I. Call To Order
The meeting was called to order at 12:00 on September 25, 2013 in Room 2502. Dr. Will Lynch presided.

II. Approval of Minutes
The Minutes from August 8, 2013 were approved as presented.

III. New Business
A. Faculty Senate Update
Dr. Baird reported that the following bills passed:
1- The bill regarding Transparency in Armstrong Infrastructure Planning,
2- The new Administrative Positions freeze bill requesting a hiring freeze of administrative positions till the faculty salaries phase be completed,
3- The bill requesting every third year Faculty Salary Analysis.

The Faculty Senate is currently discussing committee restructuring. They, also, charged the Student Success Committee to determine if the May 2012 changes to the regular admissions standards in the Armstrong Catalog should be considered a net increase or decrease in Armstrong’s admissions standards.

B. Budget 2013/2014
i. Status Update for 2013/2014 Budget
A brief up-date of the 2013/2014 department budget status was given by Dr. Lynch. The faculty was again reminded to let Dr. Lynch know about traveling plans as soon as possible.

The department took the time to thank both Dr. Lea Padgett and Ms. Yvonne Roach for the smooth transition regarding the purchasing process transition from Dr. Padgett to Ms. Roach.

ii. USG 2013/2014 lab fee synopsis
The faculty was made aware of the status of the lab fees of the department in comparison with its peers across the State of Georgia. The requests regarding lab fees are normally due in December; therefore, this is something that the department needs to discuss between the months of October and November. For more details, please refer to Attachment #1.

C. Physics Curriculum Items
The Physics Curriculum Committee submitted four items for approval that would modify the Physics program Studies in order to make the program a more efficient one.

**Item #1**
Modify Area F in the program for the Bachelor of Science in Applied Physics by adding PHYS 1111K and 1112K as an option as well as PHYS 2211K, 2212K Principles of Physics I and II. 
Rationale: this will allow students to begin a physics program with either introductory sequence.

**Item #2**
Add an alternate choice for PHYS 3100-Electric Circuit Analysis in the Major Field Courses by PHYS 3100-Electric Circuit Analysis or **ENGR 3100-Circuit Analysis**.
Rationale: This option was available in the past and is being restored.

**Item #3**
Move PHYS 3100-Electric Circuit Analysis or ENGR 3100-Circuit Analysis and PHYS 3120-Digital electronics from their current location in the Major Field Courses into a group of courses to be designated as

Choose one of the following courses:
PHYS 3100-electric Circuit Analysis or ENGR 3100-Circuit Analysis
PHYS 3120-Digital Electronics

**Item #4**
Also, add to the list of Choose Nine to twelve semester hours from the following:

PHYS 3100 or ENGR 3100 (if not previously counted above)
PHYS 3120 (if not previously counted above)

Rationale for 3 & 4: These will insure that a physics major gets exposure to circuits by taking either Digital electronics or Circuits or both by choice. Designating the list to be twelve instead of nine is necessary to get the correct number of hours for the Major Field Courses.

For more details, please refer to Attachment #2.

The faculty voted unanimously in favor of implementing the modification to the Physics Program Studies.

**D. Peer Mentoring Guidelines and Rotation**
Dr. Lynch provided the faculty with information regarding peer mentoring guidelines and rotation in order to vote to adopt one of the cycles.

The first page of the document provides some background that comes from the CST Tenure and Promotion Guidelines.

The second page contains what the department has been mechanically doing recently, which is self-explanatory.

The department voted to adopt a cycle related to the probationary period towards tenure. There were three items to consider.
a. Two faculty members are assigned for the duration of the 6 year probationary period.
b. One faculty member is assigned for the duration of the 6 year probationary period. A second faculty member is assigned on a one (or two year) rotation schedule.
c. Two faculty serve on a two year staggered rotation schedule.

The result of the vote was as follows: 18 votes in favor of adopting item B and 2 votes in favor of adopting item C. Item B was adopted and its implementation will start immediately.

For more details, please refer to Attachment #3.

E. Spring 2014 Course Schedule, Books, etc.
The faculty was informed that the booklist was moved forward and was made aware that the department controls the scheduling of rooms 1407 and 2502 on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays from 12-1pm. Reservation books for these rooms are at your disposal in the department office for your convenience. All you have to do is write your name and the time you will be using the rooms.

