APPENDIX A

Departmental Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

Department of Chemistry
University of Colorado at Denver

Adopted November 1999, amended May 2010

I. General Considerations

Tenure and promotion decisions are among the most important ways that a faculty identifies, encourages and sustains excellence in its members. Excellence is demonstrated by meeting standards based on identified and measurable criteria that are relevant, equitable and consistent with the goals of the academy and with academic freedom, and must be achieved in accordance with the highest ethical and professional standards.

The criteria of excellence for promotion and tenure are listed below according to the traditional categories of teaching, scholarship and leadership/service. These follow the categories and criteria that are used for Annual Faculty Merit Evaluation, but, as discussed previously, superior Faculty Merit Reviews do not necessarily lead to positive recommendations for tenure and/or promotion. Faculty Merit Evaluation and Promotion and/or Tenure are decoupled processes, differentiated by several factors. During Promotion and/or Tenure review, external reviewers are consulted in the evaluation of a candidate’s record. This does not occur during Faculty Merit Evaluation. During Promotion and/or Tenure review, extensive evaluation of a candidate’s record occurs at levels beyond the department. This includes the Dean’s Advisory Committee, the Dean, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs’ Advisory Committee, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Provost), and the Chancellor. This does not occur during Faculty Merit Evaluation. Thus, because its purpose and consequences are quite different, Promotion and/or Tenure review is a more complicated process than Faculty Merit Evaluation, not to mention a more important one for the University. A candidate's overall record must also demonstrate accountability, responsibility and continuing commitment consistent with an ability to maintain the quality of that record.

A departmental review committee whose voting members will consist of all resident tenured faculty at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires shall evaluate the faculty member’s record of achievement by applying the standards required for tenure and/or promotion. In cases where it is deemed important, equally qualified members of other departments within the university may be invited to serve as voting members of the review committee. Reviews will be conducted with the aid of external as well as internal expert referees, based on the dossier of achievements assembled by the candidate. All tenure-track members of the department's faculty will be invited to participate in the fact finding and deliberative portions of the review in accordance with the policies of the
Regents given in the University of Colorado Faculty Handbook laws, policies, and administrative policy statement of the Regents.

II. Areas of Evaluation

The parameters used to evaluate candidates for tenure/promotion have a parallel in the annual faculty merit evaluation process, but are gauged differently as alluded to earlier. The tenure/promotion evaluation aims not to quantify a candidate’s performance, but to evaluate its quality, thus determining the impact of the candidate on students, the department, the external world, where the candidate practices, and the university. The evaluation asks what impact the candidate is making in these areas and whether that impact, assuming it is positive, will be sustained.

The impact/responsibility of outstanding, documented evaluation of candidate’s record falls on the department particularly in the absence of any numerical rating system. In every area of evaluation, the carefully crafted letters of support must document the quality of the efforts each candidate has presented. What is the quality of the journals where articles are published? What is their acceptance rate? Questions like this in all areas of evaluation need to be addressed, some with the input of the candidate.

A. Teaching

The evaluation of teaching requires that multiple measures be used and considered. The complexity of the teaching enterprise basically demands such an evaluative approach. Teaching is comprised of many activities that involve faculty interacting with students or working on behalf of their students’ education. For example, in addition to traditional classroom instruction, chemistry faculty participate in teaching by (1) supervising organized laboratory classes, (2) pursuing research projects with individual students or groups of students, (3) holding on-line tutorials or answering student email, (4) holding regular office hours or help sessions, (5) assisting students to prepare seminars and presentations for various activities and audiences, and (6) participating in formal and informal academic and career advising. Beyond these, faculty are deeply involved in teaching when they develop curricular or novel teaching materials, assess student performances for the purpose of class improvements, interact with other faculty in discussing and developing improved teaching practice, critique their peers classroom practices, and communicate their findings to scholarly teaching journals or at national meetings. Activities corresponding to this latter set are often referred to as the “scholarship of teaching” and are required for those aspiring to excellence in teaching. All of these, with the exception of publishing and reporting on the theoretical aspects of teaching, which more appropriately qualify as research scholarship, will be considered in evaluating teaching.

Teachers demonstrate excellence by participating widely in both types of teaching identified above. They also display a superior command of their subject, teach the
most important, up-to-date and accurate information available, and promote a high level of understanding in their students.

A wide variety of indicators must be employed in the evaluation of teaching. Student course questionnaires and faculty classroom observations are only a part of the process. Analysis of course materials, syllabi and examinations, evidence of classroom innovations, letters from former students or faculty with whom they have co-taught courses, performances of research students, evidence of effective advising and publications or presentations on teaching, for example, are all components of the total picture. An overriding consideration in evaluating each criterion is evidence of a high level of quality.

B. Research and Scholarship

Every member of the tenure-track faculty is expected to be engaged in a continuing, productive research program. Research not only enhances a faculty member's understanding of his or her discipline, it also contributes to the knowledge each of us is expected to impart, and provides opportunities for directly teaching both about the discovery and applications of that knowledge. It is thus an essential part of a university professor's professional duties. A high quality research program must show significant intellectual contributions by the faculty member as well as clear evidence of direction, continuity and sustainability.

Excellence in research is judged according to the many ways in which high quality research contributes to our mission. Among the indicators of quality research are:

- publications in refereed scholarly journals (including science education journals), books, research reviews, chapters or book editorships;
- presentations, especially invited or refereed presentations, at local, national or international meetings;
- activities as a conference organizer or journal editor;
- invitations to participate on public or government expert panels;
- research funding arising from peer-reviewed proposals.

Productivity, as measured by numbers of papers, magnitude of external funding, numbers of students graduated, etc. is also an important aspect of a vigorous research program. In evaluating all such activities the department recognizes that the standards for productivity and the measures of originality and quality vary across the various sub-disciplines of chemistry. There is, therefore, no specific standard of sufficient productivity, such as a required number of publications or grants. In evaluating faculty scholarship the department will use external referees who are experts in the relevant field and will rely heavily upon them for judgments both of quality and of productivity. The effect of potential differences in overall workload on productivity will also be taken into account. The candidate's record must be judged in terms of the total picture.
Ultimately, it is the quality of a faculty member's research that is its most important hallmark. Productivity must be appropriate, but quantity can never be a substitute for quality.

C. Leadership/Service

Faculty members support the institution through their participation in university governance. Each member of the faculty must contribute to those structures and activities that support the essential functions of the university, and without which teaching and research would be impossible. Leadership/service contributions can occur at many levels, department, college, university, profession and community. Each faculty member seeking promotion or tenure must demonstrate a record of vigorous engagement in support of the institution and the community that underlies it.

III. Standards for Successful Reviews

A. Reappointment Following a Comprehensive Review

The purpose of the comprehensive review is to assess whether a faculty member is on track for eventual promotion and tenure and to develop and provide specific feedback that can help to the candidate reach the required levels of performance (for which, see below). To be recommended for reappointment a candidate must present sufficient evidence of progress towards meritorious performance in both teaching and research. Furthermore, the candidate must present promise of reaching the standard of excellence in either teaching or research by the time of the tenure review. There must also be a record of active participation in leadership/service that supports the goals of the department, college and/or university. The department will carefully evaluate expert external evaluations in determining the sufficiency of the presented record. Recognize again that there are higher levels of review that will consider the record after the department makes its recommendation.

B. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Tenure and promotion to associate professor is awarded only to faculty members who have demonstrated (1) meritorious performance in teaching, research and leadership/service, and (2) excellence in either teaching or research. Research achievements will be reviewed by internal and external experts as described in the section on research. The quality, productivity and sustainability of the research program must not only be fully evident, but carefully documented.

Candidates for excellence in teaching will be reviewed by internal and external referees who possess expertise both in teaching and in the candidate's sub-discipline (where possible internally). The indicators of teaching excellence are described in the section on teaching.
Meritorious leadership/service is demonstrated by a strong record of involvement in significant activities that support the institution's academic goals. Leadership/service on key academic and administrative committees at more than one level within the University and contributions to departmental programmatic activities will be given the greatest weight in such decisions. Leadership/service in the community or the profession will also be considered provided they support institutional and academic goals.

C. Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to the rank of full professor requires a demonstrated record of overall excellence as a faculty member, and is judged on the body of work since promotion to associate professor. Workloads of senior faculty members are more varied than for pre-tenure faculty, therefore the decision on promotion will be based more on the candidate's record as a whole, than on specified levels of achievement in particular categories. Nevertheless, promotion to full professor depends upon demonstrated significant achievements in all three areas, teaching, scholarship and leadership/service, that go beyond the levels achieved at the time of promotion to associate professor. Outstanding performance in teaching, scholarship, or leadership/service, may be given additional weight in determining whether the candidate has achieved a record of excellence, taken as a whole.
APPENDIX B

Departmental Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion
Within the Clinical Teaching Track

Department of Chemistry
University of Colorado at Denver

Adopted Spring 2010

I. General Considerations

Promotion decisions are among the most important ways that a faculty identifies, encourages and sustains excellence in its members. Excellence is demonstrated by meeting standards based on identified and measurable criteria that are relevant, equitable and consistent with the goals of the academy and with academic freedom, and must be achieved in accordance with the highest ethical and professional standards.

The criteria of excellence for promotion within the Clinical Teaching Track are listed below according to the traditional categories of teaching, scholarship and leadership/service. Expected levels of achievement corresponding to each academic level are also established. In addition to achieving the specified levels in the several separate categories, a candidate's overall record must also demonstrate accountability, responsibility and continuing commitment consistent with an ability to maintain the quality of that record, with a probability of continuous improvement.

Determination of a faculty member's achievement of the standards required for reappointment or promotion shall be made by a departmental review committee whose voting members will consist of all resident tenured and tenure-track faculty and Clinical Teaching Track faculty at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires. In cases where it is deemed important, equally qualified members of other departments within the university may be invited to serve as voting members of the review committee. The review will be conducted with the aid of external as well as internal expert referees, based on a file of achievements assembled by the candidate. All tenure-track and Clinical Teaching Track members of the department's faculty will be invited to participate in the fact finding and deliberative portions of the review in accordance with the policies of the Regents.

II. Areas of Evaluation

A. Teaching

Teaching is comprised of a large number of activities that involve faculty interacting with students or working on behalf of their students' education. For example, in
addition to traditional classroom instruction, chemistry faculty teach (1) in supervising organized laboratory classes, (2) through pursuing research projects with individual students or groups of students, (3) when they hold on-line tutorials or answer student email, (4) during office hours or help sessions, (5) in assisting students to prepare seminars and presentations for broader audiences, and (6) by participating in formal and informal academic and career advising. Beyond these, faculty are also involved in teaching when they develop curricular or novel teaching materials, assess student performances for the purpose of class improvements, interact with other faculty in discussing and developing improved teaching practice, critique their peers classroom practices, and communicate their findings to scholarly teaching journals or at national meetings. Activities corresponding to this latter set are often referred to as the "scholarship of teaching". All of these, with the exception of publishing and reporting on the theoretical aspects of teaching, which more appropriately qualify as research scholarship, will be considered in evaluating teaching.

Teachers demonstrate excellence by participating widely in both types of teaching identified above. They also display a superior command of their subject, teach the most important, up-to-date and accurate knowledge available, and promote a high level of understanding in their students.

A wide variety of indicators must be employed in the evaluation of teaching. Student course questionnaires and faculty classroom observations are only a part of the process. Analysis of course materials, syllabi and examinations, evidence of classroom innovations, letters from former students or faculty with whom they have co-taught courses, performances of research students, evidence of effective advising and publications or presentations on teaching, for example, are all components of the total picture. An overriding consideration in evaluating each criterion is evidence of a high level of quality.

B. Research and Scholarship

Every member of the Clinical Teaching track faculty is expected to engage in a continuing, productive research program. Research not only enhances a faculty member's understanding of his or her discipline, it also contributes to the knowledge each of us is expected to impart, and provides opportunities for directly teaching both about the discovery and applications of that knowledge. It is thus an essential part of a university professor's professional duties. A high quality research program will show indications of significant intellectual contributions by the faculty member as well as clear evidence of direction, continuity and sustainability.

Excellence in research is judged according to the many ways in which high quality research contributes to our mission. Among the indicators of quality research are:

- publications in refereed scholarly journals (including science education journals), books, research reviews, chapters or book editorships;
• presentations, especially invited or refereed presentations, at local, national or international meetings;
• activities as a conference organizer or journal editor;
• invitations to participate on public or government expert panels;
• research funding arising from peer-reviewed proposals.

Productivity, as measured by numbers of papers, magnitude of external funding, numbers of students graduated, etc. is also an important aspect of a vigorous research program. In evaluating all such activities the department recognizes that the standards for productivity and the measures of originality and quality vary across the various sub-disciplines of chemistry. There is, therefore, no specific standard of sufficient productivity, such as a required number of publications or grants. In evaluating faculty scholarship the department will use external referees who are experts in the relevant field and will rely heavily upon them for judgments both of quality and of productivity. The effect of potential differences in overall workload on productivity will also be taken into account. The candidate's record must be judged in terms of the total picture.

Ultimately, it is the quality of a faculty member's research that is its most important hallmark. Productivity must be appropriate, but quantity can never be a substitute for quality.

C. Leadership/service

Faculty members support the institution through their participation in university governance. Each member of the faculty must contribute to those structures and activities that support the essential functions of the university, and without which teaching and research would be impossible. Participation can occur at many levels, department, college, university, profession and community. Preferably, it occurs at all levels. Each faculty member seeking promotion or tenure must demonstrate a record of vigorous engagement in support of the institution and the community that underlies it.

III. Standards for Successful Reviews

A. Reappointment

Clinical Teaching faculty appointments automatically end after no more than 3 years. During the 3rd year of the appointment, the C/T faculty member can apply for either reappointment at the same level, or can apply for promotion, if eligible (see Section I.B.7&8). The department’s Personnel Committee serves as the review committee for reappointment with the purpose of the review being to assess whether the faculty member is on track for eventual promotion and is achieving the required levels of performance to remain on the clinical teaching track. In order to be recommended for reappointment the candidate must show evidence of meritorious performance in
teaching, scholarship, and leadership/service; and shows promise of reaching the standard of excellence consistent with the next rank in the Clinical Teaching Track.

B. Promotion to Associate Professor Clinical Teaching Track

Promotion to associate professor C/T will be awarded only to faculty members who have demonstrated (1) meritorious performance in scholarship and service, and (2) excellence in teaching. Research achievements will be reviewed both internally and externally as described in the section on research. The quality, productivity and sustainability of the research program must all be fully evident for promotion to associate professor C/T.

Candidates for excellence in teaching will be reviewed by external referees who possess expertise both in teaching and in the candidate's sub-discipline. The indicators of teaching excellence are described in the section on teaching.

Meritorious leadership/service will be demonstrated by a strong record of involvement in significant activities that support the institution's academic goals. Leadership/service on key academic and administrative committees and contributions to departmental programmatic activities will be given the greatest weight in such decisions. Leadership/service in the community or the profession will also be considered provided they support institutional and academic goals.

C. Promotion to Professor Clinical Teaching Track

Promotion to the rank of professor C/T requires a demonstrated record of overall excellence as a faculty member. It is based primarily upon the record of accomplishments of the candidate in the period since promotion to associate professor C/T. The decision on promotion will be based more on the candidate's record as a whole. Promotion will be dependent upon demonstrated significant achievements in all three areas; teaching, research and leadership/service; which go beyond the levels achieved at the time of promotion to associate professor C/T. Outstanding performance in teaching or research, and to a lesser extent in leadership and service, will be given additional weight in determining overall excellence.

To be considered for promotion to Professor C/T, the candidate must have been in the rank of Associate Professor C/T or the equivalent for at least five years.
APPENDIX C

Departmental Criteria and Procedural Details for Post Tenure Review

Department of Chemistry
University of Colorado at Denver

April 2010

I. General Considerations

Tenure is granted with the expectation of continued professional growth and ongoing productivity in teaching, research/scholarship, and leadership/service. Thus, every tenured faculty member has a duty to maintain professional competence; and , to insure this, faculty in the department of chemistry will undergo an evaluation of their professional activities every 5-years following the year the faculty member is awarded tenure by the University. The purposes of Post-Tenure Review (PTR) are:

(1) to facilitate continued faculty development, consistent with the academic needs and goals of the University, and the most effective use of institutional resources; and

(2) to ensure the professional accountability of each faculty member.

