

**DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
2007-2011
Extended with UPI contract until 2015**

DEPARTMENT CRITERIA FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

The following departmental criteria for retention, tenure, promotion, and PAA are adopted for Unit A employees in accordance with the general criteria established by the 2007-2011 Contract between Western Illinois University (WIU) and the University Professionals of Illinois (UPI), Local 4100 (Article 20).

I. Description of Department Personnel Committee: The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) will consist of all tenured faculty in the department as determined by an annual election by all tenured and tenure track faculty. In the case where there are less than three tenured faculty to serve on the DPC, the required number of tenure track faculty can be elected to makeup the difference. For applications for promotion, those faculty holding the rank to which promotion is requested or higher rank may evaluate the application, and will make recommendations to the entire DPC which will make the final decision. A person being evaluated will not participate in the evaluation. The entire DPC will vote on all applications for retention, tenure, and promotion. The department faculty members will elect the chair annually. If there is a tie vote, there will be a second round of ballots. This process will continue until there is a clear winner.

II. Performance Standards

Each member of the DPC will evaluate a faculty member in the areas of teaching/primary duties, scholarly/professional activities, and service. The final evaluation decision of the DPC will be determined by a majority vote of the committee and will be based on both the shared professional judgment of its members and the department criteria. Evaluations must be supported by written reasons and should address any special circumstances peculiar to a particular sub-discipline. Evaluations will be on a scale of EXCELLENT (E), HIGHLY EFFECTIVE (HE), SATISFACTORY (S), or UNSATISFACTORY (US).

II 1. Required Ratings

For promotion to Professor, an Excellent (E) in the area of teaching/primary duties, an Excellent (E) in the area of scholarly/professional activities, and a rating of Highly Effective (HE) or better in the area of service is required. The evaluation period for promotion to Full Professor is the entire period since the initial hiring date at WIU. For promotion to Full Professor the faculty member must demonstrate a record of consistent growth in performance. Included in the achievement of a rating of Excellent in Scholarship/Professional Activities in the evaluation for promotion to professor, the faculty member while in Associate Professor rank must have multiple peer-reviewed

articles published in national or international journal(s). In the case of multi-authored publications, the faculty member must provide evidence that he/she performed a majority of the scholarly work leading to the publication. A funded external research or program grant of >\$50,000/yr, where the faculty member applying for promotion, holds the rank of Associate Professor and is listed as the Principal Investigator (when the application was submitted), may be substituted for one of the required peer-reviewed articles published in a national or international journal.

For tenure or promotion to Associate Professor, a rating of Excellent (E) in the area of teaching/primary duties, a rating of Highly Effective (HE) or better in the area of scholarly/professional activities, and a rating of Highly Effective (HE) or better in the area of service are required. Included in the achievement of a rating of Highly Effective for Scholarly/Professional Activities in the evaluation for tenure or for promotion to associate professor, the faculty member must have at least two peer-reviewed article describing scholarly work carried out at WIU (on which the faculty member is either the principal author or a major contributing author) published in national/international journal(s). In the case of multi-authored publications in national/international journal(s), the faculty member must provide evidence that he/she made a major contribution to the research work published. A letter from the corresponding author of the publication in question stating the extent of involvement and contribution by the WIU faculty member will serve this purpose.

A funded external research or program grant of >\$50,000/yr, where the faculty member applying for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is listed as the Principal Investigator (when the application was submitted), may be substituted for one of the required peer-reviewed articles published in a national or international journal.

For retention in the first year (PY1 and PY2), a rating of Satisfactory (S) or better in teaching is required. The employee is required to submit plans for his/her involvement in scholarly/professional activities and to demonstrate at least minimal service for each evaluation period.

For retention in each year subsequent to the first and second, (PY3, PY4, PY5) a rating of Highly Effective (HE) or better in all areas will be required for retention.

