

Departmental Application of Criteria
Computing, Information and
Mathematical Sciences & Technology

2024 - 2026

Fall 2024 – Fall 2026

I. University and College Intentions

A. University Mission Statement

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

B. 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 which supports the fulfillment of the University mission. Together, these goals create what the University conceptualizes as *ACCESS* for every University stakeholder. The six goals are Academic Excellence, Teaching and Research; Community Service and Engagement; Cost Efficiencies and Diverse Revenue Streams; Enrollment, Retention and Graduation; Strengthened Infrastructure; and Shared Accountability and Image

C. Conditions for Employment

All Unit A faculty members must complete the State of Illinois ethics training and are required to have oral English proficiency as mandated by Illinois statute. Unit A teaching faculty are required to attend department meetings at no less than a 75% rate during an evaluation period. Where applicable, membership in a professional organization or professional licensure may also be required as a condition of employment at CSU.

II. The Department Application of Criteria

A. DAC Preamble

The provisions set forth herein in the Department's Application of Criteria (DAC) will be used to evaluate the job performance of Unit A and Unit B faculty in the Computing, Information and Mathematical Sciences & Technology Department. Each employee seeking retention, promotion, tenure, or Professional Advancement Increase (PAI) will be required to meet the standards as articulated in this DAC. Provisions that follow describe materials and methods used in the Department to evaluate performance of employees eligible for retention, promotion, tenure and professional advancement increases.

The goal of evaluation is to ensure that University identified standards of excellence are

maintained in those three areas. The document is organized according to three sections, with each section representing an area of evaluation. Each section identifies the categories of accepted materials and activities, their relative importance, and the methods of evaluation.

B. Portfolio Submission

The faculty member being evaluated must provide a portfolio, preferably in a digital format. The portfolio should include an updated vita, to be included as part of the evaluation. This portfolio must be submitted to the Chairperson of the Department Personnel Committee (DPC) by the date designated in the University schedule for personnel actions.

III. The Department Personnel Committee (DPC)

A. Purpose

The purpose of a Department Personnel Committee shall be to review materials submitted by faculty members of the Department seeking retention, promotion, professional advancement increase (PAI) or tenure and to provide recommendations in accordance with the DAC. The dates for each evaluation process are specified in the annual University evaluation timetable.

B. Composition

The DPC will be composed of Unit A teaching, resource, and clinical employees. The sole purpose of the Department Personnel Committee is to provide recommendations to the Department Chair concerning retention, reappointments, multiple-year appointments, promotion, PAI, or tenure of Department employees.

The purpose of a Department Personnel Committee shall be to review materials submitted by faculty members of the Department seeking retention, promotion, professional advancement increase (PAI) or tenure and to provide recommendations in accordance with the DAC. The dates for each evaluation process are specified in the annual University evaluation timetable.

If there are fewer than three faculty in the Department eligible to vote on any personnel action additional faculty members may be recruited from other departments within the University. The DPC will invite and 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 on a temporary basis. 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.

IV. Faculty Evaluation

A. Evaluation Criteria for Unit A Faculty

The degree of effectiveness of performance of each employee being considered will be evaluated in the areas of **teaching/performance of primary duties, research/creative activity, and service.**

For tenured and tenure-track faculty, teaching/performance of primary duties will be considered the most important of the three areas of evaluation. After teaching/performance of primary duties, research/creative activity and service will be given equal emphasis.

Clinical Faculty are responsible for supervising students in a clinical, experiential, or practicum setting, in addition to being engaged in teaching, research, and service depending on the nature of the appointment (See Article 16.b of contract). Clinical faculty will be evaluated according to the guidelines outlined in Article 19.3.b in the Contract using the criteria outlined in this document.

Research Professor appointments are for individuals employed on research projects funded by external grants and contracts whose primary responsibility is to contribute to the research mission of the University. They may have limited teaching and/or service responsibilities as related to their research agenda. (See Article 16.c of contract). Research faculty will be evaluated according to the guidelines outlined in Article 19.3.b in the contract using the criteria outlined in this document.

Evaluation of the faculty members' teaching/performance of primary duties includes consideration of his/her effectiveness in the execution of assigned responsibilities. This evaluation includes (1) command of the subject matter discipline; (2) oral English proficiency, as mandated by Illinois statute; (3) ability to organize, analyze and present knowledge or material in traditional and online settings, (4) ability to encourage and interest student in the learning process, (5) performance of CUE-bearing duties such as student advisement, counseling and directing individual student activities and (6) the availability of the faculty to students and for Departmental activities.

