

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
PROCEDURES, CRITERIA, STANDARDS, AND BYLAWS

Approved November 6, 2013
[Official document prepared by Faculty Personnel Services]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Preamble	1
II.	Role of Department Chair in Governance and Operating Methods	2
III.	Procedures for Development of Standards for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Professor Salary Adjustment	3
IV.	Criteria and Standards for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Professor Salary Adjustment	4
V.	Procedures for Determining Departmental Recommendations for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Professor Salary Supplement	16
VI.	Faculty Reductions	18
VII.	Selection of Department Chairperson	19
VIII.	Support for Professional Activities	21
IX.	Selection of New Tenure Track Faculty	21
	Appendix I. Chemistry Department's Standard Practices for Peer Evaluation of Teaching	23
	Appendix II. Sample Letter to External Evaluators	39

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

I. Preamble

- A. Faculty holding tenured and tenure-track appointments of at least half-time in this Department have special responsibilities with regard to the operation and governance of the Department. Such faculty are referred to throughout this document by the term “regular faculty” as defined in the current *CMU/CMUFA Agreement (Agreement)*.
- B. All regular faculty are eligible to vote on modification of this document, participate in making a recommendation for the selection of a Chairperson and new faculty, and make recommendations on sabbatical leaves. Recommendations on reappointment, tenure and promotion are made by those individuals specified in Section V of this document.
- C. In addition to regular faculty, all individuals holding at least half-time fixed-term faculty appointments in the Department may vote on any other business and serve on departmental committees, other than the Personnel Committee (as defined in the “Department of Chemistry Internal Operating System” document dated May 1999). Such service is not required by the nature of their appointment. Persons holding honorary titles, such as Adjunct Faculty or Research Scientist, are specifically excluded from voting.
- D. The rules contained in Robert’s Rules of Order shall govern all meetings of the Department in all cases to which they apply, and in which they are not inconsistent with Bylaws of the Department.
- E. A printed or electronically distributed agenda and all materials relevant to decisions (action items) will be distributed at least two (2) full “working days” before a meeting. The term “working days” is defined as those days, exclusive of Saturday and Sunday, on which classes are scheduled and meet on the campus during the Fall or Spring terms. No faculty meetings in which decisions are to be made will occur on non-working days. Meetings will be held at regular times each semester when no chemistry classes are scheduled. A calendar of meeting dates will be made available at the beginning of each semester by the Chair.
- F. Modification of these procedures or votes on personnel matters shall not be conducted without their inclusion in the agenda.
- G. Business at a meeting shall be conducted by a quorum, unless designated otherwise. A quorum at a given meeting shall be defined as a majority (>50%) of faculty eligible to act on the agenda items as specified in I.B. and I.C. above. Faculty are expected to attend Department meetings and participate actively in the

business of the Department. Votes can only be cast by those faculty physically present at the meeting with the following exception: in advance of a Department meeting, a faculty member who will be absent from the meeting for suitable reasons such as sabbatical, other University-approved leaves of absence (including FMLA), or attendance at a professional meeting may submit to the Department chair written votes on published action items along with their reason for absence. These absentee votes will be counted as long as the final motions are substantially the same as the agenda action items.

- H. When not otherwise defined, the terms “faculty,” “Department,” and “departmental” refer to a quorum of the members as defined above. Unless otherwise specified, the terms “College” and “Dean” refer to the College of Science and Technology and the Dean of that college.

II. Role of Department Chair in Governance and Operating Methods

Supplemental to the duties as chair assigned by Central Michigan University, the chair shall serve the Department by assuming duties, in consultation with the faculty, which shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

- A. Providing leadership in the area of teaching, research, scholarly publication, and proposal writing;
- B. Providing leadership in the development of new programs and curricula to meet changing demands in the chemical sciences;
- C. Assisting faculty in meeting professional goals;
- D. Meeting annually with faculty to review progress toward personal and Department goals;
- E. Facilitating scholarly activity on the part of faculty;
- F. Maintaining resources for research and scholarly activity (space, instrumentation, support personnel, etc.);
- G. Assuring that junior faculty receive appropriate mentoring;
- H. Representing the faculty and the Department to external funding agencies;
- I. Representing the Department to University administration;
- J. Maintaining funding to support Department activities;
- K. Representing the Department to the mid-Michigan scientific community and the Midland industries;

- L. Maintaining equity in faculty workload distribution through assignment of faculty responsibilities (teaching assignments, advising responsibilities, committee appointments, college/university representation, etc.) in keeping with the *Agreement* where it speaks to faculty workload;
- M. Administering the budget of the Department;
- N. Assigning lecturers, part-time and fixed-term faculty, teaching assistants, office professionals, secretarial aides, laboratory aides, work study students, student instrumentation operators, etc. to their work responsibilities; and supervising such work duties either directly or indirectly;
- O. Directing the activities of P & A personnel, instrumentation technicians, stockroom personnel, managers of instrumentation facilities, glassblowers, and other technical and/or clerical support personnel;
- P. Maintaining a central office to support the work of the Department.

III. Procedures for Development of Standards for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Professor Salary Adjustment

Departmental decision-making with regard to the procedures by which faculty participate in formulating the Department's standards for reappointment, tenure, promotion and professor salary adjustment, and personnel procedural policies, including changes in them, shall be as follows:

- A. The Department or an individual may refer items in writing, including amendments to existing procedures, to the Personnel Committee for study. All items shall be directed to the chair of the Personnel Committee.
- B. The Personnel Committee shall report its recommendation on the referred items to the Department as a whole within one month of receipt.
- C. All items shall be discussed at a meeting of the Department held at least one week after notice of the meeting has been given, along with notice of the specific agenda items.
- D. Voting on all items shall be conducted as described in Section I.G. (above).

IV. Criteria and Standards for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Professor Salary Adjustment

The successful candidate for reappointment, tenure, and promotion must present evidence to demonstrate both the quantity and quality of her/his activities and achievements in each of the three areas mentioned in the *Agreement* (teaching, scholarship, and service). As faculty progress from reappointment, to tenure, and then to promotion to the level of Professor or Professor Salary Adjustment, expectations in each area will increase. Promotion will be based upon accomplishment since the last promotion. Candidates for tenure, promotion and professor salary adjustment must demonstrate a sustained productivity in each area. When judging achievement in each area, it is the candidate's overall performance in a given area that is evaluated.

Diverse Strengths. The Department recognizes that productive faculty careers may proceed along different paths at different times, possibly emphasizing one type of activity over others according to one's strengths. Faculty who have had significant and sustained shift in workload during the review period will be evaluated under different standards as described below. All candidates must meet the standards set forth in the areas of Teaching, Scholarly Activity, and Service/Professional Development.

Time In Rank. In general, those activities since the candidate's initial appointment to CMU will be considered for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to Associate Professor. All achievements and accomplishments in the period of time since the last positive personnel decision (i.e., since the candidate's prior promotion or prior Professor Salary Adjustment) will be considered for a candidate applying for promotion to Professor or Professor Salary Adjustment.

Teaching Intensive Faculty (TIF). Tenured Associate Professors or Professors may, at their choosing, elect to focus on enhancing teaching and learning in their own courses and within the Department of Chemistry. Faculty members who are committed to excellence and innovation in teaching and learning who have chosen to direct their intellectual energy toward improving and innovating in this area during the period of review may identify themselves as Teaching Intensive Faculty at the time of application for promotion to Professor or Professor Salary Adjustment. Teaching Intensive Faculty will be evaluated for promotion based on teaching excellence and modified standards for scholarship as described below. Teaching Intensive Faculty will normally be assigned to teach 9-12 hours each semester as described in the *Agreement*. They do, however, remain eligible for reassigned time if they receive a major external grant that includes a course buy-out or qualifies for CST/ORSP reassigned time.

(When information concerning bolded items in each Section below is not included in a reappointment, tenure, and promotion application, a satisfactory explanation must be provided in the accompanying narrative.)

A. Teaching

Description. The teaching standard in all personnel decisions is demonstration of high quality teaching. High quality teaching is considered to be of critical importance in evaluating faculty for personnel decisions. Some of the hallmarks of a successful teacher would normally include strong course organization, clearly defined learning objectives, a clear command of the subject matter, classroom presentations that enhance student interest and learning, fair and appropriate evaluations, and high rates of student success.

Documentation. In order for the candidate to meet the Department standard for teaching, it is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate success in teaching by submitting a portfolio with sufficient evidence supporting her/his teaching performance. The Department recognizes that the process of evaluating a candidate's teaching is difficult because learning is a two-way process that involves effort put forth by both the teacher and the learner. The fact that students and teachers have unique learning and teaching styles is an additional complicating factor. However, once a teacher has taught a number of sections of a course, as well as a variety of courses, some trends can be seen in a teacher's ability to instruct and a reasonable evaluation of one's teaching can be accomplished.

