

**Wayne Watson, Ph.D.**  
**President**



Telephone: 773 / 995-2400  
Fax: 773 / 995-3849  
E-mail: [wwatson@csu.edu](mailto:wwatson@csu.edu)

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

October 2, 2012

Dr. Arthur Redman  
Chairperson, Department of Geography & Sociology, and Departmental Employees

**RE: OFFICIAL TRANSMITTAL OF PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL OF YOUR  
DEPARTMENT APPLICATION OF CRITERIA**

Dear Dr. Redman and Departmental Employees:

I have reviewed your revised Department Application of Criteria (DAC) which was recently submitted to the Office of the Provost. Based on my review, I hereby approve the DAC for the Department of Geography & Sociology. A copy of the approved DAC is included in this communication. 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 Watson", written over a large, horizontal, looping flourish.

Wayne Watson  
President

Attachment: Approved DAC

CHICAGO STATE UNIVERSITY  
DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY, SOCIOLOGY, HISTORY, AFRICAN  
AMERICAN STUDIES AND ANTHROPOLOGY

GEOGRAPHY AND SOCIOLOGY PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENTAL APPLICATION OF CRITERIA  
For the period beginning September, 2012

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

A. Composition

A Department Personnel Committee (DPC) shall be constituted in accordance with the Bylaws of the Department of Geography, Sociology, History, African American Studies and Anthropology.

B. 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 Contract. The dates for this process are specified in the annual University evaluation timetable.

II. Evaluation of Faculty

A. Evaluation Scale

Faculty will be evaluated based on a seven-level scale. Some rankings may not apply to some evaluation decisions; this is meant simply to clarify the order of rankings. Rankings are in the following order:

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

OCT 2 2012

B. Unit A Faculty

The degree of effectiveness of performance of each faculty member who is covered under Unit A of the Contract and who is being considered for retention, promotion, PAI or tenure shall be evaluated in the areas of teaching/performance of primary duties, research/ creative activity, and service. The criteria by which these areas shall be evaluated are set forth in Section III of this document. Teaching/ performance of primary duties is considered the most important of the three areas of evaluation. In general, research/creative activities and service are regarded as having equal importance.

C. Unit B Faculty

The degree of effectiveness of performance of each faculty member who is covered under Unit B of the Contract and who is being considered for retention shall be evaluated in the area of teaching/performance of primary duties. The criteria for evaluation are set forth in Section V of this document.

D. Portfolios

Each faculty member subject to evaluation shall prepare a portfolio of materials, which will include a

APPROVED

*[Handwritten Signature]*  
1  
10/26/12

*Departmental Application of Criteria, 2010-2015*

copy of the current Departmental Application of Criteria, a curriculum vitae, a yearlong work assignment and any revised work assignment worksheets, peer evaluations, student evaluations, instructional materials, evidence of research/creative activities, evidence of service, and any other materials as set forth in the contract.

**III. UNIT A FACULTY: Categories of Appropriate Activities and Materials by Performance Area; Relative Importance of Activities/Materials; and Methods of Evaluation**

The performance standards listed below shall be used to reach judgments about the degree of effectiveness of a faculty member’s performance and are in accord with the provisions of the Contract. They are stated to express the special features of the disciplines covered by the Departmental Application of Criteria.

<b>Personnel Action</b>	<b>Teaching/ Primary Duty</b>	<b>Research/ Creative Activity</b>	<b>Service</b>
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
Associate Professor	Superior	Significant	Significant
Full Professor	Superior	Superior	Superior
Post-Tenure Review	Adequate/Exemplary	Adequate/Exemplary	Adequate/Exemplary
PAI	Superior	Superior/Significant	Superior/Significant

**A. Teaching / Performance of Primary Duties**

**1. Categories of Materials and Activities**

- a) Classroom observation, evidenced by the *Classroom Evaluation Form*.
- b) Student evaluations, evidenced by the Summary Student Evaluation of Instructor Form.
- c) Instructional materials and participation in assessment activities as required in General Education Assessment or Program Assessment evidenced by the *Instructional Materials Evaluation Form*.
- d) Other activities relating to teaching such as course development, program development, professional development, and classroom experimental activities.
- e) To encourage the development and teaching of on-line courses, faculty members shall be given additional weight for the development and teaching of such courses.
- f) Performance of advisement duties if accompanied by the assignment of CUEs, evidenced by the *Re-Assigned Time Evaluation Form*.
- g) Performance of General Education Assessment Coordinator duties and/or Program Assessment Coordinator duties if accompanied by the assignment of CUEs, evidenced by the *Re-Assigned Time Evaluation Form*.
- h) Performance of any other activities in which the faculty member being evaluated is assigned CUEs by the chair of the department, evidenced by the *Re-Assigned Time Evaluation Form*. Such activities may include, but are not limited to: Fredrick Blum Neighborhood Assistance Center Coordinator, Program Coordinator, union officiating, and department-assigned research activities.

