

Chicago State University
Department of Social Work

Departmental Application of Criteria
Unit A and Unit B Faculty

2018-2022

Chicago State University
College of Arts and Sciences
Master of Social Work Program

DAC Revision Contributors

Unit A Faculty:

Youngjo Im, Ph.D.

Mamie Kutame, Ph.D.

Amzie Moore, Ph.D. Candidate

Unit B Faculty:

Camille Odeh, M.S.W.

Dorretta Parker, M.S.W.

DAC Revision Submitted on November 24, 2020
DAC Revision to Feedback Submitted on February 15, 2021

I. The Departmental Application of Criteria (DAC)

A. DAC Preamble

The purpose of this document is to provide criteria to evaluate employee performance in three areas – teaching, research, and service. The goal of evaluation is to ensure that university identified standards of excellence are maintained in those three areas. The document is organized according to three sections, with each section representing an area of evaluation. Each section identifies the categories of accepted materials and activities, their relative importance, and the methods of evaluation.

B. Evaluation Portfolio

The evaluation portfolio is a collection of materials submitted by the employee in order to substantiate performance in accordance with the DAC. Each portfolio will include a copy of the current Departmental Application of Criteria, a curriculum vita, a yearlong work assignment and any revised work assignment worksheets, peer evaluations, student evaluations, instructional materials, evidence of teaching/*primary duties*, evidence of research/*creative activities*, evidence of service activities, and any other materials as set forth in the *Contract*. Below are guidelines each candidate should follow when submitting a portfolio for promotion, retention, tenure, or a PAI.

1. Only include materials within the evaluation period as stipulated in the *Contract*.
2. A letter of intent should be the first item in the portfolio and should provide a narrative of activities accomplished in the three areas. The letter of intent should be no more than two pages and should clearly identify the purpose of the submission (i.e. Fourth-Year Retention, PAI) and provide a summary of the entire portfolio. It should be stated if the individual is to be evaluated on a higher standard, such as promotion or tenure by exception. Preceding each area of evaluation (teaching/*primary duties*, research/*creative activities*, service) a one to two-page summary of supporting materials in the evaluation area is suggested. This narrative should provide a more detailed summary of its content than appears in the letter of intent.
3. A table of contents is required and a paging system is strongly recommended.
4. The candidate should use the same headings and language as that found in the DAC for the three categories. Divisions between sections of the portfolio should be very clear and distinct.
5. The submission and review of portfolios are governed by a process set forth in the *Contract*. In particular, they must be submitted by the requisite deadlines and, once submitted, material may not be added or removed by the faculty in personnel action unless requested by the evaluators.
6. Submitted material shall not include personal information such as social security numbers or irrelevant documents such as the ethics training certificate.

II. Departmental Personnel Committee (DPC)

A. Purpose

The purpose of a Department Personnel Committee shall be to review materials submitted by faculty members of the department seeking retention, promotion, professional advancement increase (PAI) or tenure and to provide recommendations in accordance with the DAC. The dates for each evaluation process are specified in the annual university evaluation timetable.

B. Composition

The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) will be comprised of tenure and tenure line faculty members.

III. Evaluation Criteria for Unit A Faculty

The degree of effectiveness of performance of each faculty member who is being considered for retention, promotion, PAI, tenured-faculty review, or tenure shall be evaluated in the areas of teaching/*performance of primary duties*, research/*creative activity*, and service. The criteria by which these areas shall be evaluated are set forth in sections V-VII of this document. Teaching/*performance of primary duties* is considered the most important of the three areas of evaluation as stipulated in *Contract* Article 19.3.a.1.

The minimum performance requirements for unit A faculty in each of the three areas of evaluation is shown in Summary Table (I & II) on pages 4-6 for each personnel action. These performance requirements are as designated in the current *Contract* in Article 19.3.b.2. For a summary of the criteria for each performance requirement (Appropriate, Satisfactory, Exemplary, etc.), please also see Summary Table (I & II) on pages 4-6.

Table I & II**Summary of the Minimum Performance Requirements and the Criteria for each Performance Requirements for Unit A Faculty**

Personnel Action	Teaching/Primary Duty	Research/Creative Activity	Service
First Year Retention	Satisfactory	Appropriate	Appropriate
	“Satisfactory” rating for A.a plus (1) additional A activity (and “Satisfactory B.a rating plus (1) additional B activity if applicable)	(1) A1	(1) A1 plus (1) additional Category 1
Second Year Retention	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
	“Satisfactory” rating for A.a plus (1) additional A activity (and “Satisfactory B.a rating plus (1) additional B activity if applicable)	(3) A1	(2) A1 plus (1) B1 plus (1) additional Category 1
Third Year Retention	Effective	Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory
	“Effective” rating for A.a plus (2) additional A activities (and “Effective” B.a rating plus (2) additional B activities if applicable)	(3) A1 plus (3) A2/B1	(2) A1 plus (2) B1 plus (2) additional Category 1 plus (1) Category 2
Fourth Year Retention	Highly Effective	Effective	Effective
	“Highly Effective” rating for A.a plus (3) additional A activities (and “Highly Effective” B.a rating plus (2) additional B activities if applicable)	(3) A2/B1 plus (1) B1	(2) A1 plus (2) B1 plus (1) C1 plus (2) additional Category 1 plus (1) Category 2
Fifth Year Retention	Significant	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
	“Significant” rating for A.a plus (4) additional A activities (and “Significant” B.a rating plus (2) additional B activities if applicable)	(2) A2/B1 plus (2) B1 plus (1) B2	(2) A1 plus (2) B1 plus (1) C1 plus (2) additional Category 1 plus (2) Category 2.

Promotion to Associate/Tenure	Significant	Significant	Significant
	“Significant” rating for A.a plus (10) additional A activities (and “Significant” B.a rating plus (4) additional B activities if applicable)	(10) A2/B1 plus (4) B1 plus (3) B2	(10) A1 plus (24) additional Category 1 activities with at least one activity in groups B, C, D, and E plus (7) Category 2.
Associate/Tenured Professor	Superior (1 year)	Significant (1 year)	Significant (1 year)
	“Superior” rating for A.a plus (6) additional A activities (and “Superior” B.a rating plus (6) additional B activities if applicable)	(4) B1	(2) A1 plus (2) B1 plus (1) C1 plus (1) D1/E1 plus (1) additional Category 1 plus (4) Category 2
Promotion to Full Professor	Superior	Superior	Superior
	“Superior” rating for A.a plus (12) additional A activities (and “Superior” B.a rating plus (6) additional B activities if applicable)	(10) A2/B1 plus (6) B1 plus (3) B2	(10) A1 plus (28) additional Category 1 activities with at least one activity in groups B, C, D, and E; plus (10) Category 2
Full Professor	Superior (1 year)	Superior (1 year)	Superior (1 year)
	“Superior” rating for A.a plus (6) additional A activities (and “Superior” B.a rating plus (6) additional B activities if applicable)	(10) A2/B1 plus (6) B1 plus (3) B2	(2) A1 plus (2) B1 plus (1) C1 plus (1) D1 plus (1) E1 plus (3) additional Category 1 plus (4) Category 2
Post-Tenure Review	Adequate/	Adequate/	Adequate/
	“Highly Effective” rating for A.a plus (3) additional A activities (and “Highly Effective” B.a rating plus (2) additional B activities if applicable)	(2) A1 plus (2) B1/A2	(2) A1 plus (2) B1 plus (3) additional Category 1
	/Exemplary	/Exemplary	/Exemplary
	“Significant” rating for A.a plus (4) additional A activities (and “Significant” B.a rating plus (2) additional B activities if applicable)	(2) B1/A2 plus (1) B2	(2) A1 plus (2) B1 plus (1) C1 plus (1) D1/E1 plus (3) additional Category 1 plus (3) Category 2

PAI	Superior (1 year)	Superior (1 year)/	Superior (1 year)/
	“Superior” rating for A.a plus (6) additional A activities (and “Superior” B.a rating plus (6) additional B activities if applicable)	(10) A2/B1 plus (6) B1 plus (3) B2	(2) A1 plus (2) B1 plus (1) C1 plus (1) D1 plus (1) E1 plus (3) additional Category 1 plus (4) Category 2
		/Significant (1 year)	/Significant (1 year)
		(4) B1	(2) A1 plus (2) B1 plus (1) C1 plus (1) D1/E1 plus (1) additional Category 1 plus (4) Category 2

*Exceptional

Personnel Action	Teaching/Primary Duty	Research/Creative Activity	Service
	Exceptional	Exceptional	Exceptional
	“Superior” rating for A.a plus (30) additional A activities (and “Superior” B.a rating plus (10) additional B activities if applicable)	(30) A2/B1 plus (10) B1 plus (15) B2	(10) A1 plus (50) additional Category 1 plus (20) Category 2

Notes for Summary Table I & II:

1. Activity is defined as a unique function occurring within the evaluation period. For instance, maintaining a scientific instrument room counts as one activity, even though there may be multiple instrument rooms. However, in multi-year evaluations, instrument room maintenance can be counted once for each year that it was performed.
2. Activities in the table are organized on a hierarchy of value labeled as A or B and are coupled with numbers to identify a specific classification of activity to be evaluated.
3. Materials in a higher category can be used as substitutes for lower requirements (where applicable and appropriate) but substitutions cannot reduce the quantity of activities required.
4. "(2) A1" indicates 2 A1 activities are required during the evaluation period. "(3) A2/B1" indicates that any combination of A2 plus B1 activities totaling three is required.

IV. Categories of Materials and Activities, Relative Importance, and Methods of Evaluation for Teaching /*Performance of Primary Duties*

Teaching and other *primary duties* are important to the intellectual life of the university. A record of all teaching and teaching-related activities, supporting evidence, and summative narrative should be included in each portfolio. The narrative should explain how the candidate meets the established criteria, how assessment results have led to changes in courses, and how faculty development activities have improved teaching.