While multiple methods for evaluating teaching exist, for consistency and fairness in judging files, the following items should be included in a candidate's application materials unless there exists a compelling reason not to include them (*vide supra*): **SOS data, all SOS written student comments, grade distributions, course completion rates, and information documenting research student supervision.** The Department recognizes a candidate's right to use other means to demonstrate effective teaching, including but not limited to:

1. peer evaluation,
2. evidence of new course or pedagogy development,
3. evidence for having successfully taught a relatively wide variety of courses,
4. presentations given by a candidate's research students at professional meetings/workshops,
5. new pedagogical approaches used successfully,
6. short courses, and workshops attended that relate to improving one's teaching,
7. American Chemical Society (ACS) National Examinations,

8. success of students in subsequent chemistry courses,
9. portfolio documentation of course materials that display clarity, rigor, and innovation,
10. pre- and post-tests that measure student learning, and
11. other measures, which are acceptable to evaluators at each level of review.

In judging one's teaching, some general guidelines will be applied to those bolded items that should be included in each file. When evaluating **SOS data**, the Department recognizes that students are usually not in a position to judge the subject matter competence of a faculty member. However they can judge other aspects of teaching such as organization, communication, student-teacher rapport, availability, enthusiasm, and whether they feel that the instructor's teaching helped them learn. Scores obtained on each of the questions for each course taught should indicate relatively positive levels of student satisfaction with the instructor's efforts. Scores that indicate student dissatisfaction may indicate problems and require explanation by the candidate. Likewise, a candidate's **SOS written student comments** should be generally favorable and significant criticisms contained therein should be addressed in the narrative. **Grade distributions** should not be uniformly high or low unless the instructor has a compelling reason for such an assignment. While extreme grade distributions can be accounted for by excellent or deficient performance by students, they may also imply that an instructor either has unrealistic expectations or is not adequately teaching the material. Low **course completion rates** (i.e., high withdrawal or failure rates among those students remaining in the course following the drop and add period) may indicate problems with teaching methodology or course management. Candidates should also present **information documenting research student supervision (including outcomes as evidenced by publications and presentations with students)** so that effectiveness in teaching research students may be evaluated.

In presenting the foregoing supporting data, the candidate should document the protocols used for collecting the data. (For example, for SOS scores, what fraction of the students remaining in the course at the time of the survey actually completed it? For peer review, who conducted the review and under what conditions was it conducted? Were there prearranged or unannounced visits? Was the procedure in Appendix I followed?)

The Department recognizes that ACS examinations must be administered according to the procedures prescribed by ACS in order for the results to be meaningfully compared to the national sample, or to any other sample obtained under the same conditions. At the same time, the Department recognizes that a faculty member may choose, for academically sound reasons, to administer an

ACS examination under conditions different from the prescribed ones. The faculty member who does this understands that results so obtained cannot be meaningfully compared to results obtained under other conditions, and will be used for advisory purposes only in personnel considerations. In order for readers to assign proper weight to ACS examination results, the candidate must verify that the examination was administered under the ACS protocol. It is the candidate's responsibility to clearly specify in the narrative the conditions under which ACS standardized examinations are administered.

Teaching Intensive Faculty are expected to demonstrate a sustained superior record of achievement in teaching relative to the normal departmental standards. Teaching Intensive candidates must provide evidence of personal excellence in teaching, favorable peer evaluations, and evidence of leadership in improving instruction or curriculum.

Peer evaluation: An essential aspect of the evaluation for Teaching Intensive Faculty will be peer-evaluation of classroom teaching. During the period of review, Teaching Intensive Faculty will arrange for at least five announced classroom visits over at least two different semesters, with evaluators selected and evaluations conducted according to the Chemistry Department's Standard Practices for Peer Evaluation of Teaching (see Appendix I).

A Teaching Intensive Faculty member must provide evidence of leadership in improving instruction or curriculum. This may include, among other evidence:

- receipt of external grants to improve instruction or curriculum at CMU;
- declined external proposals where the reviewer's comments indicate the application had merit;
- implementing curricular changes and other improvements to courses and programs;
- successful mentoring of colleagues to improve their teaching.

Additional evidence of teaching excellence may be submitted including, but not limited to: letters from alumni and students; external awards recognizing teaching excellence; professional development related to teaching (conferences and workshops attended); leadership in developing, or adoption of, innovative methods of instruction.

B. Scholarly Activity

Description. Scholarly and creative activity within one's field is considered to be of critical importance in evaluating faculty for personnel decisions. Broadly defined, scholarship is systematic activity devoted to the creation of new

knowledge and/or understanding in chemistry, biochemistry, chemical education, polymer science, geochemistry, clinical chemistry, materials science or other areas embraced by the Department. It encompasses original research in a sub-field of the discipline, as well as keeping abreast of new developments in the field. Active scholarship results in the faculty member maintaining a high level of expertise in the discipline. This expertise represents a valuable intellectual asset for students, the Department, and the broader university community.

Department standards require that the candidate be engaged in sustained, high-quality original scholarly work that results in significant contributions to the state of knowledge or understanding in chemistry or a chemistry-related field. The candidate's refereed publications provide primary evidence of productive scholarly engagement. Scholarly and creative activity also includes presenting research results in appropriate venues, submitting competitive external grant proposals to support research, and, more generally, active participation in the discipline.

Documentation. In order for scholarly and creative activity to be evaluated, a candidate must provide within her/his portfolio evidence demonstrating accomplishments that address the *quality* and *quantity* of scholarly and creative activity while associated with CMU. The Department recognizes that the protocol of scholarship varies within the sub-disciplines of Chemistry but the candidate's portfolio narrative should clearly delineate any idiosyncrasies associated with her/his sub-discipline that would allow the reviewer to properly evaluate the quality of a candidate's publication and external funding record. When evaluating the number of publications or extramural funding proposals, the size and quality of the paper/proposal and the reputation of the journal or grant/contract funding agency will be given due weight. The candidate's portfolio narrative should clearly document the quality of the journals in question.

Optional External Review Procedure

If a candidate chooses to include an external review of scholarship as part of her/his portfolio, the candidate must provide the Department Personnel Committee with a list of at least six prospective independent and impartial external reviewers and a brief explanation of why those reviewers are especially well qualified to provide an objective review of the candidate's scholarly work. The external evaluation will address the candidate's scholarship as it relates to the personnel decision at hand. External evaluators are not to evaluate the candidate's teaching, advising or service to the University or profession. The candidate may also provide names, without justification, of potential evaluators that they do not want to be used for their evaluation.

The recommended reviewers must be independent and cannot have any professional or familial relation to the candidate. An independent evaluator is someone with whom the candidate has not had a working relationship. A

professional within the same discipline might be acquainted with a candidate and still be classified as an independent evaluator if his or her knowledge of the candidate comes from awareness and understanding of the candidate's work through publication, presentation, or even personal exchange, so long as that personal exchange is not in the context of a mentor, supervisor, co-author, co-worker, etc. Evaluators must be established scholars or practitioners with demonstrated expertise in the area of the candidate's specialization, preferably be from or have experience at peer-type institutions, and are of academic rank equal to or higher than that for which the candidate is being considered.

The candidate shall provide a PDF file (or similar) of the following material to the Department Personnel Committee to be forwarded to the external evaluators electronically:

- i) candidate's Curriculum Vitae,
- ii) candidate's supporting statement focusing on the area of scholarship and reflecting on accomplishments during the evaluation period,
- iii) all publications, grant award announcements, or patent disclosures that were accomplished in the period under review, either as readable files or internet links thereto.

The Department Personnel Committee will review and accept or reject the candidate's recommendations of evaluators. The Department Personnel Committee may suggest additional (and/or alternative) reviewers as deemed necessary, and will notify the candidate of such additions prior to contacting potential evaluators. The candidate may, with justification, request removal of the Personnel Committee's additions. In case of unresolved differences of opinion between the candidate and Personnel Committee, the Department Chairperson will resolve the conflict and provide the names of the potential reviewers.

Candidates must not discuss their case with prospective or actual external evaluators at any stage of the review process. Soliciting external letters of reference and providing materials to the referees is solely the responsibility of the Department Personnel Committee.

Timeline:

May 1 – Candidates for fall tenure/reappointment who choose external review shall submit a list of prospective reviewers to the Department Personnel Committee. At this time, the candidate will also submit the electronic file of information, including published papers, to be reviewed.

