

**BY-LAWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF
ASTRONOMY**
Approved by Vote of the Faculty, April 13th, 2018
Final Version as of April 11th, 2018

- 1. Department name & general provisions.** In accordance with Article 12 of the UMass-MSP Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), these Bylaws have been adopted by a 2/3 majority vote of the voting faculty of the Department of Astronomy (the “Department”) in the College of Natural Sciences (CNS or the “College”) at the University of Massachusetts Amherst (the “University” or “UMass”). Federal and state laws, UMass Trustee policies (including, but not limited to, T76-081, the Academic Personnel Policy, aka the “Red Book”), the CBA, and other established university policies, will prevail in instances of conflict with these bylaws. As required by Article 12, these bylaws were reviewed by the Administration and MSP to ensure that the bylaws do not conflict with prevailing laws, policies, and the CBA.
- 2. Faculty membership.** The Department of Astronomy includes a wide diversity of faculty members, as listed in this Article:

 - 2.1 *Bargaining Unit Tenure-System (BU-TT) faculty.* These are all the bargaining unit faculty on the tenure stream, without regard to tenure status, or full-time equivalency.
 - 2.2 *Bargaining Unit Non Tenure-System (BU-NTT) faculty.* These are all the bargaining unit faculty who are not on the tenure stream, without regard to their full-time equivalency. These include Research faculty and Teaching faculty (Lecturers).
 - 2.3 *Non Bargaining Unit Tenure-System (NBU-TT) faculty.* These include Emeritus faculty. Emeritus faculty are former BU-TT faculty at the Department, who have retired from active duty.
 - 2.4 *Non Bargaining Unit Non Tenure-System (NBU-NTT) faculty.* These include: visiting faculty in their first two years, adjunct faculty, and part-time faculty with less than 50% FTE appointment before the beginning of their second year.
 - 2.5 *Non-Unit Administrative faculty.* These include: department head, associate deans, deans, and other non-unit administrators.
 - 2.6 *FCAD faculty.* The Five Colleges Astronomy Department (FCAD) is a partnership between the Astronomy Departments at the University of Massachusetts, Smith College, Amherst College, Mount Holyoke College, and Hampshire College. Membership in the FCAD comprises all teaching and research faculty members at the member institutions who hold astronomy appointments of half time or more at the rank of Assistant Professor or higher. It does not include visiting faculty. For the purpose of this document, we define as ‘FCAD faculty’ those faculty members at the Colleges outside of the University of Massachusetts. Members of FCAD faculty are involved in some of the activities of the Department of Astronomy, University of Massachusetts, as specified below.

3. Faculty definitions.

- 3.1 *Faculty*. For the remainder of this document, the term “Faculty” includes all bargaining-unit members in the Department, i.e., BU-TT and BU-NTT, as detailed in Articles 2.1 and 2.2 above, at $\geq 50\%$ FTE with a continuing appointment.
- 3.2 *Graduate Faculty*. The term “Graduate Faculty” includes all who hold astronomy appointments and are appointed by the Graduate School of the University of Massachusetts.

4. Faculty rights, privileges, and responsibilities.

- 4.1 *Voting Rights*. All members of the Faculty are voting members. All voting members of the Faculty have both the right and duty to participate in governance of the Department, including voting on matters brought before the Faculty, except as specified otherwise below and elsewhere in these Bylaws. Except in circumstances as noted below, voting rights for non-personnel matters are extended to the Faculty. The Faculty can, by 2/3 vote, extend voting rights to additional members for a length of time as established by the Faculty.
- 4.2 *Non-Unit Administrative faculty*. Non-unit administrative faculty, defined in article 2.5 above, may not serve on the Department Personnel Committee, or participate as voting members in personnel actions, or participate as members of the Faculty in promotion and tenure cases, and faculty searches. Non-unit administrative faculty may participate in other aspects of academic governance (such as curricular decision-making).
- 4.3 *Other Non-Unit faculty*. Other Non-Unit faculty may not participate in any of the Departmental governance, unless explicitly invited to do so by 2/3 vote of the voting faculty.
- 4.4 *Graduate Faculty Voting Rights*. All members of the Graduate Faculty are voting members on matters related to the graduate curriculum, and any decisions related to the conduct of the graduate program.
- 4.5 *Duty to Participate in Governance*. All members of the Faculty have a responsibility to participate in governance of the Department, and in service to the Department, the College, and the University, if allowed by their appointment.
- 4.6 *Rights and Duties of Faculty on Leave*. Faculty on paid leave (including, but not limited to, parental leave, sabbatical leave, and sick leave) maintain their rights but not their responsibility during the leave to participate in the governance of the Department.

5. Department Meetings.

- 5.1 *Frequency*. At least twice per semester and with at least two weeks’ notice (unless emergencies arise), the Head will schedule and convene general meetings of the Faculty. The first Departmental Meeting of the academic year should be held as close as possible to the first two weeks of the Fall Semester. The Head may call and convene additional meetings as necessary to address business of the Department. By petition of at least two members of the Faculty, the Head

will convene additional special meetings to address matters raised by the petitioners. The Union shall be provided, upon request initiated by the Union, an opportunity to appear on the agenda of any regularly or specially scheduled Department meeting; such requests shall be granted at least once each semester, provided that the requests are made at least ten (10) working days in advance of said meetings.

- 5.2 *Faculty Duty of Participation.* All Faculty of the Department are expected to attend all general faculty meetings and to attend all special meetings, unless university-related duties or events conflict with the special meeting or unless specifically excused by the Head.
- 5.3 *Meeting Agendas.* The Head will publish the agenda for each Department meeting before the meeting.
- 5.4 *Rules of Order.* Meetings of the faculty requiring a vote will follow customary procedure of: presentation and debate, motion, second, debate, and vote. In case of parliamentary dispute, the Roberts' Rule of Order will apply. In instances not requiring a vote, meetings will follow a simplified version of the above procedure.
- 5.5 *Quorum.* The Department may meet and act on the business of the Department with a quorum consisting of at least 2/3 of the voting Faculty.
- 5.6 *Voting.* On matters requiring a vote of the Faculty, except as otherwise specified in these bylaws, a simple majority vote of those Faculty who are present and eligible to vote will suffice to carry a motion. All votes will be by secret ballot (if a proposal is put forward to waive the secret ballot at a meeting, a secret ballot will be held at the beginning of the meeting to this effect; a unanimous vote is required to hold non-secret ballot in the proceedings of that meeting.) Faculty must be present to vote, though "present" is not limited to physical presence: Faculty may join the meeting via phone, and/or video-conference, with advance permission of the Head; in such instances, the Faculty will designate a physically present Faculty member to record their votes. "Proxy" votes (votes from absent Faculty provided to Faculty attending the meeting) will be acceptable only at the discretion of the Faculty present at the meeting, by majority consensus.
- 5.7 *Minutes and Recordkeeping.* A member of the Faculty will take minutes, and these should be circulated to the Faculty no later than two weeks after the meeting. The Department will maintain records of all meetings, including minutes and votes, for at least ten years. The Faculty member in charge of taking minutes will rotate at each meeting. Minutes will be voted on for approval at the subsequent Faculty Meeting.

6. Standing Committees.

The Department maintains the following standing committees. New standing committees or elimination of old committees will be decided by the Faculty via a 2/3 vote.

6.1 *Department Personnel Committee (DPC).*

- 6.1.1 *DPC Purview.* All of the Faculty will annually elect a DPC to perform the functions assigned to it by the CBA, including reviewing the Annual Faculty Review and Evaluation

of every member of the Department's Faculty; reviewing and making recommendations on all promotion and tenure applications within the Department; reviewing and making recommendations on all reappointments of tenure-track Faculty within the Department; reviewing and making recommendations on promotions of non-tenure-system faculty; participating in Periodic Multi-Year Review of Faculty as prescribed by the CBA; reviewing and determining Pool A allocations of merit pay among the Department's eligible Faculty as provided for by the CBA; reviewing and making recommendations for anomaly adjustments to salaries as provided for by the CBA. In addition, the DPC will: review and approve all nominations to the Graduate Faculty; review and approve all appointments of BU-NTT and NBU-NTT Faculty.

- 6.1.2 Composition, Eligibility & Voting. The DPC will consist of at least six Faculty. The composition of the DPC will be determined annually, based on the year's upcoming major personnel actions as indicated by the Department Head. For each major personnel action, the DPC should ideally be composed of at least four Faculty (tenure or research track) at or above the rank for the proposed personnel action.
- 6.1.3 Means of Election. At a Department meeting prior to the end of the preceding academic year, the Department Head will solicit nominations/self-nominations for DPC Chair, who will be then voted by the Faculty. Once selected, the DPC Chair will solicit nominations/self-nominations for service on the DPC from September through May of the ensuing academic year, and members will be voted by the Faculty. Eligibility will be based on upcoming personnel actions, as reported by the Department Head.
- 6.1.4 Independence of the DPC. On actions for which the CBA identifies independent roles for the DPC and the Head—such as AFR reviews, reappointment, promotion, tenure, PMYRs, merit-pay allocations, and anomaly recommendations—the DPC will operate independently. The Department Head must not attempt by any means to influence the deliberations or judgment of the members of the DPC.
- 6.1.5 DPC Meetings and Operations. The DPC requires the presence (in person or via electronic means) of all of its eligible voting members in order to conduct official business related to major personnel actions. In drafting written materials, the DPC may conduct its business electronically. Motions will carry by simple majority. DPC meetings will not be open to non-DPC members. The DPC will maintain a 'peel-off' procedure for DPC members at a more junior level than the personnel case under consideration. 'Peel-off' is also required for non-tenure system faculty when cases of tenure-system faculty are under consideration. The DPC should keep a record of its voting transactions, which the Department should retain for ten years and should be available to subsequent DPC members; the DPC need not keep meeting minutes.
- 6.1.6 DPC Responses to the Dean's Queries in Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Cases. Under the CBA and the Red Book, a Dean must notify in writing and consult with the DPC if the Dean is considering making a recommendation that differs from the recommendation of the DPC in reappointment, promotion, and tenure cases for Faculty. The DPC must respond in writing.

- 6.1.7 DPC Consideration of Anomaly Pay. The DPC will follow the CBA guidelines for determining recommendations regarding faculty eligible for anomaly pay increases. In case of delegation of the recommendation to the DPC Chair, the results of the recommendations will be made known to the DPC.
- 6.1.8 Annual Faculty Report Review: The DPC is responsible for reviewing the AFRs each year, as established by the CBA, and providing comments to the Faculty members, via the DPC Chair who is responsible for recording the comments.
- 6.1.9 Merit:
- 6.1.9.1 Consideration of Merit Pay. When the CBA authorizes the award of merit pay and authorizes the DPC to recommend or determine the amounts of merit pay to be allocated to individual members of the Faculty, the DPC must adhere to the CBA's terms for eligibility and the basis of evaluation for such allocations. The DPC may not exclude from consideration any merit-eligible member of the Faculty based on tenure status, rank, full-time equivalency, or constraint of assigned duties. In line with the CBA's terms, merit review will be based on the Principles of Merit distributed each year. To be considered for merit pay in a given academic year, Faculty must have completed a timely submission of an AFR for that year.
- 6.1.9.2 Procedure for Merit Reviews. Evaluation for merit will be based on the AFR only. Discussion and evaluation of merit of each individual will be based on the process described in the Principles of Merit, which are voted by the Faculty. The discussion is confidential and is only shared within the DPC. When merit increases become available, the DPC Chair will communicate the Pool A merit increase to each individual Faculty within two weeks of the deadline of submission to the University Administration.
- 6.1.9.3 Principles of Merit. At the beginning of each academic year, the document on the Principles of Merit will be circulated to the entire Faculty by the DPC Chair no later than October 1st.
- 6.1.9.4 Transparency of the Procedure for Assigning Merit Pay. After the DPC has assigned a grade to all eligible Faculty members following standard conflict avoidance procedures, the mean grades and standard deviations will be discussed by the entire DPC, to assess and evaluate unusual cases. For this purpose, grades and standard deviations will be shared within the DPC without names associated with them, in order to preserve confidentiality.

6.2 *Undergraduate Program*

- 6.2.1 Undergraduate Program Chair. The Undergraduate Program Chair will be determined by the Department Head, in consultation with the Faculty. The Undergraduate Program Chair is the chair of the Undergraduate Program Committee.
- 6.2.2 Undergraduate Program Committee. The committee will be composed of at least four Faculty, selected from any rank, tenure status, and appointment. The Committee will provide real-time governance of the Undergraduate Program. Any permanent changes to the Undergraduate Program requires a vote of the Faculty, and may require the formation

of an ad-hoc Curriculum Committee, as appropriate. Composition will be determined by both the Department Head and the Committee's Chair.

- 6.2.3 Undergraduate Advisors. Undergraduate advisors are appointed, at least one for each year of undergraduate college, by the Department Head. Eligible Faculty may be of any rank, tenure status, and appointment. Ideally, each undergraduate advisor is appointed for four years, and follows their class from beginning of Freshman Year to Graduation.
- 6.2.4 Chief Undergraduate Advisor. The Chief Advisor is selected by the Department Head in *addition to* the Undergraduate Advisors. The Chief Advisor supervises the overall undergraduate advising program.
- 6.2.5 Honors' Program Director. The Honors' Program Director is selected by the Department Head and administers the Honors' Program within the Department.

6.3 *Graduate Program*

- 6.3.1 Graduate Admissions Committee. The committee will be composed of at least three Graduate Faculty, selected from any rank, tenure status, and appointment, tasked with reviewing applications for the graduate program and making recommendations to the Graduate School. Leadership of the Admissions Committee will be determined by the Department Head, and composition will be determined by both the Department Head and the Admissions Committee's Chair.
- 6.3.2 Graduate Program Director. The Graduate Program Director ("GPD") is selected by the Department Head, in consultation with the Faculty. Eligible faculty must be members of the Graduate Faculty, and may be of any rank, tenure status, and appointment, with the exclusion of the FCAD Faculty. The GPD is responsible for the day-to-day conduct of the graduate program, including, but not limited to: convening meetings of the graduate faculty for admissions to PhD candidacy, communicating with the Graduate School, communicating with and advising current graduate students, and consulting with the Admissions Chair on new students.
- 6.3.3 Graduate Program Committee. The Graduate Program Committee will be appointed on a yearly basis by the Department Head, in consultation with the Graduate Program Director, who is the Chair of the Committee. Eligible faculty must be members of the Graduate Faculty, and may be of any rank, tenure status, and appointment. The Committee will provide real-time governance of the Graduate Program. Any permanent changes to the Graduate Program requires a vote of the Graduate Faculty, and may require the formation of an ad-hoc Curriculum Committee, as appropriate.
- 6.3.4 Graduate Exam Committees. The Exam Committees will review and examine graduate students, as necessary, according to the procedure set by the Astronomy Graduate Program. Eligible faculty must be members of the Graduate Faculty, and may be of any rank, tenure status, and appointment. The Committees are selected by the Department Head among the eligible faculty who are not, to the extent possible, research supervisors

of the students to be examined. The committees provide, for each student examined, a written assessment to the Graduate Program Director.

6.4 *Other service responsibilities requiring annual Faculty participation.* Faculty will be asked to serve on other committees as needed at the Department, College, University, and Five Colleges (FCAD) levels. At a minimum, these include the committees/responsibilities listed below. Additional service responsibilities may be assigned as needed and determined by the Head and/or identified by the Faculty.

6.4.1 Colloquium Committee. At least two members of the Faculty are appointed by the Department Head to this committee each year, which may also include graduate student and postdoc representatives. The committee will then select its own Chair. The Colloquium Committee is charged with soliciting proposals for colloquium speakers from the Faculty, selecting, contacting, and organizing hosting for the speakers, and supervising the entire process to ensure the successful conduct of the Departmental Colloquia.

6.4.2 Computing Committee. At least four members of the Faculty are appointed by the Department Head to this committee each year, to oversee the administration of the computing infrastructure and policy of the Department. The committee will then select its own Chair. Computing Administrative Staff may be made ad-hoc members of this Committee.

6.4.3 Awards Committee. At least three members of the Faculty are appointed by the Department Head to this committee each year, to identify members of the Department for internal and external awards.

6.4.4 Diversity Committee. Selected by the Department Head, in consultation with the Faculty. Oversees diversity issues in the department, including collecting resources applicable for minority groups, advising on inclusivity best-practices, and meeting periodically with students to discuss inclusiveness issues. Committee will serve as a spokesperson for under-represented groups in the Department.

6.4.5 FCAD Senator. One member of the Faculty serves as FCAD Senator, in addition to the Department Head. Traditionally, the member of the Faculty serving as FCAD Senator is the Undergraduate Program Chair. No temporal limit to the charge is set by the current FCAD governance document.

6.5 *List of Committees and Membership.* By the end of September in each Fall Semester, the Department Head will distribute to the entire Faculty the list of Committees and Membership for the coming Academic Year, including Committees listed under Article 7 below. For teaching responsibilities, the Department Head will distribute the list of teaching assignments for Fall and Spring by the end of the first month of the previous semester.

7. Representation by Faculty on College- and University-Level Committees. Faculty may volunteer for or may agree to be appointed by the Head to service on College- and University-level committees

and in similar roles. Service on the following committees, however, is by election as described below:

- 7.1 *College Personnel Committee (CPC)*. All of the Department's Faculty will elect, once every three years, one representative to the CPC to perform the functions assigned to it by the CBA. The term of appointment on the CPC is three years, except in the case of conflicts and other contractual obligations (e.g., sabbaticals). Eligibility for service on the CPC will be limited to full-time tenured faculty.
- 7.2 *Faculty Senate*. A representative of the Faculty on the Senate will be elected by the Faculty on a yearly basis.
- 7.3 *MSP Representative*. A representative of the Faculty on the MSP will be elected by the Faculty on a yearly basis.
- 7.4 *Other College, University, and Five Colleges Level Committees*. Faculty will be asked to serve on other committees as needed at the College and University levels, and membership will be determined by the Department Head.

8. Faculty Search Committees & Procedures. The Department will conduct individual faculty searches as follows:

- 8.1 *Appointment of Search Committees for Faculty*. When the Provost and/or the College's Dean have authorized a search for a University-funded tenure-system or non tenure-system faculty member, the Head will solicit from among the faculty interest in serving on the search committee. The Head will then call for a Faculty meeting to vote on the composition of the Search Committee, including the Committee's Chair. In selecting members, the Faculty will attempt to compose a committee that is representative of the Department, which ensures well-qualified consideration of applicants' credentials, that promotes the achievement of the University's diversity goals, and that will achieve efficient execution of the search. Search committees should include at least one tenure-system faculty. For senior and open-rank searches, the composition of the committee should include, but not limited to, senior members of the Faculty.
- 8.2 *Purview of Search Committees*. Committees charged with conducting searches for tenure-system faculty will follow the "Search Procedure" guidelines as defined by the University of Massachusetts Office of Human Resources (<https://www.umass.edu/humres/search-procedure>). These committees will collaborate with the Head in developing the position description, advertising/recruitment plan, facilities plan, and other elements of the hiring requisition; will work with the Office of Equal Opportunity & Diversity with regard to promoting the recruitment of a diverse applicant pool; will receive and screen applications; may conduct initial interviews by phone, by Internet video connection, or at professional meetings (as applicable); will propose a campus-interview list; will make confidentially available to the Faculty the application materials of approved campus interviewees—provided the Faculty individually agree to maintain that confidentiality as described below; will organize campus visits, including public sessions open to all Faculty and students, for approved interviewees; will organize a meeting of the Faculty after the last campus interview in order to deliberate and vote (by secret ballot) on

the finalists. The Search Committee produces a ranked list that the Committee presents to the Faculty, who has to approve the ranked list by simple majority vote. The Search Committee then writes its final report and rationales based on the ranked list, which will be presented to both the Head and the Dean.

- 8.3 *Students' Involvement in Faculty Searches.* Graduate students will be involved in faculty searches through the nomination of two representatives who will participate in selected activities of the Search as established by the Search Committee, and will act as liaisons between the Committee and the students' body. The representatives will be in charge of reporting the students' assessment of each interviewed candidate back to the Search Committee. Students will only have access to non-confidential material, e.g., CVs, candidate's statements, and cover letters, and only for the approved campus-visit interviewees.
- 8.4 *Access to Confidential Applicant Materials.* The Department will place in a secure online location the application materials of candidates who have been approved for campus interviews (but not the application materials of the other applicants). The Department Head and any Faculty who wish to view applicant materials may do so only after first signing a confidentiality statement and attesting that they have no conflict of interest, as defined in section 8.6, that specifies the following:
- They will not disclose or distribute the contents of such confidential information to anyone outside the Department's Faculty or academic administration.
 - They will not disclose or distribute the contents of such confidential information to any of the candidates, including the candidate who may be ultimately employed.
 - They will not make a physical (including printed) copy of any of the materials.
 - They will not contact any of the parties who have provided confidential references.
 - They will abide by university policies in using the information disclosed in the materials. In particular, they will adhere to the university's guidelines on impartiality/objectivity in the university's non-discrimination policy.
- 8.5 *Role of Faculty in Tenure-System Searches & Selection.* All Faculty have a duty to engage in the search and selection process. The Search Committee should give all Faculty an opportunity to provide feedback on candidates interviewed on campus.
- 8.6 *Conflicts of Interest.* A real or perceived conflict of interest between an applicant and a Faculty member must be disclosed in writing as soon as it is realized and must be managed, mitigated, or eliminated. The principles underlying the above prescription include:
- Neither professional nor personal relationships between applicants and evaluators should influence the selection decision.
 - Neither professional nor personal relationships between applicants and evaluators should *appear* to influence the selection decision.
 - When such relationships exist, the evaluator must disclose the relationship.
 - Management, mitigation, or elimination of such conflicts should occur as follows:
- 8.6.1 Search committee members engaged in a *personal* relationship (as defined by the University) with an applicant must disclose the relationship in writing to others involved in the evaluation of the candidate and must recuse themselves from the Search Committee and any vote of the Faculty, as long as the conflicted applicant remains a candidate.

- 8.6.2 Search committee members engaged in a *close professional* relationship with an applicant must disclose the relationship in writing to others involved in the evaluation of the candidate and must recuse themselves from any deliberations involving the applicant. As the definition of a close professional relationship is a constantly evolving one in Astronomy (nowadays increasingly dominated by large collaborations, involving up to a few hundreds professionals from national and international institutions), in case of doubt the Chair of the Search Committee and/or the potentially-conflicted Search Committee Member may request for the Faculty to meet and vote on the issue. If the applicant has reached the campus-interview list, the committee member must recuse themselves from the Search Committee, but may still vote along with other Faculty on this and other applicants.
- 8.6.3 Search committee member with a *distant professional* relationship with an applicant who has reached the shortlist need not recuse themselves from the committee's work but should disclose in writing the relationship to others involved in evaluation of the candidate. The Faculty member may participate in all discussions of that applicant and need not abstain from voting on any applicant.

9. Department Specifications for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT). All standards and most procedures related to reappointment, promotion, and tenure of BU-TT Faculty and BU-NTT Lecturers are governed by the CBA and the Red Book. The following additional terms do not alter or interpret those standards and procedures but instead set department-level specifications where the CBA and Red Book permit local control.

9.1 *External Reviews of RPT Cases.*

- 9.1.1 Personnel Actions Requiring External Reviews. All promotion and all tenure cases for tenure-system faculty require external reviews (as specified in the Red Book and CBA). The 4.2 (mini-tenure) review of tenure-system faculty during their probationary period also requires external reviews, but in smaller number than tenure and promotion cases. Reappointments and promotions for research faculty require external reviews. Neither reappointments nor promotions for Lecturers require external letters; however, as permitted by the CBA's Article 21, Lecturers may request external reviews.
- 9.1.2 Definition of 'Close' and 'Not Close' Reviews. As large collaborations, involving up to a few hundred professionals from national and international institutions, are becoming more common-place in Astronomy, the definition of 'Close' needs to be adapted to the changing landscape. Co-authorship on the same papers as the candidate's does not automatically qualify as a 'close' relationship with the reviewer, since large teams often imply co-authorship among individuals barely known to each other. The judgment of close/not-close will be based on the number of co-author papers shared by the candidate and the reviewer, on the position of both in the authors' lists, and on the continuity of the publication stream. The decision of close/not close will be made by the Department Head in consultation with the DPC.
- 9.1.3 Number of External Reviews. The Department Head will make a good-faith effort to secure a minimum of six "not close" external reviews for every promotion and/or tenure

case that requires external reviews. The Head will also solicit and add to the file up to six letters from reviewers “close” to the candidate. Such close reviews are especially helpful in cases where the reviewer can describe the candidate’s particular contributions to collaborative work. The total number of letters between “not close” and “close” should be about a dozen. For the 4.2 (mini-tenure) review of tenure-system faculty during their probationary period, the Department Head will make a good-faith effort to secure about half a dozen external letters, divided between three “not close” and three “close”.

- 9.1.4 Identification and Solicitation of External Reviewers. The CBA charges the Head with soliciting external reviewers and permits the candidate to suggest external reviewers, some or all of whom may be solicited by the Head. The Head may consult with the DPC or other members of the Faculty in identifying appropriate external reviewers but may not delegate the solicitation process to others. Similarly, the Head may receive assistance in describing the “standing” of each external reviewer in the candidate’s file, but the Head is ultimately responsible for ensuring that that description clearly and completely makes the case for why each external reviewer is well positioned to perform the review; this description should be crafted for academic audiences who are unfamiliar with the pertinent scholarly field.
- 9.1.5 Qualifications of External Reviewers. In general, external reviewers should be well recognized scholars or professionals in the candidate’s field, should have active scholarly programs, and should be at institutions that are at least peers of UMass. For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, reviewers should be at the rank of Associate Professor or higher. For promotion to Professor, reviewers should be at the rank of Professor, including international reviewers. External reviewers who do not meet these criteria may be appropriate and acceptable, but in describing the “standing” of such reviewers, the Head should carefully explain why such reviewers are appropriate for the task of commenting on the candidate’s having met the relevant standards.
- 9.1.6 Candidate’s Rights Regarding External Reviewers. Before making such solicitations, the Head must show the solicitation list and solicitation message to the candidate, who may comment on but may not demand changes to the list or message within five (5) business days. The list should include some of the external reviewers suggested by the candidate. If the candidate identifies a conflict of interest with any of the proposed reviewers, the Head should assess whether a true conflict exists and, if one does, should eliminate, mitigate, or manage the conflict.

9.2 *Internal Reviews of RPT Cases.*

- 9.2.1 Identification & Solicitation of UMass Faculty & Staff Reviews. The candidate and the Department Head may identify potential reviewers internal to UMass Amherst. Internal reviews are not required and should not be regarded as substitutes for external letters. Internal letters may be especially helpful in cases where the reviewer can describe the candidate’s particular contributions to collaborations within the department or across campus. The Head must individually solicit such internal reviews.

9.2.2 Identification and Solicitation of Advisee Reviews. The candidate and Department Head will identify current and former students and mentees from whom to solicit evaluative letters. Written, signed comments from individual students—especially from those for whom the candidate has served as an advisor, mentor, or collaborator—are especially helpful in identifying the candidate’s work outside the classroom. Anonymous student letters or evaluations will not be considered. Such reviews should be individually solicited by the Head.

9.2.3 Solicitation of Classroom Student Reviews. The Department Head will request letters of evaluation for candidates from both current and past classroom students. Solicitations can be made via email to students.

9.3 *Waiver of Rights of Access to Review Letters.* A candidate for RPT may waive or decline to waive their rights of access to internal and external review letters that have been individually solicited and solicited by email to faculty, staff and students. The decision whether or not to waive those rights belongs exclusively to the candidate, and neither the Head nor any other member of the Faculty should pressure the candidate to decide one way or another.

9.4 *Number of AFRs to attach to RPT Cases.* All promotion and all tenure cases for tenure-system faculty will require inclusion of the 6 (six) most recent AFRs. Reappointments of tenure-system faculty during their probationary periods will require inclusion of the 3 (three) most recent AFRs. If less than six (or three) are available, e.g., in case of early decisions, the available AFRs should be included in the case.

9.5 *Use of SRTI Scores or Equivalent Student Surveys in RPT Cases.* SRTI scores or equivalent student surveys will be used as an indicator of major potential problems or major achievements, but not as a precise metric for deciding the classroom ability of a candidate. The Faculty recognizes that SRTI scores are an imperfect and likely biased measure of teaching efficacy.

10. Department Specifications for Appointment and Promotion of BU-NTT Faculty not currently included in the CBA. Research Faculty are BU-NTT Faculty whose Appointment and Promotion do not have specifications and criteria included in the CBA as of this writing. For these faculty members at the Department of Astronomy, initial appointment and subsequent promotion will adhere to the following criteria and procedures.

10.1 *Criteria for Appointment and Promotion.* Candidates for a Research Faculty position are usually professionals who have been successful at securing funding for, at least, their own salary. The candidates have also expressed a formal or informal interest in being associated with the Department of Astronomy at the University of Massachusetts. Criteria for appointment and promotion of Research Faculty are commensurate with the criteria used for BU-TT faculty, with the exception of the teaching and service components, which are not expected of Research Faculty. Aspects of teaching and service can be included if allowed by the appointment. Research Faculty candidates will hold high research qualifications and evidence of original contributions.

- 10.2 *Nominations* for individuals to be appointed as Research Faculty can come from the Department Head, or from individual voting faculty members, after consultation with the Department Head.
- 10.3 *The Role of the DPC.* Upon receiving a nomination, the DPC will solicit submission of a CV, list of publications, and a research statement from the nominee. The nominee will also be responsible for soliciting three letters of recommendations from external reviewers familiar with the nominee's qualifications. The external letters should be addressed directly to the Department Head.
- 10.4 *Review Process.* Upon receiving all material, the DPC will convene, review the case, and forward a recommendation to the Department Head. A simple majority will carry the recommendation.
- 10.5 *Appointment.* In case of a favorable recommendation by the DPC, the Department Head will review the case and, in case of agreement with a favorable DPC recommendation, proceed with the appointment of the Research Faculty member.
- 10.6 *Duration of Appointment.* The initial Appointment will be for a duration of three years, after which there will be a reappointment review of the Research Faculty, mirroring the probationary period (4.2 or mini-tenure) review of BU-TT Faculty, without the teaching and service components, unless allowed by the appointment. The reappointment will be for a duration of four years.
- 10.7 *Subsequent Reappointments.* After the first reappointment, subsequent reappointment reviews will occur after four years, and every seven years thereafter. External letters commensurate with the equivalent timetable of BU-TT Faculty will be requested for the second and third reappointment reviews. From the fourth reappointment review onward, only three letters from external reviewers will be required. After the second personnel action, reviews will be performed with a cadence of 7 years from the most recent action.
- 10.8 *Promotion.* The Research Faculty track mirrors the tenure track for levels, which include Assistant, Associate, and Full. Criteria for promotion will adhere to the criteria set forth for the tenure system faculty in the Red Book and the CBA, minus the teaching and service components, unless allowed by their appointment. The timescales for promotion will be decided by the Research Faculty member in consultation with both the Department Head and the Chair of the DPC. Promotions can occur concurrently with reappointment reviews.
- 10.9 *Procedure for Promotion.* The procedure will be the one established for Tenure Track Faculty in the CBA and these By-Laws. Once the Research Faculty requests or agrees to consideration for promotion, the Faculty will submit a CV, a list of Publications, and a Statement of past and current research and plans for the future. The Department Head will follow the criteria in Article 9.1 above for the selection and solicitation of external reviewers letters. Twelve (six close and six not-close) letters will be obtained and forwarded to the DPC. Subsequent steps in the procedure will mirror the ones established for the promotion of TT Faculty.

11. Department Specifications for Appointments and Re-Appointments of non-Unit NTT Faculty

The NTT faculty associated with the Department of Astronomy at the University of Massachusetts, but not covered by the Contract Bargaining Agreement include: visiting faculty in their first two years, adjunct faculty, and part-time faculty with less than 50% FTE appointment before the beginning of their second year. For these faculty members, appointment and re-appointment will adhere to the following procedure. The title of Adjunct Faculty is honorary; Adjunct Faculty do not receive wages from the University. Visiting Faculty are faculty or equivalent at another institution, and they are not bargaining unit members during their first two years.

- 11.1 *Nominations* for individuals to be appointed as Visiting Faculty, Adjunct Faculty, or other temporary Faculty lines can come from the Department Head, or from individual voting faculty members, after consultation with the Department Head.
- 11.2 *The Role of the DPC*. Upon receiving a nomination, the DPC will solicit submission of a CV, list of publications, and a research (or teaching, as appropriate) statement from the nominee. The nominee will also be responsible for soliciting three letters of recommendations from reviewers familiar with the nominee's qualifications. The letters should be addressed directly to the Department Head.
- 11.3 *Review Process*. Upon receiving all material, the DPC will convene, review the case, and forward a recommendation to the Department Head. A simple majority will carry the recommendation.
- 11.4 *Appointment*. In case of a favorable recommendation by the DPC, the Department Head will review the case, and, in case of agreement with the DPC favorable recommendation, proceed with the appointment of the candidate. The duration of the initial appointment will be for a maximum of three years.
- 11.5 *Reappointments*. Reappointments will be for a maximum of three years and require only a CV, list of publications, and a written candidate's statement. A simple majority of the DPC will carry the recommendation for reappointment.

12. Department Specifications for Appointments of Graduate Faculty. For appointment of these faculty members, the following procedure applies.

- 12.1 *Nominations*. Nominations can come from the Department Head, or from individual voting faculty members, after consultation with the Department Head. Any faculty member listed in Article 2 can be nominated for membership to the Graduate Faculty.
- 12.2 *The Role of the DPC*. Upon receiving a nomination, the DPC will solicit submission of a CV and list of publications.
- 12.3 *Review Process*. Upon receiving the material, the DPC will convene, review the case, and forward a recommendation to the Graduate Program Director.

12.4 *Appointment.* In case of a favorable recommendation by the DPC, the Graduate Faculty will be appointed by the Graduate School, after the Graduate Program Director forwards the CV and request to the School.

13. Annual Faculty Review and Evaluation. The CBA's Article 33 requires use of the bargained AFR form by every member of the Faculty who is 50% FTE or greater. Faculty who fail to submit an AFR on time may be ineligible for merit pay if it is given for that academic year. The DPC and the Department Head should substantively and candidly conduct their evaluations of each Faculty member's AFR. Supplementing the submitted AFR with information that is not in the AFR is not permitted. However, the Faculty member under review always has the right to add and qualify additional information in writing, which must be appended to and permanently filed with the AFR.

14. Equity and Inclusion. The Department strives to increase the percentage of women and underrepresented groups in Astronomy among students, post-doctoral researchers, and faculty. We aim to make the study of Astronomy, and the opportunity to contribute to Astronomy, an equal opportunity endeavor independent of disabilities, ethnicity, gender, religion, and sexual orientation. Participation by the full spectrum of our society enhances scientific discovery. Both recruiting and retention are important features of establishing equal opportunity and diversity. Equal opportunity for faculty includes, but is not limited to, careful attention to equity in: merit raises, anomaly raises, teaching assignments, committee assignments, and allocation of resources including office space, lab space, and support staff. In these considerations, we recognize that both explicit and implicit bias pose barriers, and 'Best Practices' should include mechanisms to lessen the effects.

15. Review of the Department Head. Reviews of the Department Head will follow the procedures prescribed by Senate Document #82-021. The Review Committee will be selected by the Faculty and appointed by the Dean.

15.1 *Self-Evaluation.* As an initial step, the Head will prepare a written self-evaluation of their administrative achievements during the current appointment and will provide that document to the Review Committee.

15.2 *Survey.* The Review Committee will prepare and distribute four confidential surveys: (1) one to departmental staff; (2) one to students within the Department; (3) one to Heads/Chairs of Departments within the College and to those outside of the Department who have interacted with the Head; and (4) one to the Department's Faculty. Each survey will include specific questions regarding overall performance, both administrative, interpersonal, and management of departmental interactions. These surveys will provide space for extended comments. In addition the Review Committee will separately interview each of the Faculty. Raw data and summaries of responses to these surveys and to the interviews will be reviewed by the Review Committee, will be redacted to protect the identities of all respondents, and will be included with the Review Committee's report to the dean but will not be available to faculty, staff, or students.

15.3 *Meetings with Constituencies.* The Review Committee will offer to meet with employee and student groups to receive confidential assessments of the Head's performance. Summaries of information gathered in such meetings will be included with the Review Committee's report to the dean but will not be available to faculty, staff, or students.

- 15.4 *Meeting with the Head.* After most data collection is complete, the Review Committee will invite the Head to meet to discuss the initial findings of the data collection process. The Head may decline to meet.
- 15.5 *Draft Report.* The Review Committee will complete and distribute to the Faculty a draft report (excluding raw or other data that could compromise the confidentiality of those contributing to this process), including a summary of findings, an assessment of areas of success and of needed improvement, and a recommendation regarding whether the Head should be reappointed. The report should limit its assessment to areas within the purview and control of the Head.
- 15.6 *Concluding Meeting of the Faculty.* The Review Committee will convene the Faculty to discuss the draft report and to receive recommendations for revision of the document.
- 15.7 *Final Report.* The Review Committee will finalize its report and will then submit it to the Dean, simultaneously providing a copy to the Head (excluding raw and other confidential data). The Dean may ask to meet with the Review Committee to discuss the report, but neither the Review Committee nor the Dean is obliged to meet.
- 15.8 *Head's Response.* The Head may prepare and submit to the Dean a written response to the final report.

16. Search of a new Department Head. Search of a new Department Head will follow the procedures prescribed by Senate Document #90-029. The Search Committee will be proposed by the Faculty and appointed by the Dean.

- 16.1 *Expression of Interest.* The Search Committee will solicit expressions of interest among eligible Faculty members within the Department, and will identify potential candidates.
- 16.2 *Meetings with Constituencies.* The Search Committee will meet with all the Department constituencies (faculty, staff, students), either in groups or individually, to solicit inputs on (1) candidates, and (2) expectations for the new Department Head.
- 16.3 *Draft Report.* The Search Committee will draft an initial report that includes all inputs received from the Department constituencies (article 16.2), and an initial recommendation. The draft report will be presented to the Faculty. The Search Committee will incorporate comments from the Faculty in its final report, and will adjust its final recommendation based on the same comments.
- 16.4 *Final Report.* The Search Committee will write its Final Report and Recommendations, which will be presented to both the Department and the Dean, in accordance with Article 8 of Senate Document #90-029.
- 16.5 *Conflict Resolution.* In case of disagreement among any of the interested parties (Dean, Search Committee, Department), conflict resolution will follow the procedures outlined in Article 8 of Senate Document #90-029.

17. Implementation of these bylaws: By at least a two-thirds' majority vote of the Faculty, these bylaws are adopted and take effect on April 13th, 2018. The terms of these bylaws supersede existing policies or practices of the Department to the extent that they address or conflict the matters addressed by such policies and practices. However, if ongoing processes would be unreasonably disrupted by implementation of these bylaws, individual provisions of these bylaws may be deferred until those processes are complete, provided that such deferral lasts no longer than one year beyond the effective

date cited in this paragraph. Deferral of individual provisions will not result in deferral of other provisions.

- 18. Amendment of these bylaws:** By majority vote of voting members, the Faculty may elect an ad-hoc committee to review and propose amendments to these bylaws. Adoption of any such amendments, including their dates of effectiveness, requires a two-thirds vote of the entire voting Faculty.