B. Methods Used to Evaluate Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

i. Considerations of Teaching Effectiveness

Methods used to evaluate faculty teaching/performance of primary duties include, but are not limited to (1) evaluation of teaching/advising and non-teaching duties (e.g. program coordination, lab supervision, etc.), (2) classroom observations, (3) course materials and design, (4) curriculum development, (5) peer recognition of teaching and (6) professional development related to teaching. These considerations are categorized as follows:

- | | |
|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Category I | Evaluations |
| | 1. Teaching Responsibilities |
| | a. Student evaluations of instructor's performance in classroom |

2. Non-teaching Responsibilities, as assigned
 - a. Student evaluation of advisor performance
 - b. Chair evaluation of program coordination
 - c. Chair evaluation of laboratory supervision
 - d. Chair evaluation of Department/College/University professional and assessment responsibilities
 - e. Other types of release time

Category II Annual Classroom Observations

1. Observations by peers
2. Observations by Department Chairperson

Category III Course Materials and Design

1. Primary and supplementary materials distributed in class
2. Integration and use of technology
3. Engagement of instructor in novel pedagogies and/or assessment
4. Revised course syllabus
5. Course syllabus for all courses

Category IV Curriculum Development

1. New programs
2. Expanded programs
3. Developing and teaching a new course
4. Updated programs
5. Alignment/realignment of program curriculums with standards (as needed and approved by the Department)

Category V Peer Recognition of Teaching

Category VI Professional development related to teaching

1. Attendance at conferences, minicourses or workshops
2. Certification, i.e., online teaching certificate

ii. Methods of Evaluating Teaching and Non-Teaching Primary Duties Effectiveness

Category I: Evaluations

1. Student Evaluations of Instructors

With reference to student evaluation of instructor performance in the classroom, the student course evaluations will be handled through the process administered by the University.

With reference to evaluation of non-teaching duties and responsibilities, the Department's approved evaluation form and process will be used to evaluate employees.

Student evaluations shall be administered in all courses. The numerical rating for all student evaluations for a minimum of 90% of all credit-bearing courses taught in the evaluation period, advisor evaluations, and non-teaching duties evaluations (as decided upon by the DPC) will be averaged and rounded to the nearest tenth using standard rounding conventions and then ranked using the following scale:

- Superior = 4.0 < ratings ≤ 5.0
- Significant = 3.5 < ratings ≤ 4.0
- Highly Effective = 3.0 < ratings ≤ 3.5
- Effective = 2.6 < ratings ≤ 3.0
- Satisfactory = 2.5 ≤ ratings ≤ 2.6

2. Non-teaching Responsibilities

Type of Activity	Materials to be Evaluated
a. Advisor Performance	1. Chair evaluations of advisor 2. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty provided by faculty member
b. Program Coordination	1. Letter of evaluation by Chair. 2. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty.
c. Academic Release Time	1. Letter of evaluation 2. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty
d. Research Release Time	1. Letter of evaluation 2. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty
d. Laboratory Supervision	1. Letter of evaluation by Chair. 2. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty.
e. Assessment Coordination	1. Assessment Report 2. Chair Assessment
f. Other Type of Release Time	1. Letter of evaluation. 2. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty.

Relative Importance of Non-Teaching Responsibilities and Methods of Evaluation

The performance of primary duties (beyond required classroom activities) are as central to the teaching function of the institution as direct instruction. The division of CUEs between teaching and primary duties, as listed on the approved and revised faculty workload assignment, will dictate the relative importance between these two categories where required. Compensated duties or other activities where release time has been provided do not diminish the importance of direct instructional activities, but should be viewed as significant in accordance with one's professional development and the mission of the University.

Letters of Evaluation A letter of evaluation for each primary duty may 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. An evaluation should be completed and included in the portfolio by the direct supervisor of the activity for whom re-assigned time has been provided. For activities spanning multiple years, only one letter of evaluation for each activity is required. If the direct supervisor of the activity is the chairperson, the chairperson may include their evaluation of the primary duty in their overall narrative of the candidate.

Synopsis of Activities Related to the Primary Duty

Documentation of attendance at activities related to the assigned primary duties is required. Additional documentation may include: the maintenance of appropriate and accessible records, copies of progress reports submitted, attendance at workshops, training courses or other development programs related to the primary duty. If release time has been granted for research, then a narrative summary of the research performed must be included in this section even if details of the conduct and product of research is reported in the research section. If release time has been granted for being a program coordinator, then the results of being a program coordinator may still be reported in the service section.

Evaluation of Non-Teaching Primary Duties

The DPC will weigh the evidence and decide on the appropriate ranking for Non-Teaching Primary Duties.

Category II: Peer and Chair Classroom Evaluations

The faculty member being evaluated will have annual classroom observations during

the evaluation period; one each by the Department Chairperson, and by a peer faculty member. Peer evaluations are to be conducted by faculty members of equal or higher rank and have at least two years of experience. The classes to be observed shall be agreed upon by the faculty member and the observer(s) and should span across the courses taught by the faculty member. These observers (faculty members and Department chairperson) will rate the faculty member and provide a written summary of their observation using the approved Departmental forms and process for peer and chairperson evaluations.

