

OUTLINE OF THE CHARTER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS

- I. Departmental Governance
 - A. Department Chair
 - 1. Term of Appointment
 - 2. Responsibilities
 - (a) Basic Operations
 - (b) Future Direction of the Department
 - 3. Communication of Decisions
 - B. Department Committees
 - 1. Advisory Committee
 - (a) Membership
 - (b) Charge
 - (c) Conflict of Interest
 - 2. Personnel Committee
 - (a) Membership
 - (b) Charge
 - (c) Conflict of Interest
 - 3. Grievance Committee
 - C. Department Meetings
 - 1. General Procedures
 - 2. Voting
 - (a) Voting Constituency
 - (b) Voting Procedures
 - 3. Issues Which Must Be Approved by a Majority of the Faculty
 - D. Hiring of New Faculty and Staff
 - 1. Search for and Selection of New Faculty (other than department chair)
 - 2. Search for and Selection of New Staff
 - 3. Temporary Employees
 - E. Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment
 - 1. Guidelines
 - 2. Approvals
 - F. Departmental Grievance Policy and Procedures
 - 1. Grievable Issues
 - 2. Initiation of the Grievance Process
 - 3. Departmental Grievance Committee
 - (a) Membership
 - (b) Charge

II. Search Procedures for the Department Chair

III. Evaluation, Reappointment, and Early Review of the Department Chair

A. Evaluation

1. Frequency of Evaluation
2. Evaluation Committee
3. Self-evaluation by the Department Chair
4. Distribution of Evaluation Forms
5. Report of the Evaluation Committee
6. Response of the Chair to the Report of the Evaluation Committee
7. Dissemination of the Results of the Evaluation

B. Reappointment

1. Balloting
2. Report of the Dean
3. Disposition of the Reports
4. Implementation of the Results of the Ballot
5. Closure

C. Early Review

1. Procedure

IV. Approval and Amendment of the Charter

A. Approval

B. Amendment Procedures

1. Written Proposal to Advisory Committee
2. Report of Advisory Committee to Faculty
3. Vote

V. Confidentiality

Appendices

- A. Guidelines and Procedures for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment
- B. Faculty Grievance Policy and Procedures
- C. Evaluation Form: Performance of the Department Chair
- D. Search Procedures for the Department Chair

CHARTER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS

As a department within the College of Sciences and Arts of Michigan Technological University, the Department of Physics seeks to support the mission of the University with research activities to enrich and benefit society and with a dedicated commitment to educate the University's students to meet the demands of a changing world. This Charter contains those precepts which its faculty have determined will best allow it to support the mission of MTU. In the event that any of these precepts are in conflict with University policy and procedures, the University policy and procedures will take precedence.

I. Departmental Governance

Governance of the Department of Physics is the shared responsibility of the department chair and the faculty. Departmental meetings are the primary forum for discussion of all governance and policy issues.

Governance of the Department of Physics

A. Department Chair

The chair is the chief executive officer of the department charged with initiating, implementing, and enforcing policy within the department after consultation with the faculty.

1. Term of Appointment

The term of office for the department chair is three years, renewable, as described below. An early review of the department chair can be performed before the expiration of a term by the faculty.

2. Responsibilities

(a) Basic Operations

- General operation of the department
- Chair of department meetings
- Control and maintenance of the departmental budgets
- Ensures faculty are aware of, and are involved in, department budgeting and resource allocation
- Evaluations of faculty and staff
- Facilitates faculty and staff professional development
- Recommends salary increments to the dean
- Maintains records relevant to personnel actions
- Makes teaching assignments and schedules (consistent with faculty determined teaching load guidelines and individual faculty teaching preferences)

- Makes committee assignments as appropriate
- Fund raising (including Alumni Relations)
- Prepares a year-end report for the faculty
- Represents the department to others both on campus and off
- Should be easily accessible to faculty and staff

(b) Future Direction of the Department

- Faculty and staff recruitment and hiring, as described below
- Intra- and interdepartmental interdisciplinary program development
- Graduate and undergraduate scholastic program development
- Prepares long-range planning documents

3. Communication of Decisions

All policy decisions made by the chair will be reported to the faculty in a timely manner and the rationale for those decisions will be communicated to the faculty.

B. Department Committees

The department will have a Personnel Committee, an Advisory Committee and a Grievance Committee with elected membership as described below. Other committees may be formed by, and the membership assigned by the department chair. The purpose of committees should be to ensure adequate faculty input into the operations of the department and to share the work load for tasks which the department desires to accomplish.

1. Advisory Committee

The purpose of the Advisory Committee is to provide advice (either solicited or unsolicited) to the chair and to the faculty as a whole upon issues of importance to the department. The membership of the committee should, to the extent possible, represent the viewpoints of the entire faculty.

(a) Membership

The Advisory Committee consists of six members of the department's voting constituency, excluding the department chair. Four members of the committee will be elected by the entire voting constituency and two members will be appointed by the department chair. The elected members serve 3 year staggered terms and the appointed members one year terms. The committee will elect its chair from the committee's membership. The appointments should be made in a manner to ensure the advisory committee is representative of the faculty.

(b) Charge

The Advisory Committee will act as representatives of the department for discussions, held no less often than annually, with the chair regarding general aspects of budget planning and decisions, space and other resource allocations, teaching assignments, and the determination of merit raises.

The Advisory Committee will review proposed amendments to the charter, as described below.

The Advisory Committee will ensure promotion and tenure guidelines are kept up to date, and will submit proposed changes to the faculty. Changes in the promotion and tenure guidelines require at least a 60% vote of approval from the voting constituency. Year to year changes in the guidelines should reasonably reflect the year to year development of the department.

The Advisory Committee conducts the internal search for a department chair when necessary.

(c) Conflict of Interest

A committee member is expected to withdraw from deliberations of the Advisory Committee if a conflict of interest occurs. Example: a member of the committee is a candidate during an internal search for department chair.

2. Personnel Committee

The Personnel Committee deals with personnel issues involving specific faculty members, including promotion, tenure and reappointment recommendations.

(a) Membership

The Personnel Committee consists of four members elected by the voting constituency for staggered three-year terms. Eligible committee members include all tenured faculty at the associate professor level or above with a 50% or more appointment in the Department of Physics, excluding the department chair and the department's representative on the college promotion and tenure committee. The committee members will elect a committee chair from the committee members.

(b) Charge

Provides recommendations to the department chair concerning:

- The appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion of individual faculty, including appointments with adjunct and emeritus status.
- Evaluations of individual faculty and staff, as appropriate.
- Substantive personnel changes including sabbatical leaves, furloughs, unpaid leaves, and other release from normal faculty duties. A change is substantive if significant department duties or activities will be left uncovered, covered by one or more other faculty members, or covered with temporary employees.
- Potential or alleged conflicts of interest within the department.

Provides recommendations to the Advisory committee concerning improvements to the department's Guidelines and Procedures for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment.

Conducts the evaluations of the department chair, as described below.

(c) Conflict of Interest

Should a faculty member on the personnel committee have an identifiable conflict of interest with a candidate being considered for promotion, and/or tenure, that committee member shall not partake in the deliberations or in the formulation of a recommendation for that candidate. Should this leave less than three committee members available for that particular case, additional personnel committee members will be appointed for that case by the department chair until there are three. It is considered professionally unethical for a committee member to continue participation without disclosing potential conflicts of interest to other members of the committee. Those other members of the committee shall provide advice on whether a conflict of interest exists and shall provide a written summary of the potential conflict and their advice to the department chair before submitting promotion and tenure recommendations.

A conflict of interest is presumed present in cases where there are mutual financial arrangements, legal arrangements, or legal proceedings, where a significant financial or professional impact may result from a tenure/promotion decision. This includes joint research contracts/grants (including those pending) where the result of a tenure/promotion decision may jeopardize the future of any awards, joint investments of any kind where the outcome of a promotion /tenure decision may have a significant financial impact, and scientific misconduct proceedings involving both parties. Collaborations in research and/or teaching are not, by themselves, considered a conflict of interest; however, significant collaborations should be evident within the candidate's promotion and tenure documentation.

3. Grievance Committee

The Grievance Committee is described below (see Departmental Grievance Policy).

C. Department Meetings

In addition to being the primary forum for discussion of all governance and policy issues, the department meeting also provides a key mechanism for communication among the faculty and between the faculty and the department chair.

Department meetings will normally be called by the department chair, but may be called by any faculty member if the need arises.

1. General Procedures

Department meetings will be held at a time and place where it is reasonable to expect all faculty, excluding those out of town, will be able to attend.

An agenda shall be circulated 48 hours prior to the meeting by the individual calling the meeting.

Committee recommendations, reports, or other agenda items which may require a faculty vote, must be distributed to the faculty at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. It is expected that other informational items will also be distributed at least 24 hours before the meeting if available.

Department meetings will be limited to one hour unless extended by a majority vote of the voting constituency.

Meetings can be run in any manner which respects each faculty member's right of input.

2. Voting

(a) Voting Constituency

The voting constituency consists of all tenure and tenure-track faculty with more than a 50% appointment in the department.

(b) Voting Procedures

Voting will normally take place to help decide issues at a department meeting and will automatically be considered advisory (non-binding) if less than 60% of the voting constituency is present. Secret ballots will be used at the request of any faculty member. Proxy or absentee ballots will not be

allowed for votes taken during faculty meetings. Unless explicitly mentioned elsewhere in the charter, a motion will be considered approved by a simple majority of those voting.

[Approved Charter Amendment, 1-2000]

All ballots for departmental votes where the outcome is based on the entire voting constituency, whether or not explicitly mentioned elsewhere in the charter, will include a “neutral” option.

A vote of neutral is considered to be one vote equally spread between all the other alternatives on the ballot.

A neutral vote can be entered in absentia for a faculty member based on a written request from that faculty member received before voting commences provided that an approved absence request form is on file which includes the time during which the vote is taken. Unavoidable travel delays are to be considered to be implicitly included in all cases.

A neutral vote will automatically be entered for faculty currently on an extended off-campus leave which includes the academic term during which the vote is taken unless a written request to the contrary from that faculty member is received by the department before voting commences.

Written requests of any form (including e-mail) will be accepted provided the majority of the department members present are convinced of the request’s intent and authenticity. Should it later be proved that the request was not authentic, the entire vote is invalidated.

[End of Amendment]

3. Issues Which Must Be Approved by a Majority of the Faculty

Changes or implementation of the following must be approved by a majority of the voting constituency. The department chair will normally accept changes approved in this manner. If he decides not to do so, the chair may veto the proposed change and if he does, he must apply a written statement as to the rationale.

- Departmental degree requirements for existing or proposed new degrees
- Establishment of interdepartmental degree programs involving physics
- Addition, deletion or change in the catalog description of courses
- Thesis Defense Protocols
- Teaching Load Guidelines
- Ph.D. Qualifying exam contents and procedures
- Department chair search procedures

D. Hiring of New Faculty and Staff

A goal of the Department of Physics is to attract and employ the best qualified

people for its faculty and staff positions.

The responsibility for recruiting and hiring the best people qualified for faculty and staff positions is shared by the department chair and faculty.

1. Search for and Selection of New Faculty (other than Department Chair)

The department chair will initiate the hiring of a new faculty member by first discussing with the Advisory Committee the research and teaching areas to be considered, and the rank of position to be filled. Recommendations made by the chair and the Advisory Committee shall be open for discussion at a department meeting.

The chair will prepare an ad for the position based on the comments from the Advisory Committee and faculty. Copies of the ad will be circulated to the faculty early enough in the process to allow faculty input. The ad will be placed in appropriate professional journals and publications.

The chair will appoint a Search Committee to make a preliminary selection from the applications received. The final selection of a short list of candidates to be invited for interviews will be made by the Personnel Committee in consultation with the chair.

For each candidate who interviews, the department will vote using a secret ballot on the following question: Is the candidate acceptable or not acceptable? In order to receive an offer, a candidate must be found acceptable by at least 60% of the voting constituency. If more than one candidate is acceptable, a final vote will be taken to determine the preferred candidate from among those found acceptable.

The department chair will make the final selection from those found acceptable and will inform the faculty of the decision and the reasons for the decision.

2. Search for and Selection of New Staff

The department chair will initiate search and selection procedures commensurate with the staff position to be filled and in accord with University policies.

3. Temporary employees

The department chair will initiate search and selection procedures for departmental temporary employees (including student help, instructors, and temporary staff) commensurate with the position to be filled and in accord with University policies.

E. Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment

1. Guidelines

The current guidelines in Appendix A will be utilized, with modification possible by the procedure indicated for the Advisory Committee.

2. Approvals

All recommendations for promotion, tenure and reappointment will require the approval of the Provost, President, and Board of Control.

F. Departmental Faculty Grievance Policy

Grievance procedures outline the steps to be taken by an individual or group of individuals with claims of unfair treatment.

Grievance policy and procedures for faculty have been written by the University Senate for inclusion in the Handbook for Academic Faculty. A copy of the current University grievance policy and procedures is attached as Appendix B. The purpose of this section is to define the departmental grievance committee and to describe its role within the University's grievance procedure.

1. Grievable Issues

Grievable issues are those specified in the University's Grievance Policy.

2. Initiation of the Grievance Policy

If after collegial communication between the department chair and the grievant, the grievance remains unreconciled, the grievant should file a written grievance with the department chair or the dean. This grievance must be filed within thirty work days after the discovery of the event or action that is the basis for the grievance, or thirty work days after the date on which the grievant reasonably should have known of such an event, act, or omission, if that date is later.

The department chair or dean will immediately pass the written grievance on to the departmental Grievance Committee for action.

3. Departmental Grievance Committee

(a) Membership

The Grievance Committee consists of five faculty members elected by a majority vote to serve for staggered terms of three years each. Members of the voting constituency, excluding the department chair, are eligible.

This committee will then follow the University grievance procedure. In order to prevent the possibility that the Grievance Committee might be "stacked" against the grievant, the grievant can challenge the membership of the committee, provided the grievant can identify a conflict of interest with one or more committee members. The unchallenged remainder of the committee will determine with finality the validity of the challenge.

If the committee validates the grievant's claim of conflict of interest with one or more committee members, or if a committee member is unavailable for service, an election must be held to restore the number of committee members to five. Committee members so elected will serve temporarily and only for the grievance which precipitated their election.

The Grievance Committee members will elect a committee chair from among the committee membership.

(b) Charge

The committee is to act on any grievances received in a timely manner and in accord with University policy.

II. Search Procedures for the Department Chair

In the event that a search for department chair is necessary, the Dean of Sciences and Arts, in consultation with the Faculty voting constituency, will decide if the search will be open or internal. Current procedures for open and internal searches are described in Appendix D.

III. Evaluation, Reappointment, and Early Review of the Department Chair

A. Evaluation

This describes an evaluation process for the department chair that will be conducted by an evaluation committee

1. Frequency of Evaluation

The chair shall be evaluated by both faculty and staff. A mini evaluation will be conducted during the fall quarter of the second year of the chair's appointment; a major evaluation shall be conducted during the fall quarter of the terminal year of the chair's appointment.

The purpose of the mini evaluation is to provide feedback to the chair on departmental opinion of progress to date. The major evaluation is used as one part of the reappointment process.

2. Evaluation Committee

The Personnel Committee serves as the evaluation committee for the department chair.

3. Self-evaluation by the Department Chair

In the event of a major evaluation, the chair must prepare a written report to be distributed to all faculty and staff which addresses, but need not be limited to, the following items:

- Progress toward satisfying the charge given the chair by the administration and attainment of departmental goals for the period of the evaluation
- Management of the departmental budget
- Growth and quality of academic programs
- Future needs and directions of the department
- Attempts to improve in problem areas identified in previous evaluations
- Efforts made to address controversial issues within the department

Preparation of this report is optional in the event of a mini evaluation.

The distribution of this report is followed by a meeting of all faculty and staff of the department. The purpose of this meeting is to allow the chair to answer questions and provide clarification about the report.

4. Distribution of the evaluation Forms

The evaluation form to be administered by the evaluation committee for both major and mini evaluations is attached as Appendix C. The dean, chair, faculty or staff may suggest additional questions for inclusion on the evaluation form. Changes to the form require the concurrence of both the chair and the Evaluation Committee. Evaluation forms will be distributed to all faculty and staff of the department and collected by the Evaluation Committee using the senate standard balloting procedures. The faculty and staff will be given one week to return the completed form to the Evaluation Committee.