II. 2. Tenure/Promotion by Exception

An employee who does not satisfy the degree requirement of Ph.D. as an educational requirement for tenure may apply under the basis of exceptional teaching/primary duties or exceptional Scholarship/Professional Activities. In addition to exceptional performance in the employee's chosen area, the employee will be required to meet or exceed the promotion requirements in each of the two other areas of responsibility. Criteria for exceptionality in teaching/primary duties is a rating of excellent with a score of 20 or greater in overall teaching performance. Criteria for exceptionality in scholarship/professional activities is a rating of excellent with a score of 20 or greater in overall scholarship/professional activities. Included in the achievement of a rating of Excellent in scholarship/Professional Activities in the evaluation for promotion by

exception must have multiple peer-reviewed articles published in national/international journal(s).

The faculty member is responsible for the timely furnishing of supporting documentation of performance.

III. Evaluation Criteria

The performance evaluation for faculty members in teaching/primary duties, scholarly/professional activity, and service categories should include the following criteria, identifying quality of performance with proper documentation. A Ph.D. degree in chemistry, biochemistry, or an appropriate related area is required for tenure and promotion to associate and full professor.

[The ranking of items within each of the categories A, B, and C can be changed, if a situation warrants. The request for the upgrading of an item from a lower to a higher level may be considered, if it is accompanied by a written justification from the faculty member.]

III. 1. Teaching/Primary Duties represent the most important criterion. As classroom teaching is a major, and most visible, part of a faculty member's duties, high quality teaching is expected of all faculty members.

English being the language of instruction, proficiency in spoken and written English will be a consideration in evaluation of teaching performance.

III. 1. A. Student Assessment will not be used in the evaluation of faculty performance as required by UPI contract (Article 20.4.2).

III. 1. B. Course Materials: Course materials to be used in the evaluation of performance will include peer classroom evaluations, chair classroom evaluations, course outlines/syllabi, grading standards, sample copies of examinations, and other relevant class materials submitted by the employee. A departmental file containing copies of each employee's syllabi, grading standards, student project reports, and selected examinations will be maintained by the department.

Evaluation of on-line courses and other courses offered through Distance Education will take into account inherent instructional differences between distance education and regular classes.

Student evaluations must be conducted on all courses taught by a faculty member during the semester, using the form approved by the department faculty. Tenured faculty members have the option to submit student evaluations for each course as a whole, to be administered during the lecture. Probationary faculty, and tenured faculty during the two semesters prior to their four year appraisal, must submit student evaluations conducted for both the lecture and laboratory portions of the course separately. A person designated

by the department chair with the concurrence of the department faculty at a time mutually agreeable to the chair and the faculty will administer this form to the students. The evaluations will be tabulated following the semester in which they are administered. The department chair or his/her designee will make tabulations of statistical data (departmental averages, etc.) and a summary will be given to the faculty member with a copy placed in her/his personnel file.

When applicable, evaluators will take into consideration inherent differences in form, content, and audience which might adversely affect a faculty member's student evaluations. Examples are, but not limited to, general education courses and multicultural courses.

"Faculty shall be evaluated on the basis of more than one measurement of teaching effectiveness. Numerical scores on student evaluations shall not be the sole determinant in retention, tenure, promotion, and four-year appraisal recommendations" (Article 20.11.2 of the Contract).

Student course evaluations will not be returned to the faculty member. Original evaluation forms are the property of the university. The student comments will be transcribed by the department secretary and a copy provided to the faculty member with a copy placed in her/his personnel file. A faculty member questioning the accuracy of the transcription of student comments may request the DPC chair and/or department chair to review the original evaluations for him/her.

Evaluations for team-taught courses shall focus on the course. Evaluations may be conducted for faculty/department use but will not be used for evaluating individual faculty.

One may submit videotapes of classroom performance and/or other pertinent teaching materials. Classroom visits for the purpose of evaluations by two peers (chosen by the faculty member under evaluation) and the department chair will be conducted in all lecture classes for all probationary Unit A faculty members, and for tenured faculty members during the two semesters prior to 4 yr evaluation, or PAA request. One peer evaluator will be selected from members of the DPC, and one peer evaluator will be selected from the faculty at large. All tenured faculty members are expected to have a minimum of one classroom visit for the purpose of evaluation conducted by either the department chair or a member of the DPC for one lecture class per academic year in non-evaluation years.

The visit must be held with prior notification to the faculty member. Each classroom evaluator shall provide a written evaluation, which will be a part of the official personnel file, with the concurrence of the faculty member being evaluated. A copy of the evaluation will be provided to the department chair, the DPC chair, and the faculty member.