The average rating on the items of the Department's Classroom Observation Form should be used as a guideline to determine the level of teaching effectiveness and will be considered using the following rating scale:

Superior =	4.0 < ratings ≤ 5.0
Significant =	3.5 < ratings ≤ 4.0
Highly Effective =	3.0 < ratings ≤ 3.5
Effective =	2.75 < ratings ≤ 3.0
Satisfactory =	2.5 ≤ ratings ≤ 2.75

Category III: Course Materials and Design

The DPC will be responsible for determining if teaching materials are current, reflective of the course syllabi, and address required accreditation standards. The faculty member being evaluated will provide a packet of materials representative of those used in teaching, which demonstrates the following:

- a. Integration and use of technology into the classroom
- b. Original materials created and distributed in class
- c. Supplemental materials distributed in class
- d. Revised course syllabus demonstrating updated content and/or assignments/activities
- e. Course syllabus created for a new course offering

The following will be used to rate classroom materials:

Ranking	Requirement
Superior (highest)	Evidence of at least one item from each of the following categories for multiple courses (a, b, c, and d) and at least one syllabus for a new course offering (e).
Significant	Evidence of at least one item from each of the first three categories from multiple courses (a, b, and c) and at least one item

	from either d or e.
Highly Effective	Evidence of at least one item from the first three categories from multiple classes (a, b, and c).
Effective	Evidence of at least one item from each of the first three categories (a, b, and c).
Highly Satisfactory	Evidence of at least one item from the first two categories for multiple classes (a and b).
Satisfactory	Evidence of at least one item from the first two categories (a and b).
Appropriate (lowest)	Evidence of at least one item from the first category (a).

Category IV: Curriculum Development

The faculty member being evaluated may present materials to document changes and revisions to existing programs and the development of new programs. Items that can be included in this category are:

- a. New Programs (certificate, endorsement, degree, etc.)
- b. Expand programs
- c. Design and teach a new course
- d. Program changes (curriculum updates)
- e. Alignment/realignment of program courses and curricula with standards (as needed and approved by the Department)

The following will be used to rate curriculum development:

Ranking	Requirement
Superior (highest)	Successful creation and implementation of a new program that is aligned with standards (a and e)
Significant	Evidence of efforts to create a new program that is aligned with standards (a) or expand an existing program to new markets (b).
Highly Effective	Successful creation and teaching of a new course (c).
Effective	Evidence of efforts to make a change in an existing program. Evidence must be

	present that all changes align with standards (d and e).
Highly Satisfactory	Evidence of efforts to align or realign curriculum with state standards (d).
Satisfactory	Not applicable for this category
Appropriate (lowest)	Not applicable for this category

Category V: Peer Recognition of Teaching

Faculty may provide evidence of peer recognition for excellence in teaching, beyond the standard peer observations. Evidence that may be included in this category includes awards for excellence in teaching (e.g. CSU's Faculty Excellence Awards), nominations for recognition in teaching by local, state and national organizations, etc. Nominations into Who's Who publications are not considered for this area.

Should a faculty member provide evidence of peer recognition for excellence in teaching, the highest rating for this category will be "highly effective."

Category VI: Professional Development Related to Teaching

Faculty may provide evidence of professional development related to teaching. Evidence that may be included in this category includes proof of participation at conferences, minicourses, or workshops. Awards of any certifications, such as CSU's online teaching certification, etc.

Ranking	Requirement
Superior (highest)	Evidence of at least 10 items.
Significant	Evidence of at least 8 items.
Highly Effective	Evidence of at least 6 items.
Effective	Evidence of at least 4 items.
Highly Satisfactory	Evidence of at least 3 items.
Satisfactory	Evidence of at least 2 items.
Appropriate (lowest)	Evidence of at least 1 item.

The following applies to Retention, Promotion, Tenure, and Professional Advance Increases:

Ranking	Requirement
Superior (highest)	At least 2 Superior ratings and 2 Highly Effective ratings in any of the six categories described above.
Significant	At least 1 Superior, 1 Significant, and 1 Highly Effective rating in any of the six

	categories described above.
Highly Effective	At least 1 Significant and 2 Highly Effective ratings in any of the six categories described above.
Effective	At least 1 Highly Effective and 2 Effective ratings in any of the six categories described above.
Highly Satisfactory	At least 1 Effective and 2 Highly Satisfactory ratings in any of the six categories described above.
Satisfactory	At least 1 Highly Satisfactory and 2 Satisfactory ratings in any of the six categories described above.
Appropriate (lowest)	At least 1 Highly Satisfactory, 1 Satisfactory, and 1 Appropriate rating in any of the six categories described above.

C. Methods Used to Evaluate Research/Creative Activities

Research and Creative Activity is critical to the success of the University and to the career advancement of individual faculty members who comprise the University. A record of all research activities, supporting evidence, and summative narrative should be organized according to the categories listed below. The list is not meant to be exhaustive, rather illustrative of the types of research/creative activities to be included in the portfolio.

Evaluation of the effectiveness of an employee's research/creative activity will include consideration of:

- a. The quality and quantity of research/creative activity
- b. Contributions to the employee's discipline or field
- c. Extent and nature of national, state, or local recognition of research/creative activity
- d. Nature of research presentations at professional conferences

The groups that follow describe relative rankings of activities. Activities listed within each group are illustrative of the kinds of activities that may be considered in each group. A faculty member may suggest the appropriate group in which a particular activity should be counted, if not listed.

NOTE: Formal documentation from the sponsoring agency such as professional organizations, publishers, state agencies, etc., should be submitted as evidence (e.g., minutes, letters of receipt, acceptance, completion or approval, evaluation

summaries of activities).

When indicating publications are to be part of the portfolio, a copy of the publication must be available for review during the evaluation period. This can be accomplished by including a copy of the publication or link to the website.

Group One

1. Attendance at a professional conference.
2. Submission of a proposal for presentation at a professional conference or seminar.
3. Evidence of progress towards appropriate professional certification or other professional development activity.
4. Preparation of proposals for funding from internal sources.
5. Submission of research proposal to IRB.
6. Create a plan to guide your research agenda.
7. Attending a research conference or a research skills workshop
8. Panel Discussant
10. Unsuccessful or submitted internal grant proposal
11. Unpublished documents
12. Presentation of a faculty member's unpublished research at departmental seminar or workshop.

Group Two

1. Presentations at meetings, conferences, seminars, workshops, webinars, etc. of local or state professional organizations (not including presentations at K-12 institutions).
2. Evidence of a research project approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB).
3. Submission of manuscripts for publication in refereed journals, edited books, etc.
4. Presentation at teacher/librarian in-service and staff development programs.
5. Evidence of submission of proposal for grant to external source for funding.
6. Planning a professional local meeting, conference, seminar, or workshop.
7. Publication in a non-refereed, professional printed or electronic literature.
8. Creation and distribution of digital materials relating to research area that have significant following or acknowledgement from the field (e.g. webliography, LibGuide, blogs, videos, films, etc.).
9. Invitations to speak at local organizations outside of CSU regarding research areas.
10. Awards of grants from internal sources, including research CUES, etc.
11. Utilization of research knowledge to engage community and/or students in service learning.
12. Demonstration of significant progress in research (draft chapters, full revisions)
14. Completing a book review.

15. Serving as a grant/manuscript reviewer
16. Presentation/Performance at a local/regional conference
17. Invited review of research-related or original creative works
18. Non-peer reviewed E-media publication
19. Organizing a research-related professional conference
20. Professional development presentation for the general public
21. Non-refereed conference proceedings
22. Reviews of scholarly work in refereed publications
23. Undergraduate or graduate student research project supervision
24. Submitted external grant
25. Submitted peer-reviewed manuscript
26. Successful internal grant
27. Patent application related to discipline

Group Three

1. Presentations at meetings, conferences, seminars, workshops, webinars, etc. of regional or national or international professional organizations.
2. Awards of grants or contracts from external sources (including renewals of those grants or contracts).
3. Publication in refereed scholarly journals (online or print).
4. Publication of books and/or book chapters.
5. Original translation of scholarly importance
6. Citation of published works or other professional recognition of significant accomplishment or contribution to the field.
7. Production of instructional materials for national or international professional organizations.
8. Chairing a doctoral dissertation committee.
9. Development of instructional material for national or international schools, or industries.
10. Planning and organizing a professional national or international conference or colloquium.
11. Translation of a scholarly/creative book, published by a non-vanity press, in either print or electronic format.
12. Visiting professor, visiting lecturer, or visiting scholar to another institution of higher learning of at least equivalent status with CSU in the area of the individual's expertise.
13. Published short-form essay in a peer-reviewed book or journal (such as an encyclopedia)
14. Patent application
15. Patent award related to discipline
16. Advanced degrees
17. Fellowships or invited funded visits
18. Nationally or internationally recognized research-related award

2.2a Relative Importance and Weight for Research/Creative Activities

Note: A higher group item may be considered in the place of a lower group item.

No limits are to be placed on the kinds of research or creative activities selected, as long as there is a demonstrable relationship between the candidate's contribution and their academic area. Each faculty member is encouraged to consult with a member of the DPC concerning their activities and the appropriate category to be used given the documentation presented.

Ranking	Requirement
Superior (highest)	He/she must provide evidence of at least six items. These must contain at least 3 items from group three of which 2 are refereed publications or competitive external grants, at least 2 items from group two, and at least 1 item from group one.
Significant*	He/she must provide evidence of at least five items. These must contain at least 2 items from group three, of which two must be a refereed publication or competitive external grant and at least 2 items from group two, and at least 1 item from group one.
Highly Effective	He/she must provide evidence of at least 3 items from groups two or three.
Effective	He/she must provide evidence of at least three items. These must contain at least 2 items from group two or three and at least 1 item from group one.
Highly Satisfactory	<p>He/she must provide evidence of at least three items. These must contain at least 1 item from group two or three and at least 2 items from group one.</p> <p>If the candidate has no peer-reviewed publication or competitive external grant (from beginning their position a CSU until submission of portfolio for 3rd year retention) a letter from the DPC confirming that a meeting has occurred between the</p>

	faculty member, a subset of the DPC, and the department chair. The purpose of this meeting will be to collaborate to develop a plan for obtaining the level of research required for tenure
Satisfactory	He/she must provide evidence of at least two items. These must contain at least 1 item from group two or three and at least 1 item from group one.
Appropriate (lowest)	He/she must provide evidence of at least two items from any of the groups.

*For faculty who are Unit A tenure-track as of AY2324, to achieve tenure will require only one refereed publication or competitive external grant. This applies only for the contract period through AY2526.

D. Methods Use to Evaluate Service

Service activities are as important to the life of the University as other professionally related duties. As part of service, faculty are encouraged to participate in campus cultural activities, athletic events, College meetings, Town Hall meetings, Commencement, and other related activities. Participation in these activities can be mentioned by chairpersons in faculty evaluations to demonstrate a candidate's dedication to the University, but these activities should not be included in the portfolio as service activities.

A record of all service activities, supporting evidence, and summative description should be organized according to the five categories listed below. The list is not meant to be exhaustive, rather illustrative of the types of service activities to be included in the portfolio. Faculty members applying for promotion or retention should review the language in the DAC and consult with colleagues and DPC members to ensure that items included in the portfolio are appropriate for one of the following groups:

- A. Service to the Department
- B. Service to Areas of Enrollment, Recruitment, Retention, and Graduation
- C. Service to the College and the University.
- D. Service to the Profession, Discipline, or Field
- E. Service to the Community

It is expected that service will be included at the Department, College, University, and professional levels.

While the nature and degree of service activities depend on many factors, some general

principles can guide their evaluation. Service activities should be public, purposive and professionally related to one's academic training. Service should be uncompensated and voluntary (other than *honoraria* received as a result of certain professional activities). The nature and degree of participation, length of service, and relationship of service to the individual's assigned responsibilities to the University will be considered and should be clearly articulated by the candidate. Finally, the expectation of service to the larger community and within one's professional affiliation increases (rather than decreases) over time. As one becomes more engaged in one's profession, the quantity and quality of professional contacts should naturally increase. Service enhancing the reputation of the University is more significant than service to a unit of the University.

At all times the candidate for promotion and retention can propose to the DPC that certain activities be given special consideration, be counted in a different category, or be included in the portfolio though the activity seems outside the acceptable realm. Such requests must be made in writing within the portfolio and the DPC should, in its evaluation, explain its decision to accept the candidate's appeal of the ranking and/or inclusion of a particular service activity.

Evaluation of the effectiveness of an employee's unit, College, University, community or professional service will include consideration of:

- a. Extent and nature of leadership
- b. Degree of participation
- c. Quality and length of service
- d. Extent and nature of participation in professional organization
- e. Extent and nature of national, state, or local recognition of service
- f. The relationship of the service to the employee's assigned responsibilities and to the University

The groups that follow describe relative rankings of activities. Activities listed within each group are illustrative of the kinds of activities that may be considered in each group. A faculty member may suggest the appropriate group in which a particular activity should be counted, if not listed.

NOTE: Service activities for which an employee receives compensation will not be included for consideration. The employee should also provide formal documentation as evidence (e.g. meeting minutes, letters from professional organizations, etc.).

Group One

1. Membership on and active participation in Department committees.
2. Membership in and active participation in a professional organization.
3. Volunteer work to support the goals of the University or its surrounding community.
4. Administrative functions as assigned by the chair or dean such as

- departmental webmaster, departmental newsletter editor, or departmental seminar coordinator
5. Maintenance of departmental equipment
 6. Lending professional skills or expertise to the department for the advancement of the departmental mission

Group Two

1. Service on a College or University committee.
2. Sponsorship of student organizations.
3. Active participation on search committees.
4. Serving as an officer of a Departmental committee.
5. Participation on program review committees.
6. Service through union activities.
7. Conducting a program review.
8. Service on committees for ALA, HLC, ABET, or other accrediting agencies.
9. Mentoring a new faculty member.
10. Serving as a peer evaluator for a faculty member in another department.
11. Service on a committee in a professional organization.
12. Service as referee, juror, or editor for professional publications or organizations
13. Supervision of master's thesis or service on a doctoral dissertation committee, where no compensation or CUEs are given.
14. Active participation in recruitment and retention efforts.
15. Effectively assisting the Department Chair in the preparation of University materials.
16. Organizing departmental seminars
17. Organizing public events sponsored by the department
18. Developing written material for, or performing evaluations of, new initiatives in the department
19. Service on a department committee which met regularly and required significant work of its members outside the meetings, such as Program Review committees and accreditation committees
20. Service on a department committee which required authorship of significant documents, such as a grant or NEPR committees
21. Advisor to student clubs or groups
22. Career counseling and internship supervision of students
23. Assistance with departmental promotional activities
24. Participation in departmental recruitment/admissions activities
25. Formally representing the University at external events
26. Lending professional skills or expertise to the College/University in advancement of the College/University mission
27. Assisting in the publication of professional newsletters

Group Three

1. Serving as an officer in a professional organization.
2. Speaking engagement on campus or in the community relating to the faculty member's field of study.
3. Providing services to students beyond the requirements of one's teaching assignments.
4. Volunteer work that draws upon one's academic skills.
5. Assistance in ongoing University special programs beyond that of assigned workload.
6. Workshop presentations to teachers, librarians, and other professionals in the community.
7. Serving as an officer on a College or University committee.
8. Serving on an accreditation team.
9. Serving as a member of a school district-wide committee.
10. Serving on a local school council/library board or other local organization's board.
11. Participation in school, library, or relevant professional reform activities.
12. Participation in committees or activities designed to increase cooperation with other institutions.
13. Writing reports for ALA, HLC, ABET, or other applicable accrediting agencies.

2.3.a Relative Importance and Weight for Service

Ranking	Requirement
Superior (highest)	He/she must provide evidence of at least four items. These must contain at least 2 items from group three, at least 1 item from group two, and at least 1 item from group one.
Significant	He/she must provide evidence of at least four items. These must contain at least 1 item from group three, at least 2 items from group two, and at least 1 item from group one.
Highly Effective	He/she must provide evidence of at least 3 items from groups two or three.
Effective	He/she must provide evidence of at least three items. These must contain at least 2 items from group two or three and at least 1 item from group one.
Highly Satisfactory	He/she must provide evidence of at least three items. These must contain at least 1 item from group two or three and at least 2 items from group one.

Satisfactory	He/she must provide evidence of at least two items. These must contain at least 1 item from group two or three and at least 1 item from group one.
Appropriate (lowest)	He/she must provide evidence of at least two items from any of the groups.

2.4 Requirements for Tenure or Promotion Based on Exceptionality

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

- Criteria for tenure or promotion
- Exceptional performance in two of the three areas of evaluation as listed below

2.4.a Exceptionality in the Area of Teaching:

- Faculty Excellence Award in the area of teaching from Chicago State University or other professional bodies
- Development of at least three new courses,
- Development of at least one new program of study
- Students evaluations consistently rating the faculty member at 4.2 - 5.0 during the entire evaluation period

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

2.4.b Exceptionality in the Area of Research:

- Faculty Excellence Award in the area of research from Chicago State University or other professional bodies
- Award of a federal grant
- Award of two or more externally funded grants or contracts
- Invitation to serve as a keynote speaker at a national or international conference
- National/international professional or scholarly fellowship
- Publish a scholarly book
- At least two publications in refereed research journals
- Service as editor of a refereed journal

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

2.4.c Exceptionality In the Area of Service:

- Faculty Excellence Award in the area of service from Chicago State University or other professional bodies
- Service as officer of professional organizations at the national or international level
- Chair of planning committee for a state or national conference
- Chair of an accreditation team
- Participation in reviewer development of a state/federal /international policy/program/standard related to one's specialization
- Service on school or library board, executive board, or institution of higher

learning governing board

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

2.5 Professional Advancement Increase

Any tenured employee shall be eligible for consideration for a Professional Advancement Increase if the employee has completed at least five years of service at the University at the rank of Professor and has submitted annual evaluation material in accordance with 19.4.c in each of the previous five (5) years.

2.6 Evaluation Periods and Criteria for Faculty

The performance criteria listed below will be used to reach judgments about the degree of effectiveness of a faculty member's performance. The evaluation period for retention shall be the period since the beginning of the employee's last evaluation for retention, with the exception of employees in their second year of employment in the bargaining unit who shall have their entire period of employment evaluated. In promotion evaluations, the standards used will be those to judge the employee during the entire evaluation period. In tenure evaluations, the performance standards used will be those used to judge whether an employee's performance has reached the required degree of effectiveness by the end of the evaluation period.

Personnel Action	Teaching/Primary Duty	Research/Creative Activity	Service
First-year retention	Satisfactory	Appropriate	Appropriate
Second-year retention	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Third-year retention	Effective	Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory
Fourth-year retention	Highly effective	Effective	Effective
Fifth-year retention	Significant	Highly effective	Highly effective
Tenure	Superior	Significant	Significant
Assistant Professor	Highly Effective	Satisfactory	Satisfactory

Associate Professor	Superior	Significant	Significant
Full Professor	Superior	Superior	Superior
Post-Tenure Review	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate
PAI	Superior	Significant	Significant

2.7 Annual Evaluation of Tenured Employees

The following are the criteria for the evaluation of tenured faculty members:

- **Adequate**

For a rating of Adequate, the tenured faculty member must meet the criteria for a tenure-track faculty member in retention year three. Within each three years, the faculty member must accomplish one refereed publication or competitive external grant

- **Exemplary**

For a rating of Exemplary, the tenured faculty member must meet the criteria for a tenure-track faculty member in retention year five. Within each three years, the faculty member must accomplish one refereed publication or competitive external grant.

Failure to meet the Adequate standard for two consecutive years in any given area shall trigger a one-year appraisal and professional development process as described in the contract in section 19.4.c(3).

Evaluation of Unit A Research Faculty

Research Faculty are faculty hired as independent researchers who have sufficient qualifications and motivation to advance the research agenda of the department but who are not on tenure track. The appointee is expected to make significant contributions to the research mission of the University and the department, and they are appointed on a non-tenure-track basis based upon available grant funding. The chair/director and dean will evaluate the performance of Research Faculty annually. The timetable for portfolio submission will be published in the University evaluation timetable. W

The degree of effectiveness of performance of each employee being considered for reappointment or promotion as a research faculty member will be evaluated in the areas of research activity and possibly teaching performance of primary duties and service as defined by the appointment and work assignments. If teaching/primary duties or service requirements are specified in the letter of appointment and annual work assignments, accomplishments in these areas will be considered of less importance than his or her research productivity.

Performance Standards for Research Faculty

The performance standard for continued annual appointments for the first three years of appointments is defined as "highly effective" in research in each year and "significant" overall performance in the first three years evaluated in the third year. The details of the "highly effective" and "significant" standards are described in this DAC. After three years, it is expected that research faculty will demonstrate performance at the "significant" level for research/creative activities in every year thereafter for continued annual appointments. The details of the "significant" standards for a one-year evaluation period are described in this DAC.

Research Faculty are also eligible for rank and promotion in titles such as Term Professor, Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, and Research Professor.

1. For promotion to research assistant professor: highly effective research/creative activities; highly effective teaching performance of primary duties and/or highly effective service through the evaluation period.
2. For promotion to research associate professor: significant research/creative activities; highly effective teaching/performance of primary duties and/or significant service through the evaluation period.
3. For promotion to research professor: superior research/creative activities; highly effective teaching performance of primary duties and and/or significant service through the evaluation period.

Evaluation of Unit A Clinical Faculty

Clinical Faculty are hired to supervise students in a clinical, experiential, or practicum setting, in addition to being engaged in teaching, research, and service depending on the nature of the appointment. Clinical Faculty qualifications shall be comparable to those expected of tenurable ranks and their promotion pathways parallel those of the

tenurable ranks. They are eligible for annual reappointment and multiple year appointments contingent upon, successful performance evaluations, program need and availability of funds. They are not, however, eligible for tenure.

The DPC, Chair, and Dean will evaluate the performance of clinical faculty annually. The timetable for portfolio submission will be published in the University evaluation timetable.

Performance Standards for Clinical Faculty

For Reappointments (retention) Clinical Faculty must meet the standards stated in the *Contract* germane to their appointment. Reappointment standards for the first five years are identical to the retention standards for tenure-track faculty for this first five years. These standards are listed in Section IV of this document. Reappointment is subject to available funding.

The performance standard for annual reappointment in clinical year six and beyond: "effective" teaching/performance of primary duties; "effective research/creative activity; and "effective" service during the evaluation period.

Clinical Faculty who have attained five or more years of instructional service with the University are eligible for renewable three-year contracts if they have earned "Superior" performance evaluations for their teaching/primary duties and "Significant" performance evaluations for either their research/creative activity or service in the preceding five-year period, and "Highly Effective" in the remaining area. The performance standards for maintaining three-year renewable clinical appointments are: "Highly Effective" teaching/performance of primary duties, "Highly Effective" research/creative activity, and "Highly Effective" service.

Clinical Faculty are eligible for clinical rank and promotion in titles such as Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, and Clinical Professor; however, they are not eligible for tenure.

