Communication Disorders Bylaws

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 majority vote of the faculty of the Department of Communication Disorders (the "Department") in the School of Public Health and Health Sciences (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 are subject to review by the Administration and MSP to ensure that the bylaws do not conflict with prevailing laws, policies, and the CBA; such review must occur before the bylaws or their amendments take effect.

2. **Faculty membership, rights, privileges, and responsibilities.** The Department's faculty (the "Faculty") includes all faculty in the Department without regard to bargaining-unit status, tenure status, or full-time equivalency. In general, all 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.

    2.1 *Non-Unit Faculty*. Non-unit faculty (department Chair, associate deans, deans, and other non-unit administrators) may not participate as voting members in personnel actions governed by the CBA. Such non-unit faculty members may not serve on core DPCs (or DPCs expanded to become a committee of the whole) and may not participate as members of the Faculty in promotion and tenure cases. Non-unit faculty may participate in other aspects of academic governance (such as curricular decision-making and faculty searches), provided those faculty do not have separate administrative purview over the same matters.

    2.2 *Access & Voting Rights*. All DPC faculty members shall have access to relevant information and may deliberate on all promotion and tenure cases. Both tenured and untenured faculty may sit on the DPC. However, to the extent possible, Faculty may vote only on cases where they have themselves achieved the rank and/or tenure status under consideration for the candidate. For example, only tenured Faculty may vote on cases of tenure/promotion. If a faculty member who has not achieved that rank and/or tenure status is on the DPC when a case arises for which they cannot vote, an additional DPC member who is eligible to vote will be elected by the faculty to deliberate and vote on that case.

    2.3 *Part-Time Faculty Appointments Under 50%*. Part-time bargaining-unit non-Graduate Faculty with an FTE less than 50% may have access to relevant information and may deliberate on all non-graduate programmatic and curricular matters but may not vote on such matters.

    2.4 *Faculty Appointments Greater than 50%*. Bargaining-unit, non-Graduate Faculty with an FTE of 50% or greater, without regard to tenure status, should

have access to relevant information and may deliberate and vote on all non-graduate programmatic and curricular matters.

2.5 *Duty to Participate in Governance.* Except where the composition of an individual's assigned workload would prohibit such an obligation, all members of the Faculty have a responsibility to participate in governance of the Department and in service to the Department, the School/College, and the University.

2.6 *Rights and Duties of Faculty on Leave.* Faculty on full-time paid leave (including parental leave, medical leave, and sabbatical leave) maintain their rights during the leave to exercise their rights to participate in the governance of the Department, to the extent medically possible. Unless the leave is taken in an emergency, faculty on leave must make prior arrangements for students whose grades may be affected by the leave.

2.7 *Faculty Workload.* The average TT faculty workload practice includes a teaching load of 2/2. However, in accordance with Article 15.9 of the Contract, the teaching load may be reduced through service contributions or a faculty member's research commitment, e.g., through course release or course buyouts. In acknowledgment of the department's commitment to increased research productivity, an ad hoc committee is investigating fair practices for such teaching reductions.

3. **Standing Committees**: The Department maintains the following standing committees:

   3.1 *Department Personnel Committee (DPC).*

   3.1.1 <u>DPC Purview.</u> All of the Department's Faculty will annually elect a core DPC to perform the functions assigned to it by the CBA, including but not limited to 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 all 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; leading the review process for potential reappointment of the Chair. From time to time, the core DPC may be expanded to include additional members (see 2.2, Access and Voting Rights) or the full faculty (see 3.1.8, DPC Consideration of Merit Pay).

   3.1.2 <u>Composition & Eligibility.</u> The core DPC will consist of three Faculty members. Untenured (TT) and non-tenure track (NTT) faculty may serve on the DPC to gain experience and an appreciation regarding the operation of the DPC and to advocate for issues relevant to non-tenured Faculty. In the event that the DPC does include non-tenured faculty, the non-tenured Faculty member may not vote on actions to which they are not themselves subject (for example, only tenured Faculty may vote on applications for

tenure). Whenever possible, the DPC will include at least one member from each discipline (SLP and Aud) and during promotion and tenure, preferably one member will be able to comment about that member's area of expertise. Whenever possible, the DPC will consist of three (or an odd number of) members eligible to vote on issues of re-appointment, promotion, and tenure. As described in section 2.2, the DPC may expand if the core DPC contains one or more members who cannot vote on an action (e.g., when an individual is being evaluated for tenure and promotion and the DPC is composed of one or more untenured faculty members, or when a faculty member is coming up for promotion to Full Professor and the DPC contains individuals who have not achieved that rank). In these cases, one faculty member who is eligible to vote on the case will be added (via election, consistent with 3.1.3 below) to the DPC for every core DPC member who is ineligible to vote on that action Members who serve on the School PC are not eligible to serve on the DPC.

3.1.3   Means of Election. By April 15 of each year, the Department Chair will solicit nominations for service on the core DPC to serve from June 1 of the current academic year through May 31 of the ensuing academic year and will confirm the nominees' eligibility and willingness to serve and will announce the nominees to the Faculty. All of the Department's Faculty except for non-unit Faculty are eligible to vote in electing the core DPC. The election should occur within two weeks after announcement of the nominees. The election should occur by secret ballot at a Department meeting to be convened by the Department Chair. Eligible Faculty who cannot attend the meeting may vote by e-mail to the Department Chair. The Faculty is encouraged to diversify the composition of the DPC annually such that the same members do not continually serve year-to-year.

3.1.4   Leadership of the DPC. Once elected, the members of the core DPC will select their own committee chair.

3.1.5   Independence of the DPC. On personnel actions for which the CBA identifies independent roles for the DPC and the Chair—such as AFR reviews, reappointment, promotion, tenure, PMYRs, merit-pay allocations, and anomaly recommendations—the DPC will operate independently, and the Chair must not convene or deliberate with the DPC, nor may the Chair attempt by any means to influence the deliberations or judgment of the members of the DPC.

3.1.6   DPC Meetings and Operations. The core DPC should organize and schedule its meetings as necessary to perform its duties and meet the deadlines established by the campus master calendar or by College or Department policies. The DPC, whether meeting as the core or expanded committee, requires a quorum of two-thirds of its eligible members in order to conduct official business; in voting and in drafting written materials, the DPC may conduct its business electronically. When addressing confidential personnel matters, DPC meetings will not be open to non-DPC members. The core DPC should keep a record of documents involved in recommending merit pay allocations, which the Department should retain

for five years and should be available to subsequent core DPC members; the DPC need not keep meeting minutes.

3.1.7 <u>DPC Responses to the Dean's Queries in RPT Cases</u>. Under the CBA and the Red Book, a dean must consult with the DPC if she/he is considering making a recommendation that differs from the recommendation of the DPC in reappointment, promotion, and tenure cases for tenure-system Faculty. The core DPC must respond in writing.

3.1.8 <u>DPC Consideration of Merit Pay</u>. 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. Periodically, the expanded DPC (i.e., full Faculty) will discuss current criteria for evaluating merit pay allocations. Changes to these criteria can only be made by a vote of 2/3 majority of the expanded DPC.

3.2 *Department Executive Committee.*

3.2.1 <u>DEC Purview</u>. The DEC advises and assists the Chair in the management of the Department, reports on the DEC members' operational areas, and promotes two-way communications between the Chair and the Faculty.

3.2.2 <u>DEC Composition</u>. The DEC includes the following members: the Department Chair, the Graduate Program Director, the Undergraduate Program Director, and the Clinic Director. The Department Chair may request that other faculty members serve on this committee

3.2.3 <u>DEC Meetings and Operations</u>. The Chair schedules and convenes meetings of the DEC, which need not be publicly announced or open to non-members except as required by Massachusetts law.

3.3 *Graduate Admissions Committees*. The Graduate Admissions Committees (GACs) review all candidate applications to the Department's professional graduate programs (SLP and Au.D.) and recommend candidates for admission to the GPD. At least three Faculty members should serve on the GAC for the SLP and Au.D. disciplines. The composition of members of each of the GACs should be comprised of the GPD plus two Faculty members from those disciplines. Each GAC may consult with the Clinic Director, as appropriate, when making admissions decisions. Any faculty member is welcome to provide input on applicants to assist the GAC in evaluating the candidates. All tenure-track faculty members are tasked with reviewing all applications to the Ph.D. program. Faculty members indicate whether or not they recommend admission of a particular applicant and, if they recommend admission, if they are willing to advise the applicant. The GPD has responsibility for processing all admissions.

3.4 *Curriculum Committee*. The Curriculum Committee (CC) provides direction on all department curriculum issues and proactively considers improvements in the undergraduate and graduate learning environments. The CC reviews

all course proposals and degree requirements before they can be submitted to the Faculty Senate. The CC shall be comprised of the GPD, the UPD, and at least two other TT or NTT faculty members who agree to serve on an annual basis. The CC will designate a Chair and will work on graduate curriculum issues in concert with the GPD and on undergraduate curriculum issues in concert with the UPD. Recommendations for curriculum changes will brought to the full faculty for discussion. A draft of proposed changes will be disseminated at least 3 days prior to meeting. Proposed changes in curriculum will be voted on and approved by 2/3 majority vote of the full faculty. In the event of prospective curriculum changes that affect Faculty on sabbatical or medical leave, the CC should engage these Faculty members in advance of such discussions.

3.5   Student Advisory Committee. The department will convene an a Graduate Student Advisory Committee (GSAC). The GSAC will consist of a graduate student from each of the graduate degree programs (M.A., Au.D., and Ph.D.) along with the Clinic Director, the GPD, and the Department Chair. Selection of student representatives for these committees will be made by requesting nominations from the student body. If more than one individual from each constituency is nominated, an election within graduate student body will take place. The GSAC will meet at least once per semester.

4. **Tenure-System Faculty Search Committees & Procedures**: The Department will conduct individual tenure-system faculty searches as follows:

    4.1   *Appointment of Search Committees for Tenure-System Faculty.* When the Provost and the College's Dean have authorized a search for a tenure-system faculty member, the Chair will solicit from among the faculty interest in serving on the search committee. The Department will select members from among those expressing interest and from other members of the Faculty whose service on the committee would benefit the search process. Students are not eligible to serve as members of such search committees; however, students should be given opportunities to meet faculty candidates and to provide feedback to the search committee. In selecting members, the Faculty will attempt to compose a committee that is representative of the Department, that 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. For senior and open-rank searches, the composition of the committee should be weighted toward senior members of the Faculty. The Search Committee will designate the Committee Chair from among its members.

    4.2   *Purview of Search Committees in Tenure-System Searches.* Committees charged with conducting searches for tenure-system faculty will collaborate with the Chair in developing the position description, advertising/recruitment plan, facilities plan, and other elements of the hiring requisition; will work with the Chair to fulfill the advertising/recruitment plan; 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; will 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 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 all of the Department's Faculty after the last campus interview in order to deliberate and vote on the ranking of the acceptable finalists; will write a recommendation that reflects the Faculty's ranking and rationale for that ranking and may offer the committee members' independent assessment of the finalists. If the Hiring Authority for the search has asked for an unranked list of acceptable finalists, the Faculty will limit its vote to distinguish between acceptable and unacceptable candidates, and the search committee will use its recommendation to report that information and to describe the strengths and weaknesses of the acceptable finalists.

4.3   *Access to Confidential Applicant Materials.* The Department will place in a secure online location the application materials of all candidates . The Department Chair and any Faculty who wish to view applicant materials may do so only after first signing a confidentiality statement that specifies the following:

- She/he will not disclose or distribute the contents of such confidential information to anyone outside the Department's Faculty or academic administration.
- She/he will not disclose or distribute the contents of such confidential information to any of the candidates, including the candidate who may be ultimately employed.
- She/he will not make a physical (including printed) or electronic copy of any of the materials.
- She/he will not contact any of the parties who have provided confidential references.
- She/he will abide by university policies in using the information disclosed in the materials. In particular, she or he will adhere to the university's guidelines on impartiality/objectivity in the university's non-discrimination policy.

Except for applicants' CVs and cover letters, confidential materials should not be made available to students.

4.4   *Role of Faculty in Tenure-System Searches & Selection.* All tenure-system members of the Department's Faculty have a duty to engage in the search and selection process from the beginning of the campus-interview phase through the meeting at which the Faculty rank the acceptable finalists. In order to fulfill that duty, the Faculty should inform themselves by reviewing candidates' application materials and attending candidates' public sessions. The Department's non-tenure-system faculty are welcome to similarly engage in the search and selection process but they do not have a duty to do

so; they are also welcome to join with the tenure-system Faculty in deliberating the ranking of the finalists but may not vote on that ranking.

4.5 *Conflicts of Interest.* A real or perceived conflict of interest between an applicant and a Faculty member engaged in the search process must be disclosed 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, using the guidelines from the UMass Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity for definitions of relationships:

4.5.1 Search committee members engaged in a **personal** relationship with an applicant must disclose the relationship to others involved in the evaluation of the candidate and must recuse him/herself from any deliberations involving that particular applicant. In most cases, a search committee member with a personal relationship with an applicant who has reached the campus-interview list should recuse him/herself from the committee's work, including deliberations over other applicants.

4.5.2 Search committee members engaged in a **close professional** relationship with an applicant must disclose the relationship to others involved in the evaluation of the candidate and must recuse him/herself from any deliberations involving the applicant but may vote along with other department faculty on all applicants.

4.5.3 A search committee member with a **distant** professional relationship (few collaborations or collaborations older than five years) with an applicant who has reached the shortlist need not recuse him/herself from the committee's work but should disclose 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.

5. **Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) Faculty Search Committees & Procedures**:: The Department will conduct individual non-tenure-track faculty searches using the same procedures as those described above for tenure-system faculty searches with these exceptions:

5.1 *Committee Composition.* While the composition of committees for tenure-system faculty searches should be weighted toward tenured faculty (or, in the case of senior searches, faculty of equal or higher rank), committees composed for NTT searches need not favor senior or tenure-system faculty and should include at least one current NTT faculty member if the Department has such a faculty member available whose workload composition would permit such participation. Students are not eligible to serve as members of such search committees; however, students should be

given opportunities to meet faculty candidates and to provide feedback to the search committee.

5.2 *Purview of Search Committees in NTT Searches.* The purview of the search committee in NTT faculty searches is the same as that for tenure-system faculty searches except that in lieu of convening to deliberate on the finalists, the committee may solicit feedback from all of the Department's Faculty after the last campus interview; will write a recommendation that reflects the Faculty's feedback, the committee's ranking of the acceptable finalists, and the committee's rationale for that ranking.

5.3 *Role of the Faculty in NTT Searches.* The Department's Faculty have a duty to engage in searches for NTT faculty whose appointments are 50% FTE or greater due to the potential for such faculty eventually achieving continuing appointments.

6. **Representation by Faculty on College- and University-Level Committees**. Faculty may volunteer for or may agree to be appointed by the Chair to service on college- and university-level committees and in similar roles. Service on the following committees, however, is by election as described below:

6.1 *College Personnel Committee (CPC).* All of the Department's Faculty will annually elect one representative to the CPC to perform the functions assigned to it by the CBA. Eligibility for service on the CPC will be limited to full-time tenured faculty, who have achieved the rank of Associate Professor.

6.2 *College Review Committee (CRC).* The CRC reviews the promotion applications of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers and is elected at large across the College by Faculty with any form of the title Lecturer. The Department's Faculty with any form of the title Lecturer will annually nominate from among themselves one person to stand for election to the CRC.

7. **Department Meetings**.

7.1 *Frequency.* At least twice per semester and with at least one week's notice, the Chair will schedule and convene general meetings of the Faculty. The Chair may call and convene additional special meetings as necessary to address urgent business of the Department. By petition of at least 20% of the Faculty, the Chair will convene additional special meetings to address matters raised by the petitioners.

7.2 *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.

7.3 *Meeting Agendas.* When possible, the Chair will publish the agenda for each regular Department meeting before the meeting. The Chair will

publish the agenda for any special meeting at the time of the meeting's announcement.

7.4 *Quorum.* The Department may vote on the business of the Department with a quorum consisting of at least 2/3 of the Faculty.

7.5 *Voting.* On matters requiring a vote of the Faculty, votes may be made by written proxy or electronically in a method to be determined by the Chair. Voice votes on any matter are acceptable unless any individual member of the Faculty requests otherwise, in which case the vote must occur by secret written ballot. Except as otherwise specified in these bylaws, a simple majority vote will suffice to carry a motion.

7.6 *Minutes and Recordkeeping.* On an annual basis, the Chair will solicit volunteers to take minutes, which will 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 five years.

8. **Department Specifications for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT).** All standards and most procedures related to reappointment, promotion, and tenure of Faculty 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.

8.1 *External Reviews of RPT Cases.*

8.1.1 *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). Reappointments of tenure-system faculty during their probationary periods do not require external reviews. Neither reappointments nor promotions for non-tenure-system faculty require external reviews; however, as permitted by the CBA's Article 21, Lecturers may request external reviews.

8.1.2 *Number of External Reviews.* The Department Chair will make a good-faith effort to secure at least eight "arm's-length" external reviews for every promotion and/or tenure case that requires external reviews. The Chair may solicit and add to the file any number of reviews 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.

8.1.3 *Identification and Solicitation of External Reviewers.* The CBA charges the Chair with soliciting external reviewers and permits the candidate to suggest external reviewers, some or all of whom will be solicited by the Chair. The Chair 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 Chair may receive assistance in describing the "standing" of each external reviewer in the candidate's file, but the Chair 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. Under most circumstances, the solicitation of external reviews should occur no later than three months before the candidate's file submission deadline.

8.1.4 *Qualifications of External Reviewers*. In general, external reviewers should be well recognized scholars or professionals in the candidate's field, should hold the rank of Professor, should have active scholarly programs, and should be at institutions that are at least peers of UMass. External reviewers who do not meet these criteria may be appropriate and acceptable, but in describing the "standing" of such reviewers, the Chair should carefully explain why such reviewers are appropriate for the task of commenting on the candidate's having met the relevant standards.

8.1.5 *Candidate's Rights Regarding External Reviewers*. Before making such solicitations, the Chair 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. The list mustinclude some of the external reviewers suggested by the candidate. If the candidate identifies a conflict of interest with any of the proposed reviewers, the Chair should assess whether a true conflict exists and, if one does, should eliminate, mitigate, or manage the conflict.

8.2 *Internal Reviews of RPT Cases*.

8.2.1 *Identification & Solicitation of UMass Faculty & Staff Reviews*. The candidate and the Chair may identify potential reviewers internal to UMass Amherst. Such 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 Chair must individually solicit such internal reviews.

8.2.2 *Identification and Solicitation of Student Reviews*. The Chair may solicit comments from individual students. 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. These reviews should be individually solicited, and the faculty member is encouraged to waive their rights to see these letters, so that they can be confidential. The Chair may also solicit comments from groups of students; responses to such non-individual solicitations are never protected by the candidate's waiver of access rights, and any "group solicitations" should advise potential respondents that their responses will not be confidential.

8.3 *Waiver of Rights of Access to Review Letters*. A candidate for RPT may waive or decline to waive her/his rights of access to internal and external review letters that have been individually solicited. The decision whether or not to waive those rights belongs exclusively to the candidate, and neither the Chair nor any other member of the Faculty should pressure the candidate to decide one way or another.

8.4   *Participation of Faculty in RPT Cases.* Section 2 above describes the permissible participation of the Faculty beyond the core DPC in the consideration of RPT cases.

8.5   *Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness for RPT.* The CBA's Article 33 requires that every department develop or adopt one or several modes appropriate to the evaluation of teaching in that unit and procedures for the administration of student evaluations of teaching. In compliance with that requirement, the Department adopts the following:

8.5.1   *Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness in Classroom Settings.* All Faculty should use the centrally administered SRTI instrument to solicit and receive student evaluations in every course section taught. Faculty may not themselves administer or collect student evaluations. Individual Faculty may supplement but may not replace the SRTI instrument with other another instrument(s).

8.5.2   *Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness Outside Classroom Settings.* Periodically, the Chair and/or the Graduate Program Director will solicit confidential input from all students who are working under the individual advisement/direction of a Faculty member, seeking feedback on the effectiveness of that Faculty member's instruction..

8.5.3   *Peer & Expert Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness.* Untenured Faculty in their probationary period and NTT Faculty intending to seek promotion should seek consultation and formative evaluations of their teaching effectiveness from the Institute for Teaching Effectiveness & Faculty Development. Such Faculty plus tenured Faculty expecting to apply for promotion within a year or two should solicit evaluations through direct observation of their teaching from peers inside or outside the Department. While peer and expert evaluations are not required of any Faculty member, they help provide valuable evidence in making a case for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

8.5.4   *Contributions to Program & Curriculum Development.* Applications for RPT should include evidence of the candidate's contributions to program and curriculum development (if any).

8.6   Evidence of Effective Service for RPT**.** Applications for RPT should include evidence of the candidate's contributions to service. The CBA and Red Book require that all tenure-system Faculty engage in service. NTT faculty are required to engage in service only if it is part of their assigned duties. The CBA requires that service to the faculty union and service outside the Department be considered at the department level as part of any Faculty member's AFR or evaluation for RPT purposes. In general, the consideration of service should be inclusive, acknowledging the contributions that candidates make both inside and outside the Department and inside and outside the university. The extent to which service outside the university is relevant to a case for RPT depends on the pertinence of that service to the individual's professional profile or to advancement of the university's mission. Service may include that provided in governance or management of the Department, the College, the University, the MSP, or the profession;

that representing outreach to extend knowledge beyond the university/professional community; and that intended to promote community engagement as a benefit both to the university community and to the off-campus community. Especially important is evidence of leadership in making service contributions.

Annual Faculty Review and Evaluation. Each faculty member will be evaluated annually. The CBA's Article 33 requires use of the bargained AFR form by every member of the Faculty who is 50% FTE or greater. In the occasion that we have Faculty who are less than 50% FTE, we also will use the bargained AFR form.   The core DPC and the Chair should substantively and candidly conduct their evaluations of each Faculty member's AFR.

9. **Review of the Department Chair**. If the Chair wishes to be reappointed to another term in that position, the Department's Faculty, led by the DPC, will conduct a review of the Chair during the fall semester of the final year of her/his appointment. The DPC will follow the procedures prescribed by Senate Document #82-021, beginning the process no later than October 15 during the final year of the Chair's appointment.

   10.1 *Self-Evaluation*. As an initial step, the Chair will prepare a written self-evaluation of her/his administrative achievements during the current appointment and will provide that document to the Faculty no later than October 15th.

   10.2 *Survey*. The DPC will prepare and distribute four confidential surveys no later than November 1st: (1) one to departmental staff; (2) one to all undergraduate majors and all graduate students; (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. Raw data and summaries of responses to these surveys will be reviewed by the DPC, will be redacted to protect the identities of all respondents, and will be included with the DPC's report to the dean but will not be available to faculty, staff, or students.

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

   10.4 *Meeting with the Chair*. After most data collection is complete, the DPC will invite the Chair to meet to discuss the initial findings of the data collection process. The Chair may decline to meet.

   10.5 *Draft Report*. No later than December 1st, the DPC 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 non-binding recommendation regarding

whether the Chair should be reappointed. The report should assiduously limit its assessment to areas within the purview and control of the Chair.

10.6 *Concluding Meeting of the Faculty*. Before the end of fall semester, the DPC will convene the Faculty to discuss the draft report and to receive recommendations for revision of the document.

10.7 *Final Report*. The DPC will finalize its report and will then submit it to the Dean, simultaneously providing a copy to the Chair (excluding raw and other confidential data). The Dean may ask to meet with the DPC to discuss the report, but neither the DPC nor the Dean is obliged to meet.

10.8 *Chair's Response*. The Chair may prepare and submit to the Dean a written response to the final report.

11. **Implementation of these bylaws**: By at least a two-thirds' majority vote of the Faculty, these bylaws are adopted and take effect on April 10th, 2019. 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.

12. **Amendment of these bylaws**: By majority vote, 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 Faculty.