The Department of Chemistry recognizes the critical importance of the decision to grant tenure and recommend promotion to both the individual faculty member and to the department as a whole. The Department has therefore developed the following performance criteria and procedures to guide the candidate and peer evaluators in the tenure and promotion decisions. The Department further recognizes the need for continual updating and revision of these guidelines as the performance in the department improves. In addition to the information contained within these guidelines, additional information on tenure and promotion criteria and procedures may be found in the university’s policies and procedures. It is the responsibility of the faculty member applying for tenure and/or promotion to become familiar with and abide by the policies, procedures, and deadlines involved in the granting of promotion and/or tenure.

These expectations are considered reasonable for faculty members whose workload includes significant, consistent assignment for research/scholarship/creative activity throughout the review period.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member preparing a publication or presentation to consult with his/her mentor and other faculty members to determine whether the venue is of "national" status. In the first year, the new faculty member will consult with the department chair and the D-PTRC to develop a plan for meeting the requirements for promotion and tenure.

Faculty members considered for promotion and/or tenure shall be evaluated with respect to their performance in (1) teaching, (2) research/scholarship/creative activity, and (3) service/outreach. While all candidates for promotion and/or tenure are expected to meet acceptable standards in all 3 categories, candidates for associate professor are also expected to demonstrate high quality in teaching and high quality in either research/scholarship/creative activity or service/outreach. Promotion to full professor requires sustained high quality in teaching and a demonstration of high quality that is recognized at the national level in research/scholarship/creative activity or service/outreach. Moreover, all faculty members are expected to demonstrate evidence
of character, attitude, and personality that will ensure cooperation with colleagues and commitment to programs and students of the department, the college, and the university. This expectation includes a willingness to accept and successfully complete assignments in the administration of the department and taking an active role in improving the department and its programs. Tenure is only awarded to those members of the faculty who have outstanding abilities sufficient to demonstrate that their future services and performances justify the degree of permanence afforded by academic tenure. Promotion in rank is recognition of past achievements as well as the expected potential of the person being recommended for promotion. The granting of promotion or tenure is based on the expectation that the performance level that has been demonstrated will continue or improve.

To be considered for promotion and/or tenure, the candidate must:
   a. hold a terminal degree in an appropriate field.
   b. have completed the required years of service as detailed in MTSU Policies and Procedures.
   c. satisfy the performance criteria described below.

   It should be noted that to demonstrate high quality in a given area, the candidate is not required to meet every one of the criteria listed under each area. Rather the term “high quality” is based on the overall quantity and quality of the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service/outreach. It should be further noted that the performance evaluation will be based on the period since the last promotion or since being hired at MTSU plus any years granted toward tenure upon hire.

**Performance Criteria**

1. **Teaching**

   MTSU has a long tradition of excellence in instruction and is committed to maintaining high-quality teaching. Therefore all faculty members are expected to demonstrate high quality teaching. At a minimum, the candidate is expected to demonstrate teaching comparable to the average performance of the department. It is noted here that meeting this standard does not constitute high quality in this area. The factors to be considered in judging a candidate’s teaching effectiveness include but are not limited to:

   a. quality of courses as judged by members of the D-PTRC. Factors to be considered in judging the quality of a course include well-organized and well-presented lectures along with reasonable and regular assessments of the students’ progress.

   b. updating of the content and/or presentation of the courses in response to changes in knowledge or technology.

   c. conscientiousness in carrying out obligations to students such as meeting classes regularly and on time, giving advance notice of unavoidable absence, being
available to students outside of class, and returning assignments and exams in a reasonable amount of time.

d. performance on student evaluations.

e. seeking internal and/or external funding for instructional activities. The quality of the grant proposals, whether funded or unfunded, shall be stressed in the evaluation.

f. recognition by organizations outside the Department of Chemistry in the form of teaching awards.

g. other factors such as frequently carrying teaching loads in excess of the departmental average.

2. Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity

The faculty member shall demonstrate evidence of the establishment of an active and vigorous research program at MTSU. The factors to be considered in evaluating the research/scholarship/creative activity of the candidate include, but are not limited to:

a. Publication of research activity.

The chemistry department values the scholarship of discovery (seeking knowledge), the scholarship of synthesis (building upon and combining previous findings to develop new approaches), the scholarship of application (attempting to solve practical problems), and the scholarship of teaching (transforming and extending knowledge through classroom-based activities).

In the chemistry department research/scholarship/creative activity will be evaluated for promotion. Relative to research/scholarship/creative activity, candidates for associate professor must demonstrate consistent progress toward establishing an active research program in their area of specialization as evidenced by a record of quality peer-reviewed publications. Candidates for professor must demonstrate a sustained record of high quality research, meeting the criteria for national recognition listed below. Faculty demonstrating high quality performance in teaching and research/scholarship/creative activity without a record of quality service/outreach cannot be supported for promotion at any level.

The “minimum” number of publications expected may vary among chemistry sub-disciplines. New faculty with a strong publication record will be credited with their publications, but will be expected to establish an active program of research and publication at MTSU to be considered for promotion. In all cases the quality of the research will be more important than the quantity, regardless of the absolute number of publications.

Publications may consist of any combination of peer-reviewed journal article(s), textbook(s), monograph chapter(s), or laboratory manual(s). Items accepted for publication, but not yet in print, shall be included. The publications must be reviewed by
peers who are not known to be associated with MTSU. Some of the publications must be national in scope. The quality of scholarly work shall be stressed in determining the amount of work necessary to reach the level of “high quality” performance.

b. a record of presentation at local, state, regional, national, and/or international meetings.

c. a record of seeking internal and external funding for research/creative activities as appropriate. The quality of the grant proposals, whether funded or not funded, shall be stressed in the evaluation.

d. a record of student involvement in research/creative activities. It is expected that the results of student research will be published and/or presented.

e. other factors such as awards and invitations to speak at seminars.

The chemistry department will consider the following activities when evaluating national recognition: publication(s) in nationally or internationally recognized journals, citations of publications, serving as reviewer for nationally and internationally recognized journals, presenting at national and international meetings, serving on the organizing committee for national and international meetings or symposia (this may also be under service), and serving on national review boards for funding agencies. Since the formal literature and means of disseminating scientific information is constantly changing, the D-PTRC and chair of the department of chemistry will make the sole determination of whether a journal or meeting is of "national" status. The faculty member, when hired, in consultation with the D-PTRC and the Department Chair, will develop a list of nationally recognized journals appropriate for his/her research. The faculty member will notify the D-PTRC and Department Chair if the list is updated due to collaborations and/or changes in research emphasis.

3. Service/Outreach

Service to the profession, the department, the college, and the university is expected of every faculty member. While the level of activity within this area may vary over a wide range due to commitments in other areas, everyone is expected to participate in service/outreach activities and shoulder their “fair share” of the service load. However, mere presence at a variety of activities does not constitute quality performance.

Evaluation of the service/outreach component shall be based on performance in three areas within the review period:

1) public service to the community as defined by the university’s role and mission;

2) service to the university which shall include serving on departmental, college, and/or university committees; and,

3) professional service.
Activities that fall under the rubric of service/outreach include, but are not limited to:

a. service on a student advisement committee;

b. coordinator of a course/laboratory, instrument maintenance coordinator, computer maintenance coordinator, seminar director, or other activity required to maintain the smooth functioning of the department.

c. service on departmental, college, or university committees;

d. service on the Faculty Senate;

e. service as an officer in a professional organization;

f. faculty advisor to a student organization;

 g. reviewer for journal, textbook publisher, or granting agency;

h. organizer of workshops, seminars, symposia, or other types of meetings of a scientific nature.

Note: The candidate should consult with the department chairman and the chair of the D-PTRC as to the suitability of activities not included in the above list.

The D-PTRC recognizes that this list is not comprehensive, nor is service in every category expected or required. Rather, the overall participation of the candidate is to be evaluated in comparison to the department as a whole.

The chemistry department will consider the following activities when evaluating national recognition: serving as officer for professional organizations that are national or international in scope, serving on the organizing committee for national and international meetings, workshops, symposia (this may also be listed under research), serving as reviewer for national and international journals, presenting service type work at national and international conferences.

Development of the Performance Plan

It will be the responsibility of the Department Chairperson in consultation with the faculty member to develop a detailed plan of activities that will result in promotion and/or tenure. The Department Chairperson will then submit the plan to the D-PTRC for approval at the earliest possible time. Approval of the plan requires a majority vote of the D-PTRC. After approval by the D-PTRC, any changes to the plan must be agreed to,
in writing, by the faculty member, the Department Chairperson, and the D-PTRC. Once approved by the D-PTRC, a copy of the plan will be forwarded to the Dean.

**Documentation**

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure shall submit two copies of a completed Outline of Faculty Data form to the Department Chairperson. As part of the Outline of Faculty Data, the candidate shall submit a copy of the approved individual tenure/promotion plan and a brief summary indicating whether they have “MET” or “NOT MET” the activities listed under Teaching, Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity, and Service/Outreach. The candidate will also submit two copies of the supporting documentation listed in Appendix A. In addition, the candidate may submit any other documentation he/she feels is relevant to their application and that will aid the D-PTRC in reaching a decision.

**Procedure**

The following is an abbreviated description of the procedure to be followed by the D-PTRC in evaluating an application for promotion and/or tenure. Additional procedures and policies will be found in the MTSU Policies and Procedures. The D-PTRC will evaluate both tenure and promotion and a simple majority of the committee will constitute a quorum.

The membership of the D-PTRC is composed of tenured department members regardless of rank, excluding individuals considered for promotion and the Department Chairperson, and is elected annually by all full-time tenure-track faculty members. The D-PTRC meets and selects one member to serve as chairperson. Once a chairperson has been selected, this faculty member will schedule all meetings of the D-PTRC and coordinate classroom visits. In addition the chairperson will obtain from the Chemistry Office, the summarized student evaluations for the department as a whole and make them available to the committee.

A faculty member wishing to apply for promotion and/or tenure initiates the process by informing the Chairperson of the D-PTRC in writing, and preparing two copies of an Outline of Faculty Data along with the required supporting documentation. Individual members of the D-PTRC evaluate the candidate based upon the information provided by the candidate and information from D-PTRC members who have visited the candidate’s classroom. The peer evaluator is guided in the evaluation of the candidate by the performance criteria outlined earlier. Individual peer evaluators fill out a “Peer Evaluation Form” for each candidate. A copy of this form is included in Appendix B. It should be noted that it is left to the professional judgment of the peer evaluator as to the weight to be given to the individual items on the “Peer Evaluation Form”. As a consequence of this, the “In summary” questions at the end of each area for each D-PTRC member are not necessarily the average of the individual items, nor is it required that a ranking be included for each item on the form.
After the candidate has been evaluated by the individual members, the D-PTRC meets and the candidate is given an opportunity to address the committee as a whole. The committee then candidly discusses the merits of the candidate’s application. To ensure a frank and open exchange, the deliberations of the D-PTRC are confidential and no minutes will be taken. Upon completion of the deliberations, the members of the D-PTRC vote by secret ballot, either Yes/No/Abstain, on the candidate’s request for promotion and/or tenure. Members of the D-PTRC unable to attend the meeting may vote by absentee ballot. This absentee ballot must be given to the Chairperson of the D-PTRC before the vote in committee is taken. Since promotion and tenure are separate questions, separate votes are required. The chairperson tabulates the votes and announces the results to the committee. A candidate must receive a yes vote from a majority of the voting members of the D-PTRC to be recommended for tenure and/or promotion. Once the vote has been announced, changes are not permitted unless a committee member requests a revote within two working days of the original vote. The Chairperson will then schedule a meeting of the D-PTRC for the revote. Any member of the committee has a right to request a recount of the votes and observe the recount.

Within two working days of the committee vote, the members of the D-PTRC must provide the chairperson their “Peer Evaluation Form” along with a written summary of the reasons for their vote. The written summaries of the reasons for their vote are considered confidential communications and remain the property of the individual D-PTRC committee member. The chairperson prepares a draft recommendation of the candidate’s application for promotion and/or tenure based upon the discussion and the written comments received. In addition, the chairperson will prepare a summary of the rankings from the Peer Evaluation Forms and include this with the recommendation. As part of the recommendation, the chairperson will report the results of the “In summary” questions using the following scale:

0.00 - 2.25  below average
>2.25 - 2.75  between below average and average
>2.75 - 3.25  average
>3.25 - 3.75  between average and above average
>3.75 - 4.25  above average
>4.25 - 4.75  between above average and exceptionally high positive
>4.75 - 5.00  exceptionally high, positive

The chairperson distributes this draft to the D-PTRC, which meets a final time to discuss and approve the recommendation.

After the recommendation has been approved by the D-PTRC, the Chairperson informs the Department Chairperson of the recommendation. If conflicting recommendations between the Department Chairperson and the D-PTRC result, they will collaborate in an attempt to resolve the conflict.

Upon final approval by the D-PTRC, the chairperson will forward its recommendation to the Dean. The chairperson will meet and discuss with the candidate
the decision of the committee and provide the candidate with a copy of the committee’s recommendation.

The D-PTRC will afford each candidate the opportunity to meet and discuss the review process upon which the decision was made. It is the candidate’s responsibility to initiate any request to review the process and data upon which the decision was made.

The candidate may withdraw from the review process at any level at any time without prejudice. Withdrawal from the process does not preclude the candidate from reapplying the next year, assuming the following year is not the terminal year.

Finally it needs to be reiterated, the granting of tenure and/or promotion are separate issues. Therefore the granting of either promotion or tenure does not guarantee the simultaneous granting of the other.