

Department Application of Criteria



Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences

College of Pharmacy

Chicago State University

2018 - 2022

Hafeez Faridi

Hafeez Faridi, for DPC

Michael Danquah

Michael Danquah, Dept. Chair

Chicago State University Mission and Vision

Chicago State University (CSU) is a public, comprehensive university that provides access to higher education for students of diverse backgrounds and educational needs. The university fosters the intellectual development and success of its student population through a rigorous, positive, and transformative educational experience. CSU is committed to teaching, research, service and community development including social justice, leadership and entrepreneurship.

Chicago State University will be recognized for innovations in teaching and research, and in promoting ethical leadership, entrepreneurship, and social and environmental justice. We will embrace, engage, educate, and empower our students and community to transform lives locally and globally.

Preamble

The purpose of the Departmental Application of Criteria (DAC) is to improve faculty performance and teaching effectiveness through the provision of a structured series of performance indicators and a multi-tiered system of evaluation. The evaluation process is organized to help faculty identify areas of strength and weakness and to assist faculty in documenting growth and development. The DAC is not intended nor should be construed to address areas that constitute ‘conditions of employment’. It addresses the college and university requirement for continual growth and development of faculty in the areas of teaching/primary duties, research/scholarly activity and service. The DAC is organized according to these areas and, for each, identifies categories of accepted activities, their relative importance and methods of evaluation.

The mission of the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences is to empower students with the foundation of knowledge essential to the professional pharmacy curriculum. While providing the highest quality instruction in pharmaceutical sciences, the faculty introduces and develops skills of critical thinking, problem solving and life-long learning in future pharmacists. The members of the faculty serve as role models, nurturing interpersonal skills in pharmacy students during their professional development. In turn, the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences enhances the scholarly development of these faculty members by encouraging them to strive for excellence in critical inquiry. The Department also endeavors to contribute significantly to the Chicago State University College of Pharmacy by excelling in service both within and outside of the College. The activities that constitute growth and development of faculty in this department are directly related to the achievement of this mission.

Composition and Functions of the Department Personnel Committee (DPC)

The DPC will be formed as a committee of the whole faculty of the department. DPC members will be responsible for reviewing annual retention portfolios for faculty in the same or earlier than their current retention year when they are submitted. DPC members reviewing promotion portfolios will be at the same or a higher rank as the rank applied for. Only tenured faculty will be eligible to evaluate tenure portfolios. In case there is not sufficient number of tenured faculty in the DPC, external tenured faculty will be recruited from other CSU departments as members of a special committee to evaluate the submitted portfolio(s).

I. Categories of Materials and Activities, Relative Importance, and Methods of Evaluation

A. Teaching/ Performance of Primary Duties

Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

It is the responsibility of the Department Personnel Committee (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, the

criteria in Table 1 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. Thus, the two aspects of the category Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties are to be weighted in the 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. Materials to be evaluated listed throughout this document are examples and are not intended to be all inclusive. In the case of discrepancy between the two aspects of teaching and performance of primary duties, the DPC must decide on the overall rating.

Relative Importance of Teaching Activities

Activities defined in the yearlong workload plan are most important. Other activities are equally important to each other.

Relative Importance for Criteria for Classroom and Laboratory Performance

Course materials, classroom and site visitations, and student evaluations submitted for evaluation of a faculty member will be weighted equally.

Methods of Evaluation

1. Classroom Evaluations

A minimum of three classroom evaluations will be conducted per evaluation cycle: 2 peer evaluations and a Department Chair evaluation for the same course. The faculty member will select one peer observer and the second will be assigned by the DPC. Observers will complete the evaluation and provide a general rating of the faculty member's teaching according to the following criteria: (1) clarity of presentation, (2) mastery of subject material, (3) appropriate level of student involvement and (4) classroom management. Department Chairs are additionally responsible for evaluation of student assessment materials. Observers are responsible for rating the faculty member in each domain as exceeds expectations, meets expectations or does not meet expectations.

Upon receiving the observer evaluations, the DPC will assign an observation rating based on the following criteria:

Superior: Faculty exceeds expectations in all four criteria

Significant: Faculty exceeds expectations in three of the four criteria and meets expectations in one criterion.

Highly Effective: Faculty exceeds expectation in two of the four criteria and meets expectations in two criteria.

Effective: Faculty exceeds expectation in one of the four criteria and meets expectations in three criteria.

Highly Satisfactory: Faculty meets expectations in all four of the criteria.

Satisfactory: Faculty meets expectations in subject mastery, presentation clarity, and classroom management

Unsatisfactory: Faculty does not meet expectations for a satisfactory rating

Upon assignment of observation ratings, the DPC will develop a single rating based on the following scale:

Superior: 66% of all evaluations must be Superior and assessment ranking must exceed expectations

Significant: 66% of all evaluations must be Significant or higher and assessment ranking must meet expectations

Highly Effective: 66% of all evaluations must be Highly Effective or higher

Effective: 66% of all evaluations must be Effective or higher

Highly Satisfactory: 67% of all evaluations must be Highly Satisfactory or higher **Satisfactory:** 66% of all evaluations must be Satisfactory or higher

Post-tenure faculty

Exemplary: 66% of all evaluations must be Significant or higher and evaluation of assessment must exceed expectations

Adequate: 66% of all evaluations must be Effective or higher

2. Student Evaluations

The faculty member will submit a summary of all university-authorized student evaluations conducted during the evaluation period. The evaluation questions are grouped into three categories: (i) Professionalism, (ii) Content/Knowledge and (iii) Presentation skill. Faculty must submit student evaluation summaries with each category listed which will be evaluated according to the following rating scale:

Superior: Faculty must achieve a mean 4.01 rating in all three categories

Significant: Faculty must achieve a mean 3.75 rating in two of the three categories and a 3.5 in the third

Highly Effective: Faculty must achieve a mean 3.5 rating in all three categories

Effective: Faculty must achieve a mean 3.5 rating in two of the three categories and a 3.0 in the third

Highly Satisfactory: Faculty must achieve a mean 3.0 rating in all three categories

Satisfactory: Faculty must achieve a mean 3.0 rating in two of the three categories.

In the event of unusual circumstances, such as low response rates, experimental pedagogy, the faculty member and Department chair may submit statements to provide clarity for DPC consideration.

3) Distance Education

The Distance Education Plan is available upon request from the chair of the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences. The Department will evaluate the effectiveness of a Distance Education course by the use of 3 groups of evaluators:

a. The **Department Chairperson** with ad-hoc advice from the appropriate curriculum committee(s), shall assess the quality and currency of the materials. If the Department Chairperson does not feel technically qualified to perform the assessment, he/she may appoint an ad-hoc faculty committee to do the review. The course materials should contain a syllabus summarizing information concerning the objectives, operation, and management of the course. If one of the objectives is research, it should contain a list of research resources and a description of how to use these resources.

b. The **Distance Learning Department** shall assess the effectiveness of the course offerings, materials and the timely responses of the instructor from a technical perspective.

c. 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 by the University Evaluation Website: <http://www.csu.edu/course-eval>.

4) Criteria for evaluating faculty teaching, research and service

A1. Teaching

Activities	Materials to be Evaluated
a) Classroom and laboratory performance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 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 for each different course taught during the evaluation period. 3. All peer and/or chair evaluations during the evaluation period. 4. A summary of all student course evaluation(s). 5. If applicable, the following additional materials may be submitted: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Materials from tutoring and help sessions. b. Evidence of training/mentoring students/assistants.
b) Curriculum/Course development or revision	Original instructional materials such as new lab experiments, original homework problems, novel/original learning aids, updates to lecture material to reflect current standards of practice, etc.
c) Professional development for teaching improvement [§]	Documentation of participation in activities that contribute to course development and improved teaching.

[§]Refer to the Faculty Development Plan form

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

Relative Importance of Performance of Primary Duties

The division of workload between teaching and primary duties, as according to the yearlong, will dictate the relative importance of these two categories.

Activities	Materials to be Evaluated
a) Academic advising of pharmacy learning communities	Calendar of meetings and/or synopsis of activities and evaluations conducted with small learning groups.
b) Serving as chair for a major standing committee (Curriculum, Assessment, Academic Standing, and Admission)	Submission of end of year report of committee activities.
c) Training of personnel	Where appropriate, evidence of personnel training (i.e. tutors, chemical disposal training, residents, lab assistants, etc.) should be documented.
d) Professional development for program improvement	Documentation of workshops, training courses or other development programs related to the duty.

e) Program performance plus attendance at required meetings and completion of reports	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Documentation of attendance at College and University meetings as appropriate. 2. Documentation of the maintenance of appropriate and accessible records and copies of submitted reports. 3. Copies of the results of assessment instruments, progress reports, surveys, questionnaires and/or annual evaluation reports as appropriate 4. 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 Part II Research Scholarly Activity, A. Conduct.
f) Program improvement/acquisition of resources	Documentation of significant improvements to a program and/or acquisition of resources to improve a primary duty activity should be provided and explained.
g) Other duties	Documentation of participation in teaching activities which are not included in the CUE assignments, e.g. guest lecturing in other COP courses (syllabus, lecture, and exam); teaching awards (copy of award certificate or equivalent); APPE academic rotations (copy of preceptor assignment letter); other similar activities

Other Supporting Materials

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

B. Research/Creative Activity Guidelines for Evaluation of Research/Creative Activity

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. Research output will be evaluated as sufficient in accordance with the infrastructure available to the candidate. Research activities are mutually exclusive with activities credited as either Teaching/Primary duties or Service. For the purpose of assigning a performance standard to the degree of effectiveness of research/creative activity, the criteria in Table 1 will be followed. The two aspects of the category Research/Scholarly Activity will be evaluated in two parallel sections: B1) The Conduct of Research, and B2) Research Productivity.

Relative Importance of Conduct of Research Activities

All activities in the conduct of research area will carry equal weight with the exception of B1a.

Relative Importance of Research Productivity Activities

The publication of peer reviewed articles and being PI/Co-PI on a successful, competitive grant are the most important and of equal value. These two activities are evaluated cumulatively based on activities completed at CSU. All other activities are of equal value and are evaluated according to the guidelines in Table 1.

B1. The Conduct of Research

Activities	Materials to be Evaluated
a) Develop a research plan	Research plan.
b) Research performance	A synopsis of research/scholarly progress since the last evaluation, as well as evidence of equipment/laboratory procurement, library research, and other formative activities.
c) Student research training	A statement of how students are involved in research, the student's names and their specific contribution to the research effort.
d) Upgrade of research lab/tools/resources	Evidence of improvements made to research infra-structure.
e) Professional development for research improvement [§]	Documentation of attendance at workshops or other development activity.

[§] Refer to the Faculty Development Plan form

Materials which may be submitted in the evaluation portfolio include anything appropriate for documenting the B1 activities.

B2. Research Productivity

Activities	Materials to be Evaluated
a) Peer reviewed publications	Copies of all peer reviewed publications, abstracts, books and book chapters.
b) PI/Co-PI/Contributor on a successful, competitive, external grant	The cover page, abstract, and grant award letters of successful grants.
c) Non-peer reviewed publications, internal grants, or non-competitive grants	1. Evidence to support authorship or co-authorship of a book, book chapter or review article. 2. The cover page, abstract, and grant award letters of successful internal grants.
d) Faculty or student presentations	1. Conference proceedings which list the candidate's presentations and /or contributions. 2. Conference proceedings which list student presentations and contributions for which the candidate served as mentor. 3. Research presentation outside of the college/university.
e) Pending or unsuccessful grants, publications, or presentations	1. Representative samples of research, grants, or manuscripts in progress. 2. If applicable, Grant or manuscript reviewer's comments of successful and unsuccessful grants may be submitted.
f) Co-PI/Contributor/Consultant on collaborative grant activities at CSU and/or with other institutions (which don't otherwise qualify as a B1 activity)	Evidence of participation (in roles other than PI or co-PI) in successful collaborative grant activities at CSU and/or with other institutions. These may include professional correspondence and thank you letter.
g) Other Activities	Evidence of other research activities and productivity, e.g. research awards; honors/recognition; adjunct position; other similar activities.

C. Service

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 following the criteria outlined in Table 1. All activities receiving credit for service provision must be professional discipline-related or related to health professional education and/or promotion. Service activities are also mutually exclusive with activities in the categories of teaching/primary duties and research/scholarly activity. Activities listed in this section are provided as examples and are not intended to be all inclusive. The DPC is to provide guidance to faculty regarding activities that may receive credit for service provision. For purposes of evaluation, Service will be evaluated through two separate measures: C1) Internal activities, and C2) External activities. The internal and external areas of evaluation encompass the major areas of service activities provided to the department, college, university, profession and community, as well as activities that lead to achieving the university's vision and mission.

Relative Importance of Service Activities

Service on required departmental, college or university committees is considered the most important. All other service is considered equally important.

C1. Internal Activities

Activities	Materials to be Evaluated
a) Participation in assigned department, college, and university standing committees and task force	A list of committees assigned and a letter from the chair of the committee confirming attendance at meetings.
b) Participation in department, college, and assigned university <i>ad hoc</i> committees	A list of committees assigned and a letter from the chair of the committee confirming attendance at meetings.
c) Participation in university wide committees that are not assigned	A list of committees and evidence of attendance at meetings.
d) Advisor of student groups recognized by the College of Pharmacy and/or Chicago State University	Evidence of serving as advisor to a student group recognized by the College of Pharmacy and/or Chicago State University.
e) Administrative duties	Evidence of providing assistance to the Chairperson or other member of the administration.
f) Internal (university-wide) presentations or guest lectures	Documentation of presentations representing the COP or guest lectures in non-COP courses.
g) Admissions Interviews	Documentation of participation in at least 80% of the assigned interview dates for program candidates.
h) Supervision of students	Documentation of assisting in the supervision of students for courses not otherwise designated in the faculty members workload, including helping colleagues proctor exams or helping with workshops.
i) Faculty Candidate Interviews	Itineraries of candidate interview schedules
j) Additional Service Activities	Documentation of participating in other activities for COP or CSU.

C2. External Activities

Activities	Materials to be Evaluated
a) Presentations	Documentation of presentations outside of the university.
b) Membership in Professional Organization	Documentation of self-funded organization membership.
c) Service to the profession.	Documentation of service to professional organizations.
d) Service as a grant, book, or manuscript reviewer	Letters of acknowledgment of the review activity.
e) Mentor program	Documentation of participating as a mentor.
f) Service as a conference organizer	Evidence documenting organizing a conference.
g) Community or government volunteers	Evidence of participation in community or government activities where the applicant's expertise is applicable.
h) Serving as member of a M.S. or Ph.D. student advisor committee	Documentation of serving as a member of a M.S. or Ph.D. student advisor committee.
i) Additional Service Activities	Representing the department and/or university at external functions. Guest lecturing outside the College.

II. 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.

Personnel Action	Evaluation Cycle	Teaching/Primary Duties	Research/Scholarly Activity	Service
Retention: All faculty	Probationary Year 1	Satisfactory	Appropriate	Appropriate
	Probationary Year 2	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
	Probationary Year 3	Effective	Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory
	Probationary Year 4	Highly Effective	Effective	Effective
	Probationary Year 5	Significant	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
Tenure	Year 6	Superior	Significant	Significant
Promotion: Assistant to Associate Professor		Superior	Significant	Significant
Promotion: Associate to Full Professor		Superior	Superior	Superior
Tenure by exception	A faculty may apply for consideration for tenure in her/his fourth, fifth or sixth year of full-time service in the bargaining unit at the university on the basis of exceptional/above superior performance in the area of research and at least one of the following areas: teaching/performance of primary duties or service.			

III. ANNUAL EVALUATION OF TENURED EMPLOYEES

Tenured Faculty submit differently on alternate years: Year 1 (beginning Spring 2021), a summary of work in each area (teaching-performance of primary duties/research-creative activity/service) and Year 2 (beginning Spring 2022), a portfolio with complete documentation. In either year, the Department Chair/Director and Dean may request additional documentation.

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

Required 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.

Post-tenure performance descriptor	<u>Teaching/Primary duties</u>	<u>Research/Scholarly activity</u>	<u>Service</u>
Adequate	Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
Exemplary	Significant	Significant (one year)	Significant (one year)

Failure to meet the “Adequate” standard for two consecutive years in any given area shall trigger a one-year appraisal as defined in Article 19.4, C.3 of the 2010-2015 Faculty Contract and following procedures established by the University’s Professional Development Mentoring Committee (PDMC).

IV. DEPARTMENT APPLICATION CRITERIA – UNIT B

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. All unit B employees will be evaluated by the Department Chair.

B. Contractual Evaluation Criteria

Table I.B Contractual Evaluation Criteria Personnel Action	Teaching/ Primary Duty	Research/ Scholarship	Service
Retention	Satisfactory/Highly Effective	N/A	N/A

C. Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences Minimum Requirements for Retention

In order for a candidate to be successful in 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 are detailed in section II.

TABLE I.C Minimum Requirements for Retention

Performance Descriptor	Teaching/ Primary Duty	Research/ Scholarship	Service
Satisfactory	Meet all the standards set forth in the Performance of Teaching Criteria in Section II and receive a "Satisfactory" rating or better in peer or chairperson evaluations.	NA	NA
Highly Effective	Meet all the standards set forth in the Performance of Teaching Criteria in Section II and receive a "Highly Effective" rating or better in peer or chairperson evaluations plus any 2 other A1 or A2 activities.	NA	NA

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 are 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 follow immediately afterwards. A summary breakdown of the evaluation criteria for both Teaching A1 and

Primary Duties A2 are shown in the table below. Detailed evaluation criteria expectations follow in sections A1 for Teaching and A2 for Primary Duties.

Table II.A Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

A. TEACHING/PRIMARY DUTIES	
A1.1.a TEACHING	A2.1.a PRIMARY DUTIES
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

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 practicals, 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, 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 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.

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 the maintenance of appropriate and accessible records and copies of submitted reports
- (4). Copies of the results of assessment instruments, progress reports, surveys, questionnaires and/or annual evaluation reports as appropriate
- (5). Documentation of workshops, training courses or other development programs related to the duty.
- (6) A summary of completed advisor surveys compiled by the Chair.

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

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.

V. UNIT A PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA

A. Teaching/Primary Duties

A1. Teaching	A2. Primary Duties
a) Classroom and laboratory performance	a) Academic advising of pharmacy learning communities
b) Curriculum/Course development or revision	b) Serving as chair for a major standing committee (Curriculum, Assessment, Academic Standing, and Admission)
c) Professional development for teaching improvement	c) Training of personnel
	d) Professional development for program improvement
	e) Program performance plus attendance at required meetings and completion of reports
	f) Program improvement/acquisition of resources
	g) Other Duties

B. Research/Scholarly Activity

B1. The Conduct of Research	B2. Research Productivity
a) Develop a research plan	a) Peer reviewed publications
b) Research performance	b) PI/Co-PI/Contributor on a successful, competitive, external grant
c) Student research training	c) Non-peer reviewed publications, internal grants, or non-competitive grants
d) Upgrade of research lab/tools/resources	d) External faculty or student presentations
e) Professional development for research improvement	e) Pending or unsuccessful grants, publications, or presentations
	f) Co-PI/Contributor/Consultant on collaborative grant activities at CSU and/or with other institutions (which don't otherwise qualify as a B1 activity)
	g) Other Activities

C. Service

C1. Internal Activities	C2. External Activities
a) Participation in assigned department, college, and university standing committees	a) Presentations
b) Participation in department, college, and assigned university <i>ad hoc</i> committees	b) Membership in Professional Organization
c) Participation in university wide committees that are not assigned	c) Service to the profession.
d) Advisor of student groups recognized by the College of Pharmacy and/or Chicago State University	d) Service as a grant, book, or manuscript reviewer
e) Administrative duties	e) Mentor program
f) Internal (university-wide) presentations or guest lectures	f) Service as a conference organizer
g) Admissions Interviews	g) Community or government volunteers
h) Supervision of students	h) Serving as member of a M.S. or Ph.D. student advisor committee
i) Faculty Candidate Interviews	i) Additional Service Activities
j) Additional Service Activities	

TABLE 1: Faculty Performance Criteria

Performance Descriptor	Teaching/Primary Duties	Research/ Scholarship	Service
Appropriate	NA	B1a	C1a <u>plus</u> 1 other C1 or C2 activity
Satisfactory	Receive a “ Satisfactory ” rating or better in classroom observations and student evaluations related to A1a <u>plus</u> two A1c activities	B1a <u>plus</u> one other B1 or B2 activity	Two C1a activities <u>plus</u> two other C1 or C2 activity
Highly Satisfactory	NA	B1b <u>plus</u> two other B1 or B2 activities	Two C1a activities <u>plus</u> one other C1 activity AND one C2 activity
Effective	Receive an “ Effective ” rating or better in classroom observations and student evaluations related to A1a <u>plus</u> two A1c activities AND one A2 activity	B1b <u>plus</u> one other B1 or B2 with the <u>exception</u> of B1a AND one other B2 activity	Two C1a activities <u>plus</u> two other C1 activities AND one C2 activity
Highly Effective	Receive a “ Highly Effective ” rating or better in classroom observations and student evaluations related to A1a <u>plus</u> two A1c activities AND one A2 activity	B1b AND one B2a or B2b <u>plus</u> two other B1 or B2 activities with the <u>exception</u> of B1a	Two C1a activities <u>plus</u> two other C1 activities AND two C2 activities
Significant	Receive a “ Significant ” rating or better in classroom observations and student evaluations related to A1a <u>plus</u> two A1c activities AND two other A1 or A2 activities	<u>One year:</u> B1b <u>plus</u> two other <u>B1 or B2</u> activities with the <u>exception</u> of B1a AND two B2a or B2b <u>Cumulative:</u> B1b <u>plus</u> three <u>B2a or B2b</u> AND six other B1 or B2 activities with the <u>exception</u> of B1a	<u>One year:</u> Two C1a activities <u>plus</u> four other C1 activities AND three C2 activities <u>Cumulative:</u> Eight C1a activities <u>plus</u> Ten other C1 activities AND six C2 activities

<p>Superior</p>	<p><u>One year:</u> Receive a “Superior” rating or better in either classroom observations or student evaluations with a “Significant” in the other <u>plus</u> two A1c activities AND three A2 activities</p> <p><u>Cumulative:</u> Receive same evaluation ratings as above <u>plus</u> six A1c activities AND four other activities</p>	<p><u>One year:</u> B1b <u>plus</u> three (B2a or B2b) AND two other B1, with the <u>exception</u> of B1a, or B2 activities</p> <p><u>Cumulative:</u> B1b <u>plus</u> four <u>B2a or B2b</u> AND six other B1 or B2 activities with the <u>exception</u> of B1a</p>	<p><u>One year:</u> Two C1a plus six other C1 activities AND four C2 activities</p> <p><u>Cumulative:</u> Eight C1a activities <u>plus</u> twelve other C1 activities AND eight C2 activities</p>
<p>Exceptional</p>	<p>Receive a “Superior” rating or better in either classroom observations or student evaluations with a “Superior” in the other <u>plus</u> eight A1c activities AND ten A2 activities</p>	<p>B1b plus five B2a or B2b (at least one of which must be B2b) AND six other B1 or B2 activities with the exception of B1a</p>	<p>Eight C1a activities plus Thirteen other C1 activities AND nine C2 activities</p>

*Note: Completion of multiple activities that fall under the listed categories in the above table count as separate activities. For example, publishing two peer-reviewed papers counts as two B2(a) activities

#The above-mentioned criteria are applicable to both tenure-track and tenured faculty as appropriate.



**Chicago State University College of Pharmacy Peer/Chairperson
Observation & Evaluation Form**

Faculty Name: _____ **Course Name:** _____ **Semester:** _____ **Date:** _____

INSTRUCTIONS: You are requested to observe and evaluate a faculty member’s degree of effectiveness in teaching as part of the College and University’s overall faculty assessment program. Please read each criterion carefully and provide your input thoughtfully. Guidelines are given for each domain to aid in your evaluation efforts. Please note that all guidelines may not be applicable in a given observation. This list is also not exhaustive. The peer observer is encouraged to use any guidelines deemed appropriate for each criterion. For each stated criterion, select the rating that best reflects the faculty member’s performance. At the conclusion of the observation and evaluation process, indicate an overall rating for the faculty member. Please be sure to include specific comments, particularly if the rating selected is “needs improvement.”

	Criteria	Comments (if any)	Rating (select one)
1	<p>Clarity of Presentation</p> <p>The Faculty Member:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly states, either orally or in writing (e.g., handout/syllabus) the objectives for the subject area. • Provides an overview of what is planned for the class period. • Has lecture objectives that align with the overall course objectives. • Uses appropriate pedagogy to convey material (e.g., lecture, discussion, demonstration, etc.) Speaks clearly and audibly. • Speaks at an appropriate pace. 		<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement
2	<p>Mastery of Subject Material</p> <p>The Faculty Member:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appears well prepared for class presentations. • Appears knowledgeable and up-to-date about subject area. • Presents material at a depth that is appropriate to the type of course and student level. • Explains concepts effectively, providing examples when appropriate. 		<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explains difficult concepts or problems effectively. 		
3	<p>Appropriate Level of Student Involvement</p> <p>The Faculty Member:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stimulates discussion and classroom interaction. Uses eye contact effectively. Is responsive to students' comments and feedback. 		<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement
4	<p>Classroom Management</p> <p>The Faculty Member:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses appropriate instructional supports (PowerPoint, overheads, other AV) effectively. Demonstrates enthusiasm toward the subject area. Answers students' questions clearly and directly. Begins and ends classes on time (Uses class time effectively). Creates an atmosphere conducive to learning. 		<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement

Additional Comments, if any:

Overall Rating:

Select an overall rating for the faculty using the following scale:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Superior	Faculty exceeds expectations in all four criteria
<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	Faculty exceeds expectations in three of the four criteria and meets expectations in one criterion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Highly Effective	Faculty exceeds expectation in two of the four criteria and meets expectations in two criteria
<input type="checkbox"/>	Effective	Faculty meets expectations in all four criteria
<input type="checkbox"/>	Highly Satisfactory	Faculty meets expectations in three of the criteria, including subject mastery and presentation clarity
<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory	Faculty meets expectations in subject mastery and presentation clarity
<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory	Faculty does not meet expectations for a Satisfactory rating

Observer's Name: _____

Date: _____

**Chicago State University
Faculty Development Plan**

Academic Year _____

NAME -----

TITLE -----

The form below is designed to represent a faculty member’s plan for development in his or her work at Chicago State University. It should be developed with a conscious effort to be measurable and to represent fulfillment of contractual obligations as specified by the relevant Departmental Application of Criteria. Complete the form below in your position and submit to your chairperson as an input for your annual evaluation. The plan iteration should be prospective, not retrospective. That is it should be written in Year N as a statement of the plan for Year N+1 and following.

Criteria (as applicable)	Goal for the Year	Resources Needed to Attain Goal	Vehicles to Accomplish by the End of the Year	Relationship to Strategic Plan (Specify)	Relationship to Relevant Professional Standards
Teaching (as applicable)					
Other Primary Duties (specify)					
Research/Creative Activity Presentations					

**Chicago State University
Faculty Development Plan**

Academic Year _____

Publications					
Grantsmanship (Submitted, implementation involvement, progress reports)					
Service					
Department Level					
College Level					
University Level					

Employee Date

Chairperson/Program Director Date

Dean Date