

Chicago State University Department of Social Work

Departmental Application of Criteria Unit A and Unit B Faculty

DAC Revision Contributors:

Unit A Faculty:

Amzie Moore, Ph.D.,
Brent In, Ph.D.

Unit B Faculty:

Lolita Godbold, M.S.W.

2024 -2026

Preamble:

The purpose of this document is to provide criteria to evaluate employee performance in three areas – A. teaching; B. research; and C. service. The goal of evaluation is to ensure that university identified standards of excellence are maintained in those three areas. This document is organized according to three sections, with each section representing an area of evaluation. Each section identifies the evaluation classifications with required number of activities, and categories of accepted materials and activities, and their relative importance. Additional methods of evaluation are found in the addendum for each section.

Evaluation Portfolio:

The evaluation portfolio is a collection of materials submitted by the employee to substantiate performance in accordance with the DAC. Each portfolio will include a two-page letter of intent with clearly identified purpose of the submission; a copy of the current Departmental Application of Criteria; a curriculum vita; a yearlong work assignment and any revised work assignment worksheets; peer and department chair evaluations; evidence of teaching/*primary duties* (syllabi and instructional materials with student evaluations); evidence of research/*creative activities* (published works, grants/funds applied or received, etc.); evidence of service activities (community, university, and department); and any other materials as set forth in the CSU/UIP Contract.

Departmental Personnel Committee (DPC)

DPC will be comprised of tenured and tenure line faculties. This committee will review materials submitted by faculty members of the department seeking retention, promotion, professional advancement increase (PAI) or tenure and provide recommendations in accordance with the DAC within the annual university evaluation timetable.

In following the Chicago State University’s contract, the teaching/ *performance of primary duties* is considered the most important of the three areas of evaluation. The evaluation for each section is aggregated and presented with flexibility. See below rubrics.

TABLE 1: CRITERIA FOR RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION

Retentions	Performance Standards (see Tables 2 to 4 for classification activities)		
Personnel Action	A. Teaching/Primary Duty	B. Research/Creative Activities	C. Service
Year 1 Retention	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Appropriate</i>	<i>Appropriate</i>
Year 2 Retention	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>
Year 3 Retention	<i>Effective</i>	<i>Highly Satisfactory</i>	<i>Highly Satisfactory</i>
Year 4 Retention	<i>Highly Effective</i>	<i>Effective</i>	<i>Effective</i>
Year 5 Retention	<i>Significant-A</i>	<i>Highly Effective</i>	<i>Highly Effective</i>

Promotions Performance Standards (see Tables 2 to 4 for classification activities)

Personnel Action	Teaching/Primary Duty (Table 2)	Research/Creative Activities (table 3)	Service (table 4)
Promotion to Tenure/Associate	<i>Superior</i>	<i>Significant</i>	<i>Significant</i>
Associate/Tenure Professor	<i>Superior</i>	<i>Significant</i>	<i>Significant</i>
Promotion to Full Professor	<i>Superior</i>	<i>Superior</i>	<i>Superior</i>
Full Professor	<i>Superior</i>	<i>Superior</i>	<i>Superior</i>
Post-Tenure Review	<i>Adequate</i>	<i>Adequate</i>	<i>Adequate</i>
Post-Tenure Review	<i>Exemplary</i>	<i>Exemplary</i>	<i>Exemplary</i>
Professional Advancement Increase (PAI)	<i>Superior</i>	<i>Superior</i>	<i>Superior</i>
Professional Advancement Increase (PAI)		<i>Significant-B</i>	<i>Significant</i>

***Exceptional Performance Standards (see Tables 2 to 4 for classification activities)**

Personnel Action	Teaching/Primary Duty	Research/Creative Activities	Service
	<i>Exceptional</i>	<i>Exceptional</i>	<i>Exceptional</i>

***Notes for Summary Tables 2 to 4:**

1. Activity is defined as a unique function occurring within the evaluation period. For instance, developing program evaluation design, or completing data collection, as one activity, even though there may be other sequential steps to completing the research project. However, in multi-year evaluations, each unique activity can be counted once for each year that it was performed.
2. Sections A is further delineated into subcategories of “a, b, c, and d” (i.e., “A.a” indicates subsection “a” (classroom performance) of the main section A (Teaching/Primary Duties); Section B is further delineated into subcategories of “1 and 2” (i.e., “A.1” indicates subsection “1” (research related submissions of various acceptable forms); while Subsection C does not have additional subcategories. See below Tables 2, 3, and 4.
3. "(1) A.a" and "(2) A1" indicate 1 A.a and 2 A1 activities required during the evaluation period. "(3) A2/B1" indicates any combination of A2 plus B1 activities totaling three is required.

Table 2: TEACHING/PRIMARY DUTIES PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

CLASSIFICATIONS	*Activities count is aggregated from start of employment. *Monitor additional activities required for each new review period.
<i>Appropriate</i>	-----
<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i> rating for (1) A.a. and (1) B.a. and (1) additional activities each from another A and B
<i>Highly Satisfactory</i>	-----
<i>Effective</i>	<i>Effective</i> rating for 1 A.a. and 1 B.a. and 2 additional activities each from another A and another B
<i>Highly Effective</i>	<i>Highly Effective</i> rating for 1 A.a. and 1 B.a. and 3 additional activities from another A and 2 additional activities e from another B
<i>Significant</i>	<i>Significant</i> rating for 1 A.a. and 1 B.a. and 4 additional activities from another A and 2 additional activities from another B
<i>Superior</i>	<i>Superior</i> rating for 1 A.a. and 1 B.a. and 12 additional activities from another A and 6 additional activities from another B
<i>Post tenure review – Adequate</i>	<i>Highly Effective</i> rating for 1 A.a. and 1 B.a. and 3 additional activities from another A and 2 additional activities e from another B
<i>Post tenure review – Exemplary</i>	<i>Significant</i> rating for 1 A.a. and 1 B.a. and 4 additional activities from another A and 2 additional activities from another B
<i>PAI</i>	<i>Superior</i> rating for 1 A.a. and 1 B.a. and 6 additional activities from another A and 6 additional activities from another B
<i>*Exceptional</i>	<i>Superior</i> rating for 1 A.a. and 1 B.a. and 30 additional activities from another A and 10 additional activities from another B
CATEGORIES	See Addendum A below for additional details for each category
A: Teaching	
A.a.	Classroom performance: Peer & chair evaluation; student evaluation; course syllabus; representative exams/assignments; student submissions; teaching awards; student advisements
A.b.	Other teaching related duties: Evidence of training student research/creative activities, teaching assistances and mentoring; facilitating study/tutoring groups
A.c.	Curriculum development and revision: Develop of instructional materials, tools, activities; curriculum revisions; new course developments
A.d.	Professional development related to teaching: Participation in professional development for teaching and course improvements
B: Performance of Primary Duties	
B.a.	Primary duty performances: Research release time with evidences of research activities; program coordinator or administrative release time with evidences of such activities; Doctoral dissertation supervision and review;
B.b.	Other primary duty related activities: Assessment release time with synopsis of related activities and assessment reports; advising release time with evidences of advising activities and reports

B.c.	Program development & enhancement: Evidence of contribution to candidate's area of expertise through participations in conferences and meetings
B.d.	Professional development related to primary duty: Evidence of attending to and improving programs through resource acquisition

Table 3: RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

CLASSIFICATIONS	*Activities count is aggregated from start of employment. *Monitor additional activities required for each new review period.
<i>Appropriate</i>	(1)A1
<i>Satisfactory</i>	(3)A1
<i>Highly Satisfactory</i>	(3)A1, (3)A2/B1 If the candidate has no B2 research accomplishment at this point (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 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.
<i>Effective</i>	(3)A2/B1, (1)B1 and (1)B2 recommended but not required
<i>Highly Effective</i>	(3)A2/B1, (2)B1 and (1)B2 recommended but not required
<i>Significant</i>	(10)A2/B1, (8) B1, and (2) B2;
<i>Superior</i>	(10)A2/B1, (8) B1, and (2) B2;
<i>Post tenure review</i> (third year postTenure) – <i>Adequate</i>	Additional (1)A1, (1)A2/B1 to <i>superior</i> classification activities and at least one B2 activity in three years
<i>Post tenure review</i> (third year postTenure) - <i>Exemplary</i>	Additional (2)A2/B1, (1) B2 to superior classification activities and at least one B2 activity in three years.
<i>PAI: Superior;</i>	(10) A2/B1, (6) B1, (3) B2
<i>PAI: ^bSignificant</i>	(4)B1
<i>*Exceptional</i>	(30)A2/B1, (10) B1, (7) B2
CATEGORIES	See Addendum B for additional details for each category
A1	Written research agenda; report research progress; attend research conference or skills review for research; CSU presentation; panel discussant; and grant proposal submission workshop; literature review
A2	Significant research draft; book review; grant/manuscript review; editor of refereed journal; review of research work; non-peer reviewed publication; presentation at regional/local conference; organizing research conference; participatory research
B1	Successful internal grant; submit external grant; submit peer-reviewed manuscript; successful non-peer reviewed journal; invited conference presentation; presentation at international/national conference; student thesis supervision; multi-year grant activities; translation of scholarly work; short essays publication in peer-reviewed journal/book; patent application;
B2	Publication book chapter/monograph in research discipline; publication in a peer-reviewed journal in related discipline; funded external grant). (At least one peer-reviewed publication and/or one external grant in three years for those faculty on tenure track; and at least two peer reviewed articles published before portfolio is

	submitted for tenure and promotion and to receive “Significant”/”Superior” rating). All B2 items must list Chicago State University as the author’s resident institution.
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Table 4: SERVICE PERFORMANCE STANDARD ACTIVITIES

CLASSIFICATIONS	*Activities count is aggregated from start of employment. *Monitor additional activities required for each new review period.
<i>Appropriate</i>	(2) A
<i>Satisfactory</i>	(2) A , (2) B
<i>Highly Satisfactory</i>	(2) A , (2) B and (2) more from any other categories
<i>Effective</i>	(2) A , (2) B , (1) C and (2) more from any other categories
<i>Highly Effective</i>	(2) A , (2) B and (4) more from any other categories
<i>Significant</i>	(2) A , (2) B , (1) C , (1) D/E and (5) more from any other categories
<i>Superior Superior</i>	(10) A and (20) more from other categories with at least (1) from each B, C, D, E
<i>Post tenure review – Adequate</i>	(2) A , (2) B and (4) more from any other categories
<i>Post tenure review - Exemplary</i>	(2) A , (2) B , (1) C , (1) D/E and (4) more from any other categories
<i>PAI: Superior</i>	(2) A , (2) B , (1) C , (1) D , (1) E and (7) more from any other categories
<i>Significant</i>	(2) A , (2) B , (1) C , (1) D/E and (5) more from any other categories
<i>*Exceptional</i>	(10) A and (50) more from any other categories
CATEGORIES	See Addendum C for additional details for each category
A: Service to department	Chair department committee; develop tools for departmental use (surveys, newsletters, manuals, etc.); organize events sponsored by the department; organize departmental seminars; develop collaborative relationships and articulate agreements with other institutions; serve in accreditation and program review committees; author significant documents for grants or other program reviews;
B: Service to enrollment, recruitment, retention, and graduation	Participate in marketing, recruitment, and retention efforts; advise and mentor students; provide career counseling
C: Service to college and university	Participate in college/university committees and union service; speak at college/university seminars; assist in advancing college/university mission; formally represent college/university at external events
D: Service to profession, discipline, and field	Hold professional organization office; advisory board; committees, council, and task force; accreditation team; leadership in review panel; serve as doctoral dissertation committee member; maintain active membership of professional organizations; assist in planning and attend conferences and meetings; edit/review journal articles and books; review grant or manuscripts; review creative works from professional agencies; assist in professional newsletter publications
E: Service to Community	Provide organizational leadership and consultation; initiate and lead collaborative efforts; participate in volunteer work; participate in speaking engagements

ADDENDUM

A: EVALUATING TEACHING/PRIMARY DUTIES PERFORMANCE

A record of all teaching and teaching-related activities, supporting evidence, and summative narrative should be included in each portfolio. The narrative should explain how the candidate meets the established criteria, how assessment results have led to changes in courses, and how faculty development activities have improved teaching.

Most important evaluation is the candidate's effectiveness in the following areas: execution of assigned responsibilities; command of the subject matter or discipline; ability to organize, analyze and present material clearly and effectively; ability to encourage and interest students in the learning process; evidence of technologies used in the classroom and in student mentoring, advisement, counseling, and direction of individual learning activities.

Materials to be Evaluated:

1. Revised faculty work assignments for the evaluation period.
2. All peer and chair evaluations during the evaluation period.
3. Summary of student evaluations (with student comments) for each course evaluated during the evaluation period.

Per the Contract requirement, all courses taught for credit may submit 90% of course evaluation taught during the evaluation period. Following the Contract guidance, the following average student evaluation scored are considered:

2.5 to 2.6	Satisfactory
2.61 to 3.0	Effective
3.01 to 3.5	Highly Effective
3.51 to 4.0	Significant
4.01 to 5.9	Superior

4. The course syllabus, the final exam/project, and a representative exam/assignment for each course taught.
5. Evidence of participation in required assessment activities.
6. Updates to lecture material.
7. Evidence of efforts to develop new courses, update existing courses, or change a program's curriculum.
8. Documentation of participation in professional development activities that contribute to course development and improvement of teaching.
9. The following may also be submitted:
 - a. Handouts, study guides, or assignments
 - b. Materials from tutoring or help sessions
 - c. Graded or ungraded student assignments
 - d. Signed statements relating to teaching performance
 - e. Evidence of teaching awards
 - g. Evidence of participation in the academic early warnings

Representative exams, quizzes, and other materials submitted for evaluation are expected to reflect the following qualities: balanced coverage of the assigned material, questions which are clearly stated, questions which are appropriate for the level of the course, a length which is appropriate for the time allotted, and a minimum of spelling, grammatical or typographical errors. Materials submitted will be evaluated with regard to their value in assisting student learning, their originality, and their appropriateness for the course.

Syllabi are expected to clearly define the following: course description; course objectives and outcomes; assessment methods; the name of the text and other required materials; instructor's name, phone number, e-mail address, office location, and office hours; class meeting time and location; a calendar of activities for the course; ADA statement; material to be covered in the

course; policies concerning attendance, tardiness, and makeup exams; grading standards (including ‘I’ grades); frequency and relative weights of exams, quizzes, homework, papers, and other materials; laboratory/studio safety rules (if appropriate); link to the university student evaluation site: <http://www.csu.edu/course-eval>; information about field trips (if appropriate); and policy concerning plagiarism.

All syllabi will be in HLC format and will include items required for specific accrediting agencies when appropriate. For courses where a 4000-level class meets with a 5000-level class, it is expected that the two classes will have different syllabi, different learning outcomes, and different assessment measures. Assessment of CSWE competencies/practice behaviors must be included with (a) competencies and practice behaviors to be assessed, (b) the assignment that will be used to assess the practice behaviors, (c) the rubric used to assess the practice behaviors.

Starting Fall 2024, in compliance with the Contract all courses taught for credit must undergo student course evaluation. However, these evaluations are aggregated and presented with flexibility. Faculty may select 90% of their evaluations in a particular period of review to present as part of their portfolio or evaluation documentation. 90% indicates seven of eight taught courses, as an example, or two of three taught courses, or nine out of ten taught courses. Furthermore, all candidates must include observations of at least two recent classroom visits by peers and one classroom visit by the chairperson.

B: EVALUATING RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES PERFORMANCE

No limits are 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. Faculty member should consult with a member of the DPC concerning their activities and the appropriate category to be used given the documentation presented.

University and renowned publishers will be recognized as more significant than popular publications and presses; published work as more significant than presented work; and nearly completed research activity has more significance than ongoing or newly originated research. Finally, those research and *creative activities* that enhance the reputation of the university are more significant than those that enhance a unit of the university.

Materials which may be submitted in the evaluation portfolio as Research/Creative Activities include the following but are not limited to:

1. A research/*creative activities* agenda if it is being used to fulfill a performance standard.
2. A narrative of research/scholarly progress since the last evaluation, including how students were involved in research projects.
3. Copies of all successful publications and abstracts.
4. Cover page, abstract, and grant award letters for all successful grants.
5. Conference proceedings which list the candidate’s presentations and/or contributions.
6. Documentation of attendance at research conferences, workshops, or other developmental activities, with a narrative explaining how the activity assisted in advancing their research.
7. Letter of invitation to serve as a reviewer for grants, books, monographs, or articles.
8. Representative samples of research, grants, or manuscripts in progress.
9. Book/performance reviews.
10. Evidence of improvements made to research infrastructure.

11. Cover page, abstract and reviewer comments of unsuccessful grants.
12. Professional correspondence.

Specific Details Regarding “B” Activities:

1. A B1 activity can be a completion of one phase of a multi-year creative/research long-term project such as a scholarly book, feature-film, or other long-form media project that are part of projects typically requiring many years of research time to complete.
2. Publications, monographs, books, and articles count as a B2 activity if they have been reviewed in a peer-reviewed competitive process and have either appeared or been accepted for publication. All items in B2 activity must list Chicago State University as the author’s resident institution to be counted as a “B2” activity.
3. A competitive grant renewal would count as a B2 activity, whereas a non-competitive renewal would count as a B1 activity. This permits faculty with multi-year grants to count the successful grant in more than one year.
4. All successful peer reviewed external grant proposals count as a B2 activity regardless of the amount of the grant. All earmarks, gifts, and other non-competitive awards are not B2 activities. A successful peer reviewed grant from another institution for which a CSU faculty member is a listed Co-PI on the grant counts as a B2 activity. If they are listed as a subcontractor, the grant is a B1 activity.
5. A “manuscript or grant in progress” is to be counted as a B1 activity for up to three years unless special consideration for extended years is authorized for complexity of the grant.

Any activities for which faculty are compensated as assigned time may not be counted as research. These activities remain part of teaching/performance of primary duties.

C: EVALUATING SERVICE PERFORMANCE

A record of all service activities, supporting evidence, and summative description should be organized according to the five categories noted in Table 4. These categories not exhaustive but is illustrative of the types of service activities to be included in the portfolio. As one becomes more engaged in one’s profession, the quantity and quality of professional service should naturally increase. However, service enhancing the reputation of the university broadly should be seen more significant than service to a unit of university.

Service-related activities must be clearly documented in the portfolio in any of the following ways:

1. Meeting minutes with attendee listed.
2. Letters of recognition/appreciation from committee chair.
3. Certificates of recognition/appreciate from institutional bodies.
4. Flyers and announcements with the candidate’s name listed.
5. Copies of prepared documents (reports, proposals) with candidate’s name listed.

Service should be uncompensated and voluntary (other than *honoraria* received as result of certain professional activities). Therefore, any activities for which faculty are compensated as assigned time may not be counted as service. These activities remain part of teaching/performance of primary duties.

D: EVALUATING UNIT A RESEARCH FACULTY

Research faculty are faculty hired as experienced, independent researchers who have qualifications comparable to those expected of tenurable ranks but are not tenure track. The

appointee is expected to make significant contributions to the research mission of the university, and they are appointed on a non-tenurable 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.

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 is defined as “highly effective” for all activities in the appointment for the first three years. The details of the “highly effective” 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*; significant teaching/*performance of primary duties* and/or significant service through the evaluation period.
3. For promotion to research professor: superior research/*creative activities*; superior teaching/*performance of primary duties* and and/or significant service through the evaluation period.

E: EVALUATING 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 has 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.

F: EVALUATING UNIT B FACULTY

Unit B faculty will be evaluated only on teaching/*performance of primary duties*. After one full year of service, an evaluation portfolio of their activities is to be prepared, following the schedule laid out in the university timetable. Unit B faculty will be evaluated on:

1. (1) Student evaluations
Per the Contract requirement, all courses taught for credit may submit 90% of course evaluation taught during the evaluation period. Following the Contract guidance, the following average student evaluation scored are considered:

2.5 to 2.6	Satisfactory
2.61 to 3.0	Effective
3.01 to 3.5	Highly Effective
3.51 to 4.0	Significant
4.01 to 5.9	Superior
2. (2) Chair observation
3. (3) Syllabi, and any other supporting teaching materials
4. (4) Evaluation of CSWE competencies for designated required courses listed in the curriculum assessment matrix
5. (5) Peer evaluations

Evidence of CSWE assessment in the course syllabus should include the following:

1. (a) Competencies and practice behaviors to be assessed

2. (b) The assignment that will be used to assess the practice behaviors
3. (c) The rubric used to assess the practice behaviors
4. (d) The points assigned for the assessment of practice behaviors
5. (e) Documentation illustrating how the assessment points are tied to the overall points given for that assignment

Unit B faculty will only be awarded the “unsatisfactory,” “satisfactory,” or “highly effective” ratings, as stipulated in the faculty agreement.