

Department of Chemistry

California State University, Chico

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY AND BIOCHEMISTRY
EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND POLICIES FOR FACULTY

May 2024

1. **General Operating Procedures**

- a. The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry Personnel Committee will proceed in accord with the following operating procedures and policies where they are not in conflict with those specified in the current University Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures document, CSU Trustees policies, or the collective bargaining agreement contract between CSU and CFA.
- b. Individuals have the responsibility for making certain that their files are complete and current. Modesty should not prohibit placing pertinent material in the file.

2. **Structure**

- a. The membership of the Department Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Personnel Committee shall consist of all full-time tenured and eligible FERP faculty members of the Department except for the following:
 - i. The Department Chair except as provided in the FPPP 4.1.10.
 - ii. Faculty members who are serving on the College Personnel Committee
 - iii. Faculty members on semester FERP, sabbatical or other leaves that occur during the review cycle.
 - iv. Faculty members being reviewed for promotion that academic year.
- b. Subcommittees of at least three people will be elected by the Department for each individual to be reviewed. The function of the subcommittee will be to:
 - i. Make certain that at least one faculty member of the Personnel Committee who is familiar with each individual to be evaluated have ample opportunity to observe the individual in the lecture or lab and to turn in written evaluations.
 - ii. Meet with the faculty member being evaluated to resolve any questions by either the committee or that individual.
 - iii. Write the initial draft of the final evaluation and recommendation.

3. **Operation**

- a. A quorum of the RTP subcommittee must be present in order for the subcommittee to officially meet. A quorum shall consist of a majority of committee or subcommittee members.

- b. The RTP subcommittee will consider evidence from the instructor's personnel file that deals with each of the three main areas of activity. This information shall be the basis for a written summary evaluation of the instructor's performance. In addition, a recommendation may be made regarding courses the individual should teach if retained. The final recommendations will be adopted by the entire committee. When the Committee meets to vote on the reports and recommendations, normally all members must be present. If a member abstains from voting, the member shall submit a written reason for the abstention (FPPP 10.3.9). When a recommendation has been approved by the majority of the committee, it will be placed on the official RTP form and signed by the committee. Members in disagreement with the majority opinion have the right to write minority reports.

4. **Criteria and Standards for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion**

In each area of review [Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service that contributes to the strategic plans and goals of the department/unit, college, and other contributions to the University and community (Service)] all reports conclude with an evaluation, or **rating** (FPPP 10.3.3): exceeds expectations (EE), meets expectations (ME), does not meet expectations (DE). The following table specifies what ratings are typically required to produce a recommendation for tenure or promotion.

	Instruction	Professional Growth and Achievement	Service
Tenure	ME	ME	ME
Prom. to Associate	ME	ME	ME
Prom. to Full	ME	ME	ME
Accelerated Tenure and Prom. to Associate	EE	EE	EE
Accelerated Prom. to Full	EE	EE	EE

Note that a candidate rated as does not meet expectations in **any area** will not be recommended for tenure or promotion. If a candidate being evaluated on standard timelines for

tenure and/or promotion demonstrates activity which is rated as Exceeds Expectations, this may result in additional financial compensation if the candidate advances early to the next salary bracket. The record of candidates undergoing a performance review for the purposes of retention should demonstrate that there is a reasonable chance of the candidate obtaining tenure in due course (FPPP 10.4.3.b & c). Therefore, the rating of retention candidates should be based on their progress toward the achievements necessary for recommendation for tenure or promotion. Also note that candidates for promotion to Professor must also clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself (FPPP 11.1.2).

In the consideration of promotion, the review process shall only take into account the candidate's record of performance for all years since appointment or closure of the WPAF prior to promotion to the current rank, whichever is applicable under FPPP 10.1.11 and 11.1.2.

In what follows the Department has attempted to quantify and qualify *typical* minimal activity in the three areas of review: Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service. We strongly emphasize that these qualified and quantified minimums are a *typical* set of achievements that a candidate *could* pursue, but that other achievements of equivalent value may substitute for these quantified minimums.

The purpose of the minimums stated below is not to restrict the candidate's range of work, but to aid both the candidate and the personnel committee by providing *an example set* of achievements that would merit a positive recommendation for personnel action.

Instruction

Teaching effectiveness in the first minimum and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure and promotion (FPPP 10.2.5.a) Evidence of this effectiveness will be assessed in the following **areas**.

1.1 Establishing and maintaining academically rigorous and effective classroom and laboratory instruction

1.2 Developing or implementing innovation in undergraduate chemical education both in and out of the classroom

1.3 Creating new courses or programs or revamping existing courses or programs contributing to the Department's strategic plan

1.4 Mentoring students outside of the classroom

Success in **Area 1.1** is of central importance; therefore, all faculty under review must demonstrate teaching effectiveness which meets expectations in this area. In order for a candidate to meet expectations in **Area 1.1** the candidate's evidence should include:

- knowledge of and enthusiasm for the subject matter and teaching
 - in courses within the specific sub-discipline of chemistry for which the candidate was hired to teach
 - in the General Chemistry courses for majors
 - in other courses which the candidate teaches

In addition, the candidate should present evidence highlighting some combination of the following activities:

- demonstrates student learning as a priority
 - maintains good course organization and effective communication with students
 - uses class time effectively, aligning student learning outcomes with daily activities
 - designs equitable assessments which tie directly to learning outcomes
- fosters a sense of belonging in the classroom
 - effectively implements active learning and group work which encourages participation by all students
 - embraces different learning preferences
 - encourages the development of students' scientific identities by providing a safe space to make mistakes and develop understanding
- shows a positive attitude toward students, cultivating student-student and student-instructor relationships
 - proactively addresses student performance and well-being
 - sets high standards and communicates them to students

(adapted from: *A Guide to Evaluating Teaching for Promotion and Tenure*, R.M.Diamond (Ed.), 1987, Copley Publishing, Acton MA. and *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education*, A.W.Chickering and Z.F.Gamson, 1987; and *Equitable and Inclusive Practices Designed to Reduce Equity Gaps in Undergraduate Chemistry Courses*, K. N. White, K. Vincent-Layton, and B. Villarreal, 2021)

Equity, Diversity & Inclusion is one of the University Strategic Priorities. Therefore, the implementation of inclusive teaching practices and the creation of equitable learning environments may be used by a candidate as evidence of teaching effectiveness. Evidence may include quantitative data such as reductions in equity gaps or a lack of equity gaps in the candidate's courses as shown in the Data Dashboard, or a reduction in equity gaps in student performance on assessments; qualitative evidence such as student emails or comments through SFOTs; classroom material evidence such as the implementation of Universal Design for Learning to improve access and to diversify opportunities for learning, the use of diverse and inclusive course materials, the incorporation of culturally relevant and/or culturally sustaining pedagogy, the creation of class assignments and activities that implement equitable and authentic methods of assessment; and/or evidence of completion of professional development opportunities that center on equity, diversity, and inclusion.

For the purposes of this evaluation in the **Area 1.1** section above, the committee shall consider the following evidence presented and discussed by the candidate:

- Self-evaluation
- Written course material such as syllabi, exams and homework assignments and laboratory activities
- Samples of student work if provided by the candidate
- Reports of classroom visits by committee members and others
- Student feedback on teaching and learning (SFOT)
- Written input from other individuals
- Other evidence in support of the activities outlined for area 1.1

The FPPP (sec 10.2.5.a) states that “The candidate must diligently provide meaningful evidence, beyond SFOTs, of teaching performance.”

In addition to success in **Area 1.1**, the candidate must demonstrate activity of significant quality and continuity in at least one of the remaining **Areas 1.2-1.4** to merit an overall Instructional rating of Meets Expectations.

1.2 Developing or implementing innovation in undergraduate chemical education both in and out of the classroom

1.3 Creating new courses or programs or revamping existing courses or programs contributing to the Department’s strategic plan

1.4 Mentoring students outside of the classroom

The candidate’s evidence may document activity in the following areas. Typical examples of how an instructor may demonstrate quality and continuity among the areas are provided below as Group 1 and Group 2 activities. These are *examples*, and the candidate may demonstrate their work through other activities not listed below; in these cases, the candidate will explain how their efforts are comparable to other Group 1 or Group 2 activities.

Group 1 Activities:

- Receiving an external grant to improve teaching or make a significant course improvement
- Publishing peer-reviewed works including but not limited to a peer reviewed book or book chapter, a refereed journal publication, a refereed conference proceedings paper
- Development of new courses
- Receiving a CSU system-wide grant to improve teaching or make a significant course improvement
- A significant re-design of an existing course to improve student outcomes including but not limited to the incorporation of inclusive pedagogy or significant efforts to improve equity gaps

- Mentoring resulting in student publications and/or recognition such as student awards received through nomination by the candidate, external student fellowships obtained by the candidate, or similar
- Similar work of equivalent effort and impact, as justified by the candidate's presented evidence

Group 2 Activities:

- Receiving a College or University grant to improve teaching or make a significant course improvement
- Efforts to enhance learning through a variety of in-class methods such as active-learning techniques, utilization of instructional technologies, and assessment of student learning outcomes
- Mentoring of students in chemical research, chemical education projects or various other projects during semester and/or summer research
- Mentoring of graduate students on thesis projects
- An oral presentation (in the area of chemical instruction), invited or contributed, at a professional conference
- Conducting a significant amount of mentoring or advising regarding, but not limited to, single subject credentialing, research, graduate theses, or internship facilitating
- Similar work of equivalent effort and impact, as justified by the candidate's presented evidence

In support of a tenure and/or promotion decision, candidates may cluster **three or more** Group 2 activities in the place of one Group 1 activity. It is the responsibility of the candidate to present a case that their selected cluster of Group 2 activities is equivalent to a Group 1 activity. Furthermore, a cluster of Group 2 activities can be used in place of only one Group 1 activity.

Specific Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Meets expectations:

1. Meets expectations rating in **Area 1.1** as described earlier *and*
2. At least one Group 1 Activity in **Areas 1.2-1.4**

Exceeds expectations:

1. Exceeds expectations rating in **Area 1.1** as described earlier *and*
2. At least two Group 1 Activities in **Areas 1.2-1.4**

Specific Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Meets expectations:

1. Meets expectations rating in **Area 1.1** as described earlier *and*

2. At least one Group 1 activity in **Areas 1.2-1.4**

Exceeds expectations:

1. Exceeds expectations rating in **Area 1.1** as described earlier *and*
2. At least two Group 1 activities in **Areas 1.2-1.4**

Before a candidate is evaluated for tenure and promotion, the candidate may wish to assess their progress in Instruction. The following guidance is intended to allow the candidate to determine if they are on track to Meet Expectations at their tenure and promotion review and will be used for informational purposes only. If, during a 2nd or 4th year review, a candidate does not meet these benchmarks, they should address in their narrative how they are still on track to Meet Expectations at the time of their tenure and promotion evaluation. However, no tenure, promotion, or contract decisions will be made based on meeting or failing to meet these progress marks in the 2nd and 4th years.

2nd Year candidates who meet expectations:

1. Meets expectations rating in Area 1.1 as described earlier

4th Year candidates who meet expectations:

1. Meets expectations rating in Area 1.1 as described earlier and
2. Either one Group 1 Activity or two Group 2 Activities in Areas 1.2-1.4

Professional Growth and Achievement

The Department requires that faculty demonstrate an ongoing commitment to professional growth and achievement. Inherent in scientific scholarship is the increased chemical knowledge of the candidate. It is also anticipated that improvement of the candidate's pedagogic skills in the classroom and the laboratory will result from scientific scholarship. That scholarship which enhances the student-centered learning environment is especially pertinent to the teacher-scholar model and directly applies to the Missions of the Department, the College, and the University and is accorded special merit. Evidence of professional growth and achievement is demonstrated by activities listed below. Undergraduate research that culminates in a scholarly work may be listed under *Instruction* or *Professional Growth and Achievement*. Evaluation in this area will assess the quality, continuity, and the level of effort associated with a candidate's scholarship.

