

**DEPARTMENT APPLICATION OF CRITERIA 2021-2022
CRIMINAL JUSTICE, PHILOSOPHY, AND POLITICAL SCIENCE
For Unit A and Unit B Faculty**

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

Contents

I. Composition and Purpose of a Department Personnel Committee (DPC)	2
A. Composition:.....	2
B. Purpose:	2
II. Evaluation of Faculty	2
A. General Policy for Unit A and Unit B Faculty:	2
B. Promotion and Tenure by Exception:	2
C. Evaluation Scale:	4
III. Categories of Materials and Activities, Relative Importance, and Methods of Evaluation:	4
A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties	4
Evaluation of teaching/performance of primary duties:	6
Guidelines for evaluation of teaching/primary duties.....	7
Annual Evaluation of Unit B Faculty.....	8
B. Research/Creative Activity.....	8
Category I: Professional Publications.....	9
Category II: Publishing Activities (not included in Category I)	9
Category III: Scholarly Activities (not included in Categories I and II)	9
Category IV: Developmental Activities (not included in Categories I, II, and III)	10
Evaluation of research/creative activity:	10
C. Service Activity.....	11
Evaluation of the effectiveness of a candidate' s service will include the following:.....	12
IV. Distance Education Policies for Online and Hybrid Courses:.....	13
A. Online and Hybrid Course Offerings:	13
B. Selection of Faculty to Teach Online and Hybrid Courses	14
C. Evaluating Online and Hybrid Courses:.....	14
D. Advising Students about Online and Hybrid Courses:.....	14

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

A. Composition:

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

B. Purpose:

The purpose of the DPC shall be to review materials submitted by faculty members of the Department seeking retention, promotion, professional advancement increase (PAI), or tenure and to provide recommendations in accordance with the CSU-UPI Contract (hereafter referred to as the Faculty Agreement). The dates for this process are specified in the Annual University Timetable for Evaluation.

II. Evaluation of Faculty

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

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

All Unit A teaching faculty will document participation in a professional development activity/activities within the evaluation period that contribute/s to course development and improvement of teaching, to improvement of research/creative activity, or to service.

Activities include but are not limited to participation in short courses, conferences, and workshops, and other related, educational experiences and events. These may be virtual or face-to-face experiences/events.

B. Promotion and Tenure by Exception:

Departmental Application of Criteria for Exceptionality

An eligible employee who applies for consideration for tenure or promotion on the basis of exception or for tenure by exception in the fourth or fifth years must meet the relevant university criteria as described in the contract. In addition, the employee must show evidence of exceptional performance beyond that otherwise required in *two of the three* areas of evaluation.

Exceptionality in the area of Teaching

1. Creation of two or more new courses.
2. Development of a new degree or certificate program for CSU.

3. Student evaluations consistently rating the faculty member at 4.2-5.0 over the entire evaluation period.
4. Faculty Excellence Award in Teaching from CSU or other professional bodies.

Method of Evaluation: An individual submits a representative sample of materials that provides evidence for *any two* or more of the exceptionality criteria.

Exceptionality in Research

Two additional Category I Research and Creative Activities.

- 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 publisher accepting a book for an upcoming publication. The faculty member may request that 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, an electronic copy 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, an electronic copy 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.
- f) Substantial professional reports produced for or with a government body or community organization related to the faculty member's subject area. Documentation may consist of the title page and table of contents of the report, as well as a web link to the full report, if available.

Method of Evaluation: An individual submits evidence for *any two* or more of the above activities.

Exceptionality in Service

1. Award of Faculty Excellence Award in Service from CSU or other professional bodies.
2. Service as an officer of a professional organization at the national or international level.
3. Chair of a planning committee for a state or national conference.
4. Participation on a committee/task force that reviews/develops policy related to one's area of expertise at the national or international level.
5. Meets standards for tenure and has two or more significant contributions at the university or college level.

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

C. Evaluation Scale:

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

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

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

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

Materials that must be submitted in the evaluation portfolio:

1. Two classroom observations by members of the DPC. Peer reports on Unit A teaching faculty and full-time lecturers during Fall or Spring term. Tenured faculty will submit to one observation per academic year.
2. Classroom observation by the Chair. Chairperson reports on all teaching faculty, at least once per academic year during Fall or Spring term.
3. Student evaluations: submitted to conform with the provisions of the Contract, Article 19.4.b. Each academic term, every student in each class section, shall have the opportunity to evaluate their instructor's teaching effectiveness in accordance with departmental policies and procedures except for any course with five or fewer students. All student evaluations remain property of the University. (all teaching faculty)
4. Evidence of participation in departmental assessment activities (where required; for all teaching faculty).