Besides classroom teaching, the department will consider the following extended teaching activities as primary duties (the list is not exhaustive): (1) development and/or

supervision of student research; (2) development of new course(s); (3) developing instruction-enhancing materials such as web resources and video materials; (4) implementation of known computer programs for enhancing classroom teaching; (5) preparation of instructional materials such as laboratory manuals or instructions for operation of equipment; (6) involvement in faculty instructional development; (7) non-teaching duties for which ACES have been assigned [other non-teaching duties will be evaluated under the appropriate category of scholarly/professional activities or service]; (8) attendance at scientific meetings or workshops; (9) securing grant funding which supports student involvement in research or for the development of new teaching instruments, (10) publication in peer reviewed journals that supports chemistry education, such as Journal of Chemical Education, or the Journal of Undergraduate Research, (11) other successful instruction-related activities such the development of new laboratory exercises, or the coordination of multiple sections of a large course, or the introduction of new and relevant topics noting recent advances or applications to the field to an existing course.

Duties other than teaching and teaching-related activities for which ACEs are assigned will be evaluated under the appropriate category of scholarly/professional activities or service.

III. 2. Scholarship/professional Activities represent the second most important criterion. Since the knowledge of chemistry is based on results obtained through research and similar creative activities, such activities are expected of all Unit A faculty. Scholarship may be conducted by individual faculty members or as collaborative teams. The extent of contribution in the case of joint efforts is important. Measures to be used in judging quality of scholarship will include the refereed status of the journal, the status of the agency or professional organization, and the scope of the audience present.

III. 2. A. Evaluation: In evaluating scholarship, the department will consider the following items (this list is not exhaustive): (1) refereed publications and reviews in journals; (2) external grant applications funded by state and national agencies. Credit will be given for the writing of non-research grants in those cases where the grant proposal requires comparable effort to that required for external research grants, such as program grants. (3) grant applications funded by regional / local or campus agencies; (4) other papers in refereed journals; (5) contribution of chapters/sections to books or writing books; (6) other peer-reviewed grant applications funded by national or regional agencies; (7) appointment to editorial boards or granting agency review panels; (8) presentation of invited seminars at other institutions or invited presentations at meetings or workshops; (9) supervision of student research leading to presentation of papers at scientific meetings; and (10) other scholarly activities (such as honors/awards or fellowships received, appointments to adjudicate Ph.D. thesis, or review assignments for journals and granting agencies).

Consulting activities will be evaluated in the category of Scholarly/Professional Activities. The relationship of the consultation to the mission of the department of chemistry, as well as the extent of the activity, will be considered in the evaluation.

Publication of peer-reviewed articles is required for tenure and for promotion at all ranks. Included in the achievement of a rating of Highly Effective in the evaluation for tenure or for promotion to associate professor, the faculty member must have at least two peer-reviewed articles (on which the faculty member is either the principal author or a major contributing author) published in national/international journal(s). In the case of multi-authored publications in national/international journal(s), the faculty member must provide evidence that he/she made a major contribution to the research work published. Included in the achievement of a rating of Excellent in the evaluation for promotion to professor, the faculty member must have multiple peer-reviewed articles published in national/international journal(s) while in the rank of Associate Professor. In the case of multi-authored publications, the faculty member must provide evidence that he/she performed a majority of the research leading to the publication.

Credit will be given for publication of a manuscript when it is accepted or after it has appeared in print but not both. Employee shall make the choice of when the publication is to be counted.

A funded external research or program grant of >\$50,000/yr, where the faculty member applying for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is listed as the Principal Investigator (when the application is submitted), may be substituted for one of the required peer-reviewed articles published in a national or international journal.

A funded external research or program grant of >\$50,000/yr, where the faculty member applying for promotion, holds the rank of Associate Professor, and is listed as the Principal Investigator (when the application is submitted), may be substituted for one of the required peer-reviewed articles published in a national or international journal.