1. For promotion to Clinical Associate Professor: superior teaching/performance of primary duties; significant research/creative activity, and significant service through the evaluation period.
2. For promotion to Clinical Professor: superior teaching performance of primary duties; superior research/creative activity; and superior service through the evaluation period.

SECTION 3 - EVALUATION OF UNIT B FACULTY

Unit B faculty members (lecturers) shall not be formally evaluated until they have completed one full academic term of service at the University; however, student evaluations and classroom observations shall be conducted and reviewed each semester. The responsibility for evaluating Unit B faculty members shall reside with the Department Chair.

3.1 Categories of Materials and Activities

- Student evaluations
- Classroom observations
- Course materials and design
- Other materials and/or activities for which they receive
compensation

3.2 Methods of Evaluation

3.2.a Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

The criteria used to evaluate the lecturer's student evaluations shall be the same as the criteria used to evaluate Unit A faculty's student evaluations.

3.2.b Classroom Observation

The faculty member being evaluated will have annual classroom observations during the evaluation period, i.e., one annual evaluation by the Department Chairperson, and one annual evaluation by a peer faculty member. The criteria used to evaluate the lecturer's classroom observations shall be the same as the criteria used to evaluate Unit A faculty's classroom observations.

3.2.c Evaluation of Course Materials and Design

The criteria used to evaluate the lecturer's student evaluations shall be the same as the criteria used to evaluate Unit A faculty's student evaluations.

3.2.d. Evaluation of Other Materials and/or Activities

This is an optional category which the faculty member may use to show additional efforts beyond the common duties and to earn a rating of superior. It

is encouraged for Lecturers to submit items similar to those identified in Section 2 for Unit A faculty in terms of curriculum development, peer recognition of teaching, research and creative activities, and service.

Materials submitted in this category will be evaluated according to the criteria outlined for Unit A faculty.

3.3 Relative Importance and Weight for Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

Ranking	Requirement
Superior (highest)	He/she must receive at least 2 Superior ratings and 1 Highly Effective rating in the first three categories described above and evidence of optional materials and/or activities.
Significant	He/she must receive at least 1 Superior, 1 Significant, and 1 Highly Effective rating in any of the first three categories described above.
Highly Effective	He/she must receive at least 1 Significant and 2 Highly Effective ratings in any of the first three categories described above.
Effective	He/she must receive at least 1 Highly Effective and 2 Effective ratings in any of the first three categories described above.
Highly Satisfactory	He/she must receive at least 1 Effective and 2 Highly Satisfactory ratings in any of the first three categories described above.
Satisfactory	He/she must receive at least 1 Highly Satisfactory and 2 Satisfactory ratings in any of the first three categories described above.
Appropriate (lowest)	He/she must receive at least 1 Highly Satisfactory, 1 Satisfactory, and 1 Appropriate rating in any of the first three categories described above.

3.4 Lecturer Promotion

Lecturers may be promoted to Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, or Visiting Professor, if their performance or credentials support such promotions. The Provost will assign the

designated rank.

3.5 Multi-Year Contracts

Lecturers who have attained 10 or more years of instructional service with the Department are eligible for five-year contracts if they have earned "Highly Effective" performance evaluation for two of the preceding five years. Once the five-year appointment status has been achieved, lecturers must receive "Highly Effective" performance evaluations in all DAC categories listed under teaching/primary duties at least two of the next five years to continue renewing the five-year multi-year appointment.

Lecturers on multi-year appointments must continue to earn a minimum level of "Effective" performance on annual evaluations to continue in the current multi-year contract.

SECTION 4- EVALUATION OF ADJUNCT FACULTY

The evaluation of adjunct faculty members will be at the discretion of the Department Chair. However, the Chair will use evaluation methods that are similar to those for Unit A and Unit B faculty, focusing on the student evaluations and classroom observations.

SECTION 5- DISTANCE EDUCATION

5.1 Evaluating Web-Based Courses

The process for evaluating distance education courses will be the same as traditionally taught courses, which include student evaluations, peer evaluations, and chair evaluations. The exception will be that evaluators will need to be granted non-grading instructor access to the course for an agreed upon period of time. In addition, online and hybrid courses are open to evaluation by the Distance Education Committee using the process that is published on the Center for Teaching and Research Excellence's website.

The Department's By-Laws will address the standards for online courses. As the Department is moving towards fully online degrees, there will need to be a level of conformity to course structure, assessment, and facilitation.

5.2 Process for selecting faculty to teach Internet courses

Prior to teaching any online course faculty and instructors need to complete the Online Certification Training offered through the Center for Teaching and Research Excellence or equivalent outside training or experience.

SECTION 6 - DAC REVISION

This DAC conforms to provisions set forth in the Chicago State University and UPI Local 4100, Units A, Band C 2010-2015 Contract and, when approved, will remain in effect until the contract ends and/or a new one has been negotiated and approved.