October 1 – Candidates for spring tenure or promotion who choose external review shall submit a list of prospective reviewers to the Department Personnel

Committee. At this time, the candidate will also submit the electronic file of information, including published papers, to be reviewed.

For each external referee, the candidate shall provide:

- a. name, rank/title, institutional affiliation, address, and e-mail contact information
- b. brief summary of the referee's qualifications
- c. a statement of the evaluator's relationship to the candidate, including potential conflicts of interest

Within two weeks of receipt of the candidate's list, the Personnel Committee will contact prospective external evaluators to request reviews (from a minimum of 5 evaluators). Each reviewer will be sent the same file of material to review, but will be instructed in the cover letter (see Appendix II) to evaluate only the quality of the submitted materials that fall within the evaluator's field of expertise. The Personnel Committee's letter of request to an external referee shall include:

- a. the Department's statement on confidentiality
- b. a request to disclose any potential conflicts of interest
- c. a description of the candidate's assignment, including, for example, the percentage of the appointment devoted to research/creative activities, teaching, service, etc.
- d. a description of CMU as an institution
- e. a description of the minimum standards of Scholarly Activity expected by the Department for that candidate
- f. a request to assess the extent and quality of the scholarship of the candidate, including its contribution to the discipline and impact on the field.

External reviews will be due in the Department office two months before the deadline for reappointment/tenure/promotion applications. The Department will retain each original review letter. The Personnel Committee will transmit a copy of each letter to the candidate, who then shall have the opportunity to submit a written response to the reviews.

At the candidate's discretion, either *all* or *none* of the external reviews shall be included in the reappointment/tenure/promotion application packet. If the candidate chooses to include none of the external reviews, the original letters will be destroyed and shall not become part of the portfolio under consideration by the Department, the Dean, or the Provost during their reviews. Members of the Personnel Committee and/or the Department Chair will not transmit the contents of any of the reviewer's comments in any form to the members of the recommending body when the candidate does not include them.

No candidate for reappointment, tenure or promotion shall be penalized for opting against participation in an external review or for declining to include any of the reviews in their portfolio. External reviews shall be considered as additional evidence of the quality of scholarly activity. The reviewer's comments should not supersede other evidence presented by the candidate.

The portfolio should include *documented evidence* of activities demonstrating scholarly and creative activity such as:

1. Copies of publications accepted (includes those not yet in print) by refereed journals in which the candidate is a major author (with asterisk/star next to name or other accepted indicator)
2. Copies of publications accepted (includes those not yet in print) by refereed journals in which the candidate is a contributing author with a description of the significance of her/his contributions
3. Copies of proceedings publications
4. Copies of preprints
5. Copies, summaries, or abstracts of proposals/contracts submitted for internal competitions
6. Copies, summaries, or abstracts of proposals/contracts submitted to external entities
7. Copies, summaries, or abstracts of internal proposals/contracts funded
8. Copies, summaries, or abstracts of external proposals/contracts funded
9. Copies of patents and patent applications
10. Evidence of short courses and workshops attended that relate to scholarship
11. Evidence of presentations given by candidate at national/international professional meetings
12. Copies of honors and/or awards for research
13. Evidence of presentations given at workshops
14. Evidence of presentations given by candidate to other academic or industrial groups

15. Evidence of meetings attended
16. External review of scholarship
17. Evidence of professional consulting activities
18. Documentation of other relevant scholarly activities

It is the responsibility of each candidate to document both the quantity and quality of her/his scholarly activities and achievements. Evidence of the quality of a piece of work could include a description of the review process, documentation to support the quality of the venue, or other evidence appropriate to the candidate's discipline.

Standards for Reappointment. *The standards used to assess performance are the same as those used for tenure (see below) with the understanding that the standards progressively approach the standards for tenure with time in rank.* To evaluate a candidate's promise, the Department will look for evidence of continuing development and growth of the faculty member during the pre-tenure years at CMU. In all cases, it is the candidate's responsibility to give sufficient evidence to establish the level and quality of her/his scholarly activity through documentary evidence.

Examples of scholarly activities that support a claim of promise early on in a candidate's career include, among others:

1. evidence of development of a research program, including adapting research activities to the CMU environment;
2. activity in a field that is promising or growing;
3. involvement in promising and productive collaborations;
4. participating in a grant-writing workshop;
5. application to external funding agencies requesting support for scholarly activities;
6. some publication requirements completed and evidence that others will be forthcoming;
7. presentation of CMU research achievements at professional conferences;
8. obtaining internal or external funding to support scholarly activities.

Standards for Tenure. The requirement is at least **three (3) distinct publications in refereed professional journals of acknowledged quality with the candidate as a major author.** Any untenured faculty member who has had teaching-release for the purpose of engaging in scholarly activity is expected to have one (1) additional publication for each cumulative nine (9) hours of teaching-release during the probationary period (excluding the first 6 hours of release during a CMU tenure-track appointment) up to a maximum of 6 required publications total. Where a candidate can conclusively demonstrate that a paper is of superior quality (e.g., a paper in *Science*, *JACS*, *Nature*, or in one of the other highest ranked journals in chemistry) it may be considered equivalent to two papers and hence reduce the quantitative standard outlined above. It is expected that publications for tenure will result from work conducted at CMU and will support the claim of the candidate as an independent investigator (e.g., one who has shown the capacity to pursue research separate from a doctoral or post-doctoral environment). Preprints or proceedings papers, though an important indication of scholarly productivity, do not count towards this requirement because they are expected to lead to full paper publications. ‘Distinct’ shall be taken to mean that the publications clearly describe different (though possibly related) works that are sufficiently complete to be published as separate papers (i.e., are not fragmentations of what could be a single paper). It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide evidence of the quality of their publications and of the journals where they are published.

Furthermore, the Department recognizes external grant and/or contract funding to be of central importance in establishing an active scholarly program. The candidate therefore, is required to **submit at least one competitive, external grant or contract proposal prior to the tenure decision to support research or teaching initiatives.** Competitive implies that the grant or contract proposal is subjected to independent, external peer-review and competes with other grant proposals for funding. Principal authorship of any externally-refereed and funded competitive grant or contract of a quality and scope similar to, or exceeding that of, ACS-PRF or Research Corp. awards may be substituted for no more than one of the required peer-reviewed journal publications. Such a grant or contract must support the candidate’s scholarly activities and the intellectual merit of the proposal must have been the focus of the review process. Targeted government/corporation earmarks, “lowest bidder” contracts, or contracts for routine laboratory services would not qualify and, therefore, may not be substituted for a required publication. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide sufficient evidence (for example, information about the funding agency, success rate for proposals, copies of proposals reviews, etc.) to establish that the grant or contract meets the above description. Additional grants and/or contracts may not be substituted for the remaining publication requirement(s).

The candidate is expected to demonstrate an independent, creative role in any collaborative research efforts included for evaluation in personnel decisions. In the case of a multi-authored publication or grant/contract proposal the candidate’s

contribution is central to the evaluation of how that work counts towards the Department standards for scholarship. If the candidate's contribution is substantial, that publication or grant/contract shall count as if the candidate were the sole author or grant/contract recipient. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide documentary evidence regarding her/his level of contribution to the work. When the candidate's contribution is judged to be less substantial, the value of the work toward meeting the standards in this area shall be correspondingly reduced.

Additionally, the candidate is expected to demonstrate promise, which includes potential for continued professional growth and development, and potential to contribute to the goals and objectives established by the Department. Some of the ways that a candidate may demonstrate promise include, but are not limited to, regular presentation at national and international level professional conferences, journal article or grant application reviewing, and participation in activities that reflect on-going commitments to excellence in teaching, scholarship and service including more general participation in the profession. It is the candidate's responsibility to give sufficient evidence of additional indicators of active participation in the profession.

Standards for promotion to Associate Professor. Excluding promise, the standards for promotion to Associate Professor are the same as those for tenure.

Standards for promotion to Professor or for Professor Salary Adjustment (PSA). The standards for promotion to Professor and for Professor Salary Adjustment are the same as those for promotion to Associate Professor, with the following changes:

1. The general expectation is that all faculty members will continue to develop and mature in the area of creative and scholarly activity throughout their careers. Therefore, the candidate's scholarship must be sustained and show evidence of increased maturity, quality and visibility over time. Such evidence might include, but is not limited to, regular presentations at national/international conferences, chairing/organizing symposia or meeting sessions, presentations at workshops, invited seminars, editing proceedings.
2. Any faculty member, including Teaching Intensive Faculty, who has had teaching-release for the purpose of engaging in scholarly activity (excluding sabbatical release time) is expected to have one (1) additional publication for each cumulative twelve (12) hours of teaching-release during the review period, up to a maximum of 6 required publications total.
3. Teaching Intensive Faculty. The Department recognizes the diverse strengths of its faculty. For candidates identifying themselves as Teaching Intensive Faculty, evaluation of scholarship is based on normal

departmental standards for *quality* but with reduced expectations for *quantity* of scholarly work; a minimum of one peer-reviewed publication (in the disciplinary or pedagogical literature) is required during the review period. A Teaching Intensive Faculty candidate may *not* substitute a competitive grant for their publication expectation.

