

**College of Health Sciences  
and Pharmacy  
Department of Public Health  
Departmental Application of Criteria  
(DAC)  
2022-2026 Contract  
Revised March 2024**

**PREAMBLE:**

The faculty of the Department of Public Health are committed to the mission and vision of Chicago State University. We strive for excellence in teaching, as well as to contribute to knowledge in our discipline and to the life of the University and the community. Our Unit A faculty typically carry full teaching loads which require sufficient time for preparation of lectures; meetings with and individual supervision of students; direction of student research; curriculum development; and professional development to maintain currency in the fields of public health.

A University can function only if there is a relationship of collegiality, communication and shared purpose between faculty and non-teaching administration. Hence, the evaluation criteria set forth below represent a balance between the need to document the employee's activities, and the avoidance of unnecessary documentation requirements that would interfere with the employee's research, service, and in particular, teaching duties. In addition to the required documentation, all parties who are required to review the candidate's portfolio may seek clarification or additional materials from the candidate.

**ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMITTEE:**

The Department of Public Health has opted to form a unit for evaluating its faculty members. This unit is formally known as the Public Health Personnel Committee (PHPC), consisting of Unit A faculty in the department. PHPC is also known as Departmental Personnel Committee (DPC).

**ESTABLISHMENT OF EVALUATION CRITERIA:**

The establishment of evaluation criteria is the responsibility of the faculty in collaboration with the department Chair. Faculty members of the program will be evaluated by the DPC based on the criteria established for the Department of Public Health. Materials used in the process of evaluation shall include: the evaluation portfolio, materials referred to in the employee's supporting materials, and materials in the employee's personnel file except confidential materials submitted in connection with the employee's initial appointment. Tenured senior faculty members seeking promotion are to be evaluated by members of DPC of higher ranking.

**RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CHAIR OF THE DPC**

The chair of the DPC will be elected by the members of the DPC. The chair will schedule a meeting of the DPC to evaluate members of bargaining unit A according to the schedule published by the university. The chair will designate a member of the DPC to submit a written report of the DPC's recommendations for each candidate who is evaluated. The DPC will submit a copy of this recommendation to the department chair and a copy to the candidate within the time limits established by the university.

**RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FACULTY MEMBER BEING EVALUATED:**

The faculty member being evaluated must provide a portfolio of materials, which must include the following:

- A current, signed and dated curriculum vitae.
- Evidence of academic and current professional credentials.
- Documentation of original materials representative of the following categories: Teaching/Primary Duties, Research/Creative Activity and Service.

**EVALUATION MATERIALS AND STANDARDS BY PERFORMANCE AREA - UNIT - A FACULTY**

The materials and activities listed in these categories are only illustrative of the types of materials and activities, which may be included. The lists are not intended to be all-inclusive. Research/creative activity and service will be considered of equal importance. Teaching will be considered of primary importance. Unless otherwise noted, items listed within each category and subcategory shall be of equal weight in evaluation.

Excessive documentation that would result in the employee taking significant time away from his/her duties to collect documents or assemble a portfolio is discouraged. The following materials should not be submitted with portfolios:

- Documentation of individual meetings with students
- Individual student work, except for graduate student theses/capstones directed by the employee
- Advising logs or roster or correspondence with students.
- Description of tutoring assistance to individual students.
- Logs of individual clinic/fieldwork visits.
- Minutes or attendance records of meetings.

## **I. TEACHING/PRIMARY DUTIES**

### **A. CATEGORIES OF MATERIALS AND ACTIVITIES TO BE SUBMITTED:**

A. I. Materials to be submitted for evaluation of teaching performance.

A. I. a Chairperson's report of class visitation (one per academic year)

The candidate will invite the program director to visit one class (lecture and/ or laboratory) per academic year, the class to be mutually agreed upon. The program chair will complete the appropriate course visitation form and submit a copy to the candidate. The program chair has the option to request subsequent visits of any course at a time mutually agreed upon. All completed course visitation forms completed by the chair will be included in the portfolio.

A.1.b Peer reports of class visitations (one per academic year)

Candidates are expected to invite one full time faculty member from the College of Health Sciences to observe a class at least once per academic year. Peer reports should be from a faculty member in the department/DPC. The candidate may not be reviewed by the same peer for two consecutive semesters. The peer evaluators shall complete a written evaluation of the class visitations on the appropriate form. The evaluation shall be submitted to the chairperson of the department with a copy to the candidate.

A.1.c Summary of student evaluations (one per semester)

All courses taught for credit are subject to student evaluations, thus candidates are expected to submit a summary of student course evaluations and comments. 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).

The candidate may opt to submit additional evaluations; e.g. written evaluations by graduate students.

A.2. Teaching Materials:

A.2.a Syllabi (required from all courses taught)

Candidates are expected to provide a course syllabus for each course taught during the evaluation period.

A.2.b. Original supplemental materials, and examinations  
(samples are required from all courses taught)

Evidence should include original materials for courses taught during the evaluation period. Materials that are the outcome of team collaboration should be clearly designated as such.

A.2.c Evidence of course revisions and or development.  
(If completed during the period of review)

Content of syllabi or other course materials that the faculty member revised or developed during the evaluation period should be clearly indicated, with a narrative statement of the reasons for the revisions.

A.2.d. Teaching Awards (If awarded during the course of review). The nature of the award shall be indicated, i.e. for a class, a program, a professional association or whether it is a nomination, a competitive award and if it was granted.

A.3. Evidence of Faculty Development

A.3.a Faculty Development Plan

The DAC represents the department's framework for the planned growth and advancement in one's career in the three areas of teaching and primary duties, research and creative efforts and service. The DAC is a professional development plan for faculty, focusing on faculty growth, enhancement of competence and improved effectiveness in professional and institutional requirements and obligations, as well as expanding creativity and problem solving.

A.3.b Evidence of Faculty Development

Candidates are expected to provide documentation of activities related to enhancement of knowledge and skills pertaining to effective teaching performance and maintenance of currency in areas of practice. This evidence must include, but is not limited to evidence of progress on goals described in the faculty development plan related to teaching, participation in lectures, workshops, institutes and seminars, or enrollment in courses related to teaching duties. The candidate's narrative for teaching should include a description of progress toward goals on previous faculty development plans.

I.4 Performance of Other Assigned Primary Duties

Other primary duties may include: professional and/or pre-professional student advisement, departmental program assessment, fieldwork supervision, fieldwork site development, inclusion of students in research, and other assigned duties. As noted above, documentation of these activities should be provided only when it is not an undue burden that would interfere with the employee's performance of his/her duties.

Documentation of primary teaching duties should be provided in the following categories:

- I. Importance of mentoring and the inclusion of students in undergraduate research
  - List of names of students mentored.
  - List of students involved in research, with the topic of research.

2. Academic advising
  - List of students advised.
3. Availability to students
  - The chair certifies that the faculty member has posted office hours and that office hours have been kept.
4. Employee's command of the subject matter being taught
  - Faculty Development Plan (see above).
5. Use of prevailing instructional technologies
  - Faculty Development Plan (see above)
6. Use of appropriate and varied methods of teaching, assessment, and evaluation
  - Faculty Development Plan (see above)
  - Inclusion of course syllabi, exams and other materials
7. Service learning and community engagement
  - List of students involved in service activities and types of service rendered
  - Employee's service to the community is detailed in Service (below).

## 8. METHODS OF EVALUATION

### B.1 .Relative Importance

Evaluations of Teaching Performance, Teaching Materials, and Faculty Development (Plan and evidence of development) will be considered to be of equal weight. Other assigned primary duties will be considered important in proportion to the quantity of these duties that are assigned (except in emergency situations such as program accreditation). Point values of student, faculty and peer evaluations will be considered as guidelines. Extenuating circumstances, such as courses that receive lower student evaluation scores regardless of instructor, and specific plans for improvement may be considered if scores in one of the evaluation areas is below these guidelines.

### 8.2. Rating Scales:

The core university-wide student evaluation items are on a five-point scale (Strongly Agree; Agree; Somewhat Agree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree). In this document, these correspond to numeric values from 1 to 5, where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree.

Peer and Chair evaluations are on a five-point scale (Very Good, Good, Average, Fair, Poor) with Poor= 1 and Very Good= 5.

As a measure of effective communication with students, all peer and chair evaluations must have a rating of "Good" or better on "Verbal Communication with students."

### 8.3. Standards for evaluation- Unit A Faculty

#### 8.3 .a. Satisfactory

(Necessary for retention in years one and two)

Most students completing the online evaluation should give the instructor a mean score of 2.5 or higher on core items completed.

Peer Evaluation should have an average score of 2.5 or above.

Chair Evaluation should have an average score of 2.5 or above.

Submitted materials demonstrate:

- Knowledge of the field of Public Health.
- An ability to organize and present material through a variety of teaching methods.
- Incorporation of new knowledge in the field and technological advances into teaching.

Faculty development experiences as outlined in Faculty Development Plan should support teaching assignments and professional development.

Consistent and timely performance of primary duties other than teaching.

#### B.3.b.Effective-

(Necessary for retention in year three.)

Most students completing the online evaluation should give the instructor a mean score of 2.61 or higher on core items completed.

Peer Evaluation should have an average score between 2.75 or above.

Chair Evaluation should have an average score between 2.75 or above.

No ratings for "Verbal Communication Skills" from Peer or Chair that are below "satisfactory."

Submitted materials demonstrate:

- Knowledge of the field of Public Health.
- An ability to organize and present material through a variety of teaching methods.
- Incorporation of new knowledge in the field and technological advances into teaching.
- Development of creative and interactive learning activities.

Faculty Development experiences should support-teaching assignments and professional development, and the candidate should submit evidence on the progress toward Faculty Development Plan goals.

Consistent and timely performance of primary duties other than teaching.

#### B.3.c. Highly Effective-

(Necessary for retention in year four)

Most students completing the online evaluation should give the instructor a mean score of 3.01 or higher on core items completed.

Peer Evaluation should have an average score of 3.1 or above.

Chair Evaluation should have an average score of 3.1 or above.

No ratings for "Verbal Communication Skills" from Peer or Chair that are below "Satisfactory."

Submitted materials demonstrate:

- Knowledge of the field of Public Health.
- An ability to organize and present material through a variety of teaching methods.
- Development of creative and interactive learning activities.
- Incorporation of new knowledge in the field into teaching.
- Revision of course model or series of classes within a course, in response to internal or external curriculum evaluation.

Faculty Development experiences should support-teaching assignments and professional development. Submitted evidence of progress toward Faculty Development Plans goals. Consistent and timely performance of primary duties other than teaching.

8 .3.d. Significant-  
(Necessary for retention in year 5)

Has demonstrated an ability to maintain consistently high levels of performance as evidenced by:

- Most students completing the online evaluation should give the instructor a mean score of 3.51 or higher on core items completed.
- Peer evaluations should have an average score of 3.5 or above.
- Chair evaluation should have an average score of 3.5 or above.
- Submitted materials demonstrate breadth and depth of knowledge, specialization, expertise and ongoing faculty development.
- Development of curriculum and/or demonstration of exemplary teaching skills as evidenced by activities such as the below. Please choose only one activity.
  - Development of a new course.
  - Development of fieldwork assignments/activities.
  - Development of an interdisciplinary/collaborative assignment.
  - A Teaching Award.
  - Introduction of innovative teaching activities (i.e., service learning projects, assistive technology projects).

Faculty Development experiences should support-teaching assignments and professional development.

Submitted evidence of progress toward Faculty Development Plan goals, certified by the department chair.

Consistent and timely performance of primary duties other than teaching.

8.3.e. Superior-  
(Necessary for tenure)

Has demonstrated an ability to maintain consistently high levels of performances as evidenced by:

- Most students completing the online evaluation should give the instructor a mean score of 4.01 or higher on core items completed.
- Peer evaluations should have an average score of 4.01 or above.
- Chair evaluations should have an average score of 4.01 or above.
- Submitted materials demonstrate breadth and depth of knowledge, specialization, expertise and ongoing faculty development.
- Has demonstrated an ability to create and develop curriculum and/or demonstrate exemplary teaching skills as evidenced by activities such as the below. Please choose only one activity.
  - Development of a new course
  - A major course revision

- Course design for new fieldwork site.
- Development of an interdisciplinary/ collaborative course.
- A Teaching Award at the University, College, State or National Level.
- Documented contribution to the department curriculum committee related to the sequence, content and ongoing development of programs.

Faculty Development experiences should support-teaching assignments and professional development.

Submitted evidence of progress toward Faculty Development Plan goals.  
Consistent and timely performance of primary duties other than teaching.

**C. Distance Education policy for the retention, promotion, and tenure award process.**

Faculty members assigned to distance education courses have the responsibility to produce and revise instructional design and course materials to maintain or enhance the integrity, exactness, and quality of the distance education course. The Faculty assigned to distance education courses shall receive equivalent recognition of teaching and scholarly undertakings related to distance education programs corresponding with their efforts in traditional, on-campus course facilitation activities. Faculty can engage in serving distance education students, such as web maintenance (i.e., developing ADA appropriate instructional materials suitable for online instruction and the continued monitoring, updating, and course facilitation required throughout the duration of the course), in agreement with published university intellectual property policy.

**II. RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY\***

\*The requirements for research/creative activity for tenure-track faculty in Years 1-5 (as of AY 2023-2024) will be required to accomplish only one peer-reviewed publication or competitive external grant for tenure. This exception is for the 2022-2026 contract.

**1. CATEGORIES OF MATERIALS AND ACTIVITIES TO BE SUBMITTED**

a. Category I

i. Publications

- Published book reviews,
- Served as editor or co-editor for a collected volume.
- Publications in non-peer reviewed journals.

ii. Presentations

- Papers presented to professional groups, lectures, technical sessions or in-services.
- Presentation at a professional non-peer reviewed conference by request of an agent outside the university based on the candidate's expertise.
- Translations of professional literature.

iii. Research and Grants

- Research in progress (documentation required)
- Research and/or scholarly projects as part of fellowships, internships, or clinical practice.
- Poster session at a conference or symposium that requires peer review.

iv. Others



- Citation in published work.
- Membership on a dissertation/master thesis committee outside the department and/or outside the university.
- Obtaining copyrights/patents.
- National or regional committees to research and develop policies, procedures or practice guidelines for the profession or that influence the profession (e.g. American Public-Health Association [APHA], National Environmental Health Association [NEHA], Occupational Safety and Health Administration [OSHA], Illinois Department of Health, Chicago Department of Public Health).
- Planning professional conferences/workshops with role as chair/co-chair.
- Completed research for the benefit of the university, college or department.
- Other forms of recognition for scholarly contribution such as editorial board, peer review committees, moderating/hosting panels in national, regional, international conferences in area of research.
- Development of distance learning materials, computer programs, movies or videotapes.
- Bibliography of directed, self-guided study including a narrative describing outcomes.
- Publication of articles that do not require peer review. This may include newspapers, magazines or non-peer reviewed professional publications.

b. Category II

i. Publications

- Authored or co-authored book from a scholarly publisher.
- Authored or co-authored article published by a peer reviewed journal.

ii. Presentations

- Presentation or workshop at national conferences or symposia.
- Presentations for which the abstract has undergone peer review.
- Academic presentation to a professional group for which the candidate has been invited based on expertise. This can include keynote presentations at state or national conferences, presentations within established academic lecture series or presentations associated with awards of professional merit.

iii. Grant Funding

- External, awarded research grants or study proposals and contracts written and submitted for which the candidate served as principal investigator or co-investigator.

## 2. METHODS OF EVALUATION FOR RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Research may be substantiated through materials such as (but not limited to): copies of publications; title page and table of contents of books; conference programs; program announcements; abstracts of presentations; and copies of letters of intent, consultant letters, and award notifications of grants. Relative Importance:

Category II is judged to be more rigorous than Category I. Materials are also judged in importance based on their relevance to Public Health.

The DPC will evaluate the effectiveness of the candidate's performance using the following standards (all are cumulative across the employee's time since arrival at the university):

Appropriate (Necessary for retention in year one):

Articulation of research agenda with documentation and timeline of implementation.

Satisfactory (Necessary for retention in year two):

One or more items from Categories I or II. Highly

Satisfactory (Necessary for retention in year three):

Two or more items from Categories I or II.

Effective (Necessary for retention in year four):

Three or more items from Categories I or II.

Highly effective (Necessary for retention in year five):

Three or more items from Categories I or II including at least one item from Category I.i or iii.

Significant (Necessary for tenure and promotion to associate):

Four or more items from Categories I or II including at least two items from Category II.i or iii.

Superior (Necessary for promotion to full professor):

Four or more items from Categories I or II including at least two items from Category

II.i or iii.

### III. III. SERVICE -

#### I. Categories of Materials and Activities:

##### **Service to the Department of Public Health**

- Participation in standing and/or ad hoc committees (i.e. curriculum, program evaluation, personnel, admissions committees).
- Administration, directorship, supervision, coordination, etc., of student organizations and activities.
- Department representative to external organizations/ boards/ groups.
- Mentoring junior faculty.
- Recruitment of faculty.
- Recruitment, advising, and mentoring of students.
- Participation in the accreditation process.
- Performance of other duties beyond the scope of the faculty member's specified teaching responsibilities and mandatory meeting attendance that assist in the functioning of the department.

##### **Service to the College of Health Sciences and Pharmacy (COHSP)**

- Participation in COHSP standing and ad hoc committees and/or task forces.

- COHSP representative to various organizations/boards/groups.
- Participation in non-mandatory COHSP meetings, retreats, workshops, conferences, and/or colloquia.
- Participation and/or planning college workshops of seminars or other events.
- Consulting for governmental agencies or other institutions including serving as a grant reviewer.
- Recognition by COHSP for service.

#### **Service to the University**

- Participation in University standing and ad hoc committees.
- Recognition by the University for service.
- Participation in local, regional, national, or international task force(s).
- Dissemination of scholarly research to the media, government, and/or community.
- Representation of the University to various organizations.

#### **Service to Professional Organization(s)**

- Board member for a local, state or national professional organization.
- Active service to a professional organization.
- Participation in trainings, conferences, or courses to enhance the understanding of public health practices and principles.
- Award or recognition for excellence in public health.
- Serving as a participant or consultant for accreditation and certifying organizations.

#### **Community Service**

- Involvement in civic, philanthropic, or community-based organizations including serving in a leadership role or board member.
- Participation in community service and community engagement activities as a public health expert for the improvement of the University's service area.
- Serving as a speaker or conducting educational activities to external entities.
- Assisting community-based organizations or health organizations in securing funding for research, program evaluation, or public health programming.
- Participation on site visit teams for funding agencies.

#### **Relative importance**

It is expected that individuals will document widely differing activities and emphases in their service contributions; the importance of such activities will be considered based on degree of participation, quality and length of service, effectiveness and leadership. Service will also be judged in terms of the relationship of the service to the employee's assigned responsibilities, and to the University.

#### **2. Evaluation of Service**

The DPC will evaluate the effectiveness of the candidate's performance using the following standards:

*Satisfactory (Necessary for retention in years one and two):*

- Service to the Department of Public Health, COHS and one other category is represented.

*Effective (Necessary for retention in year three):*

- Service to the Department of Public Health, COHS, and University is represented.

*Highly effective (Necessary for retention in year four):*

- Service to the Department of Public Health, COHS, University, and one other category is represented.

*Significant (Necessary for retention in year 5):*

- Involvement in all categories and holds leadership responsibilities in at least one category.

*Superior (Necessary for tenure):*

- Involvement in all categories and holds leadership responsibilities in at least two categories

#### IV. ANNUAL EVALUATION OF TENURED EMPLOYEES

The annual evaluation for tenured employees not being considered for promotion or PAI is a process to evaluate each faculty member's work performance and accomplishments. The evaluation shall consist of the review by the Department Chair/Director of the required material and other professionally-related materials, including work in progress done since the last evaluation. Faculty will be evaluated in the areas of teaching, research, and service using the standards of Exemplary and Adequate performance as described below:

The standard for Exemplary performance is described as: Superior teaching/performance of primary duties; significant research/creative activity; and significant service during the evaluation period as specified in the DAC. Exemplary performance is required for consideration of tenure by exceptionality and promotion by exceptionality, as well as for professional advancement increases.

The standard for Adequate performance is described as: Effective teaching/performance of primary duties; satisfactory research/creative activity; and satisfactory service during the evaluation period as specified in the DAC. Adequate is represented by evidence of research/scholarly activity and participation in the scholarly community beyond campus in keeping with the level of resources available to the Faculty member. One research/scholarly activity from category I or II must be accomplished and demonstrated annually, and one Category I.i. or iii within three years.

The evaluation shall include:

- (a) Required student course evaluations;
- (b) Peer or chair course evaluations at least once in a two-year period;
- (c) Syllabi from all courses taught in evaluation period;
- (d) Materials submitted by the employee to substantiate performance in each of the areas of teaching/primary duties, research/creative activity and service; and
- (e) Materials in the employee's personnel file.

Relevant materials include evidence of professional advancement and development such as receipt of continuing education units, engagement in accreditation or curriculum revisions, presentations (papers or posters) at professional conferences, and renewal of certificates or licensure.

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 statement for inclusion in the personnel file. After the review, the Dean will forward her/his recommendation to the Provost.

Failure to meet the **Adequate** standard for two consecutive years in any given area shall trigger a one-year appraisal and professional development process, as developed by the Professional Development Mentoring Committee. The Committee shall be formed of a total of seven members. There shall be three Administration-appointed and three UPI-appointed members who

shall jointly choose an additional member and this committee of seven will select the Chairperson.

This Committee shall meet regularly to develop a mentoring process to assist any tenured faculty member who fails to meet the **Adequate** standard as described above. This Committee shall draft language describing the process in detail, including a procedure for identifying mentors and for determining appropriate benchmarks for assessing development. This Committee will identify the policy and procedures for this process. They will include:

- (a) Identification and development of the appropriate resources;
- (b) Development of the mentoring process and identification of the mentors; and
- (c) Determination of appropriate benchmarks and evaluation process for assessing development.

If a faculty member fails to participate in the development and implementation of a Professional Development Plan (third year) and does not meet the **Adequate** standard in the area under review in the following year (fourth year), a sanction up to and including termination may be initiated following the procedures in Article 5. (**Article 19.4.c. 1-4**)

## **V. Tenure by Exceptionality**

### Consideration for Tenure on the Basis of Exception

- A. An employee who does not satisfy either (1) the educational requirements for tenure described in Section 22.6.a, above, or (2) the years of service requirement specified in Section 22.6.b, above, may apply for consideration for tenure in her/his third, fourth, fifth, or sixth year of fulltime service in the bargaining unit at the University on the basis of exceptional performance in at least two of the following areas: teaching/performance of primary duties, research/creative activity, or service. If the employee elects to submit a portfolio early for tenure, then that individual is responsible for notifying the Department Chair and the Contract Administrator in writing by the time specified in the Personnel Action Timetable for his/her retention portfolio submission. This request should state that the individual is deferring consideration for retention and submitting a portfolio for tenure under the exceptionality clause of the Contract. The Contract Administrator will respond in writing of acceptance and copy the UPI Chapter President.
- B. An employee who applies for consideration for tenure on the basis of Section 22.7.a shall present evidence in support of her/his claim of exceptional performance to the Department Personnel Committee and the Department Chair.
- C. If the Department Personnel Committee and the Department Chair concur that the employee should be recommended for tenure, written recommendations, supported with written reasons based on evaluation criteria, application of criteria, and materials as specified in Section 19.4, shall be prepared and transmitted by the Department Chair and the Department Personnel Committee as provided in Sections 22.9 through 22.13 of the contract, during the period for tenure review as specified in the Personnel Action Timetable.
- D. If the employee is not in her/his final probationary year, and if the employee subsequently applies for consideration for tenure as an exception to the educational requirements or years of service requirements for tenure, her/his application shall be considered and transmitted as provided in Sections 22.9 through 22.13 of the contract.
- E. For the Department of Public Health, candidates for tenure on the basis of exception must meet the criteria of superior for teaching (pg. 8), research (pg. 12), and service (pg. 14).

## VI. RESEARCH, CLINICAL AND UNIT B FACULTY

Faculty appointment as a lecturer may be offered to qualified Research, Clinical, and Unit B candidates with a Master's degree or individuals enrolled in doctoral programs in a health or related discipline. Research, Clinical, and Unit B candidates who have completed a doctoral degree, may apply for tenure-track, research or clinical faculty appointment in the relevant department in the College. Consideration for such an appointment may depend on budget availability of vacant line and funding for the position.

Research, Clinical, and Unit B faculty will be evaluated based on their teaching/primary duties and well as their service to the University. Documentation must be provided in the portfolio to demonstrate compliance with the required conditions for continuing employment as stated in this document. After one year of employment, an evaluation portfolio should be submitted to the department chairperson following the University Personnel Timetable.

For teaching/primary duties performance, Research, Clinical, and Unit B faculty will be evaluated using the same criteria and submission guidelines (e.g., in terms of syllabi and course materials) as Unit A faculty for the "satisfactory" level of performance. In addition to meeting the "Condition for Continuing Employment" described in this document, Research, Clinical, and Unit B faculty must maintain "satisfactory" performance in the teaching/primary duties for their contract to be renewed. Refer to Section III of the contract to identify the standards to be used in evaluating Research, Clinical, and Unit B faculty (Article 33.1). Conditions for multi-year contract for Research, Clinical, and Unit B Lecturers are specified in the UPI contract (Article 30.2).

### Evaluation Procedures for Lecturer or Clinical Faculty

- A. No Lecturer shall be evaluated until she/he has completed one full academic term of service at the University.
- B. Evaluation of employees on Lecturer or Clinical Faculty appointments shall consist of a review of the following by the Department Chair/Supervisor and the Dean/Director where applicable:
  - 1. 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. 90% of student evaluations must be submitted relative to the period of evaluation.
  - 2. Any other materials required by the statement of Departmental Application of Criteria in the area of teaching/primary duties;
  - 3. Any additional materials the employee submits as evidence of the effectiveness of her/his teaching/primary duties;
  - 4. Materials in the employee's personnel file;

**Additional documentation of the materials specified in (2), (3), and (4) above, as requested by the Department Chair/Supervisor**