

Wayne Watson, Ph.D.  
President



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

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

April 1, 2013

Dr. Thomas Britt  
Chairperson, Department of Health Studies  
College of Health Sciences  
Chicago State University  
DH 120C

**RE: OFFICIAL TRANSMITTAL OF PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL OF THE  
DEPARTMENT APPLICATION OF CRITERIA FOR HEALTH STUDIES**

Dear Dr. Britt:

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

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

Sincerely,

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

Wayne D. Watson

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

Attachment: Approved DAC

APPROVED 1

CHICAGO STATE UNIVERSITY  
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

2013 APR -1 P 3: 18



**College of Health Sciences  
Department of Health Studies  
Departmental Application of Criteria  
2010-2015 Contract Period  
Revised September 2012**

**PREAMBLE:**

The faculty of the Department of Health Studies are committed to the Mission and Vision of Chicago State University. We strive for excellence in teaching, as well as to contribute to knowledge in our discipline and to the life of the University and the community. Our Unit A faculty typically carry full teaching loads which require sufficient time for preparation of lectures; meetings with and individual supervision of students; direction of student research; curriculum development; and professional development to maintain currency in the fields of health studies.

A University can function only if there is a relationship of collegiality, communication and shared purpose between faculty and non-teaching administration. Hence, the evaluation criteria set forth below represent a balance between the need to document the employee's activities, and the avoidance of unnecessary documentation requirements that would interfere with the employee's research, service, and in particular, teaching duties. In addition to the required documentation, all parties who are required to review the candidate's portfolio may seek clarification or additional materials from the candidate.

**ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMITTEE:**

The Department of Health Studies has opted to form a unit for evaluating its faculty members. This unit is formally known as the Health Studies Personnel Committee (HSPC), consisting of Unit A faculty in the department. HSPC is also known as Departmental Personnel Committee.

**ESTABLISHMENT OF EVALUATION CRITERIA:**

The establishment of evaluation criteria is the responsibility of the faculty in collaboration with the department Chair. Faculty members of the program will be evaluated by the HSPC based on the criteria established for the Department of Health Studies. Materials used in the process of evaluation shall include: the evaluation portfolio, materials referred to in the employee's supporting materials, and materials in the employee's personnel file except confidential materials submitted in connection with the employee's initial appointment. Tenured senior faculty members seeking promotion are to be evaluated by members of HSPC of higher ranking.

**RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CHAIR OF THE HSPC.**

The chair of the HSPC will be elected by the members of the HSPC. The chair will schedule a meeting of the HSPC to evaluate members of bargaining unit A according to the schedule published by the university. The chair will designate a member of the HSPC to submit a written report of the HSPC's recommendations for each candidate who is evaluated. The HSPC will submit a copy of this recommendation to the department chair and a copy to the candidate within the time limits established by the university.

**RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FACULTY MEMBER BEING EVALUATED:**

The faculty member being evaluated must provide a portfolio of materials, which must include the following:

- A current, signed and dated curriculum vitae.
- Evidence of academic and current professional credentials.
- Documentation of original materials representative of the following categories: Teaching/Primary Duties, Research/Creative Activity and Service.

**EVALUATION MATERIALS AND STANDARDS BY PERFORMANCE AREA –  
UNIT - A FACULTY**

The materials and activities listed in these categories are only illustrative of the types of materials and activities, which may be included. The lists are not intended to be all-inclusive. Research/creative activity and service will be considered of equal importance. Teaching will be considered of primary importance. Unless otherwise noted, items listed within each category and subcategory shall be of equal weight in evaluation.

Excessive documentation that would result in the employee taking significant time away from his/her duties to collect documents or assemble a portfolio is discouraged. The following materials should not be submitted with portfolios:

- Documentation of individual meetings with students
- Individual student work, except for graduate student theses/capstones directed by the employee
- Advising logs or roster or correspondence with students.
- Description of tutoring assistance to individual students.
- Logs of individual clinic/fieldwork visits.
- Minutes or attendance records of meetings.

## **I. TEACHING/PRIMARY DUTIES**

### **A. CATEGORIES OF MATERIALS AND ACTIVITIES TO BE SUBMITTED:**

#### **A.1. Materials to be submitted for evaluation of teaching performance**

##### **A.1.a Chairperson's report of class visitation (one per academic year)**

The candidate will invite the program director to visit one class (lecture and/ or laboratory) per academic year, the class to be mutually agreed upon. The program chair will complete the appropriate course visitation form and submit a copy to the candidate. The program chair has the option to request subsequent visits of any course at a time mutually agreed upon. All completed course visitation forms completed by the chair will be included in the portfolio.

##### **A.1.b Peer reports of class visitations (Two per academic year)**

Candidates are expected to invite one full time faculty member from the College of Health Sciences to observe a class at least once each semester. The candidate may choose peer reviewers. The candidate may not be reviewed by the same peer for two consecutive semesters. The peer evaluators shall complete a written evaluation of the class visitations on the appropriate form. The evaluation shall be submitted to the chairperson of the department with a copy to the candidate.

##### **A.1.c Summary of student evaluations (one per semester)**

Candidates are expected to submit a summary of student course evaluations and comments. An interpretation statement of the summaries will be provided by the DPC.

The candidate may opt to submit additional evaluations; eg written evaluations by graduate students.

#### **A.2. Teaching Materials:**

##### **A.2.a Syllabi (required from all courses taught)**

Candidates are expected to provide a course syllabus for each course taught during the evaluation period.

**A.2.b. Original supplemental materials, and examinations  
(samples are required from all courses taught)**

Evidence should include original materials for courses taught during the evaluation period. Materials that are the outcome of team collaboration should be clearly designated as such.

**A.2.c Evidence of course revisions and or development.  
(If completed during the period of review)**

Content of syllabi or other course materials that the faculty member revised or developed during the evaluation period should be clearly indicated, with a narrative statement of the reasons for the revisions.

**A.2.d. Teaching Awards (If awarded during the course of review).** The nature of the award shall be indicated, ie for a class, a program, a professional association or whether it is a nomination, a competitive award and if it was granted.

**A.3. Evidence of Faculty Development**

**A.3.a Faculty development plan:**

The candidate's faculty development plan must include goals to improve teaching effectiveness and/or currency that reflect an analysis of evaluation results. The plan should include a section on use of technologies in instruction and plans to stay current with developing instructional technologies.

**A.3.b Evidence of Faculty Development**

Candidates are expected to provide documentation of activities related to enhancement of knowledge and skills pertaining to effective teaching performance and maintenance of currency in areas of practice. This evidence must include, but is not limited to evidence of progress on goals described in the faculty development plan related to teaching, participation in lectures, workshops, institutes and seminars, or enrollment in courses related to teaching duties. The candidate's narrative for teaching should include a description of progress toward goals on previous faculty development plans.

**A.4 Performance of Other Assigned Primary Duties**

Other primary duties may include: professional and/or pre-professional student advisement, departmental program assessment, fieldwork supervision, fieldwork site development, inclusion of students in research, and other assigned duties.

As noted above, documentation of these activities should be provided only when it is not an undue burden that would interfere with the employee's performance of his/her duties.

Documentation of primary teaching duties should be provided in the following categories:

1. Importance of mentoring and the inclusion of students in undergraduate research
  - List of names of students mentored.
  - List of students involved in research, with the topic of research.

2. Academic advising
    - List of students advised.
  3. Availability to students
    - The chair certifies that the faculty member has posted office hours and that office hours have been kept.
  4. Employee's command of the subject matter being taught
    - Faculty Development Plan (see above).
  5. Use of prevailing instructional technologies
    - Faculty Development Plan (see above)
  6. Use of appropriate and varied methods of teaching, assessment, and evaluation
    - Faculty Development Plan (see above)
    - Inclusion of course syllabi, exams and other materials
  7. Service learning and community engagement
    - List of students involved in service activities and types of service rendered
    - Employee's service to the community is detailed in Service (below).
-

## B. METHODS OF EVALUATION

### B.1. Relative Importance

Evaluations of Teaching Performance, Teaching Materials, and Faculty Development (Plan and evidence of development) will be considered to be of equal weight. Other assigned primary duties will be considered important in proportion to the quantity of these duties that are assigned (except in emergency situations such as program accreditation). Point values of student, faculty and peer evaluations will be considered as guidelines. Extenuating circumstances, such as courses that receive lower student evaluation scores regardless of instructor, and specific plans for improvement may be considered if scores in one of the evaluation areas is below these guidelines.

### B.2. Rating Scales:

The core university-wide student evaluation items are on a five point scale (Strongly Agree; Agree; Somewhat Agree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree). In this document these correspond to numeric values from 1 to 5, where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree.

Peer and Chair evaluations are on a five point scale (Very Good, Good, Average, Fair, Poor) with Poor = 1 and Very Good = 5.

As a measure of effective communication with students, all peer and chair evaluations must have a rating of “Good” or better on “Verbal Communication with students.”

### B.3. Standards for evaluation- Unit A Faculty

#### B.3.a. Satisfactory

(Necessary for retention in years one and two)

A majority of students completing the online evaluation should give the instructor a mean score of 2.0 or higher on core items completed.

