of a faculty member’s expertise to communicate a subject
matter to students. It may, therefore, include traditional lecturing in the classroom, supervision and training in a laboratory or clinical setting, nontraditional communication of a discipline, the collecting and developing of subject materials for communication to students, the guidance of students in independent study and research, and academic advising. A faculty member’s command of the subject matter, motivation of and relationship to students, testing and grading practices, and overall fulfillment of teaching responsibilities are primary characteristics to be considered in the evaluation of teaching. The department recognizes and encourages faculty consider but not limit their activities to the indicators of teaching effectiveness as outlined in the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (2.2.2) contained in the CST Guidelines.

Evaluation of teaching will be carried out using the Guidelines for Evaluation (2.2.3) outlined in the CST Guidelines, other related survey methods, and an evaluation of class materials such as tests, syllabi, handouts, etc. Academic advisement is also an important teaching activity, therefore participation in advisement will be considered in the evaluation process.

I.B. SCHOLARSHIP
Scholarship involves the use of a faculty member’s expertise as a scholar or artist. It includes work that adds to the subject matter of a discipline and work that increases the expertise of a faculty member as a professional. Research and publications are encouraged by the university; the pursuit and support of scholarly activities, consistent with the role of the institution, are professional obligations of every tenure-track faculty member. In the judgment of the department, scholarship must involve peer review.

Scholarship for tenure or promotion requires accomplishments from the following categories: A strong portfolio for tenure would contain two items from Category I (including at least one article in a peer-review journal). For tenure, two items from Category I (including at least one peer-reviewed article) or one item from Category I (which does not have to include a peer-reviewed article) and several items from Category II are required.

Category I (Numbers \rightarrow bullets)
- Publishing a peer-reviewed book in your professional field
- Writing a peer-reviewed chapter for a book in your professional field
- Publishing an article in a peer-reviewed journal (including basic research, applied research, teaching, and education journals). The order of authorship is unimportant in determining the value of a publication; individual contributions to collaborative work should be defined in the portfolio.
- Developing and submitting an external proposal which is funded. Individual contributions to collaborative work should be defined in the portfolio.

Category II
- Presenting a discipline-related paper at a national, regional or international meeting or conference
- Serving as an editor or referee for a professional journal
- Reviewing a discipline-related article or book
- Developing and submitting an internal proposal which is funded
- Judging proposals for grant awards
• Conducting a discipline-related workshop
• Serving on a panel at a state, national or international meeting or conference
• Publishing a discipline-related article in a non-refereed journal
• Presenting a discipline-related work in a local or regional magazine
• Submitting an external proposal which is not funded

Category III
• Attending a discipline-related research-related workshop or presentation
• Attending a sectional, national or international meeting or conference
• Submitting an internal proposal which is not funded
• Presenting or authoring a discipline-related paper at a state or local meeting or conference
• Presenting a general, college or departmental lecture (including Faculty Lecture Series)

I.C. SERVICE
Service includes all work that involves the use of a faculty member’s academic status or professional expertise to benefit the university, the community or the profession. The essential element of service is that it involves contributions associated with a faculty member’s established status in a discipline and at the university. Unless otherwise stipulated in a faculty member’s job description, service is considered a responsibility of employment and consequently subject to evaluation.

Service for tenure or promotion requires accomplishments from the following categories:

Category I
• Maintaining instrumentation
• Serving in a university-wide advisory capacity
• Coordinating Departmental outreach activities
• Serving as consultant to a school, university, organization or industry
• Serving as an officer or committee chair for a professional society

Category II
• Serving as faculty advisor for a student organization
• Regular service in the Advisement Center or other advisement programs
• Organizing university functions
• Chairing a university committee
• Participating in a Departmental outreach activity
• Serving on a committee of a professional organization

Category III
• Speaking to a school class on a discipline-related topic
• Chairing a departmental committee
• Supervision of students in support of the departmental programs
Category IV

- Serving on a university or departmental committee
- Serving as liaison between Armstrong and community organizations
- Judging science fairs and other competitions

I.D. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Professional development includes strategic learning and services that increase individual and institutional effectiveness in support of the university and the University System of Georgia.

- Attending presentations
- Workshops
- Post-doctoral training
- Attaining additional degrees
- Continuing education
- Training sessions
- Seminars on matters pertaining to the application of disciplinary knowledge and institutional effectiveness.

II. Departmental Faculty Review Procedures

The system for departmental evaluation adopted by the Department of Chemistry and Physics consists of two parts: a review by department faculty and a faculty evaluation instrument. A departmental committee will conduct evaluations required for retention (non-tenured retention), pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review recommendations. The Department of Chemistry and Physics is committed to high quality teaching effectiveness as the highest priority of the faculty, the department supports Peer Review of Instruction (2.2.4.3) as outlined in the CST Guidelines. The faculty evaluation instrument is attached at the end of this document. Guidelines for portfolio content are found in the CST Guidelines Portfolio Contents (3.4.9). The following outlines the departmental faculty review process.

II.A. For all department faculty members being considered for retention (non-tenured retention):

1. Two faculty mentors are assigned annually by agreement between the faculty member, two faculty mentors and Head to conduct a Peer review of instruction for mentoring as outlined in 2.2.4.3.a of the CST Guidelines. The evaluation instrument is attached and may be included in the portfolio.

2. A departmental committee will conduct the evaluation.

3. All full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty having seniority to the person under review (excluding the department head) will participate in these evaluations.

4. Scheduling of these evaluations will be done by the department head, in a timely manner consistent with the annual academic calendar.
5. Faculty members up for pre-tenure review, will not be reviewed by this committee as the department head can examine the pre-tenure review for faculty input.

6. Senior lecture yearly retention will be handled by the department head. Senior lecturers will turn in a current CV and APAR to the department head for their portfolios, unless the senior lecture is up for 5 year review. Then the five year review replaces the yearly retention procedure. The department head should seek faculty input before not retaining a senior lecture.

7. The first and third retention of a tenure track faculty shall be handled by the department head. The reviewee will turn in a current CV and APAR to the department head for their portfolios.

II.B. For all department faculty members being considered for tenure:

1. Two faculty mentors are assigned during the academic year of application by agreement between the faculty member, mentors and Head to conduct a Peer review of instruction for mentoring as outlined in 2.2.4.3.a of the CST Guidelines. The evaluation instrument is attached and may be included in the portfolio.

2. A departmental committee will conduct the evaluation.

3. All full-time, tenured department faculty (excluding the department head) will participate in these evaluations.

4. Scheduling will be done by the department head. The evaluation must begin at least one calendar month prior to the due date for the departmental recommendation for tenure.

II.C. For all department faculty members being considered for promotion:

1. Two faculty mentors are assigned during the academic year of application by agreement between the faculty member, mentors and Head to conduct a Peer review of instruction for mentoring as outlined in 2.2.4.3.a of the CST Guidelines. The evaluation instrument is attached and may be included in the portfolio.

2. A departmental committee will conduct the evaluation.

3. All full-time, tenured department faculty at or above the level of promotion being considered (excluding the department head) will participate in these evaluations for tenured and tenure-track promotion applicants. All full-time, tenured department faculty (excluding the department head) as well as senior lecturers will participate in the evaluations of lecturers applying for promotion to senior lecturer.
4. Scheduling will be done by the department head. The evaluation must begin at least one calendar month prior to the due date for the departmental recommendation for promotion.

II.D. For all department tenured faculty – post-tenure review:

1. Two faculty mentors are assigned during the academic year of application by agreement between the faculty member, mentors and Head to conduct a Peer review of instruction for mentoring as outlined in 2.2.4.3.a of the CST Guidelines. The evaluation instrument is attached and may be included in the portfolio.

2. A departmental committee will conduct the evaluation.

3. All full-time, tenured department faculty (excluding the department head) will participate in these evaluations.

4. Scheduling will be done by the department head, in a timely manner consistent with the annual academic calendar, and as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

5. The faculty member to be evaluated should be notified at the beginning of the academic year during which the evaluation is to be conducted.

II.E. For all senior lecturers – 5 year review:

1. Two faculty mentors are assigned during the academic year of application by agreement between the faculty member, mentors and Head to conduct a Peer review of instruction for mentoring as outlined in 2.2.4.3.a of the CST Guidelines. The evaluation instrument is attached and may be included in the portfolio.

2. A departmental committee will conduct the evaluation.

3. All full-time, senior lecturers and tenured department faculty (excluding the department head) will participate in these evaluations.

4. Scheduling will be done by the department head, in a timely manner consistent with the annual academic calendar, and as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

5. The faculty member to be evaluated should be notified at the beginning of the academic year during which the evaluation is to be conducted.

III. Peer Review of Instruction for Mentoring Procedures

A. The department head, faculty member under evaluation and mentor all agree on the assignment of the mentor.
B. The mentor shall contact the faculty member and agree on a two week window for observation of both classroom and laboratory (in the event a faculty member under review does not have a laboratory that semester, only a classroom visit will occur).