F. Chemistry SLO’s
The Chemistry Student Learning Outcomes Draft was presented so that the faculty could vote. Dr. Lynch made it clear that this is a working document that needs to be endorsed now as it is due in the Provost Office by the end of the month. The faculty voted unanimously in favor of endorsing the document.

For more details, please refer to Attachment #4.

G. Tenure and Promotion
The draft of the above document was presented for approval. One important note is that the department chose not to put tenured and promoted faculty into the lecturer, senior lecturer promotion decisions. However, the proposed CST guidelines will include tenured and promoted faculty into the lecturer, senior lecturer promotion decisions as all other departments were in favor of that. Most likely the department will have to revisit the issue in the month of December to modify it if this is included in the CST T&P guidelines.

The faculty voted unanimously in favor of accepting the document as our current Criteria Relating to Tenure and Promotion. For more details, please refer to Attachment #5.

H. Calendar 2013/2014
Dr. Lynch made the faculty aware of where we are heading this coming January. The department has Emeritus nominations due on December 9th. The decision by instructors to convert over to lecture should be out of the department by March 25th because it has to move through the Dean’s and the Provost’s Offices by April 15th.

The reason why it was important to make a decision regarding Peer Mentoring now was because first year retention for Drs. Burroughs, Gray, Guillet and Lea Padgett are due at the Dean’s Office on January 25th and we need to use October and November to begin the cycle for these four faculty.

Dr. Wallace and Mr. Jaynes are up for post-tenure review that will require action by all tenured faculty and this is due on February 1st.
Normal retention this year will only include Dr. Secrest and Ms. Mullenax because Dr. Lea Padgett got bumped up to first year retention.

In January we will be working on first year retention for four people. APAR’s will be due at the end of January. In February we will be working on post-tenure for third year retention for four people as well. Therefore both January and February will be very busy months for us.

IV. Old Business

A- Search Up-date
Dr. Lea Padgett is chairing the Lab Supervisor Search. The rest of this search committee include Drs. Gary Guillet, Jeffery Secrest, Mitch Weiland and Ms. Yvonne Roach. We already have approval to go forward with this search today.

The Organic tenure-track Search is headed by Dr. Brent Feske, who is chairing the search, Drs. Burroughs, Quillian, Wallace and Ms. Carpenter are the members of the committee.

B- Instrumentation Status
All instruments are working fine so far. The Physics Technology Fees Proposal has been submitted. Other technology fee proposals include (Vernier Hand-helds, general chemistry, Spartan, general and organic chemistry, Atomic Absorption, general chemistry and TGA/DSC, upper division chemistry).

V. Announcements

1- On September 19/2013 ten Chemistry and Physics students visited the Liberty Elementary School in Hinesville celebrating Science Night. These students worked with more than 200 elementary students and made slime.

2- ACS Coastal Georgia Section is meeting on October 10/2013 at 6:30pm at the Moon River Brewery. The speaker will be Bill Carroll.

3- ACS Coastal Georgia Section will hold its annual Low Country Boil on October 25/2013 at 6:30pm at the Bamboo Farms.

4- The ACS student chapter will be meeting on Friday 27/2013. They were recognized for the 2012/2013 year as an Honorable Mention SA-ACS chapter by the National ACS.

5- The Pre-Med Club will be meeting Monday, September 30 in room 1405 at 12 midday.

6- Ms. Melinda Dang was accepted to both the University of Alabama-Birmingham Optometry School and the Southern School of Optometry in Memphis Tennessee.

Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 12:57pm.

cc: Dr. Robert Gregerson, Dean, College of Science and Technology
Dr. Delana Nivens, Assistant Dean, College of Science and Technology
### ATTACHMENT #1

#### USG Lab Fee Schedule 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>fee title</th>
<th>amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>Earth sci</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>Chem/biochem intro</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>Chem/biochem upper</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State</td>
<td>chemistry</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State</td>
<td>geosciences</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State</td>
<td>PHYS/ASTR</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Regents Univ</td>
<td>chemistry</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Regents Univ</td>
<td>physics</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia College &amp; State U</td>
<td>science lab</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southern</td>
<td>chemistry</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southern</td>
<td>biochemistry</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southern</td>
<td>PHYS</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southern</td>
<td>GEOL</td>
<td>40/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>chemistry survey</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>chemistry</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>physics</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Georgia</td>
<td>biology/chemistry</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Georgia</td>
<td>PHYS/CS/geosci</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Georgia</td>
<td>GEOL field trip</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus State</td>
<td>chem lab fee</td>
<td>50/credit hr exclude Instr. Anyl.; increase to $75 in F14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Poly</td>
<td>lab fee</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennesaw</td>
<td>chemistry</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennesaw</td>
<td>physics</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Georgia</td>
<td>natural sciences</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdosta</td>
<td>lab science</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>lab fee</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southwestern</td>
<td>Chem lab #1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southwestern</td>
<td>Chem lab #2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southwestern</td>
<td>geology</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Baldwin</td>
<td>chem</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coll of coastal ga</td>
<td>science lab</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville</td>
<td>science lab</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalton</td>
<td>science lab</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA Gwinnett</td>
<td>science lab</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Highlands</td>
<td>chemistry</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Highlands</td>
<td>physics</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle GA</td>
<td>lab fee</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Georgia College</td>
<td>science</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta metropoitan</td>
<td>lab fee</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Valley</td>
<td>chemistry</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darton</td>
<td>lab</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA Perimeter</td>
<td>science lab</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>science</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waycross</td>
<td>science lab</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>all lab courses incl res</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Modify Area F in the PROGRAM FOR THE BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN APPLIED PHYSICS by replacing *PHYS 2211K, 2212K Principles of Physics I, II (Unless taken to satisfy core area D, in which case replace with 8 hours of lower division electives)* with *Choose one of the Sequences PHYS 1111K, 1112K Introductory Physics I, II with the permission of the department head or PHYS 2211K, 2212K Principles of Physics I, II (Unless taken to satisfy core area D, in which case replace with 8 hours of lower division electives)*

Rationale: This will allow students to begin the physics program with either introductory sequence. Such entrance into a physics program is permitted by many colleges and universities.

2. Add an alternate choice for PHYS 3100-Electric Circuit Analysis in the Major Field Courses by PHYS 3100-Electric Circuit Analysis or ENGR 3100-Circuit Analysis

Rationale: This option was available to students in the past and is being restored.

3. Move PHYS 3100-Electric Circuit Analysis or ENGR 3100-Circuit Analysis and PHYS 3120-Digital Electronics from their current location in the Major Field Courses into a group of courses to be designated as

Choose one of the following courses:
PHYS 3100-Electric Circuit Analysis or ENGR 3100-Circuit Analysis
PHYS 3120-Digital Electronics

4. Also, add to the list of Choose Nine to twelve semester hours from the following:

PHYS 3100-Electric Circuit Analysis or ENGR 3100-Circuit Analysis (if not previously counted above)
PHYS 3120-Digital Electronics (if not previously counted above)

Rationale for 3 & 4: These will insure that a physics major gets exposure to circuits by taking either Digital Electronics or Circuits or both by choice. Designating the list to be
twelve instead of nine is necessary to get the correct number of hours for the Major Field Courses.
Peer review of instruction has two primary uses: a) mentoring and b) evaluation. The methods of peer review and peer evaluation will vary according to department, however, each department is expected to develop a peer review and evaluation process. Copies of this departmental process shall be provided to the Dean of the College of Science and Technology and the College Committee on Promotion and Tenure. Departmental criteria are subject to review and approval by the Dean of the College and the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs.

a.) Peer review of instruction for mentoring purposes\(^1\):

