Department of Veterinary and Animal Sciences BYLAWS
Voted upon and adopted on 5/5/2019

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 Veterinary and Animal Sciences* (VASCI) in the *College Natural Sciences* (CNS) at the *University of Massachusetts Amherst* (UMass). Federal and state laws, UMass Trustee policies (including, but not limited to, T76-081, the Academic Personnel Policy, aka the "Red Book") and the CBA 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/head, associate deans, deans, and other non-unit administrators) 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. 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 bargaining-unit Faculty may have access to relevant information and may deliberate on all promotion and tenure cases. However, only tenured faculty may vote on promotion of tenure system faculty as discussed elsewhere in these bylaws.

    2.3 *Graduate Faculty.* Only Faculty who have been designated Graduate Faculty by the Dean of the Graduate School may deliberate and vote on graduate program and graduate curricular matters.

    2.4 *Part-Time Faculty Appointments Under 50%.* Part-time bargaining-unit non-Graduate Faculty with a full time equivalent (FTE) of 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.

    2.5 *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.

    2.6 *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. Participation in

governance and service will be proposed by Department Chair after consultation with the faculty. In case of disagreement, final decisions will be made by simple majority vote in Faculty meetings.

2.7   *Rights and Duties of Faculty on Leave.* Faculty on full-time paid leave (including parental leave and sabbatical leave but excluding sick leave) maintain their rights during the leave to exercise their rights to participate in the governance of the Department. Faculty on full-time paid sick leave and on full-time unpaid leave may retain their rights of governance contingent on Faculty acceptance by repeated majority vote at faculty meetings. 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.

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

a. *Departmental Personnel Committee (DPC)*

3.1. *DPC Purview*: All of the Department's Faculty will annually elect a DPC consisting of three faculty members to perform the functions assigned to it by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), including but not limited to reviewing the *Annual Faculty Review* (AFR) 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/Head.

3.2. *Term of Office.* Members of the DPC shall be elected annually on September 1st of each year.

3.3   *Composition & Eligibility.* The DPC will consist of 3 Faculty members of whom 1 must be a tenured faculty member. The remaining 2 DPC members may be 2 tenure system faculty members or 1 tenure system faculty and 1 non-tenure track faculty member.   For all reappointment, promotion, tenure cases within the DPC's purview as determined by the CBA, the DPC will expand to include all of the Department's Faculty whose rank and tenure status is equal to or greater than that of the proposed personnel action. (For example, only tenured Faculty may vote on applications for tenure; only Full Professors may vote for promotion from Associate to Full). These faculty members will have access to the full tenure and promotion files.

3.4. *Means of Election.* By April 1 of each year, the Department Chair/Head will solicit nominations for service on the DPC from September 1 to August 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 are

eligible to vote in electing the 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/Head. Eligible Faculty who cannot attend the meeting may vote by e-mail to the Department Chair/Head.. *Leadership.* Once elected, the members of the DPC will select their own committee chair.

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

3.6 *Annual Faculty Review and Merit Pay Evaluation.* Annual faculty reviews will be evaluated and merit pay assigned based on AFR rank.

3.7 *Graduate Program Committee* (GPC). The GPC will be chaired by the *Graduate Program Director* (GPD), and other members will be proposed by the Department Head and approved by the Faculty by a simple majority vote. The committee will consist of graduate faculty who will be responsible for reviewing graduate student applications and proposing policy for graduate students including academic requirements. Any policy changes to graduate student programs should be brought to a vote first by the GPC, and then by the entire faculty. Scholarships (Snoyenbos and Hong) will be decided by simple majority vote from all graduate faculty.

3.8 *Undergraduate Program Committee* (UPC). The UPC will be chaired by the *Undergraduate Program director* (UPD) and members will include the *Honors Program Director* (HPD), and other faculty. Faculty members of the UPC will be proposed by the Department Head and appointed by VASCI faculty by a simple majority vote. The committee will be responsible for all policy for undergraduate students, including reviewing and awarding of scholarships. The UPC is also responsible for undergraduate recruitment and developing internship opportunities with industrial partners. Any policy changes to undergraduate students, including changes in the curriculum, should be brought to a vote first by the UPC, and then by the entire faculty.

4 **Administrative and Coordinator Positions.** The following are departmental administrative roles assigned by the Department Head and approved by the Faculty through a simple majority vote.

4.1 *Graduate Program Director* (GPC). A faculty member responsible for the Graduate programs within the Department. Responsibilities relate to the administrative aspects of incoming and matriculating graduate students including but not limited to: chairing the Graduate Policies Committee, initial reviews of

applications to the Graduate Program, preparation of documents associated with the milestones of the M.S. and PhD programs.

4.2 *Undergraduate Program Director* (UPD). A faculty member responsible for the Undergraduate programs within the department. Responsibilities include chairing of the UPC, maintaining undergraduate scholarship program, attending the College and University chief undergraduate advisor (CUA) meetings, assigning academic advisors in consultation with the Department Chair and the UPC, supporting Undergraduates within our program, graduation clearance, and participation in the CNS Graduation Celebration.

4.3 *Honors Program Director* (HPD).A faculty member responsible for the Honors program within the department. Responsibilities include maintaining the Honors Program, approving honors applications, approving honors courses, honors project/thesis proposals, and honors thesis, facilitating honors thesis assignment, attending Honors College meetings, supporting Honors students within our program.

5. Administrative Roles appointed by the Department Chair.

5.1. *Scheduling Officer* (SO). Responsible for communicating with the Registrar's office, registering students for courses, reserving rooms, and scheduling courses.

5.2. *Building Coordinator(s)* (BC) Faculty or staff member(s) responsible for communicating with the Physical Plant about building maintenance and renovation.

5.3. *Laboratory Safety Coordinator(s)* (LSC) Faculty or staff member(s) responsible for laboratory safety within the department. Responsibilities in include attending LSC meetings with Environmental Health and Safety (EHS), communicating policies and maintaining laboratory safety logs.

5.4. *Web Page Coordinator(s)* Faculty or staff member (s) responsible for maintaining departmental web page.

6. Department Faculty Meetings.

6.1. *Department Faculty meetings* will be held once a month during the academic year and chaired by the Department Head who will provide an agenda at least 1 day before each meeting. Faculty may request items to be added to this agenda up to the day of the meeting. Additional meetings can be called by the Department Head or requested by faculty through the Department Head. All faculty are expected to participate in faculty meetings. If a faculty member is unable to attend a meeting in which majority votes are sought, a vote may be given to the Department Head by proxy or via e-mail at least 1 hour before the meeting.

6.2. *Faculty,* specified in Section 2, will have the right to vote on all matters, unless there is a significant conflict of interest (COI). Professional or personal relationships that may appear to influence decisions should be disclosed.

6.3. Quorum. The Department may meet and act on the business of the Department with a quorum consisting of at least half of the Faculty.

6.4. Conflict resolution. It is recognized that faculty members will occasionally disagree on an issue. It is hoped that disagreement will be resolved by debate in which alternative positions, courses of action and projected outcomes are made clear. It is expected that these discussions will be respectful. In cases where debate is resolved by a majority vote, it is required that all parties accept the majority vote.

6.5. Meeting minutes and record keeping will be done by the Department Head, or by a faculty member appointed by the head.

7   Representation by Faculty on College- and University-Level Committees.
Faculty may volunteer for or may agree to be appointed by the Chair/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 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 Professor. The Department representative on the CPC will not vote on candidates from their own Department, The duration of service will be negotiated with the Department Head.

7.2   *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.

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

8.1   *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/Head will solicit, from among the faculty, interest in serving on the search committee. The Chair/Head will appoint members of the committee 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 Chair/Head 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 Chair/Head will designate the committee chair from among its members.

8.2   *Purview of Search Committees in Tenure-System Searches.*   Committees charged with conducting searches for tenure-system faculty will collaborate with the Chair/Head in developing the position description, advertising/recruitment plan, facilities plan, and other elements of the hiring requisition; will work with the Department Head and Human Resources Administrator 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 review all application materials and, if considered necessary, ask referees for clarification of statements, 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 campus interviews comprised of group and individual meetings and 2 seminar presentations, the first encompassing original work completed, the second focusing on the scope of the work anticipated as a faculty member; will arrange a meeting of all of the Department's Faculty after the last campus interview in order to deliberate and vote (by secret ballot) 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.

8.3   *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 for other applicants).   The Department Chair/Head 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.

8.4   *Role of Faculty in Tenure-System Searches & Selection.*   As far as is possible all faculty, and in particular all tenure system 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. Faculty attending candidate presentations should provide feedback to the search committee using the survey material provided.

8.5   *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:

8.5.1. 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.

8.5.2. 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.

8.5.3. 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.

9.   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:

9.1 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.

9.2. 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.

9.3. 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.

10. **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.

    10.1 External Reviews of RPT Cases.

    10.1.1. <u>*Personnel Actions Requiring External Reviews.*</u> 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, although the department will comply with certain practices as required by the CPC, such as soliciting external and internal letters for 4.2 reviews, also known as "mini-tenure" 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.

    10.1.2. *Number of External Reviews.* The Department Chair/Head 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/Head 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.

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

10.1.4. 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/Head should carefully explain why such reviewers are appropriate for the task of commenting on the candidate's having met the relevant standards.

10.1.5. Candidate's Rights Regarding External Reviewers. Before making such solicitations, the Chair/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. The list shall 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 Chair/Head should assess whether a true conflict exists and, if one does, should eliminate, mitigate, or manage the conflict.

10.2. Internal Reviews of RPT Cases.

10.2.1. Identification & Solicitation of UMass Faculty & Staff Reviews. The candidate and the Chair/Head 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 contributions to teaching and service in the department and/or campus, and also in cases where the reviewer can speak to the particular contributions to collaborations within the department or across campus. The Chair/Head must individually solicit such internal reviews.

10.2.2. Identification and Solicitation of Student Reviews. The Chair/Head 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. Such reviews should be individually solicited. The Chair/Head 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.

10.2.3. 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/Head nor any other member of the Faculty should pressure the candidate to decide one way or another.

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

10.2.5. 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:

10.2.6. *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).

10.2.7. *Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness Outside Classroom Settings.* Annually, the Chair/Head and/or the Graduate Program Director will conduct a confidential survey of 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. The Chair and the GPD will inform the faculty member and advise accordingly.

10.2.8. *Peer & Expert Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness.* Untenured Faculty in their probationary period and NTT Faculty intending to seek promotion are advised to 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 are advised to 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.

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

10.2.10. *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, 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.

11. 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.   The DPC and the Chair/Head should substantively and candidly conduct their evaluations of each Faculty member's AFR.

12. Review of the Department Chair/Head. If the Chair/Head 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/Head 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/Head's appointment.

12.1. *Self-Evaluation.* As an initial step, the Chair/Head 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.

12.2. *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.

12.3. *Meetings with Constituencies.* The DPC will offer to meet with employee and student groups to receive confidential assessments of the Chair/Head'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.

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

12.5. *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/Head should be reappointed. The report should assiduously limit its assessment to areas within the purview and control of the Chair/Head.

12.6. *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.

12.7. *Final Report.* The DPC will finalize its report and will then submit it to the Dean, simultaneously providing a copy to the Chair/Head (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.

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

13. Implementation of these bylaws: By at least a two-thirds' majority vote of the Faculty, these bylaws are adopted and take effect on [date]. 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.

14. 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.