

# Department Application of Criteria – Unit A

Department of Chemistry and Physics  
Chicago State University

Approved by the Departmental Personnel Committee, Sept 12, 2012

Approved by the Departmental Chairperson, September 13, 2012

All tenure and tenure-track faculty, faculty applying for promotion, professional advancement increase, and lecturers will be evaluated by the Department Personnel Committee (DPC). Tenured faculty will be evaluated by their chair or dean, using the standards specified herein. All lecturers will be evaluated annually. The DPC evaluation of lecturers will constitute an informal written recommendation to the Chair, which will not be included in their personnel file.

## I. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

### A. 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.

### B 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 2010-2015 in Article 19.3.b.2 are shown in the table below with the Minimum Requirements for each category shown in Section I C below.

Table I.B Contractual Evaluation Criteria

Personnel Action	Teaching/ Primary Duty	Research/ 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/Exemplary	Adequate/Exemplary	Adequate/Exemplary
PAI	Superior	Superior/Significant	Superior/Significant

## C Department Of Chemistry and Physics 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 section II, below must meet the minimum requirements in the table below:

**Table I.C Minimum Requirements for Retention and Promotion**

Performance Descriptor	Teaching/Primary Duties	Research/ Scholarly Activity	Service
<b>Appropriate</b>	NA	Any B1.1.a or B2.1.1.a activity*	Any C1.1.a activity
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Meet all the standards set forth in the Performance of Teaching Criteria and receive a "Satisfactory" rating or better in peer evaluations, (and satisfactory A2 if applicable)	B1.1.a.(1) plus 2 other B1.1.a or B2.1.a activities	C1.1.a.(1) plus 2 other C1.1.a or C2.1.a activities.
<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	NA	B1.1.a.(1) plus 2 other B1.1.a or B2.1.a activities	C1.1.a.(1) plus 2 other C1.1.a and 1 C2.1.a activities
<b>Effective</b>	Meet all the standards set forth in the Performance of Teaching Criteria and receive an "Effective" rating or better in peer evaluations plus any other A1.1.a activity (and Satisfactory A2 plus any other A2 activity if applicable)	B1.1.a.(1) plus 2 other B1.1.a or B2.1.a activities	C1.1.a.(1) plus 2 other C1.1.a and 2 C2.1.a activities.
<b>Highly Effective</b>	Meet all the standards set forth in the Performance of Teaching Criteria and receive a "Highly Effective" rating or better in peer evaluations plus any 2 other A1.1.a activities (and satisfactory A2 plus any other activity if applicable)	B1.1.a.(1) plus 3 other B1.1.a activities and 3 B2.1.a activities.	C1.1.a.(1) plus 2 other C1.1.a and 3 C2.1.a activities
<b>Significant</b>	Meet all the standards set forth in the Performance of Teaching Criteria and receive a "Significant" rating or better in peer evaluations plus any 2 other A1.1.a activities (and satisfactory A2.1.a plus any other A1.1.a activity if applicable)	B1.1.a.(1) plus 12 other B1.1.a activities and 10 B2.1.1 activities including 2 B2.1.a.(1) activities.	C1.1.a(1) plus 12 other C1.1.a and 10 C2 activities, including at least 1 C2.1.a.(1) or C2.1.a(2) activities.
<b>Superior</b>	Meet all the standards set forth in the Performance of Teaching Criteria and receive a "Superior" rating in peer evaluations plus any 2 other A1.1.a activities and an "Effective" rating in the remaining A1.1.a activities; plus an effective rating in the A2.1.a activities.	B1.1.a.(1) plus 12 other B1.1.a activities and 10 B2.1.a activities including 4 B2.1.a.(1) activities.	C1.1.a(1) plus 12 other C1.1.a and 10 C2 activities, including at least 2 C2.1.a.(1) or C2.1.a(2) activities.
<b>Exceptional</b>	The term exceptional shall be defined as exceeding the minimum requirements 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.			

## II. CATEGORIES OF MATERIALS AND ACTIVITIES, RELATIVE IMPORTANCE, AND METHODS OF EVALUATION

### A. Teaching/ Performance of Primary Duties

The two aspects of the category Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties are to be weighted in

their evaluation in proportion to the assignment of CUEs for that aspect. Because each of these aspects is quite different, the categories, importance, criteria, and guidelines for each aspect will be covered in two parallel sections: **A1. Teaching** and **A2. Performance of Primary Duties**. The teaching section is first and the performance of primary duties follows immediately after and before the research/creative activities. The breakdown of the evaluation criteria for both **Teaching A1** and **Primary Duties A2** are summarized in the table below. Detailed expectations follow in Sections A1 for Teaching and A2 for Primary Duties.

**Table II.A Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties**

<b>A. TEACHING/PRIMARY DUTIES</b>	
<b>A1.1.a TEACHING</b>	<b>A2.1.a PRIMARY DUTIES</b>
1. Classroom performance	1. Program performance plus required meetings and reports
2. Assessment activities	
3. Peer Evaluations	2. Personnel training if appropriate
4. Curriculum development and revision	3. Program improvement/acquisition of resources
5. Professional development for teaching improvement and teaching related duties	4. Professional development for program improvement

## **A1. Teaching**

### **1. Categories of Materials and Activities**

#### **a. Activities which will be evaluated are:**

- (1). Classroom and laboratory performance
- (2). Teaching assessment activities
- (3). Peer Evaluations
- (4). Curriculum revision and development
- (5). Professional development for teaching improvement/Performance of other teaching-related duties

#### **b. Materials that must be submitted in the evaluation portfolio:**

- (1). Yearlong workload form and any revised faculty workloads completed by the evaluation
- (2). The course syllabus, the final exam, and a representative hour exam for each different course taught during the evaluation period.
- (3). All class visitation report(s) during the evaluation period.
- (4). Student course evaluation(s) as specified below in A1.3.a.1.(iii)
- (5). Narrative that highlights teaching accomplishments during review.

#### **c. Materials that may be submitted in the evaluation portfolio include but are not limited to:**

- (1). Additional exams and quizzes
- (2). Hand-outs, study guides, objectives
- (3). Original instructional materials such as new lab experiments, original homework problems, novel/original learning aids etc.
- (4). Graded or un-graded student assignments
- (5). Signed statements relating to teaching performance
- (6). Class grade distributions
- (7). Materials from tutoring and help sessions
- (8). Evidence of training/mentoring students/assistants

**2. Relative Importance of Teaching Activities**

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

**3. 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.

**a. Classroom and Laboratory Performance**

**(1). Required Course Materials**

**(i). 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; link to the university student evaluation site <http://www.csu.edu/course-eval>; 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.

**(ii). Exams/quizzes**

Exams and quizzes are submitted for evaluation are expected to reflect the following qualities: balanced coverage of the assigned material, questions which are clearly stated, questions which are appropriate for the level of the course, a length which is appropriate for the time allotted, and a minimum of spelling, grammatical or typographical errors.

**(iii). Student Evaluations**

All faculty members shall give their students, except those enrolled in practica, tutorials, independent study courses, and research courses, the opportunity to evaluate their teaching effectiveness through the student evaluations provided on-line by the University Evaluation Website: <http://www.csu.edu/course-eval>.

The faculty member shall inform students of the evaluation procedure by placing an item in their syllabi that informs the student about the on-line evaluation procedure and gives the University Evaluation Web Address. The results of these evaluations will be provided to the faculty member only after the course grade has been submitted.

**(iv). Other materials**

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

**(2). Relative Importance of Criteria for Classroom and Lab Performance**

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

**b. Teaching Assessment Activities**

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 post-tests 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. In addition the candidate will be required to supply a one-page narrative, analyzing the departmental assessment report.

**c. Peer Evaluations**

Each evaluation shall include the results of at least two recent classroom visitations. Any member of the DPC may request to visit a faculty member's class before his/her evaluation. Two visitors shall be designated by the DPC. These visitors should be in the same (or closely related) area of science as the faculty member being evaluated. Each visit shall be at a mutually agreed upon time, with at least one week's notice, and shall occur at least 15 working days before the DPC deadline for the personnel recommendation in question. Each visitor shall complete the "Classroom Visitation/Evaluation Form". The completed form should be copied to the faculty member visited and submitted to the DPC chairperson at least 15 working days before the DPC deadline. Visitors should be of equal or greater rank if possible. Each visitor shall complete the "Classroom Visitation/Evaluation Form" with narrative attached.

The Department Chairperson will schedule a class visitation with the candidate at a mutually agreed upon time. The Chairperson will use the same forms and evaluation criteria as the DPC.

**d. Curriculum Revision and Development**

These activities include but are not limited to: new course development, new instructional material development and new option development. Effectiveness as measured by adoption and implementation of the proposed courses and options should be documented. Faculty will use a rubric to focus on specific aspects of curriculum development. Instructors will respond to the following questions such as i) Why it was this instructional revision needed? ii) What did you do specifically to design and implement this revision? iii) What are the initial outcomes of your implementation?

**e. 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, 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. Effectiveness as measured by evidence of student success should be documented.

**A2. Performance of Primary Duties (Duties formally assigned CUEs during the academic year, other than teaching).**

These primary duties include but are not limited to the following categories: assessment, student advising, and/or Grant or University related administrative duties.

**1. Categories of Materials and Activities**

**a. Activities which will be evaluated are:**

- (1). Program performance plus attendance at required meetings and completion of reports.
- (2). Training of Personnel
- (3). Program improvement/acquisition of resources

(4). Professional development for program improvement

**b. Materials that must be submitted (if appropriate) in the evaluation portfolio:**

- (1). Statement of assigned duties by supervisor or listing of goals and objectives for grant funded activities,
- (2). An assessment of the faculty member's performance of duty by their direct supervisor.
- (3). Documentation of attendance at College and University meetings as appropriate.
- (4). Documentation of the maintenance of appropriate and accessible records and copies of submitted reports
- (5). Copies of the results of assessment instruments, progress reports, surveys, questionnaires and/or annual evaluation reports as appropriate
- (6). Documentation of workshops, training courses or other development programs related to the duty.
- (7) A summary of completed advisor surveys compiled by the Chair.
- (8). If release time has been granted for research, then a narrative summary of the research performed must be included. Details of the conduct of research however will still be reported in the research section.

**c. Other Materials**

Any other materials may be submitted which serve to document the candidate's performance of their primary duties.

**2. 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.

**3. Performance of Primary Duties Criteria**

**a. 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.

**b. Training of Personnel**

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

**c. 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 (example: an advisor develops a method for improving the quality and efficiency of advising

**d. 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.

**4. 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 Section I.B above, "Performance Evaluation and Evaluation Criteria, and Section I.C Minimum Requirements for Retention and Promotion", will be followed.

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.

## B. Research/Scholarly Activity

For purposes of evaluation, research/scholarly activities will be evaluated through two separate measures: the Conduct of Research and the Productivity of Research. Where the Conduct of Research Evaluation focuses on the starting and maintaining a research effort, while Research Productivity shows the volume of research output. The breakdown of the evaluation criteria for both **Research/Scholarly Conduct B1** and **Productivity B2** are summarized in the table below. Detailed expectations follow in Sections B1 for Research/Scholarly Conduct and B2 for Research/Scholarly Productivity.

**Table B. Research/Scholarly Activity**

<b>B RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY</b>	
<b>B1.1.a CONDUCT</b>	<b>B2.1.a PRODUCTIVITY</b>
1. Research performance	1. Peer reviewed publication or PI/Co-PI/Contributor on a successful competitive external grant
2. Professional development for research improvement	2. Non-peer reviewed publication or internal grant
3. Student research training	3 External faculty or student presentation
4. Set up/maintenance/upgrade of research lab/tools/resources	4. Pending or unsuccessful grants, publications or presentations
5. Service as grant reviewer, book reviewer, manuscript reviewer, professional conference organizer	5. Co-PI/Contributor on collaborative grant activities at CSU and/or with other institutions (that don't otherwise qualify as a B1 activity)
	Note: one B1.1.a or B2.1.a activity per evaluation period can be used to substitute for an A activity if the faculty member wishes.

### B1. The Conduct of Research

The Conduct of Research evaluation area focuses on those activities necessary for starting and maintaining an active research effort.

#### 1. Categories of Materials and Activities

##### a. Activities which will be evaluated are:

- (1). Research performance
- (2). Student research training

- (3). Set-up/maintenance/upgrade of research lab/tools/resources
- (4). Professional development for research improvement
- (5). Service as a grant or manuscript reviewer, or conference organizer

**b. Materials which must be submitted in the evaluation portfolio**

- (1). A narrative of research/scholarly progress since the last evaluation.
- (2). A statement of how students are involved in research, the student's names and their specific contribution to the research effort
- (3). Evidence of improvements made to research infra-structure.
- (4). Documentation of attendance at research conferences, workshops, or other development activity.
- (5). Letters of invitation to serve on grant reviews or to review manuscripts

**c. Materials which may be submitted in the evaluation portfolio, include but are not limited to anything appropriate for documenting the activities in b.**

**2. Relative Importance of Conduct of Research Activities**

The quality of the research performance will be most important followed by the quality of student research training followed by the remaining activities which will carry equal weight.

**3. Performance of Conduct of Research Criteria**

**a. Research Performance**

The quality and quantity of the research effort will be evaluated relative to the expectation level for the desired evaluation period. Newer faculty will be evaluated based on starting up their lab, library research, and other formative activities. More senior faculty will be evaluated based on their level of involvement and amount of output.

**b. Student Research Training**

Faculty will be evaluated based on the quality of the research experience they provide to the student as documented by the faculty's description of the student's contribution to the research effort. 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.

**c. 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 significant and documented.

**d. 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.

**e. 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. Manuscripts (articles, monographs, books or book chapters)



must be research oriented (which can include educational research). Such service must be documented by a copy of the request to serve on the committee.

## **B2. Research Productivity**

**The Research Productivity evaluation area focuses on the quality and volume of the research output.**

### **1. Categories of Materials and Activities**

#### **a. Activities which will be evaluated are:**

- (1). Peer reviewed publications or PI/Co-PI/Contributor on a successful, competitive, external grant
- (2). Non-peer reviewed publication or internal grant
- (3). External faculty or student presentation
- (4). Pending or unsuccessful grants, publications, or presentations
- (5). Co-PI/Contributor on collaborative grant activities at CSU and/or with other institutions (which don't otherwise qualify as a B1 activity).

#### **b. Materials which must be submitted in the evaluation portfolio include:**

- (1). Copies of all publications and abstracts
- (2). The cover page, abstract, and grant award letters of successful grants,
- (3). Conference proceedings which list the candidate's presentations and /or contributions
- (4). Conference proceedings which list student presentations and contributions for which the candidate served as mentor.
- (5). Invitations to review grants, books or articles
- (6). Representative samples of research, grants, or manuscripts in progress
- (7). Evidence documenting organizing a conference

#### **c. Materials which may be included in the evaluation portfolio include but are not limited to:**

- (1). grant or manuscript reviewer's comments
- (2). the cover page, abstract and reviewer comments of unsuccessful grants
- (3). professional correspondence
- (4). thank you letters

### **2. Relative Importance of Research Productivity Activities**

The publication of a peer reviewed article and being PI/co-PI on a successful, competitive, external grant are the most important and of equal value. All other activities are of equal value.

### **3. Performance of Conduct of Research Criteria**

Evaluation of the effectiveness of an employee's research/creative activity will include consideration of: the quality and quantity of research/creative activity; contributions to the employee's discipline or field; extent and nature of national, state, or local recognition of research/creative activity; and nature of research presentations at professional conferences.

#### **a. 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.

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 of a competitive, external grant. If a faculty member wishes any other activity to be considered as meeting these criteria, the burden of proof falls on the faculty member to make the case that the activity was successfully evaluated by external peers, and that it was sufficiently competitive.

**b. 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.

**c. 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. Consideration will be given to the prestige of the conference or institution where the presentation is given, whether the presentation was invited or contributed, and the prestige of the journal, grant, or publisher which solicits the candidate's work.

**d. 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.

**e. Collaborative grant activities at CSU and/or with other institutions (which don't qualify as a B1 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.

**4. 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 Section I.B above "Performance Evaluation and Evaluation Criteria, and Section I.C Minimum Requirements for Retention and Promotion", will be followed

**C. Service**

For purposes of evaluation, service activities will be evaluated through two separate criteria: C1 Internal Service and C2 External Service. Where C1 Internal Service concentrates on Service to Department of Chemistry and Physics and C2 External Service concentrates on the Service to the College, University and the Community. The breakdown of the evaluation criteria for both Internal C1 and External C2 are summarized in the table below. Detailed expectations follow in Sections C1 for Internal Service and C2 for External Service

**Table C. Service Activities**

SERVICE	
C1.1.a. INTERNAL	C2.1.a. EXTERNAL
1. Service on required department committees	1. College committee (formal or ad-hoc) or special college function participation
2. Service on optional department committees	2. University committee (formal or ad-hoc) or special university function participation
3. Non-CUE related service to the department	3. Professional organization service
4. Service Leadership	4. Professionally related community service
	5. Service Leadership

**C1. Internal Service Activities**

**1. Categories of Materials and Activities**

**a. Activities which will be evaluated are:**

**(1). Required Departmental Service**

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

**(2.) Optional Departmental Service**

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

**(3.) Non-CUE Related Departmental Service**

Other department service (for which CUEs are not given) can include but is not limited to: other department committee membership, 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, participation in Science Fair Central, alumni weekends or department open houses.

**(4.). Service Leadership**

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

**C2. External Service Activities**

**1. Categories of Materials and Activities**

**a. Activities which will be evaluated are:**

**(1). College Service Activities**

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

**(2.). University Service Activities**

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

**(3.). 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 ACS, AAPT, and NARST, as well as professional advisory committees.

**(4.). 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.

**(5.). Service Leadership**

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

**b. For both C1 and C2 Service activities, a narrative discussion of service activities must be provided.**

**c. For both C1 and C2 Service activities supporting evidence must be presented for each service activity to be evaluated. Examples of acceptable evidence include but are not limited to:**

- (1). A list of meetings attended for each different committee and one attendance page from one meeting for each committee
- (2). Agendas for events which list the candidate's participation
- (3). Representative thank-you letters for service activities and a list of such letters, if necessary
- (4). Appointment letters for advisory commissions.

**2. Relative Importance of Service Activities**

Service on required departmental committees is considered the most important. All other service is considered equally important.

**3. 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 (see above, Section

19.3.d.(2)); 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. Service activities for which an employee receives compensation will not be included for consideration.

#### **4. 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 Section I.B above "Performance Evaluation and Evaluation Criteria, and Section I.C Minimum Requirements for Retention and Promotion", will be followed.

### **IV. 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.

### **V. DISTANCE LEARNING**

Evaluation of faculty performance in Distance Learning Courses will be conducted according the policies and procedures outlined in the attached document "The Distance Education Policy for the Department of Chemistry and Physics".

### **VI. 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":

#### **A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties:**

1. For annual evaluation of tenured faculty, the "**adequate**" standard is represented by maintenance of standards as evidenced by student course evaluations, course materials, and evidence of contributions to course development; and

2. The "**exemplary**" standard is represented by student course evaluations, course materials, evidence of contributions to course development, curriculum development, and professional development for teaching improvement.

#### **For annual evaluation of tenured faculty, also include the following:**

1. List of any activities not covered above for which CUEs are awarded (if any). A short description of the activity should accompany these items.

#### **B. Research/Creative Activity:**

1. For annual evaluation of tenured faculty, the "**adequate**" standard 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). The evidence of at least two other B1.1.a or B2.1.a activities must be presented.

2. The "**exemplary**" standard 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.

For annual evaluation of tenured faculty, also include the following (if relevant):

A 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.

### C. Service:

1. For annual evaluation of tenured faculty, the “**adequate**” standard is represented by evidence of service and participation at the departmental and college/university levels. The evidence of at least two C1.1.a or C2.1.a activities must be presented.

2. The “**exemplary**” standard is represented by evidence of leadership in service at the departmental, college/university, or community level.

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.**

## VII. 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 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 as defined by the Department Service only. 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 his or her 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.

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. For promotion to research professor: superior research/creative activities; superior teaching/performance of primary duties and and/or significant service through the evaluation period.

## **VIII. 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 this first five years. These standards are listed in Section II of this document. 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.

Clinical Faculty who have attained five or more years of instructional service with the University are eligible for renewable three-year contracts if they have earned “superior” performance evaluations for their teaching/primary duties and “significant” performance evaluations for service in the preceding five-year period, and “highly effective” in the remaining area. The performance standards for maintaining three-year renewable clinical appointments are: “highly effective” teaching/performance of primary duties, and “highly effective” service.

Clinical Faculty is 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.

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

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

## **IX. UNIT B EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The evaluation of Unit B faculty shall be undertaken according to the evaluation methods and criteria expressed in the attached document "Department Application of Criteria- Unit B".

## APPENDIX

### Department of Chemistry and Physics CLASSROOM VISITATION EVALUATION FORM

Faculty Member Being Evaluated \_\_\_\_\_ Class \_\_\_\_\_

Purpose of Evaluation \_\_\_\_\_ Retention in Year \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ Tenure \_\_\_\_\_ Professional Advancement Increase  
\_\_\_\_\_ Promotion to Rank of \_\_\_\_\_

A. Narrative Description Attached:

B. Lecture Evaluation Components:

	Superior Unsatisfactory	Significant	Highly Effective	Effective	Satisfactory	
1. Was the material clearly presented?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. Was the material suitably organized?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. Was the content of the lecture appropriate?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. Was student interest stimulated?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

C. Laboratory Evaluation Components

	Superior Unsatisfactory	Significant	Highly Effective	Effective	Satisfactory	
1. Were the lab materials available and suitable?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. Was an appropriate introduction given to the experiment?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. Was adequate consideration given to safety?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. Was proper decorum maintained?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

D. Overall Teaching Effectiveness Judged:

Superior Unsatisfactory	Significant	Highly Effective	Effective	Satisfactory	
( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Evaluated

By \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_



**Table I.B Contractual Evaluation Criteria**

<b>Personnel Action</b>	<b>Teaching/ Primary Duty</b>	<b>Research/ Scholarship</b>	<b>Service</b>
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/Exemplary	Adequate/Exemplary	Adequate/Exemplary
PAI	Superior	Superior/Significant	Superior/Significant

**Table I.C Minimum Requirements For Retention and Promotion**

<b>Performance Descriptor</b>	<b>Teaching/Primary Duties</b>	<b>Research/ Scholarly Activity</b>	<b>Service</b>
<b>Appropriate</b>	NA	Any B1.1.a or B2.1.1.a activity*	Any C1.1.a activity
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Meet all the standards set forth in the Performance of Teaching Criteria and receive a “Satisfactory” rating or better in peer evaluations, (and satisfactory A2 if applicable)	B1.1.a.(1) plus 2 other B1.1.a or B2.1.a activities	C1.1.a.(1) plus 2 other C1.1.a or C2.1.a activities.
<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	NA	B1.1.a.(1) plus 2 other B1.1.a or B2.1.a activities	C1.1.a.(1) plus 2 other C1.1.a and 1 C2.1.a activities
<b>Effective</b>	Meet all the standards set forth in the Performance of Teaching Criteria and receive an “Effective” rating or better in peer evaluations plus any other A1.1.a activity (and Satisfactory A2 plus any other A2 activity if applicable)	B1.1.a.(1) plus 2 other B1.1.a or B2.1.a activities	C1.1.a.(1) plus 2 other C1.1.a and 2 C2.1.a activities.
<b>Highly Effective</b>	Meet all the standards set forth in the Performance of Teaching Criteria and receive a “Highly Effective” rating or better in peer evaluations plus any 2 other A1.1.a activities (and satisfactory A2 plus any other activity if applicable)	B1.1.a.(1) plus 3 other B1.1.a activities and 3 B2.1.a activities.	C1.1.a.(1) plus 2 other C1.1.a and 3 C2.1.a activities
<b>Significant</b>	Meet all the standards set forth in the Performance of Teaching Criteria and receive a “Significant” rating or better in peer evaluations plus any 2 other A1.1.a activities (and satisfactory A2.1.a plus any other A1.1.a activity if applicable)	B1.1.a.(1) plus 12 other B1.1.a activities and 10 B2.1.1 activities including 2 B2.1.a.(1) activities.	C1.1.a(1) plus 12 other C1.1.a and 10 C2 activities, including at least 1 C2.1.a.(1) or C2.1.a(2) activities.
<b>Superior</b>	Meet all the standards set forth in the Performance of Teaching Criteria and receive a “Superior” rating in peer evaluations plus any 2 other A1.1.a activities and an “Effective” rating in the remaining A1.1.a activities; plus an effective rating in the A2.1.a activities.	B1.1.a.(1) plus 12 other B1.1.a activities and 10 B2.1.a activities including 4 B2.1.a.(1) activities.	C1.1.a(1) plus 12 other C1.1.a and 10 C2 activities, including at least 2 C2.1.a.(1) or C2.1.a(2) activities.
<b>Exceptional</b>	The term exceptional shall be defined as exceeding the minimum requirements 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 II.A Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties**

<b>A. TEACHING/PRIMARY DUTIES</b>	
<b>A1.1.a TEACHING</b>	<b>A2.1.a PRIMARY DUTIES</b>
1. Classroom performance	1. Program performance plus required meetings and reports
2. Assessment activities	
3. Peer Evaluations	2. Personnel training if appropriate
4. Curriculum development and revision	3. Program improvement/acquisition of resources
5. Professional development for teaching improvement and teaching related duties	4. Professional development for program improvement

**Table B. Research/Scholarly Activities**

<b>B RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY</b>	
<b>B1.1.a CONDUCT</b>	<b>B2.1.a PRODUCTIVITY</b>
1. Research performance	1. Peer reviewed publication or PI/Co-PI/Contributor on a successful competitive external grant
2. Professional development for research improvement	2. Non-peer reviewed publication or internal grant
3. Student research training	3 External faculty or student presentation
4. Set up/maintenance/upgrade of research lab/tools/resources	4. Pending or unsuccessful grants, publications or presentations
5. Service as grant reviewer, book reviewer, manuscript reviewer, professional conference organizer	5. Co-PI/Contributor on collaborative grant activities at CSU and/or with other institutions (that don't otherwise qualify as a B1 activity)
	Note: one B1.1.a or B2.1.a activity per evaluation period can be used to substitute for an A activity if the faculty member wishes.

**Table C. Service Activities**

SERVICE	
C1.1.a. INTERNAL	C2.1.a. EXTERNAL
1. Service on required department committees	1. College committee (formal or ad-hoc) or special college function participation
2. Service on optional department committees	2. University committee (formal or ad-hoc) or special university function participation
3. Non-CUE related service to the department	3. Professional organization service
4. Service Leadership	4. Professionally related community service
	5. Service Leadership