

Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry

**College of Letters, Arts and Sciences
University of Colorado Colorado Springs**

**Criteria, Standards and Evidence for Reappointment,
Promotion and Tenure**

July 1, 2020

Criteria and Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure to Implement the Rules of The Regents as Pertaining to The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry

Introduction:

Standards and processes for reappointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty are governed by Article V and Appendix A of the Laws of the Regents. These are further delineated in a series of the University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statements. Campus guidance is supplied in UCCS Policy 200-001. These documents require the establishment of departmental criteria which are used throughout the review process.

These criteria are to be considered guidelines for the general review of candidates toward reappointment, promotion to Associate Professor with awarding of tenure, post-tenure review, and promotion to Full Professor in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in our discipline. Each candidate's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. The department is committed to quality teaching, strong scholarly work, and effective leadership and service to the university, the profession, and the community. The evaluation process assumes: possession of an appropriate terminal degree; competent education and training in the discipline; conduct that reflects the professional and academic standards for generating, validating, disputing, and transmitting knowledge; and an appreciation of and respect for the rights, duties, and privileges associated with academic freedom and collegial responsibilities.

When these criteria are applied to faculty who were granted time toward tenure, the years granted toward tenure will be considered equivalent to work performed at UCCS. While a faculty member's career record will be considered in personnel actions described here, the emphasis of evaluation will be on work performed at UCCS, and in particular, progress since the last review.

We do not use a Faculty Responsibility Statement in evaluation for reappointment, promotion, or tenure.

General Guidelines and Procedures:

The Primary Unit Committee (PUC): The PUC is responsible for the primary review of candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The candidate will select a chair of the PUC, who is a tenured faculty member in the department. The PUC will normally consist of five members, and it will be composed primarily of eligible members of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry but may also include faculty members from closely allied departments. Candidates are encouraged to include only tenured faculty members on their committee (although the Faculty Handbook rules allow for non-tenured to sit on a PUC). Once constituted for a candidate, that committee should have reasonably consistent composition over the period of the tenure process. Promotion to Professor requires inclusion of only full professors on the committee.

The chair of the PUC will meet with the candidate for reappointment, promotion, and tenure to inform the individual of the procedures, to discuss how to construct a dossier, and to solicit recommendations of who will serve as PUC members.

For reviews that require external evaluations, the PUC Chair will solicit from the candidate a list of possible outside reviewers. These external reviewers should be selected because of their expertise in the area of the candidate's scholarly work. Former advisors, collaborators, colleagues, and mentors must be kept to a minority in order to ensure an objective review. Faculty members at peer campuses or similar institutions should be included in the pool of potential reviewers. The PUC Chair can select from that list and may add to it. The list is to be submitted to the Dean, who can accept the list or add to or subtract from the list.

The PUC will perform the initial evaluation of the candidate's performance. The committee will meet at least twice and will vote on whether the candidate meets all criteria. The chair of the PUC will write a letter to the Dean that details the following items: the composition of the committee, the committee's vote, and the committee's shared rationale for the vote. All committee members will be given an opportunity to see the letter summarizing their deliberations and decision (normally at the second meeting of the committee) prior to submission to the Dean. If the department chair is not a member of the PUC, a copy of the letter will also be given to the department chair, who in that case will write a separate letter to the Dean. The PUC chair will inform the candidate of the results of the PUC's findings in a timely matter. The solicited letters from the external reviewers will not be made available to the candidate under any circumstances.

While the rest of the faculty in the primary unit will be informed of the committee's findings, as permitted in APS 1022, the faculty of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry have voted not to have a vote of the primary unit faculty as a step in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process.

Following internal assessment of the candidate by the PUC, recommendations and deliberations of the PUC will be passed to the Dean's Review Committee. In the event that the Dean's Review Committee disagrees with the decision of the PUC, the Dean will initiate a discussion about the disagreement with the chair of the PUC. The chair will then call a meeting of the PUC to reconsider the PUC's decision. The PUC chair will draft a letter summarizing the results of the reconsideration. For tenure decisions and promotion to full professor, the entire departmental faculty will also be asked to reconsider its decision.

These procedures may be modified by the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry at any time as long as modifications are in accordance with the Faculty Handbook. The modifications will become policy following approval by the Dean and the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

The following guidelines are designed to assist the faculty in implementing the Regents' standards for reappointment, promotion, and tenure by clarifying the conditions under which candidates merit advancement. Note that examples of items that may be considered as evidence of teaching, scholarly work, and leadership and service are listed in Appendices A, B, and C.

Teaching:

The candidate's teaching portfolio will include a teaching philosophy statement and evidence of student evaluation of successful teaching. The teaching portfolio will also include evidence of development as a

teacher in areas such as: 1) content expertise, 2) instructional design, 3) instructional delivery, 4) student engagement, and 5) impact of teaching and learning beyond the immediate instructional setting. Examples of evidence for these areas are included in Appendix A. The teaching portfolio will be evaluated based on the examples of evidence provided, which will include Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) and other means as selected by the candidate. In addition to the candidate's assigned teaching of lecture and/or laboratory courses, the candidate's work with students as a mentor, research advisor, independent study advisor, intern supervisor, or other activities will be considered here. Candidates will demonstrate that their courses are thoughtfully presented and coherently organized. As the candidate progresses through the tenure process, evidence of growth as a teacher will be made evident. Peer faculty observations are strongly encouraged to document the candidate's growth and development as a teacher. The candidate will strengthen the department's course offerings by contributing to the breadth, depth, and curricular needs of the department. In the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, we identify the immediate instructional setting as the place where regular assigned teaching occurs. Thus, any teaching impact at the departmental, campus, or community level demonstrates impacts of teaching and learning beyond the candidate's immediate instructional setting.

Scholarly Work:

Our department recognizes that scholarly work may take many forms including fundamental research, applied research, or the scholarly study of teaching and learning. The candidate's record of scholarly work will include a research plan that includes: 1) description of research goals and impact, with a meaningful contribution made to the candidate's sub-discipline; 2) record of publishing or disseminating the products of such scholarly work (e.g., peer-reviewed publications, conference proceedings, or presentations); and 3) goals for obtaining funding to support the scholarly work. Research progress at UCCS will be demonstrated by the following: 1) quality publication(s) (note: different sub-disciplines of chemistry and biochemistry have different standards for what constitutes a full-length peer-reviewed research publication. The candidate will demonstrate research progress that is appropriate for the sub-discipline. Only research publications in which a significant quantity – described by the candidate – of the work was completed since appointment at UCCS will be considered); 2) conference presentations; and 3) submitted and/or funded grant proposals to funding agencies, with external agencies especially valued. Other evidence of research progress at UCCS may include work to develop laboratory or research facilities, development of new techniques or software, and/or building collaborations with on- and off-campus researchers or organizations. The candidate will demonstrate inclusion of student researchers in the scholarly work endeavors, with authorship including undergraduate and graduate students valued. The department recognizes that an important function of research is to provide high-quality training opportunities for students in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry. Examples of scholarly work are outlined in Appendix B: however, we recognize each faculty member may fulfill these requirements due to recognized differences in sub-disciplines.

Leadership and Service:

The candidate must have a record of leadership and service at the department, college, campus, community, and/or professional levels. At the department, college, or campus levels, leadership and service is typically demonstrated through serving on committees. Community leadership and service may include unpaid consulting, membership on boards of organizations or agencies, responsible presentation of chemical literature through the media, provision of education to the lay public or professionals. Leadership and service to the discipline may include reviewing manuscripts or research proposals, participation at professional conferences, and leadership within professional associations. In

evaluating leadership and service both the quality and quantity of leadership and service contributions will be considered. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in leadership and service must be demonstrated at every stage of promotion. Examples of leadership and service are outlined in Appendix C; however, we recognize that different faculty may fulfill these requirements very differently.

Initial Reappointment Review:

At the Initial Reappointment review, the candidate will submit a dossier outlining goals, and a plan to achieve those goals, for both teaching and scholarly work prior to the comprehensive reappointment review. The candidate’s teaching will be evaluated by the criteria defined in the table below. The candidate will prepare a teaching portfolio supported by evidence as described in Appendix A. The candidate must also present evidence of progress of scholarly work originating at UCCS, which might include drafts of works in progress or submitted for publication, grant applications, and other evidence of research in progress as outlined in Appendix B. No external evaluations are included for the Initial Reappointment review.

Requirements
Teaching
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulfilled assigned teaching duties, with attention given to content expertise, instructional design and delivery, and student engagement • FCQ scores near or at department averages, with consideration for course size, rigor, improvement, etc. • Established a plan to improve future teaching in response to feedback from FCQs and peer evaluation • Demonstrated mentorship to students outside of the classroom (research advisor, internship supervisor, etc.)
Scholarly Work
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successfully established a working space for scholarly work (e.g. laboratory setup, equipment purchases, gaining access to materials or resources, etc.) • Recruitment of, and quality training for students participating in scholarly work • Demonstrated progress, and a plan for achieving publication and external grant submission prior to the comprehensive reappointment review
Leadership and Service
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular attendance at and contributions to department meetings • Service at the department level • Plans to serve at the college or university level, with an outline of possible service appointments • Plans for community or professional service

Comprehensive Reappointment Review:

At the Comprehensive Reappointment review, which typically occurs in the fourth year, the candidate will submit a dossier that demonstrates progress since the Initial Reappointment review in the areas of teaching, scholarly work, and leadership and service. The candidate’s dossier will provide a statement that incorporates the teaching philosophy and evidence of successful teaching (see Appendix A), with a

description of teaching impact beyond the candidate’s immediate setting. Additionally, the candidate will demonstrate progress in scholarly work initiatives (see Appendix B), with presentation of preliminary data via grant proposals or conference proceedings when possible. Given the range of sub-disciplines in our department, it should be recognized that research in some areas produces fewer publications for a given effort. The quantity of publications or external grant proposals is less important than the quality. The candidate’s progress in his or her field will be considered along with the teaching load and the number of members on the research team (post-docs, graduate, and undergraduate students). Additionally, the availability of external funding in a candidate’s area will be considered along with the financial requirements needed to support independent research at UCCS. Finally, the candidate will demonstrate leadership and active service (see Appendix C). These three areas will be evaluated separately as “Not yet on track for tenure, but can meet with appropriate corrections” or “On track for tenure”. The candidate must demonstrate progress toward tenure by achieving either of these two ratings in all three areas, to justify reappointment. The evaluation provided by solicited letters from external reviewers (minimum of three letters) will also be taken into account when evaluating the candidate’s progress toward tenure.

Not yet on track for tenure, but can meet with appropriate corrections	On track for tenure
Teaching	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulfilled assigned teaching duties, with attention given to content expertise, instructional design and delivery, and student engagement • Course syllabi include learning objectives and the candidate has different assessment/evaluation strategies • FCQ scores near or at the department averages, with consideration for course size, rigor, level, etc. • Continued progress in improving teaching from student evaluations/feedback (FCQs, mid-course evaluations), faculty peer observations, and/or participation in workshops/conferences focused on pedagogy • Demonstrated mentorship to students outside of the classroom (research advisor, independent study director, etc.) 	<p>The requirements at the left, plus these additional criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated proficiency in content expertise, instructional design and delivery, and student engagement • FCQ scores above department averages • Participation in thesis or dissertation committees • Accomplished significant improvements to instructional design (e.g. design a new course to increased breadth and depth of department curriculum, implement new pedagogical strategies, etc.) • Demonstrated impact outside of the candidate’s immediate instructional setting
Scholarly Work	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated progress in establishing an active program at UCCS, with evidence such as: 	<p>The requirements at the left, plus these additional criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations at national and regional meetings, other institutions, or discipline-specific professional conferences

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ submitted or published peer-reviewed manuscript(s) (may include student co-authors) ○ submitted proposal(s) to internal funding opportunities ● Successful receipt of internal seed funding (Undergraduate Research Academy, CRCW) ● Student presentations at local conferences (CSURF, Mountain Lion Research Day, Graduate Research Showcase, etc.) ● Generally positive letters from external evaluators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Publications and grant proposals to external funding agencies submitted (may include student co-authors) ● Strong support from external reviewers
Leadership and Service	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Regular attendance and contributions to department meetings ● Service at the department level ● Service on a committee outside of the Department (may be College, University, or System-level committee) ● Evidence of community or professional service 	<p>The requirements at the left, plus these additional criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Significant service at the department level (<i>e.g.</i>, spearheading a new initiative or taking a major leadership role) ● Chairing a committee within the department or college ● Strong evidence of professional service (such as manuscript reviews for peer-reviewed journals or service on review panel(s) for external funding agencies)

Promotion to Associate Professor and/or Tenure Review:

The candidate’s record in teaching, scholarly work, and leadership and service will each be evaluated separately with ratings of not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent. The candidate must be rated, at least, as meritorious in all three areas but must receive a rating of excellent in either teaching or scholarly work. The criteria and evidence for meritorious performance in teaching, scholarly work, and leadership and service is consistent with the Comprehensive Reappointment review with the additional expectation that development and maturation is evident in all three areas. Additionally, demonstrated impact of teaching activities should be described within the dossier submitted by the candidate. The candidate should also provide evidence (*e.g.*, receipt of peer-reviewed grants or a strong publication/presentation record appropriate for the sub-discipline) that his or her program of scholarly work has long-term viability and impact on the candidate’s sub-discipline.

Meritorious	Excellent
Teaching	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Fulfilled assigned teaching duties, with attention given to content expertise, instructional design and delivery, and student engagement 	<p>The requirements for Meritorious and the additional criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Demonstrated proficiency in content expertise, instructional design and delivery, and student engagement

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course syllabi include learning objectives and the candidate has different assessment/evaluation strategies • FCQ scores near or at the department averages, with consideration for course size, rigor, etc. • Demonstrated growth and maturation in teaching as indicated from student evaluations/feedback (FCQs, mid-course evaluations), faculty peer observations, and/or participation in workshops/conferences focused on pedagogy • Demonstrated mentorship to students outside of the classroom (research advisor, independent study director, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FCQ scores above department averages • Participation in thesis or dissertation committees • Accomplished significant improvements to instructional design (e.g. design a new course to increased breadth and depth of department curriculum, implement new pedagogical strategies, etc.) • Innovations in teaching or creative instructional development • Demonstrated impact outside of the candidate’s immediate setting (college, campus, or national recognition of teaching practices)
--	--

Scholarly Work

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated progress in establishing an active research program at UCCS, with evidence such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ accepted or published peer-reviewed manuscript(s) with UCCS student co-authors ○ awarded grants from internal funding agencies and submitted proposals to external funding agencies ○ presentations at discipline-specific professional conferences (may include student co-authors) ○ student presentations at local venues, such as CSURF, Mountain Lion Research Day, Graduate Student Research Showcase • Active research program that includes mentorship of undergraduate and graduate student(s) • Successful receipt of internal seed funding (Undergraduate Research Academy, CRCW) • Generally positive letters from external evaluators 	<p>The requirements for Meritorious and the additional criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple accepted publications with UCCS student co-authors and awarded grants from external funding agencies • Strong support from external reviewers
--	--

Leadership and Service

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular attendance and contributions to department meetings • Service at the department level • Service on a committee outside of the Department (may be College, University, or System-level committee) • Evidence of community or professional service 	<p>The requirements for Meritorious and the additional criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant service at the department level (e.g., spearheading a new initiative or taking a major leadership role) • Chairing a committee within the department or college • Strong evidence of professional service (several manuscript reviews for peer-
---	--

	reviewed journals or serving on a review panel for an external funding agency, such as NSF)
--	---

Post-tenure Review:

Recognizing the many ways in which post-tenure faculty contribute to the University, we define “meeting expectations” for purposes of post-tenure review as consisting of three elements, each of which must be met. These follow: 1) achieving a rating of “meeting expectations” or higher on each of the annual merit reviews included in the time period under review; 2) meeting the goals of the faculty member’s approved and current professional plan; and 3) submitting an acceptable professional plan that indicates an ability to achieve future ratings of “meeting expectations” or higher. If a faculty member is deficient in meeting these standards, the post-tenure review committee shall consider the total record of the candidate during the review period to determine if the deficiency is rectified by other strengths or activities during the review period. Ratings of “exceeding expectations” or “outstanding” will be awarded for exceeding the three review standards (above).

Promotion to Full Professor Review:

Promotion from Associate to Full Professor requires that the candidate has demonstrated significant growth in all three areas of teaching/scholarly work/leadership and service since receiving tenure. The evaluation is based on activities and progress since the award of tenure, with promotion requiring, “a record, that taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances require a stronger emphasis or singular focus on one or the other; and a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching and working with students, scholarly work, and leadership and service.” The criteria and evidence for promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor is consistent with the standards required for promotion to Associate Professor (and awarding of tenure). However, the candidate will demonstrate consistently excellent teaching, mentorship of students outside the classroom, and significant growth and maturation as a teacher, with demonstrated impact of teaching activities. Evidence of the teaching growth and impact includes the evidence provided at the tenure review with additions of the following: new and revised curriculum that contribute to the breadth and depth of the department, new pedagogical techniques, participation in teaching professional development, and teaching impact (see Appendix A).

The candidate must also demonstrate continued and significant intellectual growth as a scholar beyond the awarding of tenure. A steady rate of publications in rigorous, peer-reviewed journals appropriate for the subdiscipline is expected. Other indicators of growth as a scholar and research impact include publication of a scholarly book, publication of review articles, receipt of external funding (sponsored research), presentations at professional conferences, or contributions to reference books in the candidate’s subdiscipline (see Appendix B).

In the area of leadership and service, the candidate will maintain active service in committees and will demonstrate leadership (*e.g.*, service as chair), with evidence of major contribution, significant and continued growth, and accomplishment demonstrated since the awarding of tenure (see Appendix C).

Appendices

Examples of Appropriate Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

These are lists of suggestions and are neither all-inclusive nor lists of requirements. Items are not ranked or grouped in any order of importance.

Appendix A: Teaching

- Content expertise: Is the faculty member engaged in his/her discipline and able to design a course that reflects the best practices or most current state of the field?
 - Examples of evidence: developing new teaching materials, leadership in curriculum development, serving on a thesis/dissertation committee, publishing in the peer-reviewed literature in the area of the candidate's scholarly work that informs teaching in his or her discipline; having an active scholarly agenda; mentoring research students; attending discipline-specific conferences; design of public outreach materials based on expertise
- Instructional design: Is the faculty member able to design learning activities and course materials that allow students to master course learning objectives or program learning objectives?
 - Examples of evidence: course outlines or syllabi that include learning objectives; providing course materials to guide student development; use of evaluation or assessment tools (rubrics); revising a course based on student feedback via Faculty Course Questionnaires or mid-semester evaluations; utilizing technology effectively to enhance student learning; engaging in campus or system offerings related to instruction; collaborating across disciplines or departments; developing hybrid or online courses; evaluating and using different pedagogical techniques to enhance student learning; pedagogical development grants
- Instructional delivery: Is the faculty member able to teach the course effectively? The faculty member will demonstrate enthusiasm, communicate effectively and clearly, and provide timely feedback. The faculty member utilizes multiple modes of student evaluation and faculty peer observations to improve instructional delivery.
 - Examples of evidence: Student evaluations (Faculty Course Questionnaires), faculty peer observations, utilizing mid-course evaluations to alter instructional strategies, attending other courses taught by faculty in the same or different department(s) for 'best practices'
- Student engagement: Does the faculty member facilitate student learning with the outcome of student achievement?
 - Examples of evidence: Use of online learning management system; use of technology; faculty member holds office hours; use of the Science Center; service-learning courses; mentorship of student researchers, teaching assistants, or interns; student evaluations of faculty availability and respect/treatment of students; participation in academic or club advising; teaching award/honor; participation in Gateway Program Seminar; when available, use of nationally-normed American Chemical Society (ACS) exams

- Impact of teaching and learning beyond the immediate instructional setting: Does the faculty member provide mentorship and guidance to students beyond the UCCS experience? Does the faculty member's best practices in teaching inform the work of other faculty members at UCCS and other institutions?
 - Examples of evidence: alumni evaluations; writing letters of recommendation for job/graduate school/professional school placement; advising students in writing applications for fellowships or further study; mentoring visiting undergraduate research students; advising student with career preparation; developing collaborations and relationships with local businesses and organizations for alumni job placement; publishing in peer-reviewed journals with a pedagogical focus; participating and presenting at teaching conferences at the campus, system, national or international level; broad dissemination of original instructional materials, either digital or in a public setting; development of interdisciplinary programs or degrees

Appendix B: Scholarly Work

- Given the range of sub-disciplines in our department, it should be recognized that research in some areas produces fewer publications for a given effort. The candidate will strive to present preliminary data (via grant proposals or conference presentations, for example) whenever possible. The quantity of publications or external grant proposals is less important than the quality. Additionally, the availability of external funding in a candidate's area will be considered along with the financial requirements needed to support independent research at UCCS. Inclusion of student co-authors on manuscripts and professional conference presentations is highly valued.

Examples of evidence:

- Peer-reviewed publications (with or without student co-authors). The candidate may choose to include in the dossier a description of the journal (such as impact factor, journal scope or readership, or relative ranking of the journal in the sub-discipline) in which the work is published, and a description of the amount of work performed at UCCS by the candidate.
- Submitted research proposals to funding agencies (sponsored research)
- Presentation of results at professional conferences (oral presentations or posters, with or without student co-authors)
- Filing patent applications (with or without student co-authors)
- Presentations at local or regional student-focused conferences (CSURF, Mountain Lion Research Day, or Graduate School Research Showcase)
- Submitting and/or receiving funding support from internal seed grants (CRCW, Undergraduate Research Academy)
- Establishing internships or collaborations with local institutions resulting in student research opportunities, improved broader impacts for NSF proposals, or access to research instrumentation/equipment
- Developing software, new research techniques, or improving laboratory facilities (this may include facilitating the donation of equipment to the department for research or teaching pursuits)

- Establishing or facilitating start-up companies, technology transfer, or participation in CU Venture initiatives
- Receipt of certification or licensure from external agencies

Appendix C: Leadership and Service

- Serving or chairing committees at various levels: department, college, campus, and/or university
- Administrative leadership and service (program director, chair, center director)
- Service to the profession and discipline (this may include serving as a reviewer of manuscripts or proposals; serving in local chapter of the American Chemical Society; work on a conference planning committee, etc.)
- Unpaid consultation
- Membership or office-holding in professional associations
- Service contribution to other departments at UCCS or other institutions (such as serving as a reviewer for an academic program review)
- Authoring the ACS accreditation report
- Student club advising
- Participation in faculty governance
- Serving on or chairing search committees for hiring
- Participating in Compass Curriculum activities (this may include course review, teaching in GPS, etc.)
- Community outreach or development of NSF Broader Impacts (presentations at local venues, or science outreach, etc.)
- Service to UCCS goals of recruitment, retention, and persistence (serving on Orientation panels, speaking events for Mountain Lion Experience days, high school outreach, hosting visiting students for department tours, etc.)

College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences
Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry
RPT Criteria
Version History

Version 1: Initial Version

Approved by the Chemistry and Biochemistry tenured/tenure track faculty, 3/20/2020

Approved by Interim Dean Rex Welshon, 4/18/2020

Approved by Provost Tom Christensen, 6/26/2020

Effective date, 7/1/2020