5. Report of the Evaluation Committee

In the event of a major evaluation, the Evaluation Committee will prepare a report including the following items:

- Tabulation and statistical analysis of the results of the evaluation forms concerning the performance of the department chair in the areas of communication, administrative detail and progress
- Synthesis of the open-ended questions
- Summary statements reviewing the major accomplishments and problem areas of the chair over the period of evaluation
- Comments on progress in problem areas identified in previous evaluation (results of the previous evaluation may be examined in the office of the dean)

Only the first two items need be included in the committee's report in the case of a mini evaluation.

Immediately after the evaluation committee concludes its report, all evaluation forms will be destroyed by the committee.

6. Response of the Chair to the Report of the Evaluation Committee

The Evaluation Committee will give the department chair a copy of its report. The chair must respond in writing to the report of the Evaluation Committee. If the evaluation is conducted during the chair's final year of appointment, the chair's response must include a statement as to whether the chair does or does not seek reappointment.

If the evaluation is conducted during the chair's final year of appointment and the chair decides not to seek reappointment, then the processes of evaluation and reappointment are terminated. Subsequently, the faculty and staff of the department will be informed by the Evaluation Committee of the chair's decision not to seek reappointment, and all material related to this evaluation will be destroyed.

7. Dissemination of the Results of the Evaluation

The committee will arrange a closed meeting for all faculty and staff of the department. Copies of the report of the Evaluation Committee and the response of

the chair will be circulated at the meeting. These copies will not be taken outside the meeting room. The purpose of the meeting is for the dissemination of the evaluation material and not for discussion of the chair's performance.

In the case of a mini evaluation, all but one copy of the committee's report and the chair's response will be destroyed. A file consisting of the report of the Evaluation Committee and the response of the chair will be kept in the office of the departmental coordinator, where it may be inspected at any time by faculty and staff.

In the case of a major evaluation, all but two copies of the committee's report and the chair's response will be destroyed. One copy of the report of the Evaluation Committee and the response of the chair will be kept in the office of the dean where it may be inspected by faculty and staff at any time during the reappointment process. The second copy of the committee's report and chair's response becomes part of the file the dean forwards to the provost.

B. Reappointment

This section describes the procedures to be employed in the event that the department chair decides to seek reappointment for an additional three years during the last year of the current appointment.

1. Balloting

The question of reappointment of the chair will be put to a vote. Ballots shall be distributed to all members of the department's voting constituency, excluding the chair, and collected by the Evaluation Committee using the senate's standard balloting procedures. The ballot shall consist of the following statement and three possible responses:

(Name of chair) should be reappointed for three years as the Chair of the Department of Physics.

Yes No Undecided

The Evaluation Committee will inform all faculty and staff of the ballot results.

Two identical files of the report of the evaluation committee, the response of the chair, and the results of the ballot will be forwarded to the dean.

2. Report of the Dean

The dean will prepare a written statement on the strengths and weaknesses of the department chair. The report will include, but not be limited to, the following items:

- Guidance and management of the quality and growth of the academic programs within the department.
- Guidance and support of research activities within the department
- Practice of sound financial management within the department
- Management and guidance of personnel within the department
- Definition of goals for the department and progress of the department toward these established goals
- The dean's recommendation regarding the reappointment of the department chair

The distribution of this report is followed by a meeting of all faculty and staff to allow the dean to answer questions and provide clarification about the report.

3. Disposition of Reports

The dean will store in his or her office a file consisting of the report of the Evaluation Committee, the response of the chair, the results of the ballot, and the report of the dean. This file will be supplied to the next Evaluation Committee in case of reappointment. Once the department chair moves to a different position, the file is destroyed.

A second file, identical to that described in the previous paragraph, will be forwarded by the dean to the provost. This file will be disposed of as per the decision of the administration.

4. Implementation of the Results of the Ballot

A simple "YES" majority of the voting constituency is required to recommend reappointment of the chair. Likewise a simple "NO" majority of the voting constituency is required to recommend that the chair not be reappointed.

In the absence of a simple majority of the voting constituency, the larger of either "YES" or "NO" shall be the governing criterion. Reappointment of the chair requires the approval of the Dean, Provost and President. There is no limit on the number of three year terms a chair may serve. If the administration decides contrary to the simple majority of the cast vote, the Dean is required to explain the reasons for that decision in writing to the faculty and staff of the department.

5. Closure

In the case of a major evaluation, the Evaluation Committee will inform the senate that the evaluation and reappointment processes have been concluded and offer any recommendations for changes in these processes that the committee deems necessary.

C. Early Review

An Early Review of the chair may be performed for malfeasance in office.

1. Procedure

Initiation of an early review requires a written and signed petition by at least 40% of the faculty voting constituency. The petition must be presented to the Advisory Committee. Upon receipt of such a petition, the Advisory Committee informs the chair of the petition and asks the petitioners to present a signed bill of particulars. Unless such a bill of particulars is presented, within 5 working days, the process ends without further action. If the petitioners present a signed bill of particulars to the Advisory Committee, the committee forwards a copy to the chair and asks for a written rebuttal within ten working days. The committee advises the voting constituency that a possible early review procedure is pending. At the end of this period, the committee circulates the bill of particulars and the rebuttal to the voting constituency and sets a date for a department meeting. If the chair does not file a rebuttal, the process continues without this document. After discussion at a department meeting, the faculty votes whether or not to commence an early review for reappointment of the chair. The chair may not cast a vote. If 2/3 of the voting constituency, excluding the chair, vote to commence an early review, the Advisory Committee submits the results of the vote and all pertinent documents to the dean, and asks him or her to initiate the review process.

IV. Approval and Amendment of the Charter.

A. Approval

Approval of a Charter for the Department of Physics requires a simple majority vote of the department's voting constituency.

B. Amendment Procedure

1. Written Proposals to Advisory Committee

Amendments to the charter may be initiated by any member of the department's voting constituency. The process begins with a written proposal submitted to the Advisory Committee

2. Report of Advisory Committee to Faculty

The Advisory Committee will review the proposed amendment and prepare and distribute to all faculty a report which includes.

- A copy of the original proposal
- Comments concerning possible ramifications of the proposal
- The precise language of the proposed amendment as modified by the proposer after consultation with the Advisory Committee
- An alternative of the proposed amendment formulated by the Advisory Committee, should the Advisory Committee deem it desirable

3. Vote

Proposed amendments shall be placed on the agenda of the first department meeting that occurs more than 24 hours after the report of the Advisory Committee has been distributed to the faculty.

Approval of an amendment to the Charter of the Department of Physics requires a 2/3 majority vote of the department's voting constituency.

Upon approval by the Department of Physics, the amendment shall be forwarded in accordance with University policy. Additionally, all amendments will require approval by the Provost and President.

V. Confidentiality

Confidentiality will be protected except insofar as such disclosure may be required by law.

Appendices

- A. Guidelines and Procedures for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment
- B. Faculty Grievance Policy and Procedures
- C. Evaluation Form: Performance of the Department Chair
- D. Search Procedures for the Department Chair

The appendices are current versions of documents. Future changes in these documents are not considered a change to the Charter.

Appendix A

GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION, TENURE, AND REAPPOINTMENT Department of Physics Michigan Technological University

I. Introduction

Untenured faculty have finite term appointments (2 years, renewable) during which time progress toward tenure is monitored by the department. Untenured faculty making sufficient progress towards a positive tenure recommendation from the department, as outlined in these guidelines, can expect the department to make a positive recommendation for reappointment until such time as tenure is granted or they reach the University mandated deadline for a tenure decision (during the sixth year at MTU for assistant professors, the fourth year for Associate professors, and during the second year for professors). The procedure for reappointment recommendations is contained in appendix A.6.

The criteria for promotion (to the rank of Associate or Full Professor) and/or tenure described herein are deemed appropriate guidelines for the Department of Physics. They are indicative of the professional development that should be achieved by a person to be worthy of promotion and/or tenure. These criteria attempt to be sufficiently definite to minimize the possibility of arbitrary or discriminatory application, yet contain sufficient flexibility that frequent exceptions should be unnecessary. It should be understood that tenure and promotion decisions require careful evaluation of all the facts available and ultimately result in the use of judgment by the individuals involved. The criteria contained herein do not constitute a check list for promotion and tenure.

Ultimately, each academic faculty member, through individual conferences with the department chair, and members of the departmental Personnel Committee,¹ should know the level of development necessary before promotion and/or tenure will be granted. The reappointment procedures, yearly merit reviews, raises, student and peer evaluations of teaching performance, all provide regular opportunities for detailed evaluation, that should leave the candidate in little or no doubt as to his/her progress.

It is recommended that at least one member of the Personnel Committee have first hand knowledge of the candidate's teaching performance (e.g., by classroom observation), and research performance, at least to the extent of being aware of who some of the major performers are in the subfield(s) of physics relevant to the candidate's research (so as to be able to suggest names of outside evaluators).

Certain things are common to those seeking promotion and/or tenure:

¹ Details of the procedures regarding conflict of interest for the Physics Personnel Committee are in Appendix A.5 and section I.B.2.(c) of the Charter.

1. There are three broad areas in which performance is evaluated. They are teaching, research and scholarship, and service. Achieving a reasonable balance between these activities is important.
2. They must possess a doctoral degree or equivalent in their discipline.
3. Evidence of good teaching is required of all candidates for promotion and/or tenure.
4. For all seeking promotion, five outside letters will be solicited (see Appendix A.2) from professionals who are qualified to evaluate their work. To the extent possible, professionals who, by the nature of their own work, should be familiar with the work of the candidate will be used. These letters will be given considerable weight in evaluating the candidate.

II. Recommendation for Tenure/Promotion

Preamble

The recommendation for tenure is one of the most important decisions a department reaches. It therefore requires great care. Guidelines are provided by the University (through the "Faculty Handbook" and "Procedures Manual") and the College (through its own document). The more specific guidelines presented here recognize the strong research emphasis in the Physics department. The department hires only faculty members whom it expects to be able to recommend for tenure. It will do what it can to help non-tenured faculty members achieve the necessary performance levels. It will normally take 6 years for a beginning faculty member to have achievements appropriate for promotion to associate professor, and at least an additional 4 years for an associate professor to have achievements appropriate for promotion to professor.

Standards and Criteria

1. Teaching

Good teaching is required for tenure and promotion. Quality of teaching will be evaluated using a broad range of inputs, as outlined in Appendix A.1, which contribute to the candidate's complete teaching record.

Any apparent deficiencies in the quality of a candidate's teaching should be addressed in some way. Evidence of unwillingness of a candidate to try to improve major deficiencies in quality of teaching can be grounds for not granting tenure or promotion.

Candidates with deficiencies in their research record may be required to give evidence of superior teaching and superior service. Evidence of outstanding teaching is discussed in Appendix A.1. Whether the quality of a candidate's teaching performance is sufficient to make up for deficiencies in the candidate's research record is a judgment made by the Personnel Committee.

2. Research and Scholarship.

Specific criteria for judging research effort are given in Appendix A.3 for tenure at associate (Level 1) and full Professor (Level 2) levels. General criteria are given below.

External Visibility

It is expected that some of the major figures in the candidate's research field will be aware of the candidate's work, and will judge it to be substantive and of high quality.

Funding

The department will try to nurture the development of the candidate's professional stature by reducing teaching duties, providing graduate student support, providing matching funds, etc. However, the responsibility for obtaining funding for the research group on a continuing basis lies principally with the candidate. Ideally, this funding would include full support for the candidate's graduate students, for operational expenses (including computer maintenance, laboratory consumables, etc.), hardware upgrades, etc. The absence of major² efforts by the candidate to obtain this funding is grounds for not granting tenure.

Evidence of Research Independence

- Sole authorship or authorship with students and/or postdocs of refereed publications,
- sole direction of graduate theses
- principal investigator on contracts

3. Service.

The amount of service expected will increase with time and experience. Candidates for tenure at the associate professor level will be expected to have actively participated in departmental committees, and to contribute in carrying out the general responsibilities of the department, efficiently and competently executing assignments given.

Candidates for full professor are expected to provide a higher level of service, which may be evidenced by participation in college and university committees, construction and design of new programs within the department that require major time commitments, and the like.

2 Major Efforts are of a sustained, numerous (more than 1/year over a multiple-year period) type, well supported by refereed papers, outside professional talks, visits to funding agencies, etc., and responsive (to the scientific comments made by reviewers of the proposals). Moreover, if a particular proposed program has failed to gain funding support after a few attempts, new programs should be proposed. Evidence (referees' reviews, written comments from the agency involved) that proposals have come "very close" to being funded would be considered favorably in this regard.

Additional items upon which Service will be judged for all ranks is given in Appendix A.4.

III. Appointment/Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor Without Tenure

Candidates will be expected to satisfy the basic requirements for tenured Associate Professors. The main distinction is that tenured Associate Professors will be expected to have provided evidence of performance at MTU over a period of several years.

IV. Appointment/Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor Without Tenure

Generally these appointments would be made to senior faculty who recently joined or soon will be joining the MTU physics faculty. They would be expected to have the attributes of Physics Department tenured full Professors. The main distinction between the two would be how they have performed at MTU (external funding, teaching performance, and service).

V. Application for promotion/tenure

Candidates in the year for mandatory tenure decision will automatically be considered candidates for tenure (and in the case of assistant professors, also for promotion to associate professor). In other cases, candidates who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure will notify the department Personnel Committee in a timely manner (see appendix A.5). The Personnel Committee may, with the consent of the candidate, initiate the promotion and/or tenure process. Candidates who are not in a mandatory year are encouraged to consult with the Personnel Committee and/or the department chair about the advisability of proceeding before pursuing promotion and/or tenure. Candidates not in their mandatory year may withdraw their application at any time.

Candidates will supply the necessary information to the committee as outlined in this document and in a manner consistent with the College and University procedures. Candidates are encouraged to seek advice as how best to present their case, however the ultimate responsibility for the documentation rests with the candidate.

The names of those applying for promotion and/or tenure will not be considered confidential information.

VI. Appeals

The appeal of promotion/tenure/reappointments is handled by procedures set by the University as outlined in the University's Faculty Handbook and other documentation.

APPENDIX A.1

Evidence of Good to Superior Teaching:

The following inputs are used to make judgments of the overall teaching quality of all candidates for tenure or promotion:

- i. Student evaluations. The candidate's averages should not be significantly below the departmental averages for the type of course (service, undergraduate major, graduate, etc.) considered. In addition to the required numerical summaries, extracted written comments from students can be supplied.*
- ii. Peer (departmental) evaluations, which should show good teaching.
- iii. Overall teaching load, taking into account new preparations.
- iv. Design of new courses/innovation in course content. Innovative teaching methods. Instructional innovations outside the classroom.
- v. Accessibility to students.
- vi. Successful generation of outside funds or grants in kind to improve the teaching program.
- vii. Effective supervision of graduate students. If no graduate students have been supervised, the candidate should comment on the reasons.

Evidence of Outstanding Teaching

Evidence of outstanding teaching will generally include:

- i. State or national recognition of teaching excellence. Such will be judged in part with outside letters of recommendation, solicited according to Appendix A.2.
- ii. Awards recognizing outstanding instructional activities.
- iii. Scholarly activity beyond quality classroom instruction and normal course development. Such activity can be judged using the criteria for quality research activities as outlined in Appendix A.3.

Other evidence may include:

- i. Textbooks produced for major publishers (including reviews and/or a list of institutions that have adopted the book).
- ii. Pedagogical articles written for refereed journals.
- iii. Holding state or national office in teaching societies.
- iv. Professional production of instructional materials such as software, videos, etc. enjoying a national distribution.

* By supplying extracted, written comments from students, the candidate agrees to allow the personnel committee to verify such comments by inspection of the original documents from which the comments were extracted. Comments that cannot be verified or are misrepresented by the candidate will be removed from the record. Verification by the Personnel Committee is not required.

APPENDIX A.2

Letters of Recommendation

1. Five letters will be solicited from outside professionals by the department chair, who will use a standard cover letter, placed in the candidate's file. The focus of this letter should be to evaluate the candidate's contribution to their field of Physics.
2. The list of five names will be developed by the chair taken in approximately equal measure from separate lists, each with five or more names, supplied by the candidate and from the departmental Personnel Committee. Brief sketches, provided by the recommending party, of each outside referee, including any scientific or personal relationships to the candidate, should be provided. Neither thesis nor postdoctoral advisors of the candidate are permitted by the college.
3. Candidates may review the list of names supplied by the Personnel Committee before the department chair chooses five names and solicits letters. Candidates may veto certain names from the list for reasons of personality conflict or incompetence in the candidate's field. The candidate must provide a written explanation of his or her objections to the department chair.
4. Requests for outside letters will be made early enough so that responses indicating an inability by the evaluator to properly assess the candidate can be replaced by others (chosen in the same way as those on the original list). In the event the second attempt is also unsuccessful, a reduced number of letters may be used, though never fewer than three.

Candidates should be aware that quality letters from leaders in the appropriate sub-field of physics who are not current or past collaborators will be considered more positively than from professionals who are or have been collaborators.

APPENDIX A.3

Evidence of Research Ability

All candidates are expected to keep up-to-date in their field, and attend national and regional, scientific (or technical) conferences or workshops. In addition, the following items will be specifically considered:

Level 1 (Tenured Associate Professor)

1. Regular reviewer for mainstream journals in the candidate's subfield. (Candidates should be prepared to document their reviewing activities.)
2. External funding, or in its absence, a demonstration that there is an excellent chance such support will be forthcoming.
3. Publications in refereed journals of national or international importance. A minimum of 1 or 2 a year, on average, is expected. Conference proceedings may not be as highly valued. Candidates with a smaller number of publications would need to provide evidence (through awards, citations, or reference letters) that the papers were excellent contributions to the field. In addition to the number of papers, the number of authors, other than collaborating students or postdocs, will be taken into account.
4. Graduate degrees awarded.
5. Regular reviewer for funding agencies.
6. Talks given at national and international scientific or technical conferences and invited seminars and colloquia at institutions.
7. Scientific citations. Usually the successful candidate will have around 10 or more citations per year to previously published work (excluding self-citations), as listed in the Citation index. Scientific citations of all papers will be considered, regardless of whether the candidate was first author or not. The candidate is responsible for providing a list of citations in a concise and readable format.

The exact number of citations is strongly dependent on the particular field. However, 0 or 1 per year for several years is always low and 30 or more per year is high.

8. Solicited letters from external reviewers (see Appendix 2).

(Items 1, 4, and 5 are not required, but will normally be present for a successful candidate)

Level 2 (Tenured Full Professor)

A full professor has matured professionally, has made a significant contribution to their field, and has earned their colleague's respect for her or his overall research program and for her or him as a physicist. Evidence of this can be seen in that the items for Level 1 shall be more thoroughly attained and sustained over a period of time sufficient to conclude that continued successful, quality scholarly work can be expected (normally this would be four or more years after promotion to Associate Professor), and in addition, evidence of some of the following would be expected:

1. Evidence of sustained external funding, currently active or in the recent past (required).
2. Editor of a scientific or technical journal.
3. Fellowships, awards for scientific or technical merit or service, etc.
4. Invited talks at national or international conferences, invited contributions for published works such as books or review articles.
5. Organization for National or International Conferences.
6. Election to national or international offices in professional organizations and continued service to those organizations.
7. Scholarly books authored or edited.
8. Other national citations of quality work.
9. Other scholarly accomplishments considered by the Personnel Committee to be equivalent to the above.

In each case the Personnel Committee will make a judgment as to the quality of the above contributions.

APPENDIX A.4

Evidence of Service

A faculty member is expected to carry out departmental service responsibilities in a willing, efficient and competent manner. In evaluating service, the following items also will be considered:

1. Active participation on departmental, college and/or university committees.
2. Advising of undergraduate and/or graduate students.
3. Professional community contributions, such as serving as science advisor to local public schools, etc.
4. Service on M.S. and Ph.D. thesis committees, other than as advisor.
5. Advisor to student groups or organizations, service on their committees, at MTU, state-wide and nationally.
6. Speaking at departmental colloquia and seminars.
7. Successful efforts to recruit and retain students, both undergraduate and graduate, are important to the department and should be documented by the candidate.

Note that in this context, professional service related to the candidate's research (consulting, reviewer for journals, etc.) is considered as part of research (see appendix A.3).

APPENDIX A.5

Physics Personnel Committee

The selection process for the Personnel Committee is contained in the department charter.

The Personnel Committee is expected to keep the deliberations and recommendations of promotion, tenure, and reappointment cases confidential. In the event the department chair intends to make a recommendation that differs from that of the Personnel Committee, the department chair is expected to discuss the case with the Personnel Committee before submitting their recommendation. The department chair is responsible for notifying the candidate of the department chair's recommendation to the dean. Such notification, made in writing, will inform the candidate that the chair has chosen one of the three following options:

- i) strongly recommend tenure/promotion
- ii) recommend tenure/promotion
- iii) not recommend tenure/promotion.

The Personnel Committee will annually set departmental deadlines for the promotion and tenure process that allow sufficient time for potential applicants to respond and allow sufficient time for the committee to act on all applications. The committee may refuse additional applications and/or additional information about an application if received after those deadlines, but is encouraged to be as flexible as the constraints of the promotion and tenure process will allow.

The Personnel Committee may seek additional information of any kind as it feels is warranted for any case being considered, and will accept unsolicited input from any individual or group of individuals that chooses to provide that information. Should that information have any impact on the committee's recommendation, the details of that information (preferably in the form of the original documentation) will be provided within or along with the committee's recommendation.

Personnel Committee Conflict of Interests

Should a faculty member on the Personnel Committee have an identifiable conflict of interest with a candidate being considered for promotion and/or tenure, that committee member will not partake in the deliberations or in the formulation of a recommendation for that candidate. Should this leave less than three committee members available for that particular case, additional Personnel Committee members will be appointed for that case by the department chair until there are three. It is considered professionally unethical for a committee member to continue participation without disclosing potential conflicts of interest to other members of the committee. Those other members of the committee will provide advice on whether a conflict of interest exists, and will provide a written summary of the potential conflict and their advice, to the department chair before submitting promotion and tenure recommendations.

Conflict of interest shall include mutual financial arrangements, legal arrangements, or legal proceedings, where a significant financial or professional impact may result from a tenure/promotion decision. This includes joint research contracts/grants (including those pending) where the result of a tenure/promotion decision may jeopardize the future of any awards, joint investments of any kind where the outcome of a promotion/tenure decision may

have a significant financial impact, and scientific misconduct proceedings involving both parties. Collaborations in research and/or teaching are not, by themselves, considered a conflict of interest, however significant collaborations should be evident within the candidate's promotion and tenure file.

APPENDIX A.6

Reappointments of untenured faculty

Untenured faculty (in tenurable positions) have finite term appointments (2 years). Each year the Personnel Committee will review the faculty member's progress toward tenure and will supply a written recommendation regarding the faculty member's progress and the advisability of future reappointments to the department chair. The department chair will use this input, along with any other data available, to make a recommendation to the dean and to provide feedback to the faculty member that should specifically address areas where the faculty member needs to improve.

The Personnel Committee will use the available evidence (e.g., faculty service reports, faculty vita updates, student and peer teaching evaluations, and any other information they feel appropriate) when making their recommendation. External letters are not solicited for these reviews.

In the event the Personnel Committee concludes the faculty member is not making sufficient progress and that a positive tenure recommendation cannot realistically be expected to be made in the future, a recommendation will be made that the appointment be terminated. (If that recommendation is accepted, the year following the review will be the faculty member's terminal year at MTU.) Otherwise, a continuation of the appointment will be recommended.

Appendix B

The University Senate of Michigan Technological University

PROPOSAL 13-95

FACULTY GRIEVANCE POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Faculty Grievance Procedures

It is the policy of Michigan Technological University to have an effective procedure for reviewing and resolving faculty grievances. That procedure is described here.

Grievable Issues

A grievance is a complaint alleging a misinterpretation, incorrect application, or violation of a policy, procedure, or practice of the University, not pursuable by the faculty member in some other forum. Some examples of "grievable issues" are the following: the application of policy, salary levels or salary adjustments, teaching loads or workload, reprisals, academic freedom, facilities or space, and sanctions. The following issues are non-grievable under this procedure:

1. determination of policy, which is the domain of the governance system;
2. promotion and tenure actions, which have their own appeal procedure;
3. items falling within the jurisdiction of other University appeal procedures, such as discriminatory actions, scientific misconduct, and Equal Employment Opportunity complaints.

Collegial Communications

Most faculty concerns or complaints can be resolved informally through normal collegial communications. Accordingly, faculty members are encouraged to take their complaints to their relevant supervisor in the normal spirit of faculty problem solving. If this does not lead to a mutually satisfactory outcome, the faculty member may pursue the issue through the procedural steps below.

Department or division heads or chairs, deans or directors, and other administrative faculty shall assist the faculty member in the processing of the grievance.

Grievance Committees

1. Each department shall formulate a grievance process in its charter. It shall include a means for filing grievances with the Department Chair or School Dean, a committee of peers to review grievances, and appropriate forms to keep a written record. The charter's process shall be consistent with the provisions for timeliness as set forth below.
2. The University Senate shall establish a standing, university-wide Faculty Review Committee to be composed of the following persons:
 - a. Chair: The University Ombudsperson.
 - b. Two members, not from the same department, elected in the order of their plurality of the votes of the faculty at large. The election is to be run by the Senate. For the first election, the highest vote-getter shall have a term of three years and the next highest shall have a two-year term. As those terms expire, members shall be elected to three-year terms.

The Faculty Review Committee shall be responsible for writing and maintaining appropriate forms and procedures for Steps Two through Five, as well as conducting duties specified in Step Three (below). The Faculty Review Committee shall submit to the Senate an annual report of the year's activities at the end of each academic year. The report should include a summary of the number of grievances filed, resolved, appealed, etc., from the department level through the Appeal Panel.

3. A human resources staff member will be appointed to serve as a resource person on each grievance committee. This person will initially provide training services to the committee and will be on call for future deliberations at the request of the committee chair.

4. If the grievance is not resolved by Step Five (below), the Executive Vice President and Provost shall establish an Appeal Panel on a case by case basis. An Appeal Panel shall consist of three persons. The aggrieved faculty member and the original supervisor shall each select one faculty member from the University. These two persons shall choose a third University faculty member, who shall then serve the three-member panel as its chair. None of these faculty panel members shall currently be serving as an administrator; none shall have had any prior involvement in the grievance.

The Grievance Procedure

Step One: If the grievance cannot be reconciled by collegial discussions with the relevant supervisor, the grievant shall file a grievance in writing with the Department Chair or School Dean. The grievance shall be filed within thirty (30) work days after discovery of the event, action, or omission that is the basis for the grievance, or thirty (30) work days after the date on which the grievant reasonably should have known of such an event, act, or omission, if that date is later. (In cases where a basis for the grievance is an alleged historical pattern of inequity, the thirty work days shall commence after an identifiable action, event, or omission related to that pattern, or the date on which the grievant reasonably should have known of such an event, act, or omission, if that date is later.) No grievance need be accepted for processing under this procedure unless a written grievance is provided to the Department Chair or School Dean within this thirty (30) day period.

The Department Chair or School Dean will pass the written materials on to the departmental grievance committee for action. Within a time period of thirty (30) work days, that committee must notify in writing the grievant, the relevant supervisor, and the Department Chair or School Dean of its decision.

Step Two: If the department committee agrees with the supervisor, the grievant has the right to request an appeal. This request for appeal must be submitted directly to the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee in writing within five (5) work days after receipt of written notification of the department committee decision. The appeal petition will set forth in detail the nature of the grievance, state against whom the grievance is directed, and include any factual data which the petitioner deems pertinent to the case. The chair of the Faculty Review Committee shall immediately notify the supervisor and the chair of the department grievance committee of the receipt of a request for appeal.

If the department committee disagrees with the supervisor, the committee chair shall notify the supervisor in writing of the committee's decision, and shall refer the grievance to the University Faculty Review Committee. This will be done within five (5) work days after the department committee makes its decision.

Adequate time shall be allowed for the faculty member to file an appeal with the University Faculty Review Committee under circumstances where the faculty member's ability to file has been delayed by lateness or failure to supply documentation on the part of the supervisor, Department Chair or School Dean, or department committee. Discretion in this regard shall be exercised by the University Faculty Review Committee.

Step Three: The Faculty Review Committee shall decide on all grievances submitted to it within thirty (30) work days from receipt from the departmental level in Step Two. The grievant, the grievant's relevant supervisor, the Department Chair or School Dean, and the next higher level administrator shall be notified of the Committee's decision in writing.

It is the duty of this committee to decide if the grievance shall be passed on to the higher administration level of Step Four, or shall be stopped at this point. All such decisions are final. The Faculty Review Committee shall ask the relevant supervisor and the committee of peers to come forward with evidence to support their decisions within the time limits set for this review.

The Faculty Review Committee shall be responsible for making its decision in light of five questions:

- (1) Does the grievance fall into the list of grievable issues in section A.1 above?
- (2) Does the grieved issue have a substantial impact on the faculty member? The impact shall be on the individual faculty member, not simply on general policy or educational philosophy. It shall be up to the Faculty Review Committee to decide what is a "substantial impact," but the Committee should consider how important the grieved issue is to the long-term roles of a faculty member in teaching, research, and service, and to the rights and responsibilities embodied in academic freedom. Salary increments shall be considered to be an issue of substantial impact if there is alleged to be a record of cumulative (historical) inequities.
- (3) Does the evidence presented to the Committee support the existence of a grievable cause of substantial impact?
- (4) Was the grievance handled according to the processes set up by the departmental charter and/or this grievance procedure?
- (5) Is there new evidence not reasonably available at prior steps?

An appeal should be passed on to Step Four if

- a. the issue is grievable, it has substantial impact, and there is supporting evidence; or,
- b. the issue is grievable, there is supporting evidence, and the handling of the grievance deviated in a non-trivial manner from proper procedure.

The Faculty Review Committee may consider paths of conciliation and mediation, including ones utilizing its chair, the Ombudsperson, when all parties are willing to undertake mediation or when the Committee decides that the criteria for continuing a formal appeal have not been met.

Step Four. The Step Four administrator shall be the next direct level of University administration, normally College Dean but in some cases the Executive Vice President and Provost, depending on the reporting structure in a given unit. If the latter structure is the case, the procedure passes to Step Five below.

Following receipt of written notification, the Step Four administrator or acting administrator shall meet with the faculty member within five (5) work days. The Step Four administrator may request the relevant supervisor to be present; the faculty member may similarly request that a representative of his or her choice be present. The Step Four administrator shall give the faculty member a written response within five (5) work days after the meeting. The Step Four administrator may reach a written, mutually agreed resolution with the grievant, in which case the grievance process is closed.

Step Five. If the fourth step written response is not accepted by the faculty member, the faculty member shall send written notification to the Step Four administrator within five (5) work days indicating the desire to advance the grievance; the Step Four administrator will forward immediately one copy of the grievance to the Step Five administrator, the Executive Vice President and Provost. The Executive Vice President and Provost, or an appropriate designee, shall contact the faculty member within seven (7) work days to acknowledge receipt of the Step Five grievance.

The Executive Vice President and Provost may reach a written, mutually agreed resolution with the grievant. If no written agreement is reached within five (5) work days after acknowledgment of receipt, the Executive Vice President and Provost shall form an Appeal Panel within ten (10) work days after acknowledgment of receipt.

The Appeal Panel will review the grievance, will interview the principals, and may conduct other such investigations or hearings as appropriate. Every reasonable effort will be made to assure that the Appeal Panel hearing will be held within thirty (30) work days of the receipt of the request by the Executive Vice President and Provost. The panel shall submit its decision in writing to the President and the grievant within thirty (30) after the close of the hearing.

Panel Findings: The Appeal Panel will make a recommendation to the President on its findings and the President's decision will be final. When the President reaches a decision, he/she shall notify the Appeal Panel and the University Faculty Review Committee in writing of the decision.

Other Concerns and Definitions

1. In cases where off-campus faculty are involved in a grievance and telephone or e-mail resolution is unsuccessful, travel to Houghton or to other non-work locations may be required in the resolution of the grievance. The faculty member whose grievance continues past Step Three shall have all related costs of travel paid by the University.
2. All costs of legal counsel employed by the grievant shall be borne by the grievant.
3. "Work days" as used in this procedure include the days Monday through Friday only, and only when those days are not University holidays.
4. Time limits are subject to extension by written agreement of both parties; the grievant and the administrator or committee chair involved at that particular step of the discussion shall be makers of such agreement.
5. Failure of a supervisor, administrator, or committee to respond to a grievance in a timely fashion shall qualify the grievance to be advanced to the next step. The faculty member shall bear the responsibility for filing at the next level. In addition, the appeal panel may consider non-trivial failures by supervisors, administrators, or committees to conform to procedures in formulating the appeal panel's final decision.
6. Failure of the faculty member to meet filing deadlines may be cause for refusal by the administration to consider any grievance.
7. Upon resolution of a faculty grievance, the written record will not be disseminated to third parties, except to the extent that such dissemination may be required by law.
8. In all instances the count of days in this document shall begin the work day after the indicated event or action.

Adopted by Senate: April 5, 1995

Approved by President (with modifications): November 1, 1995

Adopted by Senate (with clarification): March 6, 1996

Approved by President: March 1996

The University Senate of Michigan Technological University

PROPOSAL 34-95 GRIEVANCE POLICY STATEMENT

It is the policy of Michigan Technological University to have an effective procedure for reviewing and resolving faculty grievances. A grievance is a complaint alleging a misinterpretation, incorrect application, or violation of a policy, procedure, or practice of the University, not pursuable by the faculty member in some other forum. Some examples of "grievable issues" are the following: the application of policy, salary levels or salary adjustments, teaching loads or workload, reprisals, academic freedom, facilities or space, and sanctions. The following issues are non-grievable under this procedure:

1. determination of policy, which is the domain of the governance system;
2. promotion and tenure actions, which have their own appeal procedure;
3. items falling within the jurisdiction of other University appeal procedures, such as discriminatory actions, scientific misconduct, and Equal Employment Opportunity complaints.

This policy shall be administered in accordance with procedures recommended by the Senate and approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost.

Adopted by Senate: April 19, 1995

Tabled by President: November 1, 1995

Appendix C

Evaluation Form: Performance of the Department Chair

Name _____ Department _____

Respondent Identification (Check one)

Faculty ____ Staff ____

Please rank your chair with respect in each of the areas listed below. The following scale applies to all numerical responses. 1. Strongly disagree, 2. disagree, 3. neutral, 4. agree, 5. strongly agree

Communication	1	2	3	4	5	<u>Insufficient Information</u>
1. The chair has clearly communicated the goals of the department.	1	2	3	4	5	I
2. I had sufficient input into the formulation of the departmental goals.	1	2	3	4	5	I
3. The chair is an effective advocate for the department to the higher administration.	1	2	3	4	5	I
4. The chair effectively and accurately communicates the position of the higher administration to the department.	1	2	3	4	5	I
5. The chair has shown the ability to maintain high departmental morale.	1	2	3	4	5	I
6. The chair communicates effectively with departmental committees and respects committee decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	I
7. The chair uses a participative approach to management.	1	2	3	4	5	I
8. The actions of the chair enhance the image of the department outside the university.	1	2	3	4	5	I
9. The chair is in touch with the student attitudes toward the department and its curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5	I
10. The chair works to create an environment which fosters faculty/staff development.	1	2	3	4	5	I

11. The chair treats you with respect. 1 2 3 4 5 I

12. The chair encourages and nurtures effective teaching. 1 2 3 4 5 I

Administrative Detail

13. The chair ensures that resources are distributed equitably within the department. 1 2 3 4 5 I

14. The chair ensures that work is assigned fairly and suitably. 1 2 3 4 5 I

15. Equitable decisions are made on salary adjustments. 1 2 3 4 5 I

16. The chair ensures that the financial resources of the department are managed well. 1 2 3 4 5 I

17. The chair makes decisions in a timely manner. 1 2 3 4 5 I

Progress

18. During the tenure of this chair the department has made steady progress toward the achievement of its academic goals. 1 2 3 4 5 I

19. During the tenure of this chair the department has made steady progress toward the achievement of its academic goals. 1 2 3 4 5 I

20. The chair has been an effective advocate for resource development external to the department. 1 2 3 4 5 I

21. The chair has made adequate progress toward addressing the suggestions put forward during her/his last review. 1 2 3 4 5 I

Comments

Please comment on the specific questions listed below and add any additional comments you feel are necessary.

1. In what areas do you feel that the current chair needs to improve? What actions could he/she take to implement these improvements?
2. What are the greatest strengths of this chair?
3. What changes should be made to enhance the departments performance?
4. Other comments.

Appendix D.

SEARCH PROCEDURES FOR THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR

A. Search for Department Chair

If the faculty voting constituency, in consultation with and given the approval of the dean, decide to hold an open search for department chair, the following guidelines will be followed. In an open search, candidates both internal and external to the University are eligible to apply.

1. Initiation and Formation of the Search Committee:

The Dean of Sciences and Arts initiates the search. The department's senator and a representative appointed by the present department chair will conduct the election of the search committee and tabulate the results.

The committee will consist of five (5) members. One member (faculty senate constituency) will be appointed from outside the department by the dean. The remaining committee members will be elected from among the tenured and tenure track faculty holding appointments of greater than 50% in the physics department.

The senator and appointed representative will pass out ballots listing all faculty eligible for search committee membership. Faculty will select up to four candidates from the ballot. The senator and the appointed representative will tally the votes and eliminate up to half the eligible candidates based on those receiving the lowest number of votes. If more than four eligible faculty remain on the ballot, the senator and the appointed representative will distribute another ballot, announce the names of disqualified candidates, and voting will take place again as outlined above until only four candidates remain. The senator will announce the four elected search committee members.

The senator will request the dean to appoint the external Search Committee member. The names of all search committee members will be supplied by the senator to all faculty and staff in the department.

The following stipulations apply to Search Committee appointments:

- a. Candidates for the position are not eligible to serve on the committee.
 - i. A committee member later wishing to be considered for the position must resign immediately from the committee.

- ii. The search committee will ask the department senator to hold an election to fill vacated committee seats. The rules of section D A1 will be followed except that the number of votes cast on any ballot will be no greater than the number of vacant seats.
- b. The chair and associate chair of the Search Committee will be elected at their first meeting.
- c. The Search Committee chair will be in contact with the dean regarding budget considerations (e.g. maximum number of candidates to invite for an interview, duration of stay during interview, etc.) during the search.

2. Position Description

The Search Committee, with input from the current department chair, the dean, and the affirmative action officer, produces the first draft of the position description (e.g., qualifications, expectations of department growth, etc.) that is in accordance with University guidelines.

The Search Committee also produces a document that rank orders the desired attributes (e.g. interpersonal skills, management style, etc.) of the candidates.

The position description and the rank-ordered list of desired attributes is sent to all faculty and staff of the department. These documents are discussed at a departmental meeting. Any controversial issues will be resolved by a vote. All faculty, staff, and the dean will receive copies of the final version.

A Request for Posting memo should be completed and sent to the Human Resources Office. An announcement of the open position must be publicized on campus, such as in Tech Topics.

The position will be advertised in appropriate professional journals and publications. Department faculty are encouraged to contact colleagues and forward position descriptions to them.

3. Short-list of Applicants

After reviewing vitae, reference letters, and other relevant materials, the Search Committee produces a short-list of applicants. The Search Committee should make every effort to get independent assessments from references not listed by the applicants, and should solicit faculty help in identifying appropriate references.

Any applicant can request confidentiality of his or her application. However, once a short-list is compiled, such confidentiality must be waived by the individual to proceed favorably. Short-list applicants who do not waive confidentiality will be dropped from further consideration.

The vitae and reference letters for short-list applicants will be available to all faculty for viewing in the departmental coordinator's office.

4. Candidates for Interview

With input from the faculty, the search committee will select a minimum number (to be determined in consultation with the dean) of candidates to invite for an interview (hereafter referred to simply as candidates).

Each candidate's vita will be sent to all faculty and staff of the department.

Reference letters for the candidates will be available to all faculty and staff who would like to view them in the departmental coordinator's office. No copies of the reference letters are to be made.

Candidates are to be informed of the process described in this and following sections.

5. Informational Materials

An updated document of the department's long- and short-term goals will be prepared by the Advisory Committee, in consultation with the faculty and current department chair, by the time a short-list of department chair candidates is compiled.

The Search Committee will compile a set of informational materials to send to candidates selected to interview in advance of their visit. Such materials must include, but are not limited to, the position description, the departmental charter, the department's year-end reports for the previous two years, and the updated statement of the department's long- and short-term goals. Other materials could include the physics graduate program brochure, alumni newsletter, University catalogs, etc.

6. Interviews

The Search Committee will make arrangements for each candidate to make two presentations:

- a. A technical presentation in his/her field of specialization that includes trends, directions, and opportunities for research in the field.

- b. An informal presentation to the faculty and staff that should include but is not limited to:
 - i. Administrative philosophy and plans for meeting the long- and short-term goals.
 - ii. Direction of education in the department (e.g., What should the attributes of a graduate be like ten years from now?)
 - iii. What resources are needed to attain the goals?

The Search Committee will make appointments for the candidates to meet the faculty, staff, graduate students, and various appropriate administrators.

Within one week of each interview, a "wrap up" meeting will be held with the faculty, staff, and graduate students to discuss the candidate at a time all faculty are free from teaching obligations. The departmental coordinator will transcribe and distribute the voiced comments without reference to the names of those commenting. All distributed copies of such comments will be destroyed at the conclusion of the search.

The Search Committee may make additional correspondence with candidates concerning issues raised during the wrap up meeting. Replies from candidates will be distributed to all faculty, staff, and graduate students.

7. Selection of Department Chair

The following selection process will begin after all interviews are complete.

A timetable for distribution, return, and disclosure of ballots will be determined by the search committee and disclosed to the faculty.

(a) Informational vote

Ballots for an informational vote are distributed to members of the faculty voting constituency for a first impression of overall acceptability of each candidate and to solicit comments. Ballots are to be returned to the departmental coordinator's office in sealed envelopes, signed across the seal. The following informational ballot is distributed for each candidate:

For the position of Department Chair, Physics, I find (name of candidate)

Acceptable _____ **Unacceptable** _____

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate and any other aspect that you consider important:

Ballots will be tabulated by the Search Committee. A typed transcript of all written comments will be available for review in the departmental coordinator's office, and during a department meeting scheduled by the search committee to discuss the ballot results.

(b) Second Ballot

After the department meeting disclosing the results of the informational ballot, a second ballot will be distributed to the faculty voting constituency.

All candidates will be voted on a second time to determine acceptability in the same manner as described above in section 7, except that comments will not be solicited on this second ballot.

To become an acceptable candidate requires a vote of acceptability by a simple majority of the voting constituency

Separate from the acceptability vote, the second ballot will also list all candidates and solicit a preferential ranking, with 1 being first choice, 2 being second choice, etc.

An example second ballot is:

SECOND BALLOT

For the position of Department Chair, Physics, I find CANDIDATE A
ACCEPTABLE _____ **UNACCEPTABLE** _____

For the position of Department Chair, Physics, I find CANDIDATE B
ACCEPTABLE _____ **UNACCEPTABLE** _____

For the position of Department Chair, Physics, I find CANDIDATE C
ACCEPTABLE _____ **UNACCEPTABLE** _____

**Indicate your preferential ranking of the candidates below, with 1
being first choice, 2 being second choice, etc.**

_____ **Candidate-A**
_____ **Candidate-B**
_____ **Candidate-C**

The Search Committee will tabulate the results.

(c) Continuation

The Search Committee will disclose to the faculty and staff and forward to the administration for consideration the two highest-ranked acceptable candidates along with their rankings. Approval of the department chair by the Provost and President is necessary.

In the event that fewer than two candidates receive at least 50% acceptability, at least one (maximum of two) additional candidate(s) from the short-list will be invited for an interview. This is to be followed by a "wrap up" meeting and an informational ballot as described above. All interviewed candidates will again be voted on for acceptability and preferential ranking in accordance with the above guidelines.

8. Negotiations

Negotiations take place between the candidate and the Dean.

For all external candidates, a nine-month faculty salary must first be decided.

For all internal and external candidates the minimum salary should be calculated as follows:

$$A = N(F + S) / 9$$

where A = annual salary of department chair

F = nine-month faculty salary

S = fixed sum increase in salary

N = number of months/year the department chair is to be paid.

The fixed sum increase (S) and the number of months per year the department chair is to be paid (N) are negotiated between the dean and the candidate. The return of the department chair to a position as faculty member requires an inverse calculation:

$$F = (9 A / N) - S$$

Exception to the above salary computations is negotiated between the candidate and the dean. In such cases, the formula used for annual salary and the reverse formula to be used if the department chair returns to a faculty position must be described to the department through the department's Advisory Committee.

Other personal needs of the candidate are negotiated between the candidate and the dean.

The Search Committee is informed of the final offer and the reasons for exceptions.

9. Failure of the Search Process:

In case no two candidates are found acceptable, or if an acceptable candidate does not accept an offer, the following possibilities should be considered:

- a. Enter into negotiation with the dean for (re)opening the search for external candidates. In case no agreement can be reached between the search committee and the dean, the department may petition the senate to initiate the formation of the University Arbitration Committee.
- b. The Search Committee may recommend that the dean initiate the process for the appointment of an interim department chair.

10. Closure:

The Search Committee should inform the Advisory Committee of any changes regarding Open Searches for Department Chair that it deems necessary.

B. Internal Search Procedure for Department Chair

1. Nominations

The Advisory Committee will solicit from the faculty voting constituency nominations for the position. Nominations are to be made in writing to the chair of the Advisory Committee. Nominations will be open until the start of the meeting at which the vote for chair will be held. The Advisory Committee will determine who among the nominated candidates accept such nomination. Nominees wishing to decline nomination before the vote should do so in writing to the chair of the Advisory Committee. Advisory Committee members may individually nominate candidates, but as a committee, will not endorse any candidate.

2. Eligibility

All members of the department's tenured faculty holding greater than 50% appointments in the department at a rank of a Professor or Associate Professor are eligible to be nominated for the position of department chair.

3. Voting

- a. The Advisory Committee will select a date to hold a vote. The faculty senator and a member of the Advisory Committee (other than the faculty senator should the senator also be on the Advisory Committee) will count the ballots.
- b. All nominated candidates accepting nomination will be presented by the Advisory Committee to the faculty voting constituency for a vote. Seventy Five per cent of the faculty voting constituency must be present to conduct a vote. Candidates may withdraw any time between ballots.
- c. Attempts will be made a minimum of 24 hours prior to a scheduled vote to contact members of the faculty voting constituency who will be out of town during the vote for department chair. They will be notified of the time of the scheduled vote. Arrangements will be made to contact them by phone during the vote to accept their ballots.
- d. Before voting begins, nominees can make a statement to the faculty voting constituency, not to exceed 10 minutes.
- e. Each candidate will be voted on by secret ballot, as being ACCEPTABLE or NOT ACCEPTABLE.

- f. An acceptable vote by at least 50% of the faculty voting constituency is necessary for a candidate to be deemed acceptable.
- g. The Advisory Committee will supply the names and percent acceptability of each candidate voted as acceptable.
- h. The dean will appoint the department chair from among the slate of acceptable candidates, with the approval of the Provost and President.

4. Failure

If only one or no candidates are elected as acceptable, the dean will meet with the Advisory Committee to discuss the following or other possibilities:

- a. The Advisory Committee can reopen the nomination process and conduct another vote if the list of candidates changes.
- b. Enter into negotiations with the dean to appoint the one candidate elected as acceptable, if such was the case.

C. Process for Appointment of Interim Chair in the Event of a Failed Search

In the event of a failed internal or open search for a department chair, a search for an interim department chair will be initiated by the Advisory Committee in consultation with the dean.

1. Search Procedures

Search procedures for an interim department chair are the same as those outlined above in section B, Internal Search Procedure for Department Chair, with the following exception: an acceptable vote by at least 50% of the faculty voting constituency is necessary for a candidate to be deemed acceptable.

2. Term of Appointment

The term of appointment of an interim department chair will be for not more than one year. If the term of an interim chair expires during an ongoing search for a chair, another faculty vote must be taken to either reappoint the current interim chair or elect a new one. Reappointment of the current interim chair will require an acceptable vote by at least 50% of the voting constituency.

In the event that circumstances would leave the department without a chair during the search procedure, the Dean may name an interim chair with a term of appointment to be 90 days or until the search process is completed, whichever occurs first.