Departments must take an active role in the mentoring and professional development of their faculty as quality teachers. Each department must establish specific guidelines for peer review for mentoring purposes that include formalized classroom observation by departmental peers and feedback to the faculty member. These guidelines must be approved by the Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Dean of the College. The department should use a partially standardized format/form developed and subsequently evaluated for effectiveness at least every three years, by the College Tenure and Promotion committee (available from the dean’s office), to submit feedback from classroom teaching observations. Peer review of instruction should be both informal and frequent to allow for multiple sets of formative data to be collected. Peer review for mentoring purposes should occur at least once each semester in a faculty member’s first year, and at least once each year thereafter until tenure is achieved. The mentor, a tenured faculty member in the department other than the department head, must write up a written record of the mentoring review (using the standardized form) which may or may not be entered into the faculty member’s official file at the option of the faculty member being reviewed. If there are no tenured faculty in the department to perform the peer mentoring reviews, a tenured faculty member in a closely related discipline, preferably in the College, may perform this duty for the faculty member until such time as a tenured faculty member becomes available. Any faculty member, at any rank, may, at any time, request from their department head, a peer review for mentoring purposes.

---

\(^1\) Peer Review of Instruction for Mentoring and Peer Review of Instruction for Evaluation are required for tenure-track and permanent full-time faculty and at the discretion of the department head for temporary faculty
Peer Review of Instruction for Mentoring Guidelines - Mechanics

1. Two mentors shall be assigned to each faculty member as an indication of the commitment of the department faculty to excellence in instruction.
2. The assignments will be made with respect to disciplinary expertise as well as other factors which may impact the assignments. The assignments are to be made by the Department Head in consultation with all faculty involved.
3. All department faculty who meet the College of Science and Technology criteria are expected to participate.
4. Mentoring visits are to span both lecture and laboratory as well as different courses (preferably to give a breadth of instructional settings) as the faculty members schedules allow.
5. Peer Mentoring of Teaching is a reciprocal process. Faculty members who are being mentored are encouraged to visit the instructional settings of their mentoring faculty (but are not required too).
6. Feedback is to be given using the College form for Peer Review of Instruction for Mentoring available in the Dean’s office as well as via a memorandum to the faculty member describing the observational visits and perceptions of the faculty interaction.

Rotation Schedule
B. Items related to promotion and post-tenure review: Faculty will be assigned at rank or above and will serve during the application period.
C. For items related to the probationary period towards tenure:
   a. Two faculty members are assigned for the duration of the 6 year probationary period
   b. One faculty member is assigned for the duration of the 6 year probationary period. A second faculty member is assigned on a one (or two year) rotation schedule.
   c. Two faculty serve on a two year staggered rotation schedule.
Attachment #4

Draft – Sept 2013

Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) - BS Chemistry

a) Students will demonstrate proficiency in the core disciplines: analytical, organic, physical, and inorganic chemistry. (*Assessment: ACS disciplinary exams, Major Field Exam*)

b) Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively collaborate in a group setting to complete an assigned task. (*Assessment: Rubric – Group Evaluation w/ SID*)

c) Students will demonstrate proper laboratory practices and be proficient in the theoretical and practical use of modern instrumentation and the ability to analyze and effectively evaluate experimental results using proper safety protocols. (*Assessment: Laboratory courses throughout curriculum, capstone laboratory(?)*)

d) Students will demonstrate critical thinking skills (*Assessment: ??*)

e) Students will demonstrate effective scientific communications skills in both written and oral form. (*Assessment: Rubric – a) Written & b) Oral, used in various courses but capstone in CHEM 4500*)

Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) - BA Chemistry

a) Students will demonstrate proficiency in the core disciplines: analytical, organic, physical, and inorganic chemistry. (*Assessment: ACS disciplinary exams, Major Field Exam*)

b) Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively collaborate in a group setting to complete an assigned task. (*Assessment: Rubric – Group Evaluation w/ SID*)

c) Students will demonstrate proficiency in problem solving by performing a broad variety of analytical, computational and synthetic procedures, using proper safety protocols, and will critically evaluate the results (*Assessment: Laboratory courses throughout curriculum, capstone laboratory(?)*)

d) Students will demonstrate effective written scientific skills. (*Assessment: Written Rubric, used in various courses ??*)
Attachment #5

Department of Chemistry and Physics
Criteria Relating to Tenure and Promotion
(Draft August 2013)

The Department of Chemistry and Physics supports the Mission Statement of Armstrong Atlantic State University and the Philosophy and Goals of the College of Science and Technology, in accordance with University regulations as outlined in the Armstrong Atlantic State University Faculty Handbook. While the major focus of faculty effort and resources is on quality undergraduate instruction, the pursuit and support of scholarly activities are professional obligations of every faculty member, and service is considered a responsibility of employment. Therefore, professional development, through participation in discipline-related scholarship and service, is expected.

Diversity is important to a dynamic and well-rounded department. While quality undergraduate teaching is paramount, the individual faculty member may choose how to allocate resources between scholarship and service providing that satisfactory performance is achieved in all areas. 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. Activity in both scholarship and service is required.

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 Atlantic 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 (here after 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.

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.

**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 faculty member.

In the judgment of the department, scholarship must involve peer review.

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

**Category I**
1. Publishing a book in your professional field
2. Writing a chapter for a book in your professional field
3. Publishing a discipline-related article in a refereed journal
4. Developing and submitting an external proposal which is funded

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

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

**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**
1. Maintaining instrumentation
2. Serving in a university-wide advisory capacity
3. Coordinating Departmental outreach activities
4. Serving as consultant to a school, university, organization or industry
5. Serving as an officer or committee chair for a professional society

**Category II**
1. Serving as faculty advisor for a student organization
2. Regular service in the Advisement Center or other advisement programs
3. Organizing university functions
4. Chairing a university committee
5. Participating in a Departmental outreach activity
6. Serving on a committee of a professional organization

**Category III**
1. Speaking to a school class on a discipline-related topic
2. Serving as consultant to a school, university, organization or industry
3. Chairing a departmental committee
4. Supervision of students in support of the departmental programs

**Category IV**
1. Serving on a university or departmental committee
2. Serving as liaison between Armstrong and community organizations
3. Judging science fairs and other competitions

**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.

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

**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.

**Departmental Procedures**

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 members, 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 (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.

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 members, 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 the College of Science and Technology Peer Review of Instruction for Mentoring Form 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.
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 members, 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 the College of Science and Technology Peer Review of Instruction for Mentoring Form 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.

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.

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 the College of Science and Technology Peer Review of Instruction for Mentoring Form 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.

**Peer Review of Instruction for Mentoring Procedures**

A. The department head, faculty member under evaluation and mentor all agree on the assignment of the mentors.

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 members 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.

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 members 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.

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

B. Records of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service 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 twice 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 Full-Time Temporary Faculty 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 ____  
   Post-tenure review ____

Rating Scale

Lowest  [ 1 ] Severely Deficient  
[ 2 ] Below Average  
[ 3 ] Average  
[ 4 ] Above Average  
Highest  [ 5 ] Outstanding

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 their teaching effective and guide their professional growth? Is the faculty member engaged in disciplinary activities to maintain currency in the discipline to support high quality teaching?

Comments:

2. STUDENT INVOLVEMENT: How do you assess the extent, nature, and value of this colleague’s involvement with students of Armstrong Atlantic State University? Is (s)he considerate and non-abrasive in relations with students?

Comments:
3. SCHOLARSHIP: Does (s)he participate in the peer review process in their academic area of expertise which includes demonstrated outcomes?

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
Comments:

4. PROFESSION 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:

5. SERVICE TO UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY: 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:

6. INTEREST AND INITIATIVE: Does this colleague participate actively and effectively in the identification, discussion, and resolution of problems and issues facing the Department, the College and the University?

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
Comments:

7. PROFESSIONAL BEARING: Is (s)he self-confident and fully professional and collegial in manner and appearance?

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
Comments:

8. DEPENDABILITY: Does (s)he willingly carry a full share of Departmental duties such as committee work, and accomplish related tasks punctually, completely, and without undue prodding?

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
Comments:
9. VERSATILITY: To what extent is (s)he able and willing to teach a wide variety of the Department’s courses - not only in diverse areas, but also at a variety of levels?


Comments:

10. GENERAL EFFECTIVENESS: Compared to other colleagues you have known, and to generally accepted standards of the academic community, how do you appraise his/her performance in terms of value to you as a colleague and/or in terms of overall effectiveness as a member of the faculty of the University and College in general, and the Department of Chemistry and Physics in particular?


Comments: