

Performance Evaluation and Evaluation Criteria (Unit A and B)

Department of Chemistry and Physics
Chicago State University



- The Departmental Personnel Committee (DPC) shall consist of all tenure/tenure track faculty members of the department who are not on terminal contract. The department chair is not a member of the DPC. [Additional details can be found in the Chemistry, Physics, and Engineering Studies DPC Bylaws.]
- Officers of the DPC shall be a chairperson and a secretary. New officers shall be selected each year in September at a meeting convened by the previous year's chairperson, or secretary in the absence of the chairperson.
- If there are fewer than three faculty in the department eligible to vote on any particular candidate's personnel action, additional eligible faculty members may be recruited from other departments, upon the request of the candidate. The DPC will vote to approve the addition of one or more faculty not in the department. If a majority of the DPC approves the addition, that faculty member (or members) will be added to the DPC for the particular personnel action only.
- [See Article 19.3e regarding the Evaluation Criteria and its Application as well as Article 19.4e regarding Evaluation Criteria and Committees]

<u>Unit A. Evaluation Criteria</u>	
<u>Purpose of Evaluation</u>	4
<u>Contractual Evaluation Criteria</u>	4
<u>CPE Minimum Requirements for Retention and Promotion</u>	5
<u>Teaching and Performance of Primary Duties</u>	8
<u>Teaching</u>	8
<u>Performance of Primary Duties</u>	9
<u>Research and Scholarly Activities</u>	10
<u>Service</u>	12
<u>Additional Information and Details for retention, promotion, tenure</u>	13
<u>Teaching</u>	13
<u>Primary Duties</u>	16
<u>Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties</u>	16
<u>Research</u>	17
<u>Service</u>	19
<u>Personnel Recommendations</u>	20
<u>Distance Learning</u>	20
<u>Annual Evaluation of tenured employees</u>	21
<u>Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties</u>	21
<u>Research/Creative Activity</u>	21
<u>Service</u>	21
<u>Overview</u>	22
<u>Evaluation of Unit A Research Faculty</u>	23
<u>Performance Standards for Research Faculty</u>	23
<u>Evaluation of Unit A Clinical Faculty</u>	23
<u>Performance Standards for Clinical Faculty</u>	23
<u>Unit B Evaluation Criteria</u>	25
<u>Purpose of Evaluation</u>	25
<u>Contractual Evaluation Criteria</u>	25
<u>CPE Minimum Requirements for Retention</u>	25
<u>Teaching and Performance of Primary Duties</u>	26
<u>Teaching</u>	26
<u>Performance of Primary Duties</u>	27
<u>Teaching</u>	28
<u>Primary Duties</u>	31
<u>Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties</u>	31

[Appendix: Observation Forms](#)32

[Appendix: The Distance Education Policy for the Department of Chemistry, Physics, and Engineering Studies](#)34

Unit A. Evaluation Criteria

Purpose of Evaluation

The purpose of evaluation is to judge the effectiveness of an employee's performance and to identify areas of strength and weakness, and to improve the employee's performance. Employees are responsible for knowing, meeting and demonstrating that they have met the criteria required for retention, promotion, tenure or professional advancement increase. This document is intended as a guide to support employee professional development and growth.

Contractual Evaluation Criteria

All tenured and tenure-track candidates being evaluated must meet the criteria at the level specified for each of the three areas of evaluation: Teaching/performance of primary duties, research/creative activity and service.

Teaching/Performance of primary duties will be considered the most important of the three areas of evaluation, i.e, having higher standards as stipulated in the Contract Article 19.3.a.1. Research/Creative activity and service will be given equal consideration.

The categories of evaluation of faculty in Unit A as designated in the current Contract in Article 19.3.b.2 are shown below with the Minimum Requirements for each category shown.

Table 1.			
Personnel Action	Teaching and Primary Duties	Research and Scholarship	Service
First Year Retention	Satisfactory	Appropriate	Appropriate
Second Year Retention	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Third Year Retention	Effective	Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory
Fourth Year Retention	Highly Effective	Effective	Effective
Fifth Year Retention	Significant	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
Tenure	Superior	Significant	Significant
Associate Professor	Superior	Significant	Significant
Full Professor	Superior	Superior	Superior
Post Tenure Review	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate
PAI	Superior	Superior/Significant*	Superior/Significant*
Faculty Excellence Award (FEA)	Superior (FEA)	Superior (FEA)	Superior (FEA)

*The eligible employee must demonstrate superior teaching/performance of primary duties and either superior research/creative activity or superior service and significant performance in the remaining area.

CPE Minimum Requirements for Retention and Promotion

In order for a candidate to be successful in retention, tenure, promotion or professional advancement increase the candidate, using the materials and activities for these evaluations set forth in the following section, must meet the minimum requirements in the table below.

*Activity is defined as a unique function occurring within the evaluation period. For instance, maintaining an instrument counts as one activity, even though there may be multiple instruments. However, in multi-year evaluations, instrument maintenance can be counted once for each year that it was performed. A competitive grant renewal would also count as a separate activity, whereas a non-competitive renewal would not.

Table 2: Teaching and Primary Duties Requirements	
Teaching	Meet all the standards set forth in the Performance of Teaching Criteria and ...
Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Receive a “Satisfactory” rating or better in peer and student evaluations ● Satisfactory performance review, from supervisor, on Primary Duties ● One activity from Teaching Category T4.
Effective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Receive an “Effective” rating or better in peer and student evaluations; ● Two activities from a single or multiple Teaching Categories T1-T4. <i>One activity must be from T4.</i> ● Satisfactory performance review, from supervisor, on Primary Duties
Highly Effective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Receive a “Highly Effective” rating or better in peer and student evaluations ● Three activities from a single or multiple Teaching Categories T1-T4. <i>One activity must be from T4.</i> ● Satisfactory performance review, from supervisor, on Primary Duties
Significant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Receive a “Significant” rating or better in peer and student evaluations ● Four activities from a single or multiple Teaching Categories T1-T4. <i>One activity must be from T4.</i> ● Satisfactory performance review, from supervisor, on Primary Duties
Superior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Receive a “Superior” rating in peer and student evaluations ● Six activities from a single or multiple Teaching Categories T1-T4. <i>One activity must be from T4.</i> ● Effective performance review, from supervisor, on Primary Duties
Exceptional	The term exceptional shall be defined as exceeding the Superior requirements, with two additional items from T1-T4 for the personnel action under evaluation. <i>One activity must be from T4.</i>
<p>*Activity is defined as a unique function occurring within the evaluation period. For instance, maintaining an instrument counts as one activity, even though there may be multiple instruments. However, in multi-year evaluations, instrument maintenance can be counted once for each year that it was performed. A competitive grant renewal would also count as a separate activity, whereas a non-competitive renewal would not.</p>	

Table 3: Research Requirements

Research	Note: These are minimum requirements	
Appropriate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One activity in R1-8 <i>1 activity</i> 	
Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three activities in R1-R8 <i>3 activities</i> 	
Highly Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three activities in R1-R8 <i>One activity must be from R4-5</i> <i>3 activities</i>	
Effective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three activities in R1-R8 If the candidate has no R1 at this point (from beginning their position at CSU until submission of portfolio for 4th year retention) a letter from the DPC confirming that a meeting has occurred and a plan for the candidate to obtain an R1 activity has been identified. <i>One activity must be from R4-5</i> <p><i>*Faculty who do not have an R1 at this level must meet with the Chair and a subset of DPC members to construct a plan for obtaining an R1 activity in the next two years.</i></p> <i>3 activities</i>	
Highly Effective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seven activities in R1-R8 <i>Three activities must be from R4-5</i> <i>7 activities</i>	
Significant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fifteen activities in R1-R8 <i>Two activities must be from R1</i> <i>One activity must be from R1.R</i> <i>Three activities must be from R4-5</i> <i>15 activities</i>	
Superior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fifteen activities in R1-R8 <i>Four activities must be from R1</i> <i>Two activities must be from R1.R</i> <i>Three activities must be from R4-5</i> <i>15 activities</i>	
Superior (FEA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Five activities in R4, R5, R6 Five activities in R1, R2, R3, R7, R8 <i>One activity in R1</i> <i>10 activities</i>	
Exceptional	The term exceptional shall be defined as exceeding the minimum requirements, with one additional item from R1, for the personnel action under evaluation.	

*Activity is defined as a unique function occurring within the evaluation period. For instance, maintaining an instrument counts as one activity, even though there may be multiple instruments. However, in multi-year evaluations, instrument maintenance can be counted once for each year that it was performed. A competitive grant renewal would also count as a separate activity, whereas a non-competitive renewal would not.

Table 4: Service Requirements

Service	Note: These are minimum requirements.
Appropriate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● One activity in S1-S2 <i>1 activity</i>
Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● One activity in S1 ● Two activities in S1-S3 <i>3 activities</i>
Highly Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● One activity in S1 ● Two activities in S1-S2 ● One activity in S3-S5 <i>4 activities</i>
Effective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● One activity in S1 ● Two activities in S1-S2 ● Two activities in S3-S5 <i>5 activities</i>
Highly Effective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● One activity in S1 ● Two activities in S1-S2 ● Three activities in S3-S5 <i>6 activities</i>
Significant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● One activity in S1 ● Six activities in S1-S2 ● Eight activities in S3-S5 <p align="center"><i>One activity must be from S3</i></p> <i>15 activities</i>
Superior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● One activity in S1 ● Twelve activities in S1-S2 ● Ten activities in S3-S5 <p align="center"><i>Two activities must be from S3</i></p> <i>23 activities</i>
Superior (FEA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Two activity in S1 ● Four activities in S1-S2 ● Four activities in S3-S5 <p align="center"><i>Three activities must be from S5</i></p> <i>10 activities</i>
Exceptional	The term exceptional shall be defined as exceeding the minimum requirements, with four additional items from S1-S5, for the personnel action under evaluation.

*Activity is defined as a unique function occurring within the evaluation period. For instance, maintaining an instrument counts as one activity, even though there may be multiple instruments. However, in multi-year evaluations, instrument maintenance can be counted once for each year that it was performed. A competitive grant renewal would also count as a separate activity, whereas a non-competitive renewal would not.

Teaching and Performance of Primary Duties

Teaching

	DAC Categories	Digital Measure Category
T1	Classroom performance	Directed Student Learning
T2	Peer and Student Observations and Evaluations, Awards for Teaching/Learning	Course Observations Evaluation Reports Self-Assessment of Teaching Awards, Honors, and Commendations
T3	Curriculum, Program, Instruction and Assessment Activities and Design	Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Design
T4	Professional Development for Instructional Development (teaching, assessment, program, etc.)	Faculty Development Activities Attended

Teaching: Mandatory Documentation

1. Narrative that highlights teaching accomplishments during review.
2. Yearlong workload form and any revised faculty workloads completed by the evaluation
3. The course syllabus, one representative evaluation instrument, for each different course taught during the evaluation period.
4. All class visitation report(s) during the evaluation period. See the CPE DPC Bylaws for visitation requirements. Student course evaluation(s). Tenured faculty must submit a peer or Chair evaluation at least once every two years.
5. Faculty are required to describe, in a paragraph, changes and innovations to their classes and how these changes are based on the individual course assessment results and in line with the annual departmental assessment outcomes described in the annual assessment report.
6. **Peer and Student Observations and Evaluations: 90 percent of all for-credit course evaluations taught within the period of review, with data aggregated to relative to the following averages:**
 - 2.5 to 2.6 for Satisfactory
 - 2.61 to 3.0 for Effective
 - 3.01 to 3.5 for Highly Effective
 - 3.51 to 4.0 for Significant
 - 4.01 to 5.0 for Superior

Teaching: Examples of Evidence

(Supporting evidence must be presented for each activity to be evaluated. Examples of acceptable evidence include but are not limited to the following.)

1. **Classroom performance**
Graded or ungraded student assignments; independent study projects; Evidence of training/mentoring students/assistants
2. **Peer and Student Observations and Evaluations**
3. **Curriculum, Program, Instruction and Assessment Design**
Original or revised instructional materials (new lectures, labs, discussion questions, etc.); materials from help sessions. Evidence of implementation of assessment instruments and tools, reflection on data, and

communicating data to assessment coordinators.

4. **Professional Development for Instructional Development** (teaching, assessment, program, etc.)
Attendance evidence from professional conferences; evidence showing participation in an online webinar, reviewing a paper that supports curriculum or laboratory development, attendance at CSU organized workshops and events; etc.

Performance of Primary Duties

	DAC Categories	Digital Measure Category
P1	Primary Duty Participation and Performance	Reassigned Time and CUE Bearing Activities
P2	Primary Duty professional development (if applicable)	Faculty Development Activities Attended
P3	Duties associated with grant work (if applicable)	Research Currently in Progress

Primary Duties: Mandatory Documentation

1. Statement of assigned primary duties by supervisor;
2. Documentation assessing the faculty member's performance of each duties by their direct supervisor;
3. Documentation of attendance at meetings, as appropriate;
4. Submitted reports, as appropriate (i.e. assessment reports, annual grant reports, PME reports, etc.);
5. Documentation of participation at workshops, training courses or other development programs related to the duty.

Primary Duties: Examples of Evidence

(Supporting evidence must be presented for each activity to be evaluated. Examples of acceptable evidence include but are not limited to the following.)

1. **Primary Duty Participation and Performance**
Statement from supervisory; Documentation assessing the faculty member's performance; emails from advisees; assessment reports; Funds to improve advising activities;
2. **Primary Duty professional development**
Attendance at conference on assessment; Attendance at PME conference;
3. **Duties associated with grant work**
Portion of annual grant reports; Grant summary document;

Research and Scholarly Activities

	DAC Categories	Digital Measure Category
R1	Significant impact/recognition in research and creative activity (R1.R and R1.C)	<i>Contracts, Fellowships, Grants and Sponsored Research</i>
R1.R	Peer reviewed publication or PI/Co-PI/Contributor on a successful competitive external grant.	<i>Publications and Intellectual Contributions</i>
R1.C	Significant impact creative activity involving peer recognition *note R1.R and R1.C are both classified under R1. When candidates list R1 activities, they should be explicitly labeled as R1.R or R1.C activities. (Note that a competitive grant counts for an R1R for each year of the grant.)	Research group 1
R2	Non-peer reviewed publication or internal grant, Awards for Research and/or Creative Activity	<i>Contracts, Fellowships, Grants and Sponsored Research</i> <i>Publications and Intellectual Contributions</i> <i>Awards, Honors, and Commendations</i> Research group 2
R3	External faculty or student presentations	<i>Presentations</i> Research group 2
R4	Research Performance [Professional development for research improvement, Setup and maintenance/upgrade of research lab, tools and equipment]	<i>Faculty Development Activities Attended</i> Research group 3
R5	Student research training and mentorship	<i>Directed Student Learning (e.g., independent study, thesis, capstone, dissertation, etc.)</i> Research group 3
R6	Service as grant reviewer, book reviewer, manuscript reviewer, professional conference organizer, external personnel reviewer, textbook evaluation, etc.	<i>Service Professional</i> Research group 3
R7	Co-PI/Contributor on collaborative grant activities at CSU and/or with other institutions (that don't otherwise qualify as a R1 activity)	<i>Contracts, Fellowships, Grants and Sponsored Research</i> Research group 3

R8	Pending or unsuccessful grants, publications or presentations	<i>Contracts, Fellowships, Grants and Sponsored Research</i> <i>Publications and Intellectual Contributions</i> Research group 4
----	--	---

Research: Mandatory Documentation

1. Narrative that highlights research accomplishments during review.
2. Yearlong workload form and any revised faculty workloads completed by the evaluation.

Research: Examples of Evidence

(Supporting evidence must be presented for each activity to be evaluated. Examples of acceptable evidence include but are not limited to the following.)

1. **Significant impact/recognition in research and creative activity** can be in either of two categories (R1.R or R1.C). Both R1.R and R1.C are classified as R1 activities.
 - a. R1.R: Peer reviewed publication or PI/Co-PI/Contributor on a successful competitive external grant *Manuscript; Letter of acceptance; The cover page, abstract, and grant award letters of successful grants; (A competitive grant counts for an R1R for each year of the grant.)*
 R1.C.: Creative Activity that demands significant time, has broad impact and benefit for the STEM community or University.
2. **Non-peer reviewed publication or internal grant, Awards for Research and/or Creative Activity**
Articles written for Professional Society newsletters, CUES Award; CSER Pilot grant;
3. **External faculty or student presentations**
Conference proceedings which list the candidate’s presentations and /or contributions; Sample of program or conference agenda;
4. **Research Performance** [Professional development for research improvement, Setup and maintenance/upgrade of research lab, tools and equipment]
Evidence of improvements made to research infra-structure; Documentation of attendance at research conferences, workshops, or other development activity.
5. **Student research training and mentorship**
A statement of how students are involved in research, the student’s names and their specific contribution to the research effort; Student research thesis;
6. **Service as grant reviewer, book reviewer, manuscript reviewer, professional conference organizer, external personnel reviewer, textbook evaluation, etc.**
Letters of invitation to serve on grant reviews or to review manuscripts; Evidence documenting organizing a conference;
7. **Co-PI/Contributor on collaborative grant activities at CSU and/or with other institutions** (that do not otherwise qualify as a R1 activity);
8. **Pending or unsuccessful grants, publications, or presentations;**

Service

	DAC Categories	Digital Measure Category
S1	Service on required Department Committees	University Service 1
S2	Optional service to the department (Additional committees, outreach and recruitment, ...)	University Service 2
S3	College and University Service (standing or ad-hoc committee work, special functions, etc.)	University Service 3
S4	External service (Professional organization service, service as paper reviewer, ...)	Professional or Public Service 4
S5	Service Leadership (Chair of Committee, Serving on Board of Directors, etc.), Awards for Service	University, Professional or Public Awards, Honors, and Commendations Service 5

Service: Mandatory Documentation

1. Narrative that highlights research accomplishments during review.
2. Yearlong workload form and any revised faculty workloads completed by the evaluation.

Service: Examples of Evidence

1. **Service on required Department Committees**
Participation at Department Meetings, DPCs, etc;
2. **Optional service to the department** (Additional committees, outreach and recruitment, ...)
Participation in Departmental Safety Committee, Instrument Committee, Website Construction Committee
3. **College and University Service** (standing or ad-hoc committee work, special functions, etc.)
4. **External service** (Professional organization service, service as paper reviewer, ...)
5. **Service Leadership** (Chair of Committee, Serving on Board of Directors, etc.)

Additional Information and Details for retention, promotion, tenure

Teaching

Relative Importance of Teaching Activities

Classroom and laboratory performance and peer evaluation are the most important activities. Other activities are equally important.

Performance of Teaching Criteria

Evaluation of a candidate's teaching will include consideration of the candidate's effectiveness in her/his: execution of assigned responsibilities; command of the subject matter or discipline; oral English proficiency as mandated by Illinois statute; ability to organize, analyze and present knowledge or material; ability to encourage and interest students in the learning process; and in student advisement, counseling and direction of individual activities. Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated with respect to the following criteria.

Classroom and Laboratory Performance

Required Course Materials

Syllabi

Syllabi are expected to clearly define the following: course description; course objectives and student outcomes; assessment methods, the name of the text and other required materials; instructor's name, phone number, e-mail address, office location, and office hours; class meeting time and location; ADA statement, material to be covered in lecture and lab; policies concerning attendance, tardiness, and makeup exams; grading standards (including 'I' grades); frequency and relative weights of exams, quizzes, homework, papers, and lab work; laboratory safety rules; information about field trips if required; and policy concerning cheating. In addition, it is expected that syllabi will be professionally produced with a minimum of spelling/typographical errors, grammatical errors, that all instructions and conditions are internally consistent, and that the course content and prerequisites reflect the catalog description. When appropriate, such as for certain accreditation visits, syllabi will be reformatted to fit those accreditation requirements.

Representative Evaluation Instruments

Evaluation Instruments can include, but are not limited to, sample exams or quizzes, diagnostics tests used as pre and posttests, assigned papers. These instruments should provide a measure of either formative or summative evaluation, align with the course content, be clearly written, and be appropriate for the level of the course.

A low student evaluation score cannot be the sole reason for denial and should be evaluated in conjunction with peer and chair evaluations and narrative. Failure to meet the specified average criteria for student evaluations does not immediately disqualify the candidate for a particular personnel action, such as retention, promotion, PAI, etc.)

Faculty are required to submit 90% (or above) of the completed course evaluations (i.e 9 of 10 courses) for the evaluation period. In the situation where the faculty member has taught less than 10 courses during the evaluation period, 1 course can be omitted from submission. (i.e if 4 courses are taught, 3 need to be submitted). Courses that have no submitted student evaluations, do not count in these calculations. This

criteria needs to be met for each academic year, regardless of the span of the evaluation period. (For instance, for an evaluation over a 5 year span (ex. Promotion to Full Professor) the criteria above needs to be met for each AY, rather than for the single 5 year span.)

Other materials

Other materials submitted will be evaluated regarding their value in assisting student learning, originality, and appropriateness for the course.

Relative Importance of Criteria for Classroom and Lab Performance

Course materials are considered most important, followed by the class visitations and then student evaluations.

Teaching Assessment Activities and Design

All classes must have some form of assessment as stated in the syllabus. For those classes that the department designates, additional assessment instruments must be administered. These instruments may include but not be limited to: ACS national exams, Force Concept Inventory, pre and posttests and general education assessment instruments. Faculty administering such instruments must compile the results and return them to the Assessment Coordinator on a timely basis. Effectiveness will be measured by the quality of reports submitted for evaluation. Faculty are required to describe, in a paragraph, changes and innovations to their classes and how these changes are based on assessments.

Peer Evaluations

Each evaluation shall include the results of at least two recent classroom visitations by a member of the DPC. Any member of the DPC may request to visit a faculty member's class before their evaluation. Two visitors shall be designated by the DPC. Each visit shall be at a mutually agreed upon time, with at least one week's notice unless the candidate agrees to a shorter time frame. Each visitor shall complete the "Classroom Visitation/Evaluation Form".

Additional details are available in the Department of Chemistry, Physics and Engineering Studies ByLaws. See section on annual review of tenured faculty for specific observation requirements for each full portfolio submission.

Curriculum Revision and Development

These activities include but are not limited to: new course development, new instructional material development and new option development.

Professional Development for Teaching Improvement/ Performance of Other Teaching Related Duties

Professional Development for Teaching Improvement activities include but are not limited to: participation in short courses, conferences and workshops, attainment of additional degrees, sabbaticals, fellowships, evidence showing participation in an online webinar, reviewing a paper that supports curriculum or laboratory development, attendance at CSU organized workshops and events, and other teaching related, educational experiences. Documentation of participation must be provided for consideration.

Performance of Other Teaching Related Duties activities include but are not limited to: training students in research or teaching skills (when done as part of a course), tutoring, study groups and student mentoring.

Primary Duties

Relative Importance of Performance of Primary Duties

The division of CUEs between teaching and primary duties will dictate the relative importance of these two categories. The statement of assigned duties and/or listing of goals and objectives for grant funded activities will be the guiding document for evaluation of activities related to the primary duties.

Program performance plus required meetings and reports.

Evaluation of a candidate's performance of primary duties will be based on the candidate's demonstration of the effectiveness of her/his execution of assigned responsibilities; as documented by the materials submitted for evaluation, documentation of attendance at required meetings, and copies of required reports.

Training of Personnel

Where appropriate, evidence of personnel training (i.e. tutors, chemical disposal training, master teachers etc.) should be documented.

Program Improvement/Acquisition of Resources

Significant improvements to a program and/or acquisition of resources to improve a primary duty activity should be documented and explained. For example: an advisor develops a method for improving the quality and efficiency of advising.

Professional Development for Program Improvement

These activities include but are not limited to: participation in short courses, conferences and workshops, and other program related, educational experiences. Documentation of participation must be provided for consideration.

Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

It is the responsibility of the DPC to arrive at a judgment of the degree of effectiveness of performance in teaching/performance of primary duties based on the evidence presented in the portfolio. For the purpose of assigning a performance standard to the degree of effectiveness of teaching and primary duties, the guidelines in the Contractual Evaluation Criteria (Table 1) and the Department of Chemistry Physics, and Engineering Studies Minimum Requirements for Retention and Promotion - Teaching and Primary Duties (Table 2).

Guidelines for the evaluation of performance of teaching and primary duties shall be assigned an overall evaluation level, which reflects the division of duties as determined by the division of assigned cues. In the case of discrepancy between the two aspects of teaching and performance of primary duties, the DPC must decide on the overall rating.

Research

Significant impact/recognition research and creative activity

The key element for these criteria is that the faculty member's scholarly activity be critically evaluated by a group of external peers. This can be most easily demonstrated through the acceptance of a peer reviewed publication or the successful awarding and implementation of a competitive, external grant. **Competitive grants are counted as R1Rs for each year of the grant.**

Peer reviewed publications or PI/Co-PI/Contributor on a successful, competitive, external grant

If the faculty member is the Co-PI or another contributor, then she/he must provide a description of their contribution to the grant and the significance of that contribution to the success of the grant. Professional publications include but are not limited to: articles in refereed journals, refereed conference proceedings, monographs, books, or book chapters. Consideration will be given to the number of authors and the candidate's individual contribution to the work, whether the work was performed while a faculty member and identified with the CSU address, and the professional stature of the publication. PI/Co-PI/Contributor on a successful, competitive, external grant includes, but is not limited to: research grants, student training grants, contracts, equipment, outreach grants, retention grants, and instructional improvement grants.

Significant impact creative activity involving peer recognition

Non cue bearing creative Activity that demands significant time, has broad impact and benefit for the STEM community or University can count as R1.C activities. Some examples of this work include serving in National Leadership roles, serving as a Fiscal Officer on a Grant (non-cue bearing), Developing a YouTube STEM video series, developing an Open Source STEM textbook, serving as Program Chair of a major professional research conference. Candidates must demonstrate how the particular activity has high impact, is a result of them being recognized as an expert and leader, requires a significant time commitment, and generates a product that benefits one or more of the following: research/teaching/outreach. *(Candidates would get approval of specific activities in R1.C in advance of portfolio submission, highlighting the description, the specific role, the potential impact, and the product coming out of the Creative Activity.)* If a faculty member wishes any other activity, not explicitly described above for R1.R and R1.C categories, to be considered as meeting these criteria, the burden of proof falls on the faculty member to make the case that the activity involves external peer recognition and has significant impact.

Non-peer reviewed publication or internal grant

This includes but is not limited to: contributions to reviews, compilations, non-refereed conference proceedings, invited reviews for journals, grants or books. Internal grants include, but are not limited to, University Research CUEs, RDO, CTRE grants, and/or other internally generated and reviewed grants.

External faculty or student presentations

This includes but is not limited to: student presentations co-authored by faculty mentors, contributed faculty presentations, posters, and/or seminars presented at professional meetings or external institutions.

Set-up/Maintenance/Upgrade of Research Lab/Tools/Resources

Acquisition of resources (externally or internally) that facilitate a research effort benefit not only the faculty member, but also the students trained in the faculty member's lab, and in some cases the entire departmental instructional effort. Resource acquisition must be documented.

Professional Development for Research Improvement

These activities include but are not limited to: participation in short courses, research and other professionally related

conferences and workshops, attainment of additional degrees, sabbaticals, fellowships, and other research related, educational experiences. Documentation of participation must be provided for consideration.

Pending or unsuccessful grants, publications, or presentations

This includes but not limited to: PI/Co-PI/Contributor on grant proposals that were unsuccessful, pending or in preparation, manuscripts in progress, pending presentations.

Student Research Training

Faculty will be evaluated based on the quality of the research experience they provide to the student. Consideration will also be given to the number of students trained, the length of training, and the student's ability to present their research. Student research training may be counted as more than one category.

Service as a Grant or Manuscript Reviewer, or Conference Organizer

A request to serve as a grant or research manuscript reviewer, or as a conference organizer is a recognition of one's competency in a research area and a way to bring distinction to the department. Candidate needs to clearly articulate how the role represents a recognition of competency and expertise in the candidate's field.

Collaborative grant activities at CSU and/or with other institutions (which do not qualify as a R1 activity).

Participation (in roles other than PI or co-PI) in successful collaborative grant activities at CSU and/or with other institutions. Level of involvement must be documented. Benefit to CSU, its students and the development of the faculty member should be noted.

Guidelines for Evaluation of Research/Creative Activity

Evaluation of the effectiveness of an employee's research/creative activity will include consideration of the quality and quantity of research/creative activity; and the nature of research presentations at professional conferences. It is the responsibility of the DPC to arrive at a judgment of the degree of effectiveness of performance in research/creative activity based on the evidence presented in the portfolio. For the purpose of assigning a performance standard to the degree of effectiveness of research/creative activity, the guidelines in the Contractual Evaluation Criteria and the Department Of Chemistry and Physics Minimum Requirements for Retention and Promotion - Research.

Service

Required Departmental Service

Participation in proceedings of the Departmental Curriculum Committees, Personnel Committee, and Committee of the Whole (i.e. Departmental Meetings), as well as the Mentorship Committee are required.

Optional Departmental Service

Participation in Departmental Safety Committee, Instrument Committee, Website Construction Committee, other Departmental Committees or ad hoc Departmental Committees.

Non-CUE Related Departmental Service

Other department service (for which CUEs are not given) can include but is not limited to: search committees, serving as advisor to student groups, graduate school advising, administrative assistance to the Chairperson, seminar coordinator, department seminar presenter, computer room coordinator, instrument maintenance and repair, assessment, presentations during visitations, student recruitment, representing the department at university functions, report preparation for accreditation/evaluation, alumni weekends or department open houses.

College and University Service Activities

College Service Activities can include but not limited to: College and University Committees, seminars, presentations, Union Committees and service, Special Event Committees and Duties, accreditation review committee work.

Professional Organization Service

Professional organization service can include but is not limited to: Service to professional organization such as but not limited to: the local or national NSBP, NOBCCHE, NSBE, ACS, AAPT, APS, and NARST, as well as professional advisory committees.

Professional Related Community Service

Professional related community service can include but is not limited to: public lectures, seminars, teacher in-service programs, outreach programs, science fair judging, participation in professional advisory committees, participation in Science Fair Central, alumni weekends or department open houses.

Service Leadership

Service leadership can include but is not limited to: serving as a chair or secretary of a committee, serving on the Board of a Professional Organization, serving as an event coordinator or planner.

Supporting evidence must be presented for each service activity to be evaluated. Examples of acceptable evidence include but are not limited to:

- One attendance page from one meeting for each committee or a letter from a Committee Chair acknowledging attendance or work done.
- Agendas for events which list the candidate's participation
- Representative thank-you letters for service activities and a list of such letters, if necessary
- Appointment letters for advisory commissions.

Service Criteria

Evaluation of the effectiveness of an employee's unit, college, university, community or professional service will include consideration of: extent and nature of leadership; degree of participation; quality and length of service; extent and nature of participation in professional organizations, except for presentations at professional conferences; extent and nature of national, state, or local recognition of service; and the relationship of the service to the employee's assigned responsibilities and to the University. Activities for which an employee receives compensation will not be included for consideration.

Guidelines for the Evaluation of Service

It is the responsibility of the DPC to arrive at a judgment of the degree of effectiveness of performance in service based on the evidence presented in the portfolio. For the purpose of assigning a performance standard to the degree of effectiveness of service the guidelines in the Contractual Evaluation Criteria (Table 1) and the Department Of Chemistry and Physics Minimum Requirements for Retention and Promotion - Research (Table 4).

Personnel Recommendations

In order to receive a positive personnel recommendation a candidate must be judged to have met the performance standard in each area (teaching/performance of primary duties, research/creative activity, and service), as required by the Faculty Agreement for the requested personnel action.

Distance Learning

Evaluation of faculty performance in Distance Learning Courses will be conducted according to the policies and procedures outlined in *The Distance Education Policy for the Department of Chemistry, Physics, and Engineering Studies Section* at the end of the DAC.

Annual Evaluation of tenured employees

The annual evaluation for tenured employees not being considered for promotion or PAI is a limited process to identify areas of strength and weakness and to improve performance. The effectiveness of the performance will be evaluated to be "Adequate" or "Exemplary":

Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties:

Adequate is represented by maintenance of standards as evidenced by student course evaluations, course materials, and evidence of contributions to course development. A minimum of two items from T3-T4 are required.

Exemplary is represented by student course evaluations, course materials, evidence of contributions to course development, curriculum development, and professional development for teaching improvement. A minimum of four items from T3-T4 are required.

Tenured faculty must submit at least one peer or Chair observation when the full portfolio is due (every other year). The observation must have been completed within two years of the full portfolio submission. The evaluation will be completed on the Unit A Teaching form with a narrative attached.

For annual evaluation of tenured faculty, also include the following: List of any activities not covered above for which CUEs are awarded (if any). A short description of the activity should accompany these items.

Research/Creative Activity:

Adequate is represented by evidence of research/creative activity and participation in the scholarly community beyond campus in keeping with the level and type of resources available to the faculty member (see below). Evidence of two R1-R8 activities must be presented for each annual report. For each submission of a full portfolio (every other year), one activity in R1, R2, R3, or R7 is required [must have been done within 2 years of the full portfolio submission]. One R1R within three years.

Exemplary is represented by a scientific publication in a refereed journal, professionally-related book, presentation at a professional meeting, or significant contribution to an externally funded grant/fellowship, evidence of pending or unsuccessful grants publications or presentations or evidence of contribution to a collaborative grant activity at CSU in conjunction with other institutions. A minimum of four items from R1-R4, R6-R8 are required. One activity from R1, R2, R3 is required. One R1R within three years.

For annual evaluation of tenured faculty, also include the following (if relevant): List of the resources used/available, i.e.,

- A. Research space;
- B. On-campus funding;
- C. Current grant funding;
- D. Travel funds;
- E. Research-related release time; and
- F. A list of research-related student activities achieved under the faculty member's direction.

Service:

Adequate is represented by evidence of service and participation at the departmental and college/university levels. The evidence of at least two S1 - S4 activities are required.

Exemplary is represented by evidence of leadership in service at the departmental, college/university, or community level. The evidence of at least four S1 - S4 activities are required. At least one activity in S5 is required.

Overview

The evaluation shall consist of the review of the following required material and other professionally related materials by the Department Chair:

Student course evaluations; Materials submitted by the employee to substantiate performance in the areas of teaching/primary duties, research/scholarly activity and service; Materials in the employee's personnel file.

Following review of the documents, the Department Chair shall write a brief evaluation statement and send it to the Dean for review. A copy of the evaluation statement shall be sent to the employee. The employee may attach a written response to the evaluation statements for inclusion in the personnel file. Tenured faculty will be evaluated annually by their chair and dean, using the standards specified herein. However, in the case of a disagreement between a faculty member and the chair or dean relative to an annual evaluation, the faculty member may request an evaluation of the submitted materials from the DPC; this evaluation will become part of the permanent record.

Evaluation of Unit A Research Faculty

Research Faculty are faculty hired as experienced, independent researchers who have qualifications comparable to those expected of tenure-track ranks, but are not tenure track. The appointee is expected to make significant contributions to the research mission of the University, and they are appointed on a non-tenure-track basis based upon available grant funding. The chair/director and dean will evaluate the performance of the Research Faculty annually. The timetable for portfolio submission will be published in the University evaluation timetable.

The degree of effectiveness of performance of each employee being considered for reappointment or promotion as a research faculty member will be evaluated in the areas of research activity and possibly teaching/performance of primary duties and service. If teaching/primary duties or department service requirements are specified in the letter of appointment and annual work assignments, accomplishments in these areas will be considered of less importance than the candidate's research productivity.

Performance Standards for Research Faculty

The performance standard for continued annual appointments is defined as "highly effective" for all activities in the appointment for the first three years. The details of the "highly effective" standards are described in this DAC. After three years, it is expected that research faculty will demonstrate performance at the "significant" level for research/creative activities in every year thereafter for continued annual appointments. The details of the "significant" standards for a one-year evaluation period are described in this DAC.

Research Faculty is also eligible for rank and promotion in titles such as Term Professor, Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, and Research Professor.

- For promotion to research assistant professor: highly effective research/creative activities; highly effective teaching/performance of primary duties and/or highly effective departmental service through the evaluation period
- For promotion to research associate professor: significant research/creative activities; significant teaching/performance of primary duties and/or significant departmental service through the evaluation period.
- For promotion to research professor: superior research/creative activities; superior teaching/performance of primary duties and/or significant service through the evaluation period.

Evaluation of Unit A Clinical Faculty

Clinical Faculty are hired to supervise students in a clinical, experiential, or practicum setting, in addition to being engaged in teaching, research, and service depending on the nature of the appointment. Clinical Faculty qualifications shall be comparable to those expected of tenure-track ranks and their promotion pathways parallel those of the tenure-track ranks. They are eligible for annual reappointment and multiple-year appointments contingent upon, successful performance evaluations, program need and availability of funds. They are not, however, eligible for tenure.

The DPC, chair, and dean will evaluate the performance of clinical faculty annually. The timetable for portfolio submission will be published in the University evaluation timetable.

Performance Standards for Clinical Faculty

For Reappointments (retention) Clinical Faculty must meet the standards stated in the Contract germane to their appointment. Reappointment standards for the first five years are identical to the retention standards for tenure-track faculty for the first five years. Reappointment is subject to available funding.

The performance standard for annual reappointment in clinical year six and beyond: "effective" teaching/performance of primary duties; "effective" service during the evaluation period.

The performance standards for maintaining three-year renewable clinical appointments are: “highly effective” teaching/performance of primary duties, and “highly effective” service.

Clinical Faculty are eligible for clinical rank and promotion in titles such as Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, and Clinical Professor; however, they are not eligible for tenure.

- For promotion to clinical associate professor: superior teaching/performance of primary duties; significant research/creative activity; and significant service through the evaluation period.
- For promotion to clinical professor: superior teaching/performance of primary duties; superior research/creative activity; and superior service through the evaluation period.

Unit B Evaluation Criteria

Purpose of Evaluation

The purpose of evaluation is to judge the effectiveness of an employee's performance and to identify areas of strength and weakness, and to improve the employee's performance. Employees are responsible for knowing, meeting and demonstrating that they have met the criteria required for retention. All unit B employees will be evaluated by the Department Chair.

Contractual Evaluation Criteria

The categories of evaluation of faculty in Unit B as designated in the current 2018-2022 in Article 33 are shown in the table below:

Table 1			
Personnel Action	Teaching and Primary Duties	Research and Scholarship	Service
Retention	Satisfactory	N/A	N/A

Note: The possible ratings are unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and highly effective. See Table 2 for definitions.

CPE Minimum Requirements for Retention

The candidate must meet the minimum requirements for Satisfactory or Highly Effective performance as shown in the table below. The materials and activities required for evaluation follow.

Table 2: Teaching and Primary Duties Requirements	
Teaching	Meet all the standards set forth in the Performance of Teaching Criteria and ...
Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Receive a "Satisfactory" rating or better in peer or chair evaluations ● Satisfactory performance on Primary Duties
Highly Effective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Receive a "Highly Effective" rating or better in peer or chair evaluations ● Highly Effective performance on Primary Duties ● Two T1-T4 or P1-P3 activities.

Teaching and Performance of Primary Duties

Teaching

	DAC Categories	Digital Measure Category
T1	Classroom performance	Directed Student Learning
T2	Peer and Student Observations and Evaluations, Awards for Teaching/Learning	Course Observations Evaluation Reports Self-Assessment of Teaching Awards, Honors, and Commendations
T3	Curriculum, Program, Instruction and Assessment Design	Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Design
T4	Professional Development for Instructional Development (teaching, assessment, program, etc.)	Faculty Development Activities Attended

Teaching: Mandatory Documentation

1. Narrative that highlights teaching accomplishments during review.
2. Yearlong workload form and any revised faculty workloads completed by the evaluation
3. The course syllabus, the final exam, and a representative hour exam for each different course taught during the evaluation period.
4. All class visitation report(s) during the evaluation period. See the CPE DPC Bylaws for visitation requirements. Student course evaluation(s).
5. Faculty are required to describe, in a paragraph, changes and innovations to their classes and how these changes are based on the individual course assessment results and in line with the annual departmental assessment outcomes described in the annual assessment report.

Teaching:

Examples of Evidence. (Supporting evidence must be presented for each activity to be evaluated. Examples of acceptable evidence include but are not limited to the following.)

1. **Classroom performance**
Graded or ungraded student assignments; independent study projects; Evidence of training/mentoring students/assistants
2. **Peer and Student Observations and Evaluations**
3. **Curriculum, Program, Instruction and Assessment Design**
Original or revised instructional materials (new lectures, labs, discussion questions, etc.; materials from help sessions
4. **Professional Development for Instructional Development** (teaching, assessment, program, etc.)
Attendance evidence from professional conferences; attendance at CSU organized workshops and events; etc.

Performance of Primary Duties

	DAC Categories	Digital Measure Category
P1	Primary Duty Participation and Performance	Reassigned Time and CUE Bearing Activities
P2	Primary Duty professional development (if applicable)	Faculty Development Activities Attended
P3	Duties associated with grant work (if applicable)	Research Currently in Progress

Primary Duties: Mandatory Documentation

1. Statement of assigned primary duties by supervisor;
2. Documentation assessing the faculty member's performance of each duties by their direct supervisor;
3. Documentation of attendance at meetings, as appropriate;
4. Submitted reports, as appropriate (i.e assessment reports, annual grant reports, PME reports, etc.);
5. Documentation of participation at workshops, training courses or other development programs related to the duty.

Primary Duties:

Examples of Evidence (Supporting evidence must be presented for each activity to be evaluated. Examples of acceptable evidence include but are not limited to the following.)

1. **Primary Duty Participation and Performance**
Statement from supervisory; Documentation assessing the faculty member's performance; emails from advisees; assessment reports; Funds to improve advising activities;
2. **Primary Duty professional development**
Attendance at conferences on assessment;
3. **Duties associated with grant work**
Portion of annual grant reports; Grant summary document;

Teaching

Relative Importance of Teaching Activities

Classroom and laboratory performance and peer evaluation are the most important activities. Other activities are equally important.

Performance of Teaching Criteria

Evaluation of a candidate's teaching will include consideration of the candidate's effectiveness in her/his: execution of assigned responsibilities; command of the subject matter or discipline; oral English proficiency as mandated by Illinois statute; ability to organize, analyze and present knowledge or material; ability to encourage and interest students in the learning process; and in student advisement, counseling and direction of individual activities. Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated with respect to the following criteria.

Classroom and Laboratory Performance

Required Course Materials

Syllabi

Syllabi are expected to clearly define the following: course description; course objectives and student outcomes; assessment methods, the name of the text and other required materials; instructor's name, phone number, e-mail address, office location, and office hours; class meeting time and location; ADA statement, material to be covered in lecture and lab; policies concerning attendance, tardiness, and makeup exams; grading standards (including 'I' grades); frequency and relative weights of exams, quizzes, homework, papers, and lab work; laboratory safety rules; information about field trips if required; and policy concerning cheating. In addition, it is expected that syllabi will be professionally produced with a minimum of spelling/typographical errors, grammatical errors, that all instructions and conditions are internally consistent, and that the course content and prerequisites reflect the catalog description. When appropriate, such as for certain accreditation visits, syllabi will be reformatted to fit those accreditation requirements.

Representative Evaluation Instruments

Evaluation Instruments can include, but are not limited to, sample exams or quizzes, diagnostics tests used as pre and posttests, assigned papers. These instruments should provide a measure of either formative or summative evaluation, align with the course content, be clearly written, and be appropriate for the level of the course.

Student Evaluations

Each academic term, all of an instructor's students shall have the opportunity to evaluate their instructor's teaching effectiveness in accordance with methods and procedures specified in the approved statement of Departmental Application of Criteria. All official student evaluations remain the property of the University.

Consistent reviews with an average under 2.5 in a specific course over 3 consecutive semesters that the candidate has taught the course, necessitates a plan, developed by the candidate to be reviewed by the Chair, to engage in professional development and revise aspects of the course. Candidates who need to meet or exceed the criteria of effective in teaching should have averages on student evaluations (calculated over 2 years) at 2.5 or above.

Faculty are required to submit 90% (or above) of the completed course evaluations (i.e 9 of 10 courses) for the evaluation period. In the situation where the faculty member has taught less than 10 courses during the evaluation period, 1 course can be omitted from submission. (i.e if 4 courses are taught, 3 need to be submitted). Courses that have no submitted student evaluations, do not count in these calculations.

Other materials

Other materials submitted will be evaluated regarding their value in assisting student learning, originality, and appropriateness for the course.

Relative Importance of Criteria for Classroom and Lab Performance

Course materials are considered most important, followed by the class visitations and then student evaluations.

Teaching Assessment Activities and Design

All classes must have some form of assessment as stated in the syllabus. For those classes that the department designates, additional assessment instruments must be administered. These instruments may include but not be limited to: ACS national exams, Force Concept Inventory, pre and posttests and general education assessment instruments. Faculty administering such instruments must compile the results and return them to the Assessment Coordinator on a timely basis. Effectiveness will be measured by the quality of reports submitted for evaluation. Faculty are required to describe, in a paragraph, changes and innovations to their classes and how these changes are based on assessments.

Peer Evaluations

Each evaluation shall include the results of at least one recent classroom visitation. The Chair designates one or more visitors who can either be a faculty member or the department Chair, themselves. Each visit shall be at a mutually agreed upon time, with at least one week's notice unless the candidate agrees to a shorter time frame. Each visitor shall complete the "Classroom Visitation/Evaluation Form". The candidate can request additional visitors for peer evaluations. In the event of a negative review from a single visitor, the candidate will have a second review from someone in the department, at their choosing. Additional details are available in the Department of Chemistry, Physics and Engineering Studies ByLaws.

Curriculum Revision and Development

These activities include but are not limited to: new course development, new instructional material development and new option development.

Professional Development for Teaching Improvement/ Performance of Other Teaching Related Duties

Professional Development for Teaching Improvement activities include but are not limited to: participation in short courses, conferences and workshops, attainment of additional degrees, sabbaticals, fellowships, evidence showing participation in an online webinar, reviewing a paper that supports curriculum or laboratory development, and other teaching related, educational experiences. Documentation of participation must be provided for consideration.

Performance of Other Teaching Related Duties activities include but are not limited to: training students in research or teaching skills (when done as part of a course), tutoring, study groups and student mentoring.

Primary Duties

Relative Importance of Performance of Primary Duties

The division of CUEs between teaching and primary duties will dictate the relative importance of these two categories. The statement of assigned duties and/or listing of goals and objectives for grant funded activities will be the guiding document for evaluation of activities related to the primary duties.

Program performance plus required meetings and reports.

Evaluation of a candidate's performance of primary duties will be based on the candidate's demonstration of the effectiveness of her/his execution of assigned responsibilities; as documented by the materials submitted for evaluation, documentation of attendance at required meetings, and copies of required reports.

Training of Personnel

Where appropriate, evidence of personnel training (i.e. tutors, chemical disposal training, master teachers etc.) should be documented.

Program Improvement/Acquisition of Resources

Significant improvements to a program and/or acquisition of resources to improve a primary duty activity should be documented and explained. For example: an advisor develops a method for improving the quality and efficiency of advising.

Professional Development for Program Improvement

These activities include but are not limited to: participation in short courses, conferences and workshops, and other program related, educational experiences. Documentation of participation must be provided for consideration.

Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

It is the responsibility of the Chair to arrive at a judgment of the degree of effectiveness of performance in teaching/performance of primary duties based on the evidence presented in the portfolio. For the purpose of assigning a performance standard to the degree of effectiveness of teaching and primary duties, the guidelines in the Contractual Evaluation Criteria (Table 1) and the Department of Chemistry Physics, and Engineering Studies Minimum Requirements for Retention and Promotion - Teaching and Primary Duties (Table 2).

Guidelines for the evaluation of performance of teaching and primary duties shall be assigned an overall evaluation level, which reflects the division of duties as determined by the division of assigned cues.

Appendix: Observation Forms

Department of Chemistry, Physics and Engineering Studies VISITATION EVALUATION FORM (Unit A)

Faculty Member Being Evaluated:

Class:

Purpose of Evaluation

Retention in Year:

Tenure

Promotion to Rank of:

A. Narrative Description Attached:

Yes

No

B. Lecture Evaluation Components:

Superior Significant Highly Effective Effective Satisfactory Unsatisfactory

1. Was the material clearly presented?
2. Was the material suitably organized?
3. Was the content of the lecture appropriate?

	Superior	Significant	Highly Effective	Effective	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1. Was the material clearly presented?						
2. Was the material suitably organized?						
3. Was the content of the lecture appropriate?						

C. Laboratory Evaluation Components

Superior Significant Highly Effective Effective Satisfactory Unsatisfactory

1. Were the lab materials available and suitable?
2. Was an appr. introd. to the experiment given?
3. Was adequate consideration given to safety?

	Superior	Significant	Highly Effective	Effective	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1. Were the lab materials available and suitable?						
2. Was an appr. introd. to the experiment given?						
3. Was adequate consideration given to safety?						

D. General Class Characteristics

Superior Significant Highly Effective Effective Satisfactory Unsatisfactory

1. What is the level of student engagement in the course?
2. Rate the level at which student ideas are valued.

	Superior	Significant	Highly Effective	Effective	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1. What is the level of student engagement in the course?						
2. Rate the level at which student ideas are valued.						

E. Overall Teaching Effectiveness Judged:

Superior Significant Highly Effective Effective Satisfactory Unsatisfactory

	Superior	Significant	Highly Effective	Effective	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory

Narrative follows

Evaluated by:

Date:

Department of Chemistry, Physics and Engineering Studies
VISITATION EVALUATION FORM (Unit B)

Faculty Member Being Evaluated:

Class:

Purpose of Evaluation:

A. Narrative Description Attached: Yes No

B. Lecture Evaluation Components:

	Highly Effective	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1. Was the material clearly presented?			
2. Was the material suitably organized?			
3. Was the content of the lecture appropriate?			

C. Laboratory Evaluation Components

	Highly Effective	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1. Were the lab materials available and suitable?			
2. Was an appr. introd. to the experiment given?			
3. Was adequate consideration given to safety?			

D. General Class Characteristics

	Highly Effective	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1. What is the level of student engagement in the course?			
2. Rate the level at which student ideas are valued.			

E. Overall Teaching Effectiveness Judged:

	Highly Effective	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory

Evaluated by:

Date:



Appendix: The Distance Education Policy for the Department of Chemistry, Physics, and Engineering Studies

2/15/2021

Overview

The Department of Chemistry, Physics and Engineering Studies considers Distance Education courses to be any course that is completely online or offered in a hybrid format. Such courses may be offered for credit or non-credit.

The Department accepts on-line and/or hybrid courses to apply toward a chemistry or physics degree as long as a course is officially approved by the University, or in the case of transfer courses, is accepted as comparable credit by the University and/or Department.

All faculty who teach on-line/hybrid courses must have successfully completed the Online Certification Training (OCT) offered by the CTRE or comparable training, approved by the CTRE. The training must be completed prior to the start of the course.

The department may offer as many Distance Education courses per semester as is appropriate to satisfy program needs of the department and the university.

Approval of Online/Hybrid Courses

Approval of new or revised on-line/hybrid courses follows the same initial process used for face-to-face courses and the university policy for approval of online/hybrid courses. The new course is first submitted and approved by the relevant Curriculum Committee and then is submitted to the Department for approval. Courses are reviewed by the Distance Education Committee following the process outlined on the Distance Education Committee website <https://www.csu.edu/DEC/approvalprocess.htm>. Sample course materials are prepared for the Learning Management System (LMS) and the course developer prepares at least 3 sections in the shell and confers with the CTRE-Office of Online Instruction. Once reviewed the course is submitted for approval by the University DEC.

Reviewing on-line/hybrid courses:

The Department, with advice as needed from the CTRE, will monitor and review on-line/hybrid course offerings each term and make recommendations for changes or improvements to the relevant Department Curriculum Committee.

Online/hybrid courses will be treated equally as face-to-face courses and evaluated as described by the Departmental Application of Criteria. This includes peer and student evaluations and review of course materials by the Departmental Personnel Committee. Faculty who teach on-line/hybrid courses will coordinate with DPC appointed observers to review course materials. Items to review could include (but are not limited to): live or recorded video lectures, samples of a discussion forum where the instructor is guiding the discussion, a virtual laboratory or online assignment.

Departmental academic advisors will counsel students on the specifics of distance education expectations and courses available. Advisors and faculty member teaching an online/hybrid course are encouraged to provide students access to supports such as the Smart Measure Online Readiness Assessment (<http://csu.readi.info/>) that helps students identify their own learning styles, technological knowledge, computer literacy, and/or competing personal responsibilities. Students needing assistance from the Office of Abilities will be instructed by advisors on how to access these resources.

Enrolled Students shall assess the effectiveness of the course offerings, materials and the timely responses of the instructor. Students will be given the opportunity to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of the instructor through the student evaluations provided on-line through the CSU evaluation process.

Courses in the curriculum to be offered online/hybrid:

Courses in the Department that are offered online include, but are not limited to PHYS 1600 in addition to courses in the Physical Sciences that are not part of the Chemistry or Physics major programs. Students may apply a maximum of 27 of online/hybrid credits in HUM and SS plus and 12 online/hybrid courses in SCI/MATH in CPE. No online/hybrid credits in chemistry classes are permitted for students pursuing the ACS certification for the Chemistry major. Physical Science courses include but are not limited to PH S 1000, 1080, 1150, and 1850.

* for an updated list consult the University dynamic catalog and DEC site.

Teaching of Online/hybrid offerings:

There is no limit on the number of distance education courses a faculty member in the department may teach. Department curriculum committees are encouraged to recommend online course offerings and course coverage to the Chair at least one year in advance.

Faculty approved to teach hybrid/online are selected to teach the online/hybrid courses by the Department Chairperson in consultation with the faculty in the discipline.