C. Service

Description. Service within one's field is considered to be important in evaluating faculty for personnel decisions. Broadly defined, service is systematic activity devoted to the functioning and well-being of the Department, college, university and the profession. It may take many forms: committee service, committee leadership, professional service (e.g., reviewing manuscripts or proposals, organizing symposia, serving as an officer in a professional society, etc.), professional leadership, and many others. Active service is fundamental to the goals of the Department and to the mission of the university and requires that all faculty be actively engaged.

Documentation. In order for service activity to be evaluated, a candidate must provide within the portfolio evidence documenting accomplishments that address the *quantity* and *quality* of service. The candidate should demonstrate breadth and (with increasing rank and experience) leadership in service. A listing of service activities is insufficient. The role and contribution of the candidate in each activity should be delineated. The candidate is expected to include in the narrative a clear summary of the nature and extent of contributions to each service activity listed. For promotion to Full Professor or Professor Salary Adjustment, significant leadership in some aspect of one's service record is required.

The portfolio should include documented evidence of service activities such as:

1. Service on departmental committees.
2. Leadership on departmental committees.
3. Service on college or university committees.
4. Leadership on college or university committees.
5. Other leadership roles within the college or university.
6. Reviewing grant proposals or manuscripts submitted to professional journals.
7. Service on the editorial board of professional journals.
8. Professional service to state or national agencies.

9. Leadership roles in professional societies – local, regional, national, international.
10. Service on external curricular/evaluation bodies.
11. Student recruitment activities.
12. Advising a professional student group.
13. Major/minor advising in chemistry and related areas.
14. Providing science outreach to elementary/secondary schools.
15. Providing workshops for teachers.
16. Guest lecturing in other departments/institutions.
17. Receiving an external grant award to support service activities.
18. Other relevant activities that can be documented.

Standards for Tenure.

Active service to the Department; College and/or University; and profession is expected.

Standards for promotion to Associate Professor.

Excluding promise, the standards for promotion to Associate Professor are the same as those for tenure.

Standards for promotion to Professor or for Professor Salary Adjustment (PSA).

The standards for promotion to Professor and for Professor Salary Adjustment are the same as those for promotion to Associate Professor, with the following change:

For promotion to Full Professor or Professor Salary Adjustment:

- Significant leadership in some aspect of one's service record is required.

Teaching Intensive Faculty: Evaluation in the area of Service/Professional Development is based on the normal departmental standards for promotion to Professor or for Professor Salary Adjustment (PSA).

V. Procedures for Determining Departmental Recommendations for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Professor Salary Adjustment

The procedures followed by the Department of Chemistry and individual candidates in personnel matters must conform to the current *Agreement*. Candidates are required to be

familiar with the Sections of the *Agreement* that deal with reappointment, tenure, and promotion policies including relevant dates.

- A.** The Department Chair shall notify the Department prior to the contractual date applications for personnel matters (reappointment, tenure, or promotion) are due in the Department office. Such notification will include the names of candidates for reappointment and/or tenure. For any promotion, the individual shall be responsible for requesting in writing that consideration for promotion be given in order to initiate action. Such requests are to be addressed to the chair of the Personnel Committee, who will inform the entire faculty of the schedule for review.
- B.** The communication from the chair described in V.A. is advisory only and shall serve as written reminder in order to afford the candidate an opportunity to submit materials in writing that document the candidate's achievements in the areas required for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, as appropriate (Section IV, above).
- C.** The Personnel Committee shall have the responsibility of receiving materials and presenting them to the appropriate recommending body (see below) of the Department on matters of reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Materials, once submitted, may not be changed by the candidate without a request for such by the recommending body (as described below). The Personnel Committee shall be obliged to accept and present to the appropriate recommending body all printed materials presented by the candidate and by any member of the recommending body. Materials submitted by individuals other than the candidate shall conform to the guidelines specified in the *Agreement* that speak to this issue. In particular, no anonymous material shall be placed in the file and all material submitted must represent documented evidence that addresses how the candidate has or has not met the Department standards for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. All evidence not submitted by the candidate and used in making recommendations concerning reappointment, tenure, or promotion shall be shared with the candidate normally two weeks before the Department recommendation is made. The candidate shall be provided an opportunity to address such evidence.
- D.** The membership of a recommending body shall consist of all tenured chemistry faculty members except the candidate under consideration. Faculty members currently or previously related by family or marriage, or who have or have had a personal relationship which would make it difficult to make an unbiased recommendation, shall not be involved in personnel discussions or recommendations affecting that faculty member. The chair of the Personnel Committee or a designated member of the recommending body shall act as chair of the recommending body.
- E.** Within seven days after receipt of the candidate's materials, the membership of the recommending body shall review the materials, and convene to discuss them.

If the recommending body wishes the candidate to address errors of fact or to respond to specific questions, the chair of the body shall make the request to the candidate and the discussion may be postponed for up to seven (7) days to allow the additional information to be added to the file. Materials submitted by individuals other than the candidate will be treated as described in V.C. above. No new information shall be presented by individuals other than the candidate after this point, and only by the candidate at the request of the recommending body. The Department recommendation shall be reached by vote as described in Section I.G. (above). The candidate shall be informed of the departmental recommendation by the chair of the recommending body within two (2) days after completion of balloting.

- F.** The chair of the recommending body shall have the responsibility for preparing the final departmental recommendation and forwarding it to the Department chair, together with all materials used to reach the decision, unchanged from those present at the time of the Department's recommendation vote. The departmental recommendation will contain a systematic evaluation of the candidate's record according to university policy. The department chair will complete the remainder of the transmittal form and may attach an independent evaluation. A copy of the Departmental recommendation, including any separate recommendation from the chair, shall be given to the candidate and to the chair of the recommending body no later than the time it is forwarded to the dean. The candidate may submit a written clarification or rebuttal of the Departmental and/or chair recommendations, and this statement shall be attached to the department's recommendation at the next level. All materials used to reach the decision together with the recommendations will be forwarded to the Dean's office by the Department chair.

VI. Faculty Reductions

In a case in which reductions in the number of regular faculty are necessary (other options for reductions as specified in the current *Agreement* having been exhausted) departmental recommendations on such reductions will be made in accordance with the guidelines described in the current *Agreement*. Specifically, programmatic needs and length of university service are to be the primary considerations used to arrive at recommendations of layoffs of regular faculty. When these considerations are met the following options will be exercised in the order indicated:

- A.** To leave unfilled the requisite number of faculty vacancies existing or expected as a result of natural attrition, e.g., retirement, resignation, etc.
- B.** Not to reappoint untenured faculty members serving in tenure track positions.

In situations when Items B or C must be considered, the chair in consultation with the Personnel Committee will make a determination of which areas are most crucial to the health and long-term goals of the Department and make a recommendation to the Dean based on the considerations described above.

VII. Selection of Department Chairperson

- A.** The chairperson of the Department shall be recommended from among the tenured and tenure track members of the Department faculty, or, in unusual circumstances, from external sources, to serve for a specified term, normally three years. The chair may serve successive terms.

Normally, during the fall semester of the year immediately preceding that in which the term of the chair expires, the Personnel Committee shall consult with the dean's office regarding the advisability of an internal or external search. If the search is to be internal, the chair of the committee will notify, in writing, all Department members of the impending vacancy. All tenured and tenure track faculty are eligible to serve and are encouraged to consider the opportunity to provide leadership to the Department. Interested candidates shall declare their interest in writing to the Personnel Committee within two (2) weeks of notification.

Two weeks following the notification of vacancy, a list of those to be considered shall be distributed to the faculty. A questionnaire, drafted by the Personnel Committee and approved by the Department, will be given to each candidate. The candidates shall have two weeks to respond to the questionnaire, and to place on file with the Personnel Committee an up-to-date curriculum vitae and the completed questionnaire. The questionnaires and curricula vitae shall remain on file in the Department office for one (1) week following the closing date for filing these materials. Members of the Department, as well as the Dean of the College, shall be notified by the Personnel Committee and urged to review these materials during that time.

Within one week following the closing date for inspection of these materials, the chair of the Personnel Committee shall draw lots to determine the order in which candidates shall be interviewed by the Department. These interviews shall take place during the week following determination of order. Within one week following the interviews, the Department shall recommend a chair by secret ballot in the following manner.

The names of all candidates shall appear on the ballot in alphabetical order and one ballot shall be given to each eligible member of the Department. Members shall cast votes for each candidate either affirmative or negative. (An affirmative vote is taken to mean that the voter approves of the candidate as a potential chair; hence, one may wish to vote affirmatively – or negatively – for all the

candidates.) Balloting shall be conducted as described in Section I.G. (above) and completed within 48 hours.

Those eligible faculty not physically present due to sabbatical, FMLA, other University-approved leaves of absence, attendance at a professional meeting, or other professional activity will be given an opportunity to vote electronically whenever practicable within the specified timeframe. It shall be the responsibility of the absent faculty member to provide accurate contact information and to respond to communications in a timely manner. The voting body will have the final right to determine when an absent colleague has failed to meet these responsibilities, thus rendering her/his participation impracticable.

After this ballot is cast, the names of all candidates who receive affirmative votes from a majority of the voting members shall be voted on by a second ballot. Balloting shall be completed within 48 hours. Each member shall vote for the candidate of her/his choice or shall abstain. Affirmative votes by a majority of voting members shall be required for election. Abstentions therefore have the same effect as negative votes.

If a second ballot is required, it shall be conducted between the two candidates receiving the largest number of votes, or among three or more candidates if necessitated by a tie vote. If necessary, this process shall be followed by a third ballot. In case of an impasse, i.e., three consecutive ballots in which no candidate receives a majority, the search will be reopened.

If no internal candidates are selected, the Personnel Committee will recommend whether to include external candidates. If such a recommendation is made, and if the Department assents by majority vote, a new chairperson may be sought externally. To be recommended for appointment, the same procedure shall be followed as outlined above for internal candidates.

Recommendations of the Department are subject to approval by the Dean and the Provost.

- B.** The faculty of the Department, excepting the chairperson, shall meet annually during the month of April to discuss the chairperson's performance for the purpose of providing formal feedback from the members of the Department to the chairperson. The discussion shall be based upon the duties of the chairperson as assigned by both the University and the Department. The Personnel Committee shall submit to the chairperson within one week a letter summarizing her/his strengths and weaknesses as enumerated by those in attendance. Within two weeks of receipt of the letter, the chairperson shall submit a response to the Department in writing. Both documents shall be shared with the Dean in keeping with the *Agreement*.

VIII. Support for Professional Activities

- A.** The Department of Chemistry strongly supports faculty sabbatical leaves and encourages eligible faculty to participate. The Personnel Committee shall evaluate proposals for sabbatical leave on the basis of consistency with university policy, qualification of applicant to complete project, and value of leave to Department, and bring a recommendation to the Department. The Department recommendation shall be reached by vote as described in Section I.G. (above).

- B.** The Department of Chemistry strongly supports other types of professional leaves, including those supported by grants and contracts. In order to coordinate the impact of these activities with other Department activities, any person planning to request a professional leave, from all or part of regular teaching duties, is to inform the Department chair of this intention according to the temporal guidelines published for sabbatical leaves. In cases where this is not possible, the chair is to be informed at the time the application is made.

When the professional leave requested is other than a sabbatical leave, the person is to present, in lieu of the material found in a sabbatical application, a letter of intent which must include, as appropriate:

1. a brief synopsis of the study;
 2. the geographical location at which the study is to be carried out;
 3. the source, date, and duration of the requested support;
 4. requested release time;
 5. request for other Department resources; and
 6. an invitation letter from an external agency, if applicable.
- C.** Although untenured faculty are not eligible for sabbatical leaves, they do qualify for support of their activities by the Department. This support includes, but is not limited to, receiving travel funds and use of departmental facilities and monies for research and instructional purposes.

IX. Selection of New Tenure Track Faculty

- A.** Whenever a new tenure track faculty position is to be requested the disciplinary specifications, if any, shall be determined by the tenured and tenure track faculty. The request with rationale shall then be submitted to the Dean.

- B.** The Department Chair shall notify the Personnel Committee as soon as possible if a search for a tenure track position is authorized. The committee shall write a job

specification and advertisement for departmental approval. If approved and agreed to by the Dean and Faculty Personnel Services, the advertisement shall be placed, and the committee shall receive the applications. The committee shall compose a list of the most qualified applicants and submit these names for departmental action. After review, the tenured and tenure track faculty shall select from the entire pool of applicants those who, with the approval of the Dean and Faculty Personnel Services, shall be invited to campus for interviews. Following completion of the interviews, each candidate will be voted as “acceptable” or “unacceptable” by written ballot. Any candidate who fails to receive “acceptable” votes from a majority of those voting is eliminated from further consideration. The faculty shall select by written majority ballot a candidate from among those voted “acceptable” to be recommended to the Dean (see Section I.G., above). If none of the initially interviewed candidates is found to be acceptable, the search may be continued with additional interviews. The rank and salary offer for the candidate chosen shall be negotiated between the candidate and the Dean in consultation with the Department Chair.

Appendix I. Chemistry Department's Standard Practices for Peer Evaluation of Teaching

“Best Practices” for Peer Evaluation of teaching includes several principles:

1. **Faculty involvement in developing the process is essential.** Since each department has unique characteristics, faculty should be involved in tailoring general recommendations on peer review into specific guidelines at the departmental level.
2. **Good peer review processes include several critical characteristics.** These critical characteristics include: openness, mutually agreed-upon criteria, adherence to developed procedures, written feedback at all stages, discussion of the results, and methods for monitoring and revising the process.
3. **An effective peer review system must be supported by institutional leadership.** For peer review to be effective, the institution must value the importance of teaching and articulate this value in all documents related to the faculty review and reward system.
4. **Multiple sources, methods, and points in time must be included.** The most common sources of information on teaching effectiveness include: student evaluation, instructor self-assessment, peer review of course material, and **peer classroom observation**. Reliance on any one source of information to assess teaching effectiveness is to be avoided.
5. **Peers are the best source of judgment in several areas of teaching performance.** Peers serve as the best judge of subject matter expertise, course goals, instructional materials and methods, assessment and grading practices, student achievement, and professional and ethical behavior
6. **Both Formative and Summative Review must be accomplished.** Formative Review that provides information used by the individual for improvement and professional development of teaching begins the first year of employment. Summative Review focuses on information needed for personnel decisions and accountability begins when a personnel decision is pending.
7. **Formative and Summative Reviews must only be used for the purpose stated.** Reviews for faculty development and reviews for personnel decisions must be kept separate.
8. **Teaching mentors should be assigned to new faculty during the first year of their contract.** New faculty should be given support for developing their teaching skills during their first year from experienced, successful teachers in the department or possibly from another discipline.
9. **Preparation for being a Peer Reviewer is essential.** Peer reviewers can be mentors, developers, and judge depending on the type of review. Peer reviewers need to study the literature related to in their roles as formative or summative reviewers. Reviewers especially need advance preparation for effective classroom observations.

Colleagues have the expertise to evaluate the quality of a course as evidenced by its content and format. Colleagues within the department are best suited to make judgments about course content and objectives, the instructor's collegiality, student performance on exams and reports, and student preparedness for subsequent courses. Peer evaluation of faculty can provide information about the process and effectiveness of teaching. However, correct use of this procedure is time consuming. The peer observation of teaching provides a strong outcome only when the process is collaborative. It is best done when training can be provided and several visits can be arranged by at least two observers. In addition, best practices require that this technique is most effective when prefaced by a discussion between the instructor and observer regarding the goals of the class.

Excellence in teaching takes many forms. Perhaps one of the basic characteristics of good teaching is that students are learning. This learning, according to many experts, should occur in a positive, supportive environment rather than a negative, aversive environment. However, it is difficult, if not impossible, to assess the contribution of any single faculty member in relation to what a student has learned. Students enter the classroom with differing abilities, motivations, backgrounds and level of knowledge. End of course testing cannot differentiate what an

individual faculty member has contributed to a student's overall knowledge level. Assessing these types of outcomes may best be done on a program level. So, how can peer reviewers assess 'good teaching' at the individual, faculty member level? Chickering and Gamson (1987) offer seven principles based on research on good teaching and learning in colleges and universities. These principles are **not** about getting everyone to teach in the same way, it is about helping individuals and peers to reflect on and evaluate teaching. **Department of Chemistry Summative Peer Evaluation Instrument** was designed to evaluate the effectiveness of these principles.

The effective teacher:

Principle 1: Sets clear goals and intellectual challenges for student learning.

Principle 2: Ties course goals and objectives to the assessment of student learning.

Principle 3: Employs appropriate teaching methods and strategies that actively involve learners.