Materials that may be submitted in the evaluation portfolio:

5. Additional class observation reports from other faculty members within the evaluation period
6. Student evaluation forms from additional classes within the evaluation period, based on the department's established evaluation forms

Course materials that must be submitted in the evaluation portfolio (for untenured faculty):

7. Course syllabi for each course taught during the evaluation period unless there are multiple sections of the same course or significant changes have been made to a previous course syllabus. Syllabi from all taught courses, including independent studies, tutorials, practica, internships, etc. ALL COURSES for Fall and Spring semesters. Syllabi are expected to clearly define the following:

- course description;
- course objectives/outcomes;
- assessment methods;
- the name of the text and other required materials;
- instructor's name, phone number, e-mail address, office location, and office hours;
- class meeting time and location;
- a calendar of activities for the course;

- ADA statement;
 - material to be covered in the course;
 - policies concerning attendance and tardiness;
 - grading standards, frequency and relative weights of exams, quizzes, homework, papers, and other materials; and
 - link to the University student evaluation site <http://www.csu.edu/course-eval>.
 - In addition, it is expected that syllabi will be professionally produced with a minimum of spelling, grammatical or typographical errors, that all instructions and conditions are internally consistent, and that the course content and prerequisites reflect the catalog description.
 - All syllabi will be in the format that is recommended by the University and will include items required for specific accrediting agencies when appropriate.
 - For courses where a 4000-level class meets with a 5000-level class, it is expected that the two classes will have different syllabi, different learning outcomes, and different assessment measures.
8. At least two exams for each course taught during the evaluation period, excluding seminars, unless there are multiple sections of the same course that utilize the same exam or significant changes have been made
9. If exams are not the primary method of evaluation of the student, a detailed discussion of one project or paper from which grades are determined for each course during the evaluation period unless multiple sections of the same course are taught that utilize a similar methodology

Course materials that may be submitted in the evaluation portfolio:

10. Additional exams
11. Handouts
12. Study guides
13. Original instructional materials
14. Internet or web-related instruction (hard copy)
15. Reading lists
16. Lists of guest speakers
17. Any other information the faculty member considers important

Primary duties that may be submitted in the evaluation portfolio:

18. Internship advising (if faculty member receives CUEs)
19. Student academic advising (if faculty member receives CUEs)
20. Assessment (if compensated)
21. Administrative assistance to the chair (if compensated)
22. Report preparation for accreditation/evaluation (if compensated)
23. Union committee membership/leadership positions (if compensated)
24. Any additional compensated duties

Additional activities that may be submitted in the evaluation portfolio:

25. Professional development for teaching improvement
26. Development of extension courses, distance learning or internet courses
27. Faculty Excellence Awards (teaching emphasis)
28. Supervision of student teachers
29. Presentation at the "great debate" series
30. Presentations in residence halls, fraternities, or sororities
31. Speaking at symposia/panels serving students
32. Guest speaker at student organized activity
33. Curriculum revision and development, including course revisions and updates
34. Other student-centered activity (with appropriate documentation)

Relative importance:

- Classroom performance is the most important category. It will be based on classroom evaluation reports from the Chair and DPC member(s), and the student evaluations, weighted equally.
- Course materials will be considered of secondary in importance to student evaluations.
- Curriculum revision and development, including course revision and accreditation report development, should be considered for promotion and tenure.
- Performance standards for non-teaching primary duties (e.g., assessment, advising activities) should be considered increasingly significant as the standard for review becomes more significant.

Evaluation of teaching/performance of primary duties:**Classroom visitations:**

- At least two classroom visitations will be conducted by members of the DPC of equal or higher rank chosen by the Chair of the DPC and in the same discipline as the candidate in consultation with the candidate as to the time. If there is but one faculty member within the discipline of equal or higher rank, the DPC Chair should select the second evaluator of equal or higher rank from another discipline in the department. After the visitation, the applicant may ask that additional visitations by other members of the DPC, including members from other disciplines within the department, be made. All evaluations should use the "Peer Evaluation" form and will become part of the personnel process. All evaluations will be given to the Chair of the DPC, who will provide a copy to the faculty member being evaluated. **THEY MUST BE INCLUDED IN THE PORTFOLIO.**
- The department chair will schedule a class visitation with the candidate at an agreed upon time. The Chair's report will be included in the departmental evaluation of the candidate. It is the responsibility of the candidate to ensure that the Chair is made aware of the need for a class visitation when the candidate needs such an evaluation for the portfolio.
- The "Peer Evaluation" form will include written consideration of the organization and presentation of the subject matter and the apparent responsiveness of students.
- Evaluators should use the appropriate language of the DAC (e.g., satisfactory, highly effective, superior) on the peer evaluation form.
- The DPC chair is responsible for informing the evaluator of the requisite standard required of a faculty member for the evaluation.
- There is a need for an objective measurement scale for Chair and Peer evaluations; the following scale is recommended:
 - 2.5 to 2.6 for Satisfactory
 - 2.61 to 3.0 for Effective
 - 3.01 to 3.5 for Highly Effective
 - 3.51 to 4.0 for Significant
 - 4.01 to 5.0 for Superior

Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness:

- Each academic term, every faculty member shall ensure that all of his/her students have the opportunity to evaluate his/her teaching effectiveness. Student evaluations shall be compiled using the University's online evaluation form with additional questions added if approved by the department Chairperson and a majority of the Unit A faculty. The faculty member may, at her/his discretion, choose to utilize the Department's Evaluation form as a supplement to the online evaluation form.
- The University's evaluation form is available online for all students to complete. At the end of the semester, the compiled results of the online evaluations should be made available to the faculty member in hard copy for inclusion in the portfolio. Since the faculty member cannot control the choice a student makes to complete the online form, the faculty member shall not be penalized for a low completion rate of the online form. It is expected that faculty members will encourage students to complete the online form with appropriate reminders toward the end of the semester.

- Any departmental evaluations utilized for each class will be kept separate.
- All student evaluations will become part of the faculty member's file and will be part of the faculty member's personnel records.
- The measurement scale for Student evaluations is as follows:
 - 2.5 to 2.6 for Satisfactory
 - 2.61 to 3.0 for Effective
 - 3.01 to 3.5 for Highly Effective
 - 3.51 to 4.0 for Significant
 - 4.01 to 5.0 for Superior

Course materials are to be evaluated on the following bases:

- Scope/coverage of information--appropriateness to the course level;
- Quality and fairness of exams;
- Fairness of the grading policy.
- The syllabus must include a statement of course objectives, requirements, readings, and a written description of attendance and grading policies.
- Where disagreement regarding the scope, quality, and fairness of any course material submitted occurs, the Chair will assign a senior faculty member in the same discipline as the candidate to complete an "Instructional Materials Evaluation" form for the purpose of judging the course materials. A candidate may submit such a form already completed by another member of his/her discipline as part of the portfolio materials to assist the DPC in judging course materials.
- Other primary duties (e.g., assessment, advising): satisfactory performance of other primary duties related to teaching shall be evaluated according to documentation provided by the candidate for the relevant period of performance based on the appropriate job description (where applicable).

Guidelines for evaluation of teaching/primary duties.

Based on documented evidence presented for the criteria in all teaching/performance and primary duty categories, the candidate will be judged by the voting members of the DPC as to whether the member has fulfilled the standard indicated for the appropriate category. The standards for evaluation are as follows:

A **Satisfactory** teaching evaluation (needed for retention in probationary years one and two, and for annual evaluation of all temporary faculty) will require the following:

- Overall classroom visitation evaluations must be satisfactory or better;
- Student evaluations must be judged on average as 2.5 to 2.6 for Satisfactory.
- The course materials must be satisfactory.

An **Effective** teaching evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year three; and promotion to assistant professor) will require the following:

Overall classroom visitation evaluations must be effective or better.

- Student evaluations must be judged on average as 2.61 to 3.0 for Effective
- The course materials are effective.
- One contribution must be made in categories A18-A34.

A **Highly Effective** teaching evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year four; and may be applied to temporary faculty) will require the following:

- Overall classroom visitation evaluations must be highly effective or better.
- Student evaluations must be judged on average as 3.01 to 3.5 for Highly Effective
- The course materials are highly effective.
- Two (2) contributions must be made in categories A18-A34.

A **Significant** teaching evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year five; promotion to associate professor) will require the following:

- Overall classroom visitation evaluations must be highly effective or better.
- Student evaluations must be judged on average as 3.51 to 4.0 for Significant.
- The course materials are highly effective.
- Two (2) significant contributions must be made in categories A18-A34.
- One additional contribution must be made in categories A18-A34 for promotion to associate professor.

A **Superior** teaching evaluation (needed for tenure; promotion to professor; PAI) will require the following:

- Overall classroom visitation evaluations must be superior.
- Student evaluations must be judged on average as 4.01 to 5.0 for Superior.
- Course materials are highly effective.
- Three significant contributions are made in categories A18-A34.
- One additional contribution must be made in categories A18-A34 for promotion to full professor or PAI.

Regarding the annual evaluation of tenured Unit A faculty,

Teaching/Primary duties will be judged **Adequate** that meet the following criteria:

- Student evaluations must be judged on average as 3.01 to 3.5 for Highly Effective
- Course materials are satisfactory.
- Two significant contributions in categories A18-A34.

Teaching/Primary duties will be judged **Exemplary** that meet the following criteria:

- Student evaluations must be judged on average as 4.01 or higher
- Course materials are highly effective.
- Three significant contributions in categories A18-A34.

Annual Evaluation of Unit B Faculty.

Regarding the annual evaluation of Unit B (full-time temporary or part time temporary) faculty, unsatisfactory, satisfactory or highly effective performance must be demonstrated based on the standards below (after one full semester of teaching):

1. Two classroom observations by members of the DPC. Peer reports on full-time lecturers during Fall or Spring term.
2. Classroom observation by the Chair. Chairperson reports on all teaching faculty, at least once per academic year during Fall or Spring term.

A **Satisfactory** teaching evaluation (needed for retention in probationary years one and two, and *for annual evaluation of all temporary faculty*) will require the following:

- Overall classroom visitation evaluations must be satisfactory or better;
- Student evaluations must be judged on average as 2.5 to 2.6.
- The course materials must be satisfactory.

A **Highly Effective** teaching evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year four; *and may be applied to temporary faculty*) will require the following:

- Overall classroom visitation evaluations must be highly effective or better.
- Student evaluations must be judged on average as 3.01 to 3.5 for Highly Effective
- The course materials are highly effective.
- Two (2) contributions must be made in categories A18-A34.

B. Research/Creative Activity

Categories of materials and activities: Faculty members shall not be restricted or limited in the areas in which they engage in scholarly activities. The most significant criterion for evaluation shall be evidence that the faculty member is active and engaged in his/her academic discipline. No limits are to be placed on the kind of research and/or creative activities selected, if there is a demonstrable relationship between the faculty member's research and his/her academic discipline. The activities listed within each category are meant to be illustrative of the kind of activities that may be considered in each category. The lists below are not meant to be either definitive or exhaustive. Each faculty member is encouraged to consult with a member of the DPC concerning his/her activities, their appropriate category ranking, and the appropriate type of documentation.

Category I: Professional Publications

1. Monograph
2. Published Book
3. Original Translation
4. Peer-reviewed journal article
5. Published journal article
6. Book chapter in an edited collection

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

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

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

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

14. Manuscripts in preparation: The acceptability of manuscripts in preparation and the appropriate documentation shall be determined by the DPC using the "Unpublished Materials Evaluation Form." The Chair of the DPC may designate a referee in the same area of expertise to provide a written evaluation of the materials submitted in consultation with the faculty member.
15. Research in progress: The acceptability of research in progress shall be determined by the DPC in consultation with the faculty member. Where human subject research occurs, the written approval notice shall constitute documentation of ongoing and appropriate research activity. The Chair of the DPC may designate a referee in the same area of expertise to provide a written evaluation of the materials submitted in consultation with the faculty member.
16. 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.
17. Papers presented at local/state/regional professional meetings, or evidence that a paper has been accepted for presentation at such a meeting.
18. Invited presentation at a professional meeting that requires substantial preparation
19. Original work in an anthology or scholarly edited volume of essays
20. Edit a published scholarly work of documents or essays

21. Edit professional journal
22. Edit *Proceedings* of a professional conference
23. Serving as a reviewer for granting agencies, publishers, or any other area in which a faculty member's expertise is recognized. Acceptable documentation shall consist of letters soliciting the faculty member's reviews.
24. Statements from external professionals testifying to a faculty member's expertise, participation in ongoing research projects, the quality of a faculty member's work and area of expertise and so forth. Acceptable documentation shall consist of letters testifying to the faculty member's expertise and/or activity.