Scholarship shall be evaluated within the context of one or more of the following definitions: Teaching and Learning, Discovery, Artistic Creativity, Integration of Knowledge, and Application. These are also essential considerations for retention, tenure, or promotion for teaching faculty as they are directly or indirectly related to effective instruction. Continued first-hand knowledge of his or her field is required of all teaching faculty.

The Department has adopted the following as *examples* of appreciable scholarly activities for Professional Growth and Achievement in chemistry, biochemistry and chemical education. The candidate may demonstrate their work through other activities not listed below; in these cases the candidate will explain how their efforts are comparable to other Group 1 or Group 2 activities.

- Group 1 Activities
 - Published peer-reviewed Articles in Journals (required)
 - Funding of external Grant Proposals
 - Authoring a Textbook or Support Materials
 - Formalized positions in national or international education groups
 - Similar work of equivalent effort and impact, as justified by the candidate's presented evidence
- Group 2 Activities
 - Funding of internal Grant Proposals
 - Submission of external grant proposals
 - Presentations or Leadership at Professional Meetings (Local, Regional, National, or International)
 - Presenter of Papers or Posters
 - Invited Lectures
 - Organizer of Symposium or Workshop
 - Chairman of Professional Organization or Committee
 - Chairperson of Faculty Learning Groups or equivalent campus groups
 - Specific Activities in Chemical Education
 - Participation in Meetings or Workshop
 - Participation in Faculty Learning Groups or equivalent campus groups
 - Involvement in K-12 or General Education will be considered in all the above categories where appropriate.
 - Similar work of equivalent effort and impact, as justified by the candidate's presented evidence

In support of a tenure and/or promotion decision, candidates may cluster **three or more** Group 2 activities in the place of one Group 1 activity. It is the responsibility of the candidate to present a case that their selected cluster of Group 2 activities is equivalent to a Group 1 activity. Furthermore, a cluster of Group 2 activities can be used in place of only one Group 1 activity.

The scholarly activities indicated above are typical Departmental expectations for tenure and promotion to **Associate Professor** and promotion to **Professor**. It is realized that some scholarly works require greater amounts of effort and time and may be evaluated as exceptional scholarly achievements. It is also realized that there may be professional activities that will not normally result in peer reviewed publications or grants. These types of activities may be of such merit that alone or in clusters may constitute a significant professional achievement without culminating in a published scholarly work. Again, it is the responsibility of the candidate

to present a case that these scholarly works should be considered a Group 1 or Group 2 activity.

Specific Criteria for Retention

The record of candidates undergoing a performance review for the purposes of retention should demonstrate that there is a reasonable chance of the candidate obtaining tenure in due course (FPPP 10.4.3.b). Therefore, the rating of retention candidates should be based on their progress toward the achievements necessary for recommendation for tenure or promotion. Additionally, and in agreement with FPPP 10.4.4.c.1, evidence of performance while at California State University, Chico, shall be the primary consideration in all tenure decisions.

Specific Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Meets expectations: Two Group 1 professional achievements of which one must be a peer reviewed publication. Candidates may cluster **three or more** Group 2 activities in the place of one Group 1 activity.

Exceeds expectations: Four Group 1 achievements of which two must be peer reviewed publications. Again, candidates may cluster **three or more** Group 2 activities in the place of one Group 1 activity.

Specific Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Meets expectations: Two Group 1 activities since promotion to Associate Professor of which one must be a peer reviewed publication. Again, candidates may cluster **three or more** Group 2 activities in the place of one Group 1 activity.

Exceeds expectations: Four Group 1 activities since promotion to Associate Professor of which two must be peer reviewed publications. Again, candidates may cluster **three or more** Group 2 activities in the place of one Group 1 activity.

Before a candidate is evaluated for tenure and promotion, the candidate may wish to assess their progress in Professional Growth and Achievement. The following guidance is intended to allow the candidate to determine if they are on track to Meet Expectations at their tenure and promotion review and will be used for informational purposes only. If, during a 2nd or 4th year review, a candidate does not meet these benchmarks, they should address in their narrative how they are still on track to Meet Expectations at the time of their tenure and promotion evaluation. However, no tenure, promotion, or contract decisions will be made based on meeting or failing to meet these progress marks in the 2nd and 4th years. As stated in the FPPP (10.4.3.b), retention shall be awarded to those whose performance seems to afford them a reasonable possibility of obtaining tenure given the number of probationary years remaining.

2nd Year candidates who meet expectations:

1. Documented progress on a Group 1 activity or two Group 2 activities complete.

4th Year candidates who meet expectations:

1. One Group 1 activity.
2. Documented progress on a second Group 1 activity or two Group 2 activities complete.

For candidates with service credit, evaluations and performance reviews will include work that is part of a service credit year or years and other granted credits. Candidates with service credit will be expected to meet the same overall benchmarks for Meets Expectations and Exceeds Expectations at the time of their evaluation for tenure and promotion. Candidates may include Group 1 or Group 2 activities that were completed after signing a contract with Chico State but before beginning work on campus as part of their evaluation. As with all candidates, evaluation in all areas will assess the quality, continuity, and the level of effort associated with a candidate's scholarship. Importantly, evidence of performance while at California State University, Chico, shall be the primary consideration in all tenure decisions.

Service that contributes to the strategic plans and goals of the department/unit, college, University, and community

As outlined in the FPPP, service work activities shall be generally defined as

- assuming roles on significant committees,
- involvement in the community or profession, and/or
- facilitating activities

As noted in the FPPP (8.3.1.e.4), candidates may present evidence of service beyond formal institutional roles - such as task forces, mentoring, community engagement, or putting on events/activities that enrich the University. Additionally, all service contributions should be considered in the context of "contributions to the university's mission and strategic plan on campus and/or in the community." Service could therefore be presented by the candidate with reference to the diversity of roles that CSU, Chico plays in the lives of students and the North State.

The Department has adopted the following as *examples* of service. The candidate may demonstrate their work through other activities not listed below; in these cases the candidate will explain how their efforts are comparable to other examples listed here. The evaluating committee is encouraged to evaluate the continuity of service by the candidate, especially those being considered for promotion from Associate to Full professor.

- Chair of a Department, College, University, System or National committee
- participation on a grant review panel
- maintenance of department instruments

- seminar coordinator
- SAACS advisor
- member of a Department, College, University, System, or National committee
- serving as a peer reviewer for manuscripts, grants, book chapters, etc.
- participating in department fundraising or development activities
- participation in recruiting activities
 - Wildcat Welcome, Chico Preview Day, Choose Chico, etc.
- presentations or workshops in K-12 science education
 - at Gateway, at local schools, through the education community
- participation in personnel committees for other departments
- member of the board of a campus Center
- work with alumni, advisory boards, or corporations
- leadership/officer position in campus affinity groups that facilitate faculty professional development and diverse student success
- participation in and/or presenting at diversity, equity and inclusion professional development opportunities
- contributions aligned with improving graduation rates, eliminating equity gaps, HSI related priorities, Accessible Technology Initiative priorities, Basic Needs Initiative priorities, healing-centered campus priorities

Faculty under review should note that activity in ALL areas above is not required to reach the standard of meets expectations. Faculty under review are also expected to work collaboratively and productively with colleagues. (If this standard is met at a satisfactory level, the Department need not address it in the personnel committee report and recommendations).

Specific Criteria for Retention

The record of candidates undergoing a performance review for the purposes of retention should demonstrate that there is a reasonable chance of the candidate obtaining tenure in due course (FPPP 10.4.3.b). Therefore, the rating of retention candidates should be based on their progress toward the achievements necessary for recommendation for tenure or promotion.

Specific Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Meets expectations: The evidence demonstrates the candidate's consistent, on-going involvement in activities listed above. In addition to typical involvement in Departmental Committee work, a leadership role must be played in at least one Departmental committee or service work. Also, the candidate must play a role in committee work outside of the Department, such as for the College, the University, for a professional association, or other service work.

Exceeds expectations: In addition to the involvements described as meets expectations, the candidate must demonstrate a consistently high level of service in two of the example activities

listed above (the candidate should feel free to present similar service work of equivalent effort and impact, as justified by the candidate's presented evidence). Where this area of evaluation refers to participation on committees, "exceeds expectations" performance is evidenced by the candidate assuming leadership roles on significant University- or College- level committees or with professional associations, and also demonstrating consistent, on-going contributions to such committees.

Specific Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Meets expectations: The evidence demonstrates the candidate's consistently high level of involvement in two activities listed above. Where this area of evaluation refers to participation on committees, "meets expectations" performance is evidenced by the candidate assuming *leadership* roles on significant University-, or College- level committees or with professional associations, and also demonstrating consistent, on-going contributions to such committees.

Exceeds expectations: In addition to the involvements described as meets expectations, the candidate must demonstrate a consistently high level of involvement in three activities such as the example activities listed above (the candidate should feel free to present similar service work of equivalent effort and impact, as justified by the candidate's presented evidence). Where this area of evaluation refers to participation on committees, "exceeds expectations" performance is evidenced by the candidate assuming leadership roles on significant University- or College-, level committees or with professional associations, and also demonstrating consistent, on-going contributions to such committees.

Before a candidate is evaluated for tenure and promotion, the candidate may wish to assess their progress in Service. The following guidance is intended to allow the candidate to determine if they are on track to Meet Expectations at their tenure and promotion review and will be used for informational purposes only. If, during a 2nd or 4th year review, a candidate does not meet these benchmarks, they should address in their narrative how they are still on track to Meet Expectations at the time of their tenure and promotion evaluation. However, no tenure, promotion, or contract decisions will be made based on meeting or failing to meet these progress marks in the 2nd and 4th years.

2nd Year candidates who meet expectations:

1. Membership on department-level committees

4th Year candidates who meet expectations:

1. Continued membership on department-level committees
2. Evidence of service outside the department

5. Criteria and Standards for Accelerated Tenure and Promotion

Candidates may request to be considered for accelerated tenure and accelerated promotion. According to the FPPP (sec 10.5.3 and 11.1.3), to be promoted, such candidates must meet the criteria for "exceptional." The departmental definitions of "exceptional" merit are indicated below.

1. To be recommended for accelerated tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, candidates must:
 - a. Meet all the criteria for regular tenure/promotion.
 - b. Demonstrate significant continuity in teaching quality and an ongoing commitment to professional growth and achievement and service.
 - c. Have a rating of "Exceeds Expectations" in all three areas of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service
 - d. Have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department's typical full-time assignment.
2. To be recommended for accelerated promotion to Full Professor, candidates must:
 - a. Meet all the criteria for regular promotion.
 - b. Demonstrate significant continuity in teaching quality and an ongoing commitment to professional growth and achievement and service.
 - c. Have a rating of "Exceeds Expectations" in all three areas of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service.
 - d. Clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and beyond the University itself.

6. Five Year Reviews

This guidance is based on section 11.2 in the FPPP, which states that every five years, a tenured faculty will undergo a periodic evaluation. The focus of this evaluation should be to provide developmental feedback, encouragement, and appreciation for the faculty member's positive contributions to the University. If necessary, feedback for recommended improvement can be included.

The five-year reviews should be completed by a committee of faculty at equal or higher rank than the faculty member being evaluated. The committee of three should be composed of two faculty members and the Department Chair (if eligible). The composition of the committee should be voted on by all tenure/tenure-track faculty.

The periodic evaluation should review materials submitted by the candidate, which can include:

- an updated CV
- course syllabi
- course examinations
- copies or abstracts of publications

- evidence of participation in scholarly meetings
- copies of papers presented at scholarly meetings
- letters of commendation
- evidence of committee service
- additional information the faculty member wishes to contribute

The committee should also consider recent peer and student evaluations. Should they desire, the committee also may invite signed, written commentary and evaluation statements from students, faculty, and administrators regarding the faculty member under consideration.

As for pre-tenure periodic evaluations, the committee will prepare a department report. This report will assess teaching effectiveness, currency in the field, scholarship and creative activity, and service to the University. A brief meeting with the faculty member being evaluated to clarify any questions may be conducted. The report will be submitted to the Dean, who will either concur with the department report or prepare an independent report. The Dean will then submit these materials to the PAF. Should the faculty member desire, a rebuttal can also be submitted to the PAF.

7. Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty

The responsibilities of lecturer faculty are focused primarily on instruction. The main responsibility is:

1.1 Establishing and maintaining academically rigorous and effective classroom and laboratory instruction

In order for a candidate to receive a Satisfactory rating in **Area 1.1**, the evidence must document measurable outcomes in some combination of the following areas:

- demonstrates student learning as a priority
 - maintains good course organization and effective communication with students
 - uses class time effectively, aligning student learning outcomes with daily activities
 - designs equitable assessments which tie directly to learning outcomes
- fosters a sense of belonging in the classroom
 - effectively implements active learning and group work which encourages participation by all students
 - embraces different learning preferences
 - encourages the development of students' scientific identities by providing a safe space to make mistakes and develop understanding
- shows a positive attitude toward students, cultivating student-student and student-instructor relationships
 - proactively addresses student performance and well-being

- sets high standards and communicates them to students

(adapted from: *A Guide to Evaluating Teaching for Promotion and Tenure*, R.M. Diamond (Ed.), 1987, Copley Publishing, Acton MA.; *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education*, A.W. Chickering and Z.F. Gamson, 1987; and *Equitable and Inclusive Practices Designed to Reduce Equity Gaps in Undergraduate Chemistry Courses*, K. N. White, K. Vincent-Layton, and B. Villarreal, 2021)

Equity, Diversity & Inclusion is one of the University Strategic Priorities. Therefore, the implementation of inclusive teaching practices and the creation of equitable learning environments may be used by a candidate as evidence of teaching effectiveness. Evidence may include quantitative data such as reductions in equity gaps or a lack of equity gaps in the candidate's courses as shown in the Data Dashboard, or a reduction in equity gaps in student performance on assessments; qualitative evidence such as student emails or comments through SFOTs; classroom material evidence such as the implementation of Universal Design for Learning to improve access and to diversify opportunities for learning, the use of diverse and inclusive course materials, the incorporation of culturally relevant and/or culturally sustaining pedagogy, the creation of class assignments and activities that implement equitable and authentic methods of assessment; and/or evidence of completion of professional development opportunities that center on equity, diversity, and inclusion.

For the purposes of this evaluation, the committee may consider the following evidence if provided by the candidate:

- Self-evaluation
- Written course material such as syllabi, exams and homework assignments and laboratory activities
- Samples of student work if provided by the candidate
- Reports of classroom visits by committee members and others
- Student feedback on teaching and learning
- Written input from other individuals
- Other evidence in support of the activities outlined for Area 1.1

In addition to success in **Area 1.1**, the candidate *may* demonstrate activity in at least one of the remaining **Areas 1.2-1.4**; these areas are not required for lecturer faculty. While accomplishments in Areas 1.2-1.4 are not required for lecturer faculty to maintain their position, activity in these areas may be used to establish currency in the field for potential range elevation.

For example, lecturers *may* report activity in the following areas:

1.2 Developing or implementing innovation in undergraduate chemical education both in and out of the classroom

1.3 Creating new laboratory activities or revamping existing laboratories

1.4 Mentoring students outside of the classroom

Activity in Areas 1.2-1.4 may result in some of the following:

- Efforts to enhance learning through a variety of in-class methods such as active-learning techniques, utilization of instructional technologies, and assessment of student learning outcomes
- Mentoring of undergraduate students in chemical research, chemical education projects or various other projects
- Mentoring of graduate students on thesis projects
- Teaching grants and awards
- Peer-reviewed articles related to chemical education
- Development of new courses or significant re-design of existing courses
- Earning a graduate degree
- Other, as evidenced by the candidate

The committee shall consider its ratings in **Area 1.1** in determining the candidate's overall performance rating. Accomplishments in **Areas 1.2-1.4** are not required but may contribute towards range elevation. The committee shall provide a rating in Area 1.1 to the Dean, which should be used for the purposes of retention. The committee shall provide a summary of activity in Areas 1.2-1.4, which could be used as guidance to the Dean for range elevation.

Range Elevation for Lecturer Faculty – Criteria, Eligibility, and Procedures

It is vital to ensure that all lecturer faculty are provided with a clear set of expectations to reach a potential goal of range elevation (RE). In accepting the position of lecturer, the expectation is that of effective instruction. Therefore, the foremost and indispensable criteria for RE consideration is that of teaching effectiveness (as evidenced in Area 1.1); academic research, professional growth and development, and service work can also positively contribute to range elevation consideration.

It is possible for a lecturer faculty member to receive satisfactory performance and periodic evaluations for their teaching and receive regular work based on their entitlement as well as renewed one-year or three-year contracts as set out in the CBA (Sec 12). However, to be considered for RE, a lecturer faculty member is required to demonstrate sustained teaching effectiveness (as outlined in Area 1.1) and maintain currency in the field (as outlined in Areas 1.2-1.4). A lecturer faculty member may also earn a graduate degree (for example, Master of Science, Master of Education, Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Education) as part of evidence for RE consideration. Accumulating teaching experience alone is not considered teaching excellence sufficient for RE.

In order to document achievements in Areas 1.2-1.4 for RE consideration, lecturer faculty are encouraged to place supporting information into their personnel file by contacting the Dean's Office. Such information could include but is not limited to: an up-to-date Curriculum Vitae, a self-reflection of teaching, evidence of research (laboratory based or chemical education based), letters of support from the department chair or other committee chairs, certificates of completion from workshops or faculty learning communities, and any peer-reviewed publications. Lecturer faculty have the right to access to their personnel files (FPPP 7.0.17).

When the lecturer faculty member is ready to make a RE consideration request, they will construct a formal statement (1-2 pages) summarizing their achievements in teaching to meet the criteria in Area 1.1 and any activity in Areas 1.2-1.4. This statement is to be submitted to the department chair and the chair of the RTP committee for review by the candidate's personnel subcommittee by the deadline set by Academic Affairs. The committee is responsible for reviewing the RE materials and writing a recommendation. Once reviewed at the department level and by the department chair, the request and recommendation will move to the College Dean. The Dean will follow the procedures set out in the FPPP (Sec 12.2.2) when making the decision for RE.

Revision History

Revised: Sept 11, 2007

Revised: Sept 24, 2013

Approved: August 30, 2016

Revised: Spring 2022

Ratified by Department: January 19, 2023

Revised and Approved: Spring 2024



Department/Program Standards Approval Sheet

Process:

- a) Department or program votes; if approved, Department Chair/Director submits to College Dean for review.
- b) College Dean reviews, consults with Department Chair/Director regarding questions/ issues, then forwards Dean reviewed Word document to Faculty Affairs and Success via email for review.
- c) Faculty Affairs and Success reviews for compliance with CBA/FPPP, consults with the Dean and Department Chair/Director as needed, then forwards Department/Program Standards to Provost for review and approval;
- d) Provost reviews and approves, recommending changes if necessary, then returns document to Faculty Affairs and Success.
- e) If not approved, Faculty Affairs and Success forwards requested changes for revision and re-submission to Dean and Department Chair/Director.
- f) If approved, Faculty Affairs and Success adds *Provost Designee Approved Date* footer to the document and:
 - a. Routes this approval sheet with approved Department/Program Standards for signatures via Adobe Sign,
 - b. Uploads document to Faculty Affairs and Success Standards website, and
 - c. Informs Dean and Department Chair/Director of approval with link to Faculty Affairs and Success website location.

Chair/Director Approval:  Date: May 30, 2024

Dean Review: *David M. Hassenzahl* Date: May 30, 2024

Provost/Designee Approval: *Mahalley D. Allen* Date: Jun 4, 2024