

DEPARTMENTAL APPLICATION OF CRITERIA
Department of Biological Sciences
Effective Fall 2024

I. University and College Information

A. University Mission Statement

Chicago State University transforms students' lives by innovative teaching, research, and community partnerships through excellence in ethical leadership, cultural enhancement, economic development, and justice.

B. College of Arts and Sciences Mission Statement

The College of Arts and Sciences provides the intellectual nucleus of the University. The college prepares its students to be competitive in challenging careers in the humanities, fine and performing arts, the social and behavioral sciences, and the STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) disciplines. The college provides students throughout the university with broad interdisciplinary awareness and competence to equip them for citizenship in the 21st century environment of diversity, globalization and social justice.

C. University Strategic Planning Goals and College Key Performance Indicators

The Key Performance Indicators for the College of Arts and Sciences parallel the University's Strategic Planning Goals. Each of the six CSU strategic goals is aligned with a specific public agenda goal or CSU strategic issue that supports the fulfillment of the University mission. The six goals are:

- 1) Academic Excellence, Innovation and Student Transformation;
- 2) Student Enrollment, Retention and Graduation;
- 3) University Culture, Climate and Accountability;
- 4) Strengthened Infrastructure;
- 5) Cost Efficiencies and Diverse Revenue Streams; and
- 6) Community Service, Urban Leadership and Economic Engagement.

II. Department Information

The Department of Biological Sciences helps the College and University achieve their strategic goals and missions through ongoing review of Unit A and B faculty as described in this document and through enacting the mission statement articulated below.

A. Department Mission Statement

The Department of Biological Sciences is committed to providing a rigorous curriculum to meet the needs of our diverse student population through courses, mentored research, and service opportunities. We strive to prepare our students for professional careers, postgraduate education and global citizenship. To this end, the department provides a strong educational foundation in STEM that supports innovation, entrepreneurship, leadership and community service.

B. The Departmental Personnel Committee (DPC)

The Departmental Personnel Committee (DPC) evaluates probationary faculty; faculty applying for tenure, promotion or professional advancement increase; and unit B lecturers (full- and part-time non-tenure track faculty). The DPC consists of (1) a rotating Chair selected by the Department Chair from among the pool of tenured faculty, and (2) all Unit A faculty at the current rank of Full Professor and faculty above the rank of the applicant. If there are fewer than three faculty in the department eligible to vote on any personnel action additional eligible faculty members may be recruited from the following departments: Chemistry, Physics and Engineering Studies, and the Pharmaceutical Sciences in Pharmacy. The DPC will vote to approve the addition of a faculty member not in the department. If a majority of the DPC approves the addition, that faculty member will be added to the DPC. The faculty member or members from outside the department will only be eligible to vote on decisions where there are fewer than three regular department members eligible to vote. DPC evaluation is based on the standards described in this Departmental Application of Criteria (DAC) and terms of the *Contract*.

Unit A faculty are evaluated in a meeting(s) of the DPC. Each member casts a vote (yes, no, or abstain) on whether a candidate has met the standards for retention or promotion. The votes and a summary evaluation written by the DPC chair are reviewed and signed by the committee, then submitted to the Department Chair. Unit B lecturers are evaluated annually in a meeting of the DPC. The DPC evaluation is submitted as a recommendation to the Department Chair. The DPC evaluation is not included in Unit B personnel files.

C. Responsibilities of Candidates for Evaluation

Faculty requesting evaluation must submit a portfolio of materials to the DPC that covers the period of consideration. The candidate must prepare the portfolio in accordance with the criteria contained in this DAC. The portfolio requires peer evaluations of teaching. Candidates must arrange for peers to evaluate their teaching and ensure that these evaluations are timely and include different faculty peers where possible.

Unit B lecturers must prepare a portfolio annually as specified herein and in the *Contract*. The DPC chair assigns members of the DPC to visit classes of Unit B lecturers after consultation with the lecturer.

Tenured faculty must submit a portfolio to the Department Chair biennially in accordance with the standards specified herein and in the *Contract*. The DPC does not evaluate these portfolios.

All Unit A faculty are encouraged to design a faculty development plan (Appendix 1) guided by their pending evaluation or promotion periods, relevant evaluation standards herein, and in the Contract.

III. Criteria for Unit A (Tenured and Tenure-Track) Faculty

Relative importance of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, Research/Creative Activity, and Service:

Unit A faculty are evaluated in three areas: Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, Research/Creative Activity, and Service. All tenured and tenure-track candidates must meet the criteria at the level specified herein for each of the three areas of evaluation. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties (PPD) is considered the most important of the three areas of evaluation, i.e., having higher standards as stipulated in the *Contract*. Research/Creative Activity and Service are given equal consideration. In addition to the narrative format below, this DAC includes appendices and tables that complement each other as an aggregate to facilitate the review process.

A. Teaching and Performance of Primary Duties

The two sections of the category, Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, are weighted in their evaluation in proportion to the assignment of CUEs on the Revised Work Assignment. The materials required to meet the performance standards for each section are described below and presented in tabular form in Appendix 2.

1. Categories of materials and activities for evaluation of teaching/performance of primary duties

a) Categories of materials and activities for teaching traditional, hybrid or online courses

Applicants should organize their submission in the following four categories with category one being the most important (also consult criteria below and in Appendix 2).

- 1) classroom performance:
 - i. report of class visitation (peer and chair evaluations);
 - ii. student evaluations;
- 2) course materials;
- 3) curriculum revision, development, and student learning assessment;
- 4) professional development for teaching improvement.

b) Categories of materials and activities for performance of primary duties

Performance of primary duties is judged on the basis of details provided in Appendix 2. Examples of Primary Duties include assessment release time, advising release time, program coordinator release time, administrative release time, facilities director, and other compensated activities not associated with Teaching or Research.

2. Evaluation methods and standards

The materials required to meet the performance standards of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties are listed below. Candidates must submit a narrative that outlines course evaluation results and other accomplishments in both areas, if applicable.

Candidates are expected to routinely contribute to assessment of student learning in their courses and are required to submit them in a timely fashion for courses that are part of scheduled departmental or general education assessment and/or accreditation plans.

a) Classroom performance:

1) Reports of class visitations for traditional (face to face), hybrid, and online courses:

Classroom visitations must: (1) be completed by a team, usually at different times, and composed of at least two DPC members appointed by the Chairperson of the Department Personnel Committee (DPC) in consultation with the candidate; (2) be completed within the evaluation period; and (3) follow guidelines and criteria detailed in the Peer Evaluation Form (Appendix 3).

Online/hybrid courses are treated equally as face-to-face courses in terms of classroom visitations, except that faculty teaching online/hybrid courses are required to schedule a time to enroll evaluators in their virtual class. Peer evaluators must be allowed to view relevant online course materials and activities in similar fashion as traditional courses.

2) Student evaluations:

Each academic term, except summer, all of an instructor's students must have the opportunity to evaluate their instructor's teaching effectiveness. The evaluations are done as specified by the Department and University.

3) Departmental chairperson evaluation:

The Department Chairperson must arrange to attend a class, in-person or virtually, given by the candidate. A classroom visitation report will be included in the Department Chairperson's evaluation of the candidate.

b) Course materials:

Course materials are evaluated on the basis of appropriateness to the level of the course. Course materials must include: (1) up-to-date syllabi that include course objectives, student learning outcomes, course grading policies, and attendance policies; (2) representative lecture PowerPoints and/or other instructor presentation materials; (3) representative formative and summative

assessments (e.g. quizzes, exams, term papers, and presentations, etc.); and (4) representative laboratory exercises and skill-building assignments if applicable.

Other materials and evidence of course development, revision and assessment of student learning may be included, such as: (1) samples of reading lists, (2) online course pages and resources, (3) the integration of technology to meet or enhance the goals of the course, (4) relevant certification or official recognition of excellence, and (5) student assessment reports. Student names must be de-identified in any materials submitted.

c) Standards for evaluating Teaching/PPD:

Based on documentable evidence submitted, the candidate will be judged by the voting members of the DPC as to whether or not he/she has fulfilled the required standards for teaching/PPD as per Article 19 of the *Contract*:

- 1) for retention of tenure-track faculty in probationary years one and two, “satisfactory” teaching/PPD;
- 2) for retention in probationary year three, “effective” teaching/PPD;
- 3) for retention in probationary year four, “highly effective” teaching/PPD;
- 4) for retention in probationary year five, “significant” teaching/PPD;
- 5) for tenure, promotion to associate professor, and for professional advancement increase, “superior” teaching/PPD;
- 6) for promotion to professor, “superior” teaching/PPD;
- 7) for exceptionality, “exemplary” teaching/PPD and student evaluations of 4.5 or higher in two consecutive years.

In order to quantitatively judge student evaluations, the following table will be used by the DPC:

| | | |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|
| Satisfactory > 3.0 | Effective > 3.25 | Highly Effective > 3.5 |
| Significant > 3.75 | Superior 4.0 | Exemplary > 4.5 |

Averages are calculated by an unweighted average of all classes taught during the evaluation period. Faculty are expected to submit at least 90% of the completed course evaluations (i.e., 9 of 10 courses) for the evaluation period. In the situation where the faculty member has taught less than 10 courses during the evaluation period, one course can be omitted from submission (i.e., if four courses are taught, three need to be submitted). Courses that have no submitted student evaluations do not count in these calculations.

An average score of 3.0 (satisfactory) or higher is considered sufficient for all personnel actions, except for promotion to professor or promotion by exception (see above). Student evaluations are not the sole criteria for evaluating teaching/PPD. The DPC must also consider peer evaluations, course materials and completion of

primary duties (if applicable).

Reviews with an average consistently under 3.0 in a specific course over a series of three semesters in which the candidate has taught the course necessitates a plan, developed by the candidate in consultation with the Chair, to engage in professional development and revise aspects of the course.

B. Research/Creative Activity

1. Categories of materials and activities

Categories of materials and activities, in descending order of importance, are detailed below. These standards are abbreviated in the Research/Creative Activity Table, Appendix 4).

a) Publications (column 1 of table):

- 1) professional, peer-reviewed publication in an academic journal;
- 2) professionally-related book or monograph;
- 3) book chapter, or scholarly literature review published in an academic journal;
- 4) editorially-reviewed technical report in a trade publication;
- 5) editorially-reviewed, discipline-specific review article published by an academic organization.

b) Grants, fellowships and awards (column 2 of table):

- 1) competitive, extramural, multi-year research grant or its progress report maintaining it in good standing;
- 2) competitive grant, fellowship or award, including one-year awards, training/retraining grants, preferably involving students;
- 3) submission of competitive, extramural multi-year grant proposal;
- 4) non-refereed grant, fellowship or award;
- 5) travel award to present or attend a national or international professional meeting;
- 6) grant/travel award for students directly associated with research and not teaching/PPD.

c) Research presentations (column 3 of table):

- 1) invited oral presentation at a meeting sponsored by a national/international professional organization;
- 2) research presentation, poster, or contributive paper with a published abstract at a meeting sponsored by a national/international professional organization;
- 3) organizer or leader of a research symposium/working group at a meeting sponsored by a national/international professional organization;

- 4) oral presentation, poster session, contributive paper or symposium leader at a local scientific meeting;
 - 5) seminar presentation in the University or the Department
 - 6) M.S. thesis defense by a student advisee;
 - 7) symposium, scholarly or professional working group on research activities to enhance engagement in STEM;
- d) Professional development (column 4 of table):
- 1) major advisor for one or more MSc Thesis students who are not yet registered for BIOL 5700;
 - 2) receipt of an intramural grant;
 - 3) manuscript submitted for publication in an academic journal;
 - 4) grant proposal submitted for internal funding;
 - 5) research mentorship of students who are not receiving credit; e.g., students funded by CSER, volunteers;
 - 6) seminar or speaking engagement promoting research to university or community audience;
 - 7) tutoring students for success in research courses taught by other professors or for research/graduate program recruitment.

2. Evaluation methods and standards and relative importance

The candidate will submit materials indicative of his/her Research/Creative Activity to the Department Chairperson. Candidates should include a narrative, outlining their accomplishments in this area and noting alignment with items in Appendix 4. Accomplishments involving CSU students should be highlighted. The submission will be made available to all members of the DPC for their consideration prior to discussion by the entire committee. It is expected that candidates will be first author/corresponding author on publications and PI/co-PI on grants. However, collaboration with colleagues at other, especially Research I, universities is encouraged. In the event that a candidate is a secondary author on a publication or key personnel on a grant, the DPC will assess the quality of the candidate's contribution. If research achievements from higher importance levels have not been achieved, combinations of lower level achievements may be considered as a substitute.

a) Standards for evaluating Research/Creative Activity:

Based on the documentable evidence presented and tabulated in the Research/Creative Activity Table in Appendix 4, the candidate will be judged by the voting members of the DPC on whether he/she has fulfilled the required standard indicated for the appropriate retention, promotion or tenure category as per Article 19 of the *Contract*. The standards for evaluation are:

- 1) For retention in probationary year one, “appropriate” research evidenced by completing at least one of the activities in Research/Creative Activity Table (see Appendix 4) columns 1-4;
- 2) For retention in probationary year two, which includes time since beginning of employment, “satisfactory” research evidenced by completing two or more of the activities in Research/Creative Activity Table columns 1-4;
- 3) For retention in probationary year three, “highly satisfactory” research, evidenced by completing at least three activities in Research/Creative Activity Table columns 1-4;
- 4) For retention in probationary year four, “effective” research, evidenced by completing at least three activities in Research/Creative Activity Table, two of which must be in columns 1-3*

*Faculty who have not completed an activity in columns 1-2 of the Research/Creative Activity Table must meet with the Department Chair and a subset of the DPC to construct a plan for meeting the standards for tenure in the next two years.

- 5) For retention in probationary year five, “highly effective” research, evidenced by completing at least three activities in Research/Creative Activity Table columns 1-3;
- 6) For tenure and for promotion to Associate Professor, “significant” research, evidenced by completing two activities in the Research/Creative Activity Table, column 1A-C and/or column 2A; or one activity each, from column 1A-C and column 3B; or one activity each from column 2A and column 3B; and three other activities from columns 1-3 and three additional activities from columns 1-4; -

Tenure-track faculty currently in years 1-5 (as of AY 2023-2024) will be required to accomplish only

one major research activity for tenure. This exception is only for the 2022-2026 Contract.

- 7) For promotion to Professor, “superior” research, evidenced by completing one activity in Research/Creative Activity Table column 1A-C, one activity in column 2A, and at least five activities from columns 1-4 while a member of CSU faculty during the appropriate evaluation period (see *Contract*);
- 8) For professional advancement increase, “superior” research, as described in article III.B.2.a.8 above; and at least “significant” service (defined below);
OR “significant” research, as described in article III.B.2.a.7 above; and “superior” service (defined below) [each area shall be examined in the aggregate, that is, taken as a whole, through the last five years prior to the evaluation]; and
- 9) Exception, research that exceeds “superior” as evidenced by completing two activities in Research/Creative Activity Table 1A and/or 2A; and at least six other activities from columns 1-4 that include student involvement while a member of CSU faculty, and published, awarded or presented during the appropriate evaluation period (see *Contract*) .

C. Service

1. Categories of materials and activities

Categories of materials and activities are detailed below and ~~(must be unassigned, and non-compensated);~~ These standards are also summarized in the Service Table, Appendix

a) Department activities:

- 1) member of Department committees or other initiatives including search, grievance, peer evaluation, etc.; (include evidence of active participation);
- 2) leadership on Department committees or other initiatives;
- 3) student advising; student club/group advisor;
- 4) student retention/recruitment activities; facilitating formal exchanges among students and faculty, other institutions or groups;
- 5) member of graduate student thesis committee.

b) University and College activities:

- 1) active participation on College or University committees or other initiatives including accreditation, curriculum, search, comm., etc.;
 - 2) leadership role on University or College committees or initiatives;
 - 3) advisor to student clubs/groups;
 - 4) participation in university or college-wide retention/recruitment activities, student symposia or workshops;
 - 5) union service.
- c) Professionally-related public and community service including, but not limited to:
- 1) lectures, workshops or presentations to public audiences;
 - 2) service to professional organizations including grant, manuscript review or committee participation;
 - 3) judge at science fairs, external research symposia or similar events;
 - 4) other uncompensated service not otherwise categorized, such as technical and facility support, consulting, or membership on external theses/dissertations.

2. Relative importance

Service activity at the Department, University and College levels is considered to be of equal importance and more important than community service. Serving as an officer or in some other leadership role is considered a more significant contribution than serving as a member of a committee.

3. Evaluation methods and standards

The candidate will submit a summary sheet, narrative and documentation of his/her service to the Department Chairperson. These will be made available to all members of the DPC for their consideration prior to the discussion by the entire committee. If higher level service achievements have not been achieved, combinations of lower level achievements may be considered as a substitute for them.

a) Standards for evaluating Service:

Based on the documentable evidence presented and quantitatively specified in the Service Table Appendix 5, the candidate is judged by the voting members of the DPC as to whether or not he/she has fulfilled the required standard indicated for the appropriate retention, promotion or tenure category as per Article 19 of the *Contract*. The standards for evaluation are:

- 1) for retention in probationary year one, “appropriate” service, as evidenced by service at the department or college/university level;
- 2) for retention in probationary year two and for promotion to assistant professor, “satisfactory” service, as evidenced by effective participation at the department or college/university level;
- 3) for retention in probationary year three, “highly satisfactory” service, as evidenced by highly

- satisfactory participation on one or more department committees and service at the college/university level;
- 4) for retention in probationary year four, “effective” service, as evidenced by effective participation on two or more department committees and service on at least one committee at the college/university level;
 - 5) for retention in probationary year five, “highly effective” service, as evidenced by highly effective participation on two or more department committees and service on at least one committee at the college/university level;
 - 6) for tenure and promotion to associate professor, “significant” service, as evidenced by significant participation on three or more department committees and service on at least two committees at the college/university level;
 - 7) for promotion to professor, “superior” service, as evidenced by continuously active service at the department and college/university level;
 - 8) for professional advancement increase, “superior” service, as evidenced by continuously active service at the department and college/university level and at least “significant” research (see above) OR “significant” service, as evidenced by effective participation on department committees and service at the university level and “superior” research (see above). Publications or grant awards in science teaching, teaching technology, or course enhancement may also be used as evidence of “superior” service for the PAI award. Each area shall be examined in the aggregate, that is, taken as a whole, through the last five years prior to the evaluation;
 - 9) exception, as evidenced by serving as an officer at the department and college/university levels and official relevant recognition of excellence in this area, and substantial and ongoing service in the community especially column 3A from Service Table.

IV. Criteria for Unit B Faculty (Lecturers)

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

Candidates are asked to submit a portfolio that includes 1) a summary narrative, 2) visitation and student evaluation results, 3) assessment activities if applicable, 4) representative course materials, and 5) other accomplishments including non-teaching compensated duties, if applicable, during the period of evaluation.

1. Categories of materials and activities

- a) Categories of materials and activities to be evaluated for teaching traditional, hybrid and online courses:
 - 1) classroom performance:
 - i. reports of class visitation (peer and chair evaluations);
 - ii. student evaluations;
 - 2) course materials; and
 - 3) student assessment contributions.

Teaching is judged collectively on the basis of the above categories with classroom visitation reports and student evaluations, as well as course materials, being the most important categories.

b) Categories of materials and activities for performance of primary duties other than teaching:

Unit B faculty do not normally perform duties other than teacher, but if so, then their Performance of Primary Duties will be judged on the basis of evidence provided for completion (see Appendix 2 for suggestions). Overall performance is to be weighted in their evaluation in proportion to the time spent on teaching versus other compensated primary duty.

2. Evaluation methods and standards

a) Classroom performance:

1) reports of class visitation by peers:

A classroom visitation team, composed of at least two DPC members, will be appointed by the Chairperson of the DPC in consultation with the candidate undergoing evaluation. The visitation team will prepare written evaluations of classroom performance following guidelines and criteria detailed in the Peer Evaluation Form (Appendix 3). The evaluation will be discussed with the candidate and presented at a meeting of the DPC. The DPC report will be submitted as an informal recommendation to the Department Chair, which shall not be included in the Unit B faculty member's personnel file.

2) Reports of class visitation by Department Chairperson:

The Department Chairperson will arrange to attend a class in-person or virtually, given by the candidate. A classroom visitation report will be included in the Department Chairperson's evaluation of the candidate.

3) Student evaluations:

Each academic term except summer, all of an instructor's students shall have the opportunity to evaluate their instructor's teaching effectiveness-The evaluations will be done as specified by the Department and University.

b) Course Materials:

Course materials to be submitted for evaluation are outlined in Appendix 2, Table 2 and must include: (1) up-to-date syllabus with objectives of what students will learn and practice, course grading, and attendance policies, (2) representative lecture PowerPoints and other instructor materials, (3) representative formative and summative assessments (e.g. quizzes, exams, term

papers, and presentations, etc), and (4) representative laboratory exercises and skill-building assignments if applicable. Other materials and evidence of course development, revision and assessment of student learning may be included such as: (1) samples of reading lists, (2) online course pages and resources, (3) the integration of technology to meet or enhance the goals of the course, and (4) student assessment reports if applicable. Student names must be de-identified in any materials submitted.

c) Student assessment

All Unit B faculty are expected to conduct assessment for student learning in their courses and in consultation with the Assessment Coordinators. The specified assessment instruments will be used and the assessment results submitted to the Assessment Coordinator in a timely fashion. Student names must be de-identified in any assessment reports or similar materials submitted.

3. Standards for evaluating Teaching/PPD

Unit B Faculty Lecturers must earn a minimum of a “satisfactory” rating from their Chair and Dean in order for their name to appear on the re-employment roster. The standards below then apply.

Lecturers who have attained ~~10~~ five or more years of instructional service with the University are eligible for renewable five-year contracts if they have earned “highly effective” performance evaluations for ~~two~~ three of the preceding five years. Once the five-year appointment status has been achieved, Lecturers must receive “highly effective” performance evaluations for their teaching/primary duties in at least ~~two~~ three of the next five years, to continue renewing the five-year multi-year appointment. Lecturers on a multi-year appointment will receive the title of Senior Lecturer for as long as they are on a multi-year contract [see *Contract* Article 30.2.b.(2)].

If Lecturers fail to attain a multi-year contract because of not achieving sufficient numbers of “highly effective” evaluations, they will be eligible again after earning two “highly effective” performance evaluations within five years [see *Contract* Article 30.2.b.(3)].

Lecturers on multi-year appointments must continue to earn a minimum level of “satisfactory” performance on annual evaluations to continue in the current multi-year contract [see *Contract* Article 30.2.b.(4)].

Regarding student evaluations, the standards for “satisfactory” or “highly effective” shall be the same as described in article III.A.2.c of this DAC.

V. Criteria for Research Faculty

A. Standards for retention of Research Faculty

Relative importance of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, Research/Creative Activity, and Service:

Research Faculty are hired for their expertise in the research area and are expected to contribute primarily in that area. If teaching/primary duties or service requirements are specified in the letter of appointment and annual work assignments, then the candidate will also be evaluated in one or both of those areas, but such evaluation will be considered of less importance than his or her research productivity. Research Faculty will provide evidence of how they are supporting the mission of the department, for example in student mentoring.

1. Categories of materials and activities and their relative importance

a) Research/Creative Activity:

Please include a brief narrative, outlining your accomplishments in this area.

- 1) For retention of Research Faculty in years one and two: “highly effective” research/creative activity, as evidenced by continuous receipt of external grant funding, presentation(s) at one or more professional conferences per year, and submission of at least one manuscript per year.
- 2) For retention of Research Faculty in year three: “highly effective” research/creative activity, as evidenced by continuous receipt of external grant funding, presentation(s) at one or more professional conferences, and publication of at least one peer-reviewed paper.
- 3) For promotion to Research Assistant Professor: “highly effective” research/creative activity in the aggregate, through the evaluation period, as evidenced by continuous receipt of external grant funding, presentation(s) at one or more professional conferences during the evaluation period, and publication of at least one peer-reviewed paper during the evaluation period.
- 4) For retention of Research Faculty in years four and beyond: “significant” research/ creative activity, as evidenced by continuous receipt of external grant funding, presentation(s) at one or more professional conferences per year, and publication of at least one peer-reviewed paper per year.
- 5) For promotion to Research Associate Professor: “significant” research/creative activity in the aggregate, through the evaluation period, as evidenced by continuous receipt of external grant funding, presentation(s) at one or more professional conferences per year during the evaluation period, and publication of an average of at least one peer-reviewed paper per year during the evaluation period.
- 6) For promotion to Research Professor: “superior” research/creative activity in the aggregate, through the evaluation period, as evidenced by continuous receipt of external grant funding, presentation(s) at one or more professional conferences per year during the evaluation period, and publication of an average at least two peer-reviewed papers per year, for which the candidate is the corresponding author, on work performed at CSU during the evaluation period.

b) Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties (if applicable): Standards as in III.A.1. (for Categories of Materials and Activities) and III.BA.12.a. & b. (for ~~Methods of Evaluation~~ Evaluation Methods).

- 1) For retention of Research Faculty in years one-three: “highly effective” teaching/PPD (if applicable).
 - 2) For promotion to Research Assistant Professor, “highly effective” teaching/PPD (if applicable) in the aggregate, through the evaluation period.
 - 3) For retention of Research Faculty in years four and beyond: “significant” teaching/PPD (if applicable).
 - 4) For promotion to Research Associate Professor, “significant” teaching/PPD (if applicable) in the aggregate, through the evaluation period.
 - 5) For promotion to Research Professor, “superior” teaching/PPD (if applicable) in the aggregate, through the evaluation period.
- c) Service (if applicable): Standards as in III.AC.31&2. (for Categories and relative importance) and I.B.III.C.3. (for Standards).
- 1) For retention of Research Faculty in years one-three: “highly effective” service (if applicable).
 - 2) For promotion to Research Assistant Professor: “highly effective” service (if applicable) in the aggregate, through the evaluation period.
 - 3) For retention of Research Faculty in years four and beyond: “significant” service (if applicable).
 - 4) For promotion to Research Associate Professor: “significant” service (if applicable) in the aggregate, through the evaluation period.
 - 5) For promotion to Research Professor: “significant” service (if applicable) in the aggregate, through the evaluation period.

VI. Criteria for Annual Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

Tenured faculty submit a report to the Department Chair annually as noted in the *Contract*. The report summarizes their contributions in the areas of Teaching/Primary Duties, Research/Creative Activity, and Service. As specified in the Contract, Article 19.4.c.(1).(d), documentation (a portfolio) is required every other year. This documentation may cover the previous year, or it may cover the two years since the last portfolio.

Tenured faculty are evaluated by their Chair and Dean using the standards of “Adequate” and “Exemplary” as described below. In the case of a disagreement between a tenured faculty and the Chair or Dean regarding the annual evaluation, the faculty member may submit a rebuttal and request an evaluation of the submitted materials from the DPC; the rebuttal and evaluation become part of the permanent record.

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

1. The “adequate” standard is represented by maintenance of standards as evidenced by student course evaluations, course materials, evidence of contributions to course development; and completion of Primary Duties, if applicable.
2. the “exemplary” standard is represented by student course evaluations, course materials, evidence of contributions to course development, curriculum development, professional development for

teaching improvement and major contributions in performance of Primary Duties, if applicable.

B. Research/Creative Activity

1. The “adequate” standard is represented by evidence of completing at least two activities in the Research Table (Appendix 4) each year and at least one major accomplishment (activities in the Research Table column 1 or 2A-B every three years. This shall include research efforts in science teaching & education or outreach for all candidates.
2. The “exemplary” standard is represented by evidence of completing at least three activities in the Research Table (Appendix 4) each year and at least one major accomplishment (activities in the Research Table column 1 or 2A-B every ~~three~~ years. This shall include research efforts in science teaching & education or outreach for all candidates.

Each annual report by tenured faculty should include an explanatory list of activities and accomplishments, for example: —

- a. use of research space on campus or off-campus;
- b. current funding (internal, external, travel, etc.);
- c. research-related release time; and
- d. graduate and undergraduate student research under the faculty member’s direction, especially Master’s theses.

C. Service:

1. For annual evaluation of tenured faculty, the “adequate” standard is represented by evidence of service and participation at the departmental and college/university levels.
2. The “exemplary” standard is represented by evidence of leadership in service at the departmental, college/university, or community level.

When a portfolio is required, tenured faculty must include documentation of three or more activities from the Service Table to meet the standard of “adequate”; or three or more activities, including one from 1A or 2A of the Service Table to meet the standard of “exemplary”.

Appendix 1. Faculty Development Plan

Candidates are encouraged to design a faculty development plan aligned with their pending evaluation or promotion periods, and guided by relevant evaluation standards as defined in the DAC, and instructions within the *Contract*. The suggested format of the plan follows.

NAME _____ TITLE _____

Period of Evaluation: _____

Retention Year, Rank or Promotion Sought: _____

| Criteria (as applicable) | Goal for the Year/Period of Evaluation | Resources Needed to Attain Goal | Vehicles to Accomplish Goal by the End of the Year/Evaluation Period | Relationship to Strategic Plan (Specify) | Relationship to Professional Standards (if relevant) |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Teaching (as applicable) | | | | | |
| Other Primary Duties (specify) | | | | | |
| Research/Creative Activity | | | | | |
| Publications | | | | | |
| Grantsmanship (Submitted, implementation involvement, progress reports) | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Presentations | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | |
| Service | | | | | |
| Department Level | | | | | |
| College Level | | | | | |
| University Level | | | | | |
| Community | | | | | |

Employee Date

Chairperson/Program Director Date Dean Date

Appendix 2. Teaching and Performance of Primary Duties

The two sections of the category Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties (PPD) are to be weighted in the evaluation in proportion to the assignment of CUEs on the Revised Work Assignment.

The PPD are as central to the function of the institution as direct instruction. Compensated duties or other activities, where release time has been provided, are just as important as direct instructional activities, and should be viewed as contributing to one's professional development and the mission of the University. Examples of Primary Duties include Assessment Release Time, Advising Release Time, Program Coordinator release time, Administrative Release Time, Facilities Director, and other compensated activities not associated with teaching or research.

The materials required to meet the performance standards of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties are tabulated below.

Table 1. Categories of Materials for Evaluating Teaching and Performance of Primary Duties

| A. TEACHING | B. PRIMARY DUTIES |
|--|---|
| a. Classroom performance | a. Description of duties |
| b. Course Materials | b. Performance evaluation |
| c. Curriculum revision, development and assessment | c. Evidence of completion of primary duties |
| d. Professional development | d. Other supportive evidence |

Table 2. Materials to be evaluated by the DPC for Column A: Teaching

| Category | Materials to be Submitted |
|--------------------------|---|
| a. Classroom performance | Chair Evaluation Peer evaluations Student evaluations |
| b. Course materials | up-to-date syllabi must be included with details on mode of teaching (traditional, online/distance learning, hybrid, etc.), up-to-date course assessment, grading, and attendance policies representative lecture PowerPoints and on-line course pages formative and summative assessments (e.g. quizzes, exams, term papers, and presentations) laboratory exercises and skill-building assignments other materials (reading lists, online, resources, examples of how technology is integrated to meet/enhance course goals, etc) |

| | |
|--|--|
| c. Curriculum revision, development, and student learning assessment | Original instructional materials for new courses Original assessment materials for existing and new courses Substantive updates to course materials Contributions to positive changes in the program's curriculum Submission of required assessment reports to assessment coordinators |
| d. Professional development | Documentation of participation in professional development activities that contribute to course revision or development, including official certification and professional contributions Documentation or evidence of teaching improvement |

Table 3. Materials to be evaluated by the DPC for Column B: Performance of Primary Duties

| Category | Materials to be Submitted |
|---|---|
| Description of duties | Revised faculty work assignment Synopsis/summary of primary duties |
| 2. Performance evaluation | Letter of evaluation by Chair of Biology Department or direct supervisor* |
| 3. Evidence of completion of duties | Report or similar documentation that shows that responsibilities were met |
| 4. Other supportive evidence of achievement | Other relevant activities and/or contributions, |

*A letter of evaluation for each primary duty should include a statement of assigned duties, a listing of goals and objectives for the release time, and an assessment of the faculty member's performance of the duty. The ~~chairperson~~ Chair may include their evaluation of primary duties in their overall narrative of the candidate.

Appendix 3. Peer Evaluation Form

Please complete the form below including a synopsis and/or letter that identifies possible areas of merit or concern. Include an overall rating of the instructor on the incremental scale from satisfactory, highly satisfactory, effective, highly effective, significant and superior, noting if the evaluation standard as described in the DAC was met.

Instructor:

Date:

Class:

Topic:

Online, Hybrid or traditional:

Approx. number of students:

| Criterion | Limited | Satisfac- tory | Highly satisfact- ory | Effect- ive | Highly Effect- ive | Signifi- cant | Superior | Not Applic- able |
|--|---------|-------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------|------------------------|
| Alignment of course materials with level and scope of the course and learning outcomes of the program | | | | | | | | |
| Instructor's organization and flow during lecture/discussion and/or lab | | | | | | | | |
| Interest, enthusiasm of instructor and interactions with students | | | | | | | | |
| Use of examples, explanations and anecdotes that aid student learning and are relevant to students | | | | | | | | |
| Quality and use of teaching materials including technology and scientific instruments, Learning Management System (Moodle or other), hand-outs, online videos, etc.) | | | | | | | | |
| Student engagement and learning community including collaborative discussions, peer-to-peer activities and discourse in and out of the class | | | | | | | | |

Synopsis and overall rating:

Appendix 4. Research/Creative Activity Table

| Research Categories | | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Item Letter | 1- Publications | 2-Grants, fellowships & awards | 3-Presentations | 4-Professional/ research development |
| A | Professional, peer-reviewed publication in an academic journal | Competitive, extramural, multi-year research grant or its maintenance in good standing | Invited oral presentation at a meeting sponsored by a national/international professional organization | a) Major advisor for one or more MSc Thesis students who are not yet in BIOL 5700 b) Receipt of intramural grant |
| B | Peer-reviewed book or monograph | a) competitive, extramural grant, one year or less b) competitive fellowship | Research presentation, poster, or contributive paper with published abstract at a meeting sponsored by a national/international professional organization | a) Manuscript submitted for publication b) Grant proposal submitted for internal funding |
| C | a) Peer- reviewed Book chapter b) Scholarly literature review article published in an academic journal | Submission of extramural grant proposal | Organizer/leader of a research symposium or working group -a meeting sponsored by a national/international professional organization | Research mentorship of students who are not receiving credit; e.g., students funded by CSER, volunteers |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| D | <p>Editorially-reviewed technical report in a trade publication</p> <p>Editorially reviewed, discipline-specific publication by an academic organization</p> | <p>Non-refereed extramural grant, scholarship/fellowship</p> | <p>Local presentation or poster session, contributive paper, symposium presentation</p> <p>Completed M.S. graduate student thesis defense</p> <p>Seminar presentation at University or Department</p> | <p>Seminar or speaking engagement promoting research to university or community audience</p> |
| E | <p>Editorially reviewed, discipline-specific publication by an academic organization</p> | <p>a) Travel award to present or attend a national or international professional meeting;</p> <p>b) Grants or travel awards for students directly associated to research and not teaching/PPD</p> | <p>Symposium, scholarly and or professional working group on research activities to enhance engagement in STEM areas</p> | <p>Tutoring students for success in research courses taught by other professors or for research/grad program recruitment</p> |

Appendix 5. Service Table PROPOSED

| | Service Categories | | | |
|-------------|--|--|--|---|
| Item Letter | 1 Departmental activities | 2 University and College activities | 3 Professionally-related community service and outreach | 4 Other |
| A | | | Public lectures, workshops, presentations to lay audiences | Additional discipline-related service not otherwise mentioned, including uncompensated technical or facility support and consult; external theses/dissertation committees |
| | Office/ leadership role on department committees or initiative | Office/ leadership role on college or university committees or initiatives | | |
| B | | | Service to professional organizations; reviewer for journals or grants | |
| | Active participation on department committees or initiatives including search or grievance committees, peer evaluations, workshops, etc. | Active participation on college or university committees and initiatives including search, grievance, accreditation committees, etc. | | |
| C | Student advising (unassigned) including departmental student clubs/groups; mentoring student research | Advisor to college/university student clubs/groups | Judge at science fairs, external research symposia or similar events | |
| D | Student retention/recruitment activities; facilitating formal exchanges among students and faculty, other institutions, etc. | Participation in university or college-wide retention/recruitment activities, or student symposia and workshops | | |

| | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---------------|--|--|
| E | Graduate student thesis committee | Union service | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---------------|--|--|

THE DISTANCE EDUCATION POLICY FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Approved November 19, 2020

GENERAL DEFINITIONS

Distance Education Committee –when used throughout this document, the term shall be taken to mean a committee of the Biology Department that consists of selected Unit A members of the department. Department committees are appointed each year by the Chair.

University Distance Education Committee- when used throughout this document, the term shall be taken to mean the university-wide committee with faculty and administration members elected and/or appointed as detailed in Appendix G of the Contract.

Center for Teaching and Research Excellence (CTRE) –when used throughout this document, the term shall be taken to mean the unit within the University that provides faculty development opportunities and support that hasten faculty attainment of professional goals in teaching and research.

Online Course –when used throughout this document, the term shall be taken to mean any course that is taught predominantly online as described in Appendix G of the Contract.

Hybrid Course –when used throughout this document, the term shall be taken to mean any course that is taught online but with regularly scheduled on-campus meetings as described in Appendix G of the Contract.

BIOLOGY COURSES CURRENTLY APPROVED FOR ONLINE OR HYBRID DELIVERY

Online:

- BIOL 1150 Human Biology
- BIOL 1230 Biology of Reproduction
- BIOL 1250 Biology of Sexual Diseases
- PSLY 2040 Human Physiology
- PSLY 4330 Physiological Control Mechanisms

Hybrid:

- BIOL 1070 Biological Science Survey I Lecture and Laboratory
- BIOL 1080 Biological Science Survey II Lecture and Laboratory
- BIOL 1130 Science in Service Society
- BIOL 1510 Biology Concepts
- BIOL 2059 Intro Microbiology

POLICIES

The Department accepts on-line and/or hybrid courses to apply toward a biology degree so long as a course is officially approved by the University, or in the case of transfer courses, is accepted as comparable credit by the University and/or Department. The total number of online/hybrid courses in any case should not exceed 50% of total credits applied toward the degree.

All faculty who teach on-line/hybrid courses must have successfully completed the Online Certification Training (OCT) offered by the CTRE or comparable training approved by the CTRE. The training must be completed in time for the beginning of the course.

The Department shall approve new on-line/hybrid courses as outlined below. This process is the same used for face-to-face courses and follows university policy. After Step 2, the faculty member proposing the course will prepare appropriate Curriculum Forms and continue the process.

1. The faculty member submits a revised or new course proposal to the department chairperson.
2. The approved proposal is submitted to the Department Curriculum Committee for review.
3. Curriculum Forms are prepared by the chair of the Department Curriculum Committee and signed by the Department chair. A course review is then sought from the College and University beginning with review by the university Distance Education Committee (DEC). The process is outlined on the Distance Education Committee website <https://www.csu.edu/DEC/approvalprocess.htm>.
4. If approved by DEC, the Curriculum Forms are signed and sent to the College of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee and other curriculum committees as applicable, for example:
 - a. The General Education Committee
 - b. The University Council on Teacher Education
 - c. The Graduate Curriculum Council
5. The University Curriculum Coordinating Committee is the final committee to review curriculum forms before submission to the Office of Academic Affairs and signed by the Provost. Approved courses are then entered into the course scheduling system and listed in the appropriate publications.

The Department process for monitoring and reviewing on-line/hybrid courses relies upon the department Distance Education Committee with advice from the CTRE as needed. The Committee monitors and reviews on-line/hybrid course offerings and makes recommendations for changes or improvements to the Department Curriculum Committee.

Online/hybrid courses will be treated equally as face-to-face courses and evaluated in similar manner as dictated by the Departmental Application of Criteria. This includes peer and student evaluations and review of course materials by the Departmental Personnel Committee. Faculty who teach on-line/hybrid courses will be required to schedule with evaluators a time to visit a virtual class and view relevant course materials as needed. An asynchronous class recording can be used for faculty evaluation.

Academic advisors will counsel students on the specifics of distance education expectations and courses available. Advisors and instructors of an online/hybrid course will also provide students access to supports such as the *Smart Measure Online Readiness Assessment* (<http://csu.readi.info/>) that helps students identify their learning styles, technological knowledge, computer literacy, and/or competing personal responsibilities. Students needing assistance in online/hybrid coursework related to issues of abilities will be guided by advisors and instructors on how to obtain support from the Office of Abilities, following the same process as for face-to-face courses.

The above Distance Education policies have been discussed and approved by the faculty of the Department of Biological Sciences: Dr. Walid Al-Ghoul, Dr. Anser Azim, Dr. Christopher Botanga, Dr. Melvin Daniels, Dr. Mark Erhart, Dr. Megan Garfinkel, Dr. Andrew Maselli, Dr. Molly McDonough.

Joyce Ache Gana, Chair of Biology: _____ Date: _____