April 23, 2021

Dr. Janene Marshall
Department of Pharmacy Practice
College of Pharmacy

RE: Official Transmittal of Presidential Approval
        Departmental Application of Criteria

Dear Dr. Marshall and Faculty:

I have reviewed your Departmental Application of Criteria (DAC) draft recently submitted to the Office of the Provost. Based on my review, I hereby approve the DAC for the Department of Practice. A copy of the approved DAC is included in this communication.

I appreciate the work of the faculty to create this important document. I am confident it will serve to encourage ongoing excellence in the work of the faculty, for the good of your department, the college, and our university.

Sincerely,

Zaldwaynaka Scott, Esq.
President

Attachment: Approved DACs

Cc: L. Roundtree, Interim Provost and Senior Vice President, Academic Affairs
        M. Fete, Dean
        B. Rowan, Associate Provost, Contract Administration
        D. Lynch, President, CSU-UPI Local 4100
        CSU-UPI Employees
        File

Departmental Application of Criteria

Department of Pharmacy Practice
2018 – 2022

_____
Trishia E. Shaw, DPC Chair

_____
Janene Marshall, Dept. Chair

Chicago State University Mission & 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 Departmental Application of Criteria (DAC) provides Department of Pharmacy Practice faculty members with a structured way to document their accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship and service. This information is organized into a portfolio of evidence with artifacts. The portfolio of each faculty member undergoes evaluation by the Department Personnel Committee (DPC). 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", such as the need for clinical faculty to maintain licensure in the State of Illinois. 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 artifacts of evidence, their relative importance and methods of evaluation.

The mission of the Department of Pharmacy Practice is to prepare and empower pharmacy students and pharmacists to become competent providers of pharmacist care in all practice settings. This mission is achieved through a combination of innovative didactic coursework, experiential training, mentoring, scholarship, and community service in partnership with students, pharmacy practitioners and other health care providers and our communities. The Department serves the professional community through the development and evaluation of innovative pharmacy practice models that promote the role of the pharmacist as an integral member of the healthcare team. The activities in this document that constitute growth and development of faculty in this department are directly related to the achievement of this mission.

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

A. Teaching/Primary Duties

Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties
It is the responsibility of the Departmental 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 (page 16) 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 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 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.

Methods of Evaluation
1. Teaching Evaluations
A minimum of three teaching 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 Department Chair. 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. Online or hybrid courses will be evaluated in the same manner as on campus courses in that they must also be evaluated by two peers and the Department Chair. Classroom management will be assessed in a manner consistent with the method of course delivery

Upon reviewing the observer evaluations, the DPC will assign an observation rating based on the following criteria for clinical, non-tenure track faculty:

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 meets expectations in all four criteria

Highly Satisfactory: Faculty meets expectations in three of the criteria, including subject mastery and presentation clarity

Satisfactory: Faculty meets expectations in subject mastery and presentation clarity

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 or higher

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

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

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

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

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

2. Student Evaluations

The faculty member will submit a summary of all university-authorized student evaluations conducted during the evaluation period. Faculty must submit student evaluation summaries which will be evaluated according to the following rating scale 1 through 5:

Superior: Faculty must achieve a mean $\geq$ 3.75 rating on evaluations

Significant: Faculty must achieve a mean between 3.5 – 3.74 rating on evaluations

Highly Effective: Faculty must achieve a mean between 3.25 - 3.49 rating on evaluations

Effective: Faculty must achieve a mean between 3.0 - 3.49 rating on evaluations

Highly Satisfactory: Faculty must achieve a mean between 2.5 – 2.99 rating on evaluations

Satisfactory: Faculty must achieve a mean between 2.0 – 2.49 rating on evaluations

In the event of unusual circumstances, i.e., low response rates or experimental pedagogy, the faculty member and department chair may submit statements to provide clarity for DPC consideration.

Tenured 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

A1. Teaching

Activities	Materials to be Evaluated
a) Classroom, and laboratory performance	- The yearlong workload form and any revised faculty workloads completed by the evaluation date. - The course syllabus or lecture handout, the final exam or test questions contributed to exam and a representative hour exam for each different course taught during the evaluation period. - Classroom evaluations during the evaluation period. - Student evaluations from all courses delivered during the evaluation period - If applicable, the following additional materials can be submitted: - Materials from tutoring and help sessions. - Evidence of training/mentoring students/assistants. - Evidence of teaching performance may also be demonstrated by the receipt of teaching awards.
b) Clinical precepting of Introductory Professional Practice Experience (IPPE) and/or Advanced Pharmacy Practice Experience (APPE) students	- Schedule of IPPE and/or APPE students - Syllabus for APPE Module - Student evaluations - Evidence of precepting performance may also be demonstrated by the receipt of precepting awards (i.e. Preceptor of the Year)
c) Curriculum/course revision and/or development	Original instructional materials such as new lab experiments, original homework problems, novel/original learning aids, updates in sequencing to facilitate integrated instructor or in response to assessment data or curriculum committee request etc.
d) Professional development for teaching, clinical practice/precepting improvement	Documentation of participation in activities that contribute to course development and improve teaching, which includes but not limited to CTRE workshops, AACP teaching seminars, faculty development workshops. Documentation of incorporation of a new technique/information into a course may also be provided
e) Delivery of faculty and preceptor development courses	- Submission of faculty development course program announcement or lecture handout - Submission of the course evaluation form - Submission of summaries course evaluation
f) Preceptor for advanced training program (e.g., residency)	- Goals and objectives for the rotation module - A summary of residency preceptor evaluations

A2. Performance of Primary Duties (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/Mentorship of Pharmacy Students (within learning communities)	• Calendar of meetings and/or • Synopsis of activities conducted with small learning groups. • Evidence of Portfolio Review
b) Serving as chair for a major standing committee	• Submission of committee list denoting individual as chair • Submission of end-of-year committee report
c) Training of personnel	Evidence of training students/assistants (i.e. tutors, chemical disposal training, residents, etc.) should be documented.
d) Professional development for program or clinical practice improvement	Documentation of workshops, training courses or other development programs related to the duty.
e) Serving as primary course coordinator or co-coordinator	Submission of course syllabus with course coordinators listed
f) Guest lectures in other COP courses	Submission of course syllabus
g) Developing and maintaining a clinical practice site	Submission of summary of duties performed at the site • Evaluation from chair (only for year 1) • Evaluation from site supervisor/medical director
h) Coordination of an advanced training program i.e. residency, fellowship or certification	Evidence documenting serving as program coordinator • Goals and Objectives for the program • Summary of participant evaluations
i) Management of ancillary personnel at clinical practice site	• Submission of documents outlining responsibility for personnel management • Submission of job responsibilities at site including responsibility for personnel management

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

B. Research/Scholarly 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 and Scholarly Activity.

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 external grant are the most important and of equal value. These two activities are evaluated cumulatively based on activities completed at the university. 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	Submission of Research Plan
b) Research performance	A synopsis of research/scholarly progress since the last evaluation.
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. - Accepted APPE fourth year Capstone Project Proposal - Project Abstract and/or - IRB application and/or - IRB Approval Letter and/or - Student posters/publications - Documentation of non-Capstone student research projects(i.e. Special Topics in Research courses) - Project Abstract and/or - IRB application and/or - IRB Approval Letter and/or - Student posters/publications
d) Professional development for research improvement	Documentation of attendance at conferences, workshops, webinars or other development activity.

Other Supporting Materials
Materials which may be submitted in the evaluation portfolio include any evidence appropriate for documenting the activities in B1.

B2. Research and Scholarly Activity

Activities	Materials to be Evaluated
a) Peer reviewed publications	Copies of all publications and abstracts.
b) PI or Co-PI on a successful, competitive, external grant	The cover page, abstract, and grant award letters of successful grants.
c) Non-peer reviewed publication; internal or non-competitive, external grants	- Evidence supporting authorship of a book, book chapter or article. - The cover page, abstract, and grant award letters of successful grants. - Copies of abstracts and publications
d) External faculty or student presentations	- Conference proceedings which list the candidate's presentations and /or contributions. - Conference proceedings which list student presentations and contributions for which the candidate served as mentor. - Delivery of peer reviewed presentations and/ or peer reviewed CE presentations - Delivery of non-peer reviewed (invited) presentations
e) Pending or unsuccessful grants, publications, or presentations	Representative samples of research, grants, or manuscripts in progress.
f) Co-PI/Contributor/Consultant on collaborative grant activities at CSU and/or with other institutions (which don't otherwise qualify as a B2b/c 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 letters.
g) Peer reviewed clinical training materials or creative educational products	Copies of training materials or products

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 provided to the department, college, university, profession and community, as well as activities that lead to achievement of the university and college missions.

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 department, assigned college, assigned university standing committees and standing committees at the clinical practice site	• A list of committees assigned and a letter from the chair of the committee confirming attendance at meetings • Meeting minutes from the clinical practice site or a letter from the committee chair
b) Participation in department, assigned college, and assigned university *adhoc* committees	A list of COP committees and a service letter from the chair of the committee
c) Participation in university wide committees that are not assigned	A list of committees and meeting minutes documenting attendance at meetings or events sponsored by the committee
d) Advisor of Student Organizations recognized by the College of Pharmacy and/or Chicago State University	Evidence of serving as an advisor to a student group recognized by the college of pharmacy or CSU. Evidence must include the College/University published list of student organizations and assigned advisors.
e) Administrative duties assigned by the Chair or Dean	Evidence (i.e. service letter) of providing assistance to the Chairperson or other member of the administration.
f) Internal (University-wide) presentations	Documentation of presentations representing the College of Pharmacy or guest lectures in non-pharmacy courses.
g) Admissions Interviews	Documentation of participation in interview dates assigned by the Admissions Committee.
h) Supervision of students for courses	Documentation of assisting in the supervision of students for courses not otherwise designated in the faculty member's workload including workshops, labs, field experiences, assessment activities, or supporting students

	in professional development activities.
i) Faculty Candidate Interviews	Documentation of participation in the interview process for prospective faculty members/administrators for the College of Pharmacy
j) Additional Service Activities	Documentation of participating in other activities for the College of Pharmacy.

C2. External Activities

Activities	Materials to be Evaluated
a) External Presentations	Documentation of presentations outside the university representing the university.
b) Professional organizations -Membership	Documentation of a membership in the organization
c) Professional organizations - Service	Evidence of service to the organization(s), which can include: • Participation in a formal mentoring program • Holding office • Receiving a service award • Participation in local, regional, state, national, or international boards, organizations or taskforces • Special interest groups or committees
d) Faculty Development Mentoring Program	Documentation of participating as a mentor in the campus wide mentoring program.
e) Community or government volunteer service	Documentation of service • Participation in a formal mentoring program Holding office • Receiving a service award • Participation on advisory committee or patient • advocacy board • Participation in local, regional, state, national, or international boards, organizations, taskforces or working/planning groups • Community event service (including but not limited to health fairs, screening days, health education workshops/symposia, immunization days, poison prevention activities, health profession promotion events, medical missions)
f) Service as a grant or manuscript reviewer, member of a journal editorial board or conference organizer	• Letters of acknowledgement of grant reviews or manuscript reviews. • Letters of acknowledgement of board service
g) Participation on *adhoc* committees and/or taskforces at practice site	Submission of meeting minutes and/or a letter from the committee chair documenting participation
h) Additional external service activities	Documentation of participating in other activities for the college or university.

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
	Probationary Year 6+	Effective	Effective	Effective
Tenure	Year 6	Superior	Significant	Significant
Clinical Multiyear Contract – Qualification	Year 6	Superior	Significant or Highly Effective*	Significant or Highly Effective*
Clinical Multiyear Contract – Renewal		Highly Effective	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
Promotion: Instructor to (Clinical) Assistant Professor		Highly Effective	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Promotion: (Clinical) Assistant to (Clinical) Associate Professor		Superior	Significant	Significant
Promotion: (Clinical) Associate to (Clinical) Full Professor		Superior	Superior	Superior

*One Category must be "Significant"

III. POST-TENURE ANNUAL EVALUATION

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	Teaching/Primary Duties	Research/ Scholarly Activity	Service
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 Agreement and following procedures established by the University's Professional Development Mentoring Committee (PDMC).

IV. EVALUATION OF UNIT B FACULTY

Unit B faculty are evaluated on performance of teaching/primary duties only. Submission of the portfolio to the Department Chair for evaluation should include supportive documentation as previously defined for Unit A faculty. Unit B faculty are expected to achieve at minimum a "Satisfactory" rating, however that does not guarantee reappointment.

V. Summary: Performance Evaluation Criteria

Teaching/Primary Duties	
A1. Teaching	**A2. Primary Duties**
a) Classroom, clinical precepting and laboratory performance	a) Academic advising of pharmacy learning communities
b) Curriculum/course revision and/or development	b) Serving as chair for a major standing committee
c) Professional development for teaching, clinical practice/precepting improvement	c) Training of personnel
d) Delivery of faculty and preceptor development courses	d) Professional development for program or clinical practice improvement
e) Preceptor for advanced training program (e.g., residency)	e) Serving as primary course coordinator or co-coordinator
	f) Guest lectures in other COP courses
	g) Developing and maintaining a clinical practice site
	h) Coordination of an advanced training program
	i) Management of ancillary personnel at clinical practice site

Research	
B1. The Conduct of Research	**B2. Research Productivity**
a) Develop a Research Plan	a) Peer reviewed publications
b) Research Performance	b) PI or Co-PI on a successful, competitive, external grant
c) Student Research Training	c) Non-peer reviewed publication; internal or non-competitive, external grants
d) Professional development for research improvement	d) External faculty or student presentations
	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 B2b/c activity)
	g) Peer reviewed clinical training materials or creative educational products

Service	
C1. Internal Activities	**C2. External Activities**
a) Participation in department, assigned college, assigned university standing committees and standing committees at the clinical practice site	a) External Presentations
b) Participation in department, assigned college, and assigned university *adhoc* committees	b) Professional organizations - Membership
c) Participation in university wide committees that are not assigned	c) Professional organizations – Service
d) Advisor of Student Organizations recognized by the College of Pharmacy and/or Chicago State University	d) Faculty Development Mentoring Program
e) Administrative duties assigned by the Chair or Dean	e) Community or government volunteer service
f) Internal (University-wide) presentations	f) Service as a grant or manuscript reviewer, or conference organizer
g) Admissions Interviews	g) Participation on *adhoc* committees and/or taskforces at practice site
h) Supervision of students for courses	h) Additional external service activities
i) Faculty Candidate Interviews	
j) Additional Service Activities	

V. **DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EXCEPTIONALITY**

To be considered for tenure or promotion on the basis of exceptional performance the candidate must meet:

a) Criteria for tenure or promotion
b) Cumulative exceptional performance in two of the three areas of evaluation

Exceptionality in the Area of Teaching

- Faculty Excellence Award in the area of teaching from Chicago State University or other professional organizations
- Development of three or more new courses
- Development of a new program of study or certificate program
- Student evaluations consistently rating the faculty member at 3.75-5.0 over the entire evaluation period

Method of Evaluation: The faculty member submits a representative sample providing evidence of any three of the above exceptionality criteria

Exceptionality in the Area of Research/Scholarly Activity

- Faculty Excellence Award in the area of research from Chicago State University or other professional organizations
- Award of federal grant
- Award of two or more externally funded grants or contracts
- Invitation to serve as a keynote speaker at a national or international conference
- Award of a national or international fellowship
- Author of a book (textbook, reference book)
- Author of one or more chapter(s) in a book
- Two or more publications in peer reviewed journals

Method of Evaluation: The faculty member submits a representative sample providing evidence of any three of the above exceptionality criteria

Exceptionality in the Area of Service

- Excellence/Achievement Award in the area of service from Chicago State University or other professional organization
- Service as chair of university committee
- Service as officer of professional organizations at the national or international level
- Chair of planning committee for a state or national conference
- Participation in reviewer development of a state and federal pharmacy related policy/program
- Service on executive board for professional organization
- Service as editor for peer reviewed journal or book

Method of Evaluation: The faculty member submits a representative sample providing evidence of any three of the above exceptionality criteria.

V. THE DISTANCE EDUCATION POLICY FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PHARMACY PRACTICE

1. The Department of Pharmacy Practice considers Distance Education coursesto be any course that is completely online (internet courses), Television link-up, or interactive TV workshop between a location on campus and remote sites off- campus. Such courses may be offered for credit or non-credit.

2. The department will not permit more than 75% of the above courses to fulfill the requirements for a degree.

3. The department will determine which departmental courses can be offered within the CSU Distance education program.

    a. The Chair of the department shall poll the faculty to determine if there arethose who wish to offer courses within the Distance Education program.

    b. The Faculty member will present to the faculty the proposal for a Distance Education course. The faculty member must demonstrate their technical ability to provide such course by providing evidence for the use of technology in a traditional course offering. If an internet course is proposed, evidence of web-enhance teaching would be appropriate. To offer a Distance Education Course, departmental approval, Administration approval (Chair,Dean, Provost), and Distance Learning approval are required.

    c. If the course is being developed only for Distance Education, a full courseproposal is necessary. Departmental approval, followed by University Curriculum Committee, administrative approval and Department of Distance Learning approval are required.

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

    e. The faculty member should notify the Department of Distance Learning ofany special technical needs of the course offering in obtaining Distance Learning approval.

    f. The Department Chair will formulate a roster of faculty who wish to teacha Distance Education course in the event that the demand for teaching assignments exceeds the support from Distance Learning. This roster will be developed in a manner similar to those developed for teaching assignments in the summer session.

4. 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.

TABLE 1: Performance Level Criteria			
Performance Descriptor*	Teaching/Primary Duties	Research/ Scholarship	Service
Appropriate	N/A	Completion of a B1(a) activity	Completion of a C1(a) and a C2(b) activity
Satisfactory	Must receive a "Satisfactory" rating or better in classroom observations and student evaluations related to A1(a) **plus** two A1 or A2 activities (including A2g for clinical faculty)	**Tenure Track Faculty:** Completion of B1(a) **plus** any other B1 activity **Clinical Track Faculty:** Completion of B1(a) activity **plus** any other B1 activity	Completion of two C1(a) activities**,** a C2(c) activity **and** one other C1 or C2 activity
Highly Satisfactory	N/A	**Tenure Track Faculty:** Completion of a B1(b) activity **plus** one other activity that qualifies as a B1(c), B1(d) or B2 **Clinical Track Faculty:** Completion of an activity that qualify as B1(b) **plus** one other activity that qualifies as a B1(c) or B2	Completion of two C1(a) activities, one C2(c) activity or one C2(e) activity **and** one other activity that qualifies as C1 or C2
Effective	Must receive an "Effective" rating or better in classroom observations and student evaluations related to A1(a) **plus** completion of an A1(c), A2(a) and one additional A1 or A2 activity (including A2g for clinical faculty)	**Tenure Track Faculty:** Completion of a B2 activity plus one B1 or B2 activity (except B1a) **Clinical Track Faculty:** Completion of a B2 activity	Completion of two C1(a) activities, one C2(c) activity or one C2(e) activity **and** two other activities that qualify as C1 or C2
Highly Effective	Must receive a "Highly Effective" rating or better in classroom observations and student evaluations related to A1(a) **plus** one additional A1 and two A2 activities (Including A2g for clinical faculty)	**Tenure Track Faculty:** Completion of a B2(a) or B2(b) activity **plus** one B1 and two B1 or B2 activities (except B1a) **Clinical Track Faculty:** Completion of a B2(a), (b) or (c) activity **plus** a B1 activity (except B1a)	Completion of two C1(a) activities, one C2(c) activity or one C2(e) activity **and** three other activities that qualify as C1 or C2
Significant (One Year)	Must receive a "Significant" rating or better in classroom observations and student evaluations related to A1(a) **plus** one A1 and two A2 activities (including A2g for clinical faculty)	**Tenure Track Faculty:** Completion of one B2(a) or B2(b) activities **plus** two B1 (except B1a)and two B2 activities **Clinical Track Faculty:** Completion of one B2(a) activities **plus** two B1 (except B1a) or B2 activities	Completion of two C1(a) activities, one C2(c) activity or one C2(e) activity **and** five other activities that qualify as C1 or C2
Significant (Cumulative)	N/A	**Tenure Track Faculty:** Completion of three B2(a) or B2(b) activities plus six B1 or B2 activities **Clinical Track Faculty:** Completion of two B2(a) activities	8 C1(a), 8 C1 and 10 C2 activities

		plus four B1 or B2activities	
Superior (One Year)	Must receive a "Superior" rating in either classroom observations or student evaluations and a "Significant" rating in the other related to A1(a) **plus** two A1 and three A2 activities (including A2g for clinical faculty)	**Tenure Track Faculty:** Completion of three B2(a) or B2(b) activities **plus** three B1 (except B1a) or B2 activities **Clinical Track Faculty:** Completion of three B2(a) activities **plus** three B1 (except B1a) or B2 activities	Completion of two C1(a) activities, one C2(c) activity or one C2(e) activity **and** eight other activities that qualify as C1or C2
Superior (Cumulative)	Must receive a "Superior" rating in either classroom observations or student evaluations and a "Significant" rating in the other related to A1(a) **plus** six A1 and eight A2 activities (including A2g for clinical faculty)	**Tenure Track Faculty:** Completion of four B2(a) or B2(b) activities **plus** six B1 or B2 activities since the last promotion or PAI **Clinical Track Faculty:** Completion of three B2(a) activities **plus** five B1 or B2 activities since the last promotion	10 C1(a), 8 C(1) and 12 C2 activities since the last promotion or PAI

*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

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	**Clarity of Presentation** The Faculty Member: • 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		☐ **Exceeds Expectations** ☐ **Meets Expectations** ☐ **Needs Improvement**
2	**Mastery of Subject Material** The Faculty Member: • 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. • Explains difficult concepts or problems effectively.		☐ **Exceeds Expectations** ☐ **Meets Expectations** ☐ **Needs Improvement**
3	**Appropriate Level of Student Involvement** The Faculty Member: • Stimulates discussion and classroom interaction • Uses eye contact effectively • Is responsive to students' comments and feedback.		☐ **Exceeds Expectations** ☐ **Meets Expectations** ☐ **Needs Improvement**

Criteria		Comments (if any)	Rating (select one)
4	**Classroom Management** The Faculty Member: • 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.		☐ **Exceeds Expectations** ☐ **Meets Expectations** ☐ **Needs Improvement**

Additional Comments, if any:

Overall Rating:

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

☐	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 meets expectations in all four criteria
☐	Highly Satisfactory	Faculty meets expectations in three of the criteria, including subject mastery and presentation clarity
☐	Satisfactory	Faculty meets expectations in subject mastery and presentation clarity
☐	Unsatisfactory	Faculty does not meet expectations for a Satisfactory rating

Observer's Name: _____ Date: _____