## *Departmental Application of Criteria, 2010-2015*

### **2. *Relative Importance***

- a) In the event a faculty member is assigned teaching duties only, the categories shall be weighted as follows: a) 50%; b) 25%; and c) 25%. Work in category “d” (from above) may be used to make up a deficiency in one of the first three categories.
- b) In the event that a faculty member is assigned duties in addition to teaching, such as advising, (category “f” from above), assessment coordinator (category “g” from above), or any other re-assigned time duties (category “h” from above), the evaluation will be based entirely on the *Re-Assigned Time Evaluation Form*. Re-assigned time duties will be assessed based on the percentage of the contractual requirement represented by the CUEs assigned to the activity: 1 CUE = 4%, 2 CUEs = 8%, 3 CUEs = 12%, 4 CUEs = 16%, 5 CUEs = 20%, 6 CUEs = 24%, etc. While it will be impossible to accurately work with strict percentages in a qualitative assessment, a good faith effort will be made by both the DPC and the Department Chairperson to consider performance in re-assigned time activities following the rough formula laid out above. The remainder of the contractual requirement would be fulfilled through the completion of teaching duties.

### **3. *Methods of Evaluation***

#### a) Evaluation of Classroom Performance

Classroom observations shall be conducted by two members of a DPC, one chosen by the applicant and one by the DPC.

Each of the observers shall prepare a written statement of his/her classroom observations using the standard *Classroom Evaluation Form* adopted by the department. These evaluations shall be given to the Chairperson of the DPC who shall provide them to the faculty member being evaluated and to the members of the DPC for use during an evaluation meeting. The Chairperson of the DPC will also advise the applicant and all members of the DPC as to the appropriate personnel action the applicant is requesting (probationary year level, tenure, promotion, PAI) and the language required for such action as laid out in the contract.

All *Classroom Evaluation Forms* shall be signed and dated by the primary evaluator and the faculty member being evaluated.

The department Chairperson shall conduct at least one classroom observation of every faculty member being evaluated for retention, promotion, tenure, or PAI. The class visited shall be determined in consultation with the faculty member being evaluated. The results of the visitation should be discussed with the faculty member involved. An independent signed and dated *Classroom Evaluation Form* shall be submitted by the department Chairperson to the faculty member involved and the DPC as part of the Chair’s evaluation.

To be judged “satisfactory” in this category, the evaluations must be “satisfactory” or higher.

To be judged “effective” in this category, the evaluations must be “effective” or higher.

To be judged “highly effective” in this category, the evaluations must be “highly effective” or higher.

To be judged “significant” in this category, the evaluations must be “significant” or higher.

To be judged “superior” in this category, the evaluations must be “superior.”

In the case where one of the peer evaluations is lower than the specified level, the DPC may still elect to give the higher rating overall if it explicitly justifies its decision on the basis of the quality of material submitted in category “d” (see sections “1d” and “2a” from above).

Distance Learning Courses will be evaluated by a review of the materials and transcripts of on-

*Departmental Application of Criteria, 2010-2015*

line discussions, faculty materials, student responses. Evaluations shall be determined accordingly.

b) Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

At least once each academic term, each faculty member shall have his/her teaching effectiveness evaluated by students. Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness shall be compiled through use of the University's on-line evaluation form with additional department questions if approved by the Chairperson and a majority of tenured faculty.

The University's evaluation form is available on-line for all students to complete. At the end of the semester, the compiled results of the on-line evaluations shall be made available to the faculty member. Since the faculty member cannot control the choice students make regarding the completion of the on-line forms, no faculty member will be penalized for a low completion rate. It is expected that faculty members will encourage students to complete the on-line form through information in the course syllabus and appropriate reminders near the end of the term.

A faculty member may choose to offer an additional anonymous paper evaluation. These shall be distributed at a convenient time near the end of each term. The instructor will not be present in the classroom when the alternative evaluation forms are distributed and filled out. The forms shall be collected by either a staff member or a student volunteer and returned to the Office of the Department Chairperson where the primary data are compiled after the semester is over. The summary of the appropriate forms shall be made available to the DPC if the faculty member is being considered for a personnel action. In the case when the alternative paper form is used, summary statements of student evaluations shall be signed by the individual preparing the data. A faculty member shall have the opportunity to examine his/her own student evaluations. The raw data shall be preserved until the end of the personnel process.

The DPC shall consider differences in course characteristics (large/small lecture; seminar; lab) when evaluating the results. Evaluation of a faculty member's teaching/performance of primary duties will be in accord with all items listed in the Contract. The summary question of the Student Evaluation of Instructor Form ("Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.") shall be used in making the following judgments.

To be judged "Satisfactory" in this category, an average of at least 60% of the class evaluations covering the period under evaluation must be "Satisfactory" or higher. (Example: If 58% of the responses in three classes are "Satisfactory" or higher and if 66% of the responses in a fourth are "Satisfactory" or higher, then the average of the "Satisfactory" is 60%.)

To be judged "effective" in this category, at least 65% of the evaluations must be "Effective" or higher. To be judged "highly effective" in this category, at least 70% of the evaluations must be "Effective" or higher and at least 50% must be "Highly Effective" or higher.

To be judged "Significant" in this category, at least 70% of the evaluations must be "Highly Effective" or higher and at least 50% must be "Significant" or higher, and at least 15% must be "Effective" or higher.

To be judged "superior" in this category, at least 75% of the evaluations must be "Significant" or higher, at least 50% must be "Superior" or higher, and at least 25% must be "Highly Effective" or higher.

When the university's on-line evaluation form is utilized, either with or without department additions, averages consisting of the following criteria will be utilized:

Ineffective	1.0 – 1.9
-------------	-----------

*Departmental Application of Criteria, 2010-2015*

Appropriate	2.0 – 2.9
Satisfactory	3.0 – 3.2
Highly Satisfactory	3.3 – 3.5
Effective	3.6 – 3.9
Highly Effective	4.0 – 4.3
Significant	4.4 – 4.7
Superior	4.8 – 5.0

The department recognizes the difficulty of developing and teaching new courses. To encourage faculty experimentation and development, for any course that is being taught for the first time by a faculty member, the percentage of favorable ratings for that class only will be increased by 20%. If it is a new course or a substantially altered course that the faculty member developed, the percentage of favorable ratings for that course will be increased by 20% for the first two times that the course is taught. For example, if a course is being taught for the first time, or is substantially altered, then a response rate of 35% “Highly Effective” will count as a rate of 55% “Highly Effective” for that class.

To encourage faculty to develop and teach Distance Learning courses, the percentage of favorable ratings for that course will be increased as noted above for the first term the course is taught on-line by that faculty member. In addition, the second term the course is taught on-line by that faculty member, assuming additional technological innovations, 10% will be added to the favorable ratings for that course.

c) Evaluation of Instructional Materials

Evaluation of instructional material shall be conducted by two members of the DPC.

Instructional materials are to be taken as a whole. Each evaluator shall prepare a signed and dated written statement of his/her evaluation of instructional material using the *Instructional Materials Evaluation Form*. These evaluations shall be given to the Chairperson of the DPC, who shall provide them to the faculty member being evaluated and to the other members of the DPC for use during an evaluation meeting.

In addition, the Department Chairperson shall conduct an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s instructional materials. An independent *Instructional Materials Evaluation Form* shall be submitted by the department Chairperson to the faculty member and the DPC as part of the Chair’s evaluation.

All department *Instructional Materials Evaluation Forms* shall be signed by the primary evaluator and the faculty member being evaluated.

To be judged “satisfactory” in this category, the evaluations must be “satisfactory” or higher.  
To be judged “effective” in this category, the evaluations must be “effective” or higher.  
To be judged “highly effective” in this category, the evaluations must be “highly effective” or higher.

To be judged “significant” in this category, the evaluations must be “significant” or higher.

To be judged “superior” in this category, the evaluations must be “superior.”

d) Peer Evaluation of Additional Materials

This is an optional category which the faculty member may use to show additional efforts beyond the common duties, recognizing that the strengths of some faculty members may differ from those of others.

**Departmental Application of Criteria, 2010-2015**

Materials submitted in this category shall be used in the overall evaluation process if the faculty member submits such materials and if there is a deficiency in the other categories. In such a case the DPC must in its overall evaluation of the faculty member state how such material was used in its evaluation of the faculty member.

<b>A Activities</b>	<b>Materials to be Evaluated</b>
a. Classroom performance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Revised faculty work assignments for the evaluation period.</li> <li>2. All peer and chair evaluations during the evaluation period.</li> <li>3. Summary of student evaluations (with student comments) for each course evaluated during the review period. This includes online and hybrid courses.</li> <li>4. The course syllabus, the final exam/project, and a representative hour exam/assignment for each different course taught during the evaluation period.</li> <li>5. Evidence of participation in required assessment activities.</li> <li>6. The following <u>may</u> also be submitted:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Additional quizzes or exams.</li> <li>b. Handouts, study guides, or assignments.</li> <li>c. Signed statements relating to teaching performance.</li> <li>d. Evidence of teaching awards.</li> <li>e. Class grade distributions.</li> <li>f. Materials from tutoring or help sessions.</li> <li>g. Evidence of participation in the academic early warnings.</li> <li>h. Other materials.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
b. Other teaching related activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evidence of training students in research/creative activities.</li> <li>2. Evidence of training students as teaching assistants.</li> <li>3. Evidence of student mentoring.</li> <li>4. Evidence of assisting with study groups/tutoring groups.</li> <li>5. Evidence of observing of student teaching candidates.</li> </ol>
c. Curriculum development and revision	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Original instructional materials such as homework problems, novel/original learning aids, and new hands-on activities.</li> <li>2. Updates to lecture material.</li> <li>3. Evidence of efforts to develop new courses, update existing courses, or change a program's curriculum.</li> </ol>
d. Professional development for teaching improvement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Documentation of participation in professional development activities that contribute to course development and improvement of teaching.</li> </ol>

**4. Methods of Evaluation of Non-Instructional Primary Duties**

The chairperson will conduct the evaluation of performance of non-instructional primary duties. The chairperson will prepare the *Re-Assigned Time Evaluation Form* with a signed and dated written statement. The performance of primary duties (beyond required classroom activities) are as central to the teaching function of the institution as direct instruction. The acquisition of resources, activities directed at program improvement and other professional development activities that are associated with these activities must be evaluated. The division of CUEs between teaching and primary duties, as listed on the approved and revised faculty workload

## *Departmental Application of Criteria, 2010-2015*

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 accord with one's professional development and the mission of the University. Below are specific instructions regarding the evaluation of B activities:

### **Letters of Evaluation**

A letter of evaluation for each primary duty should include a statement of assigned duties, a listing of goals and objectives for the release time, and an assessment of the faculty's member 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 that may be required includes: 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.

### **Program Improvement/Acquisition of Resources**

Significant improvements to a program and/or acquisition of resources to improve a primary duty activity should be documented and explained (example: an advisor develops a method for improving the quality and efficiency of advising).

### **Professional Development for Program Improvement**

These activities include, but are not limited to: participation in short courses, conferences and workshops, and other programs related to professional development in the area of expertise of the candidate. Documentation of participation in professional development activities must be provided for consideration to be given in the portfolio.

*Departmental Application of Criteria, 2010-2015*

<b>Non-Instructional Activities</b>	<b>Materials to be Evaluated</b>
a. Research Release Time	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Letter of evaluation.</li> <li>2. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty.</li> </ol>
b. Program Coordinator or Administrative Release Time	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Letter of evaluation.</li> <li>2. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty.</li> </ol>
c. Academic Release Time	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Letter of evaluation.</li> <li>2. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty.</li> </ol>
d. Assessment Release Time	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Letter of evaluation.</li> <li>2. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty.</li> <li>3. Representative assessment reports.</li> <li>4. Evidence of attendance at assessment meetings.</li> </ol>
e. Advising Release Time	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Letter of evaluation.</li> <li>2. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty.</li> <li>3. Summary of completed advisor surveys (where available).</li> <li>4. Evidence of attendance at advising meetings.</li> </ol>
f. Other Type of Release Time	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Letter of evaluation.</li> <li>2. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty.</li> </ol>

**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 discipline. No limits are to be placed on the kinds of research/creative activities selected, as long as there is a demonstrable relationship between the faculty member's research and his/her academic area. The Department recognizes that research within Geography, Sociology, Economics and Anthropology may differ significantly among those disciplines and, further, that a variety of different kinds of research may be appropriate within each discipline. The categories that follow are meant to describe relative rankings of activities in accordance with section 19.3(3)(b) of the Contract; and the activities listed within each category are meant to be illustrative of the kinds of activities that may be considered in each category. These lists are not meant to be either definitive or exhaustive. A faculty member may suggest the appropriate category in which a particular activity should be counted. Each faculty member is encouraged to consult with the DPC concerning his/her activities, their category ranking, and the appropriate documentation.

*Category I:*

- a) Published book from an established, non-vanity, publisher. Documentation may consist of the title page or table of contents of a book as the publication appeared in print, or a letter from an editor or

## *Departmental Application of Criteria, 2010-2015*

publisher accepting a book for an upcoming publication. The faculty member may ask request for a full-length book to be equal in weight to multiple articles. If this is requested, this request must be part of the faculty member's portfolio and include a table of contents and a title page showing the book's publisher.

- b) Peer-reviewed articles, whether in journals, books, or other venues including articles which have been accepted for publication and not yet published for which the faculty member is the primary/corresponding author. Documentation may consist of off-prints of the published work, photocopies of the first page of an article, or a letter from an editor or publisher accepting an article for an upcoming publication.
- c) Peer-reviewed articles, whether in journals, books, or other venues including articles which have been accepted for publication and not yet published for which the faculty member is NOT the primary/corresponding author but to which the faculty member has made a major contribution. Documentation may consist of off-prints of the published work, photocopies of the first page of an article, or a letter from an editor or publisher accepting an article for an upcoming publication. In such cases the DPC will look carefully at the contribution of the candidate to the work in making their determination. It is the responsibility of the candidate to fully explain their role in the project so the DPC can make a well informed decision.
- d) Award of an external grant or fellowship. No limit is to be placed on the kind of grant or the purpose for which it was awarded, so long as there is a demonstrable relationship between the award and the faculty member's discipline and/or area of expertise. Documentation must include the grant award letter.
- e) Editing or co-editing an edited book-length volume from an established, non-vanity, publisher. Documentation may consist of the title page or table of contents of a book as the publication appeared in print, or a letter from an editor or publisher accepting a book for an upcoming publication.

### *Category II:*

- a) Manuscripts submitted to or in review in peer-reviewed publications. Documentation may consist of letters, faxes or e-mails from the editor or publisher acknowledging receipt or providing a status report.
- b) Peer-reviewed articles, whether in journals, books, or other venues including articles which have been accepted for publication and not yet published for which the faculty member is NOT the primary/corresponding author and the faculty member has NOT made a major contribution. Documentation may consist of off-prints of the published work, photocopies of the first page of an article, or a letter from an editor or publisher accepting an article for an upcoming publication.
- c) Publications in any venue not covered in Category I. No limit is to be placed on the kinds of manuscripts published or on the publications in which the manuscripts appear, so long as there is a demonstrable relationship to the faculty member's discipline and/or area of expertise. Documentation shall conform to the guidelines in Category I.
- d) Award of internal grants or fellowships. No limit is to be placed on the kind of grant or the purpose for which it was awarded, so long as there is a demonstrable relationship between the award and the faculty member's discipline and/or area of expertise. Documentation must include the grant award letter.
- e) Book reviews published in professional journals or similar publications
- f) Paper(s) presented at national or international professional meetings, or evidence that a paper has been accepted for presentation at such a meeting that will not take place until after the submission of retention/promotion documents.
- g) Invited scholarly presentations at academic institutions or professional organizations.

## *Departmental Application of Criteria, 2010-2015*

- h) Activities related to a multi-year grant not claimed in Category I.

### *Category III:*

- a) Manuscripts in preparation. The acceptability of unpublished manuscripts and the appropriate documentation shall be determined by the DPC in consultation with the faculty member. The Chair of the DPC may designate a referee in the same area of expertise to provide a written evaluation of the materials submitted, on the Department Unpublished Materials form, for consideration by the DPC.
- b) Research in progress. The acceptability of ongoing research and the appropriate documentation shall be determined by the DPC in consultation with the faculty member. The Chair of the DPC may designate a referee in the same area of expertise to provide a written evaluation of the materials submitted, on the Department Unpublished Materials form, for consideration by the DPC.
- c) 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.
- d) Paper(s) presented at local/state/regional professional meetings, or evidence that a paper has been accepted for presentation at such a meeting that will not take place until after the submission of retention/promotion documents.
- e) The development of research collaborations with institutions or community-based organizations, so long as there is a demonstrable relationship between the organization's purpose or agenda and the faculty member's discipline and/or area of expertise.
- f) Serving as a peer reviewer for granting agencies, publications, publishers, or any other area in which the faculty member's expertise is recognized. Acceptable documentation shall be copies of letters soliciting the faculty member's reviews.
- g) Statements from professionals outside the University testifying to the faculty member's participation in ongoing research or creative projects, to the quality or importance of the faculty member's work, to the value or importance of the faculty member's contributions to his/her discipline or area of expertise, and so forth. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to insure timely submission of any statement(s) that he/she wishes to have considered by the DPC.

### *Category IV:*

- a) Classes taken to update skills. Such classes may relate to the faculty member's discipline or area of expertise, or to teaching and/or pedagogy in their theoretical or practical aspects.
- b) Progress toward a related degree. The appropriateness of such a degree, including its level and subject matter, shall be determined by the DPC in consultation with the faculty member.
- c) Acquisition of knowledge in a specific area, so long as there is a demonstrable relationship between the area in question and the faculty member's discipline, area of expertise, ongoing research, collaboration with other professionals, and so forth. Appropriate documentation shall be determined by the DPC in consultation with the faculty member.
- d) Talks, lectures, seminars, or special presentations given to groups within or outside of the University. Documentation may include, but is not limited to, flyers announcing the presentation, reviews of the presentation, or communications from the organizers of or participants in the event.

## **2. *Methods of Evaluation***

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

## *Departmental Application of Criteria, 2010-2015*

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 III or 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 any Category III or 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 at least three of the criteria in Category III or 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 III or 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 two items from Category III or IV.
- f. A **Significant** research/creative activity evaluation (needed for tenure; promotion to associate professor) will require the candidate to meet:
  - a. At least one of the criteria in Category I, including at least one peer-reviewed publication.
  - b. At least two additional activities in Categories I - IV.
  - c. One additional activity in Categories I-IV for promotion to associate professor.
- g. A **Superior** research/creative activity evaluation (needed for promotion to professor) will require the candidate to meet:
  - a. At least two of the of the criteria in Category I, including at least one peer-reviewed publication.
  - b. At least three additional activities in Categories I-IV for promotion to full professor or PAI.

With regard to the annual evaluation of **tenured faculty**,

- a. Research/creative activity will be judged **adequate** by meeting at least one of the criteria in Category III or higher during a two-year period.
- b. Research/creative activity will be judged **exceptional** by meeting at least one of the criteria in Category II or higher during a two year period.

For **PAI**, the candidate must demonstrate:

Superior performance in Teaching/Primary duties and in EITHER Research or Service;

Significant performance must be shown for the remaining area.

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**

#### **1. Categories of Materials and Activities**

Faculty members are expected to participate in university and/or community related activities. A summary record of such activities is to be provided as part of the portfolio. Supporting evidence for these activities is also expected.

Faculty members participate in a wide variety of service activities. In the portfolio, these activities should be categorized in one or more of the five categories listed below. Suggestions for possible activities within each list are shown within each category. Lists are not meant to be all-inclusive, nor is it necessarily expected that faculty members will have activities within each category.

## *Departmental Application of Criteria, 2010-2015*

- a) Service to Field and Professional Organizations, including:
  - Offices in professional organizations
  - Membership and participation in professional organizations
- b) Service to University, including:
  - Offices in University committees
  - Membership in University committees
  - Assistance in the Honors programs, University Without Walls or other special programs
  - Faculty Union service
  - Speaking to classes outside the college
- c) Service to College, including:
  - Offices in College committees
  - Membership in College committees
  - Speaking to classes in other departments within the college
- d) Service to Department, including:
  - Offices in Departmental committees
  - Membership in Departmental committees
  - Student advising
  - Career counseling and internship supervision
  - Maintenance of laboratory equipment
  - Assistance with departmental promotion activities
  - Assistance with student groups
  - School visitations
  - Speaking to classes of other faculty members within the department
  - Applying for grants for Departmental equipment and activities.
- e) Service to Community, including:
  - Involvement in community activities which draw upon one's academic skills
  - Boards of Directors of Community Organizations and Agencies related to one's area(s) of expertise
  - Volunteer work which draws upon one's academic skills
  - Professional speaking engagements in the community
  - General community outreach

### **2. *Relative Importance***

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 growth, and the nature of the faculty member's academic background.

Not every discipline lends itself to the same service opportunities, especially as it is related to community activities. It is also anticipated that the amount of service activities engaged in by a faculty member may vary from year to year. Another obligation may arise resulting in a decline in service while the faculty member nonetheless continues in good faith to engage in some of the activities listed above.

Evaluation of a faculty member's service will be in accord with all items listed in the Contract.

### **3. *Methods of Evaluation***

Faculty members' service activities will be judged based on the number of activities and the quality

## *Departmental Application of Criteria, 2010-2015*

of each activity. For example, serving in a leadership position on a committee will be evaluated as being more significant than membership alone. Serving on the board of a community organization carries more weight than an ad hoc committee membership of community organization. In addition, faculty members may request more consideration for special activities by attaching an additional explanation of the specific work involved in this activity. The DPC will judge whether to give the faculty member extra consideration. Faculty members are encouraged to use this option if applicable. It is recognized that quality of service ranks higher than the quantity of activities.

The DPC and the contract recognize that a faculty member, when applying for tenure, has begun with an expectation for retention of appropriate service in probationary year one, satisfactory in probationary year two, and so forth. Evaluation language by the DPC will reflect this. The performance standard for the faculty member in multi-year evaluations shall be determined by considering accrued activities demonstrated by documented activities and comparing to the standards listed below.

**4. *Guidelines for evaluation of service: Based on documented evidence presented for the criteria 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 for the appropriate category.***

- a. An **Appropriate** service evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year one) will require one acceptable performance in at least one activity.
- b. A **Satisfactory** service evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year two) will require acceptable performance in at least two activities, at least one of which must be to the college or university
- c. A **Highly Satisfactory** service evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year three; promotion to assistant professor) will require acceptable performance in at least three activities, at least one of which must be to the college or university
- d. An **Effective** service evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year four) will require acceptable performance in at least three activities, two of which must be to the university, college or department
- e. A **Highly Effective** service evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year five) will require acceptable performance in at least four activities, two of which must be to the university, college or department
- f. A **Significant** service evaluation (needed for promotion to associate professor; tenure) will require the following:
  - (1) Acceptable performance in at least four activities, two of which must be to the university, college or department
  - (2) 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 to the university, college or department and at least four additional activities
- h. For annual evaluation of **tenured faculty**,
  - (1) Service will be judged **adequate** by acceptable performance in at least one of the activities to the university, college or department
  - (2) Service will be judged **exemplary** by acceptable performance in at least two activities and by significant performance (a leadership role) in any one of the areas listed above.
- i. For **PAI**, the candidate must demonstrate:  
Superior performance in Teaching/Primary duties and in EITHER Research or Service;  
Significant performance must be shown for the remaining area.

The DPC may also choose to change the service ranking of a faculty member one level up. If the

*Departmental Application of Criteria, 2010-2015*

DPC decides to do this, they must include a letter in the portfolio explaining the reason for this change.

All members of the DPC will review and discuss documentation of service submitted by a candidate. They may request a written statement as to the quality of the service from other persons involved in the service activities documented by the candidate.

It is recognized that holding office in national, university, college, or departmental committees is more time-consuming and requires more effort than membership in any of the above activities, therefore, holding office should be counted as a two-point activity, where applicable according to the formula above.

On occasion, a faculty member may receive CUE's for one of the service activities on the list, such as service as Faculty Senate President. The department considers this to be in recognition of the importance of the service activity. It is not to be construed as a reallocation of the activity to Teaching/Primary Duties.

All the categories of service activities are of equal importance. It is expected that individuals will document widely differing activities and emphases in their service contributions; the importance of such activities will be considered on the basis of each individual's documentation.

Evaluation of a faculty member's service will be in accord with all items listed in the Contract. The table below offers examples of each category, but in no way is meant to be exhaustive.

<b>Service Group</b>	<b>Acceptable Performance</b>	<b>Significant Performance</b>
<b>Service to Field and Professional Organizations</b>	Membership and participation in professional organizations	Offices in professional organizations
<b>Service to University</b>	Membership in University committees	Offices in University committees
<b>Service to College</b>	Membership in College committees	Offices in College committees
<b>Service to Department</b>	Membership in Departmental committees School visitations Assistance with student groups	Offices in Departmental committees Mentoring students to develop leadership in student groups and clubs
<b>Service to Community</b>	Volunteer work which calls upon one's academic skills	Boards of Directors of Community Organizations and Agencies related to one's area(s) of expertise

**IV. UNIT A FACULTY: 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 Agreement.

**V. UNIT A FACULTY: Application for Tenure by Exception in the Fourth or Fifth Years**

A faculty member applying for tenure in the fourth or fifth years will be judged exceptional upon meeting the criteria for tenure in the sixth year.

**VI. UNIT A FACULTY: Application for Promotion**

For a faculty member to be promoted to the position of **Assistant Professor**, the individual must be rated as “highly effective” in the Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties category, in research and creative activities the faculty member must be rated as “satisfactory,” and he/she must also have achieved a “satisfactory” rating in service.

For a faculty member to be promoted to the position of **Associate Professor**, the individual must be rated as “superior” in the Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties category, in research and creative activities the faculty member must be rated as “significant,” and he/she must also have achieved a “significant” rating in service.

For a faculty member to be promoted to the position of **Professor**, the individual must be rated as “superior” in the Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties category, in research and creative activities the faculty member must be rated as “superior,” and he/she must also have achieved a “superior” rating in service.

**VII. UNIT A FACULTY: Application for PAI**

For a faculty member to receive a **PAI (Professional Advancement Increase)**, the individual must be rated as “superior” in the Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties category, and he/she must be rated a minimum of one “superior” in research/creative activities and “significant” in service; or may be rated “significant” in research/creative activities and “superior” in service.

**VIII. UNIT B FACULTY: Categories of Appropriate Materials and Methods of Evaluation**

Unit B faculty members (lecturers) shall not be evaluated until they have completed one full academic term of service at the University. The responsibility for evaluating Unit B faculty members shall reside with the Department Chair.

**A. Categories of Materials and Activities**

1. Classroom observation, evidenced by the Department Classroom Evaluation Form.
2. Student evaluations, evidenced by the Student Evaluation of Instructor Form.
3. Instructional materials, evidenced by the Instructional Materials Evaluation Form.
4. Other materials and/or activities related to teaching, such as course development, program development, professional development, and classroom experimental activities.

**B. Relative Importance**

1. The categories shall be weighted as follows: 1: 50%; 2: 25%; 3: 25%.
2. Documented activities or materials in category 4 may be used to make up a deficiency in one of the first three categories or to raise the overall evaluation of the faculty member.

**C. Methods of Evaluation**

**1. Classroom observation.**

The classroom performance of the faculty member shall be observed at least twice during the period under evaluation. The class visited shall be determined in consultation with the faculty member being evaluated. One observation shall be conducted by the Department Chair and a second by another faculty member in the same discipline as the faculty member being evaluated, so long as the observing faculty member is covered by the Unit A contract. Faculty members other than the Department Chair performing the classroom observation shall be appointed by the Department Chair in consultation with the faculty member who is being evaluated. The observer shall prepare a written statement of his/her observations using the Department’s standard Classroom Evaluation Form. The statement shall be signed by the observer and by the faculty member being evaluated. A copy of the evaluation shall be given to the faculty member and the original shall be forwarded to the

## *Departmental Application of Criteria, 2010-2015*

Department Chair. The results of the visit should be discussed with the faculty member.

- To be judged “satisfactory” in this category, the evaluations must be “satisfactory” or higher.
- To be judged “effective” in this category, the evaluations must be “effective” or higher.
- To be judged “highly effective” in this category, the evaluations must be “highly effective” or higher.
- To be judged “significant” in this category, the evaluations must be “significant” or higher.
- To be judged “superior” in this category, the evaluations must be “superior.”

### **2. *Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness***

- a) The faculty member shall submit summaries of student evaluations for courses that he/she has taught during the period under evaluation in accordance with Article 33.1.b(1) of the Contract. The evaluations shall be collected and tabulated using the same procedures and observing the same guidelines as set forth in Section III.A.3.b of this document.
- b) To be judged “satisfactory” in this area, at least 60% of the evaluations must be “average” or higher. To be judged “effective” in this area, at 70% of the evaluations must be “average” or higher. To be judged “highly effective” in this area, at least 70% of the student evaluations must be “average” or higher and at least 50% must be “good” or higher.

### **3. *Evaluation of Instructional Materials***

The faculty member being evaluated shall submit copies of his/her syllabi/class policies and representative tests/examinations for all courses taught during the period under evaluation. These materials shall be evaluated by the Department Chair or by a Unit A faculty member from the same discipline as the faculty member under evaluation. If a faculty member other than the Department Chair performs the evaluation of instructional materials, that person shall be appointed by the Department Chair in consultation with the faculty member being evaluated. The evaluator shall prepare a written statement of his/her evaluation using the Department Instructional Materials Evaluation Form. The statement shall be signed by the observer and by the faculty member being evaluated. A copy of the evaluation shall be given to the faculty member and the original shall be forwarded to the Department Chair.

B) With regard to the annual evaluation of **temporary 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