C. The mentor shall visit the faculty member’s classroom and laboratory and perform a mentoring evaluation using the departmental instrument (College of Science and Technology Peer Review of Instruction for Mentoring Form).

D. The mentor and faculty member shall meet to review the outcomes within two weeks of the visit.

E. The faculty member shall receive the original evaluative summary for their records and may choose to include this document in their portfolio.

IV. Peer Review of Instruction for Evaluation Procedures

A. The department head shall contact the faculty member and agree on a two week window for observation of both classroom and laboratory (in the event a faculty member under review does not have a laboratory that semester, only a classroom visit will occur).

B. The department head shall visit the faculty member’s classroom and laboratory and perform a mentoring evaluation using the departmental instrument (College of Science and Technology Peer Review of Instruction for Mentoring Form).

C. The department head and faculty member shall meet to review the outcomes within two weeks of the visit.

D. The faculty member shall receive the original evaluative summary for their records, a copy will be placed in the faculty members permanent record and the document will be included in their portfolio.

V. Committee Procedures

A. The department head shall appoint a chair for the committee.

B. Records of performance in teaching, scholarship, service and professional development for the faculty member being evaluated must be made available for review by the committee prior to each evaluation. These documents should include, but are not limited to a current CV, all of the Annual Professional Activities Reports, all of the Annual Faculty Evaluations, all of the annual FACE summaries for the period being evaluated, and all previous tenure, promotion, and retention memoranda. Complete instructions as to the content of the portfolio required by the College of Science and Technology are available from the Office of the Dean.
C. The committee shall review the portfolio to ensure its completeness.

D. Committee members should read the files of the respective applicants. Files are available in the departmental office and may be taken to the conference room for reading. In the interest of speed and confidentiality, packets may not be taken to faculty offices.

E. A Faculty Evaluation Form should be used to record the assessment of the files and any information or opinions pertinent to the decision making process.

F. The committee will meet to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the applicants. In all cases, discussion should be conducted in a collegial manner. The goal of all retention, tenure, promotion and post-tenure procedures is to improve the department.

G. During the second meeting, discussion of applications will be completed and a vote will take place. Votes will be conducted by secret ballot supplied by the department head. There will be separate ballots for each promotion and tenure vote. These will be tabulated by the committee, sealed in an envelope, and submitted with the recommendation of the committee.

H. The chair of the Retention, Tenure, Promotion, Post-Tenure Review and/or 5-year Senior Lecturer Review Committee will submit a memorandum detailing the outcome of the vote and a short rationale for the result. This memorandum should be signed by all committee members. The committee’s memorandum shall be attached to the application and made available to the applicant. Should the committee be unable to agree on an acceptable memorandum then the majority of committee members will submit a signed memorandum and a minority memorandum may also be submitted. In addition, all committee members have the right to submit memoranda to the department head about the results of the proceedings.

I. All committee recommendations are due to the department head two weeks before the evaluation results are due in the office of the Dean of Science and Technology.
Faculty Evaluation Form
Department of Chemistry and Physics

Evaluation for ____________________________ Date_______

In consideration of (check one)
Retention ____
Tenure ____
Promotion to:
   Assistant Professor ____
   Associate Professor ____
   Professor ____
   Senior Lecturer ____
Post-tenure Review ____
5-Year Senior Lecturer Review ____

Rating Scale

Lowest  [ 1 ] Unsatisfactory
[ 2 ] Needs Improvement
[ 3 ] Satisfactory (indicates meeting departmental expectations)
[ 4 ] Highly Satisfactory
[ 5 ] Outstanding

Highest

1. TEACHING: How do you evaluate this colleague with regard to teaching? Does (s)he effectively use her/his expertise to communicate the subject matter to students? How do you evaluate the command of subject matter, testing and grading practices, and overall fulfillment of teaching responsibilities for this colleague? Does the faculty member use student-based outcomes to evaluate her/his teaching effectiveness and guide her/his professional growth? Is the faculty member engaged in disciplinary activities to maintain currency in the discipline to support high quality teaching?


Comments:
2. SCHOLARSHIP: Does (s)he participate in the peer review process in her/his academic area of expertise which includes demonstrated outcomes (not required of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers)?


Comments:

3. SERVICE: How do you evaluate this colleague with regard to professional service (both within the University and in the community at large) and “reputation value” to the University and Department?


Comments:

4. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Does the faculty member demonstrate a commitment to professional growth and development manifested by interaction and collaboration with colleagues with common interests on campus and in the professional community at large?


Comments:

GENERAL COMMENTS: