

TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICY

**Department of Chemistry
Columbus State University
January-December 2013**

Introduction

This document incorporates all of the rules and procedures detailed in the Columbus State University and the College of Letters and Sciences tenure and promotion policies, whether or not they are specifically cited or directly quoted below. However, it also contains policies that may be unique to the Department of Chemistry, including criteria that may exceed the minimal standards described in the College or University-wide document.

Department Standards of Excellence

The Department of Chemistry shall publish Standards of Excellence and review them annually. The Standards of Excellence communicate the department's expectations of faculty as relevant to annual performance reviews, pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. These standards shall be consistent with the College of Letters and Sciences policies outlined, as well as with institutional policies published in the CSU Statutes and the CSU Faculty Handbook. Department standards and changes in the standards are first recommended by a majority vote of the tenured faculty in the department. Recommended standards and changes to the standards must be approved by the department chair, dean and provost before they take effect.

Such standards will identify the criteria by which the Department evaluates performance in the areas of teaching effectiveness; research, scholarly or creative engagement; and service to the institution, profession and community.

Promotion and Tenure

Promotion Procedures

- Faculty members intending to apply for promotion in the fall semester of an academic year should consult the department chair in the preceding spring semester.
- The department should form a personnel committee provided there are at least three tenured faculty members who are eligible to serve. Faculty members who are related to any candidate by blood or marriage, who are romantically involved or have other major conflicts of interest are ineligible to serve.
- The department chair may not serve on the committee.
- Formation of department personnel committee occurs during Fall planning week each year.
- Departmental committee recommendations must be submitted to the candidate, department chairperson, and the Dean. In the absence of a departmental personnel

committee, the chairperson has options of (a) appointing an ad hoc committee of tenured faculty to advise him or her with respect to the merits of the application, and (b) requesting individual recommendations in writing from faculty. All committee and administrative recommendations will be in writing and made available to the applicant.

The department chairperson must submit to the Dean his or her recommendation including support or non-support of departmental committee action (when such a committee exists) and all materials concerning the departmental review of the application. The applicant will be informed in writing of the recommendation of the department chairperson at the time of transmittal of the recommendation to the College committee. All materials from the departmental review will be returned to the office of the Dean for review by the College personnel committee.

Promotion Eligibility

1. University policy permits assistant professors to apply for promotion as early as their fifth year in rank. However, no special consideration will be given to candidates based on their overall time in rank, and candidates applying for promotion in the fifth year will be held to the same standards of accomplishment as those who have served in rank for six or seven years. The department chair is responsible for mentoring faculty members and making recommendations as to when an assistant professor should seek promotion. The assistant professor, while not required to follow that chair's advice, should give it serious consideration.
2. Faculty holding the rank of associate professor may stand for promotion to professor during their fifth year in rank, or later. The department chair is responsible for mentoring faculty members and making recommendations as to when an associate professor should seek promotion. The associate professor, while not required to follow that chair's advice, should give it serious consideration.

Areas of Review

1. Teaching effectiveness
2. Research, scholarly or creative engagement
3. Service to the institution, profession and community

Criteria for Promotion

Faculty must exhibit satisfactory performance in all three areas with demonstrated excellence in two of three areas (one must be teaching). In addition, evidence of peer reviewed publication will be necessary for a positive promotion decision.

General Guidelines for Appointment or Promotion

Assistant Professor – Appointment or promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor should be based upon demonstrated academic ability and potential for professional growth; the individual must have a PhD in chemistry.

Associate Professor – Appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor should be based upon actual performance as well as demonstrated potential for further development while in residence at Columbus State University. There must be evidence that the individual is developing professionally and is contributing to his/her field, generally documented by peer-reviewed publication.

Professor – As the highest academic rank, the title of Professor implies recognition of the individual by peers and associates as an outstanding teacher and an accomplished, productive and respected scholar.

Departmental Standards of Excellence for Promotion

Teaching Effectiveness

A. The evidence of satisfactory performance will include the following:

- *Course preparation*: Documentation of course preparation in a given academic year for each course including course syllabi and copies of final exams.
- *Student evaluation*: Satisfactory student evaluations (≥ 3) in the courses taught in each academic year. Summaries of Course Evaluations including all student evaluations administered (on paper or electronically) since appointment or (where appropriate) the last successful personnel action.
- *Peer Evaluation*: Satisfactory peer evaluation by tenured faculty in the department of chemistry.
- *Advising*: Student advising and maintaining advising logs, or assisting with job referrals/internships.
- *Office hours*: 6hr/week

B. The evidence of excellent performance in teaching will include any four of the following:

- *Course development and delivery*: A record of development of a new course, or the adoption of a new delivery method, or documented evidence of student learning in the courses taught.
- *Development of teaching materials*: Development of teaching materials, such as laboratory manuals, solution manuals, worksheets, computer-based teaching materials, handouts, and use of technology.
- *Student evaluation*: Excellent (≥ 4) student evaluations in the courses taught in each academic year. Summaries of Course Evaluations including all student evaluations administered (on paper or electronically) since appointment or (where appropriate) the last successful personnel action.
- *Peer Evaluation*: *Excellent* peer evaluation by tenured faculty in the department of chemistry.
- *Advising*: A very high advising load relative to other members of the department.

- *Mentoring research*: Mentored undergraduate or graduate research and the mentee presented the research in a conference.
- *Faculty development activities in teaching*: Taught seminars/workshops on teaching methods, and or received a faculty development grant on teaching.
- *Teaching award*: Selected as a finalist or received a teaching award (Receiving an award will be given more weightage).
- *Grants*: Received funding for a grant to improve teaching instruction and curriculum development.
- *Workshops/Conferences*: Presented papers directly related to teaching and curriculum development.
- *Overload*: Taught an overload (more than fourteen hours in a semester).

Research, Scholarly or Creative engagement

A. The evidence of satisfactory performance will include any two of the following:

- *Paper presentation*: At least one paper presented at a local/regional/national conference.
- *Participation*: Attended local/regional/national conferences.
- *Manuscripts*: submitted a manuscript to a peer-reviewed journal.
- *Invited research presentations*: Presented an invited research paper in a conference.
- *External grant*: Submitted an external grant proposal not funded.
- *Internal grant*: Received an internal grant related to research.

B. The evidence of excellent performance will include the following:

- *Peer-Reviewed publication* (required): Published a research paper in a peer-reviewed journal or published a book or chapter in a book.
- *External grant* (additional): Received funding for an external grant.
- *Research/Scholarly activity award* (additional): Selected as a finalist or received an award (Receiving an award will be given more weightage).

Service to the Institution, Profession and Community

A. The evidence of satisfactory performance will include any two of the following:

- *Institutional Service*: Regular participation on department, college, or university committees; successful and timely completion of administrative duties/assignments; help in recruiting efforts.
- *Professional Service*: A reviewer, discussant, or chair in a national, regional, or local conference; reviewing a manuscript for a journal or book publisher; membership of regional or national professional societies.
- *Community Service*: Active contributing memberships in area organizations related to the discipline; participating in outreach programs (e.g. Science Fair, Science Olympiad, and National Chemistry Week).

B. The evidence of excellent performance will include any one of the following areas:

- *Institutional Service*: Leadership roles (e.g., chair of a committee) on important department, College, and/or University committees; successful and timely completion of administrative duties/assignments; assistance in outreach efforts at the department, College or University level; helping with registration during freshman orientation or participating in the Campus Discovery Day; engaging in recruiting efforts by visiting local high schools; serving as a faculty adviser for a CSU student society/club.
- *Professional Service*: Holding leadership roles in national, regional, or local professional organizations related to the discipline; editing conference proceedings; serving as a member of an editorial board; *selected as a finalist* or received a service award (Receiving an award will be given more weightage).
- *Community Service*: Committee membership/chairperson of a community level organization or board of directors or equivalent; professional services such as speeches/lecture; presentation in continuing education programs; consulting (both with and without remuneration).

Initial Appointment at Associate Professor or Professor

Candidates may be offered initial appointment above the rank of Assistant Professor provided they meet the requirements (other than years of service) for promotion to the desired rank and the appointment is approved by the President, after considering the recommendations of the department, department chair, Dean, and Provost.

