

Department of Chemistry
College of Letters, Arts and Sciences

May 31, 2009

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE TO IMPLEMENT THE RULES OF THE REGENTS AS PERTAINING TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

MARCH 10, 2009

APPROVED BY THE PROVOST MAY 27, 2009

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 and tenure and post-tenure review in the Department of Chemistry at the University of Colorado at 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 research, and effective 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(s); conduct which 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 shall 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:

1. The Primary Unit is the Department of Chemistry and the Primary Unit committee will normally consist of eligible members of the Department and may also include faculty from closely allied departments, such as biology and physics. The Primary Unit committee faculty will be responsible for the primary review of candidates for reappointment, tenure and promotion. Each Primary Unit committee can have different composition for different faculty members. However, once constituted for a particular faculty member, that committee will generally have reasonably consistent composition over a period of several years.

2. The chair of the Primary Unit will meet with the candidate for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to inform the individual of the procedures and discuss how to construct a dossier, and to solicit recommendations of possible external reviewers (when appropriate) and Primary Unit Committee members. The candidate must provide the Primary Unit chair with a list of approximately ten possible outside reviewers (including addresses, telephone, fax, email information, and a brief biography of each) for those reviews where external reviewers are required. The 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 and/or subtract from the list.
3. The chair of the Primary Unit, in consultation with the candidate, will select:
 - a. Primary Unit Committee that is appropriate to perform the initial review of the qualifications of the candidate for reappointment. The normal number of members for this Department will be five. Chemistry faculty candidates are encouraged to include as members of their committees only persons who are tenured (although the Faculty Handbook rules allow for non-tenured to sit on a Primary Unit Committee); promotion to Professor requires inclusion of only full professors on the Committee.
 - b. The external reviewers from whom outside letters of evaluation will be solicited. Outside reviewers should be selected because of their expertise in the area of the candidate's research. Former advisers, collaborators, colleagues and mentors should be kept to a minority in order to ensure an objective review. Faculty members at peer group campuses or similar institutions/departments should be included in the pool of potential reviewers.
4. The Primary Unit committee will perform the initial evaluation of the candidate's qualifications. The committee will meet at least twice and will vote on whether the candidate meets all criteria, and present the results of their vote to the chemistry faculty (*i.e.*, how many voted for and how many voted against). The chair of the Primary Unit committee will also 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 chair is not a member of the Primary Unit Committee, a copy of the letter will also be given to the chair of the Department, who in that case will write a separate letter to the Dean, a copy of which will be given to the candidate. The department chair will inform the candidate of the results of the Primary Unit Committee's findings. The feedback will be provided orally as soon as possible after the meeting. Copies of the letters of evaluation at all levels of review will be made available in a timely manner to the candidate. The external letters will not be made available to the candidate under any circumstances.
5. In the case of tenure decisions, the Primary Unit Committee chair will bring the results of the committee discussion and decision to the entire departmental tenured faculty, and solicit a vote from the entire tenured faculty. If the entire departmental faculty and Primary Unit committee disagree, the outcome of the departmental vote will be detailed in a letter to the Dean by the chair that describes the rationale for the positive as well as the negative votes. In the case of reappointments other than tenure decisions, and promotion to full professor, the entire departmental faculty will not vote. (This item becomes relevant when the size of the department warrants.)

6. In the event that the first level review (Dean's Review Committee) of the primary unit's deliberation leads either the Dean's Review Committee or the Dean to disagree with the decision of the primary unit, the Dean will initiate a discussion about the disagreement with the primary unit chair. The chair will then call a meeting of the primary committee to reconsider the primary unit's decision. The primary unit 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.
7. These procedures may be modified by the Department of Chemistry 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 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, research and service are listed in the Appendix.

First Review (usually in the second year):

The candidate's total record, including teaching, research and service, shall be evaluated. No specific rating in each area is required, but the record must show sufficient potential of future success to justify reappointment.

Teaching: The candidate's teaching shall be evaluated by multiple means which will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Refer to the Appendix, Section A. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered here. The candidate is expected to show potential for continued development as a teacher. Candidates should demonstrate that their courses are coherently organized and thoughtfully presented. Furthermore, candidates will be expected to demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which will be good interaction with students, concern with curriculum, and satisfactory development of skills in presenting material. Improvement and innovations in teaching methods and in curriculum development and contribution to the department will be taken into consideration. Each candidate should prepare a teaching cache (as part of the dossier) that provides evidence of these characteristics, a statement of teaching philosophy, and a teaching plan outlining teaching goals for the next 3-5 years. Evidence of growing skill in the desired characteristics should include: Performance on Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQ's, both numerical ratings and written comments), chair's evaluation and at least one or more of the following (evidence to be provided in the cache): syllabi, lecture notes or other classroom instruction materials, web materials, mentorship of research students (See also under research.), involvement in student advising, willingness to contribute to the department's curriculum, establishment of a teaching mentor relationship and other items listed in the Appendix, Section A.

Research: Candidates are expected to present evidence of progress toward publication, which might include drafts of works in progress or submitted for publication, grant applications, and/or evidence of research in progress. As part of the dossier, each candidate must submit a

research cache consisting of examples of work accomplished or in progress, and a well-designed research plan outlining the candidate's research goals over the next 3-5 years. This might include drafts of work in progress, presentations at professional meetings, and/or articles submitted for publication. The candidate should have submitted an external grant proposal or two by the first review. Typical research expectations of laboratory researchers for the first renewal are that the candidate has set up a laboratory for research and obtain necessary equipment to carry out the research. The candidate's research activities should involve student researchers as much as possible. In this regard the Department considers mentoring undergraduate and graduate researchers as contributing to research, although this is clearly both teaching and research. The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work which integrates existing knowledge, and applied research. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research.

Service: The candidate is expected to have participated fully in the department, including attendance at faculty meetings, sharing in the departmental decision-making process, and participating in activities that contribute to the department's well-being. The individual should also have begun to identify appropriate places to contribute to the university and wider community.

Comprehensive Review (usually in the fourth year):

At this level, the candidate should have demonstrated merit as a teacher and researcher, and have established himself or herself as a contributor to the Department, and to some extent, to the campus or wider community. The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service will each be evaluated separately as below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. The candidate must demonstrate sufficient progress toward tenure to justify reappointment. This will typically be a rating of at least meritorious in all three areas. The review may also take into account issues of material bearing such as strategic goals of the department, college and campus. However, these issues are not counted towards tenure and promotion.

Teaching: Demonstration of merit as a teacher can be made by multiple measures through peer, student, and/or self-evaluation. Evaluations are based upon FCQs, chair evaluation and other items provided in the cache. The teaching cache should demonstrate evidence of improvement (*e.g.*, course development or development of techniques and strategies) in teaching since the first review. The cache should include a teaching philosophy statement, discussion of recent and future teaching development activities, and evidence of student evaluation of successful teaching. Evidence of instructional success outside the classroom is also important (*e.g.*, mentoring within the laboratory; thesis committee contributions, etc.). Peer evaluation may be included.

The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means which will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Refer to the Appendix, Section A. This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and updating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered here. A rating of meritorious will require evaluations of the teaching cache which are typically near or above the departmental average and evidence of effective teaching. A rating of excellent will require evaluations of the teaching cache which are typically above the

departmental average, evidence of effective teaching, and dedication to student learning. In evaluating teaching, course content and level, class size, and student demographics will be considered in interpreting student evaluations.

Research: The candidate must demonstrate reasonable progress toward tenure as demonstrated by reports at professional conferences, refereed publications and by the external letters of evaluation of his/her work. (External reviewers are to be clearly informed that this Department offers degrees in chemistry at the baccalaureate and Master's levels only.) The research cache should include examples of published work, with emphasis placed on refereed presentations, refereed journal articles, book chapters, grant proposals, etc. Conference presentations are valued for several reasons, and they may lead to valid suggestions of outside reviewers. There should be clear evidence that a focused research program has been established that will produce rigorous, publishable research, typically with students, that makes a meaningful contribution to the discipline. Reappointment would not occur if there was little or no realistic prospect that publications will be forthcoming within the next two years. Work to improve laboratory facilities, development of new research techniques and software, and developing collaborations may also be considered as evidence of reasonable progress toward tenure. However, progress in these areas alone will not overcome lack of publications or the prospect of forthcoming publications. The quality of publications and where they appear is to be judged, not merely the number of publications. Outside reviewers will be asked to review the candidate's publications. The Department looks with favor upon candidates who involve students in their research and who encourage students to participate in regional and national meetings. The Department looks with favor upon faculty publications done in collaboration with students and co-authored with students.

The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work which integrates existing knowledge and applied research. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research. A rating of meritorious requires progress as demonstrated by submission of internal and external research grant proposals, presentations at professional meetings, publication in refereed journals, and by external letters of evaluation of a candidate's work. A rating of excellent requires significant, multiple scholarly contributions, which may include refereed journal articles, refereed book chapters, article-length literature review articles and external grants. Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity specified has not been met. For example, a full-length article in a reputable chemistry journal may be equated to more than one communication or short article. A communication or short article may also be judged to have very high quality if the contribution is significant to the field. It is possible that a person will develop processes, products or procedures that are patentable, such that patents may count towards a person's scholarly record. Contract research and collaborative research are other examples of scholarly activities that may be counted towards an overall scholarly record.

Service: The department recognizes service to the campus, community and to our profession. A rating of meritorious requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and some service to the college, campus, community or profession. Normally, the candidate will have served on at least one college committee. A rating of excellent requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and multiple service contributions to the college, campus, community, or profession. In evaluating service both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered.

Promotion to Associate Professor and Awarding of Tenure (usually in the seventh year):

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service will each be evaluated separately as below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. The candidate must be rated as, at least, meritorious in all three areas and must receive a rating of excellent in either teaching or research.

Teaching: The candidate must be judged to be a meritorious teacher by evaluation of the teaching cache. The evidence and criteria for meritorious performance are consistent with previous reviews, with the additional expectation that maturation and improvement are evident. Continuous efforts at improvement and creative instructional development should be evident in the teaching cache.

The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means which will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in the appendix to this document. This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and updating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered here. A rating of meritorious will require evaluations of the teaching cache which are typically near or above the departmental average and evidence of effective teaching. A rating of excellent will require evaluations of the teaching cache which are typically above the departmental average, evidence of effective teaching, and dedication to student learning. Being excellent means being rigorous in teaching and not only being popular. In evaluating teaching, course content and level and class size will be considered in interpreting student evaluations.

Research: The candidate must have significant publications that make an original scholarly contribution, published or accepted in final form in peer-reviewed journals, based upon work done since the initial appointment. The quality of publications and where they appear is to be judged, not merely the number of publications. Outside reviewers will be asked to review the candidate's publications. Article-length contributions to edited books, edited research works, collaborative work, textbooks and other publications will be considered on their scholarly merit. Other indicators of scholarly accomplishment include presentations at national meetings, external research funding through grants and contracts, and published books. In all cases, the scholarly quality and contribution to the theoretical and applied fields of chemistry are of utmost importance, with quantity being necessary but not sufficient to demonstrate research merit. Although quality is of greater importance than quantity, the department expects evidence of continuous productivity over a period of years. Co-authored publications with student researchers are expected, wherever possible.

The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work which integrates existing knowledge and applied research. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research. A rating of meritorious requires peer-reviewed publications, which make an original scholarly contribution as published or as accepted in final form. These may include refereed journal articles, refereed book chapters, or article-length reviews. Receipt of peer-reviewed grants or contracts helps to demonstrate the viability of a long term research program. A rating of excellent requires several peer-reviewed publications, which make an original scholarly contribution published or accepted in final form. These may include refereed journal articles, refereed book chapters by recognized scientific publishers, or article-length refereed

review articles. Receipt of peer-reviewed grants or contracts further helps to demonstrate the viability of a long term research program. Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity specified has not been met. Presentations at professional meetings may be considered as additional evidence of ongoing research activity.

Service: In addition to meeting his or her obligation to department and university service, the candidate should also demonstrate service within the discipline and/or to the community. Service to the discipline may include reviewing journals or research proposals, participation at professional conferences, and leadership within professional associations. Service to the community may include 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, for example.

A rating of meritorious requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and service to the college, campus, community or profession. A rating of excellent requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and multiple service contributions to the college, campus, community, or profession. In evaluating service both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered.

Promotion to Full Professor:

Promotion to Full Professor requires that the candidate must be judged as having made significant progress in all three areas of teaching, research and service since receiving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The evaluation for promotion to Professor is to be based largely on activities and progress since the award of tenure.

Promotion requires “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, research, scholarship or creative work, and service.”

Teaching: The candidate must meet the standards required for promotion to Associate Professor, with evidence of continuing creativity and/or improvement of courses. In addition, the candidate’s maturity and stature as a scholar should be reflected in his or her teaching cache.

The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means which will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in Appendix, Section A of this document. This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and updating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate’s work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered here. In evaluating teaching, course content, level and size will be considered in interpreting student evaluations. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a teacher since tenure must be demonstrated through development of new and revised curriculum, new pedagogical techniques, participation in professional development, work with students outside the classroom and other areas of teaching such as those in the Appendix.

Research: The candidate must demonstrate evidence of intellectual growth as a scholar (*i.e.*, the work needs to extend beyond the ideas accomplished prior to promotion to Associate Professor). A steady rate of presentation and publication in rigorous, peer-reviewed journals is expected, on the average of one every two to three years. Other indicators of scholarly maturity include publication of a scholarly book, publication of review articles, external funding of contracts and grants, presentations at regional and national conferences, or contributions to handbooks or reference books in the candidate's specialty area. In addition, there must be evidence of national or international esteem for the individual's publications as important and authoritative works in the candidate's specialty field.

The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work which integrates existing knowledge and applied research. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a researcher since tenure must be demonstrated through additional refereed publications, peer-reviewed grants and other areas of research such as those in the Appendix, Section B. Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity is less. Presentations at professional meetings may be considered as additional evidence of ongoing research activity.

Service: The candidate must have maintained a record of departmental service, in most cases including some degree of leadership (*e.g.*, of committees). The candidate must provide evidence of a major contribution in some areas of professional, university, or public service.

The department recognizes service to the campus, community and to our profession. In evaluating service both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in service since tenure must be demonstrated through a discussion of service progress in the department, college, campus, university, community and in our profession. We recognize that different faculty at this level will fulfill this requirement very differently. The Appendix, Section C lists some issues that may be considered.

Post-tenure Review:

Recognizing the many different 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: 1) having achieved a rating of "meeting expectations" or higher on each of the annual merit reviews included in the time period under review, 2) having met the goals of the faculty member's current professional plan, and 3) having submitted an acceptable professional plan which indicates an ability to achieve "meeting expectations" or higher ratings in the future. If a faculty member is deficient in meeting this standard, the committee shall consider the total record of the faculty member during the review period to determine whether strengths in some time periods or some activities compensate for the deficiency such that a rating of "meeting expectations" is still appropriate. Ratings of "exceeding expectations" or "outstanding" will be awarded for exceeding these standards.

Appendix:

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.

A. TEACHING

- Student Evaluation of Teaching
- Teaching Awards and Other Outstanding Accomplishments in Instruction
- Peer Evaluation of Teaching
- Grants for curriculum development.
- Alumni Evaluation
- Quality of Doctoral Dissertation and Master's Thesis Supervision and Graduate Committee Contributions
- Supervision and Mentoring of Independent Study Students
- Innovations in Teaching
- Creativity in Teaching
- Participation in Teaching-Related Subject Activities
- Effectiveness of Students in Succeeding Courses and/or in the Pursuit of Graduate Education and/or in Careers
- Student Supervision in Professional Experience Activities and Internships.
- Evaluation of Student Performance in departmental examinations and assessments
- Preparation of Course Material
- Student Development/Encouragement (Centers of Excellence, Library Knowledge, Learning Disability Recognition, Encouragement of Students)
- Course Organization
- New Course Development
- Teaching Improvement Activity (Workshops, Conferences)
- Role Modeling and Mentoring Based on a Teaching Experience on Any Educational Level
- Teaching Contribution at Any Institution in Addition to the University of Colorado
- Risk Factor Involved in the Teaching Venture
- Contributions of teaching to diversity

B. RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK (The first four items are very important.)

- Peer Reviewed Publications
- Papers Presented at Professional Conferences in Chemistry or Related Areas
- Grants and Contracts (Sponsored Research)
- Research with Undergraduate and Graduate Students and publication/presentation of co-authored work with students in scientific journals/at scientific conferences.
- Unsponsored Research
- Recognition by other Scholars of Research and Publications
- Professional Reputation (Both Inside and Outside University)
- Evidence of Capacity for Future Achievements

- Participation in Development Workshops
- Participation in Career Development Activity (Workshops, Conference, Summer Schools, etc)
- Papers Presented at Professional Workshops and Conferences
- Long-Term Research Projects
- Expert and Technical Consultation of Research Projects
- Role Modeling and Mentoring of Research on Any Educational Level
- Risk Factor Involved in the Research Venture
- Cultural and Societal Impact
- Contribution of Research to Diversity

C. SERVICE

- Departmental, College, Campus and University Committees
- Administrative Service (such as program director, chair, center director ...)
- Service to the Profession and Discipline (Local, State, National, International Level)
- Consultation and Public Service
- Role Modeling and Mentoring on Any Educational Level
- Reviewing Research Proposals
- Reviewing Books in Scholarly Journals
- Reviewing Grant Proposals
- Refereeing Manuscripts
- Participation at Professional Conferences, Specifically Organizational Activities (Organizational Activities, Local Planning Committees, Site Visit Details, Activities Involved in Local, Regional and National Meetings, etc.)
- Membership In and/or Office-holding in Professional Associations.
- Service Contribution to Education at Any Level and at Any Institution in Addition to the University of Colorado
- Contribution to diversity
- Participation in faculty governance