



Office of the Provost

Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry

Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Guidelines

Office of the Provost
James Madison University

MSC 7607
Alumnae Hall, Room 102
91 Alumnae Drive
Harrisonburg, VA 22807
540.568.3429

University Mission Statement

We are a community committed to preparing students to be educated and enlightened citizens who lead productive and meaningful lives.

Department Mission Statement

The central mission of the Chemistry Department is to provide students with a fundamental understanding of the concepts of chemistry and an appreciation of the role of chemistry in society.

General Administrative

Executive Committee

An Executive Committee, composed of Chemistry faculty, will be elected by the faculty each academic year. This committee will have the following composition and duties:

1. The committee will have three members.
2. The primary functions of the committee are: (a) to serve as a “sounding board” for the Academic Unit Head, (b) to collect and present faculty opinion on various issues while the decision making process is still open, and (c) to bring to the Academic Unit Head’s attention various matters that might be of mutual concern.
3. The Committee should not become directly involved in the day-to-day or routine administrative affairs of the Department.
4. The mechanism of operation must be a cooperative and jointly agreed upon interaction with the Academic Unit Head. The details of this interaction should be worked out each academic year, and will depend upon the wishes of the Academic Unit Head, the make-up of the Committee, and the needs of the Department.
5. Members of the executive Committee are elected for three year terms and many not serve more than three years consecutively. One new member is elected each academic year.
6. Voting: Each faculty member votes for one candidate to be placed on the Executive Committee by secret ballot. The faculty member receiving the highest number of votes is elected to the position for a three year term.

Faculty Stipends from the Department

Faculty members may be allotted up to \$1000 per year for expenses incurred for teaching projects, research, or travel for professional reasons. Funds not encumbered by February 1st of an academic year will be returned to the University.

Nomination of Faculty for Awards

The department should act to proactively identify awards for which the faculty are eligible. Awards should be brought to the attention of the Academic Unit Head or Executive Committee. In the event that more than one nomination for a given award is proposed, the Executive Committee in consultation with the Academic Unit Head will select the nominee. The Executive Committee is responsible for designating a faculty member to help guide the submission of the award application.

Major Awards for which faculty should be regularly nominated include:

- College of Science and Mathematics Madison Scholar
- College of Science and Mathematics Teaching Award
- College of Science and Mathematics Service Award

- General Education Teaching Award
- University Advising Award
- Research Corp
- Other Professional Awards

CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION, PROMOTION AND TENURE

Part I. General Considerations

- A. The Department considers evaluations to be an ongoing process designed to support professional development. Any stated standards should be looked upon as guidelines related to matters the Department considers important rather than goals to be achieved, checked off, and perhaps forgotten in a quest for promotion and tenure. Department members should be dedicated, accomplished, viable chemists and teachers, and are expected to have a full—time commitment to the Department, College and University. (The general responsibilities of a full-time faculty member are defined in the Faculty Handbook and by University policies.) Because there are numerous methods of achieving excellence, the standards should not be interpreted as inflexible and absolute. The Personnel Advisory Committee (pac/Executive Committee) and Academic Unit Head will exercise considerable professional judgment as to whether unsatisfactory, satisfactory or outstanding performance has been achieved.
- B. The reward system at JMU, and specifically within the Department, should be sufficiently flexible that all members of the faculty will be able to concentrate on their strongest areas within teaching, scholarship and service.
- C. Evidence of promise for continued dedication to teaching, continued scholarly activity, and continued service are essential before the Department will recommend tenure or advancement of rank. It should also be noted that recommendations for tenure and for promotion to a higher rank are separate decisions; one does not automatically follow from the other.
- D. Every Department member (including the Academic Unit Head) regardless of rank, experience, or tenure, shall undergo a yearly evaluation by the Department pac/Executive Committee. For purposes of evaluation, a department member is defined as one who has 50% or more of her/his responsibilities (teaching, scholarly achievement/professional qualification, and professional service) assigned from or directed toward the Department. The Annual Chemistry Faculty Summary will serve as the primary source of information for this evaluation, but a faculty member may submit additional materials for this evaluation if he or she chooses. This material will be made available to all members of the department. A binder will be kept in a central location and will be available upon request.

- E. Any promotion and tenure decisions made on the Academic Unit Head must include input from the appropriate PAC and must follow the same procedures and apply the same standards as those involving regular Department members. When hiring a Chemistry Faculty member at any rank within the Department, if some agreement other than the standard seven year period for tenure is being negotiated, the Academic Unit Head and the PAC of the Chemistry Department should be consulted by the Dean or other administration official responsible for hiring. Similarly, if the initial appointment is to be at the Associate Professor or Professor level, or if credit in rank toward early promotion is being given for experience at other institutions, the Academic Unit Head and the PAC should be consulted by the administrative official responsible for hiring. Finally, if a chemist is being considered for a University position outside the Department, the Academic Unit Head and the PAC of the Chemistry Department should evaluate the candidate's credentials and have input in the hiring process, if that candidate is to have tenure or an appointment in the Chemistry Department.
- F. While there are guidelines as to necessary content and what are acceptable components for a packet, the format for submission of materials in support of promotion and/or tenure should be left entirely to the discretion of the person being evaluated. However, it should be noted that the Academic Unit Head and the PAC will ultimately have to justify recommendations for the granting or denial of promotion or tenure in terms of the categories listed in the University Faculty Handbook.
- G. It is the responsibility of the Academic Unit Head and the PAC (not the individual applying for promotion and/or tenure) to indicate performance in terms of Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory or Outstanding in each of the specified categories.
- H. It is the responsibility of the Academic Unit Head to give each new faculty member a written set of expectations.

Part II. Criteria and Specific Standards and Considerations

A. Teaching

1. Evaluation is based primarily on professional peer evaluation. Criteria will include content, organization, mastery of material, and delivery. Examples, but not requirements, of considerations are:
 - a. classroom visitation by other members of the faculty.
 - b. course mechanics/organization: clearly defined course objectives; course content, syllabi, other handouts, and readings and/or textbook consistent with the course description, current trends in chemistry, and accepted Departmental practice; course level and rigor consistent with accepted Departmental practice.

- c. instructional vitality: re-evaluation or reworking of course offerings; mastery of subject material needed to teach a variety of introductory level courses as well as upper level courses in his/her specialty.
 - d. long term contributions: effectiveness of delivery in seminars and presentations; professional improvement plan; evidence of successful post graduate performance by students; devotion to teach and helping students.
 - e. Attendance at professional meetings or workshops geared toward teaching, consultations with the Center for Instructional Technology, Center for Faculty Innovations.
2. Student evaluations
- a. Although subjective, student evaluations should be within the guidelines set by the most recent report by the Chemistry Department Ad Hoc Faculty Committee on Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness.
 - b. An exceptional rating on student evaluations is not required for obtaining an exceptional rating in teaching by the pac/Executive Committee.
 - c. Additional comments can be solicited from research students.
3. Faculty are expected to assist students in their pursuit of knowledge and direction, and to be supportive of the liberal education of students.

B. Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualification

1. All faculty are expected to have some mechanism for continuous professional development. This may consist of, but is not restricted to, regular reading of professional journals and books, participation in the Departmental seminar program, attendance at professional meetings, and on-going scholarly activity.
2. Before a faculty member can be considered for promotion to associate professor or for award of tenure, he/she shall have at least two publications in the chemical or related sciences that include undergraduate collaborators. At least one of those publications must be in peer reviewed research journal. The individuals contributions in collaborative publications should be clearly spelled out. In addition, a faculty member is expected to apply for funding at a level that is commensurate with maintaining an active undergraduate research program in his/her area.
3. Before a faculty member can be considered for promotion to professor, he/she shall have at least three peer reviewed publications in the chemical or related sciences

that include undergraduate collaborators. At least one of those publications must be in a peer reviewed research journal. The individual should also have additional evidence of scholarly achievement since the last promotion or initial employment at JMU, whichever occurred later. The individuals contributions in collaborative publications should be clearly spelled out. In addition, a faculty member is expected to have funding at a level commensurate with maintaining an active undergraduate research program in his/her area.

4. Publications for which one would receive credit toward promotion or tenure at JMU should normally describe work done subsequent to arrival at JMU.
5. Other indicators of scholarship and professional achievement include, but are not restricted to (no priority or weighting is implied): further publication in peer reviewed journals, the publication of chapters of books, textbooks, or auxiliary teaching materials through nationally recognized publishing houses, patents, presentations at scholarly meetings, grant awards and fellowships, leadership positions in professional organizations, participation in continuing education workshops, and evolution of research.

C. Service

It should be noted that the Chemistry Department places more emphasis on Teaching and Scholarship/Professional Qualification than on Service. By this we mean that although Service is a necessary consideration, it would be difficult to achieve promotion or tenure based on Service at the expense of Teaching or Scholarship and Professional Qualification.

1. Departmental Service
There are two specific expectations of all Chemistry faculty: significant responsibility for at least one major Departmental activity each year, and effective advising of students through both academic and career guidance. Faculty are encouraged to participate in additional activities that contribute to the Departmental teaching mission.
2. College and University Service
Faculty are encouraged to participate in service to the College and University.
3. Other Professional Service
The Department encourages service of a professional nature outside of the University.

Part III. PAC - pac/Executive Committee Membership

- A. The Chemistry Department believes that PAC evaluations for promotion and tenure, and annual evaluations by the pac/Executive Committee should be conducted by peers of the

person being evaluated. Therefore, only peers may serve on a Chemistry Department PAC or pac/Executive Committee. In this context a peer is a faculty member who has 50% or more of her/his responsibilities (teaching, scholarly achievement/professional qualification, and professional service) evaluated by the elected Chemistry Department pac/Executive Committee. Faculty who are on Educational Leave, or have other temporary assignments of one year or less, will have the option to inform the Department Head of their desire to be counted as members of the pac/Executive Committee.

- B. The Chemistry Department shall elect a three-member pac/Executive Committee to advise the Academic Unit Head on personnel matters and to conduct annual faculty evaluations (see page 2).
- C. For tenure decisions, the PAC shall consist of all eligible tenured faculty in the Department, excluding the Academic Unit Head.
- D. For promotion recommendations the PAC shall consist of all eligible faculty in the Department holding at least the rank being considered, excluding the Academic Unit Head (e.g., for promotion to associate professor, the recommendation would be made by all associate and full professors)

Part IV. Procedures

A. Tenure and Promotion

1. Candidate

- a. A candidate for promotion may be self-nominated, nominated by the Academic Unit Head, or by the pac/Executive Committee. In any event, he/she must notify the Academic Unit Head of his/her intention to be a candidate by March 1 of the academic year prior to the year in which he/she is to be considered.
- b. If a person is a candidate for promotion only, a complete dossier is due to the Academic Unit Head thirty-five (35) days prior to the date it is due to the Dean of the College.
- c. If a person is a candidate for both promotion and tenure, or for tenure only, a complete dossier is due to the Academic Unit Head during the penultimate year of the probationary period, three (3) months prior to the date it is due to the Dean of the College. Although the granting of tenure and promotion are separate decisions, and one does not automatically follow the other, a candidate for both is encouraged to submit only one dossier.
- d. A detailed first year review of new (except one year appointments) faculty is required by the pac/Executive Committee and the Academic Unit Head.

- e. A mid-probationary review is required of non-tenured faculty. Materials for the review are due to the Academic Unit Head by the 1st of September or the end of the first week of classes in the fall semester after the mid-probationary year; they are to include the Annual Chemistry Faculty Summaries for the period covered.
- f. It is the Academic Unit Head's responsibility, not the candidates, to distribute copies of the candidate's dossier to the appropriate pac/Executive Committee and to the Dean of the College.

2. PAC – pac/Executive Committee

- a. Tenure mid-probationary review
This review is conducted by the newly elected pac/Executive Committee. Input from the entire faculty will be solicited prior to the final draft of the review. The intent of the review is to inform the candidate of her/his progress at the mid-point of the probationary period, and to provide guidance for the candidate.
- b. Tenure recommendation
A “no” vote by 25% of the PAC will constitute a no vote of the committee.
- c. Promotion
A simple majority of those eligible to vote will suffice for designation of outstanding, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in the three categories of evaluation. The decision regarding promotion will be determined by the outcome of the voting on the three categories of evaluation in accord with the Faculty Handbook. In the event of an initial tie vote, the PAC will solicit non-binding input from other sources.

B. Annual Evaluation

Annual evaluations will be conducted for all faculty members by the pac/Executive Committee. This evaluation will be used as the basis for determination of merit pay adjustments.

1. Database

The Annual Chemistry Faculty Summary will be used as the primary source for evaluation. All faculty will submit an Annual Chemistry Faculty Summary each spring by the due date given by the Academic Unit Head. It will include material for the year reporting period as defined by the University and normally will be due to the Academic Unit Head within two weeks of the end of the period.

2. Evaluation by the pac/Executive Committee
 - a. The classification that will be given to the Academic Unit Head will be a professional subjective evaluation. It will not be based upon a checklist approach designed to ascertain that a faculty member has filled in the appropriate number of lines on the form or a numeric algorithm. Quality and content are the most important considerations in the evaluation.
 - b. Each pac/Executive Committee member will evaluate every other Chemistry Department member in the categories of teaching effectiveness, scholarly achievements and professional service. The evaluation shall result in a classification of Outstanding, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory in each category. A classification of Outstanding or Unsatisfactory will require a justification from the evaluator, whereas a classification of Satisfactory will not. These classifications are for intradepartmental use only.
 - c. The pac/Executive Committee will meet, and, using the individual pac/Executive Committee members' classifications, may provide the Academic Unit Head with an overall classification for every faculty member in each of the three categories (teaching effectiveness, scholarly achievements, and professional service).
 - d. The pac/Executive Committee will not provide a rank ordering of faculty within any of the categories, nor overall.
3. Academic Unit Head (AUH)
 - a. The AUH will arrive at her/his own decisions concerning each faculty member and consider the recommendations of the pac/executive.
 - b. The AUH will then share her/his views with and provide any additional germane documentation to the pac/executive, if disagreement exists.

PART V. Renewable Term Appointments.

Faculty holding Renewable Term Appointments (RTA) will be evaluated using the same criteria and procedures as those outlined in the JMU Faculty Handbook and the Chemistry Department Criteria and Standards for Annual Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure for tenure/tenure-track faculty. Promotion of an Assistant Professor employed on an RTA contract to Associate Professor rank is expected to occur within seven years. Failure to achieve promotion by the end of the sixth year of service will result in unsatisfactory annual evaluations until promotion has been granted.

Part VI. In order to maintain professional standards and to grow as a Department, some of the criteria, standards, or procedures may need to be updated on occasion, and will be undertaken at the discretion of the Department.

Appeal of Annual Evaluations

[See the University Faculty Handbook Section III.E.4.g.: “Before the Academic Unit Head submits the official written evaluation to the Dean, there must be an opportunity for the faculty member to review and appeal the evaluation to the body designated by the Academic Unit. The faculty member has a maximum of seven days following receipt of the official written evaluation to make the appeal in writing. Failure to file a timely written appeal will result in the evaluation being sent forward to the Dean, and no further appeal rights are available.”]

[See the University Faculty Handbook Section III.E.4.h.: “In considering an appeal, the crucial questions for the reviewing body are whether all relevant information was objectively reviewed by the Academic Unit Head (AUH), and whether the AUH evaluated similar achievements among similarly situated academic unit members using the same standard of judgment. The appeal process must be completed by October 21. The evaluation process is not final until any appeal has been completed.”]

After the AUH provides the faculty member with the official written evaluation, but before the official written evaluation is sent to the Dean, the faculty member has the opportunity to appeal the evaluation.

A faculty member may appeal an annual evaluation by the AUH on any of the following bases.

- (1) His or her annual evaluation did not take into account all relevant information.
- (2) The information was not objectively reviewed by the AUH.
- (3) The AUH evaluated similar achievements among similarly situated academic unit members using a different standard of judgment.

The faculty member should first discuss the appeal with the Academic Unit Head. If the concern is not resolved, the faculty member can send a written appeal to the pac/Executive Committee. The written appeal must be filed with the pac/Executive Committee by October 7 of the year in which the evaluation is received. A copy of the appeal must be provided by the appealing faculty member to the AUH.

Since the pac/Executive Committee submits recommendations to the AUH in the chemistry annual review process, an ad-hoc review committee consisting of a pac/Executive Committee member, a tenured faculty member appointed by the AUH, and a tenured faculty member chosen by the appealing faculty member will be appointed to consider the appeal.

The appeal must include a copy of the three most recent annual evaluations (if applicable), the faculty member’s most recent annual report of professional activities, and a detailed explanation of the basis for the appeal. The appealing faculty member is expected to supply any other

information or documentation that the review committee deems relevant, upon request by the review committee.

The review committee will review the appeal and issue a written recommendation to the AUH, with a copy sent to the appealing faculty member and the Dean, by October 21. The review committee may decide:

- (a) that the appeal was filed on an inappropriate basis, in which case the appeal will be dismissed; or
- (b) that the appeal was filed on an appropriate basis, in which case the review committee will consider the documents presented and decide that the documents do not support the allegations; or
- (c) that the appeal was filed on an appropriate basis, in which case the review committee will consider the documents presented and decide that the documents support the allegations.

If the review committee determines that the documents support the allegations in the appeal, the review committee may recommend to the AUH and the pac/Executive Committee that the evaluation be changed.

The recommendation will be considered by the AUH and the pac/Executive Committee, who have until October 28 to finalize the evaluation and present it to the faculty member as his or her final decision. The AUH will request the faculty member's signature on the final evaluation. A faculty member's failure to sign the final evaluation will result in the AUH sending the final evaluation to the Dean without the faculty member's signature on the form, with a notation of the faculty member's failure to sign.

Guidelines for Evaluation of Classroom Performance

I. Data Treatment and Interpretation of Student Evaluations

- A. There is a growing body of evidence that supports that student evaluations are not based on course quality but rather with instructor rapport and demeanor. It is entirely possible that a faculty member could receive low ratings in spite of covering course material in a fair and professional manner. The subjective nature of student evaluations can introduce biases that are a result of ethnicity, background, or gender. Because of these limitations, no quantitative significance should be applied to these surveys since student evaluations are nothing more than a qualitative diagnostic of questionable validity. Regardless, student evaluations will be administered by the Chemistry Department. Their primary function will be to determine whether evaluation by another means is necessary so that all faculty have the opportunity to receive appropriate mentoring to correct any real, rather than perceived, deficiencies.

- B. For internal uses of faculty student course evaluations, the following metrics be used as a guide to determine whether additional evaluation is merited.

Simple mean for question #5
Simple mean for question #6
Simple mean for question #7
Overall mean of $(\#10 + \#11 + \#12 + \#13)/4$

The Departmental mean will be based upon a five-year moving average for each of the questions described in this section. The averages will be calculated from the semester Departmental averages for the five preceding academic years. A new set of five-year-year moving averages will be calculated at the end of each academic year and distributed to the faculty.

- C. If an individual faculty member falls more than 1.0 absolute unit below any of the Departmental means listed in I.B, the faculty member should be informed by the Academic Unit Head that a potential problem may exist. (If the Departmental standard deviation associated with any item in section I B exceeds 1.0 unit, then the standard deviation should replace the 1.0 unit limit.)
- D. Several complementary evaluations may be used to supplement student evaluations. These methods might include the approaches described below.

Classroom Visitation. Faculty are encouraged to invite colleagues to visit lecture and lab sections. The objective of classroom visitation could be to ascertain the validity of a problematic student evaluation or provide feedback and mentoring on teaching. Visitations should occur on multiple occasions over the course of the semester.

Contact of Current or Prior Students. Since the evaluation of learning often can only be accessed after the student has completed a course, the input from former students can provide valuable information on the long-term effectiveness of a teacher.

- E. Only the overall assessment of teaching, as determined from the Faculty Annual Evaluation process, should be passed on to higher administration. Student evaluations could contribute to this overall teaching assessment

II. Laboratory Evaluations

The department feels that laboratory courses should be evaluated.

{We will consider the mechanism used by Illinois State as a starting point for developing an effective laboratory evaluation mechanism}.

III. Recommendations Concerning the Mechanical Aspects of Student Evaluations

- A. The Department recommends that in accordance with the existing Departmental policy that evaluations be given in all courses each time the course is offered.
- B. The Department recommends that a student administer the evaluation and deliver an envelope containing the marked evaluation cards to the Chemistry Department secretary immediately following the evaluation.* The instructor's course and section should be clearly specified on the envelope.
- C. The Department recommends that the evaluations should be processed by the computer center and returned to the individual faculty members, with copies being forwarded to the Academic Unit Head, within one week of the end of the semester.

* Although circumstances may necessitate that the instructor be present when forms and cards are distributed, no faculty member should be in the room during the evaluation process. In team taught courses the procedure should be followed.

Course and Instructor Survey

INSTRUCTIONS. This survey gives you an opportunity to express anonymously your views about the course and instructor. The average results of this survey are not available to the instructor until after final grades are submitted. Leave the name and identification columns of the card blank. Use only #2 or softer pencils.

1. Class

- a. Freshman
- b. Sophomore
- c. Junior
- d. Senior
- e. Other

2. Overall Grade Point Average at JMU

- a. Don't have one yet
- b. Below 2.00
- c. 2.00 to 2.49
- d. 2.50 to 2.99
- e. over 3.00

3. Reason for Taking this Course

- a. General Studies
- b. Teacher Certification
- c. Part of My Major
- d. Recommended by Advisor
- e. Elective

	A	B	C	D	E
4. Does the instructor demonstrate a thorough knowledge of the subject matter?					
	Poor Knowledge			Very Knowledgeable	
5. Does the instructor present the material in a well organized manner?					
	Totally Unorganized			Well Organized	
6. Does the instructor appear to be prepared for class					
	Never prepared			Always Prepared	
7. How do you rate the instructor's explanations and examples?					
	Poor			Clear	

	A	B	C	D	E
8. Do the assignments increase your understanding of the material covered in the course?					
	Not at all			Very Helpful	
9. Do the evaluations and examinations cover the material presented and assigned?					
	Completely Unrelated			Cover Very Well	
10. How would you rate the instructor's relationship with the class?					
	Poor			Excellent	
11. Considering class size and time limitations, does the instructor make you feel free to ask questions and enter into discussions?					
	Not Free at all			Very Free	
12. Does the instructor seem interested in teaching and helping you?					
	No Interest			Very Interested	
13. Overall, I would rate this instructor					
	One of the Worst			One of the Best	
14. Overall, I would rate this course					
	One of the Easiest			One of the Hardest	

Voting Format for Tenure Track Faculty Positions

The faculty of the Department of Chemistry will use the following protocol when making recommendations about filling vacancies for tenure track faculty lines (positions).

Call for a Meeting for Selection of Candidates to Interview:

1. The Academic Unit Head or the Executive Committee will call a meeting of eligible voters to discuss the applicant pool brought forward by the search committee. Only eligible voters (see below) may participate in this meeting. The meeting will be conducted in closed session with privacy maintained as allowed by exclusion from the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A quorum of eligible voting faculty must be in attendance for the meeting to proceed. A quorum consists of 2/3 of the eligible voting faculty members. Proxy votes (see below) count as de facto attendance.
3. A “short list” of candidates will be selected at this meeting for the purpose of personal on-site interviews and/or telephone interviews according to the will of the voting faculty.
4. It will be the responsibility of the Academic Unit Head to obtain the Dean’s consent to invite these candidates to the Department for on-site interviews in a timely manner.
5. Faculty members who are eligible to vote but are unable to attend may vote by providing signed proxy ballots to the Academic Unit Head or a member of the Executive Committee.

Call for a Meeting for Discussion and Selection of Candidates to be Made an Offer for a Position:

6. The Academic Unit Head, the Executive Committee, or the Chair of the Search Committee will call a meeting of eligible voters to discuss the candidates. Only eligible voters may participate in this meeting. The meeting will be conducted in closed session with privacy maintained as allowed by exclusion from the Freedom of Information Act.
7. A quorum of eligible voting faculty must be in attendance for the meeting to proceed. A quorum consists of 2/3 of the eligible voting faculty members. Proxy votes (see below) count as de facto attendance.
8. At this meeting all candidates who have interviewed on-site with the Department will be discussed. The merits and liabilities of each candidate will be discussed, particularly their qualifications and fit with the Chemistry Department. If further information or more time for discussion is deemed necessary to make a selection, no voting will occur at this meeting. However, if the voting faculty establish that adequate information for all candidates has been obtained, the selection vote can take place. In recognition that the selection of a candidate must often be done with alacrity, if another meeting is necessary, a time frame will be established at that meeting for the final selection meeting.

9. Nonvoting interested parties (e.g. students, staff, professional faculty, faculty from other departments, scientists from outside JMU, etc.) may provide information on any candidate to the Academic Unit Head, any member of the Executive Committee, or the Search Committee Head in writing. This information will be used as part of the discussion as appropriate, and will be destroyed by whoever received it at the end of the selection process.
10. The voting on the acceptability of each candidate should be based on an answer to the following question: “Within the context of helping the Department remain an excellent undergraduate program and within the constraints imposed by the needs and resources of the Department, does the candidate appear to have the potential to be a successful member of the Department?”
11. An eligible voter may voluntarily or involuntarily **not participate** (e.g. leave absence, illness, emergencies, etc.) in either the candidate short list selection meeting or the selection of candidates for position(s).
12. A vote may be cast to either support or oppose the candidate. Supporting and opposing votes must be professionally defended to the voting faculty.
13. To remain in the pool of acceptable candidates, a candidate must receive a supporting vote of $\geq 70\%$ of the voting faculty.
14. The acceptable candidates will be rank ordered in a separate vote as follows.
15. A forced ranking of all voting faculty will be performed on the list of “N” acceptable candidate. In each faculty member’s opinion, the candidate with the highest ranking will be given a rank of “N”, with each successively lower candidate receiving a rank diminishing by 1. The sum of the rankings will constitute the departmental ranking, with the highest sum being the most highly rated candidate.
16. In the event of a tie, re-ranking will be done by voting on only the affected candidates using the procedure of line 15.
17. A recommendation will be sent forward that acceptable candidates be offered the position according to their rank in the final vote.
18. All discussion of candidates in the selection meeting shall remain confidential to protect the privacy of applicants.
19. Multiple positions may be filled without separate meetings for each position, but it must be clearly defined at the outset which candidates are being considered for which positions. Separate and distinct votes are required for candidates suitable for each position.

Voting Eligibility

20. All Peer Reviewed Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty at all ranks (assistant professor, associate professor, full professor), including the Academic Unit Head, who are “in good standing” will be eligible to vote on candidates for faculty positions. Not “in good standing” means that tenure has been denied or that a contract has been or is going to be terminated for cause.
21. To be eligible to vote on a candidate, a faculty member should have met with the candidate either individually or in a small group during one of the scheduled faculty meeting times. In addition, a faculty member must attend at least one of the two oral presentations that the candidate gives while visiting the Department. Faculty should make every effort to attend all presentations made by a candidate. Seminars will be scheduled in such a fashion that all will have an opportunity to attend.
22. A signed proxy from eligible voters unable to attend the meetings that may include information about the acceptability and ranking of all of the candidates may be left with the Academic Unit Head or any member of the current Executive Committee. All proxies will be destroyed at the end of the candidate selection process by whoever received the proxy.

Chemistry Department Conflict Resolution Committee

The Academic Unit Head will assign two faculty members to be on the Department Conflict Resolution Committee. In addition, three student members will usually be assigned to the committee. The student members will normally be the President and Vice-president of the ACS Student Affiliates chapter as well as the President of Alpha Chi Sigma.

Student Conflict Resolution Procedure

1. The student component of the committee will have hearings and listen to students with complaints. After making the complaint, the student has anonymity from that point.
2. The student component will take the complaints back to the whole committee where complaints or problems will be discussed.
3. The faculty member will then be informed of the complaint by the Department Head or the committee and asked to respond to it.
4. If not corrected, the problem will be sent to the Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics for disposition.

Credit for Experience in the Chemical Sciences

The Chemistry Department, subject to the guidelines listed below, generally will award one credit hour in Chem. 390 for each external research experience (under special circumstances two credit hours could be justified, but this is a maximum). This credit can be awarded for either paid or non-paid positions.

1. It is preferred that arrangements be made in advance of the external experience. However, when this is not possible, credit may still be awarded subject to the other guidelines.
2. For external experiences, the student must provide a written report and make an oral presentation on his/her research within one semester of its completion. For internal experiences, at minimum, an abstract describing the accomplishments during their experience in the chemical sciences must be written and submitted to the faculty advisor prior to credit being awarded for Chem. 390. A full report and a presentation at the spring symposium is expected for credit in Chem. 497 to be awarded.
3. A faculty sponsor, in collaboration with the Department Head, must evaluate the experience and assign a letter grade. It will be the student's responsibility to provide the supporting information (i.e. letters from supervisors, etc.).
4. No more than two such external research experiences may be used for major credit by a given student.