Tenure Procedures

- Faculty members intending to apply for tenure in the fall semester of an academic year should consult the department chair in the preceding spring semester.
- The department should form a personnel committee provided there are at least three tenured faculty members who are eligible to serve. Faculty members who are related to any candidate by blood or marriage, who are romantically involved or have other major conflicts of interest are ineligible to serve.
- The department chair may not serve on the committee.
- Formation of department personnel committee occurs during Fall planning week each year.
- Departmental committee recommendations must be submitted to the candidate, department chairperson, and the Dean. In the absence of a departmental personnel committee, the chairperson has options of (a) appointing an ad hoc committee of tenured faculty to advise him or her with respect to the merits of the application, and (b) requesting individual recommendations in writing from faculty. All committee and administrative recommendations will be in writing and made available to the applicant.
- The department chairperson must submit to the Dean his or her recommendation including support or non-support of departmental committee action (when such a

committee exists) and all materials concerning the departmental review of the application. The applicant will be informed in writing of the recommendation of the department chairperson at the time of transmittal of the recommendation to the College committee. All materials from the departmental review will be returned to the office of the Dean for review by the College personnel committee.

Tenure Eligibility

1. University policy permits assistant professors to apply for tenure as early as their fifth year in rank (with the understanding that University rules limit them to only two attempts—see #5 below). However, no special consideration will be given to candidates based on their overall time in rank, and candidates applying for tenure in the fifth year will be held to the same standards of accomplishment as those who have served in rank for six or seven years. Department chairs are responsible for mentoring faculty members and making recommendations as to when an assistant professor should seek tenure. The faculty member, while not required to follow the chair's advice, should give it serious consideration.
2. Only assistant professors, associate professors, and professors who are employed full-time and who are appointed in tenure-track positions are eligible for tenure. The initial evaluation of a faculty member and recommendation for the award of tenure shall be the responsibility of the faculty member's department.
3. Only faculty members holding terminal degrees, or the equivalent in training, ability, or experience, may be considered for tenure. Terminal degrees must come from a university that is fully accredited or, in the absence of a system of accreditation, internationally recognized.
4. Probationary faculty members who do not receive a positive tenure decision by the end of their seventh year in rank will normally receive a terminal appointment, unless their tenure clock has been extended by prior written agreement of the Dean and Provost, with approval of the President.
5. Candidates who are not successful in their first tenure application are limited to one additional application for tenure within the seven year probationary period. For this purpose, a review at the first level (department) is considered an application for tenure.

Areas of Review

1. Teaching effectiveness
2. Research, scholarly or creative engagement
3. Service to the institution, profession and community

Criteria for Tenure

Faculty must exhibit satisfactory performance in all three areas with demonstrated excellence in two areas (one must be teaching). The candidate's achievements must demonstrate potential for long-term effectiveness in the department. In addition, evidence of peer reviewed publication is necessary for a positive tenure decision.

Departmental Standards of Excellence for Tenure

Teaching Effectiveness

A. The evidence of satisfactory performance will include the following:

- *Course preparation*: Documentation of course preparation in a given academic year for each course including course syllabi and copies of final exams.
- *Student evaluation*: Satisfactory student evaluations (≥ 3) in the courses taught in each academic year. Summaries of Course Evaluations including all student evaluations administered (on paper or electronically) since appointment or (where appropriate) the last successful personnel action.
- *Peer Evaluation*: Satisfactory peer evaluation by tenured faculty in the department of chemistry.
- *Advising*: Student advising and maintaining advising logs, or assisting with job referrals/ internships.
- *Office hours*: 6hr/week.

B. The evidence of excellent performance in teaching will include any four of the following:

- *Course development and delivery*: A record of development of a new course, or the adoption of a new delivery method, or documented evidence of student learning in the courses taught.
- *Development of teaching materials*: Development of teaching materials, such as laboratory manuals, solution manuals, worksheets, computer-based teaching materials, handouts, and use of technology.
- *Student evaluation*: Excellent student evaluations (≥ 4) in the courses taught in each academic year. Summaries of Course Evaluations including all student evaluations administered (on paper or electronically) since appointment or (where appropriate) the last successful personnel action.
- *Peer Evaluation*: *Excellent* peer evaluation by tenured faculty in the department of chemistry.
- *Advising*: A very high advising load relative to other members of the department; participation in Freshman Orientation and Discovery Day activities.
- *Mentoring research*: Mentored undergraduate or graduate research and the mentee presented the research in a conference.
- *Faculty development activities in teaching*: Taught seminars/workshops on teaching methods, and or received a faculty development grant on teaching.

- *Teaching award*: Selected as a finalist or received a teaching award (Receiving an award will be given more weightage).
- *Grants*: Received funding for a grant to improve teaching instruction and curriculum development.
- *Workshops/Conferences*: Presented papers directly related to teaching and curriculum development.
- *Overload*: Taught an overload (more than fourteen hours in a semester).

Research, Scholarly or Creative engagement

A. The evidence of satisfactory performance will include any two of the following:

- *Paper presentation*: At least one paper presented at a local/regional/national conference.
- *Participation*: Attended local/regional/national conferences.
- *Manuscripts*: submitted a manuscript to a peer-reviewed journal.
- *Invited research presentations*: Presented an invited research paper in a conference.
- *External grant*: Submitted an external grant proposal not funded.
- *Internal grant*: Received an internal grant related to research.

B. The evidence of excellent performance will include the following:

- *Peer-Reviewed publication* (required): Published a research paper in a peer-reviewed journal or published a book or chapter in a book.
- *External grant* (additional): Received funding for an external grant.
- *Research/Scholarly activity award* (additional): Selected as a finalist or received an award (Receiving an award will be given more weightage).

Service to the Institution, Profession and Community

A. The evidence of satisfactory performance will include any two of the following:

- *Institutional Service*: Regular participation on department, college, or university committees; successful and timely completion of administrative duties/assignments; help in recruiting efforts.
- *Professional Service*: A reviewer, discussant, or chair in a national, regional, or local conference; reviewing a manuscript for a journal or book publisher; membership of regional or national professional societies.
- *Community Service*: Active contributing memberships in area organizations; participating in outreach programs (e.g. Science Fair, Science Olympiad, and National Chemistry Week).

B. The evidence of excellent performance will include any one of the following areas:

- *Institutional Service*: Leadership roles (e.g., chair of a committee) on important department, College, and/or University committees; successful and timely completion of administrative duties/assignments; assistance in outreach efforts at the College or University level; helping with registration during freshman orientation or participating in the Campus Discovery Day; engaging in recruiting efforts by visiting local high schools; serving as a faculty adviser for a CSU student society/club.
- *Professional Service*: Holding leadership roles in national, regional, or local professional organizations; editing conference proceedings; serving as a member of an editorial board; *selected as a finalist* or received a service award (Receiving an award will be given more weightage).
- *Community Service*: Committee membership/chairperson of a community level organization or board of directors or equivalent; professional services such as speeches/lecture; presentation in continuing education programs; consulting (both with and without remuneration).

Meeting the departmental *Standards of Excellence* does not entitle an individual to be awarded tenure. In tenure decisions, present and anticipated staffing needs of the department, College, and University are fully considered. Since the tenure decision involves factors which extend beyond determination of the competence, performance and promise of the faculty member under review, the failure to award tenure does not necessarily imply an unfavorable evaluation of the faculty member.

Tenure upon Appointment

In exceptional cases, the president may approve an outstanding candidate for the award of tenure upon the faculty member's initial appointment provided that:

- Tenure has been earned at another institution.
- Candidate meets departmental *Standards of Excellence* for appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor.
- Candidate brings a demonstrably national reputation to the institution
- Due consideration has been given to the recommendations of the committees and administrators normally involved in the tenure approval process.

Pre-Tenure Review Policy

Purpose

The pre-tenure review is designed to assist a faculty member in preparing for the tenure process in a timely manner. The pre-tenure review should be more than merely an assessment of previous performance. It should include a professional development plan (PDP) prepared by the faculty member that defines his/her long range plans that will allow him/her to reasonably expect to earn tenure. The past performance of the faculty member and the PDP will be reviewed by a committee of the faculty member's peers and his/her annual evaluator for the purpose of identifying strengths and weaknesses and making suggestions for enhancement of those strengths and remediation of any weaknesses. This process is intended to develop and nurture eligible individuals and educate them about the tenure process and criteria early in their employment at Columbus State University. Participation in this process does not assure that tenure will be awarded.

Procedure

1. All probationary faculty (tenure-track faculty not yet awarded tenure) will undergo a pre-tenure review no later than the end of the spring term of the third year of employment at CSU. Faculty who have been awarded probationary credit toward tenure must undergo pre-tenure review at the end of the second year of employment with CSU.
2. During the first semester at CSU the faculty member, in consultation with his/her department chair will prepare a one-year PDP covering the first full calendar year designed to enhance the faculty member's eligibility for tenure as well as support the objectives of the department, the goals of the College, and the mission of the University.
3. This plan will provide the basis for the annual evaluation of the faculty member the following spring. The PDP will specify goals with a time frame for each, activities to assist the faculty member in achieving those goals, and an ongoing evaluation plan. A copy of the PDP will be sent by the annual evaluator to the Dean for review and budgetary considerations. This process is repeated in years two and three.
4. In the third year (or second for those with probationary credit) pre-tenure review will follow the faculty member's annual evaluation for that year.
5. The faculty member will prepare a portfolio in the same format required in the formal tenure process. This portfolio will include a description of accomplishments with appropriate documentation in the same format as the formal tenure process described in the Columbus State University Faculty Handbook and in this document.
6. A Pre-Tenure Committee will be formed for each faculty member undergoing pre-tenure review. Each Pre-Tenure Review Committee shall be composed of a minimum of three tenured faculty from the department/College. One member of the committee should be selected from a department within the College to which the faculty member is not assigned. The committee and the committee chair will be selected by the faculty member and the department chair, and approved by the Dean.

7. Materials submitted by the faculty member will be evaluated by the Pre-Tenure Review Committee. Using the Pre-Tenure Review Evaluation Form, the committee will provide feedback in the form of recommendations to assist the candidate in preparation for tenure review. In addition, the committee will grade the faculty member in the areas of teaching, research and service using the following evaluations: Satisfactory Progress or Unsatisfactory Progress.
8. The department chair will review materials and make a recommendation which provides an analysis of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.
9. The assessment and review recommendations of the Pre-Tenure Review Committee will be forwarded to the Dean with a copy of the Evaluation Form being sent to the faculty member and department chair.

At the conclusion of this process, all materials will be returned to the faculty member. The original evaluation by the Pre-Tenure Review Committee will be placed in the candidate's personnel file so that it is available to be used in the tenure process.

Post-Tenure Review Policy

Each tenured faculty member will have a post-tenure review in the spring of every fifth year. That is, post-tenure review will occur five years after the last promotion or personnel action. To assure a meaningful and fair process, each evaluation should include review by the College Post Tenure Review Committee (CPTRC) and a long-range professional development plan (typically five years). This process fosters each faculty member's professional growth, while making each faculty member accountable to his/her colleagues and the university's mission. The results of post-tenure reviews must be linked to rewards and professional development. Faculty members who are performing at a high level should receive recognition for their achievements.

Administrators who have tenure and who may also have some teaching responsibilities will not be subject to post-tenure review as long as a majority of their duties are administrative in nature. At such time as an administrator may return full-time to the faculty, she/he will be placed into the post-tenure review cycle and will be evaluated under those guidelines as a faculty member in the fifth year following the return to the faculty and at subsequent five year intervals. For the purposes of this rule, department chairs and interim department chairs who have served at least one year in that position will be considered administrators. No chair or interim chair will undergo post-tenure review while serving in that capacity.

Areas of Evaluation

1. Teaching effectiveness
2. Research, scholarly or creative engagement
3. Service to the institution, profession and community

Criteria for Post-Tenure Review

Faculty must demonstrate satisfactory performance in all three areas as described in the departmental *Standards of Excellence*.

Departmental Standards of Excellence for Post-Tenure

Teaching Effectiveness

The evidence of satisfactory performance will include the following:

- *Course preparation*: Documentation of course preparation in a given academic year for each course including course syllabi and copies of final exams.
- *Student evaluation*: Satisfactory student evaluation (≥ 3) in the courses taught in each academic year. Summaries of Course Evaluations including all student evaluations administered (on paper or electronically) since appointment or (where appropriate) the last successful personnel action.
- *Peer Evaluation*: Satisfactory peer evaluation by tenured faculty in the department of chemistry.
- *Advising*: Student advising and maintaining advising logs, or assisting with job referrals/internships.
- *Office hours*: 6hr/week

Research, Scholarly or Creative engagement

The evidence of satisfactory performance will include any two of the following:

- *Paper presentation*: At least one paper presented at a local/regional/national conference.
- *Participation*: Attended local/regional/national conferences.
- *Manuscripts*: Submitted a manuscript to a peer-reviewed journal.
- *Invited research presentations*: Presented an invited research paper in a conference.
- *External grant*: Submitted an external grant proposal not funded.
- *Internal grant*: Received an internal grant related to research.

Service to the Institution, profession and community

The evidence of satisfactory performance will include any two of the following:

- *Institutional Service*: Regular participation on department, College, or University committees; successful and timely completion of administrative duties/assignments; help in recruiting efforts.
- *Professional Service*: A reviewer, discussant, or chair in a national, regional, or local conference; reviewing a manuscript for a journal or book publisher; membership of regional or national professional societies.
- *Community Service*: Active contributing memberships in area organizations; participating in outreach programs (e.g. Science Fair, Science Olympiad, and National Chemistry Week).

Procedure

1. The Dean will inform, in writing, twelve (12) months in advance, the faculty members scheduled the next spring for post-tenure review.
2. The faculty member, in consultation with the department chair, will create a five-year Professional Development Plan (PDP) specifying goals with a reasonable time frame for each; activities to assist the faculty member in achieving those goals, and an on-going evaluation. This PDP will be evaluated annually by the faculty member's chair for monitoring of progress and/or for possible modification. Neutral party arbitration, by a mutually acceptable party, will be employed in those cases where a faculty member and a department chair cannot agree on a PDP.
3. The tenured faculty member shall submit a PDP and appropriate documentation of performance for review to both the department chair and the CPTRC. Documentation should include a portfolio comprised of current curriculum vitae, annual performance reviews for the years under consideration, a statement prepared by the faculty member detailing his or her accomplishments, student and peer evaluations of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness, and any other documentation deemed relevant by the faculty member under review.
4. The department chair will submit to the CPTRC an assessment of the faculty member which indicates whether his or her performance has been satisfactory or unsatisfactory in each of three areas of responsibility over the past five years. Candidate may attach a response within five university working days following receipt.
5. The CPTRC will review the materials and render a recommendation of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory in each of the three areas of responsibility. In the case of a satisfactory recommendation, the CPTRC may elect to include comments about the faculty member's, identified areas of excellence and/or possibilities for future professional development. In the case of an unsatisfactory recommendation, the CPTRC will make recommendations about the faculty member's future professional development. Candidate may attach a response within five university working days following receipt.
6. The CPTRC recommendation will be forwarded to the faculty member, the department chair and the Dean.
7. The Dean will review the evaluations prepared by the department chair and the CPTRC and provide his or her own written assessment of candidate's overall performance to include budget considerations for merit pay and/or professional development costs. This written evaluation will be sent to the candidate, department chair and provost, and will be maintained in the candidate's permanent personnel files in the College and Academic Affairs.

Outcome

Faculty will be given a satisfactory/unsatisfactory rating in each of the three primary areas of responsibility: teaching; research, scholarly or creative achievements; and service by the department chair and CPTRC. A satisfactory rating must be earned in all three areas to receive

an overall satisfactory recommendation. In the event of a split recommendation by the department chair and CPTRC, the Dean will assign the overall satisfactory/unsatisfactory rating.

Satisfactory Outcome

A satisfactory outcome will result in a post-tenure merit salary review. The satisfactory outcome and qualitative comments included in the post-tenure evaluation will serve as the basis for recommendations on merit pay increases, equity adjustments and professional development funding.

Unsatisfactory Outcome

An unsatisfactory outcome in any of the three areas will require the creation of a revised PDP (RPDP). Working with the department chair, the faculty member will develop a formal plan for faculty development that includes clearly defined and specific goals or outcomes, an outline of activities to be undertaken, a timetable, and an agreed-upon monitoring strategy.

The RPDP must be approved by the department chair and submitted to the Dean for review and budgetary consideration. Faculty development funds should be allocated, as available, to address the areas in need of improvement. The candidate's progress on the RPDP must be noted at each annual review. Faculty receiving an unsatisfactory outcome may not be recommended for merit pay increases or equity adjustments until performance has returned to satisfactory. The faculty member will resubmit documentation for Post-tenure Review until a satisfactory outcome is achieved.

Retirement Exemption

Faculty who submit a formal letter of intent to retire are exempted from Post-tenure Review if the official date of retirement is within three (3) years after the semester of scheduled review.

Appeals

A faculty member who disagrees with an unsatisfactory post-tenure review may appeal:

- First, in writing within fifteen (15) university working days after the date of the notification by the dean, to the University Post-Tenure Appeals Committee (UPTAC) that is composed of five faculty members drawn from a pool of tenured associate or full professors.
- Then, in writing within fifteen (15) university working days after the date of the UPTAC notification, to the university president through the provost.

Annual Evaluation of Faculty

As required by Board of Regents policies, the performance of each faculty member will be evaluated annually. The evaluation will take place by March 31 and will cover the performance of responsibilities from the previous calendar year.

It will be the responsibility of each faculty member to document his or her specific accomplishments, and the quality and significance of those accomplishments, in a portfolio submitted to the department chair by February 15 of each year. Accomplishments will be reviewed by the department chair against the objectives established and approved by the faculty member and the department chair in the previous year's annual review meeting. Following review of the previous year's performance, goals should be established to serve as the basis for the following year's annual review.

In the annual review process, the department chair will evaluate each faculty member's performance as satisfactory performance, unsatisfactory performance and excellent performance.

The evaluation process will proceed as follows

- The faculty member will submit a portfolio documenting the accomplishments in a calendar year (spring and fall semester). The portfolio will be prepared using the format of the department *Standards of Excellence*.
- The department chair will review the portfolio and write the annual evaluation report.
- The department chair will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member's annual written evaluation.
- The faculty member will sign a statement indicating that he/she has been apprised of the content of the annual written evaluation.
- The faculty member may elect to respond in writing to the content of the evaluation. The response must be submitted within ten working days to the department chair and will be attached to the evaluation.
- The department chair will acknowledge in writing his/her receipt of this response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made as a result of either the conference or the faculty member's written response. This acknowledgement will also become a part of the records.
- The results of the evaluation will be reflected in recommendations by the evaluator for merit pay increases. Only faculty receiving ratings of satisfactory performance and excellent performance will be considered for merit pay increases.

Areas of Review

1. Teaching effectiveness
2. Research, scholarly or creative engagement
3. Service to the institution, profession and community

Annual Evaluation Criteria

All faculty will be evaluated in each of these components annually. The following department *Standards of Excellence* will be the predominant basis for evaluation of all faculty.

Teaching Effectiveness

A. The evidence of satisfactory performance will include all of the following:

- *Course preparation*: Documentation of course preparation in a given academic year for each course including course syllabi and copies of final exams.
- *Student evaluation*: Satisfactory student evaluation (≥ 3) in the courses taught in an academic year. Summaries of Course Evaluations including all student evaluations administered (on paper or electronically).
- *Peer Evaluation*: Satisfactory peer evaluation by tenured faculty in the department of chemistry.
- *Advising*: Student advising and maintaining advising logs, or assisting with job referrals/internships.
- Office hours: 6hr/week

B. The evidence of excellent performance will include any four of the following:

- *Course development and delivery*: A record of development of a new course, or the adoption of a new delivery method, or documented evidence of student learning in the courses taught.
- *Development of teaching materials*: Development of teaching materials, such as laboratory manuals, solution manuals, worksheets, computer-based teaching materials, handouts, and use of technology.
- *Student evaluation*: Excellent student evaluation (≥ 4) in the courses taught in an academic year. Summaries of Course Evaluations including all student evaluations administered (on paper or electronically).
- *Peer Evaluation*: *Excellent* peer evaluation by tenured faculty in the department of chemistry.
- *Advising*: A very high advising load relative to other members of the department; participation in orientation and visitation activities.
- *Mentoring research*: Mentored undergraduate or graduate research and the mentee presented the research in a conference.
- *Faculty development activities in teaching*: Taught seminars/workshops on teaching methods, and or received a faculty development grant on teaching.
- *Teaching award*: Selected as a finalist or received an award (Receiving an award will be given more weightage).
- *Grants*: Received a grant to improve teaching instruction and curriculum development.
- *Workshops/Conferences*: Presented papers directly related to teaching and curriculum development.
- *Overload*: Taught an overload (more than fourteen hours in a semester).

Research, Scholarly or Creative engagement

A. The evidence of satisfactory performance will include any one of the following:

- *Participation*: Attended local/regional/national conferences.
- *Paper presentation*: Presented a research paper at a local conference.

- *Internal grant*: Submitted an internal grant related to research

The evidence of excellent performance will include any one of the following:

- *Paper presentation*: Presented a research paper at a regional/national conference.
- *Manuscripts*: Submitted a manuscript to a peer-reviewed journal
- *Invited research presentations*: Presented an invited research paper in a conference/workshop
- *External grant*: Submitted an external grant.
- *Research/Scholarly activity award*: Selected as a finalist or received an award (Receiving an award will be given more weightage).
- *Internal grant*: Received an internal grant related to research.
- *External grant*: Received funding for an external grant.

Service to the Institution, profession and community

A. The evidence of satisfactory performance will include any one of the following:

- *Institutional Service*: Regular participation on department, College, or University committees; or successful and timely completion of administrative duties/assignments; help in recruiting efforts.
- *Professional Service*: A reviewer, discussant, or chair in a national, regional, or local conference; or reviewing a manuscript for a journal or book publisher; or maintaining membership of regional or national professional societies.
- *Community Service*: Active contributing memberships in area organizations; or participating in outreach programs (e.g. Science Fair, Science Olympiad, and National Chemistry Week)

B. The evidence of excellent performance will include any one of the following:

- *Institutional Service*: Leadership roles (e.g., chair of a committee) on important department, College, and/or University committees; or successful and timely completion of administrative duties/assignments ; or assistance in outreach efforts at the department, College or University level; or helping with registration during freshman orientation or participating in the Campus Visitation Day; or engaging in recruiting efforts by visiting local high schools; or serving as a faculty adviser for a CSU student society/club.
- *Professional Service*: Holding leadership roles in national, regional, or local professional organizations; editing conference proceedings; serving as a member of an editorial board; finalist for or receiving a service award.
- *Community Service*: Committee membership/chairperson of a community level organization or board of directors or equivalent; professional services such as speeches/lecture; presentation in continuing education programs; Consulting (both with and without remuneration).

Guidelines for Submitting Dossier

For Pre-Tenure Review, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review

Beginning at the point of pre-tenure review (or at the point of promotion or post-tenure review, for those who are hired with tenure), each faculty member should prepare and maintain a portfolio to be presented to the appropriate committees and administrators at the appropriate time. Assistant Professors, Associate Professors seeking promotion, and untenured faculty members on the tenure track should include labeled tabs for each of the items below, even if some of those tabs will be empty at various times (e.g., candidates for pre-tenure review will not have an entry for the College Tenure and Promotion Committee's letter).

The faculty member's portfolio will include each of the relevant categories in the order provided below.

1. Table of Contents with page numbers accurately conveying the location of each piece of information listed below.
2. Cover Sheet with signature of candidate and department chair. (The template may be found in the T&P policy of COLS).
3. Application for Tenure and Application for Promotion forms (as appropriate). These forms may be found in the Faculty Handbook, Appendix IA.
4. Letter of Application for pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review. This is an opportunity for the candidate to summarize the case in his/her favor.
5. Departmental *Standards of Excellence*.
6. Department Committee's Recommendation (where relevant).
7. Department Chair's Recommendation.
8. College Personnel Committee's Recommendation including the necessary signature pages (where relevant).
9. Dean's Recommendation (where relevant).
10. Curriculum Vitae (current). The standard CV format may be found in the Faculty Handbook, Appendix IA.
11. Candidate's Offer Letter or Most Recent Letter Granting Promotion and/or Tenure (for untenured faculty, the offer letter is needed to verify eligibility for and/or credit toward tenure).
12. Annual Evaluations (complete set since appointment, tenure, promotion, or last post-tenure review, where relevant).
13. Letters of Recommendation from colleagues in or out of the unit (optional; to be solicited and included, if desired, by the candidate).
14. Evidence Regarding Teaching Performance - All evidence regarding teaching performance (except student evaluations and learning assessments) should be included here, including self-statement (optional), peer evaluations, representative syllabi, etc.
15. Summaries of Course Evaluations including all student evaluations administered (on paper or electronically) since appointment or (where appropriate) the last successful personnel action. Regardless of when the last successful personnel action occurred, this section should include no less than three years' worth of data.

16. Evidence Regarding Assessments of Student Learning - Each faculty member will provide a statement regarding their efforts to measure student learning outcomes and/or their participation in departmental efforts to assess program outcomes.
17. Evidence Regarding Research and Creative Performance - All evidence regarding scholarship, including self-statement (optional). Candidates for tenure or promotion to associate professor should include work published prior to appointment and all work published since appointment. Tenured faculty seeking promotion to full professor or those undergoing post-tenure review should include all work published since their last successful personnel action.
18. Evidence Regarding Campus, Professional, and Community Service including self-statement (optional). Evidence provided should follow the order above: 1) campus service; 2) professional service; 3) community service.