Peer Evaluation should have an average score of 2.25 or above.

Chair Evaluation should have an average score of 2.25 or above.

Submitted materials demonstrate:

- Knowledge of the field of Health Studies.
- An ability to organize and present material through a variety of teaching methods.
- Incorporation of new knowledge in the field and technological advances into teaching.

Faculty development experiences as outlined in Faculty Development Plan should support teaching assignments and professional development.

Consistent and timely performance of primary duties other than teaching.

**B.3.b.Effective-**

(Necessary for retention in year three.)

A majority of students completing the online evaluation should give the instructor a mean score of 2.25 or higher on core items completed.

Peer Evaluation should have an average score between 2.3 or above.

Chair Evaluation should have an average score between 2.3 or above.

No ratings for “Verbal Communication Skills” from Peer or Chair that are below “satisfactory.”

Submitted materials demonstrate:

- Knowledge of the field of Health Studies.
- An ability to organize and present material through a variety of teaching methods.
- Incorporation of new knowledge in the field and technological advances into teaching.
- Development of creative and interactive learning activities.

Faculty Development experiences should support-teaching assignments and professional development, and the candidate should submit evidence on the progress toward Faculty Development Plan goals.

Consistent and timely performance of primary duties other than teaching.

**B.3.c.Highly Effective-**

(Necessary for retention in year four)

A majority of students completing the online evaluation should give the instructor a mean score of 2.75 or higher on core items completed.

Peer Evaluation should have an average score of 3.1 or above.

Chair Evaluation should have an average score of 3.1 or above.

No ratings for “Verbal Communication Skills” from Peer or Chair that are below “Satisfactory.”

Submitted materials demonstrate:

- Knowledge of the field of Health Studies.
- An ability to organize and present material through a variety of teaching methods.
- Development of creative and interactive learning activities.
- Incorporation of new knowledge in the field into teaching.
- Revision of course model or series of classes within a course, in response to internal or external curriculum evaluation.

Faculty Development experiences should support-teaching assignments and professional development. Submitted evidence of progress toward Faculty Development Plans goals.

Consistent and timely performance of primary duties other than teaching.

**B.3.d. Significant-**

(Necessary for retention in year 5)

Has demonstrated an ability to maintain consistently high levels of performance as evidenced by:



- A majority of students completing the online evaluation should give the instructor a mean score of 3.0 or higher on core items completed.
- Peer evaluations should have an average score of 3.5 or above.
- Chair evaluation should have an average score of 3.5 or above.
- Submitted materials demonstrate breadth and depth of knowledge, specialization, expertise and ongoing faculty development.
- Development of curriculum and/or demonstration of exemplary teaching skills as evidenced by activities such as:
  - Development of a new course.
  - Development of fieldwork assignments/activities.
  - Development of an interdisciplinary/collaborative assignment.
  - A Teaching Award.
  - Introduction of innovative teaching activities (i.e., service learning projects, assistive technology projects).

Faculty Development experiences should support-teaching assignments and professional development.

Submitted evidence of progress toward Faculty Development Plan goals, certified by the department chair.

Consistent and timely performance of primary duties other than teaching.

#### B.3.e. Superior-

(Necessary for tenure)

Has demonstrated an ability to maintain consistently high levels of performances as evidenced by:

- A majority of students completing the online evaluation should give the instructor a mean score of 3.5 or higher on core items completed.
- Peer evaluations should have an average score of 3.75 or above..
- Chair evaluations should have an average score of 3.75 or above.
- Submitted materials demonstrate breadth and depth of knowledge, specialization, expertise and ongoing faculty development.
- Has demonstrated an ability to create and develop curriculum and/or demonstrate exemplary teaching skills as evidenced by activities such as:
  - Development of a new course
  - A major course revision
  - Course design for new fieldwork site.
  - Development of an interdisciplinary/ collaborative course.
  - A Teaching Award at the University, College, State or National Level.
  - Documented contribution to the department curriculum committee related to the sequence, content and ongoing development of programs.

Faculty Development experiences should support-teaching assignments and professional development.

Submitted evidence of progress toward Faculty Development Plan goals.  
Consistent and timely performance of primary duties other than teaching.

