

**Departmental Guidelines for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure
Performance Evaluation Criteria
Department of Chemistry
Metropolitan State University of Denver
(Revised Fall 2014)**

I. Mission Statement

The Chemistry Department of Metropolitan State University of Denver shall offer chemistry courses of the highest quality to science and non-science majors via formal classroom instruction, laboratory exercises, directed independent study, and online instruction to provide trained chemists capable of entering graduate schools of chemistry, various schools of medicine, and local and state industries as well as teaching chemistry at the high school level in the Denver metropolitan area or in the state of Colorado.

To provide an environment conducive to learning, Chemistry Department faculty shall engage in a variety of scholarly activities designed to keep themselves current in their field and/or expand their areas of expertise.

Chemistry department faculty and staff shall contribute to the community via a variety of service activities and by participating in partnerships and collaborations with professional organizations, public and private schools, private corporations, and government organizations.

II. Department Goals

To enable students to develop an understanding of the fundamental principles of chemistry that will serve them all throughout their professional careers.

To prepare students for graduate work in chemistry, for chemical careers in industry/government/academia, and for post-graduate studies in the health sciences.

To offer a high quality concentration in Criminalistics for Chemistry majors who wish to pursue a career in Forensic Science.

To facilitate distance learning by providing a number of courses over the internet.

To maintain the department's accreditation by the American Chemical Society and the Criminalistics program's accreditation by the Forensic Science Education Programs Accreditation Commission.

III. Criteria and Guidelines

A. Criteria, Guidelines and Rating Scale for Performance Reviews

The Department of Chemistry guidelines shall also be the basis for the narrative used for tenure and promotion evaluation. The department's guideline establishes rigorous performance standards consistent with the goals of academic excellence. The areas of performance are Teaching, Scholarly Activities, and Service. The rating scale for these three criteria shall be Meets Standards, and Needs Improvement.

1. Areas of Performance

a. Teaching:

Teaching is a complex and reflective human activity that, in the higher education context, is offered in a forum that is advanced, semi-public, and essentially critical in nature. No single definition can possibly suffice to cover the range of talents that go into excellent teaching or that could be found across the board in the varied departments and disciplines of an entire college. Good teachers are scholars, researchers, inventors, scientists, creators, artists, professionals, investigators, practitioners or those with advanced expertise or experience who share knowledge, using appropriate methodologies, and who demonstrate and encourage enthusiasm about the subject matter in such a way as to leave the student with a lasting and vivid conviction of having benefited from that interaction.

Effective teachers typically maintain high academic standards, prepare students for professional work and development, facilitate student achievement, and provide audiences for student work. Some might add that the best teaching transmits specific skills or enhances talents that students possess, while others would note that good teaching develops habits of mind or provides models of scholarly, scientific, artistic or professional behavior and inquiry much more important than particular information. Faculty typically aspire to a number of other civic purposes in the classroom that may also include encouraging their students to long for the truth, to aspire to achievement, to emulate heroes, to become just or to do good, for example.

At the instructional level, the most important responsibilities of a teacher to his/her students are the following:

- (1) **Content Expertise:** To demonstrate knowledge and/or relevant experience, effective teachers must display knowledge of their subject matters in the relevant learning environment (classroom, on-line, hybrid, field work, etc.), which typically includes the skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced experience, training, or education.
- (2) **Instructional Design:** To re-order and re-organize this knowledge/experience for student learning, effective teachers must design

course objectives, syllabi, materials, activities, and experiences that are conducive to learning.

- (3) **Instructional Delivery**: To “translate” this knowledge/experience into a format accessible to students, effective teachers must communicate information clearly, create environments conducive to learning, and use an appropriate variety of teaching methods.
- (4) **Instructional Assessment**: To evaluate subject mastery and other student accomplishments, effective teachers must design assessment procedures appropriate to course objectives, ensure fairness in student evaluation and grading, and provide constructive feedback on student work.
- (5) **Advising In and Beyond the Classroom**: To provide guidance for students as they pursue undergraduate and post-baccalaureate education and/or employment. Effective advisors must interact with students to provide career guidance and information, degree program guidance and information (e.g., advice on an appropriate schedule to facilitate graduation), and answers to questions relating to a discipline.

b. Scholarly Activities:

Scholarly and creative activities are disciplinary or interdisciplinary expressions or interpretations that develop new ideas, uncover new knowledge, reframe existing questions, create new forms of representation, solve problems, or explore enduring puzzles.

Purposes include, but are not limited to, the following: advancing knowledge or culture through original research or creative activities; interpreting knowledge within or across disciplines; synthesizing information across disciplines, across topics, or across time; aiding society or disciplines in addressing problems; or enhancing knowledge of student learning and effective teaching.

In addition to these scholarly activities, this category may also include activities in which the faculty member shares other knowledge with members of the learned and professional communities; continued education and professional development activities appropriate to professional status or assignments; and other activities specific to the faculty member’s discipline or assigned responsibilities.

c. Service:

Faculty engage in service when they participate in the shared governance and good functioning of the institution; service to the institution can be at the program, department or college level. Beyond the institution, faculty engage in service when they use their disciplinary and/or professional expertise and talents to contribute to the betterment of their multiple environments, such as regional communities, professional and disciplinary associations, non-profit organizations, or government agencies. Examples of service might include:

- Committee participation
- Committee leadership
- Program or department contributions
- Board participation
- Unpaid public service to community and/or professional organizations
- Contributions to disciplinary associations

2. Rating Scale

The rating scale that shall be applied to each of the three criterion, teaching, scholarly activity and service, are:

Meets Standards This rating represents a level of performance that demonstrably and substantially exceeds the basic competency standard of the College of LAS (Letters, Arts and Science). Sustained performance at this level is necessary to support an application for tenure or promotion. Performance at this level is necessary for tenure and promotion, and a satisfactory post-tenure review.

Needs Improvement Does not meet standards. While this rating represents a level of performance that may meet a basic, minimal competency standard, it is insufficient to support an application for promotion or tenure, and if continued, a satisfactory post-tenure review.

Performance at this level may reduce a faculty member's eligibility for base salary increases and in some cases may render the faculty member ineligible for salary increases, and subject to a performance improvement plan, disciplinary action, and dismissal in accordance with applicable MSU Denver procedures.

In reviewing faculty performance using these ratings, evaluators shall conscientiously adhere to the descriptions of each rating category, taking care to acknowledge differing levels of performance among faculty members.

3. Reassigned Time Activities

- a. The evaluation of reassigned time shall be based upon the documented completion of the objectives approved in writing for reassigned time.
- b. All reassigned time activities will be approved by the Chair, Dean, and Provost (the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs).
- c. Evaluation of reassigned time activity within the Department will be evaluated by the Chair. Evaluation of reassigned time activity outside the department will be done by the supervisor of the project in which the faculty member is involved.

- d. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide the supervisor with documentation of the reassigned time activities at least two weeks before the supervisor is required to conduct the faculty member's review.
- e. If a faculty member has been granted reassigned time to work on a project for which there is no supervisor on campus, then the Department Chair will evaluate the faculty member's contributions based on documentation collected jointly by the chair and the faculty member. This evaluation shall be completed after consultation with the Dean.
- f. If a performance review is due before the reassigned time activities are completed, a progress report and evaluation of completed activities will be provided by the faculty member.
- g. At the completion of the reassigned time, the faculty member will provide a final report to the Chair and/or supervisor.
- h. If the faculty member is given a non-departmental administrative appointment, the evaluation of this reassigned time will be considered separately from the faculty's performance review.

4. Special Cases

- a. Leaves of absence (medical, without pay):

Faculty granted a leave of absence for no more than one semester shall submit a performance Portfolio to evaluate their activity only during that part of the year in which they were fulfilling their responsibilities as a faculty member. If a faculty member was on leave for more than a semester, no evaluation will be conducted.

5. Responsibilities of Tenure-Track Faculty and Reviewers

- a. **Faculty Member:** Each fall semester beginning in the second year of employment, tenure-track faculty must prepare a Portfolio as described below in section "B." The evaluation period is the previous academic year: Fall, Spring, and Summer. The due date for the document will be published in the academic calendar.

Any faculty member who fails to provide the required Portfolio risks not being reappointed for the following year. Faculty who can document an emergency or extenuating circumstance shall be given appropriate consideration.

- b. **Department/Peer Review Committee:** The department shall establish a Department/Peer Review Committee to conduct reviews of tenure-track faculty in their third and sixth year. (If the department does not have at least three eligible tenured faculty members, a Peer Review Committee will be established which will include members from cognate departments.) The review will be conducted according to the departmental guidelines. The procedures used by the Department/Peer Review Committee in arriving at its evaluation recommendations, including evidence examined and additional forms developed by the Committee for its use, shall be presented to and approved by a majority of the tenure-track and tenured faculty in the department. The Department/Peer Review Committee shall include at least three tenured faculty members who have been trained in the evaluation process.

- c. **Chair:** The Department Chair shall work with the tenured and tenure-track faculty to develop departmental guidelines that contain clearly articulated standards for each criterion. These departmental guidelines shall be written in the context of the College's, School's, and Department's/Program's mission and the contractual obligations of the faculty. The Chair shall ensure that the department faculty reviews the guidelines annually. The Chair or the Department/Peer Review Committee shall use the departmental guidelines as the basis for the faculty member's performance review.

B. Annual Performance Reviews of Tenure-Track Faculty

Each tenure-track faculty member shall be reviewed annually, on a cumulative basis, until awarded tenure or terminated. Reviewers at all levels for each year of review will write a letter commenting upon the faculty member's strengths and offering suggestions for improvement, recommending for or against reappointment based on the faculty member's performance and informed by the department guidelines. Faculty hired on joint appointments will select one Department for retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. The annual performance will be conducted following the procedures described in the most current Handbook for Professional Personnel and delineated by the Office of Academic and Student Affairs. The evaluation standards are outlined in the Chemistry Departmental Guidelines.

IV. Overall Evaluation Standards

The tenure candidate shall write a narrative that clearly explains their role as a faculty member. Although listed as three separate areas of evaluation, Teaching, Scholarly Activities, and Service often interact and become integrated within a faculty member's overall responsibilities. When possible, this interplay should be discussed in the Portfolio Narrative along with how the faculty member has grown through their probationary period.

A. Evaluation Standards for Teaching

Teaching is the act of creating and maintaining an environment which enhances the opportunities for student learning and discipline-related growth; it includes advising students to facilitate graduation and to transition to post baccalaureate careers or further educational opportunities.

Effective teachers display knowledge of their subject matters in the relevant learning environment (classroom, on-line, hybrid, field work, etc.), which typically includes the skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced experience, training, or education.

Guideline to Achieve Tenure:

The candidate will compose a Profile Narrative as directed by Digital Measures that should reflect their continued growth in teaching during the probationary years. Areas of continual growth are:

- Philosophy of teaching
- Development of learning objectives
- Pedagogical approaches used to meet learning objectives and evidence that students are achieving these goals
- Evidence that a tenure candidate's courses are up to date with the advances in Chemistry and science in general
- Instructional delivery methods that facilitate varied learning styles
- Use of assessment results and inclusion of scholarly activities to improve the overall quality of their courses

The faculty member SRI scores for all classes taught shall be a part of the Portfolio. In addition, a single summative peer observation and two department peer reviews per academic year shall be required for evaluation for tenure.

The Tenure-Track faculty member shall also provide in the Narrative a description of their activities in regards to the advising of students. A description of student advising should show how the candidate assisted students in achieving academic success, post-graduate education, and career opportunities. The faculty member should also discuss how advising is linked with their courses, scholarly activities and professional service, as appropriate.

Needs Improvement:

Faculty member has not accomplished all of the necessary activities to attain the "Meets Standards" rating.

- No demonstration that courses are regularly updated with new information, as consistent with the discipline.
- Little attention is given neither to instructional design and delivery to facilitate student learning, nor to the use of assessment to improve the course.
- If teaching general studies courses, faculty member has not designed the course consistent with the department's/college's expectations or has not done assessments as required by the general studies program.
- Classes are not evaluated using SRI scores, or SRI scores (Course as a Whole and Faculty Contribution to Course) are consistently (e.g., ~ two-thirds of average ratings) below 0.7 of the prefix average for same level course over a candidate's tenure-track probationary period at MSU. (If prefix average = 4.8, candidate needs to be consistently at or above the average for the prefix of 4.1 ($4.8 - 0.7 = 4.1$)).
- Faculty lacks summative peer observation or the observation does not demonstrate sound pedagogy to support student learning.
- Faculty member does not maintain 5 regular office hours and makes multiple mistakes when advising students.

Meets Standards:

This performance level demonstrates the minimum required accomplishments for a faculty member.

- Each course is kept current through review of instructional resources and the regular addition of new materials as appropriate.
- Narrative describes how courses are designed and delivered using multiple approaches to facilitate student learning, and expectations for student performance.
- Faculty member uses professional expertise along with course and/or program assessment results to improve courses. For any general studies courses taught, the tenure-track candidate shall designed their course in accordance with the official course syllabus, thus meeting departmental and college expectations.
- Assessment of general studies course comply with departmental and college requirements.
- SRI scores (Course as a Whole and Faculty Contribution to Course) are compared to same level courses (lower or upper division) within the prefix. Tenured candidate's SRI scores are consistently (e.g., ~ two-thirds of average ratings) within 0.7 of the prefix average over their tenure probationary period. (If prefix average = 4.8, candidates need to have an overall average for the prefix of 4.1 ($4.8 - 0.7 = 4.1$)). If averages are below this average, candidates need to show a trend of improvement toward the prefix average for same level courses over a minimum of two consecutive semesters, and the narrative addresses work toward improving student ratings of instruction through shifting instructional content and/or design and/or delivery and incorporating feedback from student commentary.
- Summative peer observation addresses strong pedagogy to facilitate student learning.
- Faculty member thoroughly and accurately advises students, using professional knowledge, thus providing them with multiple options and timely information.

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness can be provided in multiple ways, such as the following:

- Develop a new course
- Revise an existing course
- Supervise and mentor independent research students
- Develop a new laboratory manual
- Use reassigned time to improve teaching and/or curricular approaches
- Mentor advisees via CAPP reports and schedule planning
- Mentor students via learning opportunities outside of regular classroom
- Write letters for students seeking jobs and post-graduate opportunities

Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness should be provided in multiple ways, such as:

- Assessment of content cognitive learning benchmarks (ACS Exams) mandated by Department
- Assessment of content learning benchmarks (ChemQuery, ROT)
- Evidence that scholarly activities are routinely folded into the regular classes being taught (connecting to work of undergraduate researchers; disseminating extended opportunities for learning outside the classroom—speakers, activities of student science clubs, education about jobs in chemistry and related fields) mandated by Institution
- Student metacognitive benchmark assessments (SRIs) mandated by the Institution
- Assessment of student metacognitive benchmarks using peer-reviewed tools (MSLQ, Semantic Differential)
- Assessment of student psychomotor skills (IMMEX, CHEMX, MCA-I)
- Confirmation of content and cognitive rigor in the course (e.g. Summative Peer Observations, correlation data on course GPA vs SRIs; vs normed and instructor-written exams; vs cognitive, affective and/or psychomotor assessment instruments)

B. Evaluation Standards for Scholarly Activities

Scholarly and creative activities are disciplinary or interdisciplinary expressions or interpretations that uncover new knowledge about our world and universe, develop ideas, frame questions, create new forms of representation, solve problems, create new things (e.g. robots to new chemicals), or explore enduring puzzles.

Guideline to Achieve Tenure:

Tenure candidate must demonstrate in their narrative and annotated resume that they have made one or more major contributions to their discipline that have been peer-reviewed or a disciplinary equivalent.

<p><u>Needs Improvement:</u></p> <p>Minimum requirements and/or Standards have not been met.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• During the probationary period, the faculty member does not produce work that is accepted through peer review or the disciplinary equivalent (as determined by the department's RTP committee, and Chair of the department).
---	--

<p><u>Meets Standards:</u></p> <p>This performance level demonstrates the minimum required accomplishments for a faculty member.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the probationary period, a tenure candidate has had a disciplinary or pedagogical or creative work accepted in a peer-reviewed publication or the disciplinary equivalent (as determined by the department's RTP committee, and Chair of the department). • They have had at least one presentation, and preferably, multiple presentations, of their scholarly or creative works accepted after review for presentation at a professional meeting. • Other activities may include writing grants to outside agencies, upgrading their education, certification or licenses relative to their work assignments, or writing a chapter in their area of expertise for a commercial publishing house that requires a prospectus and review – more Scholarly Activities are listed below.
---	--

Scholarly Activities may include:

- Papers published in peer-reviewed journals (both paper and on-line)
- Books, book chapters, book units published after peer-review (through recognized publishers, e.g. Prentice Hall, Wiley)
- Awarded funding from outside resources (e.g. NIH, NSF, DOC and other federal or private funding agencies)
- Manuscripts (books or papers) submitted to refereed publishers which are currently under review
- Funding proposals (large requests) submitted but not yet funded to outside resources
- Invited professional reviews
- Awarded funding used to provide students with opportunities for networking, researching, or independent study
- Invited oral papers and/or workshops (International>National>Regional>Local)
- Awarded funding from internal sources used for research in chemistry or pedagogy
- Oral papers and/or workshops accepted under call for abstracts (International>National>Regional>Local)
- Research conducted with students that potentially will lead to dissemination of results
- Manuscripts submitted for publication (with or without students)
- Evidence of currency in both content and research-based curriculum. (e.g. conferences attended, papers presented, workshops).

C. Evaluation Standards for Service

Faculty engage in service when they participate in the shared governance and good functioning of the institution; service to the institution can be at the program, department, school, or college level. Beyond the institution, faculty engage in service when they use their disciplinary and/or professional expertise and talents to contribute to the betterment of their multiple environments, such as regional communities, professional and disciplinary associations, nonprofit organizations, or government agencies.

Guideline to Achieve Tenure:

Tenure candidate must demonstrate in their narrative that they have participated in shared governance at the university, and used their disciplinary or professional expertise to make an unpaid contribution to their professional organizations or the community outside of the college.

<p><u>Needs Improvement:</u></p> <p>Faculty member has not met minimum requirements and/or Standards for Service.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tenure-track faculty member has not made ongoing or significant contributions in service to the department, school, university, or outside community.
<p><u>Meets Standards:</u></p> <p>This performance level demonstrates the minimum required accomplishments for a faculty member.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The tenure-track candidate must demonstrate significant contributions to shared governance within the department, college, and university. Contribution to outside communities may involve participation within a candidate's disciplinary organization, or contributions using their disciplinary expertise to the community outside of the university. These contributions must be ongoing and make a significant difference. These contributions often, but not exclusively, take the form of significant committee work.

**Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review and
Promotion to
Associate Professor and Professor
Department of Chemistry
(Revised: October 10, 2012)**

1. Purpose

The primary goal of Post-Tenure Review (PTR) is to assess performance of tenured faculty members over a five-year period in the areas of Teaching, Advising, Scholarly Activities, and Service. PTR affords tenured faculty members and their supervisors periodic opportunities to assess the faculty member's performance from a long-term perspective. In the event that performance of the tenured faculty member, in any one of the three performance areas, is determined to be below average (Needs Improvement) from the long-term perspective, the PTR process offers the faculty member an opportunity to demonstrate a "Meets Standards" level performance in each performance area that is below average through an individualized Performance Improvement Plan.

2. Definition

The PTR evaluation must include consideration of faculty activities and performance in light of school/department/program goals, and priorities which are reflective of Trustee, and institutional goals and priorities, as well as peer, student and supervisor evaluations, and must evaluate the following aspects of a faculty member's performance:

- a) **Teaching effectiveness** in promoting student learning, of which advising of students is a part.
- b) **Scholarly activities** that enhance the overall curriculum and pedagogical approaches of the department to ensure that a rich and rewarding learning environment exists.
- c) **Service** to the institution, professional organizations and the community.
- d) Other activities, if appropriate, to his/her academic discipline and/or professional assignments.

When application of these criteria and guidelines result in a "Meets Standards" rating for each performance area, the faculty member's review will be complete.

The PTR process is governed and guided by the most current issue of section V (POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE-LINE FACULTY: REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, PROMOTION, POST-TENURE REVIEW, AND EMERITUS STATUS) of the Handbook of Professional Studies, which is revised annually. Preparation of faculty Portfolio, evaluation criteria for Teaching, Scholarly Activities, and Service, procedures of review of the faculty's

PTR Portfolio, and criteria of successful or unsuccessful PTR review are described in section V. Faculty preparing PTR Portfolio and/or Promotion Portfolio shall closely follow outline procedures in section V.

PTR affords faculty members and their supervisors with periodic opportunities to assess the faculty member's performance and shall be conducted for two primary reasons:

- To offer tangible recognition to those faculty members who have demonstrated high or improved performance, and
- To assist tenured faculty members to improve performance if necessary by providing formative feedback.

3. Due Process Policies

Due process policies are defined in section VII.H.3 of MSU Denver's *Handbook for Professional Personnel* (revised annually).

4. Criteria for PTR Evaluation

The faculty member must meet the contractual responsibilities and policies defined in the current MSU Denver's *Handbook for Professional Personnel*. Failure to do so may result in disciplinary action, up to and including termination.

Tenure faculty members will prepare a Portfolio using Metro State's online faculty evaluation system, Digital Measures (*Digital Measures User's Guide*, most current edition, MSU Denver's Educational Technology Center). Evaluation committees and individual evaluators will use the faculty prepared Portfolio to determine their level of performance during the five-year evaluation period. Categories to be measured are: Teaching, Scholarly Activities, and Service.

The rating scales that shall be applied to these criteria are:

Needs Improvement	This rating represents a level of performance that does not meet standards. While this rating represents a level of performance that may meet a basic, minimal competency standard, it is insufficient to support an application for a satisfactory PTR.
	Performance at this level may reduce a faculty member's eligibility for base salary increases and in some cases may render the faculty member ineligible for salary increases, and subject to a performance improvement plan, disciplinary action, and dismissal in accordance with applicable University procedures.
Meet Standards	This rating represents a level of performance that demonstrably and substantially exceeds the basic competency standard of the University and LAS (Letters, Arts and Science). Performance at this level is necessary for a satisfactory PTR review and promotion.

In reviewing faculty performance using the above ratings, evaluators will conscientiously adhere to the descriptions of each rating category, taking care to acknowledge differing levels of performance among faculty members.

4A. Teaching Performance

The faculty member must demonstrate sustained "Meets Standards" level of performance in teaching and advising, over the five-year evaluation period.

Teaching:

- 1) Course materials that demonstrate currency in the field and describe the desired learning objectives for students.
- 2) Appropriate and thorough assessment of student progress
- 3) Evaluation of teaching by students through the SRI evaluation system.

Advising:

- 1) Degree program guidance for the various programs in the Department of Chemistry.
- 2) Advise students on their class schedules to facilitate progress toward a degree, and answers to questions relating to a discipline. Examples include:
 - a. providing supporting documentation or letters to assist students in obtaining employment, graduate school placement, or placement in medical related schools
 - b. providing other information important to students regarding the field of

- chemistry, and the department, school, or university procedures and expectations
- c. providing information and guidance to aid students in completing chemistry courses they are enrolled in
 - d. working with students in discipline-related activities, such as undergraduate research, student organizations, and local and national conferences
 - e. other activities specific to the faculty member's discipline and department goals

Evaluation Standards for Teaching and Advising

The tenure faculty will compose a Profile Narrative as directed by Digital Measures that should reflect their continued growth in teaching and advising during the five-year evaluation period.

At the instructional level, the most important responsibilities of a teacher to his/her students are the following: (ref, Handbook of Profession Personnel, (section V.C.3))

- (1) *Content Expertise*: To demonstrate knowledge and/or relevant experience: Effective teachers display knowledge of their subject matters in the relevant learning environment (classroom, on-line, hybrid, field work, etc.), which typically includes the skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced experience, training, or education.
- (2) *Instructional Design*: To re-order and re-organize this knowledge/experience for student learning: Effective teachers design course objectives, syllabi, materials, activities, and experiences that are conducive to learning.
- (3) *Instructional Delivery*: To communicate and “translate” this knowledge/experience into a format accessible to students: Effective teachers communicate information clearly, create environments conducive to learning, and use an appropriate variety of teaching methods.
- (4) *Instructional Assessment*: To evaluate the mastery and other accomplishments of students: Effective teachers design assessment procedures appropriate to course objectives, ensure fairness in student evaluation and grading, and provide constructive feedback on student work.
- (5) *Advising In and Beyond the Classroom*: To provide guidance for students as they pursue undergraduate and post-baccalaureate education and/or employment: Effective advisors interact with students to provide career guidance and information, degree program guidance and information (e.g., advice on an appropriate schedule to facilitate graduation), and answers to questions relating to a discipline.
- (6) *NOTE*: Teaching performance will be evaluated based on the teaching done by a faculty member; faculty, who teach less than 12 credit hours each semester, will not be penalized for performing other critical duties needed by the Department, College, or University. Normally, these

responsibilities will be delineated in and accounted for through reassigned time awards and evaluations.

Evaluation criteria for teaching and advising are:

<p><u>Needs Improvement:</u></p> <p>Faculty member has not accomplished all of the necessary activities to attain the “Meets Standards” rating in Teaching or Advising.</p>	<p>Teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No demonstration that courses are regularly updated with new information, as consistent with the discipline. • Little attention is given to instructional design, delivery to facilitate student learning, or to the use of assessment to improve the course. • If teaching general studies courses, faculty member has not designed the course consistent with the department’s/university’s expectations, or has not done assessments as required by the general studies program. • Classes are not evaluated using SRI evaluation system, or a majority of the SRI scores are below 4.0. • Faculty lacks the one summative peer observation, or the one peer observation does not demonstrate sound pedagogy to support student learning. <p>Advising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty member does not maintain 5 regular office hours and makes multiple mistakes when advising students. • Faculty member does not advise students.
<p><u>Meets Standards:</u></p> <p>This performance level demonstrates the minimum required accomplishments for a tenured faculty member.</p>	<p>Teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each course is kept current through review of instructional resources and the regular addition of new materials as appropriate. • Narrative describes how courses are designed and delivered using multiple approaches to facilitate student learning. Expectations for student learning and performance that are clearly communicated in course syllabi, along with student-learning objectives and outcomes. • Faculty member uses professional expertise along with courses and/or program assessment results to improve courses. • For any general studies courses taught, the tenure faculty designed their courses in accordance with the official course syllabus meeting departmental and university expectations including the writing of student learning outcome expectations. • Faculty’s SRI scores are consistently (e.g., ~ 2/3 or more)

	<p>above 4.0. If SRI scores are generally below 4.0, there must be a trend of improvement toward 4.0, and their narrative addresses current efforts toward improving student ratings of instruction through shifting instructional content and/or design and/or delivery and incorporating feedback from student commentary.</p> <p>Advising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty member thoroughly and accurately advises students, using professional knowledge and contacts when possible.
--	--

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness can be provided in multiple ways.

- Develop a new lecture and/or laboratory course
- Revise an existing lecture and/or laboratory course
- Develop a new laboratory manual or lecture materials

Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness may be provided in multiple ways including, but not limited to:

- Assessment of content cognitive learning benchmarks (ACS Exams) mandated by the Department
- Evidence that scholarly activities are routinely folded into classes that are being taught.
- Student metacognitive benchmark assessments (SRIs) mandated by the Institution
- Confirmation of content and cognitive rigor in the course (e.g. Summative Peer Observations, and/or correlation data on a course's GPA, SRIs, normed and instructor-written exams, and/or affective and/or psychomotor assessment instruments)

Evidence of Advising Effectiveness can be provided in multiple ways.

- Mentor advisees via CAPP reports and schedule planning
- Mentor students via learning opportunities outside of regular classroom
- Write letters for students seeking jobs and post-graduate opportunities

4B. Scholarly Activity

The faculty member must demonstrate sustained "Meets Standards" level of

performance in creative or scholarly work that enhances teaching or otherwise contributes to growth in the faculty member discipline. In addition to traditional creative and scholarly activities such as conference presentations and contributions of peer-reviewed scholarship and creative activities, this criteria may include activities in which the faculty member shares knowledge with members of the learned and professional communities which are related to the faculty member's discipline or area of instruction. Other Scholarly Activities may include: continuing education and professional development activities appropriate to professional assignments.

In addition to these scholarly activities, and depending on the specific Department Guidelines, this category may also include activities in which the faculty member shares other knowledge with members of the learned and professional communities; continued education and professional development activities appropriate to professional status or assignments; and other activities specific to the faculty member's discipline or assigned responsibilities.

Evaluation Standards for Scholarly Activities

Scholarly and creative activities are disciplinary or interdisciplinary expressions or interpretations that develop ideas, frame questions, create new forms of representation, solve problems, or explore new areas in the field of chemistry, or related fields of study.

Evaluation criteria for Scholarly Activities are:

<p><u>Needs Improvement:</u></p> <p>Minimum requirements and/or Standards have not been met.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the review period, the faculty member does not produce work that is either accepted through peer review, or the disciplinary equivalent (as determined by the department's PTR committee and Chair of the department).
<p><u>Meets Standards:</u></p> <p>This performance level demonstrates the minimum required accomplishments for a faculty member.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the five-year evaluation period, a tenured faculty member demonstrates continued work on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ disciplinary, pedagogical, or creative academic projects that will eventually be presented at local, regional or national conferences, and are accepted in a peer-reviewed publication ○ disciplinary equivalent (as determined by the department's PTR committee and Chair of the department). • Other activities may include writing grants to outside agencies, review of scholarly works for noted journals in the field of chemistry and criminalistics, or writing a book

	<p>or book chapter in their area of expertise for a commercial publishing house that requires a prospectus and review. Other Scholarly Activities are listed below this table.</p>
--	--

Scholarly Activities may include:

- Papers published in peer-reviewed journals (both paper and on-line)
- Books, book chapters, book units published after peer-review (through recognized publishers (e.g. Prentice Hall, Wiley)
- Awarded funding from outside resources (e.g. NIH, NSF, DOC and other federal or private funding agencies)
- Awarded funding used to provide students with opportunities for networking, researching, or independent study
- Awarded funding from internal sources used for research in chemistry or pedagogy
- Invited to make presentation and/or conduct workshops at international, national, regional, or local conferences or meetings
- Presentation and/or workshops accepted under call for abstracts at international, national, regional, or local conferences or meetings.
- Research conducted with students that potentially will lead to published results

4C. Service

Faculty members must demonstrate sustained “Meets Standards” level service contributions by:

- 1) Service to the department, the college (LAS), and/or the university.
- 2) Typically unpaid public service to community and/or professional organization.

Evaluation Standards for Service

Tenured faculty members are engaged in service when they participate in the shared governance and good functioning of the institution and/or service to the institution at the program, department, college, or university level. Beyond the institution, faculty engaged in service when they use their disciplinary and/or professional expertise and talents to contribute to the betterment of their multiple environments, such as local and regional communities, professional and disciplinary associations, nonprofit organizations, or government agencies.

Evaluation criterion for Service are:

<p><u>Needs Improvement:</u></p> <p>Faculty member has not met minimum requirements and/or standards for service.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty member has not made ongoing or significant contributions in service to the department, college, or university. • Faculty member has not been involved in their professional organization(s) or in outside service to the communities.
<p><u>Meets Standards:</u></p> <p>This performance level demonstrates the minimum required accomplishments for a faculty member.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The faculty has made contributions to shared governance within the department, and college or university. They have also made contributions within their disciplinary organization(s), or contributions using their disciplinary expertise to the community outside of the university. These contributions must be ongoing.

5. Post-Tenure Performance Improvement Plan Process

A. Purpose

The purpose of an individualized Performance Improvement Plan is to provide a tenured faculty member a guideline and plan to raise their performance levels to the “Meets Standard” criteria.

B. Process

When a faculty member is rated “Needs Improvement” in the PTR process in any performance area, a post-tenure performance improvement plan (the “Plan”) will be developed which addresses only the assessment areas of Teaching, Scholarly Activities, or Service for which a “Needs Improvement” rating was received as follows:

1. The faculty member generates the Plan that is reviewed by the chair and submitted to the dean for approval. The Plan must be developed, reviewed, and approved by the chair and dean with 90 days.
2. The Plan will:
 - a. Establish specific goals and requirements, based upon the PTR criteria and the department guidelines, which are designed to assist the faculty member to meet the PTR criteria and achieve a “Meets Standards” rating

- b. Describe specific actions to be taken by the faculty member that are designed to help the faculty member achieve the goals
 - c. Specify that the Plan's goals be met by a specific evaluation date, not to exceed three years from the date the Plan is approved by the dean (or the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs, in the event of an appeal).
3. The dean, in consultation with the chair of the department will review the faculty member's performance under the Plan, and the dean will make a final determination whether the faculty member has satisfied the terms and conditions of the Plan.
 - a. A faculty member who satisfied the terms and conditions of the Plan will be rated "Meets Standards" as of the evaluation date of the Plan. The faculty member shall begin a new five-year cycle of annual performance reviews and periodic comprehensive evaluations.
 - b. A faculty member who fails to satisfy the terms and conditions of the Plan with respect to any performance area will be subject to sanctions as specified in Sections XIII and XV of the Handbook of Professional Personnel. Sanctions or termination shall be appealable and must follow the due process procedures in Sections XIII and XV of Handbook of Professional Personnel.

See Section VII.H.7 and 8 for more details for implementation of a Post-Tenure Performance Improvement Plan.

6. Promotion to Professor

General Policies

- a. An application for promotion may not be granted absent a comprehensive evaluation.
- b. Judgments on the merit of candidates will be based on performance already demonstrated and not on potential that might or might not be realized.
- c. Meeting the minimum qualifications does not imply automatic promotion.
- d. A duplicate of the promotion dossier may be submitted for post-tenure review when both comprehensive evaluations occur in the same academic year.

6A. Criteria for Promotion Evaluation

Candidates for promotion will be evaluated in the areas of teaching, advising, scholarly activities, and service.

Contributions to teaching and advising will be the most significant factors in evaluating faculty for promotion in the Department of Chemistry, but outstanding teaching and advising will not be sufficient to justify promotion. The faculty member must meet the contractual responsibilities defined in the most current version of MSU Denver's Handbook for Professional Personnel, and must adhere to all applicable policies set forth in this Handbook as a prerequisite to promotion.

Eligibility for promotion in rank shall require a minimum number of years in rank at the College as follows:

- Associate Professor – a minimum of six years total in rank as Assistant Professor at a regionally accredited baccalaureate-granting institution of high education, two of which must have been at MSU Denver.
- Professor – a minimum of four years in rank as Associate Professor at a regionally accredited baccalaureate-granting institution of higher education, two of which must have been at MSU Denver.

In determining years in rank, the current year (year in progress) during which application for promotion is made is counted as a year of service toward the requirement for time in rank.

a. Department of Chemistry's Evaluation Guidelines for Promotion of a Tenured Faculty Member to Associate Professor

Faculty seeking promotion to Associate Professor without application for tenure shall include the same documentation items as delineated below for Portfolios for promotion to Professor.

b. Department of Chemistry's Evaluation Guidelines for Promotion to Professor

Tenure faculty members seeking promotion to Professor will prepare a Dossier/Portfolio using MSU Denver's online faculty evaluation system, Digital Measures (*Digital Measures User's Guide, - Guidelines for Dossier Preparation for Promotion*, most current revision, found at MSU Denver's Educational Technology Center). The portfolio shall consist of:

- (a) Cover Sheet
- (b) Narrative Statement – 3-8 pages in length

- (c) Annotated *Curriculum Vitae*
- (d) Student Ratings of instruction since last major review – for the award of tenure, post tenure review, or promotion to Associate Professor, whichever came most recently
- (e) Letters of review and faculty responses (if any) since the tenure Portfolio (inclusive of those letters) and including also all letters/responses from post-tenure reviews
- (f) Reassigned time reports and evaluations, when relevant, since most recent major review
- (g) Selected additional materials for review – a minimum of four (4) and a maximum of nine (9). At least two must be from the Teaching category and one each from the Scholarly Activities and Service categories.
- (h) One (1) summative peer observation
- (i) Supplementary documentation and other official and relevant information as determined by the Provost

Evaluation committees and individual evaluators will use the faculty's prepared Dossier, in accordance with section V, of the most current revision of the *Handbook of Professional Personnel*, in the determination of whether promotion is to be granted.

Standards to be applied for application for Professor shall be as follows:

Teaching Performance

The faculty member must demonstrate sustained "Meets Standards" level of performance in teaching and advising, over the five-year evaluation period.

Teaching:

- 1) Course materials that demonstrate currency in the field and describe the desired learning objectives for students.
- 2) Appropriate and thorough assessment of student progress
- 3) Evaluation of teaching by students through the SRI evaluation system.

Advising:

- 3) Degree program guidance for the various programs in the Department of Chemistry.
- 4) Advise students on their class schedules to facilitate progress toward a degree, and answers to questions relating to a discipline. Examples include:
 - f. providing supporting documentation or letters to assist students in obtaining employment, graduate school placement, or placement in medical related schools
 - g. providing other information important to students regarding the field of chemistry, and the department, school, or university procedures and expectations

- h. providing information and guidance to aid students in completing chemistry courses they are enrolled in
- i. working with students in discipline-related activities, such as undergraduate research, student organizations, and local and national conferences
- j. other activities specific to the faculty member's discipline and department goals

Evaluation Standards for Teaching and Advising

The tenure faculty will compose a Profile Narrative as directed by Digital Measures that should reflect their continued growth in teaching and advising during the five-year evaluation period.

At the instructional level, the most important responsibilities of a teacher to his/her students are the following: (ref, Handbook of Profession Personnel, (section V.C.3))

- (7) *Content Expertise*: To demonstrate knowledge and/or relevant experience: Effective teachers display knowledge of their subject matters in the relevant learning environment (classroom, on-line, hybrid, field work, etc.), which typically includes the skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced experience, training, or education.
- (8) *Instructional Design*: To re-order and re-organize this knowledge/experience for student learning: Effective teachers design course objectives, syllabi, materials, activities, and experiences that are conducive to learning.
- (9) *Instructional Delivery*: To communicate and “translate” this knowledge/experience into a format accessible to students: Effective teachers communicate information clearly, create environments conducive to learning, and use an appropriate variety of teaching methods.
- (10) *Instructional Assessment*: To evaluate the mastery and other accomplishments of students: Effective teachers design assessment procedures appropriate to course objectives, ensure fairness in student evaluation and grading, and provide constructive feedback on student work.
- (11) *Advising In and Beyond the Classroom*: To provide guidance for students as they pursue undergraduate and post-baccalaureate education and/or employment: Effective advisors interact with students to provide career guidance and information, degree program guidance and information (e.g., advice on an appropriate schedule to facilitate graduation), and answers to questions relating to a discipline.
- (12) *NOTE*: Teaching performance will be evaluated based on the teaching done by a faculty member; faculty, who teach less than 12 credit hours each semester, will not be penalized for performing other critical duties needed by the Department, College, or University. Normally, these responsibilities will be delineated in and accounted for through reassigned time awards and evaluations.

Evaluation criteria for teaching and advising are:

<p><u>Needs Improvement:</u></p> <p>Faculty member has not accomplished all of the necessary activities to attain the “Meets Standards” rating in Teaching or Advising.</p>	<p>Teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No demonstration that courses are regularly updated with new information, as consistent with the discipline. • Little attention is given to instructional design, delivery to facilitate student learning, or to the use of assessment to improve the course. • If teaching general studies courses, faculty member has not designed the course consistent with the department’s/university’s expectations, or has not done assessments as required by the general studies program. • Classes are not evaluated using SRI evaluation system, or a majority of the SRI scores are below 4.0. • Faculty lacks the one summative peer observation, or the one peer observation does not demonstrate sound pedagogy to support student learning. <p>Advising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty member does not maintain 5 regular office hours and makes multiple mistakes when advising students. • Faculty member does not advise students.
<p><u>Meets Standards:</u></p> <p>This performance level demonstrates the minimum required accomplishments for a tenured faculty member.</p>	<p>Teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each course is kept current through review of instructional resources and the regular addition of new materials as appropriate. • Narrative describes how courses are designed and delivered using multiple approaches to facilitate student learning. Expectations for student learning and performance that are clearly communicated in course syllabi, along with student-learning objectives and outcomes. • Faculty member uses professional expertise along with courses and/or program assessment results to improve courses. • For any general studies courses taught, the tenure faculty designed their courses in accordance with the official course syllabus meeting departmental and university expectations including the writing of student learning outcome expectations. • Faculty’s SRI scores are consistently (e.g., ~ 2/3 or more) above 4.0. If SRI scores are generally below 4.0, there must be a trend of improvement toward 4.0, and their

	<p>narrative addresses current efforts toward improving student ratings of instruction through shifting instructional content and/or design and/or delivery and incorporating feedback from student commentary.</p> <p>Advising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty member thoroughly and accurately advises students, using professional knowledge and contacts when possible.
--	---

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness can be provided in multiple ways.

- Develop a new lecture and/or laboratory course
- Revise an existing lecture and/or laboratory course
- Develop a new laboratory manual or lecture materials

Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness may be provided in multiple ways including, but not limited to:

- Assessment of content cognitive learning benchmarks (ACS Exams) mandated by the Department
- Evidence that scholarly activities are routinely folded into classes that are being taught.
- Student metacognitive benchmark assessments (SRIs) mandated by the Institution
- Confirmation of content and cognitive rigor in the course (e.g. Summative Peer Observations, and/or correlation data on a course's GPA, SRIs, normed and instructor-written exams, and/or affective and/or psychomotor assessment instruments)

Evidence of Advising Effectiveness can be provided in multiple ways.

- Mentor advisees via CAPP reports and schedule planning
- Mentor students via learning opportunities outside of regular classroom
- Write letters for students seeking jobs and post-graduate opportunities

Scholarly Activity

The faculty member must demonstrate sustained “Meets Standards” level of performance in creative or scholarly work that enhances teaching or otherwise contributes to growth in the faculty member discipline. In addition to traditional creative and scholarly activities such as conference presentations and contributions of peer-reviewed scholarship and creative activities, this criteria may include

activities in which the faculty member shares knowledge with members of the learned and professional communities which are related to the faculty member's discipline or area of instruction. Other Scholarly Activities may include: continuing education and professional development activities appropriate to professional assignments.

In addition to these scholarly activities, and depending on the specific Department Guidelines, this category may also include activities in which the faculty member shares other knowledge with members of the learned and professional communities; continued education and professional development activities appropriate to professional status or assignments; and other activities specific to the faculty member's discipline or assigned responsibilities.

Evaluation Standards for Scholarly Activities

Scholarly and creative activities are disciplinary or interdisciplinary expressions or interpretations that develop ideas, frame questions, create new forms of representation, solve problems, or explore new areas in the field of chemistry, or related fields of study.

Evaluation criteria for Scholarly Activities are:

<p><u>Needs Improvement:</u></p> <p>Minimum requirements and/or Standards have not been met.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the review period, the faculty member does not produce work that is either accepted through peer review, or the disciplinary equivalent (as determined by the department's PTR committee and Chair of the department).
<p><u>Meets Standards:</u></p> <p>This performance level demonstrates the minimum required accomplishments for a faculty member.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the five-year evaluation period, a tenured faculty member demonstrates continued work on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ disciplinary, pedagogical, or creative academic projects that will eventually be presented at local, regional or national conferences, and are accepted in a peer-reviewed publication ○ disciplinary equivalent (as determined by the department's PTR committee and Chair of the department). • Other activities may include writing grants to outside agencies, review of scholarly works for noted journals in the field of chemistry and criminalistics, or writing a book or book chapter in their area of expertise for a commercial publishing house that requires a prospectus and review. Other Scholarly Activities are listed below this table.

Scholarly Activities may include:

- Papers published in peer-reviewed journals (both paper and on-line)
- Books, book chapters, book units published after peer-review (through recognized publishers (e.g. Prentice Hall, Wiley)
- Awarded funding from outside resources (e.g. NIH, NSF, DOC and other federal or private funding agencies)
- Awarded funding used to provide students with opportunities for networking, researching, or independent study
- Awarded funding from internal sources used for research in chemistry or pedagogy
- Invited to make presentation and/or conduct workshops at international, national, regional, or local conferences or meetings
- Presentation and/or workshops accepted under call for abstracts at international, national, regional, or local conferences or meetings.
- Research conducted with students that potentially will lead to published results

Service

Faculty members must demonstrate sustained “Meets Standards” level service contributions by:

- 1) Service to the department, the college (LAS), and/or the university.
- 2) Typically unpaid public service to community and/or professional organization.

Evaluation Standards for Service

Tenured faculty members are engaged in service when they participate in the shared governance and good functioning of the institution and/or service to the institution at the program, department, college, or university level. Beyond the institution, faculty engaged in service when they use their disciplinary and/or professional expertise and talents to contribute to the betterment of their multiple environments, such as local and regional communities, professional and disciplinary associations, nonprofit organizations, or government agencies.