Principle 4: Has good rapport, communicates and interacts effectively with students.

Principle 5: Attends to the intellectual growth of students.

Principle 6: Respects diverse talents and learning styles of students.

Principle 7: Incorporates learning beyond the classroom

In higher education, peer classroom-observation is perhaps the most familiar form of peer review. Unfortunately, it is prone to reliability problems, often the unintentional result when peers make brief visits and report from the perspective of their own, often unknown, biases. The evaluation literature makes it clear that the consistent presence of students in the classroom makes them a better source of information about such things as an instructor's approach, fairness, clarity of explanations, and the like. However, peers are more accurate judges of such areas as the relevancy of subject matter, competency of the instructor, or the instructor's use of teaching strategies current to the discipline. For those purposes, peer review is important (Chism, 2007). In 1994, the American Association for Higher Education advanced the concept of peer review of teaching. The AAHE suggested that good teaching was more than simply focusing on the teaching behaviors of the faculty member but should combine inquiry into the substance of the course work with a careful investigation of what the students actually learned. With this model, peer reviewers focus on student understanding as an index of successful teaching.

Despite the challenges related to the reliability of peer observations, they have been accepted as a legitimate mechanism for providing meaningful data for teaching improvement. Peer observations can serve as a valuable additional source of information, rather than an alternative to student ratings, in a teaching portfolio. Table 1 offers additional advantages and disadvantages for consideration. Nonetheless, it is important to triangulate evaluation data by using multiple methods to compensate for the inadequacies in each method (Berk, 2004).

Table 1. The Advantages and Disadvantages of Peer Review of Teaching

Advantages	Disadvantages
<p>The peer's own development may be fostered through the ideas obtained from watching a colleague (Chism, 2007).</p> <p>Results of several studies indicate that faculty may be the best judge of content expertise, pedagogy, and related dimensions (DeZure, 1999).</p> <p>Moves the profession away from the traditionally held notion that "teaching-is-a-private-act" and through self-reflection, collegial discussions, and informed decision-making about instructional design, brings the teaching profession into a scholarly light.</p> <p>Can be used for formative (to help improve teaching) and summative (for personnel decisions) purposes.</p>	<p>Without training or experience, faculty may not feel comfortable judging the teaching of their colleagues (Yon, Burnap & Kohut, 2002).</p> <p>One or two class observations do not constitute a representative sample of teaching performance for an entire course (Berk, 2005).</p> <p>There are several common biases in peer observation scales, such as the halo effect, end-aversion bias, acquiescence/yea-saying bias, and gender, racial/ethnic, and sexual –orientation bias (Berk, 2004).</p> <p>If peer ratings are used summatively for tenure, promotion, reappointment, or salary decisions, then low reliability can have an adverse impact on the instructor's career (Berk, 2004).</p> <p>Some faculty have tremendous fears about being observed, and the act of observation will affect the overall teaching/learning environment to some degree or another.</p>

Peer Review of Course Materials

The peer review of course materials typically includes the review and rating of the quality of the course syllabus, instructional plans and materials, projects or tests, and instructor comments on student work. Researchers suggest that informed and well trained peers, especially those within the same field, are ideally suited to assess the accuracy and adequacy of instructional materials (Chism, 2007; Yon, Burnap & Kohut, 2002). Table 2 offers additional advantages and disadvantages of peer review of course materials.

Table 2. The Advantages and Disadvantages of Peer Review of Course Materials

Advantages	Disadvantages
<p>Peer review of course material is less subjective and more cost-effective, efficient, and reliable than peer observations (Berk, 2005).</p> <p>Classrooms do not have to be interrupted in order to conduct a peer review. Peer review of materials can occur at a time and place suitable to the schedule of the reviewer (Chism, 2007)</p> <p>Peers are most competent to evaluate mastery of course content, selection of content, course organization, appropriateness of instructional materials, appropriateness of evaluations, commitment to teaching, and concern for student learning (Cohen & McKeachie, 1980).</p> <p>Reviewers can gain insights into their own teaching through working with sets of questions that enumerate characteristics of effective course materials (Chism).</p>	<p>Peer rating scales may not measure important characteristics of teaching effectiveness (Berk, 2005).</p> <p>Combining review of course materials with evidence gathered in other ways is necessary to effectively evaluate teaching excellence. It is possible that an instructor with clear and well-organized class handouts can be rude to students and rambling and inaccurate in class (Chism, 2007)</p> <p>To fully understand the instructor’s rationale and the context of the course, it will be necessary to either interview the instructor and/or request that the instructor provide this information as a part of the evaluation dossier (Chism).</p>

When conducting a peer reviewed observation of teaching, researchers recommend a three-step process, which includes (1) a pre-observation meeting to obtain contextual information about the course, instructor and students; (2) the observation which can include a holistic approach utilizing narrative report and a checklist or rating form to assess specific aspects of the class; and (3) a post-observation meeting with the instructor to debrief the class session with the peer reviewer and the instructor providing reflections (Chism, 2007; Selden and Associates, 2006). The faculty member and the peer reviewer meet to discuss the course and the particular class to be observed to provide context for the observer. In the second step, the observation occurs and the observer completes the **Department of Chemistry Summative Peer Evaluation Instrument**. In the final step, the faculty peers meet to review the observed session and to share their perspectives on the experience. The Department of Chemistry process will follow this 3 stage approach as described below.

Responsibilities of the Peer Observer (Reviewer) and Faculty Member (Reviewee)
Pre-observation Meeting Guidelines

- A. The date for the pre-observation meeting should occur within one week prior to the observation.
- B. Prior to the pre-observation meeting, the faculty member to be observed provides the following materials to the observer for review:
 - a. Syllabus of the course to be observed

- b. A summary of the class session to be observed, including
 - i. Content (summarization of the class lesson)
 - ii. Goals and objectives of the class session to be observed
 - iii. Intended pedagogical approaches and activities, e.g. cooperative learning, small groups, lecture, laboratory experiment, discussion, student presentation, etc.
- C. For the pre-observation meeting, the following are suggested topics:
 - a. Discuss what student learning expectations are for the class under review.
 - b. Describe the activities that will allow students to meet the session's expectations.
 - c. Specify what the students have been asked to do to prepare for this session and what content related to this class has previously been covered.

Observation Meeting Guidelines

During and subsequent to the class observation, the peer observer completes the **Department of Chemistry Summative Peer Evaluation Instrument** that follows. This form should be completed prior to the post-observation meeting. During the observation class meeting, the reviewer should observe the class and take notes without disrupting.

Post-observation Meeting Guidelines

Within one week after the observation, the reviewer should meet with the reviewee and provide feedback to the reviewee about the observation. This post-observation meeting should not occur directly after the class since the requisite processing and thought may not have taken place. This post-observation meeting should cover:

- a. A description of the class activities,
- b. A description of the students' responses to class and interactions,
- c. Reviewer impressions of the reviewee as an instructor during the period observed. Impression statements should be referenced to or accompanied by specific examples or observation particulars,
- d. Questions about the observation,
- e. Other topics the reviewer and reviewee care to discuss related to the observation.

A signed hard copy of the **Department of Chemistry Summative Peer Evaluation Instrument** should be delivered to the reviewee within two (2) weeks of the observation.

Department of Chemistry Summative Peer Evaluation Instrument

(Class type: Classroom based / Lecture – not appropriate for laboratory or on-line format)
 (CMU’s instrument for on-line courses is found at <http://cel.cmich.edu/cid/peer-review.html>)

Faculty Member Being Reviewed:

Peer Reviewer:

Date & Time of Observation(s):

Course Number & Title:

Class Size (# in attendance):

Date of pre-observation meeting:

Date of post-observation meeting:

Signature of Observer _____ **Date** _____

DIRECTIONS: Using the anchors below, check your rating for each teaching behavior that’s applicable for the specific class observed. Please comment on any item as appropriate.

Teaching Behavior	Yes - Definitely	Yes – For the most part	No – Very Rarely or Never	Not Applicable or Not Observed	Comments
Principle 1: Sets clear goals and intellectual challenges for student learning.					
Is the depth and breadth of the material appropriate for the level of the course and the students?					
Does the faculty member emphasize a conceptual grasp of the material?					
Is the material selected by the faculty member appropriate for the specified goals and objectives?					
Has the instructor clearly outlined his/her goals and objectives for the course?					

Teaching Behavior	Yes - Definitely	Yes – For the most part	No – Very Rarely or Never	Not Applicable or Not Observed	Comments
Are materials designed in a clear, logical, and appropriately structured format?					
Is there evidence of short and long term planning?					
Does the course syllabus reflect course policies?					
Does the instructor present important information and concepts?					
Does the instructor display expert knowledge of the subject matter and the ability to explain the material?					
Do the lectures match the course level and student ability?					
Is the rigor and effort required of students appropriate to the course level?					
Is the work required educational rather than “busy work”?					
Did the instructor present an overview of the class content/objectives?					
Was the instructor successful in covering the planned class content and objectives?					
Did the instructor ask probing questions?					
Principle 2: Ties course goals and objectives to the assessment of student learning.					
Does the instructor have assessable learning objectives?					
Are the faculty member’s course objectives reflected in course assignments and grading?					

Teaching Behavior	Yes - Definitely	Yes – For the most part	No – Very Rarely or Never	Not Applicable or Not Observed	Comments
Do daily course lessons and assignments aid the student in achieving final course objectives?					
Are the evaluation techniques appropriate to curricular goals and objectives?					
Are a variety of evaluation techniques being used?					
Are assignments and exams directly related to curricular goals and objectives?					
If applicable, does the course meet the appropriate University Program General Education category criteria and assessment guidelines?					
Are objectives and coverage clearly indicated on the syllabus distributed to students?					
Principle 3: Employs appropriate teaching methods and strategies that actively involve learners.					
Does the faculty member help students learn to apply what they are learning?					
Are the students reacting well to the lesson?					
Are course materials logically organized?					
Is there sufficient time between assignments?					
Is evaluative feedback provided promptly?					
Are demonstrations or visual aids (slides, overhead transparencies, digital animations, etc.) well used and appropriately integrated into presentations?					

Teaching Behavior	Yes - Definitely	Yes – For the most part	No – Very Rarely or Never	Not Applicable or Not Observed	Comments
Is the lesson organized well and presented clearly?					
Are the topics presented in a logical fashion?					
Are relevant examples used?					
Are topics summarized and important points occasionally restated?					
Principle 4: Has good rapport, communicates and interacts effectively with students.					
Does the faculty member appear to be enthusiastic about teaching, <i>i.e.</i> does the faculty member show interest in students and their learning?					
Does the faculty member appear to be enthusiastic about the subject matter?					
Are the faculty member's interactions with students conducive to learning?					
Does the faculty member communicate effectively (oral and written)?					
Is the faculty member's use of humor /anecdotes appropriate?					
Did the instructor greet students at the beginning of class?					
Does the faculty member use effective active listening skills?					
Is confidential information handled ethically and with discretion?					
Are topics, exam dates, course policies, deadlines, office hours, contact information, etc. well defined on the syllabus?					
Is the organization of handouts appropriate and logical?					

Teaching Behavior	Yes - Definitely	Yes – For the most part	No – Very Rarely or Never	Not Applicable or Not Observed	Comments
Are visual aids appropriate, of high quality and legible?					
Are students given the opportunity to discuss exam results or other assignments with the instructor?					
Are course grading criteria and make-up policies clearly stated in the syllabus?					
Does the instructor lecture at an appropriate rate?					
Does the instructor avoid potentially annoying mannerisms or speech fillers (“okay”, “um”, “uh”, repeated gestures or phrases)?					
Does the instructor seem to have good rapport with students?					
Did the instructor start and end the class on time?					
Did the instructor present key concepts in an understandable manner and organized?					
Does the instructor interact well with students and encourage participation?					
Are the lectures and handout materials current?					
Did the instructor make efficient use of class time?					
Did the instructor enunciate clearly, vary modulation, tone and pace appropriately?					
Did the instructor speak with adequate volume?					
Did the instructor establish and maintain eye contact with the students?					

Teaching Behavior	Yes - Definitely	Yes – For the most part	No – Very Rarely or Never	Not Applicable or Not Observed	Comments
Did the instructor maintain students' attention?					
Did the instructor maintain a relaxed, but controlled environment that was conducive to learning?					
Did the instructor use a variety of engagement techniques (Q&A, discussion, small-group activities, student presentations, active learning, think-pair-share, etc.)?					
Principle 5: Attends to the intellectual growth of students.					
Are the faculty member's goals appropriate for the level of the course and the students?					
Is higher-order learning or critical thinking a part of the curriculum?					
Are materials designed to challenge and stimulate students who quickly master basic goals and objectives?					
Is material previously learned incorporated into subsequent course materials?					
Are supplemental materials available when the students need them?					
Does the instructor encourage students' questions?					
Does the instructor carefully listen to students' questions and answer appropriately?					
Does the instructor restate students' questions or comments as necessary or encourage students to answer difficult questions by providing cues?					

Teaching Behavior	Yes - Definitely	Yes – For the most part	No – Very Rarely or Never	Not Applicable or Not Observed	Comments
Does the instructor set up study or review sessions for students?					
Does the instructor limit questions when necessary (because of time, to prevent side-tracking, etc.)? [Did the instructor request that very difficult, time consuming, or irrelevant questions be addressed at a later time?]					
Principle 6: Respects diverse talents and learning styles of students.					
Does the faculty member recognize when students do not understand?					
Did the instructor respond appropriately to students' puzzlement or boredom?					
Did the instructor demonstrate respect for students and their thoughts/concerns?					
Did the instructor use alternative explanations when necessary?					
Does the instructor use alternate approaches to learning (other than lecture), e.g. demonstrations, participatory exercises, small group discussions to appeal to different learning styles?					
Does the faculty member model respect for other faculty and students?					
Does the course syllabus provide information for students who may be having difficulty in the course?					
Does the course syllabus provide information for students with documentable disabilities?					

Teaching Behavior	Yes - Definitely	Yes – For the most part	No – Very Rarely or Never	Not Applicable or Not Observed	Comments
Does the faculty member provide accommodations as necessary for students with documented disabilities?					
Principle 7: Incorporates learning beyond the classroom					
Do assignments require students to apply material learned in class to their own life?					
Do class discussions make use of prior student learning?					
Are there class assignments that require or allow students to work together outside of class?					
Does the instructor use case studies, real-world examples, or scenarios?					
Does the instructor use relevant examples to explain major ideas?					

Peer Review Resources

- Lee Shulman, "Teaching as Community Property," in Pat Hutchings, ed., *From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching, A Project Workbook* (Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1995).
- Alberto F. Cabrera, et al., "Developing Performance Indicators for Assessing Classroom Teaching Practices and Student Learning: The Case of Engineering," in *Research in Higher Education* 42:3 (2001): 327-352.
- Daniel J. Bernstein, et al., "An Examination of the Implementation of Peer Review of Teaching," in *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 83 (Fall 2000): 73-86;
- Dieter J. Schönwetter, et al., "Content Familiarity: Differential Impact of Effective Teaching on Student Achievement Outcomes," in *Research in Higher Education* 43:6 (2002): 625-655.
- Peter A. Cohen and Wilbert McKeachie, "The Role of Colleagues in the Evaluation of College Teaching," in *Improving College and University Teaching* 28 (1980): 147-154;
- Carol-Ann Courtney, et al. "Through What Perspective do We Judge the Teaching of Peers," in *Teaching and Teacher Education* 24 (2008): 69.
- Kremer, John F. "Construct Validity of Multiple Measures in Teaching, Research, and Service and Reliability of Peer Ratings." In *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82:2 (1990): 213-218.
- Raoul A. Arreola, *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System*, 2nd Ed. (Bolton, MA: Anker, 2000); and Chism.
- Michael Scriven, "The Methodology of Evaluation," in Robert E. Stake, ed., *Curriculum Evaluation* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967).
- Nancy Van Note Chism, *Peer Review of Teaching: A Sourcebook*, 2nd Ed. (Bolton, MA: Anker, 2007).
- Ronald R. Cavanagh, "Formative and Summative Evaluation in the Faculty Peer Review of Teaching," in *Innovative Higher Education* 20:4 (1996): 235-240
- John A. Centra, *Reflective Faculty Evaluation: Enhancing Teaching and Determining Faculty Effectiveness* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1993)
- Chism; Hutchings, ed.; Trav D. Johnson and Katherine E. Ryan, A Comprehensive Approach to the Evaluation of College Teaching, in *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 83 (Fall 2000): 109-123.
- John A. Centra, "Colleagues as Raters of Classroom Instruction," in *The Journal of Higher Education* 46:3 (1975): 327-337.
- John A. Centra, "Evaluating the Teaching Portfolio: A Role for Colleagues," in *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 83 (Fall 2000): 87-93.
- J.A. Kulik, "Evaluation of Teaching: Memo to the Faculty" (Ann Arbor: Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, University of Michigan, 1974).
- Kremer; Kenneth A. Feldman, "Instructional Effectiveness of College Teachers as Judged by Teachers Themselves, Current and Former Students, Colleagues, Administrators, and External (Neutral) Observers," in *Research in Higher Education* 30:2 (1989), 137-194.
- Lawrence S. Root, "Faculty Evaluation: Reliability of Peer Assessments of Research, Teaching, and Service," in *Research in Higher Education* 26:1 (1987).
- Patricia Hutchings, "The Peer Review of Teaching: Progress, Issues and Prospects," in *Innovative Higher Education* 20:4 (1996): 221-234.

- Johnson and Ryan; Lisa R. Lattuca and Jennifer M. Domagal-Goldman, "Using Qualitative Methods to Assess Teaching Effectiveness," in *New Directions for Institutional Research* 136 (Winter 2007): 81-93
- Peter Seldin, *The Teaching Portfolio: A Practical Guide to Improved Performance and Promotion/Tenure Decisions*, 3rd Ed. (Bolton, MA: Anker, 2004).
- Feldman; Centra 2000; Maria Yon et al., "Evidence of Effective Teaching: Perceptions of Peer Reviewers," in *College Teaching* 50:3 (2002): 104-110.
- Kathleen M. Quinlan, "Inside the Peer Review Process: How Academics Review a Colleague's Teaching Portfolio," in *Teaching and Teacher Education* 18 (2002): 1035-1049.
- Maria Yon, Charles Burnap and Gary Cohut, "Evidence of Effective Teaching: Perceptions of Peer Reviewers," in *College Teaching* 50:3 (2002): 104-110.
- Daniel D. Pratt, "Conceptions of Teaching," in *Adult Education Quarterly* 42:4 (1992): 203-220
- Daniel D. Pratt and Associates, *Five Perspectives on Teaching in Adult and Higher Education* (Malabar, FL: Krieger, 1998); and www.teachingperspectives.com.
- Dineke E. H. Tiegelaar, Diana H. J. M. Dolmans, Ineke H. A. P. Wolfhagen, Cees P. M. van der Vleuten, "The Development and Validation of a Framework for Teaching Competencies in Higher Education," in *Higher Education* 48:2 (Sept. 2004): 253-268.
- Peer Observation and Assessment of Teaching, Institute for Teaching, Learning & Academic Leadership, University at Albany:
http://www.albany.edu/teachingandlearning/tlr/peer_obs/index.shtml. (This site offers detailed explanations of six key components of the peer observation of teaching.)
- Teacher Behaviors Inventory, Harry G. Murray (1983):<http://letsgetengaged.wikispaces.com/file/view/teachingbehav.pdf> (While this form was designed for student to complete, this survey can be used by instructors and/or peer reviewers to inform the frequency of specific classroom behaviors that effect student ratings of teaching.)
- Classroom Observation Instruments, Center for Teaching and Learning, University of Minnesota: <http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/teachlearn/resources/peer/instruments/index.html>. This site offers a variety of observation instruments, including open-ended forms, scaled forms, a worksheet, report formats, and a "made-to-order" form option.
- Policy on Peer Review of Teaching, Department of Cellular & Physiological Sciences, University of British Columbia: <http://www.calstatela.edu/academic/aa/fdc/resources/peer-review.pdf>. (See guide beginning on page 2.)
- Classroom Observation Notes, Center for Instructional Development and Research, University of Washington: <http://depts.washington.edu/cidrweb/resources/observation-notes.pdf>. (See this guide for a "field note" style observation format.)
- Peer Review of Teaching, North Carolina State University:
http://www.ncsu.edu/provost/peer_review/
- Brent, R., & Felder, R.M. (2004). *A protocol for peer review of teaching*.
- Berk, R.A., Naumann, P.L., & Appling, S.E. (2004). Beyond student ratings: Peer observation of classroom and clinical teaching, 1(1). *International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship*. Retrieved from http://www.ronberk.com/articles/2004_beyond.pdf. Copyright by The Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing (2004).

- The Peer Review of Online Teaching, Penn State University: <https://www.e-education.psu.edu/facdev/peerreview>
- Rubric for Online Course Evaluation, California State University – Chico: <http://www.csuchico.edu/tlp/resources/rubric/rubric.pdf>
- Quality Assurance Checklist: <http://www.cel.cmich.edu/cid/quality-checklist.html> (This checklist, developed by CMU’s Center for Instructional Design, is recommended for use by faculty/course developers to ensure online courses are developed and revised with rigor and based on quality standards.)
- Peer Review Checklist: <http://cel.cmich.edu/cid/peer-review.html> (This checklist, developed by CMU’s Center for Instructional Design, is designed to invite peer review and feedback on the quality of online course content and whether the course content meets the course/program objectives.)

Appendix II. Sample Letter to External Evaluators

Dear _____,

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an external evaluator of the scholarly work of Professor XXX, who is being considered for [tenure / promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor / promotion from Associate Professor to Professor]. Enclosed you will find a copy of [NAME OF FACULTY]'s current vita, copies of [her/his] publications [, grant award notifications] and a statement that [s/he] wrote identifying [his/her] most significant work and indicating why [s/he] thinks it is significant. As per the collective bargaining agreement in place at CMU, your review will be made available to the candidate and he/she will be given the opportunity to respond to the Department prior to the start of the internal evaluation process. The contents of the reviews are regarded by the University as confidential to the extent permitted by law and shall be released only to those individuals who are authorized to review and make recommendations on [XXX].

Central Michigan University (CMU) offers a broad range of undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts, sciences, arts and applied professional fields that are nationally recognized for quality and value. CMU emphasizes excellence in teaching, scholarship and service to the institution and profession. CMU is a research-intensive university, with a student population of approximately 26,000.

The College of Science and Technology (CST) provides rigorous and high quality undergraduate and graduate programs in a variety of scientific, computing and mathematics fields. Faculty members engage students through interactive teaching, advising, basic and applied research, and collaborative activities. CST faculty members are teacher-scholars who commit themselves to a high level of interaction with their students. Generally CST faculty teach 9-12 contact hours each semester, so evaluators should keep this in mind when reviewing the candidate's record. Professor XXX has averaged a contact load of YYY hours each semester during the period under review. Since the 2006-7 academic year, the Department of Chemistry has graduated an average of 19 undergraduate Chemistry or Biochemistry majors and 8 Masters level Chemistry majors each year with 17 tenure-track faculty positions.

[Tenure / Promotion to Associate Professor / Promotion to Professor] recognizes a sustained commitment to excellence or distinction in teaching, scholarship, and service. The Bylaws of the Chemistry Department require that candidates demonstrate a sustained program of recognized scholarship that results in a minimum of [3, # depending on buy-out] publications in the period under review. We emphasize that while different disciplines will necessarily have different levels of grant success and publication, a key element is a sustained commitment to peer-reviewed scholarly productivity. At Central Michigan University, in making a decision on promotion [and/or tenure], primary weight is given to accomplishments and attainments while in the current rank. In the case of _XXX, [he/she] was appointed to [his/her] current rank on [give date].

Please provide an objective assessment of the candidate's accomplishments as a scholar and your opinion on whether the candidate has demonstrated the degree of accomplishment required for [tenure / promotion to Associate Professor / Promotion to Professor] at CMU. In making your evaluation of the candidate's work, please address the following:

- What, if any, has been your professional and/or personal relationship with the candidate? This should include how long you have known the candidate, whether you have a personal or professional relationship with the candidate, and, in general, whether there is potential for conflict of interest. We recommend that our external reviewers not have served as members of the dissertation committee, advisors, members of the same research group, or co-authors.
- What is the significance of the issues addressed by the candidate's work?
- What is your assessment of the originality and the quality of the work?
- Is the methodology used appropriate to the issues addressed and consistent with best practices in the field?
- Does the work produce useful lines of future inquiry for the candidate and/or for others in the field?
- Has the candidate's work appeared in journals or been published by presses that are appropriate to the field and that are indicators of high quality?
- Does the body of the candidate's work reviewed indicate continuing development as a scholar?

In addition to responding to these specific inquiries, please feel free to comment on other aspects of the candidate's scholarly work.

Due to the calendar for making [tenure/promotion] decisions, please complete your review of the material and submit your evaluation by [July 15 / November 15] at the address below, by FAX to 989-774-3883, or by e-mail to me at [E-MAIL ADDRESS]. As a final request, I ask that you send with your review a copy of your current abbreviated vita so that others will have knowledge of your credentials to place the review in context.

Thank you for your assistance in this important matter. In order to sustain the academic quality of CMU, we are requesting outside evaluations to assist in judging the professional scholarship of our faculty. We realize it is a time-consuming task, and we are truly grateful for your assistance.

Sincerely,

XXX, Chair Personnel Committee
268 Dow Science Complex
Chemistry Department
Central Michigan University
Mount Pleasant, MI 48859