III. 3. Service: Service is the third most important criterion. There are many tasks, aside from teaching and research, which must be performed for the continued smooth operation of the Department, College, and University. All faculty members are expected to share in the performance of these tasks. Service activities may be at the department-, college-, university-, or non-university level. Mere membership on committees is insufficient. Faculty should take a leadership role (Chair, etc) on departmental, and college and/or university committees when available. The Chair and DPC will consider the quality of the contribution, the available positions on appointed and elected committees, and the demonstrated willingness of the faculty member to work on committees.

III. 3. A. Service activities that will be considered include; advising and recruiting at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. If the faculty member is assigned ACEs for advising, instrument coordinator, or safety and security coordinator the performance is evaluated under 'teaching/Primary Duties'. If no ACEs are assigned for duties, such as thesis committee service; service as a tech rep to the department, college or university; recruitment or involvement of departmental visitations by potential students; service as adviser of a student organization, the performance is evaluated under service. Presentations at area schools and other places represent community service. Involvement in community activities must be directly related to the discipline.

For faculty assigned to the WIU-Quad Cities campus evaluation of service will reflect what service activities are available at the location, recognizing alternatives to Macomb based committee service.

III. 3 B. Evaluation: In evaluating service, the department will consider the following items (this list is not exhaustive): (1) chair of university committee, (2) chair of college committee, (3) chair of departmental committees, (4) chair of conference organization committee, (5) membership in university committee (6) membership in college level committee, (7) membership in department level committee, (8) membership in conference organization committee, (9) officer in national or international professional organization, (10) officer in local, state, or regional professional organizations, participation in GA training sessions; (11) service as faculty sponsor for student organization (12) service on thesis committees, (13) membership in professional organizations (14) chairing sessions at professional meetings, (15) visiting other campuses or involvement in graduate fairs for recruitment purposes, (16) service as Discover Western leader or other recruitment tours, (17) membership in community organizations related to chemistry, (18) active participation in GA training sessions, (19) service on national or international discussion panels, (20) service on state or regional discussion panels, (21) service on campus or local discussion panels or workshops, (22) service as instrument/facilities coordinator (for which ACEs are not assigned), (23) other principal service activities, (24) other important service activities. See evaluation scale below.

IV. Definitions of Performance Standards

IV.1. Teaching

Teaching performance will be determined mathematically as follows:

Teaching performance will be based on five performance benchmarks. All five performance benchmarks listed below will count equally, each with a possible range of 1.00 to 5.00:

1.00 – 5.00	Benchmark for Quantitative Student Evaluations (Section A)
1.00 – 5.00	Benchmark for Classroom Evaluations by Peers (Section B)
1.00 – 5.00	Benchmark for Classroom Evaluation by the Department Chair (Section B)
1.00 – 5.00	Review of syllabi, teaching materials, etc. (Section C)
<u>1.00 – 5.00</u>	<u>Review of Extended Teaching Duties (Section D)</u>
5.00 – 25.00	Total Teaching Performance

Total Teaching Performance will be defined by the following system:

EXCELLENT	=	17.5 - 25.0
HIGHLY EFFECTIVE	=	15.0 - 17.4
SATISFACTORY	=	13.0 - 14.9
UNSATISFACTORY	=	5.00 - 12.9

IV. 1A. Benchmarks for Quantitative Student Evaluations

Student evaluations will be conducted every semester in all lecture classes for all Unit A and B faculty. All probationary faculty members are expected to have student evaluations conducted in all courses, including all laboratory sections in which they serve as instructor, every semester. Tenured faculty members have the option to have separate student evaluations conducted in both the lecture and laboratory sections for which they serve as instructor, or to have student evaluations conducted for the course as a whole, during the lecture portion.

Benchmarks for Quantitative Student Evaluations – In the student evaluation questionnaire (Appendix I), the mean of the response for the question/item (e.g., question #9 on the present questionnaire) that requires students to give a rating for the overall teaching effectiveness will be graded by the department as follows:

‘EXCELLENT’	=	a mean score of 3.75 - 5.00
‘HIGHLY EFFECTIVE’	=	a mean score of 3.25 - 3.74
‘SATISFACTORY’	=	a mean score of 3.00 – 3.24
‘UNSATISFACTORY’	=	a mean score of 1.00 - 2.99

Historically general education courses in the Department of Chemistry have rendered low course evaluation scores because of the nature and difficulty of the subject and preparative background needs. In the case of general education courses the student evaluation scores may be adjusted according to long term trends for such courses. Faculty members shall not be denied retention, tenure, or promotion based solely on student evaluation scores. Overall teaching performance will be assessed using all evaluative tools noted in this document for teaching/primary duties.

IV. 1B. Benchmarks for Quantitative Classroom Evaluations by Peers and/or Department Chair

Classroom evaluations by two peers and the department chair will be conducted in all lecture classes for all probationary Unit A faculty, and for tenured faculty members during the two semesters prior to 4 yr evaluation. One of the peer evaluators will be selected from members of the DPC, and the other from the faculty at large (to be selected by the faculty member under evaluation). All tenured faculty members are expected to have a minimum of one classroom evaluation conducted by either the department chair or a member of the DPC for one lecture class per academic year in non-evaluation years. Classroom evaluation by two peers will also be carried out for two terms prior to a faculty member's 4 year evaluation or to applying for PAA consideration.

In the classroom evaluation questionnaire (attached), the response for the question/item (e.g., question #9 on the present questionnaire) that requires peers/chair to give a rating for the overall effectiveness will be graded by the department as follows:

'EXCELLENT'	=	a mean score of 3.50 - 5.00
'HIGHLY EFFECTIVE'	=	a mean score of 3.00 - 3.49
'SATISFACTORY'	=	a mean score of 2.50 - 2.99
'UNSATISFACTORY'	=	a mean score of 1.00 - 2.49

All classroom evaluations are provided to the faculty member for inclusion in evaluation portfolios with a copy kept in department personnel file.

IV. 1C. Review of syllabi, teaching materials, etc.

Syllabi, exams, quizzes, laboratory exercises, and other course materials supplied by the faculty member will be evaluated based on the following guidelines:

- i. Accessibility: The instructor seems actively helpful, sensitive to the student's concerns and questions, and provides helpful resources.
- ii. Course Content: The instructor demonstrates a command and awareness of current scholarship in the subject matter.
- iii. Course Organization: The course material is covered in an organized manner that aids student understanding.
- iv. Soundness and Rigor: The course is academically challenging and instructionally sound. Evaluators will refer to ACS guidelines for standards of soundness and rigor.
- v. Academic Policies: The instructor follows academic policies as approved by the department faculty.

EXCELLENT (E) = Score of 3.50 – 5.00

The review of syllabi and other course materials demonstrates excellence in all areas (C. i-v) listed above.

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE (HE) = Score of 3.00 – 3.49

The review of syllabi and other course materials demonstrates strengths in four of the five areas (C. i-v) listed above.

SATISFACTORY (S) = Score of 2.50 – 2.99

The faculty member regularly meets classes (both lecture and labs) as scheduled, is prepared for class, and maintains required office hours. A review of syllabi, teaching

IV. 1. E. Documentation to be considered in the evaluation process:

Student evaluations; Peer and chair evaluations;

Self-evaluation narratives written by the employee;

Course materials (syllabi, grading standards, examinations, reports on student research projects, etc.);

Other documentation as appropriate

IV. 2. Scholarship/professional Activities represent the second most important criterion. Since the knowledge of chemistry is based on results obtained through research and similar creative activities, such activities are expected of all Unit A faculty. Scholarship may be conducted by individual faculty members or as collaborative teams. The extent of contribution in the case of joint efforts is important. Measures to be used in judging quality of scholarship will include the refereed status of the journal, the status of the agency or professional organization, and the scope of the audience present.

IV. 2. A. Total Scholarly/Professional Activities Performance will be defined by the following system:

EXCELLENT (E)	=	17.5	-	25.0
HIGHLY EFFECTIVE (HE)	=	15.0	-	17.4
SATISFACTORY (S)	=	13.0	-	14.9
UNSATISFACTORY (UN)	=	5.00	-	12.9

Each scholarship activity evaluated will be assigned points as listed below and a total score will be used to assign the descriptor above (E), (HE), (S), or (UN).