Evaluation criterion for Service are:

<p><u>Needs Improvement:</u></p> <p>Faculty member has not met minimum requirements and/or standards for service.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faculty member has not made ongoing or significant contributions in service to the department, college, or university.• Faculty member has not been involved in their professional organization(s) or in outside service to the
--	--

	communities.
<p><u>Meets Standards:</u></p> <p>This performance level demonstrates the minimum required accomplishments for a faculty member.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The faculty has made contributions to shared governance within the department, and college or university. They have also made contributions within their disciplinary organization(s), or contributions using their disciplinary expertise to the community outside of the university. These contributions must be ongoing.

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

EVALUATION STANDARDS FOR CATEGORY II & CATEGORY III FACULTY

INTRODUCTION: Category II and Category III faculty (the latter referred to as Affiliate) are subject to the norms and expectations of academic freedom befitting an institution of higher education. Furthermore, they serve as contingent faculty appointed for defined terms. Category II faculty are hired most often to teach full-time under contracts of a duration from between one and three years; Affiliate faculty are hired to teach on a per-credit-hour basis for specific classes, as needed, usually on a semester-by-semester basis. Category II faculty and Affiliate faculty are eligible for reappointment at the discretion of the Dean and Department Chair, respectively. Decisions to reappoint are based upon the needs of the department or program and also take into consideration the candidate's qualifications and performance. Performance evaluation, therefore, is done in part to support reappointment decisions and in part to foster improvement among both Category II and Affiliate faculty members.

EVALUATION STANDARDS FOR TEACHING

Teaching is the act of creating and maintaining an environment which enhances the opportunities for student learning and discipline-related growth; it includes advising students to facilitate graduation and to transition to post baccalaureate careers or further educational opportunities.

Effective teachers display knowledge of their subject matters in the relevant learning environment (classroom, on-line, hybrid, field work, etc.), which typically includes the skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced experience, training, or education.

CATEGORY II: GUIDELINES FOR REAPPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER: In their one page narrative, the faculty member must explain how they have met expectations for assigned duties and responsibilities. It should present a reflective self-assessment that highlights accomplishments and indicates plans for the future and presents their best case for continuance in their position or promotion to senior lecturer if they are applying. The candidate should briefly describe their approach to teaching including how they: 1. Update their courses integrating current knowledge into their teaching, 2. Design their courses, 3. Deliver material to facilitate student learning, and 4. Use assessment results to improve their courses. The faculty member administers Student Ratings of Instruction (SRI's) using the approved form

per the Handbook for Professional Personnel. A single summative peer observation is required for their first year of employment as a Category II faculty. If a sufficient number of trained peer observers are not available, a departmental peer observation may be substituted for the required summative observation. The Category II faculty member should provide documentation of the unavailability of trained peer observers in the portfolio. At least one departmental peer observation is required each year during the first three years of employment and one is required every three years thereafter.

<p>Meets Standards: This performance level demonstrates the minimum required accomplishments for a faculty member.</p>	<p>Courses follow the official course syllabus and the faculty member adheres to university policies regarding ADA accommodations. Each course is kept current through review of instructional resources and the regular addition of new materials, as appropriate. Narrative describes how courses are designed and delivered using multiple approaches to facilitate student learning. Expectations for student learning and performance are clearly communicated in syllabi and the faculty member uses student learning objectives/outcomes to facilitate student learning and assessment. Faculty member uses professional expertise along with course and/or program assessment results to improve courses. For any general studies courses taught, the faculty member designed their course in accordance with the official course syllabus, meeting departmental and university expectations including the writing and student learning outcome expectations. Assessment of general studies courses complies with departmental and university requirements. SRI's generally at or above 4.25. If below this, they have shown a trend of improvement and the narrative addresses work toward improving SRI's through shifting instructional content and/or design and/or delivery and incorporating feedback from student commentary. Summative peer observation addresses strong pedagogy to facilitate student learning. Faculty member receives summative or formative departmental peer observation that addresses strong pedagogy to facilitate student learning with an overall rating of "meets standards". At least one course will be evaluated each year during the faculty member's first three years of employment. At least one course will be evaluated every three years during subsequent periods of employment. Departmental peer evaluations will be both formative and summative. Peer observers will be tenured chemistry faculty members chosen by the department chair in consultation with the faculty member. Faculty member is expected to have responded to any concerns or performance rated as "needs improvement" in previous evaluations. Faculty member maintains five office hours per week, thoroughly and accurately advises students, and</p>
---	---

	maintains records of advising sessions.
Needs Improvement: This rating simply means the faculty member has not accomplished all of the necessary activities to attain the “Meets Standards” rating.	<p>Minimum requirements and/or standards for content expertise have not been met.</p> <p>Courses do not follow the official course syllabus and/or the faculty member does not adhere to university policies regarding ADA accommodations. No demonstration that courses are regularly updated with new information, as consistent with the discipline. General studies courses not designed consistent with the department’s and college’s expectations or assessment required by the general studies program is not performed. Classes are not evaluated using SRI’s or the SRI’s consistently remain below 4.25. Faculty member lacks summative peer observation or the observation does not demonstrate sound pedagogy to support student learning. Faculty receives annual departmental peer observation with an overall rating of “needs improvement”. Faculty member fails to maintain five office hours per week or to provide accurate advice to students.</p>

CATEGORY III (AFFILIATE) FACULTY: GUIDELINES FOR REAPPOINTMENT: Affiliate faculty members are reappointed at the discretion of the department chair. Courses follow the official course syllabus and are kept current through review of instructional resources and the regular addition of new materials, as appropriate. The Affiliate faculty member adheres to department and university policies including ADA accommodations and submission of final grades. Expectations for student learning and performance are clearly communicated in syllabi and the faculty member uses student learning objectives/outcomes to facilitate student learning and assessment. Syllabi for all courses will be provided to the department chair. For any general studies courses taught, the faculty member designed their course in accordance with the official course syllabus meeting, departmental and university expectations including the writing and student learning outcome expectations. Assessment of general studies courses comply with departmental and university requirements. The Affiliate faculty member administers Student Ratings of Instruction (SRI’s) using the approved form per the Handbook for Professional Personnel. The SRI’s are generally 4.25 or above. If below this, they have shown a trend of improvement. Affiliate faculty member receives summative or formative departmental peer observation that addresses strong pedagogy to facilitate student learning with an overall rating of “meets standards”. At least one course will be evaluated each year during the faculty member’s first three years of employment. At least one course will be evaluated every three years during

subsequent periods of employment. Departmental peer evaluations will be both formative and summative. Peer observers will be full-time chemistry faculty members chosen by the department chair in consultation with the full-time faculty member/evaluator. The affiliate faculty member is expected to have responded to any concerns or performance rated as “needs improvement” in previous evaluations.