

2021 - 2022 Departmental Application of Criteria

Department Chemistry and Biochemistry

Approved _____

UNIT A section begins on page 6

UNIT B

Unit B faculty members shall be evaluated according to the EIU/UPI Unit B Faculty Agreement only in the area of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties. Levels of achievement required are given in Table 1.

The faculty member will submit evidence of materials and activities that will enable evaluation to take place. Descriptive narratives may be included as appropriate. All such evidence should include names, dates, and any other pertinent information. Evaluators may also refer to the faculty member's personnel file to assist in formulating the evaluation, or request the faculty member to provide additional information (as specified in the current EIU/UPI Unit B contract).

I. Assigned Duties

Assigned duties shall be considered as primary duties for the purposes of evaluation.

II. Categories of Materials and Activities Considered Appropriate and Relative Importance of Materials/Activities

Items listed below shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive.

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

1. Categories of Materials and Activities

- a. Peer evaluation (including face-to-face and/or internet-based course evaluation)
- b. Teaching grants awarded, external
- c. Course or curriculum development
- d. Student evaluations
- e. Teaching materials
- f. Items related to assigned coordinator duties
- g. Teaching grant proposals submitted, external
- h. Teaching grants awarded, internal
- i. Teaching awards
- j. Continuing education to enhance teaching skills and methods
- k. Teaching grant proposals submitted, internal
- l. Other

2. Relative Importance

The items in (1) above are listed in order of approximate relative importance.

3. Notes

The department recognizes that student evaluations can be affected by course difficulty, class size and make-up, and other factors such as method of delivery (face-to-face or online), innovative teaching and course designs that might require more of students than their previous expectations. Hence, sole use of the quantitative data from student evaluation forms is discouraged in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. More importantly, the department requests evaluators consider all the evaluation data in context.

III. Methods of Evaluation to be Used Listed by Performance Area

Items listed below shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive. “Chairperson” refers to the chair or acting chair of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry. “Peer” refers to a tenured/tenure-track (Unit A) or annually contracted (Unit B) Chemistry and Biochemistry faculty member, or the Chairperson. An evaluator’s “visit” of a course refers to attending a lecture delivered in person or reviewing the equivalent of at least one lesson of a class period. Reviewing the corresponding course website is encouraged, especially in courses with a significant internet delivery component.

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

Using information in the evaluation portfolio, the Chairperson will provide evaluative statements and assign, in the area of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, each faculty member one of four ratings: superior, highly effective, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory using II.A. and III.A.

1. Peer Evaluation:

- a. Peer evaluations for Unit B faculty will be conducted by faculty (see 2.a, below) and the Chairperson.
- b. For face-to-face delivered courses, these evaluations will involve classroom visitations. The faculty member and evaluator will mutually agree on the time and place for the visitation.
- c. For Internet-based (distance-education) courses, the evaluations will involve a “visit” by the evaluator to the instructor’s course website. The faculty member and the evaluator will mutually agree upon the time window in which this “visitation” takes place, as well as the delivery materials and the coverage to be evaluated.
- d. For hybrid courses (partially face-to-face delivered and partially internet-based), the faculty member and the evaluator will mutually agree upon where the visitation takes place (either in the instructor’s classroom, or website, or both), the delivery materials and coverage to be evaluated, as well as the time/time window for the “visitation.”
- e. Peer evaluations of laboratory courses and summer courses are considered optional and will be conducted at the discretion of the faculty member who is evaluated. Such evaluations will be reviewed based on the same criteria.
- f. The peer evaluation shall be written in narrative form, using the Approved Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry Peer Evaluation Form, and must be based on classroom visitation or course observation in the case of technology-delivered courses.
- g. Each peer evaluator will provide a copy of the peer evaluation to the applicant.
- h. The applicant must submit at least the minimum number of peer evaluations required for any particular evaluation period (as described below in 2. Peer evaluation minima).

2. Peer evaluation minima:

- a. For each evaluation period, a minimum of one evaluation by the chair and one evaluation by a Unit A member from two courses is required, unless only multiple sections of the same course are taught during the evaluation period in which case the evaluations may be from the same course. (Note the summary of peer evaluation minima in Table 2)

- b. The minima must be supplied by departmental peer evaluators. Additional evaluations may be supplied by evaluators either internal to or external to the department.
3. Student Evaluation of Face-to-face Delivered Courses:
- a. Student evaluations of teaching, using the Chemistry and Biochemistry Core Items for Student Evaluations form, will be conducted in each course taught each semester. Faculty members may add additional items to the form. Faculty members may choose whether to conduct student evaluations in the classroom or online.
 - b. A statistical summary of student evaluations from each section of each course taught must be included in the portfolio. All comments from student evaluations must be included.
 - c. The procedure for conducting student evaluations in the classroom is as follows:
 - 1) Each course instructor will be responsible for making sure student evaluations are distributed in a timely manner. “Timely manner” is defined as after at least 80% of the term has passed but no later than the last day of regular classes.
 - 2) The instructor will distribute the forms, provide necessary instructions, and explain the rating system.
 - 3) The instructor will ask a student to return the completed forms, in the envelope provided, to the Chemistry and Biochemistry Department Office and will leave the room until the evaluations are completed.
 - 4) The instructor will not see the completed forms until after the grades have been submitted.
 - 5) Original evaluation forms, a copy of a blank evaluation form, and a statistical summary will be provided to the faculty member.
 - d. The procedure for conducting student evaluations online is as follows:
 - 1) Evaluations will be conducted over the Internet using a secure system.
 - 2) Each course instructor will be responsible for making sure student evaluations are made available to students in a timely manner. “Timely manner” is defined as after at least 80% of the term has passed but no later than the last day of regular classes.
 - 3) The instructor will not see the completed forms until after the grades have been submitted.
 - 4) A statistical summary and student comments will be provided to the faculty member.
 - e. For team taught courses, “timely manner” is defined as after each instructor has completed 80% of their instruction term, respectively.
 - f. If the instructor concludes that challenges or difficulties beyond his/her control and unique to face-to-face delivered courses has directly impacted student evaluations, an explanatory note may be included with the evaluation package.
 - g. It shall be the faculty member's responsibility to maintain copies of all original student evaluations provided by the Office of Testing and Evaluation for the duration of any applicable evaluation period and to provide copies to evaluators upon request.
4. Student Evaluation of Internet-based (Distance Education) Courses:
- a. Student evaluations of teaching, using the Chemistry and Biochemistry Core Items for Student Evaluations form, will be conducted in each Internet-based (distance education) course taught each semester. Faculty members may add additional items to the form.

- b. A statistical summary of student evaluations from each section of each course taught must be included in the portfolio. All comments from student evaluations must be included.
 - c. Evaluations will be conducted over the Internet using a secure system.
 - d. Each course instructor will be responsible for making sure student evaluations are distributed in a timely manner. "Timely manner" is defined as after at least 80% of the term has passed but no later than the last day of regular classes.
 - e. The instructor will not see the completed forms until after the grades have been submitted.
 - f. If the instructor concludes that challenges or difficulties beyond his/her control and unique to Internet-based (distance learning) courses (including but not limited to inadequate hardware/software support, Internet connection problems, substandard software from publishers) has directly impacted student evaluations, an explanatory note may be included with the evaluation portfolio.
 - g. It shall be the faculty member's responsibility to maintain copies of all original student evaluations provided by the Office of Testing and Evaluation for the duration of any applicable evaluation period and to provide copies to evaluators upon request.
5. Teaching materials:
- a. These should include at least the syllabus of each course taught, but may also include representations of content delivery, assessments, and/or other materials as deemed appropriate by the faculty member.

B. Assigned Credit Units

Each faculty member will include in his/her portfolio documentation for all activities for which credit units were received.

Table 1. A summary of required levels of evaluation for Unit B members as articulated in the contract† (specific to the 2018-2022 EIU-UPI Unit B Agreement)

Merit based increase	Highly Effective or Superior
Performance based increase	Superior*

† - Evaluation rank to be chosen from the following: Superior > Highly Effective > Satisfactory > Unsatisfactory

* - Portfolio submission with a superior rating in a 4-year aggregate, or an automatic performance based increase with 4 consecutive superior ratings

Table 2. Summary of Peer and Chair Evaluation Minima for Unit B

Evaluation period	Minima	Restriction
Each one	1 chair + 1 unit A faculty	two different courses unless only one course assigned

APPROVED UNIVERSITY PEER EVALUATION FORM

In accordance with Article 8.1.b.(2) of the Unit B Agreement, I have reviewed the teaching/performance of primary duties of _____ on [date/s]_____ and considered the following items upon which I have commented and offered examples:

[additional pages may be attached as needed]

This evaluation is written for the _____ (face-to-face and/or online) portion(s) of _____ (face-to-face delivered, or internet based, or hybrid course) course _____(course number).

1. Command of the subject matter or discipline
2. Oral English proficiency (as mandated by Illinois statute)
3. Ability to organize knowledge or material for teaching and learning
4. Ability to analyze knowledge or material for teaching and learning
5. Ability to present knowledge or material for teaching and learning
6. Ability to encourage and interest students in the learning process

Date

Signature

UNIT A

Unit A faculty members under consideration for retention, tenure, promotion, or professional advancement increase shall be evaluated according to the EIU/UPI Unit A Faculty Agreement in the three areas of (1) Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, (2) Research/ Creative Activity and (3) Service. Of these three areas teaching will be considered the most important. Research/Creative activity will receive greater emphasis relative to Service. Levels of achievement required in each area for retention, promotion, and professional advancement increases (PAI) are given in Table 3.

The faculty member will submit evidence of materials and activities that will enable evaluation to take place. Descriptive narratives may be included as appropriate. Materials and activities shall be placed in the performance area most appropriate for their consideration. A single activity may not be counted in more than one performance area, unless there is a clear explanation of division of the activity between categories. All such evidence should include names, dates, and any other pertinent information. Evaluators may also refer to the faculty member's personnel file to assist in formulating the evaluation, or request the faculty member to provide additional information (as specified in the current EIU/UPI Unit A contract). In the evaluation process the department recognizes the total nature of a faculty member's contribution to the university.

IV. Assigned Duties

Most activities for which three or more credit units per academic year are assigned shall be considered as primary duties for the purposes of evaluation. Exceptions include: research, sabbatical, and any assignments for which less than three credit units per academic year are assigned. These shall be evaluated in the appropriate category.

V. Categories of Materials and Activities Considered Appropriate by Performance Area and Relative Importance of Materials/Activities

Items listed below shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive.

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

1. Categories of Materials and Activities

- a. Peer evaluation (including face-to-face and/or internet-based course evaluation)
- b. Teaching Grants awarded, external
- c. Course or curriculum development
- d. Student evaluations
- e. Teaching materials
- f. Items related to assigned coordinator duties
- g. Teaching Grant proposals submitted, external
- h. Teaching Grants awarded, internal
- i. Teaching awards
- j. Continuing education to enhance teaching skills and methods
- k. Teaching Grant proposals submitted, internal
- l. Other

2. Relative Importance

The items in (1) above are listed in order of approximate relative importance.

3. Notes

The department recognizes that student evaluations can be affected by course difficulty, class size/make-up, and other factors such as method of delivery (face-to-face or online), innovative teaching and course designs that might require more of students than their previous expectations. Hence, the sole use of quantitative data from student evaluation forms is discouraged in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. More importantly, the department requests evaluators consider all the evaluation data in context.

B. Research/Creative Activity

1. Categories of Materials and Activities

- a. Publications (peer-reviewed)
- b. Research Grants awarded, external
- c. Manuscripts under revision
- d. Research Grant proposals submitted, external
- e. Presentations at international or national meetings
- f. Presentations at regional meetings and seminar presentations
- g. Research Grants awarded, internal
- h. Research Grant proposals submitted, internal
- i. Research students supervised
- j. Manuscripts submitted and/or under review; Preprints, conference paper, and/or non-peer reviewed publications
- k. Work in progress
- l. Consulting (related to research/creative activity)
- m. Research awards received
- n. Continuing education to enhance research skills
- o. Professional meetings attended without a presentation
- p. Other

2. Relative Importance

The items in (1) above are listed in order of approximate relative importance.

C. Service

1. Categories of Materials and Activities

- a. Professional activities at the international, national, regional and state levels
- b. Service Grants awarded, external
- c. Books, research proposals, and journal manuscripts reviewed
- d. University-wide councils and committees served on as chairperson
- e. College committees served on as chairperson
- f. University-wide councils and committees served on as an officer (e.g., vice chair, or sub-committee chair, or CAA recorder)
- g. University-wide councils and committees served on as a member
- h. Service Grant proposals submitted, external
- i. Advisor of student organization
- j. Service Grants awarded, internal
- k. Service Grant proposals submitted, internal
- l. Departmental committees served on as chairperson
- m. College committees served on as an officer (e.g., vice chair or sub-committee chair)
- n. College committees served on as a member
- o. Departmental services (e.g., equipment maintained, seminar coach or thesis committee member)
- p. Departmental committees served on as a member
- q. Service awards received
- r. Community activities and services related to area of expertise
- s. Consulting
- t. Other

2. Relative Importance

The items in (1) above are listed in order of approximate relative importance.

VI. Methods of Evaluation to be Used Listed by Performance Area

Items listed below shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive. “Chairperson” refers to the chair or acting chair of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry. “Peer” refers to a Unit A faculty member, or the Chairperson. An evaluator’s “visit” of a course refers to attending a lecture delivered in person or reviewing the equivalent of at least one lesson of a class period. Reviewing the corresponding course website is encouraged, especially in courses with a significant internet delivery component.

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

Using information in the evaluation portfolio, the DPC and Chairperson will independently provide evaluative statements and assign, in the area of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, each faculty member one of four ratings: superior, highly effective, satisfactory, unsatisfactory.

1. Peer Evaluation:

- a. Peer evaluations for Unit A faculty will be conducted by Unit A faculty and/or the Chairperson.
- b. For face-to-face delivered courses, these evaluations will involve classroom visitations. The faculty member and evaluator will mutually agree on the time and place for the visitation.
- c. For Internet-based (distance-education) courses, the evaluations will involve a “visit” by the evaluator to the instructor’s course website. The faculty member and the evaluator will mutually agree upon the time window in which this “visitation” takes place, as well as the delivery materials and the coverage to be evaluated.
- d. For hybrid courses (partially face-to-face delivered and partially internet-based), the faculty member and the evaluator will mutually agree upon where the visitation takes place (either in the instructor’s classroom, or website, or both), the delivery materials and the coverage to be evaluated, as well as the time/time window for the “visitation.”
- e. Peer evaluations of laboratory courses and summer courses are considered optional and will be conducted at the discretion of the faculty member who is evaluated. Such evaluations will be reviewed based on the same criteria.
- f. The peer evaluation shall be written in narrative form, using the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry Peer Evaluation Form, and must be based on classroom visitation, or course observation in the case of technology-delivered courses.
- g. Each peer evaluator will provide a copy of the peer evaluation to the applicant.
- h. The applicant must submit at least the minimum number of peer evaluations required for any particular evaluation period (as described below in 2. Peer evaluation minima).

2. Peer evaluation minima (Note the summary of peer evaluation minima in Table 4):

- a. For each probationary year, at least one evaluation per semester (except for optional courses – see 1.e above).
- b. In probationary years 1, 2, and 5, for every course taught per semester, a minimum of one evaluation.

- c. For tenure application (normally probationary year 6), throughout the entire evaluation period, a minimum of six evaluations from at least two courses (with different course numbers) from at least four different peer evaluators. The department encourages applicants to include as many different evaluators as possible. The minimum must include at least one evaluation per semester for each course taught since application for year 5 retention.
 - d. For tenured faculty applying for promotion or PAI, a minimum of three evaluations from at least two different courses during the relevant period.
 - e. Peer evaluations included in the portfolio for the relevant evaluation period should be from at least two different individuals, except for the tenure application period as described in c above.
 - f. The minima must be supplied by departmental peer evaluators. Additional evaluations may be supplied by evaluators either internal to or external to the department.
3. Student Evaluation of Face-to-face Delivered Courses:
- a. Student evaluations of teaching, using the Chemistry and Biochemistry Core Items for Student Evaluations form, will be conducted in each course taught each semester. Faculty members may add additional items to the form. Faculty members may choose whether to conduct student evaluations in the classroom or online.
 - b. A statistical summary of student evaluations from each section of each course taught must be included in the portfolio. All comments from student evaluations must be included.
 - c. The procedure for conducting student evaluations in the classroom is as follows:
 - 1) Each course instructor will be responsible for making sure student evaluations are distributed in a timely manner. "Timely manner" is defined as after at least 80% of the term has passed but no later than the last day of regular classes.
 - 2) The instructor will distribute the forms, provide necessary instructions, and explain the rating system.
 - 3) The instructor will ask a student to return the completed forms, in the envelope provided, to the Chemistry and Biochemistry Department Office and will leave the room until the evaluations are completed.
 - 4) The instructor will not see the completed forms until after the grades have been submitted.
 - 5) Original evaluation forms, a copy of a blank evaluation form, and a statistical summary will be provided to the faculty member.
 - d. The procedure for conducting student evaluations online is as follows:
 - 1) Evaluations will be conducted over the Internet using a secure system.
 - 2) Each course instructor will be responsible for making sure student evaluations are made available to students in a timely manner. "Timely manner" is defined as after at least 80% of the term has passed but no later than the last day of regular classes.
 - 3) The instructor will not see the completed forms until after the grades have been submitted.
 - 4) A statistical summary and student comments will be provided to the faculty member.
 - e. For each team-taught course, "timely manner" is defined as after each instructor has completed at least 80% of their instruction term, respectively.

- f. If the instructor concludes that challenges or difficulties beyond his/her control and unique to face-to-face delivered courses has directly impacted student evaluations, an explanatory note may be included with the evaluation package.
 - g. It shall be the faculty member's responsibility to maintain copies of all original student evaluations provided by the Office of Testing and Evaluation for the duration of any applicable evaluation period and to provide copies to evaluators upon request.
4. Student Evaluation of Internet-based (Distance Education) Courses:
- a. Student evaluations of teaching, using the Chemistry and Biochemistry Core Items for Student Evaluations form, will be conducted in each Internet-based (distance education) course taught each semester. Faculty members may add additional items to the form.
 - b. A statistical summary of student evaluations from each section of each course taught must be included in the portfolio. All comments from student evaluations must be included.
 - c. Evaluations will be conducted over the Internet using a secure system.
 - d. Each course instructor will be responsible for making sure student evaluations are distributed in a timely manner. "Timely manner" is defined as after at least 80% of the term has passed but no later than the last day of regular classes.
 - e. The instructor will not see the completed forms until after the grades have been submitted.
 - f. If the instructor concludes that challenges or difficulties beyond his/her control and unique to Internet-based (distance learning) courses (including but not limited to inadequate hardware/software support, Internet connection problems, substandard software from publishers) has directly impacted student evaluations, an explanatory note may be included with the evaluation package.
 - g. It shall be the faculty member's responsibility to maintain copies of all original student evaluations provided by the Office of Testing and Evaluation for the duration of any applicable evaluation period and to provide copies to evaluators upon request.
5. Teaching materials:
- a. These should include at least the syllabus of each course taught, but may also include representations of content delivery, assessments, and/or other materials as deemed appropriate by the faculty member.

C. Research/Creative Activity

Using information in the evaluation portfolio, the DPC and Chairperson will independently provide evaluative statements and assign, in the area of Research/Creative Activity, each faculty member one of four ratings: superior, significant, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory (or appropriate for probationary year 1).

This category includes but is not limited to chemical/biochemical research in education and pedagogy, experimental, and theoretical areas. The documentation will include activity records for all years relevant to the particular evaluation period. Work in progress (V.B.1.k.) should be documented and included in the activity records. It is strongly suggested that for work close to completion, such as manuscripts, grant proposals, preprints, conference papers,

etc., complete drafts are included.

An application for tenure is strongly recommended to include publication(s) in peer-reviewed journals based on work substantially performed as an EIU faculty member, and evidence of significant efforts to acquire external funding.

D. Service

Using information in the evaluation portfolio, the DPC and Chairperson will independently provide evaluative statements and assign, in the area of Service, each faculty member one of four ratings: superior, significant, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory (or appropriate for probationary year 1).

A work-related activity not counted as teaching/primary duties or research/creative activity will be considered service.

D. Assigned Credit Units

Each faculty member will include in his/her portfolio documentation for all activities for which credit units were received.

E. Relative Importance of Research/Creative Activity and Service

Research/Creative Activity will receive greater emphasis relative to Service.

Table 3. A summary of required levels of evaluation for Unit A members as articulated in the contract† (specific to the 2018-2022 EIU-UPI Unit A Agreement)

	Teaching	Research	Service
Retention			
Year 1	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Year 2	Satisfactory ⁺	Satisfactory ⁺	Satisfactory ⁺
Year 3	Highly Effective	Significant (Satisfactory) [#]	Satisfactory (Significant) [#]
Year 4	Highly Effective	Significant (Satisfactory) [#]	Satisfactory (Significant) [#]
Year 5	Superior	Significant	Significant
Tenure	Superior	Significant	Significant
Promotions			
Instructor → Assistant	Highly Effective ⁺	Satisfactory ⁺	Satisfactory ⁺
Assistant → Associate (Untenured)	Superior	Significant	Significant
Assistant → Associate (Tenured)	Superior ⁺	Significant ⁺	Significant ⁺
Associate → Full	Superior ⁺	Superior ⁺	Superior ⁺
Professional Advancement Increase	Superior ⁺	Superior (Significant) ^{*+}	Significant (Superior) ^{**}

Notes:

† - Evaluation rank to be chosen from the following:

Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties: Superior > Highly Effective > Satisfactory > Unsatisfactory

Research/Creative Activity: Superior > Significant > Satisfactory > Unsatisfactory

Service: Superior > Significant > Satisfactory > Unsatisfactory

The ranking of Appropriate is also available for evaluation in probationary year 1 for the categories of Research/Creative Activity and for Service. (The above is summarized from what is written in the contract.)

+ - Evaluation period considered as a single aggregate, viewed as a whole.

- Satisfactory required in one of these categories, significant required in the other.

* - Superior required in one of these categories, significant required in the other.

Table 4. Summary of Peer* Evaluation Minima for Unit A

Evaluation period	Minima for each evaluation period	Restriction
Year 1	1 per semester for each course taught	2 different peer evaluators
Year 2	1 per semester for each course taught	2 different peer evaluators
Year 3	1 per semester	2 different peer evaluators
Year 4	1 per semester	2 different peer evaluators
Year 5	1 per semester for each course taught	2 different peer evaluators
Year 6	1 per semester for each course taught	2 different peer evaluators
Promotion to tenure	6 for entire period including 1 per semester for each course taught since application for year 5 retention	2 different courses; 4 different peer evaluators
Promotion after tenure	3	2 difference courses; 2 different peer evaluators
PAI	3	2 difference courses; 2 different peer evaluators
* Chair or Unit A Chemistry and Biochemistry faculty member		

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY AND BIOCHEMISTRY YEARLY FACULTY ACTIVITY RECORD

For the period: _____ Today's date: _____

Name: _____ Rank: _____

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

1. Peer evaluation (including face-to-face and/or internet-based course evaluation)
2. Teaching grants awarded, external
3. Course or curriculum development
4. Teaching materials
5. Items related to assigned coordinator duties
6. Teaching grant proposals submitted, external
7. Teaching grants awarded, internal
8. Teaching awards
9. Continuing education to enhance teaching skills and methods
10. Teaching grant proposals submitted, internal
11. Other

B. Research/Creativity Activity

1. Peer-reviewed publications within the last year (title, authors, references; *indicates senior author; attach copy)
2. Research grants awarded, external
3. Manuscripts under revision
4. Research grant proposals submitted, external
5. Presentations at international or national meetings
6. Presentations at regional meetings and seminar presentations
7. Research grants awarded, internal
8. Research grant proposals submitted, internal
9. Research students supervised
10. Manuscripts submitted and/or under review; Preprints, conference paper, and/or non-peer reviewed publications
11. Work in Progress

12. Consulting (related to research/creative activity)
13. Research awards received
14. Continuing education to enhance research skills
15. Professional meetings attended without a presentation
16. Other

C. Service

1. Professional activities at the international, national, regional and state levels
2. Service grants awarded, external
3. Books, research proposals and journal manuscripts reviewed
4. University-wide councils and committees served on as chairperson
5. College committees served on as chairperson
6. University-wide councils and committees served on as an officer (e.g., vice chair, or sub-committee chair, or CAA recorder)
7. University-wide councils and committees served on as a member
8. Service Grant proposals submitted, external
9. Advisor of student organization
10. Service grants awarded, internal
11. Service grant proposals submitted, internal
12. Departmental committees served on as chairperson
13. College committees served on as an officer (e.g., vice chair or sub-committee chair)
14. College committees served on as a member
15. Departmental services (e.g., equipment maintained, seminar coach or thesis committee member)
16. Departmental committees served on as a member
17. Service awards received
18. Community activities and services related to area of expertise
19. Consulting
20. Other

APPROVED DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY AND BIOCHEMISTRY PEER EVALUATION FORM

In accordance with Article 8.3.b. of the Unit A Agreement, I have reviewed the teaching/performance of primary duties of _____ on [date/s] _____.

This evaluation is written for the _____ (face-to-face and/or online) portion(s) of _____ (face-to-face delivered, or internet based, or hybrid course) course _____ (course number).

The narrative should address the following issues with examples where appropriate:

- Command of the subject matter or discipline.
- Oral English proficiency (as mandated by Illinois statute).
- Ability to organize, analyze and present knowledge or material for teaching and learning.
- Ability to encourage and interest students in the learning process.

Date

Signature

APPROVED DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY AND BIOCHEMISTRY CORE ITEMS FOR STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Answer questions 1-8 using the following scheme:

5 = strongly agree 4 = agree 3 = undecided 2 = disagree 1 = strongly disagree

1. It was difficult for me to master the material in this course.
 2. I made a sufficient effort to master the materials presented in this course.
-

3. The instructor effectively organizes knowledge or material for teaching and learning.
4. The instructor appears comfortable with the material.
5. The instructor presents knowledge or material effectively.
6. The instructor is readily accessible outside of class.
7. The instructor encourages and interests students in the learning process.
8. The instructor is concerned about and willing to help students.

Because the next two questions might be sources of personal identification, answering them is optional.

9. What is your current class? 1=freshman, 2=sophomore, 3=junior, 4=senior, 5=graduate student
10. What is your expected grade in this class? 5=A, 4=B, 3=C, 2=D, 1=F

Please include written comments to questions 11-12 on the back

11. When your instructor teaches this course again, what would you suggest your instructor do the same? What would you suggest your instructor do differently?
12. Other comments welcome.