IV. 2. B. A scholarship rating will be assigned based on the following ranges per item:

(1)	Research refereed book publication	8 - 15
	Primary author (12 - 15)	
	Contributing author (8 - 12)	
(2)	International or national refereed journal publication	5 - 10
	Primary author (10)	
	Contributing author (5 - 8)	
(3)	State or regional or student oriented refereed journal publication	3 - 6
	Primary author (4 - 6)	
	Contributing author (3 - 4)	

(4)	Proceedings, abstract, or preprint publications	1 - 2
(5)	Large (>\$75K/yr) research or program grant funded	20 - 30
	Principal Investigator (25 - 30)	
	Co-investigator (20 - 25)	
(6)	Implementation for 2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th , etc. of large multi-year research or program grant	15 - 25
	Principal Investigator (20 - 25)	
	Co-investigator (15 - 20)	
(7)	Submission of unsuccessful large research or program grant proposal	4 - 10
	Principal Investigator (8 - 10)	
	Co-investigator (4 - 8)	
(8)	Significant (\$25K to \$75K/yr) research or program grant funded	10 - 20
	Principal Investigator (15 - 20)	
	Co-investigator (10 - 15)	
(9)	Implementation for 2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th , etc. year of significant multi-year research or program grant	8 - 15
	Principal Investigator (12 - 15)	
	Co-investigator (8 - 12)	
(10)	Submission of unsuccessful significant research or program grant proposal	4 - 8
	Principal Investigator (6 - 8)	
	Co-investigator (4 - 6)	
(11)	Moderate (\$10K - \$24K/yr) research or program grant funded	8 - 15
	Principal Investigator (12 - 15)	
	Co-investigator (8 - 12)	
(12)	Implementation for 2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th , etc. year of moderate research or program grant	6 - 12
	Principal Investigator (8 - 12)	
	Co-investigator (6 - 8)	
(13)	Submission of unsuccessful moderate research or program grant proposal	3 - 6
	Principal Investigator (4 - 6)	
	Co-investigator (3 - 4)	

(14)	Small (< 10K) external or internal grant funded Includes URC, summer stipend, or faculty mentor grants	6 - 10
(15)	Submission of small (<10K) unsuccessful external or internal grant proposal	1 - 3
(16)	Invited presentations Regional, national or international conference State conference	(10 - 12) (8 - 10) 8 - 12
(17)	Professional presentation Regional, national or international conference State conference Local conference	(8 - 10) (6 - 8) (5 - 6) 5 - 10
(18)	Supervision of student presentations Regional, national or international conference State conference Local conference	(6 - 8) (4 - 6) (3 - 4) 3 - 8
(19)	Other principal scholarship work Includes meeting organizer, appointment to editorial boards, review panels, national honor's, fellowships received, book chapter published, thesis supervision, relevant consulting activities, etc.	8 - 15
(20)	Other important scholarship work Includes chairing meeting sessions, review of journal articles, participation in workshops, panel discussions, etc.	5 - 10

IV. 2. C. Documentation: Documentation to be considered in the evaluation process:

Narratives written by the employee; copies of papers published in journals; Copies of books or chapters published; Copies of papers presented at professional meetings; Documentation for an item refereed by the employee (such as a referee's report); Copies of grant application and grant reports; Citations to published or unpublished scholarly work; Copies of reviews of scholarly work; Other documentation as appropriate.

IV. 3. A. Service: Performance Evaluation

SATISFACTORY (S)-The faculty member attends department meetings, serves on department committees, and completes other assigned tasks.

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE (HE)-To achieve the rating of HE in probationary years 3 to 5, the faculty member must, during each probationary year, make meaningful contributions

to department meetings, must provide valuable service as a member of department committees, and must complete other significant assigned tasks. To achieve the rating of HE in the evaluation for tenure or for promotion to associate professor, the faculty member must, in addition to the above, chair departmental committees, serve as faculty sponsor for a student organization, or have served on at least one college committee, one university committee, or one pertinent community/regional committee. This higher level service must have been for a cumulative total of two years or more. To achieve the rating of HE in the evaluation of promotion to professor, the faculty member must have served on at least one college committee and one university committee or one pertinent community/regional committee, or served as faculty sponsor of a student organization for a cumulative total of two years or more since his/her promotion to the rank of associate professor.

EXCELLENT (E)-In addition to the above, the faculty member must achieve a distinguished record of service marked by an active role in committee work and service tasks with significant leadership responsibility.

IV. 3. B. Total Service Activities Performance will be defined by the following system:

EXCELLENT (E)	=	17.5	-	25.0
HIGHLY EFFECTIVE (HE)	=	15.0	-	17.4
SATISFACTORY (S)	=	13.0	-	14.9
UNSATISFACTORY (UN)	=	5.00	-	12.9

Each service activity evaluated will be assigned points as listed below and a total score will be used to assign the descriptor above (E), (HE), (S), or (UN)

IV. 3. C: A service rating will be assigned based on the following ranges per item:

(1)	Chair of university level committee*	8 – 12
(2)	Chair of college level committee*	6 - 10
(3)	Chair of department level committee*	4 – 8
(4)	Chair of conference organization committee	6 - 10
(5)	Membership in university level committee	4 – 8
(6)	Membership in college level committee	3 – 7
(7)	Membership in department level committee	2 – 6
(8)	Membership in conference organization committee	4 - 8
(9)	Officer in a national/international professional organization	4 – 8

(10)	Officer in local, state, or regional professional organization	3 – 7
(11)	Service as faculty sponsor for student organization	3 - 7
(12)	Committee member for thesis defense	2 – 4
(13)	Membership in professional organization	1 - 2
(14)	Chairing sessions at professional meetings	2 – 5
(15)	Visiting other campuses or involvement graduate fairs for recruitment purposes	3 - 5
(16)	Service as Discover Western leader, or other recruitment tours	2 – 4
(17)	Membership in community organizations related to chemistry	1 - 3
(18)	Participation in TA/GA training sessions	3 - 5
(19)	Service of national or international discussion panels or workshops	4 - 8
(20)	Service on state or regional discussion panels or workshops	3 - 6
(21)	Service on campus or local discussion panels or workshops	2 - 4
(22)	Service as instrument coordinator*	1 – 3
(23)	Other principal service work	6 – 12
(24)	Other important service work	5 – 10

* Service for which ACEs were not assigned

Documentation of the amount of time involved and the productivity of the service activity must be made.

IV. 3. D. Documentation to be considered in the evaluation process:

Narratives written by the employee; reports of achievements prepared by committee chairs; Letters of commendation; Records of participation and attendance.

V. General Comments

All evaluators will take into consideration the resources available as well as any unusually heavy teaching loads or service commitments.

Should professional opinion from outside the department be desired in any area of evaluation, requests for such opinions will be sought only with the prior approval of the faculty member. Assessment results will not be used in the evaluation of faculty.

VI. DEPARTMENT CRITERIA FOR UNIT B EMPLOYEES

The evaluation of Association Faculty shall be limited to the teaching/primary duties that are a part of the approved job description of the employee. However, the applicant is encouraged to demonstrate involvement in scholarly/professional activities and service within the requirements of the WIU-UPI Contract for 2007-2011 [Article 33.1 b]. The items and documentation that may be considered are the same as those listed in section A of this document for Unit A employees.

The Department Chair shall review each Associate Faculty member's portfolio documentation on teaching/primary duties and other additional materials and write an evaluation in a manner consistent with the requirements stated in Article 33.1 of the Contract for 2007-2011.

VI. A. Evaluation of Associate Faculty

The evaluation methods/procedures to be applied are the same as those used for Unit A faculty with the following exceptions:

1. For annual evaluations, performance shall be rated as "unsatisfactory", "satisfactory," or "highly effective." Faculty having performance ratings of satisfactory or higher will listed on the re-employment roster by seniority rank order.
2. Associate Faculty in at least the ninth year of service having received "highly effective" performance ratings in each of the last three years shall be promoted to Senior Associate Faculty status.

VI. B. Specific Criteria for Promotion of Unit B faculty to Assistant Professor

Associate faculty who meet the Department Criteria may apply for promotion to Assistant professor. To be promoted to Assistant Professor, an Associate faculty (Unit B) should have a professional record comparable to those who would be seriously considered if a Unit A Assistant Professor vacancy were to be advertised.

The portfolios submitted must contain all student evaluations, including comments, course materials, and other documents for the last four years and course materials for any earlier periods for any earlier periods of employment at WIU.