**C. Distance Education policy for the retention, promotion, and tenure award process.**

Faculty members assigned to distance education courses retain the authority and the responsibility to produce and revise instructional design and course materials in order to maintain or enhance the integrity, exactness, and quality of the distance education course. The Faculty assigned to distance education courses shall receive equivalent recognition of teaching and scholarly undertakings related to distance education programs corresponding with their efforts in traditional, on-campus course facilitation activities. Faculty will be compensated for any effort in serving distance education students, such as web maintenance (i.e., developing ADA appropriate instructional materials suitable for online instruction and the continued monitoring, updating, and course facilitation required throughout the duration of the course), in agreement with published university intellectual property policy.

## II. RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY

### 1. CATEGORIES OF MATERIALS AND ACTIVITIES TO BE SUBMITTED

#### a. Category I

##### i. Publications

- Published book reviews,
- Served as editor or co-editor for a collected volume.
- Publications in non-peer reviewed journals.

##### ii. Presentations

- Papers presented to professional groups, lectures, technical sessions or in-services.
- Presentation at a professional non-peer reviewed conference by request of an agent outside the university based on the candidate's expertise.
- Translations of professional literature.

##### iii. Research and Grants

- Research in progress (documentation required)
- Research and/or scholarly projects as part of fellowships, internships, or clinical practice.
- Poster session at a conference or symposium that requires peer review.

##### iv. Others

- Citation in published work.
- Membership on a dissertation/master thesis committee outside the department and/or outside the university.
- Obtaining copyrights/patents.
- National or regional committees to research and develop policies, procedures or practice guidelines for the profession or that influence the profession (e.g. American Public Health Association [APHA], National Environmental Health Association [NEHA], Occupational Safety and Health Administration [OSHA], Illinois Department of Health, Chicago Department of Public Health).
- Planning professional conferences/workshops with role as chair/co-chair.
- Completed research for the benefit of the university, college or department.
- Other forms of recognition for scholarly contribution such as editorial board, peer review committees, moderating/hosting panels in national, regional, international conferences in area of research.
- Development of distance learning materials computer programs, movies or videotapes.
- Bibliography of directed, self-guided study including a narrative describing outcomes.

- Publication of articles that do not require peer review. This may include newspapers, magazines or non-peer reviewed professional publications.

## b. Category II

### i. Publications

- Authored or co-authored book from a scholarly publisher.
- Authored or co-authored article published by a peer reviewed journal.
- Authored or co-authored article accepted by a peer reviewed journal with letter of acceptance. **Any revisions requested by the journal must be submitted before the candidate's status is finalized.**

### ii. Presentations

- Presentation or workshop at national conferences or symposia.
- Presentations for which the abstract has undergone peer review.
- Academic presentation to a professional group for which the candidate has been invited based on expertise. This can include keynote presentations at state or national conferences, presentations within established academic lecture series or presentations associated with awards of professional merit.

### iii. Grant Funding

- Research grants or study proposals and contracts written and submitted for which the candidate served as principal investigator or co-investigator or collaborator. A grant is defined as an application for funding to a potential funding agency. A research proposal is a detailed scientific description of the proposed research. A research contract is providing research support and services to a study on a contract basis.
- Research grant or study proposals and contracts awarded for which the candidate served as principal investigator or co-investigator or collaborator.

## 2. METHODS OF EVALUATION FOR RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Research may be substantiated through materials such as (but not limited to): copies of publications; title page and table of contents of books; conference programs; program announcements; abstracts of presentations; and copies of letters of intent, consultant letters, and award notifications of grants. Relative Importance:

Category II is judged to be more rigorous than Category I. Materials are also judged in importance based on their relevance to Health Studies.

The HSPC will evaluate the effectiveness of the candidate's performance using the following standards (all are cumulative across the employee's time since arrival at the university):

**Appropriate:**

Articulation of research agenda with documentation and timeline of implementation.

**Satisfactory:**

One or more items from Categories I or II.

**Highly Satisfactory:**

Two or more items from Categories I or II.

**Effective:**

Three or more items from Categories I or II.

**Highly effective:**

Three or more items from Categories I or II including at least one item from Category II.

**Significant:**

Four or more items from Categories I or II including at least one item from Category II.

**Superior:**

Four or more items from Categories I or II including at least two items from Category II.

An additional item from Category II is required at each stage of promotion.

### III. SERVICE –

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

##### a. Service to the department

- Participation in standing and/or ad hoc committees i.e. curriculum, program evaluation, personnel, admissions committees.
- Advisor of student organization.
- Program's representative to various organizations/ boards/ groups.
- Performance of other duties beyond the scope of the faculty member's specified teaching responsibilities and mandatory meeting attendance that assist in the functioning of the department.

##### b. Service to the College

- College standing and ad hoc committees and/or task forces.
- College representative to various organizations/boards/groups.
- Participation in non-mandatory College meetings, retreats and/or colloquia.
- Participation and/or planning college workshops of seminars or other events.
- Recognition by the college.

##### c. Service to the University

- University committees
- Recognition by the University
- Representation of the University to various organizations.

##### d. Service to Professional Organization(s)

- Board member for a local, state or national professional organization.
- Active service to a professional organization.

##### e. Community service (professional and nonprofessional)

#### Relative 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 based on degree of participation, quality and length of service, effectiveness and leadership. Service will also be judged in terms of the relationship of the service to the employee's assigned responsibilities, and to the University.

## 2. Evaluation of Service

The HSPC will evaluate the effectiveness of the candidate's performance using the following standards:

**Appropriate:**

Service to department is represented.

**Satisfactory:**

Service to department and one other category is represented.

**Highly satisfactory:**

Service to department and college, and one other category is represented.

**Effective:**

Service to department, college, and university, and one other category is represented.

**Highly effective:**

Service to department, college, and university, and two other categories are represented, with consideration given to duration and/or level of involvement.

**Significant:**

Involvement in all categories and holds leadership responsibilities.

**Superior:**

Involvement in all categories and holds leadership responsibilities in at least two categories.

#### IV. ANNUAL EVALUATION OF TENURED EMPLOYEES

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 the review by the Department Chair/Director 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 performance as described below:

The standard for Exemplary performance is described as: Superior teaching/performance of primary duties; significant research/creative activity; and significant service during the evaluation period as specified in the DAC. Exemplary performance is required for consideration of tenure by exceptionality and promotion by exceptionality, as well as for professional advancement increases.

The standard for Adequate performance is described as: Effective teaching/performance of primary duties; satisfactory research/creative activity; and satisfactory service during the evaluation period as specified in the DAC.

The evaluation shall include:

- (a) Required student course evaluations;
- (b) Materials submitted by the employee to substantiate performance in each of the areas of teaching/primary duties, research/creative activity and service; and
- (c) Materials in the employee's personnel file.

Relevant materials include evidence of professional advancement and development such as receipt of continuing education units, engagement in accreditation or curriculum revisions, presentations (papers or posters) at professional conferences, and renewal of certificates or licensure.

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. The process under this Article will start during the **2013-2014** academic year, with the first appraisal/faculty development process not starting until after the **2014-2015** evaluations are completed. The Committee shall be formed of a total of seven members. There shall be three Administration-appointed and three UPI-appointed members who



shall jointly choose an additional member and this committee of seven will select the Chairperson.

This Committee shall meet regularly to develop a mentoring process to assist any tenured faculty member who fails to meet the **Adequate** standard as described above. This Committee shall draft language describing the process in detail, including a procedure for identifying mentors and for determining appropriate benchmarks for assessing development. This Committee will identify the policy and procedures for this process. They will include:

- (a) Identification and development of the appropriate resources;
- (b) Development of the mentoring process and identification of the mentors; and
- (c) Determination of appropriate benchmarks and evaluation process for assessing development.

If a faculty member fails to participate in the development and implementation of a Professional Development Plan (third year) and does not meet the **Adequate** standard in the area under review in the following year (fourth year), a sanction up to and including termination may be initiated following the procedures in Article 5. (**Article 19.4.c. 1-4**)

## **V. RESEARCH, CLINICAL AND UNIT B FACULTY**

Faculty appointment as a lecturer may be offered to qualified Research, Clinical, and Unit B candidates with a Master's degree or individuals enrolled in doctoral programs in a health or related discipline. Research, Clinical, and Unit B candidates who have completed a doctoral degree, may apply for tenure-track, research or clinical faculty appointment in the relevant department in the College. Consideration for such an appointment may depend on budget availability of vacant line and funding for the position.

Research, Clinical, and Unit B faculty will be evaluated based on their teaching/primary duties and well as their service to the University. Documentation must be provided in the portfolio to demonstrate compliance with the required conditions for continuing employment as stated in this document. After one year of employment, an evaluation portfolio should be submitted to the department chairperson following the University Personnel Timetable.

For teaching/primary duties performance, Research, Clinical, and Unit B faculty will be evaluated using the same criteria and guidelines as Unit A faculty for the "satisfactory" level of performance. In addition to meeting the "Condition for Continuing Employment" described in this document, Research, Clinical, and Unit B faculty must maintain "satisfactory" performance in the teaching/primary duties for their contract to be renewed. Refer to Section III of the contract to identify the standards to be used in evaluating Research, Clinical, and Unit B faculty (Article 33.1). Conditions for multi-year contract for Research, Clinical, and Unit B Lecturers are specified in the UPI contract (Article 30.2).