

Wayne Watson, Ph.D.
President



Telephone: 773 / 995-2400
Fax: 773 / 995-3849
E-mail: wwatson@csu.edu

9501 S. King Drive / ADM 313
Chicago, Illinois 60628-1598

April 1, 2013

Professor Marian Perkins
Chairperson, Department of Criminal Justice,
Philosophy and Political Science
College of Arts and Sciences
Chicago State University
HWH 325

**RE: OFFICIAL TRANSMITTAL OF PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL OF THE
DEPARTMENT APPLICATION OF CRITERIA FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE,
PHILOSOPHY, AND POLITICAL SCIENCE**

Dear Professor Perkins:

I have reviewed the revised Department Application of Criteria (DAC) for the Department of Criminal Justice, Philosophy and Political Science, which was submitted to the Office of the Provost. Based on my review, I hereby approve the revised version (see attached). Please share the approved DAC with the appropriate departmental employees.

Thank you for your efforts in preparing the DAC for your department as one which reflects accountability and academic excellence.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Wayne D. Watson", is written over a large, light-colored oval shape.

Wayne D. Watson

cc: Dr. Sandra Westbrooks, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dr. Debra Jefferson, Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs and Contract
Administration
Dr. David Kanis, College of Arts and Sciences
Dr. Laurie Walter, President, CSU Chapter – UPI 4100

Attachment: Approved DAC

DEPARTMENTAL APPLICATION OF CRITERIA 2010-2015
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, PHILOSOPHY, POLITICAL SCIENCE
CRIMINAL JUSTICE, PHILOSOPHY, AND POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAMS

for Unit A and Unit B Faculty
[revised Fall 2012]

Preamble: The purpose of this document is to provide criteria to identify areas of strength and weakness and to improve employee performance and teaching effectiveness where required. The document is organized according to three sections; composition and purpose of the Department Personnel Committee (DPC), the statement of evaluation for faculty, and the criteria to be used for evaluation in three additional areas; teaching, research, and service activities. Each section identifies the categories of accepted materials and activities, their relative importance, and the methods of evaluation.

I. Composition and Purpose of a Department Personnel Committee (DPC)

A. Composition:

The composition of the DPC for the Department of Criminal Justice, Philosophy and Political Science (CJPPS) shall be constituted in accordance with the Bylaws of the Department.

B. Purpose:

The purpose of the DPC 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 CSU-UPI Contract (hereafter referred to as the Faculty Agreement). The dates for this process are specified in the Annual University Timetable for Evaluation.

II. Evaluation of Faculty

A. General Policy for Unit A and Unit B Faculty:

To receive a positive personnel recommendation, the candidate must be judged to have met the designated performance standard in each area as required by the Faculty Agreement for the requested personnel action. For Unit A Faculty, those areas shall include teaching, research/creative activities, and service. For Unit B Faculty, retention shall be evaluated in the area of teaching/primary duties. For candidates who have not yet completed the Ph.D., a letter from the dissertation committee indicating their progress and select chapters from the dissertation must be included in the portfolio. In each case, the DPC will determine whether the submission has successfully met the quality necessary and appropriate for the relevant performance standard.

B. Promotion and Tenure by Exception:

A faculty member will be judged exceptional upon exceeding the standards and/or criteria contained herein and in accord with the Faculty Agreement. Consideration for exceptionality shall be based on the applicable section of the Contract. The candidate may apply for such consideration in two ways; first, the employee must meet the relevant criteria listed above and must show evidence of exceptional performance beyond that otherwise required or secondly, the candidate may apply for tenure in her/his fourth, fifth, or sixth year of full-time service on the basis of exceptional performance in at least two of the following areas; teaching/primary duties, research/creative activities, or service.

