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Promotion Process: One bucket system
Promotion Process: Three bucket system
Chromosomes are arranged in pairs: maternal and paternal homologues.
Chromosomes vary in size—different numbers of genes.
Each chromosome consists of a single DNA molecule and associated histone proteins.
DNA would not be visible in the light microscope so DNA is condensed in chromosomes shown.
Position of the centromere can vary. It can be in the middle but also can be asymmetric.
Chromosomes show bands.
Chromosome 21 was the first chromosome sequenced.
Having even one too many chromosomes leads to the death of most embryos, but an extra copy of 21 results in a viable trisomy, Down syndrome.
• NSF Wider/Eager Study

Reimer et al., RSF Journal, 2016

- Interactive
- Small group discussion
- Real world connection
- Reference prior class
- Guages student understanding
- Modifies lesson after guaging
Department Chair

• Junior faculty
  • Require citation of at least one pedagogy reference in new course action forms
  • Institute program of peer observation conducted by mentor faculty
    • Guide implementation of evidence based teaching practices
    • Second form of evaluation in promotion process

• Senior faculty
  – Participate in providing peer observations
    • Expose senior faculty to evidence based teaching practices
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WIG: Excellence in Teaching Required for Merit/Promotion

In UC system VPAP oversees academic reviews
- Every 2-4 years depending on rank (Assist, Assoc, Full)
- Files evaluated by Dept, Chair, Dean,
  CAP,
  VPAP, Provost, and Chancellor
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• Fall 2014
  – CAP agrees that accelerations require excellence not only in research but at least 1 of the other 2 areas
  – Announced to all Deans and Faculty University wide

• Winter/Spring 2015
  – Accelerations based on outstanding research (with adequate teaching/service) denied
Moving toward evidence based evaluation of teaching in AP review

- **Spring 2015**
  - CAP agrees to require at least one type of evidence in addition to student evals

- **Fall 2015**
  - Announced to all Deans and Faculty

- **February 2016**
  - Review of files submitted to date (~200)
  - Majority still had only student evals
  - I was invited by AAU to give a talk on our progress in using evidence other than student evaluations
AP Review: Revised 4/2016

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness MUST INCLUDE Student Evaluations of Teaching, ALONG WITH Self Evaluation and/or Other Evaluation Documents

- Student Evaluations of Teaching (can include statistical summaries)
- Self-Evaluation Documents (e.g. course syllabi, teaching statement)
- Other Evidence Documents (e.g. peer review of your teaching, awards)
What teaching materials should be included for review?

1. Student evals
2. Course syllabi
3. Self-statement
4. Teaching Practice Inventory
5. Peer evaluation
6. Awards
7. Student Achievements/Learning gains
8. Other
Promotion Process: Three bucket system
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