Post-tenure Review (PTR) is a regular, comprehensive evaluation of every tenured faculty member's professional performance, and is undertaken every five years following promotion with tenure. This regular review is undertaken by the department and it determines whether the faculty member is maintaining the standards expected of a tenured member of the chemistry department faculty, as outlined in the following policy on professional standards.

Evaluation of a faculty member's achievement during the preceding 5-year period shall be made by the departmental Personnel Committee whose membership is elected from the tenured faculty. In cases where it is deemed necessary, equally qualified members of other departments within the university may be invited to serve as voting members of the post-tenure review committee.

II. Areas of Evaluation

A. Teaching

Teaching is comprised of a large number of activities that involve faculty interacting with students or working on behalf of their students' education. For example, in addition to traditional classroom instruction, chemistry faculty teach (1) in supervising organized laboratory classes, (2) through pursuing research projects with individual students or groups of students, (3) when they hold online tutorials or answer student email, (4) during office hours or help sessions,
in assisting students to prepare seminars and presentations for broader audiences, and (6) by participating in formal and informal academic and career advising.

Beyond these, faculty are also involved in teaching when they develop curricular or novel teaching materials, assess student performances for the purpose of class improvements, interact with other faculty in discussing and developing improved teaching practice, critique their peers classroom practices, and communicate their findings to scholarly teaching journals or at national meetings. Activities corresponding to this latter set are often referred to as the "scholarship of teaching". All of these, with the exception of publishing and reporting on the theoretical aspects of teaching, which more appropriately qualify as research scholarship, will be considered in evaluating teaching.

Teachers demonstrate excellence by participating widely in the various types of teaching identified above. They also display a superior command of their subject, teach the most important, up-to-date and accurate knowledge available, and promote a high level of understanding in their students.

A wide variety of indicators must be employed in the evaluation of teaching. Student course questionnaires and faculty classroom observations are only a part of the process. Analysis of course materials, syllabi and examinations, evidence of classroom innovations, letters from former students or faculty with whom they have co-taught courses, performances of research students, evidence of effective advising and publications or presentations on teaching, for example, are all components of the total picture. An overriding consideration in evaluating each criterion is evidence of a high level of quality.

B. Research and Scholarship

Every member of the tenure-track faculty is expected to engage in a continuing, productive research program. Research not only enhances a faculty member's understanding of his or her discipline, it also contributes to the knowledge each of us is expected to impart, and provides opportunities for directly teaching both about the discovery and applications of that knowledge. It is thus an essential part of a university professor's professional duties. A high quality research program will show indications of significant intellectual contributions by the faculty member as well as clear evidence of direction, continuity and sustainability.

Excellence in research is judged according to the many ways in which high quality research contributes to our mission. Among the indicators of quality research are:

• publications in refereed scholarly journals (including science education journals), books, research reviews, chapters or book editorships;
• presentations, especially invited or refereed presentations, at local, national or international meetings;
• activities as a conference organizer or journal editor;
• invitations to participate on public or government expert panels;
• research funding arising from peer-reviewed proposals.

Productivity, as measured by numbers of papers, magnitude of external funding, numbers of students graduated, etc. is also an important aspect of a vigorous research program. In evaluating all such activities the department recognizes that the standards for productivity and the measures of originality and quality vary across the various sub-disciplines of chemistry. There is, therefore, no specific standard of sufficient productivity, such as a required number of publications or grants. The effect of potential differences in overall workload on productivity will also be taken into account. The candidate's record must be judged in terms of the total picture.

Ultimately, it is the quality of a faculty member's research that is its most important hallmark. Productivity must be appropriate, but quantity can never be a substitute for quality.

C. Leadership/Service

Faculty members support the institution through their participation in university governance. Each member of the faculty must contribute to those structures and activities that support the essential functions of the university, and without which teaching and research would be impossible. Participation can occur at many levels, department, college, university, profession and community. Preferably, it occurs at all levels. Each faculty member must demonstrate a record of vigorous engagement in support of the institution and the community that underlies it.

III. Standards for Successful Reviews

A. Teaching Expected Standards:

1. An annual merit evaluation score of 2.3 or higher in the teaching component of the evaluation.

2. Participation in all areas of the department’s teaching mission. Evidence in the form of student evaluations, peer evaluations, student research reports, course curriculum proposals, etc. should be included with the dossier.

3. Evidence of teaching effectiveness. This should come in multiple forms including student course questionnaires; faculty classroom observations; analysis of course materials (e.g. syllabi, examinations, and assignments); examples of classroom innovations; letters from former students or faculty with whom they have co-taught courses; performance of research students.

4. Evidence of student research involvement. This may include student generated reports, and/or published manuscript or abstracts with student coauthors.
B. Research Scholarship Expected Standards:

1. An average annual merit evaluation score of 2.3 or higher in the research/scholarship component of the evaluation.
2. A record of consistent and continuous scholarly productivity. This can be demonstrated in a number of ways, including:
   a. Publication in peer reviewed journals
   b. Publication of books, monographs, or reviews
   c. Participation in professional meetings
   d. Grant activities
3. During a 5-year period, a faculty member must have some professional publications, published meeting abstracts, and/or evidence of grant activity to receive a rating of “meeting expectations”

C. Leadership/Service Expected Standards:

1. An average annual merit evaluation score of 2.3 or higher in the leadership/service component of the evaluation
2. Membership on committees in the department, college, or University.
3. Involvement in the community of professional peers as evidenced by:
   a. Refereeing activities
   b. Participation as organizer, session chair, etc. in professional meeting

IV. Post-tenure Review Procedures

A. Regular Five-Year Review

1. The Chemistry department will constitute a Post-tenure Review committee by faculty election from the tenured faculty, as described in the department by-laws section on the Personnel Committee.

2. Faculty who have achieved summary evaluations of "meeting expectations" or better since the last PTR (or since receiving tenure if this is their first PTR) will undergo Regular Review at five year intervals. When one or more years of "below expectation" in a single area is obtained in the annual merit evaluation, the faculty member is urged to participate in a coaching program with the Department Chair and/or the departmental Personnel Committee. As part of this coaching session a differentiated workload might be considered. Receiving a rating of “below expectations” in a single area does not initiate a triggered post-tenure review.

3. In a Regular Five-Year Review, the faculty member prepares a post-tenure review dossier that includes:
   a. The 5 previous year’s performance evaluations,
   b. A personal statement,
   c. A current curriculum vita, and
d. Documentation of the teaching, research/scholarship and leadership/service activities for the preceding 5 years.

4. As part of the dossier, the faculty member prepares a personal statement that serves as a self-evaluation of their contributions in teaching, research/scholarship, and leadership/service. In addition, the faculty member will provide the PTR committee with an updated Professional Plan for the next five years.

5. The Post-Tenure Review committee examines the dossier and the faculty member's Professional Plan(s) from that PTR cycle. (See the administrative policy statement on "The Professional Plan for Faculty.")

6. The PTR committee will write a brief report stating whether the candidate is meeting expectations or not. The report will summarize the department's findings regarding the faculty member's adherence to the previous Professional Plan(s) (taking into account the differentiated workload, where present), meeting the Chemistry department's standards, and conclusions about his/her productivity and contributions to the University in teaching, research/creative work, and leadership/service. A copy of this report will be given to the faculty member. The report is an opportunity to evaluate the faculty member's contributions over the past 5 years to the unit, the university, the community (where relevant) and the profession. The reports will be forwarded to the dean, who will provide a summary report and copies of the individual reports to the academic vice chancellor on the results of all the post-tenure reviews in the college/school. A copy of the PTR report will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. In the case that the PTR committee determines that the faculty member is not "meeting expectations," the faculty member must undertake a Performance Improvement Agreement. (See Section C.)

B. Triggered Review

Faculty who receive a summary evaluation of "below expectations" at any time during the five year PTR cycle are required to meet with the Department Chair to identify the causes of the unsatisfactory evaluation and to plan and implement a written Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA) to remedy their problems. (See Section X Appendix D, below)
APPENDIX D

University of Colorado Denver

Department of Chemistry
(Adopted by Faculty Fall 2014)

Faculty Merit Evaluation Guidelines

Faculty merit evaluations will be carried out by the Department Chair and a sub-committee of at least three members of the department’s Personnel Committee selected by the Department Chair. The evaluations will be based on the information contained in each faculty member’s yearly report of professional activities (FRPA) and any other information that faculty member may submit. It is strongly urged that any additional information submitted conform to the categories in these Faculty Merit Evaluation Guidelines and that faculty carefully document the nature of their work in terms that allow evaluators to determine the quality aspects of that work.

It clearly needs to be understood that the Faculty Merit Evaluation process is decoupled from the Promotion/Tenure Processes enumerated in later appendices. Faculty Merit Evaluation is carried out to determine whether a faculty member is performing at a level that is within the expectations of the department. This is tied to possible yearly salary increments. Attempts to make the Faculty Merit Evaluation and Promotion/Tenure processes more compatible have always met with resistance by faculty governance leaders, the result being that these processes remain decoupled. Although it is rare, there have been cases in the university where yearly Faculty Merit Evaluations have been very good, but a candidate for Tenure/Promotion has been unsuccessful when their record over a longer period was examined. Often the unsuccessful determinations rest on evaluations by external reviewers, external review being required in all Tenure/Promotion/Reappointment decisions. To avoid such surprises, it is prudent that chemistry department faculty members evaluate their progress toward Promotion/Tenure/Reappointment in a global sense beyond Faculty Merit Evaluation process by seeking input from department members and external experts. The department is willing and eager to provide guidance in helping with this.

Each member of the evaluation subcommittee will be given copies of the information the faculty submit for the annual evaluation. The members of the sub-committee and the Department Chair will independently evaluate the professional activities of each faculty member based on the guidelines found in the following document, and they will assign numerical scores of 0.0 – 5.0 for each of the areas in which that faculty member is being evaluated. The members of the sub-committee will pool their ratings and provide an average numerical rating in each of the categories being evaluated for each faculty person. The sub-committee members will also pass along any comments that they would like included in the evaluation report that is returned to the faculty member and submitted to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The Department Chair will average his/her numerical ratings with the sub-committee’s average numerical ratings to arrive at the final numerical rating in each category that is evaluated for each faculty person. An overall numerical rating will be generated by taking a weighted average of
the numerical ratings in each of the categories. The weighting is based on the workload distribution that is part of each faculty member’s employment contract.

Each faculty member’s yearly evaluation shall be given to that person, along with information about departmental ranges and averages, at least two weeks before the evaluation is due in the Dean’s office. Each faculty member will be given opportunity during the interim to discuss the evaluation and to correct any erroneous or incomplete information upon which the evaluation was based.

I. Tenure-track Faculty shall be evaluated in three separate areas: Teaching, Scholarship, and Leadership/Service.

A. Evaluation Criteria and Scoring

1. Teaching – 40 points equals 5.0 rating

A. Classroom Instruction

Formal classes: Tenure-track faculty are scored on the basis of teaching 12 credit hours per academic year. 1.5 points per semester credit hour are awarded based on satisfactory completion of teaching duties, for total of 18 points. In addition, the point value assigned for each class may be multiplied by up to three multipliers:

- **Quality Factor** from -50% to +50% (-0.75 or +0.75 points per credit hour) based on evidence of teaching innovation and effectiveness provided with the FRPA, including teaching questionnaires, faculty classroom observations, analysis of course materials such as syllabi, examinations, assignments, etc., examples of classroom innovations, letters from former students or faculty with whom they have co-taught course, etc.

- **Class Size Factor** up to +50% bonus (+0.75 points per credit hour) based on enrollment at the census date. The class size bonus is 10% for class sizes greater than 60, incrementing by 10% for every additional 10 students up to a maximum bonus of 50% for class sizes of greater than 100 students.

- **New Class or Substantive Revision Factor** up to +50% bonus (+0.75 points per credit hour) based on evidence of curriculum development, including an analysis of course materials such as syllabi, lecture material, in-class and homework assignments, examinations and projects, classroom innovations, etc.

Multiple factors may be applied, but only to the base points. Thus, a new 3-credit hour course, delivered at the highest quality, for 120 students would earn: 4.5 + 2.25 + 2.25 + 2.25 =11.25 points. A new 4-credit hour course,
delivered at the highest quality, for 120 students would earn: $6 + 3 + 3 + 3 = 15$ points.

If a faculty member does not teach 12 credit hours per year – because of leadership/service course releases, course buy-outs, new-faculty teaching relief, sabbatical etc. – they will be given 1.5 points for each course credit that they have been released from. These points cannot be multiplied by any of the above factors.

**Student Mentoring** – (No more than 8 points can be assigned in this category)

Each semester or summer term of mentoring a teaching assistant, learning assistant, or research student (graduate or undergraduate) generates 0.5 points for each on-campus student per term, and 0.1 points for each off-campus student per term.

Mentoring includes individual instructional activities during which faculty interact with students or work on behalf of their students’ education.

Activities include developing students’ expertise in the following activities:

- Pedagogical skills, including effective lecturing, office hours and help sessions.
- Preparing seminars, posters, and presentations for broader audiences.
- Preparing publications for the scientific literature
- Sponsorship for grants and awards.
- Attention to safe laboratory practices.
- Research skills, such as experimentation and operation of instrumentation.
- Adherence to student honor code and behavior consistent with scientific ethics.

Faculty who are claiming credit for student mentoring/individual instruction must collect evidence of these activities (such as final reports, posters, etc.) These documents should be saved, as they may be needed to support the Department’s renewal of certification by the ACS.

In addition each completed Masters or Senior Honors Thesis (or similar summary research document) generates 1.0 point.

C. **Additional Teaching Activities**

Additional points are awarded for non-classroom-based teaching activities that promote high quality teaching. The following activities, accompanied by documenting evidence, generates 1.0 points per activity:

- Informal academic and career advising and mentoring.
- Special honors received by the faculty member based on teaching accomplishments and recognition.
• Demonstration of accessibility and communication with students. Examples include on-line tutorials, student email, extra office hours, and student help sessions.
• Professional development activities related to teaching and learning, including attending training sessions, workshops, and symposia devoted to pedagogical approaches and improvements.
• Educational innovation, including implementation of novel curricular or teaching methods such as those learned during professional development activities.
• Interacting and collaborating with other faculty (within and between departments) in discussing and developing improved teaching practice.
• Critiquing the classroom practices of peers.
• Assessing student performances for the purpose of class improvements.
• Involvement in enhancing the department’s teaching mission (developing new courses, assessments, etc.) including evidence of rigor of the student learning experience.
• Attention to diversity, equity, and inclusion in teaching materials and in the classroom.
• Special academic programs.

D. Additional Bonus An additional bonus of up to 8 points (20% of the possible 40 points) may be added to the rating for activities related to teaching that are not explicitly part of one of the categories given above.

A summary teaching score is obtained by taking the point total assigned for this category dividing by 40 and multiplying by 5.0.

2. Scholarship – 40 points equals a 5.0 rating

A. Publications – (Up to 40 points can be assigned in this category)

Research articles: Between 4 and 8 points are assigned for each research manuscript published

A paper is worth 4 to 8 points depending on the quality of the paper and the journal in which it is published. The department Chair and the evaluating sub-committee will take multiple factors into account, including suggestions from the publishing faculty member, in making determinations of quality.

Review articles: 3 points are assigned for each review manuscript published

Monographs or Texts: 5 – 17 points are assigned per monograph or text. Credit can be received in multiple years for monographs or textbooks
Other (e.g. unrefereed publications): Between 0 and 2 points are assigned for each publication in this category. No more than 5 points can be assigned.

B. Presentations – (No more than 10 points can be assigned in this category)

Invited Seminars: Between 1 – 3 points are assigned for each invited seminar.

Conference talks: Between 1 – 3 points are assigned for each conference presentation

Special Conference Activities: Between 0 and 3 points can be assigned for these activities. These include conference organization, chairing sessions, etc.

C. Research Students – (No more than 6 points can be assigned in this category)

Undergraduate Students: 0.5 points per semester for each undergraduate research student.

Graduate Students: 1.5 points per year for each on-campus graduate student, and 0.3 points per year for each off-campus graduate student.

Post-Doctoral: 1.5 points per year for each on-campus post-doctoral fellow, and 0.5 points per year for each off-campus post-doctoral fellow.

Professional Research Associate: 1.5 points per year for each on-campus PRA

D. Funding Activities – (No more than 17 points can be assigned in this category)

New Proposals submitted: Between 1 and 4 points are assigned for each new proposal submitted during the year.

Funded Proposals: Between 2 and 6 points are assigned for each proposal that is funded or is continuing.

Special Contributions or Awards: Between 0 and 8 points can be assigned for these activities

E. A numerical score that is no more than 20% of the total possible may be added to the rating for activities related to scholarship that are not explicitly part of one of the categories given above.
A summary scholarship numerical score is obtained by taking the point total assigned for this category dividing by 40 and multiplying by 5.0.

2. Leadership/Service – 20 points equals a 5.0 rating

The ranges that are indicated for possible scores in each of the categories below are intended to reflect the perceived degree of effort and the quality of performance of the faculty member being evaluated. These will be determined, in so far as possible, from data supplied in that faculty member’s annual FRPA, and other information made available to the evaluating committee and the Chair. A high level of quality in the performance of leadership/service is a requisite for reaching the highest score in any of these categories.

A. Department/College/University Committee Work – (no more than 15 points can be assigned in this category, with no more than 6 at any level)

Committee Membership: Up to 1.5 point is assigned for each committee served on

Committee Chairmanship: Up to 4.0 points for chairing a committee

B. Special Initiatives – (no more than 6.0 points can be assigned for this category)

Library, Department/College/University rules or programs: Between 0 and 6.0 points can be assigned for these activities. Examples include department chair, center director, graduate program director, etc.

C. Academic Advising

Major Advising: Between 0 and 4.0 points can be assigned for Chemistry major advising

Minor Advising: Between 0 and 4.0 points can be assigned for Chemistry minor advising

D. Community and Professional Leadership/Service – (no more than 8.0 points can be assigned in this category)

Journal Editor, etc.: Up to 4.0 points can be assigned for this type of activity

Journal/Agency Reviewer: Between 0.6 and 4.0 can be assigned for this type of activity

Public Leadership/Service: Between 1.0 and 4.0 points can be assigned for Public Service activities, based on relevance and extent.
E. A numerical score that is no more than 20% of the total possible may be added to the rating for activities related to leadership/service that are not explicitly part of one of the categories given above.

A summary leadership/service numerical score is obtained by taking the point total assigned for this category dividing by 20 and multiplying by 5.0

4. Overall Ratings and Summary Evaluations:

Each faculty member’s overall rating is based on the weighted average of the individual summary scores in the areas of teaching, scholarship and leadership/service (normally 40%, 40% and 20%, respectively). The summary evaluation is based on the overall rating and on individual ratings in the three areas detailed above as follows:

An overall rating of 4.3 or above, with scores of at least 4.0 in two of the areas of evaluation will be receive a summary evaluation score of ‘outstanding’.

An overall rating of 3.5 or above, with scores of at least 3.0 in two of the areas of evaluation will be receive a summary evaluation score of ‘exceeding expectations’.

An overall rating of 2.0 or above, but not meeting the standards stated above, will receive a summary evaluation of ‘meeting expectations,’ except in the circumstances stated below.

An overall rating below 2.0, or a rating below 2.5 with more than two areas of evaluation scoring below 2.0, will result in a summary evaluation of ‘below expectations’.

An overall rating below 1.0, or scores in two areas of evaluation below 1.0, will result in an overall rating of ‘failing to meet expectations.’

B. Procedures for Addressing an Overall Rating of “Below Expectations”.

1 Appeal of a “below expectations” rating.

Faculty members who get a summary evaluation of “below expectations” in any year can request a peer review of their annual performance. The annual performance evaluation as conducted by the Chemistry department is based equally on the Department Chair’s evaluation and the evaluation of a sub-committee of the department’s Personnel Committee. The faculty requested review will be conducted by the department’s entire Personnel Committee, alone, using the following procedure:
a. The faculty member must request the peer review of their annual performance in writing within 2-weeks of their annual FRPA review meeting with the Department Chair. Copies of this request will become part of department’s merit evaluation, and a copy will be sent to the dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

b. The Department Chair will notify the members of the department Personnel Committee that the faculty member has requested a peer review of annual performance.

i. The faculty member will provide to each member of the Chemistry Department Personnel Committee a copy of their FRPA, along with any additional information that they choose, to document their professional activities during the previous calendar year.

ii. At least one week after the updated FRPA has been submitted to the Personnel Committee, but not longer than 3-weeks after the FRPA has been submitted, the Personnel Committee will meet to discuss the faculty member’s annual performance and to establish a summary evaluation. The detailed reasons for this peer review summary evaluation will be put in a written document, and a copy given to the faculty member and one given to the Department Chair.

iii. After the Personnel Committee has met to establish the results of the peer review, either a representative of the Personnel Committee or the entire Committee will meet with the faculty member to provide the results of the peer review. After meeting with the faculty member, the Committee will meet with the Department Chair to provide the results of the peer review, and to deliver a copy of the written summary evaluation.

iv. If the faculty member disagrees with the results of the peer review, they may appeal the rating through established grievance procedures in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

2. The Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA)

a. Faculty who receive a "below expectations" summary rating as the result of their annual performance evaluation must participate in developing and implementing a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA) designed to improve their performance. Faculty members who do not agree with the below expectations rating may request a peer review of their annual performance record using the Chemistry department’s process developed for this purpose (Section E, below). Subsequently, faculty members who believe the department’s peer review is mistaken may appeal the rating through established grievance procedures in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. No action will be taken to begin a PIA until this appeal process, if invoked, is completed. This appeal process should be completed within six weeks or less from the date it is initiated by the faculty member.
b. Working with the department chair and the department Personnel Committee, the faculty member develops a PIA that includes specific goals, timelines, and benchmarks that will be used to measure progress at periodic intervals. Usually, PIAs will be established for one year. But, if research deficiencies warrant longer, the PIA may be set up for two years. The campus administration shall designate an advisor or resource office to provide advice to the faculty member and to the chemistry department on best practices and models for PIAs and appropriate benchmarks. The next annual merit evaluation following the term of the PIA shall address whether the goals of the PIA have been met.

c. If the goals of the PIA have been met, as evidenced in the next annual merit evaluation, the faculty member continues in the current five-year post-tenure review cycle.

d. If the goals of the PIA have not been met at the next annual merit evaluation, an extensive review process shall be initiated.

3. Extensive Review

a. Faculty who have received two "below expectations" ratings within the previous five years or whose PIA did not result in an evaluation of "meeting expectations" or better will undergo Extensive Review by the Chemistry department. Faculty members who do not agree with the below expectations rating may request a peer review of their annual performance record using the established department procedures. Subsequently, faculty members who believe the primary unit's evaluation is mistaken may appeal the rating through established grievance procedures in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. No action will be taken to begin an Extensive Review until this appeal process, if invoked, is completed. This appeal process should be completed within six weeks or less from the date the second "below expectations" rating is received. Failure by the faculty member to participate in developing or implementing the Extensive Review is insubordination and dereliction of duty and will be subject to sanctions, which include the possibility of termination of employment.

b. Because Extensive Review is designed to assist faculty who are falling below the level of satisfactory professional performance, it takes place whenever a faculty member establishes a pattern of unsatisfactory performance, i.e., two evaluations of performance "below expectations" in a five year period.

c. For an Extensive Review, the chemistry department will examine: (1) the five previous annual performance evaluation reports; (2) the FCQs from those years, peer evaluations, and, if desired, other types of teaching evaluation; (3) evidence of research/scholarship work; (4) the faculty member's previous Professional Plan (and any amendments to the plan, and differentiated workload agreements, where present); (5) the faculty member's self-evaluation of performance as it relates to the Professional Plan(s); (6) record of leadership/service activities; and (7) any other material the faculty member would like the unit to consider.
d. The Chemistry department Personnel Committee prepares an evaluative report of 
the faculty member's teaching, research/creative work, clinical activity, and 
leadership/service based upon its review of the materials and information covering 
the period in question. If there is disagreement about the faculty member's 
performance in research/creative work, or if the faculty member under review or 
the chemistry department Personnel Committee requests, the review will also 
include evaluations from qualified persons external to the University. In this case, 
the faculty member and the chemistry department Personnel Committee shall 
jointly develop a list of external reviewers who will be asked to evaluate the faculty 
member's performance in research/creative work.

e. The Chemistry department, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, or the 
University may require other materials for Extensive Reviews, if appropriate, but 
the aim should be to keep the process efficient and effective.

4. The Development Plan

a. Upon completion of the evaluative report, the faculty member, working with 
the Chemistry department Personnel Committee, shall write a Development 
Plan for the next one or two years with specific goals and actions designed to 
address the areas of deficiency identified in the Extensive Review process. The 
Development Plan must address the teaching, research/creative work, and 
leadership/service assignments anticipated during the period of the plan. It 
must describe performance goals in light of identified deficiencies, strategies 
for improvement, and the time frame (up to two years) in which the problems 
are to be solved. Further, the Plan must contain definite means of measuring 
progress in achieving the goals and periodic monitoring of progress. Finally, 
the Development Plan must be approved by the Chemistry department chair 
and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences dean, following consultation with 
the Chemistry department Personnel Committee.

b. While the individual faculty member is responsible ultimately for the successful 
outcome of the Development Plan, the Chemistry department has an obligation 
to assist the faculty member who seeks guidance in developing a realistic plan 
to remedy the identified areas of deficiency. The campus administration shall 
designate an advisor or resource office to provide advice to the faculty member 
and to the Chemistry department on best practices and models for Development 
Plans and appropriate benchmarks of progress.

c. Assessments of professional competence depend upon peer review. At the 
conclusion of the Development Plan period, either (1) the faculty and chair of 
the Chemistry department or (2) the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts and 
Sciences personnel review committee assess the progress of the faculty member 
and forward their conclusions to the dean. After consultation with the dean's 
review committee, the dean determines whether the faculty member has 
achieved the goals of the Development Plan and thus has returned his/her 
professional performance to meeting expectations. Those who are judged to be
meeting expectations begin a new 5-YEAR PTR cycle in the next academic year. Those who are judged not to have achieved professional competence will face sanctions, including the possibility of revocation of tenure and dismissal. Copies of the Extensive Review Development Plan and the Chemistry department's assessment of the progress achieved by the end of the development period will be added to the faculty member's personnel file.

II. Instructional Faculty shall be evaluated on Teaching and on Service, but not on Research, using the following criteria:

A. Evaluation Criteria and Scoring (assuming 90% teaching)

1. Teaching – 90 points equals 5.0 rating

   NOTE: Point allocations for traditional classroom instruction are the same as for the tenure track. Point allocations for student mentoring and additional teaching activities are scaled by a factor of 3.0

A. Classroom Instruction

   Formal classes: Instructional faculty are scored on the basis of teaching 27 credit hours per academic year. 1.5 points per semester credit hour are awarded based on satisfactory completion of teaching duties, for total of 40.5 points. In addition, the point value assigned for each class may be multiplied by up to three multipliers:

   • **Quality Factor** from -50% to +50% (-0.75 or +0.75 points per credit hour) based on evidence of teaching innovation and effectiveness provided with the FRPA, including teaching questionnaires, faculty classroom observations, analysis of course materials such as syllabi, examinations, assignments, etc., examples of classroom innovations, letters from former students or faculty with whom they have co-taught course, etc.

   • **Class Size Factor** up to +50% bonus (+0.75 points per credit hour) based on enrollment at the census date. The class size bonus is 10% for class sizes greater than 60, incrementing by 10% for every additional 10 students up to a maximum bonus of 50% for class sizes of greater than 100 students.

   • **New Class or Substantive Revision Factor** up to +50% bonus (+0.75 points per credit hour) based on evidence of curriculum development, including an analysis of course materials such as syllabi, lecture material, in-class and homework assignments, examinations and projects, classroom innovations, etc.

   Multiple factors may be applied, but only to the base points. Thus, a new 3-credit hour course, delivered at the highest quality, for 120 students would earn: 4.5 + 2.25 + 2.25 + 2.25 = 11.25 points. A new 4-credit hour course, delivered at the highest quality, for 120 students would earn: 6 + 3 + 3 + 3 = 15 points.
B. **Student Mentoring**

Each semester or summer term of mentoring a teaching assistant, learning assistant, or research student (graduate or undergraduate) generates 1.5 points for each on-campus student per term, and 0.3 points for each off-campus student per term.

Mentoring includes individual instructional activities during which faculty interact with students or work on behalf of their students' education.

Activities include developing students' expertise in the following activities:

- Pedagogical skills, including effective lecturing, office hours and help sessions.
- Preparing seminars, posters, and presentations for broader audiences.
- Preparing publications for the scientific literature.
- Sponsorship for grants and awards.
- Attention to safe laboratory practices.
- Research skills, such as experimentation and operation of instrumentation.
- Adherence to student honor code and behavior consistent with scientific ethics.

Faculty who are claiming credit for student mentoring/individual instruction must collect evidence of these activities (such as final reports, posters, etc.) These documents should be saved, as they may be needed to support the Department’s renewal of certification by the ACS.

In addition each completed Masters or Senior Honors Thesis (or similar summary research document) generates 3.0 points.

C. **Additional Teaching Activities**

Additional points are awarded for non-classroom-based teaching activities that promote high quality teaching. The following activities, accompanied by documenting evidence, generates 3.0 points per activity:

- Informal academic and career advising and mentoring.
- Special honors received by the faculty member based on teaching accomplishments and recognition.
- Demonstration of accessibility and communication with students. Examples include on-line tutorials, student email, extra office hours, and student help sessions.
- Professional development activities related to teaching and learning, including attending training sessions, workshops, and symposia devoted to pedagogical approaches and improvements.
• Educational innovation, including implementation of novel curricular or teaching methods such as those learned during professional development activities.
• Interacting and collaborating with other faculty (within and between departments) in discussing and developing improved teaching practice.
• Critiquing the classroom practices of peers.
• Assessing student performances for the purpose of class improvements.
• Involvement in enhancing the department’s teaching mission (developing new courses, assessments, etc.) including evidence of rigor of the student learning experience.
• Attention to diversity, equity, and inclusion in teaching materials and in the classroom.
• Special academic programs.

D. Additional Bonus  An additional bonus of up to 20 points (20% of the possible 100 points) may be added to the rating for activities related to teaching that are not explicitly part of one of the categories given above.

A summary teaching score is obtained by taking the point total assigned for this category dividing by 90 and multiplying by 5.0.

2. Leadership/Service

The ranges that are indicated for possible scores in each of the categories below are intended to reflect the perceived degree of effort and the quality of performance of the faculty member being evaluated. These will be determined, in so far as possible, from data supplied in that faculty member’s annual FRPA, and other information made available to the evaluating committee and the Chair. A high level of quality in the performance of leadership/service is a requisite for reaching the highest score in any of these categories.

A. Department/College/University Committee Work – (no more than 15 points can be assigned in this category, with no more than 6 at any level)

  Committee Membership: Up to 1.5 point is assigned for each committee served on

  Committee Chairmanship: Up to 4.0 points for chairing a committee

B. Special Initiatives – (no more than 6.0 points can be assigned for this category)

  Library, Department/College/University rules or programs: Between 0 and 6.0 points can be assigned for these activities. Examples include department chair, center director, graduate program director, etc.

F. Academic Advising
Major Advising: Between 0 and 4.0 points can be assigned for Chemistry major advising

Minor Advising: Between 0 and 4.0 points can be assigned for Chemistry minor advising

G. Community and Professional Leadership/Service – (no more than 8.0 points can be assigned in this category)

Journal Editor, etc.: Up to 4.0 points can be assigned for this type of activity

Journal/Agency Reviewer: Between 0.6 and 4.0 can be assigned for this type of activity

Public Leadership/Service: Between 1.0 and 4.0 points can be assigned for Public Service activities, based on relevance and extent.

H. A numerical score that is no more than 20% of the total possible may be added to the rating for activities related to leadership/service that are not explicitly part of one of the categories given above.

A summary leadership/service numerical score is obtained by taking the point total assigned for this category dividing by 10 and multiplying by 5.0

C. Overall Merit Score and Summary Evaluation:

1. Overall merit score:

For a full-time member of the Instructional Faculty who is teaching 27 credit hours during the academic year. A score of 90 points in the Teaching category equals a 5.0 numerical evaluation. Not all of the Instructional Faculty will have a full-time appointment in teaching, however, therefore the relationship between the point total assigned using the above criteria and the 0.0-5.0 numerical evaluation will be scaled based on the number of credit hours taught by the Instructional Faculty member.

Many Instructional Faculty members are expected to have an appointment that includes leadership/service as part of the workload. The leadership/service score will also be calculated using the criteria listed above. For each 10% of the faculty member’s effort allocated to leadership/service, the leadership/service numerical score is obtained by taking the leadership/service point total assigned, dividing by 10 and multiplying by 5.0.

In the standard example detailed in section A of this document, the member of the instructional faculty who teaches 27 credits during the academic year, and who has a 10% leadership/service requirement, will be assigned a numerical score based on 90 assigned points being equal to 5.0 in Teaching, and 10 assigned points being equal to
5.0 in leadership/service. The overall merit score will then be the weighted average (9/1) of the Teaching and Leadership/Service scores.

2. Summary Evaluation:

The summary evaluation of Instructional Faculty members is based on that person’s overall merit score. A score below 2.0 will result in a summary evaluation of ‘below expectations’.

3. Summary Evaluations of “Below Expectations’:

An evaluation of ‘below expectations’ may be appealed by the process described in section I.B.1 of this appendix. The Department Chair will convene a meeting with the Personnel Committee within two weeks of a final decision to rate an Instructional Faculty member as ‘below expectations’ to consider whether, and under what conditions, that person might be offered an instructional position in future semesters. The Department Chair will report the recommendation of this group to the Dean of CLAS, who is the hiring authority for Instructional Faculty.

III. Clinical Teaching track Faculty shall be evaluated in three separate areas; Teaching, Scholarship, and Leadership/Service; using the following criteria:

Faculty members in a C/T position have variable workloads: primarily teaching but with some percentage of their effort in, Scholarship, and Leadership/Service. In the annual merit evaluations, points will be assigned for the C/T faculty members’ professional activities using the same criteria as used with the tenure-track faculty. Because tenure-track faculty have a very different distribution of effort in Teaching, Scholarship and Leadership/Service; the point totals used to establish the 0-5.0 numerical ranking for the C/T faculty will be adjusted proportionally relative to the scale used when making these numerical assignments with tenure-track faculty.

A. Evaluation Criteria and Scoring (assuming 80:10:10)

1. Teaching – 80 points equals 5.0 rating

   NOTE: Point allocations for traditional classroom instruction are the same as for the tenure track. Point allocations for student mentoring and additional teaching activities are scaled by a factor of 2.5

   A. Classroom Instruction
Formal classes: Clinical-track faculty are scored on the basis of teaching 24 credit hours per academic year. 1.5 points per semester credit hour are awarded based on satisfactory completion of teaching duties, for total of 36 points. In addition, the point value assigned for each class may be multiplied by up to three multipliers:

- **Quality Factor**: from -50% to +50% (-0.75 or +0.75 points per credit hour) based on evidence of teaching innovation and effectiveness provided with the FRPA, including teaching questionnaires, faculty classroom observations, analysis of course materials such as syllabi, examinations, assignments, etc., examples of classroom innovations, letters from former students or faculty with whom they have co-taught course, etc.

- **Class Size Factor** up to +50% bonus (+0.75 points per credit hour) based on enrollment at the census date. The class size bonus is 10% for class sizes greater than 60, incrementing by 10% for every additional 10 students up to a maximum bonus of 50% for class sizes of greater than 100 students.

- **New Class or Substantive Revision Factor** up to +50% bonus (+0.75 points per credit hour) based on evidence of curriculum development, including an analysis of course materials such as syllabi, lecture material, in-class and homework assignments, examinations and projects, classroom innovations, etc.

Multiple factors may be applied, but only to the base points. Thus, a new 3-credit hour course, delivered at the highest quality, for 120 students would earn: \(4.5 + 2.25 + 2.25 + 2.25 = 11.25\) points. A new 4-credit hour course, delivered at the highest quality, for 120 students would earn: \(6 + 3 + 3 + 3 = 15\) points.

**B. Student Mentoring**

Each semester or summer term of mentoring a teaching assistant, learning assistant, or research student (graduate or undergraduate) generates 1.25 points for each on-campus student per term, and 0.25 points for each off-campus student per term.

Mentoring includes individual instructional activities during which faculty interact with students or work on behalf of their students’ education.

Activities include developing students’ expertise in the following activities:

- Pedagogical skills, including effective lecturing, office hours and help sessions.
- Preparing seminars, posters, and presentations for broader audiences.
- Preparing publications for the scientific literature
- Sponsorship for grants and awards.
- Attention to safe laboratory practices.
- Research skills, such as experimentation and operation of instrumentation.
- Adherence to student honor code and behavior consistent with scientific ethics.
Faculty who are claiming credit for student mentoring/individual instruction must collect evidence of these activities (such as final reports, posters, etc.) These documents should be saved, as they may be needed to support the Department’s renewal of certification by the ACS.

In addition each completed Masters or Senior Honors Thesis (or similar summary research document) generates 2.5 points.

C. Additional Teaching Activities

Additional points are awarded for non-classroom-based teaching activities that promote high quality teaching. The following activities, accompanied by documenting evidence, generates 2.5 points per activity:

- Informal academic and career advising and mentoring.
- Special honors received by the faculty member based on teaching accomplishments and recognition.
- Demonstration of accessibility and communication with students. Examples include on-line tutorials, student email, extra office hours, and student help sessions.
- Professional development activities related to teaching and learning, including attending training sessions, workshops, and symposia devoted to pedagogical approaches and improvements.
- Educational innovation, including implementation of novel curricular or teaching methods such as those learned during professional development activities.
- Interacting and collaborating with other faculty (within and between departments) in discussing and developing improved teaching practice.
- Critiquing the classroom practices of peers.
- Assessing student performances for the purpose of class improvements.
- Involvement in enhancing the department’s teaching mission (developing new courses, assessments, etc.) including evidence of rigor of the student learning experience.
- Attention to diversity, equity, and inclusion in teaching materials and in the classroom.
- Special academic programs.

D. Additional Bonus  An additional bonus of up to 16 points (20% of the possible 80 points) may be added to the rating for activities related to teaching that are not explicitly part of one of the categories given above.

A summary teaching score is obtained by taking the point total assigned for this category dividing by 80 and multiplying by 5.0.

B. Scholarship
A. Publications – (Up to 40 points can be assigned in this category)

Research articles: Between 4 and 8 points are assigned for each research manuscript published.

A paper is worth 4 to 8 points depending on the quality of the paper and the journal in which it is published. The department Chair and the evaluating sub-committee will take multiple factors into account, including suggestions from the publishing faculty member, in making determinations of quality.

Review articles: 3 points are assigned for each review manuscript published.

Monographs or Texts: 5 – 17 points are assigned per monograph or text. Credit can be received in multiple years for monographs or textbooks.

Other (e.g. unrefered publications): Between 0 and 2 points are assigned for each publication in this category. No more than 5 points can be assigned.

F. Presentations – (No more than 10 points can be assigned in this category)

Invited Seminars: Between 1 – 3 points are assigned for each invited seminar.

Conference talks: Between 1 – 3 points are assigned for each conference presentation.

Special Conference Activities: Between 0 and 3 points can be assigned for these activities. These include conference organization, chairing sessions, etc.

G. Research Students – (No more than 6 points can be assigned in this category)

Undergraduate Students: 0.5 points per semester for each undergraduate research student.

Graduate Students: 1.5 points per year for each on-campus graduate student, and 0.3 points per year for each off-campus graduate student.

Post-Doctoral: 1.5 points per year for each on-campus post-doctoral fellow, and 0.5 points per year for each off-campus post-doctoral fellow.

Professional Research Associate: 1.5 points per year for each on-campus PRA
H. Funding Activities – (No more than 17 points can be assigned in this category)

   **New Proposals submitted:** Between 1 and 4 points are assigned for each new proposal submitted during the year.

   **Funded Proposals:** Between 2 and 6 points are assigned for each proposal that is funded or is continuing.

   **Special Contributions or Awards:** Between 0 and 8 points can be assigned for these activities.

I. A numerical score that is no more than 20% of the total possible may be added to the rating for activities related to scholarship that are not explicitly part of one of the categories given above.

A summary scholarship numerical score is obtained by taking the point total assigned for this category dividing by 40 and multiplying by 5.0. For appointments other than 10% scholarship, for each 10% effort, 10 points equals a 5.0 rating.

C. Leadership/Service

The ranges that are indicated for possible scores in each of the categories below are intended to reflect the perceived degree of effort and the quality of performance of the faculty member being evaluated. These will be determined, in so far as possible, from data supplied in that faculty member’s annual FRPA, and other information made available to the evaluating committee and the Chair. A high level of quality in the performance of leadership/service is a requisite for reaching the highest score in any of these categories.

1. **Department/College/University Committee Work – (no more than 12 points can be assigned in this category, with no more than 6 at any level)**

   **Committee Membership:** Up to 1.0 point is assigned for each committee served on

   **Committee Chairmanship:** Up to 3.0 points for chairing a committee

2. **Special Initiatives – (no more than 5 points can be assigned for this category)**

   **Library, Department/College/University rules or programs:** Between 0 and 5 points can be assigned for these activities.

3. **Academic Advising**

   **Major Advising:** Between 0 and 3 points can be assigned for Chemistry major advising
Minor Advising: Between 0 and 3 points can be assigned for Chemistry minor advising.

4. Community and Professional Leadership/Service – (no more than 6 points can be assigned in this category)

Journal Editor, etc.: Up to 3.0 points can be assigned for this type of activity.

Journal/Agency Reviewer: Between 0.5 and 3.0 can be assigned for this type of activity.

Public Leadership/Service: Between 1 and 3 points can be assigned for Public Leadership/service activities, based on relevance and extent.

5. A numerical score that is no more than 20% of the total possible may be added to the rating for activities related to leadership/service that are not explicitly part of one of the categories given above.

A member of the C/T Faculty will have a variable workload with no less than 10% effort in leadership/service. The relationship between the point total assigned using the above criteria and the 0.0-4.0 numerical evaluation is scaled based on the scale used for the tenure-track faculty. For example, a member of the C/T faculty who has a 10% workload in leadership/service (one-half that of a tenure-track faculty member) during the academic year will be assigned a numerical score based on 8 assigned points being equal to 5.0 for their leadership/service activities.

D. Overall Evaluation:

1. Overall merit score: The overall merit score is based on the weighted average of the faculty member’s summary scores in teaching, scholarship and leadership/service.

2. Summary Evaluation: Each C/T Faculty member will be assigned a summary evaluation based on his or her overall merit score. An overall merit score below 2.0 will result in an summary evaluation of ‘below expectations’.

3 Summary Evaluations of ‘Below Expectations’:

An evaluation of ‘below expectations’ may be appealed by the process described in section I.B.1 of this appendix. The Department Chair will convene a meeting with the Personnel Committee within two weeks of a final decision to rate a C/T Faculty member as ‘below expectations’ to consider whether, and under what conditions, that person might be allowed to continue in a C/T Faculty position in future semesters. The Department Chair will immediately report the recommendation of this group to the Dean of CLAS.
IV. Tenured Faculty on a differentiated workload shall be evaluated in Teaching, Scholarship and Leadership/Service, using the following criteria:

A. Scoring Criteria

Tenured Faculty members on a differentiated workload have a distribution of effort in Teaching, Scholarship, and Leadership/Service that differs from the 40:40:20 that is standard for tenure-track faculty. In the annual merit evaluations, points will be assigned for the tenured faculty with a differentiated workload using the same criteria as used with those on a normal workload. Because the normal workload is a 40:40:20 distribution of effort in Teaching:Scholarship:Leadership/Service; the point totals used to establish the 0-5.0 numerical ranking for faculty on a differentiated workload will be adjusted proportionally relative to the scale used when making these numerical assignments with tenure-track faculty, that is, for each 10% of workload assigned in each category, a score of 10 points in that category is equal to a merit rating of 5.0.

B. Overall Ratings, Summary Evaluations, and Personnel Actions:

The calculation of the overall merit rating and summary evaluation of a faculty member with a differentiated workload will be calculated exactly as described for all other tenure track faculty in section A of this appendix, using weightings consistent with the terms of that faculty member’s appointment. The process for an appeal of an assigned merit rating or summary evaluation score is the same as for all faculty members, described in section I.B.1 of this appendix. Personnel actions arising from an assigned summary evaluation with a score below 2.0, or equivalent, are the same as for all tenure track faculty members, as described in section I.B.2-4 of this appendix.
APPENDIX E

Parameters for assignment of research space.
For the Chemistry department to thrive and grow as a research enterprise, we must make the most efficient use of our limited research space. This is especially true as the department adds faculty in the future. Assignment of research space will be by the department chair based on the following guidelines and parameters (and with the following priority):

1. *Each tenure/tenure track faculty* member will be given a minimum of 1 bay in a research laboratory, where each laboratory room in the New Science Building is considered to have 4 bays (with the exception of 4118 which has 2 bays). Adjustment to this assignment will be based on the following parameters (and, in order of the following priorities):

   a. Newly hired and Untenured Assistant Professors will be allocated adequate laboratory space to accommodate the research program that they are assembling so that they have every opportunity to sustain or initiate a successful research career.

   b. Faculty members with an active research grant(s) can request to expand their assigned space based on needs to fulfill the research obligations of the grant.

   c. Faculty members who have demonstrated productivity in the previous 3 years, with productivity measured by:

      i. Numbers of publications in peer-reviewed professional journals

      ii. Numbers of grant proposals submitted

      iii. Professional research presentations at regional or national meetings

      iv. Mentoring of research students (graduate or undergraduate). Mentoring of research students must be documented by student reports that are submitted by the student(s) at the end of each term.

2. To be considered for increased laboratory space assigned to a particular research group, the faculty member must submit a written request to the department chair that details the amount of additional space needed, the rationale for this need, the anticipated time-frame for this need, and the outcome that the additional space
will provide (e.g. 2 research publications, preliminary data needed to submit a new research proposal, etc.). Requests for additional space can be made at any time during the year. The chair will review the request and act as quickly as possible. If the expansion is approved, then:

a. If expansion of one research group’s space requires a necessary contraction of another research group’s space, this will take place between semesters provided that the details of the expansion/contraction can be worked out.

b. If the expansion can occur into space that is currently unassigned, then it can occur immediately upon approval of the chair.

c. At the end of the proposed time-frame, the research group must either:
   i. Contract to its previous space
   ii. Submit another request that details the activity of the previous time-frame, and that establishes a new time-frame, new objectives, and new outcomes.

3. **Non-tenure-track faculty** (Instructors, Senior Instructors, research faculty, Clinical Teaching Track faculty) and **tenure track faculty with alternative assignments** (senior administrators etc.) may submit a request to have assigned research laboratory space. Because research activity is not part of the distribution of effort in the contract for Instructors and Senior Instructors and may not be an expectation of others in the groups above, assignment of laboratory space for faculty in these positions is not guaranteed. A written request for laboratory space must be in the form of a research proposal that details the amount of space requested, the anticipated time-frame for this need, the research that will be conducted, and the outcome that the space will provide (e.g. 2 research publications, preliminary data needed to submit a new research proposal, student research reports, etc.). Criteria by which research space may be allocated to non-tenure-track faculty include:

   a. Obtaining a research grant that contributes to the department’s Facilities & Administrative (F & A) account.
b. Collaborating with a UC Denver tenure/tenure-track faculty member’s research group on a research project. In this instance, the case must be made that space separate from that assigned to the tenure/tenure-track faculty person is needed.

c. Mentoring undergraduate research students who are registered for Independent Study (CHEM 2840, 3840 or 4840). Continued assignment of laboratory space to mentor undergraduate research students is contingent upon students submitting written reports.

Space will be allocated to non-tenure-track faculty and the other faculty specified above only:

a. If space is available,

b. The assigned space is not needed to support the research activities of the core, active tenure/tenure-track faculty,

For an unfunded non-tenure-track faculty member, the maximum amount of time that research space will be allocated is 1 academic year, and the maximum amount of space assigned will be 1 bay. Continued use of the assigned research laboratory beyond this time-period requires another proposal to the department chair, and approval is contingent upon:

a. Availability of space

b. submission of a research proposal to a funding agency that is based on the preliminary results obtained during the prior year’s research, or

c. publication of a manuscript in a peer reviewed journal.

d. Presentation of research at a regional or national meeting.

e. Submission of student generated research reports at the end of each term during which the student(s) is enrolled in CHEM 2840, CHEM 3840 or CHEM 4840.

In the case of a non-tenure-track faculty member, or others listed above, who is supported by external funding:

a. The laboratory space assigned will be for the duration of the grant,

b. A 1-year extension may be granted following completion of the grant provided that a renewal proposal has been submitted (but not yet awarded)

Additional space assignments/allocation/reallocation may be contingent on future hiring plans.