C. Evaluation Scale:

Faculty will be evaluated based on a seven-level scale listed below. Some rankings may not apply to some evaluation decision and may not be required in each case. The rankings are as follows:

- Appropriate (lowest rank)
- Satisfactory
- Highly Satisfactory
- Effective
- Highly Effective
- Significant
- Superior (highest rank)



CHICAGO STATE UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
2013 APR - 1 P 3: 19

APPROVED

III. Categories of Materials and Activities, Relative Importance, and Methods of Evaluation:

I. A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

1. Categories of materials and activities:

a. Classroom performance:

- (1) Materials that **must** be submitted in the evaluation portfolio:
 - (a) Two classroom observations by members of the DPC (exemption for tenured annual review)
 - (b) Classroom observation by the Chair (exemption for tenured annual review)
 - (c) Each academic term, every student in each class section, shall have the opportunity to evaluate their instructor's teaching effectiveness in accordance with departmental policies and procedures with the exception of any course with 5 or fewer students. All student evaluations remain property of the University. (all teaching faculty)
 - (d) Evidence of participation in departmental assessment activities (where required; for all teaching faculty).
- (2) Materials that **may** be submitted include, but are not limited to the following:
 - (a) Additional class observation reports from other faculty members within the evaluation period
 - (b) Student evaluation forms from additional classes within the evaluation period, based on the department's established evaluation forms

b. Course materials:

- (1) Materials that **must** be submitted in the evaluation portfolio (for untenured faculty):
 - (a) Course syllabi for each course taught during the evaluation period unless there are multiple sections of the same course or significant changes have been made to a previous course syllabus
 - (b) At least two exams for each course taught during the evaluation period, excluding seminars, unless there are multiple sections of the same course that utilize the same exam or significant changes have been made
 - (c) If exams are not the primary method of evaluation of the student, a detailed discussion of one project or paper from which grades are determined for each course during the evaluation period unless multiple sections of the same course are taught that utilize a similar methodology
- (2) Materials that may be submitted include:
 - (a) Additional exams
 - (b) Handouts
 - (c) Study guides
 - (d) Original instructional materials
 - (e) Internet or web-related instruction (hard copy)
 - (f) Reading lists
 - (g) Lists of guest speakers
 - (h) Any other information the faculty member considers important

c. Additional Primary Duties:

- (1) Internship advising (if faculty member receives CUEs)
- (2) Student Academic Advising (if faculty member receives CUEs)
- (3) Curriculum revision and development, including course revisions and updates
- (4) Professional development for teaching improvement
- (5) Development of extension courses, distance learning or internet courses
- (6) Faculty Excellence Awards (teaching emphasis)
- (7) Supervision of student teachers
- (8) Assessment (if compensated)
- (9) Administrative assistance to the chair (if compensated)
- (10) Report preparation for accreditation/evaluation (if compensated)
- (11) Union committee membership/leadership positions (if compensated)
- (12) Other student centered teaching related activities such as:
 - (a) Presentation at the "great debate" series
 - (b) Presentations in residence halls / fraternities or sororities
 - (c) Speaking at symposia / panels serving students
 - (d) Guest speaker at student organized activity

- (e) Other student centered activity (with appropriate documentation)
- (13) Any additional compensated duties
- 2. Relative importance:
 - a. Classroom performance is the most important category. It will be based on classroom evaluation reports from the Chair and DPC member(s), and the student evaluations, weighted equally.
 - b. Course materials will be considered of secondary in importance to student evaluations.
 - c. Curriculum revision and development, including course revision and accreditation report development, should be considered for promotion and tenure.
 - d. Performance standards for non-teaching primary duties (e.g. assessment, advising activities) should be considered increasingly significant as the standard for review becomes more significant.
- 3. Evaluation of teaching/performance of primary duties:
 - a. Classroom visitations:
 - (1) At least two classroom visitations will be conducted by members of the DPC of equal or higher rank chosen by the Chair of the DPC and in the same discipline as the candidate in consultation with the candidate as to the time. If there is but one faculty member within the discipline of equal or higher rank, the DPC Chair should select the second evaluator of equal or higher rank from another discipline in the department. After the visitation, the applicant may ask that additional visitations by other members of the DPC, including members from other disciplines within the department, be made. All evaluations should use the "Peer Evaluation" form and will become part of the personnel process. All evaluations will be given to the Chair of the DPC, who will provide a copy to the faculty member being evaluated. **THEY MUST BE INCLUDED IN THE PORTFOLIO.**
 - (2) The department chair will schedule a class visitation with the candidate at an agreed upon time. The Chair's report will be included in the departmental evaluation of the candidate. It is the responsibility of the candidate to ensure that the Chair is made aware of the need for a class visitation when the candidate needs such an evaluation for the portfolio.
 - (3) The "Peer Evaluation" form will include written consideration of the organization and presentation of the subject matter and the apparent responsiveness of students.
 - (4) Evaluators should use the appropriate language of the DAC (e.g., satisfactory, highly effective, superior) on the peer evaluation form.
 - (5) The DPC chair is responsible for informing the evaluator of the requisite standard required of a faculty member for the evaluation.
 - b. Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness:
 - (1) Each academic term, every faculty member shall ensure that all of his/her students have the opportunity to evaluate his/her teaching effectiveness. Student evaluations shall be compiled through the use of the University's online evaluation form with additional questions added if approved by the department Chairperson and a majority of the Unit A faculty. The faculty member may, at her/his discretion, choose to utilize the Department's Evaluation form as a supplement to the online evaluation form.
 - (2) The University's evaluation form is available online for all students to complete. At the end of the semester, the compiled results of the online evaluations should be made available to the faculty member in hard copy for inclusion in the portfolio. Since the faculty member cannot control the choice a student makes to complete the online form, the faculty member shall not be penalized for a low completion rate of the online form. It is expected that faculty members will encourage students to complete the online form with appropriate reminders toward the end of the semester.
 - (3) Any departmental evaluations utilized for each class will be kept separate.
 - (4) All student evaluations will become part of the faculty member's file and will be part of the faculty member's personnel records.
 - c. Course materials are to be evaluated on the following bases:
 - (1) Scope/coverage of information--appropriateness to the course level;
 - (2) Quality and fairness of exams;
 - (3) Fairness of the grading policy.

- (4) The syllabus must include a statement of course objectives, requirements, readings, and a written description of attendance and grading policies.
 - (5) Where disagreement regarding the scope, quality, and fairness of any course material submitted occurs, the Chair will assign a senior faculty member in the same discipline as the candidate to complete an "Instructional Materials Evaluation" form for the purpose of judging the course materials. A candidate may submit such a form already completed by another member of his/her discipline as part of the portfolio materials to assist the DPC in judging course materials.
 - d. Other primary duties (e.g., assessment, advising): satisfactory performance of other primary duties related to teaching shall be evaluated according to documentation provided by the candidate for the relevant period of performance based on the appropriate job description (where applicable).
4. Guidelines for evaluation of teaching/primary duties. Based on documented evidence presented for the criteria in I.A.1.a. through I.A.3.c., the candidate will be judged by the voting members of the DPC as to whether or not s/he has fulfilled the standard indicated for the appropriate category. The standards for evaluation are as follows:
- a. A **Satisfactory** teaching evaluation (needed for retention in probationary years one and two, and for annual evaluation of all temporary faculty) will require the following:
 - (1) Overall classroom visitation evaluations must be satisfactory or better;
 - (2) Student evaluations must be judged more positive than negative.
 - (3) The course materials must be satisfactory.
 - b. An **Effective** teaching evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year three; and promotion to assistant professor) will require the following:
 - (1) Overall classroom visitation evaluations must be effective or better.
 - (2) Student evaluations must be judged more positive than negative.
 - (3) The course materials are effective.
 - (4) One contribution must be made in categories I.A.1.c. (1)-(13).
 - c. A **Highly Effective** teaching evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year four; and may be applied to temporary faculty) will require the following:
 - (1) Overall classroom visitation evaluations must be highly effective or better.
 - (2) Student evaluations must be judged more positive than negative.
 - (3) The course materials are highly effective.
 - (4) Two (2) contributions must be made in categories I.A.1.c. (1)-(13).
 - d. A **Significant** teaching evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year five; promotion to associate professor) will require the following:
 - (1) Overall classroom visitation evaluations must be highly effective or better.
 - (2) Student evaluations must be judged more positive than negative.
 - (3) The course materials are highly effective.
 - (4) Two (2) significant contributions must be made in categories I.A.1.c. (1)-(13).
 - (5) One additional contribution must be made in categories I.A.i.c. (1)-(13) for promotion to associate professor.
 - e. A **Superior** teaching evaluation (needed for tenure; promotion to professor; PAI) will require the following.
 - (1) Overall classroom visitation evaluations must be superior.
 - (2) Student evaluations are judged more positive than negative.
 - (3) Course materials are highly effective.
 - (4) Three significant contributions are made in categories I.A.1.c. (1)-(13).
 - (5) One additional contribution must be made in categories I.A.i.c. (1)-(13) for promotion to full professor or PAI.

- f. With regard to the annual evaluation of **tenured Unit A faculty**,
- (1) Teaching/Primary duties will be judged **Adequate** that meet the following criteria:
 - (a) Student evaluations are judged more positive than negative.
 - (b) Course materials are satisfactory.
 - (c) One significant contribution in categories I.A.1.c. (1)- (13).
 - (2) Teaching/Primary duties will be judged **Exemplary** that meet the following criteria:
 - (a) Student evaluations are judged more positive than negative.
 - (b) Course materials are highly effective.
 - (c) Two significant contributions in categories I.A.1.c. (1)- (13)
- g. With regard to the annual evaluation of **full-time temporary Unit B faculty**, satisfactory performance must be demonstrated in each of the following areas (after one full year of teaching):
- (1) Evaluations based on classroom visitations conducted by the Chair and a senior faculty member in the discipline of the candidate
 - (2) Syllabi and instructional materials including examinations
 - (3) Student Evaluations administered in accord with departmental procedure
 - (4) Any other appropriate submission
- h. With regard to the annual evaluation of **part time temporary faculty**, satisfactory performance must be demonstrated in each of the following areas to begin after one semester:
- (1)Evaluations based on classroom visitations conducted by a senior faculty member in the discipline of the candidate
 - (2) Syllabi and instructional materials including examinations
 - (3) Student Evaluations administered in accord with departmental procedure
 - (4) Any other appropriate submission
- j. With regard to the evaluation of materials on the basis of "**exceptionality**," the materials submitted must exceed the standard of performance required for the given action.

B. Research/Creative Activity

1. Categories of materials and activities: Faculty members shall not be restricted or limited in the areas in which they engage in scholarly activities. The most significant criterion for evaluation shall be evidence that the faculty member is active and engaged in his/her academic discipline. No limits are to be placed on the kind of research and/or creative activities selected, as long as there is a demonstrable relationship between the faculty member's research and his/her academic discipline. The activities listed within each category are meant to be illustrative of the kind of activities that may be considered in each category. The lists below are not meant to be either definitive or exhaustive. Each faculty member is encouraged to consult with a member of the DPC concerning his/her activities, their appropriate category ranking, and the appropriate type of documentation.
 - a. **Category I: Professional Publications**
 - (1) Monograph
 - (2) Published Book
 - (3) Original Translation
 - (4) Peer-reviewed journal article
 - (5) Published journal article
 - (6) Book chapter in an edited collection

Documentation consists of an offprint of the published work, photocopies of the first page of an article or table of contents of a book as the publication appears in print.

b. Category II: Publishing Activities (not included in Category I)

- (1) Publications in any venue not covered in Category I
 - (2) Manuscripts submitted (or in review) in peer-reviewed publications
 - (3) Evidence that the faculty member's research/creative activity is regarded as significant within his/her discipline (indices, journal citation, professional letters referencing published work)
 - (4) Book reviews published in professional journals
 - (5) Papers at national or international professional meetings, or evidence that a paper has been accepted for presentation at such a meeting though the meeting will not take place until after the submission of the document or portfolio
 - (6) Award or grant
 - (7) Progress toward a terminal degree in the faculty member's primary discipline
- Documentation shall conform to the guidelines in Category I unless otherwise specified.

c. Category III: Scholarly Activities (not included in Categories I and II)

- (1) Manuscripts in preparation: The acceptability of manuscripts in preparation and the appropriate documentation shall be determined by the DPC using the "Unpublished Materials Evaluation Form." The Chair of the DPC may designate a referee in the same area of expertise to provide a written evaluation of the materials submitted in consultation with the faculty member.
- (2) Research in progress: The acceptability of research in progress shall be determined by the DPC in consultation with the faculty member. Where human subject research occurs, the written approval notice shall constitute documentation of ongoing and appropriate research activity. The Chair of the DPC may designate a referee in the same area of expertise to provide a written evaluation of the materials submitted in consultation with the faculty member.
- (3) Grant or fellowship proposals or applications in preparation: The acceptability of such proposals shall be judged by the DPC which may solicit the opinions of referees in the faculty member's discipline and/or area of expertise.
- (4) Papers presented at local/state/regional professional meetings, or evidence that a paper has been accepted for presentation at such a meeting.
- (5) Invited presentation at a professional meeting that requires substantial preparation
- (6) Original work in an anthology or scholarly edited volume of essays
- (7) Edit a published scholarly work of documents or essays
- (8) Edit professional journal
- (9) Edit *Proceedings* of a professional conference
- (10) Serving as a reviewer for granting agencies, publishers, or any other area in which a faculty member's expertise is recognized. Acceptable documentation shall consist of letters soliciting the faculty member's reviews.
- (11) Statements from external professionals testifying to a faculty member's expertise, participation in ongoing research projects, the quality of a faculty member's work and area of expertise and so forth. Acceptable documentation shall consist of letters testifying to the faculty member's expertise and/or activity.

Documentation shall include copies of material and an "Evaluation Form" where appropriate.

d. Category IV: Developmental Activities (not included in Categories I-III)

- (1) Professional involvement with community-based organizations
- (2) Presentation at departmental, college or university seminar
- (3) Discussant or panel chair at professional conference
- (4) Curate or organize a public or CSU exhibition
- (5) Any other appropriate submission (include "Unpublished Activities" form)

2. Relative importance:
 - a. Research listed in Category I and II represent a higher level of scholarly achievement and is therefore weighed more heavily than the activities listed in categories III and IV.
 - b. DPC members shall assess the relative significance of a published work, considering factors such as the press or journal which publishes the work, the impact of the work in the field, and any other factors consistent with the standards of the academic discipline.
3. Evaluation of research/creative activity:
 - a. Quality and professional stature of publications will be judged by the DPC
 - b. Consideration will be given only to work that can be documented according to the categories listed above during the evaluation period
 - c. Consideration will be given to the prestige of the conference or institution where a presentation is given
 - d. Evidence of professional/research development must be submitted to document the activities
 - e. Evidence must be submitted to document the awards
4. Guidelines for evaluations of research/creative activity. Based on documented evidence presented for the criteria Categories I-IV, the candidate will be judged by the voting members of the DPC as to whether or not s/he has fulfilled the standard indicated for the appropriate category. The standards for evaluation are as follows:
 - a. An **Appropriate** research/creative activity evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year one) will require the candidate to meet one of the criteria in any Category IV.
 - b. A **Satisfactory** research/creative activity evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year two) will require the candidate to meet at least two of the criteria in Category IV.
 - c. A **Highly Satisfactory** research/creative activity evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year three; promotion to assistant professor) will require the candidate to meet one of the criteria in Category III and two items from Category IV.
 - d. An **Effective** research/creative activity evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year four; promotion to assistant professor) will require the candidate to meet at least one of the criteria in Category II and one item from Category IV.
 - e. A **Highly Effective** research/creative activity evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year five) will require the candidate to meet at least two of the criteria in any Category II and one item from Category III and one item from Category IV.
 - f. A **Significant** research/creative activity evaluation (needed for tenure; promotion to associate professor) will require the candidate to meet:
 - (1) At least one of the criteria in Category I and
 - (2) At least two additional activities in Categories III.
 - (3) One additional activity in Categories III or two activities in Category IV are needed for promotion to associate professor.
 - g. A **Superior** research/creative activity evaluation (needed for promotion to professor) will require the candidate to:
 - (1) Either one of the of the criteria in Category I (1-3) or [red for emphasis]
 - (2) one item in Category I (1-5) and three additional items from Category II and
 - (3) One additional activity from Category III and two additional activities from Category IV for promotion to full professor or PAI.
 - h. With regard to the annual evaluation of **tenured faculty**,
 - (1) Research/creative activities will be judged **Adequate** by meeting at least one of the criteria in Category III or higher during a two year period.
 - (2) Research/creative activities will be judged **Exemplary** by meeting at least one of the criteria in Category II or higher during a two year period.

- i. For **PAI**, the candidate must demonstrate:
 - (1) Superior performance in Teaching/Primary duties and in EITHER Research or Service;
 - (2) Significant performance must be shown for the remaining area.
- j. With regard to the evaluation of materials on the basis of "**exceptionality**," the materials submitted must exceed the standard of performance required for the given action.

C. Service Activity:

- 1. Categories of materials and activities: Faculty members are expected to participate in university and/or community related activities. A documentary record of such activities is to be provided in the portfolio.
 - a. Department activities:
 - (1) Required:
 - (a) Participation in the proceedings of the DPC
 - (b) Participation at department meetings
 - (2) Other departmental service:
 - (a) Participation in departmental committees
 - (b) Chairing departmental committees
 - (c) Search committee membership
 - (d) Ad hoc committee membership
 - (e) Serving as advisor to student groups
 - (f) Student Academic Advising (if not compensated)
 - (g) Student recruitment
 - (h) Administrative assistance to the chair (if not compensated)
 - (i) Assessment (if not compensated)
 - (j) Report preparation for accreditation/evaluation (if not compensated)
 - (k) Organization of high school outreach programs
 - (l) Academic fair judging at CSU
 - (m) Creation of departmental web page, pamphlets, student handbooks
 - (n) Departmental fund-raising
 - (o) Student advising (if not compensated)
 - b. University and college activities:
 - (1) Membership/leadership on university or college committees
 - (2) Union committee membership/leadership positions (if not assigned duties)
 - (3) University search committees
 - (4) Faculty Senate membership
 - (5) Organization of colloquia, workshops, lectures, debates on campus
 - (6) Faculty Excellence Award (service emphasis)
 - c. Professionally related community service or service to the profession:
 - (1) Giving public lectures
 - (2) City-wide high school outreach activities
 - (3) Unpaid consulting or volunteer service
 - (4) Participation in other community outreach programs
 - (5) Accreditation visitations
 - (6) Teacher in-service programs
 - (7) Edit professional newsletter
 - (8) Membership in professional organizations
 - (9) Leadership in professional organization
 - (10) Any other necessary and appropriate submission of service to the profession or the campus community
- 2. Relative importance: Service activity at the department, university and college levels will be considered to be of equal importance but, in any case, more important than community service. Serving as an officer or in some other leadership role will be considered to be a more significant contribution than serving as a member of a committee. Care must be taken when evaluating service to consider the committee assignments and work available to the faculty

member, the place of the faculty member in their professional development, and the nature of the faculty member's academic background. Recognition should be given to the fact that not every discipline lends itself to the same service opportunities, especially as these relate to community-based activities. It is also anticipated that the amount of service activities will vary from year to year.

3. Service criteria: Evaluation of the effectiveness of a candidate's service will include the following:
 - a. Extent and nature of leadership
 - b. Degree of participation
 - c. Quality and length of service
 - d. The relationship of the service to the candidate's assigned responsibilities and to the university.
4. Guidelines for evaluation of service: Based on documented evidence presented for the criteria listed in I.C.1.a. (2) through I.C.1.c. above, the candidate will be judged by the voting members of the DPC as to whether or not s/he has fulfilled the standard indicated.
 - a. An **Appropriate** service evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year one) will require one acceptable performance in at least one activity in I.C.1.a. (2)
 - b. A **Satisfactory** service evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year two) will require the following:
 - (1) Acceptable performance in at least one activity in I.C.1.a. (2)
 - (2) Acceptable performance in at least one activity in I.C.1.b. or I.C.1.c.
 - c. A **Highly Satisfactory** service evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year three; promotion to assistant professor) will require the following:
 - (1) Acceptable performance in at least one activity in I.C.1.a.(2)
 - (2) Acceptable performance in at least two activities in I.C.1.b. or I.C.1.c.
 - d. A **Effective** service evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year four) will require the following:
 - (1) Acceptable performance in at least two activities in I.C.1.a. (2)
 - (2) Acceptable performance in at least one activity in I.C.1.b. or I.C.1.c.
 - e. A **Highly Effective** service evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year five) will require the following:
 - (1) Acceptable performance in at least two activities in I.C.1.a.(2)
 - (2) Acceptable performance in at least two activities in I.C.1.b. or I.C.1.c.
 - f. A **Significant** service evaluation (needed for promotion to associate professor; tenure) will require the following:
 - (1) Acceptable performance in at least two activities in I.C.1.a. (2)
 - (2) Acceptable performance in at least two additional activities in I.C.1.a. (2) through I.C.1.c.,
 - (3) Significant performance (a leadership role) in any one of the areas listed above
 - g. A **Superior** service evaluation (needed for promotion to professor) will require that the candidate demonstrate acceptable performance in at least one activity in I.C.1.a.(2) and at least four additional activities in I.C.1.a.(2) through I.C.1.c.
 - h. For annual evaluation of **tenured faculty**,
 - (1) Service activities will be judged **Adequate** by acceptable performance in at least one of the activities in I.C.a.(2) through I.C.1.c.
 - (2) Service activities will be judged **Exemplary** by acceptable performance in at least two activities in I.C.1.a.(2) through I.C.1.c. and by significant performance (a leadership role) in any of the areas listed above.

- i. For PAI, the candidate must demonstrate:
 - (1) Superior performance in Teaching/Primary duties and in EITHER Research or Service;
 - (2) Significant performance must be shown for the remaining area.
- j. With regard to the evaluation of materials on the basis of "exceptionality," the materials submitted must exceed the standard of performance required for the given action.

IV. Distance Education Policies for Online and Hybrid Courses:

A. Online and Hybrid Course Offerings:

- 1.) The department will not permit more than 50% of an individual student's courses to be online or hybrid courses for the purpose of fulfilling the requirements for a degree.
- 2.) Criteria for approval of online and hybrid courses:
 - a. Any online or hybrid course to be offered within the department's curriculum will need to be approved first by the department's curriculum committee.
 - b. When approving courses to be offered online or in hybrid format, the department is the first level of approval and should focus on the quality of the content and design of the course. The department is the only body that can determine if the content of the course is appropriate for the curriculum. Therefore, the department's curriculum committee will review the syllabus and interview the instructor to determine the appropriateness of content, design and pedagogical approach within the context of the department's entire curricular offerings.
 - c. Following departmental approval, proposed online or hybrid courses will need to be approved by the requisite university committees including; the College Curriculum Committee (CCC), the University Curriculum Coordinating Committee (UCCC), the University General Education Committee (GEC), and/or the Distance Education Committee (DEC).
- 3.) Courses taught in an online or hybrid format carry the same consideration for personnel actions (retention, promotion, tenure) as any traditionally offered (i.e., face to face instruction) course.
- 4.) The department may offer as many online and hybrid courses per semester as is appropriate to satisfy the program needs of the department and university.
- 5.) Online and hybrid courses must conform to all applicable program, department, and university policies including but not limited to the Credit Hour Policy that specifies course content requirements to ensure uniformity and consistency of course content. Where a discrepancy arises, the faculty of the discipline shall have primacy in determining how this policy is implemented with respect to the courses within their curriculum.

B. Selection of Faculty to Teach Online and Hybrid Courses:

- 1. The Chair of the department shall poll the faculty to determine if there are those who wish to offer course within the Distance Education program.
- 2. Faculty teaching online or hybrid courses shall complete the Online Certification Training offered by the University's Center for Teaching and Research Excellence (CTRE).
- 3. Faculty members teaching online and hybrid courses must be responsive to students' needs and questions about coursework and they shall hold office hours (virtual or in person) similar in duration to those required by traditional course offerings.
- 4. The Chair of the department will formulate a roster of faculty who wish to teach an online or hybrid course in the event that demand for teaching assignments exceeds program need or the support from the University. This roster will be developed in a manner similar to those developed for teaching during the Summer Session.
- 5. Beyond the considerations listed above, there is no limit to the number of online or hybrid courses a faculty member may teach each semester.

C. Evaluating Online and Hybrid Courses:

- 1. The method for evaluating online and hybrid courses within the department will follow the same process used by traditionally offered courses.

2. These methods of evaluation will include student evaluations, peer evaluations, and Chair evaluation(s) as outlined in section III.A.3. above and as required by the appropriate personnel action.

D. Advising Students about Online and Hybrid Courses:

3. Students that register for any online or hybrid course will be advised as to the requirements necessary to be successful in an online or hybrid course, including having the appropriate technology, time, discipline, and skill needed to complete the course. Students without access to the needed technology or lacking the necessary skills will be advised toward traditional courses or technology courses to build their skill level.
4. Students will be provided with the booklet, "Succeeding Online" published by the CTRE.
5. Online and hybrid courses will be provided by the department as long as the Library and the CTRE continue to provide online support services, an available online Technology Literacy training module, and the Information Literacy training module (called "CSIT") with links available for instructor use (or a suitable substitute).

DEPARTMENTAL APPLICATION OF CRITERIA 2010-2015
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, PHILOSOPHY, POLITICAL SCIENCE
CRIMINAL JUSTICE, PHILOSOPHY, AND POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAMS

Unit A and Unit B Faculty
[revised Fall 2012]

APPENDIX A:
EVALUATION FORMS

DEPARTMENTAL APPLICATION OF CRITERIA 2010-2015
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, PHILOSOPHY, POLITICAL SCIENCE
CRIMINAL JUSTICE, PHILOSOPHY, AND POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAMS
UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS EVALUATION FORM

FACULTY MEMBER EVALUATED: _____

Reason for Evaluation: _____ Retention (_____ Year)
 _____ Tenure
 _____ Promotion to the Rank of _____
 _____ PAI

Brief Description of Materials Evaluated:

Evaluated by _____

Materials Judged to be:

() HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT () SIGNIFICANT () EFFECTIVE () SATISFACTORY () BELOW AVERAGE

Written Comments by Evaluator:

Signature of faculty member evaluated _____ Date: _____

**DEPARTMENTAL APPLICATION OF CRITERIA 2010-2015
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, PHILOSOPHY, POLITICAL SCIENCE**

CRIMINAL JUSTICE, PHILOSOPHY, AND POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAMS

PEER EVALUATION OF CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE FORM

FACULTY MEMBER EVALUATED: _____

Reason for Evaluation: _____ Retention (_____ Year)
_____ Tenure
_____ Promotion to the Rank of _____
_____ PAI

Brief Description of Materials Evaluated:

Evaluated by _____

Materials Judged to be:

() HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT () SIGNIFICANT () EFFECTIVE () SATISFACTORY () BELOW AVERAGE

Written Comments by Evaluator:

Signature of faculty member evaluated _____ Date: _____

DEPARTMENTAL APPLICATION OF CRITERIA 2010-2015
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, PHILOSOPHY, POLITICAL SCIENCE
CRIMINAL JUSTICE, PHILOSOPHY, AND POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAMS
INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS EVALUATION FORM

FACULTY MEMBER EVALUATED: _____

Reason for Evaluation: _____ Retention (_____ Year)
_____ Tenure
_____ Promotion to the Rank of _____
_____ PAI

Brief Description of Materials Evaluated:

Evaluated by _____

Materials Judged to be:

() HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT () SIGNIFICANT () EFFECTIVE () SATISFACTORY () BELOW AVERAGE

Written Comments by Evaluator:

Signature of faculty member evaluated _____ Date: _____

DEPARTMENTAL APPLICATION OF CRITERIA 2010-2015
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, PHILOSOPHY, POLITICAL SCIENCE
CRIMINAL JUSTICE, PHILOSOPHY, AND POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAMS
RECOMMENDATION ON RETENTION/TENURE/PROMOTION FORM

The DPC: _____ recommends
_____ does not recommend

FACULTY MEMBER EVALUATED: _____

for: _____ Retention (_____ Year)
_____ Tenure
_____ Promotion to the Rank of _____
_____ PAI

by a vote of: _____ Affirmative _____ Negative _____ Abstention

On this Date: _____

Reasons for Recommendation:

Signatures of Voting DPC Members: