

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

October 2, 2012

Dr. Sylvia Gist
Chairperson, Department of Graduate Reading, Elementary Education & Mid-level Education
and Departmental Employees

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

Dear Dr. Gist 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 Graduate Reading, Elementary Education & Mid-level Education. 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, stylized oval flourish.

Wayne Watson
President

Attachment: Approved DAC

**Department of Graduate Reading, Elementary & Middle Level Education
(GREMED)
DEPARTMENT APPLICATION CRITERIA (DAC)**

Introduction:

The faculty member being evaluated must provide a portfolio of materials that will be used as part of the evaluation process. The portfolio must be submitted to the chairperson of the Department Personnel Committee (DPC) by the date designated in the university schedule for personnel actions to allow sufficient time for members of the DPC to review the materials. The DPC committee is composed of all tenured and tenure-track faculty members. The DPC processes helps its members arrive at a recommendation for retention or non-retention, promotion and tenure. Only tenured faculty participates in the processes for tenure-track faculty, when 50% or more of the department is tenured. The entire department participates in the processes for tenure, when less than 50% of the department is tenured.

If a department fails to elect a Personnel Committee, or if a Department Personnel Committee fails to make a recommendation, the failure shall not prevent decisions concerning retention, reappoints, multi-year appoints, promotion, PAI, or tenure of department (See Article 19.e.(1))

Responsibilities of Faculty Member Being Evaluated:

The faculty member being evaluated must provide a portfolio of materials including an updated vita, which she/he would like to be used as part of the evaluation. The packet is to be submitted to the chairperson of the Department Personnel Committee (DPC) by the date designated in the university schedule for personnel actions. This will allow members of the DPC adequate time to review the materials.


After the beginning of the evaluation process, the faculty member may not add materials to the portfolio unless: (a) additional documentation has been requested by the DPC Committee, the Department Chair, Dean, University Personnel Committee, appropriate University Vice President or President; (b) the material is submitted in response to an evaluator's placement of materials or written statements in the employee's evaluation portfolio or personnel file after the beginning of the evaluation process; or, (c) the material was not available prior to the beginning of the evaluation process. [See Article 19.4 in its entirety]

Relative Emphasis of Evaluation Areas:

The degree of effectiveness of performance of each tenured/tenure-track faculty member being considered for retention, promotion, or tenure will be evaluated in the areas of teaching/performance of primary duties, research/creative activity, and service. Teaching/performance of primary duties will be considered the most important of the three areas of evaluation. [See Article 19.3.a.(1)] After teaching/performance of primary duties, research/creative activity and service will be given equal emphasis.

The evaluation period for retention shall be the period since the beginning of the employee's last evaluation for retention, with the exception that employees in their second year of employment in the bargaining unit shall have their entire period of employment evaluated. In tenure evaluations, the performance standards will be used to judge whether an employee's performance has reached

APPROVED

 10/2/12

001

2012

the required degree of effectiveness by the end of the evaluation period. [See Article 19.3.(a).2.(a)]

I. TEACHING/PERFORMANCE OF PRIMARY DUTIES

A. Categories of materials and activities for use in evaluation include, but are not limited to those listed below:

Category 1: Student Evaluations – ALL students, *except those enrolled in practica, tutorials, independent study courses, and other such courses shall have the opportunity to evaluate faculty members each term using the university on-line evaluation instrument. Inclusive within the university on-line evaluation tool are questions relative to instructors' communicative and accessibility to candidates.*

Students will be reminded of the evaluation by the faculty member being evaluated, and will complete the evaluation by a time designated by the university. The department may choose to add items for all faculty members, and individual faculty members may add items to the instrument by contacting the instrument administrator. The evaluation results for the department added items will be made available to the faculty member and the department chairperson. The evaluation results for the individual faculty added items will be visible only to the individual faculty member. The Online Course Evaluation Administrator will provide a summary of the evaluation results to individual faculty members and department chairperson. A copy will be included in the faculty member's department file.

The rating levels of teaching effectiveness are as follows:

Level I	-	Appropriate	3.0 – 3.2
Level II	-	Satisfactory	3.3 - 3.5
Level III	-	Highly Satisfactory	3.6 – 3.8
Level IV	-	Effective	3.9 – 4.1
Level V	-	Highly Effective	4.2 – 4.5
Level VI	-	Significant	4.6 - 4.8
Level VII	-	Superior	4.8 – 5.0

Category 2: Annual Classroom Observations

The faculty member being evaluated will have three classroom observations during the current evaluation period: one by the department chairperson and two by tenured/tenure-track faculty members with three or more years of teaching experience at CSU: one peer evaluator must be from the Elementary and Middle Level Department, the other may be from any education program in the College of Education or the College of Arts and Sciences at CSU. The classes to be observed shall be agreed upon by the faculty member in conjunction with the peer evaluator and the department chairperson.

The two peer evaluators will each provide a written summary of their evaluations using the *Observation Evaluation Form*. These written evaluations will be given to the faculty member for inclusion in the evaluation portfolio. A copy will also be given to the department chairperson. The average score on the seven items of the *Observation*

Evaluation Form is a guideline for rating levels of teaching effectiveness according to the following scale:

Level I	-	Appropriate	3.0 – 3.2
Level II	-	Satisfactory	3.3 - 3.5
Level III	-	Highly Satisfactory	3.6 – 3.8
Level IV	-	Effective	3.9 – 4.1
Level V	-	Highly Effective	4.2 – 4.5
Level VI	-	Significant	4.6 - 4.8
Level VII	-	Superior	4.8 – 5.0

Category 3: Teaching/Primary Duty Materials

Evaluation of an employee’s teaching/performance of primary duties will include consideration of the employee’s effectiveness in her/his: execution of assigned responsibilities; command of the subject matter or discipline; oral English proficiency as mandated by Illinois statute; ability to organize, analyze and present knowledge or material; ability to encourage and interest students in the learning process; and in student advisement, counseling, and direction of individual activities. (See Article

The faculty member being evaluated must present a packet of materials which include evidence from items “a” through “l”; and, any other materials appropriate to the faculty member’s primary duties.

- a. Revised Faculty Workload Worksheet
- b. Course Evaluations conducted on-line and are reflective of appropriate levels of effectiveness
- c. Course Syllabi is aligned to NCATE, SPA & HLC standards
- d. Copy of office hours
- e. Evidence of Key Assessment project/s assessed in LiveText® applying the appropriate SPA standards in all evaluative rubrics.
- f. Examples of technology used by faculty member for instruction and assessment includes: PowerPoint, LiveText®, Promethean, Moodle, Jing, and Elluminate).
- g. Examples of technology use required of students for instruction and assessment includes: PowerPoint, LiveText®, Promethean, Moodle, Jing, and Elluminate).
- h. Original research-based materials distributed in class, e.g. class notes, handouts, activities, and presentations reflective of varied methods of teaching.
- i. Examples of instructor-developed course assessments, e.g. tests, quizzes, assignments reflective of varied instructional methods.
- j. Program Assessment Coordinator documentation (Assessment Plan, Assessment Report, analysis of State licensure test results, data contributions; and, explanations of accreditation reports, presentations at department meetings, and any other documentation deemed appropriate.)

- k. Other materials related to primary duties (e.g. participation at majors meetings and advisory board meetings; coordinating, developing, or assessing comprehensive exams; field experience coordination; coordinating and evaluating pre-student teacher oral interviews; lab maintenance; supervision materials; long range planning; student professional portfolio review; new/transfer student orientations; student workshops; advising; evaluations from a supervisor of those duties; and/or other documents which represents the faculty member's work.)
- l. In order to teach distance education, hybrid, or web-based courses, an instructor must have CTRE certification; or, prior experience successfully teaching distance education, hybrid, or web-based courses utilizing technology-based methods as evidenced by candidate, peer, and/ or chair evaluations. Teaching of these courses will be based upon programmatic need.

These materials are to be judged by the DPC as reflecting the syllabus of the course as approved by the individual program in the department, and based on accreditation standards. Where weaknesses are noted, an opportunity shall be given to the faculty member to respond to the DPC Chair's observations. Course materials are to be kept current and revised as is appropriate

Category 4: Curriculum Development

The faculty member being evaluated may present a packet of materials which shall include, but are not limited to, any of the following:

- a. Development of curriculum materials for existing courses.
- b. Development of new programs
- c. Development of revised and/or expanded programs
- d. Development of a new course
- e. Development of a Hybrid course
- f. Development of a Web course
- g. Design and implement intrastate, interstate, or study abroad student initiatives.

Note: The activities referenced in Category 4 are performed beyond the assigned teaching assignment or work load without additional compensation or cues.

A. Relative Importance and Weight for Teaching/Primary Duties

1. For a rating of *satisfactory* in the area of **Teaching** effectiveness the individual must have a *satisfactory* rating in Categories 1, 2, and 3. [See Article 19.3.a.(2)a.1]
2. For a rating of *highly satisfactory* in the area of **Teaching** effectiveness, the individual must receive ratings of *highly satisfactory* in Categories 1, 2, and 3.
3. For a rating of *effective* in the area of **Teaching** effectiveness, the individual must receive ratings of *effective* in Categories 1, 2, and 3

4. For a rating of *highly effective* in the area of **Teaching** effectiveness, the individual must receive ratings of *highly effective* in Categories 1, 2, and 3; and include one (1) Curriculum Development element from Category 4.
5. For a rating of *significant* in the area of **Teaching** effectiveness, the individual must receive ratings of *significant* in Categories 1, 2, and 3; and include two (2) Curriculum Development elements from Category 4.
6. For a rating of *superior* in the area of **Teaching** effectiveness, the individual must receive ratings of *superior* in Categories 1, 2, and 3; and show evidence from at least two (2) activities from Category 4 by the end of the evaluation period.

B. Relative importance of materials and activities for Teaching/Primary Duties

- During the entire evaluation period for Retention in probationary year one (1) an individual must perform at the *satisfactory* level.
- During the entire evaluation period for Retention in probationary year two (2) an individual must perform at the *satisfactory* level.
- During the entire evaluation period for Retention in probationary year three (3) an individual must perform at the *effective* level.
- During the entire evaluation period for Retention in probationary year four (4) an individual must perform at the *highly effective* level.
- During the entire evaluation period for Retention in probationary year five (5) an individual must perform at the *significant* level.
- For consideration for **Tenure** or Promotion to **Associate Professor** an individual must perform at the *significant* level by the end of the evaluation period.
- For consideration for Promotion to **Professor**, an individual must perform at the *superior* level for Teaching/Primary Duties by the end of the evaluation period.
- For consideration for a **Professional Advancement Increase (PAI)** an individual must perform at the *superior* level for Teaching/Primary Duties;

Note: Unless prior written approval has been obtained from the Provost CUEs are not awarded to individuals for designing interstate or study abroad student initiatives.

II. RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Categories of materials and activities appropriate for the evaluation of Research/Creative Activity are grouped to demonstrate the order of their relative importance as guidelines of effective performance. Categories of materials and activities for use in evaluation include, but are not limited to those listed below. Sufficient, verifiable, corroborating evidence is required for each activity. A copy of publications must be included in the portfolio; and/ or, the website must be included for on-line publications.

Group I

1. Submission of a proposal for presentation at a professional conference or seminar.
2. Evidence of progress towards completion of terminal degree is a required condition of tenure-track employment. Thus, the advanced degree, including a post-doc or other degree/certificate programs beyond what is required for tenure, will be given consideration for this Group I activity.
3. Submission of a research project for approval by the Institutional Review Board (IRB)
4. Evidence of submission of grants or contract proposal from an internal source

Group II

1. Evidence of completion of terminal degree and/or doctoral dissertation.
2. Presentations at meetings, conferences, seminars, workshops, etc. of local, state, or regional professional organizations (does not include presentations at K-12 institutions)
3. Evidence of preparation/submission of manuscripts for publication in refereed journals, edited books, etc.
4. Evidence of a research project approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB)
5. Publication in non-refereed professional printed or electronic literature
6. Presentation of faculty member's research at department forums
7. Presentation at teacher in-service and staff development programs at K-12 institutions
8. Presentation of research-based practices, or review of recent research, or faculty development activities to departmental, college, or university forum.
9. Internal awards of grants or contract proposals.
10. On-going research in area of expertise
11. Evidence of submission of grants or contract proposals from external sources
12. Citation in published works or other professional recognition from local, regional, national or international professional organizations
13. Mentoring and inclusion of undergraduate students in research processes.

Group III

1. Presentations at meetings, conferences, seminars, workshops, etc. of national or international professional organizations (does not include presentations at K-12 institutions)
2. Awards for research or other professional work
3. Awards of externally funded grants, contracts, or research.
4. Presentation of faculty member's research at college or university forum.
5. Publication of refereed printed or electronic journal articles, books, book reviews, or book chapters
6. Publication by a professionally recognized publisher of curriculum, film, video tape, or other instructional materials related to content field in print or electronic format
7. Faculty created programs, curriculum, or other materials adopted by schools, school districts, or agencies

8. Translation of a scholarly/creative book, published by a non-vanity press, in either print or electronic format
9. Editor or co-editor responsible for the intellectual content of a book, or journal in either print or electronic format
10. Visiting professor, visiting lecturer, or visiting scholar in the area of the individual's expertise where research is the foundation of position or purpose of appointment.
11. National fellowship/internship where research is the foundation of position or purpose of appointment.
12. Research and supervision of master's thesis
13. Chair of a dissertation committee.
14. Evidence of being recruited for expertise to provide consultation in one's profession education field.
15. Completed research in area of expertise.
16. Evidence of continuous work on a multi-year research/creative project.
17. Faculty provides evidence of selection for post-doc studies and or secondary degree with its relevant research.

A. Method of evaluating Research/Creative Activity – relative importance and weight

1. For a rating of *appropriate* in the area of Research/Creative Activities, the individual must present evidence of one (1) activity from any of the three (3) Groups.
2. For a rating of *satisfactory* in the area of Research/Creative Activities, the individual must present evidence from two (2) activities from any of the three (3) Groups.
3. For a rating of *highly satisfactory* in the area of Research/Creative Activities, the individual must present evidence of three (3) activities from any of the three (3) Groups.
4. For a rating of *effective* in the area of Research/Creative Activities, the individual must present evidence of three (3) activities from Groups II or III.
5. For a rating of *highly effective* in the area of Research/Creative Activities, the individual must present evidence of three (3) activities in Groups II or III with one (1) from Group III and one (1) peer-reviewed/ refereed publication.
6. For a rating of *significant* in the area of Research/Creative Activities, for Tenure and promotion to **Associate Professor**, the individual must present evidence of four (4) activities in Groups II or III and at least two (2) peer-reviewed/ refereed publications.
7. For a rating of *superior* in the area of Research/Creative Activities, for promotion to **Professor**, the individual must present evidence of five (5) activities from Groups II or III and at least three (3) refereed publications.
8. For a rating of *superior* in the area of Research/Creative Activities, for **Professional Advancement Increase (PAI)** an individual must perform at the *superior* level for Teaching/Primary Duties

B. Relative importance of activities for Research/Creative Activity

- During the entire evaluation period for Retention in probationary year one (1) an individual must perform at the *appropriate* level.
- During the entire evaluation period for Retention in probationary year two (2) an individual must perform at the *satisfactory* level.
- During the entire evaluation period for Retention in probationary year three (3) an individual must perform at the *satisfactory* level.
- During the entire evaluation period for Retention in probationary year four (4) an individual must perform at the *effective* level.
- During the entire evaluation period for Retention in probationary year five (5) an individual must perform at the *highly effective* level.
- For consideration for **Tenure** an individual must perform at the *significant* level by the end of the evaluation period.
- For consideration for Promotion to **Assistant Professor** an individual must perform at the *satisfactory* level by the end of the evaluation period.
- For consideration for Promotion to **Associate Professor** an individual must perform at the *significant* level by the end of the evaluation period.
- For consideration for Promotion to **Professor**, an individual must perform at the *superior* level for Teaching/Primary Duties by the end of the evaluation period.

III. SERVICE

Categories of materials and activities appropriate for the evaluation of service are grouped to demonstrate the order of their relative importance as evidence of effective performance.

Evaluation of the effectiveness of an employee's unit, college, university, community or professional service will include consideration of: extent and nature of leadership; degree of participation; quality and length of service; extent and nature of participation in professional organizations, except for presentations at professional conferences (see Section 19.3.d.(2)); extent and nature of national, state, or local recognition of service and the relationship of the service to the employee's assigned responsibilities and to the University. Service activities for which an employee receives compensation will not be included for consideration.

Categories of materials and activities include, but are not limited to those listed below and include unpaid consulting or volunteer service at the University and in school districts. Verifiable, corroborating evidence is required for each activity. **NOTE:** Faculty members receive no monetary payment and no CUEs for such activities as committee work, speaking engagements, accreditation activities, report writing.

GROUP I

1. Consultation with persons needing professional expertise

2. Informing the public of available departmental and/or university services
3. Membership and active participation in department committees
4. Membership in professional organizations
5. Participation in College faculty meetings
6. Writing letters of recommendation for students

Group II

1. Service on a college or university committee
2. Sponsorship of student organizations
3. Service through union activities
4. Membership on search committees
5. Serving as an officer of a departmental committee
6. Conducting program review
7. Service on College of Education NCATE or CSU NCA committee
8. Mentoring a new faculty member
9. Providing remediation to students who fail the Oral Interview
10. Providing assistance to the department chair, including writing reports for no additional compensation.
11. Participation in dissertation committees (that is not part of the assigned teaching work load; and, no compensation or cues are given for this activity).
12. Participation as referee, juror, or editor for professional publications or organization

Group III

1. Serving as an officer in a professional organization
2. Professional speaking engagement on campus or in the community
3. Providing professional services to students beyond the requirements of one's teaching assignments
4. Volunteer work which draws upon one's academic skills
5. Assistance in ongoing university special programs beyond that of assigned workload
6. Serving as an officer on college, university or system-wide committee
7. Serving as a member of a system-wide committee
8. Serving on a Local School Council, school board, library board, or any other professionally related board
9. Participation in school reform activities
10. Participation in mentoring teachers or induction activities at Chicago State University or in school districts.
11. Participation in committees or activities designed to increase cooperation with other institutions
12. Writing NCATE or NCA reports
13. Serving on an accreditation team at the state or national level.
14. Sponsorship of student organizations
15. Planning and developing creative professional activities which significantly add to the field, such as conferences, seminars, workshops, etc.

16. Provide evidence of school-based institutional relationship building for the purpose of recruitment, retention, and program development.

A. Method of evaluating Service – relative importance and weight

1. For a rating of *appropriate* performance in the area of Service, the individual must present evidence of one (1) activity from any Group.
2. For a rating of *satisfactory* performance in the area of Service, the individual must present evidence of two (2) activities from any Group.
3. For a rating of *highly satisfactory* performance in the area of Service, the individual must present evidence of three (3) activities from any Group
4. For a rating of *effective* performance in the area of Service, the individual must present evidence of three (3) activities from Group II or III.
5. For a rating of *highly effective* performance in the area of Service, the individual must present evidence of three (3) activities from Group II or III with at least one (1) from Group III.
6. For a rating of *significant* in the area of Service, the individual must present evidence of at least four (4) activities from Groups II or III with at least two (2) from Group III.
7. For a rating of *superior* in the area of Service, the individual must present evidence of at least five (5) activities from Group II or III with at least two (2) from Group III.

B. Retention, Promotion, and Tenure

- During the entire evaluation period for Retention in probationary year one (1) in Service an individual must perform at the *appropriate* level.
- During the entire evaluation period for Retention in probationary year two (2) an individual must perform at the *satisfactory* level.
- During the entire evaluation period for Retention in probationary year three (3) an individual must perform at the *highly satisfactory* level.
- During the entire evaluation period for Retention in probationary year four (4) an Individual must perform at the *effective* level.
- During the entire evaluation period for Retention in probationary year five (5) an Individual must perform at the *highly effective* level.
- For consideration for Tenure or Promotion to **Associate Professor** an individual must perform at the *significant* level by the end of the evaluation period.
- For consideration for promotion to **Professor** an individual must perform at the *superior* level by the end of the evaluation of period

Cumulative Performance Standards for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure

- During the entire evaluation period for retention in probationary year one (1) an individual must perform at the *satisfactory* level in Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties; at the *appropriate* level in Research/Creative Activity and in the Service. [See Article 19.3.a.(2)a.1]
- During the entire evaluation period for retention in probationary year two (2) an individual must perform at the *satisfactory* level in Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties; Research/Creative Activity; and Service. [See Article 19.3.a.(2)a.2]

- During the entire evaluation period for retention in probationary year 3 an individual must perform at the *effective level* in Teaching/Performance Primary Duties and at the *highly satisfactory* level in Research/Creative Activity and Service. [See Article 19.3.a.(2)a.3]
- During the entire evaluation period for retention in probationary year 4 an individual must perform at the *highly effective* level in Teaching/Creative Activity and *effective* in Research/Creative Activity and Service. [See Article 19.3.a.(2)a.4]
- During the entire evaluation period for retention in probationary year 5 an individual must perform at the *significant* at the Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties; and *highly effective* in Research/Creative Activity and Service. [See Article 19.3.a.(2)a.5]
- For consideration for tenure an individual must perform at the *superior* level in Teaching/Primary Duties; and at the *significant* level in Research/Creative Activity and Service by the end of the evaluation period. [See Article 19.3.a.(2)a.6]
- For promotion to Assistant Professor the individual must perform at the *highly effective* level in Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties and at the *satisfactory* level in Research/Creative Activities and Service in each area as examined in the aggregate that is, taken as a whole, through the evaluation period. [See Article 19.3.a.(2)a.7.(i)]
- For promotion to Associate Professor the individual must perform at the *superior* level in Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, and at the *significant* level in Research/Creative Activity and Service in each area examined in the aggregate that is, taken as a whole, through the evaluation period. [See Article 19.3.a.(2)a.7.(ii)]
- For promotion to Professor the individual must perform at the *superior* level in Teaching Primary Duties, Research/Creative Duties, and Service in each area examined in the aggregate that is, taken as a whole, through the evaluation period. (See Article 19.3.a.(2)a.7.(iii)]

YEAR OF SERVICE	TEACHING/ PRIMARY DUTY	RESEARCH/ CREATIVE ACTIVITY	SERVICE
Probationary Year One	Satisfactory	Appropriate	Appropriate
Probationary Year Two	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Probationary Year Three	Effective	Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory
Probationary Year Four	Highly Effective	Effective	Effective
Probationary Year Five	Significant	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
Tenure	Superior	Significant	Significant

FOR PROMOTION	TEACHING/ PRIMARY DUTY*	RESEARCH/ CREATIVE ACTIVITY*	SERVICE*
Assistant Professor	Highly Effective	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Associate Professor	Superior	Significant	Significant
Professor	Superior	Superior	Superior
*In each area as examined in the aggregate, that is taken as a whole, through the evaluation period.			

TENURE OR PROMOTION BY EXCEPTION

An eligible employee who applies for consideration for tenure or promotion on the basis of exceptional performance must meet the relevant University evaluation criteria described in section 19.3.a.(2)(a)a.6 or 7. In addition, the employee must show evidence of exceptional performance beyond that otherwise required in two of the three areas of evaluation. Individuals may apply for *Tenure or Promotion by Exception* in the fourth or fifth year of full-time service.

Exceptionality in the area of Teaching/Primary Duties:

1. Faculty Excellence Award in the area of Teaching from Chicago State University or other professional body
2. Development of three (3) or more completely new courses
3. Development of a new program
4. Student evaluations consistently rating the faculty member at 4.5-5.0 over the entire evaluation period

Method of Evaluation: An individual submits representative samples providing evidence of any two of the exceptionality criteria.

Exceptionality in the area of Research/Creative Activities:

1. Award of Faculty Excellence Award in the area of Research/Creative Activities from Chicago State University or other professional bodies
2. Award of federal grant
3. Award of two or more externally funded grants or contacts
4. Invitation as a keynote speaker at a national or international conference
5. Visiting professor, lecturer, or scholar on an international level in the individual's area of expertise
6. International fellowship or internship
7. Two or more publications in a refereed research journal
8. Three or more publications from Groups III, items 5 through 10.
9. Service as editor or co-editor of a refereed journal

Method of Evaluation: An individual submits representative samples of materials that provide evidence for two or more of the above activities.

Exceptionality in the area of Service:

1. Award of Faculty Excellence Award in the area of Service from Chicago State University or other professional bodies
2. Serves as an officer of a professional organization at the national or international level
3. Chair of planning committee for a state or national conference
4. Participation on committee that reviews/develops policy related to one's area of expertise at the national or international level.
5. Service as an unpaid consultant to national or international organization
6. Cumulative participation in five or more of the activities specified in Group III

Method of Evaluation: An individual submits representative samples of materials that provide evidence of two or more of the above activities.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR TENURED FACULTY

The annual evaluation for tenured employees not being considered for promotion or PAI is a process to evaluate each faculty member's work performance and accomplishments. The evaluation shall consist of review by the Department Chair of the required material and other professionally related materials, including work in progress done since the last evaluation. Faculty will be evaluated in the areas of teaching, research, and service using the standards of *Exemplary* and *Adequate* as specified in each Department Application Criteria.

The faculty member being evaluated for post-tenure review, should ensure that the portfolio submitted for evaluation contains the following items: (1) A detailed Table of Contents; (2) A copy of the current approved DAC; (3) A current vita; (4) A summary of all required student course evaluations; (5) Revised yearlong assignment forms and re-assigned time forms (for all years being evaluated), and (6) Materials submitted by the faculty member to substantiate performance in each of the areas of teaching/primary duties, research/creative activity, and service; (7) Materials in the employee's personnel file; and (8) a separate section will be designed for the inclusion of materials which may be inserted by evaluators in accordance with Sections 19.4.d.(4) and 19.4.d.(5).

The following will define what is required from a post-tenured faculty member for a rating of *Exemplary* and *Adequate* as specified in the DAC.

- A. To meet the standard of *Adequate* the faculty member must meet the following criteria:**

Teaching/Primary Duties: The faculty member must meet following level in teaching/primary duties

Category 1: Student Evaluation Average: *effective* as defined earlier in this DAC.

Category 2: Chair Evaluation Average: *highly effective* as defined earlier in this DAC.

Category 3: Teaching/Primary Duties Materials: *highly effective* as defined earlier in this DAC.

Research/Creative Activities: The faculty member must meet a rating of *effective* in this area as defined earlier in this DAC.

Service: The faculty member must meet a rating of *effective* as defined earlier in this DAC.

B. To meet the standard of Exemplary the faculty member must meet the following criteria:

Teaching/Primary Duties: The faculty member must meet following level in teaching/primary duties

Category 1: Student Evaluation Average: *highly effective* as defined earlier in this DAC

Category 2: Chair Evaluation Average: *significant* as defined earlier in this DAC

Category 3: Teaching/Primary Duties Materials: *significant* as defined earlier in this DAC

Research/Creative Activities: The faculty member must meet a rating of *highly effective* in this area as defined earlier in this DAC.

Service: The faculty member must meet a rating of *highly effective* as defined earlier in this DAC.

Following review of the documents, the Department Chair shall write a brief evaluation statement and send it to the Dean for review. A copy of the evaluation statement shall be sent to the employee. The employee may attach a written response to the evaluation statement for inclusion in the personnel file. After the review, the Dean will forward her/his recommendation to the Provost.

Failure to meet the *adequate* standard for two consecutive years in any given area shall trigger a one-year appraisal and professional development process, as developed by the Professional Development Mentoring Committee. [See Article 19.4 (a.)(b.)(c.)(1)(2)(3)(4)]

EVALUATION CRITERIA for LECTURERS

No Lecturer or Clinical Faculty shall be evaluated until she/he has completed one full academic term of service at the university. Evaluation of employees on Lecturer or Clinical Faculty appointments shall consist of a review of the following by the Department Chair/Supervisor and the College of Education Dean/Director where applicable.

Each academic term the faculty member being evaluated for retention should ensure that the retention portfolio submitted for evaluation contains the following items: (1) Table of Contents, (2) A copy of the current approved DAC, (3) A current vita, (4) A summary of all

student evaluations, except those enrolled in practica, tutorials, independent study courses, and other such courses shall have the opportunity to evaluate their instructor's teaching effectiveness in accordance with methods and procedures specified in the approved statement of DAC. (5) A copy of the chairperson classroom visitation evaluation, (6) Any other materials the employee submits as evidence of their effectiveness of her/his teaching/primary duties in support of retention or tenure evaluation.

I. EVALUATION OF TEACHING/PERFORMANCE OF PRIMARY DUTIES FOR FULL-TIME LECTURER AND FULL-TIME CLINICAL FACULTY

A. Categories of materials and activities for use in evaluation shall include, but are not limited to those listed below:

Category 1 – Student Evaluations –All students must be given the opportunity to evaluate the individual each term using the evaluation instrument and process defined earlier in this DAC.

Category 2 – Classroom Observations - Conducted by the department chair or the chair's representative

Category 3 – Course Materials - The full-time lecture being evaluated must present a packet of materials which includes evidence from items "a." through "i." and any other materials appropriate to the full-time lecturer's primary duties.

- a. Course Evaluations summaries from student and Chair, or Chair's representative, evaluations
- b. Syllabi
- c. Copy of Office Hours
- d. Key assessment project(s) assessed in LiveText®
- e. Examples of technology used by lecturer for instruction and assessment.
- d. Examples of technology use required of students for instruction and assessment.
- e. Original materials distributed in class e.g. class notes, handouts, activities, and presentations
- e. Examples of course assessments, e.g. tests, quizzes, assignments
- f. Other materials related to primary duties

These materials are to be judged by the Department Chair as reflecting the approved syllabus of the course and based on accreditation standards. Course materials are to be kept current and revised as is appropriate.

The rating levels of teaching effectiveness are as follows:

Level I	-	Appropriate	3.0 – 3.2
Level II	-	Satisfactory	3.3 - 3.5
Level III	-	Highly Satisfactory	3.6 – 3.8
Level IV	-	Effective	3.9 – 4.1
Level V	-	Highly Effective	4.2 – 4.5
Level VI	-	Significant	4.6 - 4.8
Level VII	-	Superior	4.8 – 5.0

B. Relative importance and weight of materials and activities

For a rating of *highly effective* in the area of teaching effectiveness, the individual must receive minimum rating of *highly effective* in at least two of the two categories (Categories 1 & 2) and *satisfactory* in the third category (Category 3).

C. TEACHING/PRIMARY DUTIES - Performance Standards for Full-Time Lecturers and Full-Time Clinical Faculty

- During the entire evaluation period for year one (1) an individual must perform at the *satisfactory* level as defined earlier in this DAC.
- During the entire evaluation period for year two (2) an individual must perform at the *highly satisfactory* level as defined earlier in this DAC.
- During the entire evaluation period for year three (3) an individual must perform at the *effective* level as defined earlier in this DAC.
- During the entire evaluation period for year four (4) an individual must perform at the *highly effective* level as defined earlier in this DAC.
- During the entire evaluation period for year five (5) and beyond an individual must perform at the *significant* level as defined earlier in this DAC.

II. RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - Performance Standards and relative importance for Full-Time Lecturers and Full-Time Clinical Faculty

- During the entire evaluation period for year 3 an individual must perform at the *appropriate* level as defined earlier in this DAC.
- During the entire evaluation period for year 4 an individual must perform at the *appropriate* level as defined earlier in this DAC.
- During the entire evaluation period for year 5 and beyond an individual must perform at the *satisfactory* level as defined earlier in this DAC.

III. SERVICE ACTIVITIES - Performance Standards and relative importance for Full-Time Lecturers and Full-Time Clinical Faculty

- During the entire evaluation period for year 3 an individual must perform at the *appropriate* level as defined earlier in this DAC.

- During the entire evaluation period for year 4 an individual must perform at the *appropriate* level as defined earlier in this DAC.
- During the entire evaluation period for year 5 and beyond an individual must perform at the *satisfactory* level as defined earlier in this DAC.

Performance Expectations for Full-Time Lecturers and Full-Time Clinical Faculty

YEAR OF SERVICE	TEACHING/ PRIMARY DUTIES	RESEARCH/ CREATIVE ACTIVITY	SERVICE
1	Satisfactory		
2	Highly Satisfactory		
3	Effective	Appropriate	Appropriate
4	Highly Effective	Appropriate	Appropriate
5 and beyond	Significant	Satisfactory	Satisfactory

Following Review of Lecturer’s or Clinical Faculty/Professional Documents

The Department Chair and/or the chair’s representative who observed the faculty teaching/primary duties and the College of Education Dean shall each write an evaluation of the employee’s teaching/primary duties, research/creative, and service. The evaluations shall state whether and why the employee’s degree of effectiveness in each area meets expectations with reference to the performance standards specified in the appropriate DAC.

A rating of *satisfactory* or above shall not constitute a promise of future employment. Future employment opportunities shall be governed by the provisions of Article 30.

D. Unsatisfactory Recommendations for Lecturers and Clinical Faculty

In the event of an *unsatisfactory* recommendation, the evaluation must include a classroom visitation report by the Chair or Chair’s representative as defined by the DAC. A copy of the evaluation shall be sent to the employee. Upon the request of the employee, a conference shall be held between the Chair and the employee to discuss the written evaluation.

If an employee’s performance is judged *unsatisfactory*, the Department Chair and the COE Dean shall provide written reasons, based on the statement of the DAC.

The employee may forward the decision of the Chair and COE Dean to the Union Chapter President who shall notify the Provost to initiate the selection process for Review by an Appeals Committee. The Appeals Committee shall be composed of three (3) bargaining unit members from Unit A and/or Unit B: one member selected by the employee, one member selected by the Department Chair, and the third by the two (2) members selected.

The materials submitted by the employee shall be forwarded to the appropriate Vice President for review and evaluation. [See Article 33 in its entirety.]

The Appeals Committee shall select a Chair and operate under procedures agreed to by the Union Chapter President and the Contract Administrator, within 30 days of ratification of the current Contract. The recommendations of the Department Chair, the COE Dean and the Appeals Committee, if applicable, and the materials submitted by the employee shall be forwarded to the appropriate Vice President for final review and evaluation.

A copy of the evaluations shall be sent to the employee. The employee may attach a written response to the evaluation statements for inclusion in the employee's personnel file.

Developed by GREMED Faculty:

Dennis Federico, Instructor

Douglas Lia, Ed.D.

Karen Freeman, Ed.D.

Chyrese S. Wolf, Ed.D.

and GREMED DPC Co-Chairs:

Sherelene A. Harris, Ed.D.

Margaret A. Kelly, Ed.D.

9/25/12