

## Personnel Committee Rules

These bylaws govern the election and charge of the Personnel Committee. The bylaws were developed in September 2018 by the group of the division heads and the chair. Analytical: Paul Nam; Biochemistry: Nuran Ercal; Inorganic: Jay Switzer; Organic: Lia Sotiriou-Leventis; Physical: Klaus Woelk

Third and Greatly Expanded Draft (version 3.1: 9/25/18, version 3.2: 10/02/18):

**Composition and Election:** The Chemistry Department Personnel Committee shall have 3 members. Committee members shall serve 3-year terms. The committee should include one faculty serving his/her first year on the committee, one faculty serving his/her second year on the committee, and one faculty serving his/her third year on the committee. The faculty member serving his/her third year on the personnel committee shall be the chair of committee.

Each 3-year term starts on August 1 and ends on July 31. Beginning in SP19, one new member will be elected at the end of the spring semester (April or May) and this newly elected faculty will commence committee work on August 1. Only tenured professors can stand for election to the personnel committee. The outgoing chair of the personnel committee is not eligible to stand for immediate reelection. Members are elected by simple majority in secret ballot. Should an election result in a tie, another election will occur until one candidate will win a majority. The results of the elections will be reported in faculty meeting minutes with vote counts specified.

**Creation of the Inaugural Personnel Committee:** The process in FS18 shall include three successive elections: First, a vote of the "chair" who will serve only one year on the inaugural committee. Second, a vote of the faculty member who will serve only two years on the inaugural committee. And finally, third, a vote of the faculty member who will serve a full 3-year term on the inaugural committee.

**Annual Evaluation of Regular Faculty:** It shall be the main charge of the Chemistry Department Personnel Committee to perform a competent and fair annual evaluation of all T/TT and NTT faculty. The annual evaluations are to be performed irrespective as to whether salary raises will or will not be given in any given year. The evaluation will cover the activities in the previous calendar year. The evaluation will be performed at end of the spring semester (April or May). The evaluation will be based on criteria that will be specified by the chair. The criteria will be developed with broad consensus by the faculty, the criteria will be distributed to the faculty, and the criteria will be consistent with expectations in the College and on Campus.

Regular T/TT faculty will be evaluated in three separate categories: Teaching, Research, and Service. The default relative weights of these categories shall be 40% Teaching, 40% Research, and 20% Service. Changes in these relative weights ( $t, r, s$ ) are possible after negotiation with the Chair and with approval by the Dean. Each faculty will receive a score (1 - 4; 1 is low; 4 is high) in each of the three categories; the teaching score  $T$ , the research score  $R$ , and the service score  $S$ . And the overall score  $OS$  will be the weighted average:  $OS = (t \cdot T + r \cdot R + s \cdot S) / 100$ . The personnel committee will be provided a list that shows the relative weights in the categories Teaching, Research, and Service for each faculty member.

The same process will be used for the evaluation of the members of the Personnel Committee. In this case, the evaluation will be performed by the other two members of the committee.

The same process will be used for the evaluation of NTT faculty. However, the relative weights of the categories Teaching, Research, and Service may be greatly different depending on the kind of NTT appointment. For an NTT Teaching Professor, the default relative weights of these categories shall be 80% Teaching and 20% Service. For an NTT Research Professor, the default relative weights of these categories shall be 80% Research and 20% Service. Changes in these relative weights are possible after negotiation with the Chair and with approval by the Dean.

The result of the evaluation in each category will be the assignment of each faculty into one of four groups (1 - 4; 1 is low; 4 is high). Satisfactory performance will lead to the assignment into one of the top three groups. Assignment to the fourth group indicates unsatisfactory performance in that category. An unsatisfactory rating in any of the categories does not need to cause an unsatisfactory overall rating. It is the purpose of this aspect of the evaluation process to identify any emerging problems early so that they can be addressed and resolved. An overall score of  $OS \geq 2$  indicates an overall satisfactory performance.

Assignment into one of the top three groups indicates satisfactory performance and distinctions in these categories are based on the faculty's standing relative to the average of the faculty with satisfying performance. Assignment to group 3 indicates that the faculty's performance met the average of the faculty members with satisfying performances. Assignment to group 4 indicates that the faculty's performance exceeded the average of the faculty members with satisfying performances. Assignment to group 2 indicates that the faculty's performance was satisfying but somewhat below the average of the faculty members with satisfying performances.

Each one of the three personnel committee members shall perform his/her own evaluation of each faculty member. The committee shall record (a) the teaching score  $T$ , the research score  $R$ , and the service score  $S$  assigned by each committee member, (b) the averages and the standard deviations of those scores, and (c) the overall score  $OS$ . A suitable form will be made available by the department office along with a list that shows the relative weights in the categories Teaching, Research, and Service for each faculty member.

Each of the evaluators must provide a brief written justification in each instant of the assignment of a score of "1" or "4". After each committee member will have completed all of the evaluations, the group of evaluators will compute the averages and the standard deviations. Commentary should be provided in cases where the three scores differ significantly.

The chair shall consider the results of the evaluations in salary adjustments and other kinds of resource distributions. The chair will use the written justifications in support of top scores ("4") to argue for raises from special merit pools by the upper administration. The chair will use the written justifications in support of low scores ("1") as a starting point for remediation.

**Triennial Evaluation of Adjunct Faculty:** The Chemistry Department Personnel Committee shall review the status of adjunct faculty appointments in the fall semester (October or November). Every adjunct faculty in his/her third year of his/her current appointment shall be considered for a possible reappointment for three more years. This review includes the requisition of an updated resume, of an update of contact information (affiliation, address, phone number, email address, URL of home page, current portrait), and of an updated list of primary collaborators in the department (faculty, graduate students, undergraduate students, post-doctoral students). The review shall be based on a brief summary of joint activities of the adjunct faculty and personnel of the Department of Chemistry. In most cases, this summary will be written by the adjunct faculty member. In some cases, the summary may be written by the collaborator(s) in the Department of Chemistry.

In a letter to the chair of the department, the chair of the personnel committee shall summarize the results of the review and make a recommendation regarding the continuation of the appointment. The case will be presented to the faculty. The faculty will vote on the recommendation in secret ballot and simple majority is required to continue the appointment. The Chair will write a formal letter to inform the adjunct faculty member of his/her reappointment for another three-year term.

The summary of the results of the review by the personnel committee, the outcome of the vote, and the chair's letter are to be kept on file in the department. HR needs to be informed of the outcome of the review. Departmental records including the departmental web site need to be updated