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

Category IV: Developmental Activities (not included in Categories I, II, and III)

25. Professional involvement with community-based organizations
26. Presentation at departmental, college or university seminar
27. Discussant or panel chair at professional conference
28. Curate or organize a public or CSU exhibition
29. Any other appropriate submission (include "Unpublished Activities" form)

Relative importance:

- Research listed in Category I (B1 through B6) and Category II (B7 through B13) represent a higher level of scholarly achievement and is therefore weighed more heavily than the activities listed in Category III (B14 through B24) and Category IV (B25 through B29).
- DPC members shall assess the relative significance of a published work, considering factors such as the press or journal which publishes the work, the impact of the work in the field, and any other factors consistent with the standards of the academic discipline.

Evaluation of research/creative activity:

- Quality and professional stature of publications will be judged by the DPC
- Consideration will be given only to work that can be documented according to the categories listed above during the evaluation period
- Consideration will be given to the prestige of the conference or institution where a presentation is given
- Evidence of professional/research development must be submitted to document the activities
- Evidence must be submitted to document the awards

Guidelines for evaluations of research/creative activity. Based on documented evidence presented for the criteria Categories I through IV (B1 through B29), the candidate will be judged by the voting members of the DPC as to whether the candidate has fulfilled the standard indicated for the appropriate category. The standards for evaluation are as follows:

An **Appropriate** research/creative activity evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year one) will require the candidate to meet one of the criteria in any Category IV (B25 through B29).

A **Satisfactory** research/creative activity evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year two) will require the candidate to meet at least two of the criteria in Category IV (B25 through B29).

A **Highly Satisfactory** research/creative activity evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year three; promotion to assistant professor) will require the candidate to meet one of the criteria in Category III (B14 through B24) and two items from Category IV (B25 through B29).

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 (B7 through B13) and one item from Category IV (B25 through B29).

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 (B7 through B13) and one item from Category III (B14 through B24) and one item from Category IV (B25 through B29).

A **Significant** research/creative activity evaluation (needed for tenure; promotion to associate professor) will require the candidate to meet:

- At least one of the criteria in Category I (B1 through B6) and
- At least two additional activities in Categories III (B14 through B24).
- One additional activity in Categories III (B14 through B24) or two activities in Category IV (B25 through B29) are needed for promotion to associate professor.

A **Superior** research/creative activity evaluation (needed for promotion to professor) will require the candidate to:

- At least one of the criteria in Category I (B1 through B6) and
- At least three additional items from Category II (B7 through B13) and
- One additional activity from Category III (B14 through B24) and
- Two additional activities from Category IV (B25 through B29) for promotion to full professor or PAI.

Regarding the annual evaluation of tenured faculty,

- Research/creative activities will be judged **Adequate** by meeting at least one of the criteria in Category III (B14 through B24) or higher and one item from Category IV (B25 through B29) during a one-year period.
- Research/creative activities will be judged **Exemplary** by meeting at least one of the criteria in Category II (B7 through B13) or higher and two items from Category IV (B25 through B29) during a one-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.

C. Service Activity

Categories of materials and activities: Faculty members are expected to participate in university and/or community related activities. A documentary record of such activities is to be provided in the portfolio.

Required department activities:

1. Participation in the proceedings of the DPC
2. Participation in department meetings

Other departmental service:

3. Participation in departmental committees
4. Chairing departmental committees
5. Search committee membership
6. Ad hoc committee membership
7. Serving as advisor to student groups
8. Student academic advising (if not compensated)
9. Student recruitment
10. Administrative assistance to the chair (if not compensated)

11. Assessment (if not compensated)
12. Report preparation for accreditation/evaluation (if not compensated)
13. Organization of high school outreach programs
14. Academic fair judging at CSU
15. Creation of departmental web page, pamphlets, student handbooks
16. Departmental fund-raising
17. Student advising (if not compensated)

University and college activities:

18. Membership/leadership on university or college committees
19. Union committee membership/leadership positions (if not assigned duties)
20. University search committees
21. Faculty Senate membership
22. Organization of colloquia, workshops, lectures, debates on campus
23. Faculty Excellence Award (service emphasis)

Professionally related community service or service to the profession:

24. Giving public lectures
25. City-wide high school outreach activities
26. Unpaid consulting or volunteer service
27. Participation in other community outreach activities
28. Accreditation visitations
29. Teacher in-service programs
30. Edit professional newsletter
31. Membership in professional organizations
32. Leadership in professional organization
33. Any other necessary and appropriate submission of service to the profession or the campus community

Relative importance:

Service activity at the department, university and college levels will be considered to be of equal importance but, in any case, more important than community service. Serving as an officer or in some other leadership role will be considered to be a more significant contribution than serving as a member of a committee. Care must be taken when evaluating service to consider the committee assignments and work available to the faculty member, the place of the faculty member in their professional development, and the nature of the faculty member's academic background. Recognition should be given to the fact that not every discipline lends itself to the same service opportunities, especially as these relate to community-based activities. It is also anticipated that the amount of service activities will vary from year to year.

Evaluation of the effectiveness of a candidate's service will include the following:

- Extent and nature of leadership
- Degree of participation
- Quality and length of service
- The relationship of the service to the candidate's assigned responsibilities and to the university.

Guidelines for evaluation of service:

Based on documented evidence presented for the criteria listed in C2 through C33 above, the candidate will be judged by the voting members of the DPC as to whether the candidate has fulfilled the standard indicated.

An **Appropriate** service evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year one) will require one acceptable performance in at least one activity in C3 through C17

A **Satisfactory** service evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year two) will require the following:

- Acceptable performance in at least one activity in C3 through C17
- Acceptable performance in at least one activity in C18 through C23 or C24 through C33

A **Highly Satisfactory** service evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year three; promotion to assistant professor) will require the following:

- Acceptable performance in at least one activity in C3 through C17
- Acceptable performance in at least two activities in C18 through C23 or C24 through C33

An **Effective** service evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year four) will require the following:

- Acceptable performance in at least two activities in C3 through C17
- Acceptable performance in at least one activity in C18 through C23 or C24 through C33

A **Highly Effective** service evaluation (needed for retention in probationary year five) will require the following:

- Acceptable performance in at least two activities in C3 through C17
- Acceptable performance in at least two activities in C18 through C23 or C24 through C33

A **Significant** service evaluation (needed for promotion to associate professor; tenure) will require the following:

- Acceptable performance in at least two activities in C3 through C17
- Acceptable performance in at least two additional activities in C3 through C33
- Significant performance (a leadership role) in any one of the areas listed above

A **Superior** service evaluation (needed for promotion to professor) will require the following:

- Acceptable performance in at least two activities in C3 through C17
- Acceptable performance in at least four additional activities in C3 through C33.
- Significant performance (a leadership role) in any two of the areas listed above

For annual evaluation of tenured faculty,

- Service activities will be judged **Adequate** by acceptable performance at least one activity in C3 through C17 and by acceptable performance in at least one of the activities in C18 through C33.
- Service activities will be judged **Exemplary** by acceptable performance in at least two activities in C3 through C33 and by significant performance (a leadership role) in any of the areas listed above. in at least one activity in C3 through C17 and by acceptable performance in at least two activities in C18 through C33 and by significant performance (a leadership role) in any of the areas listed above.

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.

Regarding the evaluation of materials on the basis of "exceptionality," the materials submitted must exceed the standard of performance required for the given action.

IV. Distance Education Policies for Online and Hybrid Courses:

A. Online and Hybrid Course Offerings:

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

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

1. The Chair of the department shall poll the faculty to determine if there are those who wish to offer course within the Distance Education program.
2. Faculty teaching online or hybrid courses shall complete the Online Certification Training offered by the University's Center for Teaching and Research Excellence (CTRE). OCT or equivalent is required for faculty certification.
3. Faculty members teaching online and hybrid courses must be responsive to students' needs and questions about coursework and they shall hold office hours (virtual or in person) similar in duration to those required by traditional course offerings.
4. The Chair of the department will formulate a roster of faculty who wish to teach an online or hybrid course if demand for teaching assignments exceeds program need or the support from the University. This roster will be developed in a manner like those developed for teaching during the Summer Session.

C. Evaluating Online and Hybrid Courses:

1. The method for evaluating online and hybrid courses within the department will follow the same process used by traditionally offered courses.
2. These methods of evaluation will include student evaluations, peer evaluations, and Chair evaluation(s) as outlined in section the "Evaluating or teaching/performance of primary duties" section above and as required by the appropriate personnel action.

D. Advising Students about Online and Hybrid Courses:

1. Students that register for any online or hybrid course will be advised as to the requirements necessary to be successful in an online or hybrid course, including having the appropriate technology, time, discipline, and skill needed to complete the course. Students without access to the needed technology or lacking the necessary skills will be advised toward traditional courses or technology courses to build their skill level.
2. Students will be provided with the booklet, "Succeeding Online" published by the CTRE.

3. Online and hybrid courses will be provided by the department if the Library and the CTRE continue to provide online support services, an available online Technology Literacy training module, and the information literacy training module (called "CSIT") with links available for instructor use (or a suitable substitute).