The two aspects of the category teaching/*performance of primary duties* are to be weighted in their evaluation in proportion to the assignment of CUEs on their revised work assignment. Because each of these aspects are quite different, the categories, their importance, the criteria, and guidelines for each will be covered in two parallel sections organized according to the following designations: **A. Teaching** and **B. *Performance of Primary Duties***.

The teaching section is first and the *performance of primary duties* follow immediately after, and before the research/*creative activities*. The materials required to meet the performance standard for each section are listed in Table III and Table IV.

V. Teaching/*Primary Duties* Categories

A. Teaching

- (a) Classroom performance
- (b) Other teaching related duties
- (c) Curriculum development and revision
- (d) Professional development related to teaching

B. *Performance of Primary Duties*

- (a) Primary duty performance
- (b) Other primary duty related activities
- (c) Program development and enhancement
- (d) Professional development related to primary duty

Table III

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

Relative Importance of Teaching (A) Activities and Methods of Evaluation

For all teaching faculty, the evaluation of classroom performance is the most significant activity. Evaluation of a candidate's teaching will include consideration of the candidate's effectiveness in the following areas: execution of assigned responsibilities; command of the subject matter or discipline; ability to organize, analyze and present material clearly and effectively; ability to encourage and interest students in the learning process; evidence of technologies used in the classroom and in student mentoring, advisement, counseling and direction of individual learning activities. Below are specific instructions regarding the evaluation of A activities:

Course Syllabi

Syllabi are expected to clearly define the following: course description; course objectives and 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, tardiness, and makeup exams; grading standards (including 'I' grades); frequency and relative weights of exams, quizzes, homework, papers, and other materials; laboratory/studio safety rules (if appropriate); link to the university student evaluation site: <http://www.csu.edu/course-eval>; information about field trips (if appropriate); and policy concerning plagiarism. 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 HLC format 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.

*Assessment of CSWE competencies/practice behaviors: Documentation in course syllabus of (a) competencies and practice behaviors to be assessed, (b) the assignment that will be used to assess the practice behaviors, (c) the rubric used to assess the practice behaviors, (d) the points assigned for the assessment of practice behaviors, and (e) documentation illustrating how the assessment points are tied to the overall points given for that assignment.

Course Materials

Representative exams, quizzes, and other materials submitted for evaluation are expected to reflect the following qualities: balanced coverage of the assigned material, questions which are clearly stated, questions which are appropriate for the level of the course, a length which is appropriate for the time allotted, and a minimum of spelling, grammatical or typographical errors. Materials submitted will be evaluated with regard to their value in assisting student learning, their originality, and their appropriateness for the course. Regular revisions and updates to course materials shall be valued more than repetitive, unrevised materials over a multi-year period.

Student Evaluations

Faculty shall give all students, except those enrolled in practicum, tutorials, independent study courses, and research courses, the opportunity to evaluate their teaching effectiveness through the student evaluations provided on-line by the university evaluation website: <http://www.csu.edu/course-eval>. The faculty member shall advise students of the evaluation procedure by placing an item in their syllabi that informs the student about the on-line evaluation procedure and gives the university evaluation web address. The results of these evaluations will be provided to the faculty member only after the course grade has been submitted. The faculty member will place in their portfolio the evaluations (including student comments) for each course evaluated during the review period. The DPC will determine how results from student evaluations are translated into a performance indicator (Satisfactory, Significant, etc.).

*For student evaluations, the following measurements may be used as a rule of thumb: 2.5 to 2.6 for Satisfactory; 2.61-3.0 for Effective; 3.01 to 3.5 for Highly Effective; 3.51-4.0 for Significant; and 4.01 to 5.0 for Superior.

Teaching Assessment Activities

All courses should have assessment measures. Additional assessment instruments may be required for some courses, as designated by the department. Faculty administering such instruments must compile the results and return them to the assessment coordinator on a timely basis. Effectiveness will be measured by the quality of reports submitted for evaluation.

Peer/Chairperson Classroom Visitations

Each candidate for retention, promotion, tenure, or a PAI shall include the results of at least two recent classroom visitations by peers and one classroom visitation by the chairperson. Each visitor shall complete the “classroom visitation/evaluation form” approved by the department. The completed form should be copied to the faculty member visited, to the DPC chairperson, and to the department chairperson.

*For peer/chair evaluations, the following measurements may be used as a rule of thumb: 2.5 to 2.75 for Satisfactory; 2.76-3.5 for Effective; 3.51 to 4.0 for Highly Effective; 4.01-4.5 for Significant; and 4.51 to 5.0 for Superior.

Curriculum Revision and Development

These activities include, but are not limited to, new course development, new instructional material development and new option development. Effectiveness as measured by adoption and implementation of the proposed courses and options should be documented.

Professional Development Activities for Teaching Improvement

Activities include but are not limited to, participation in short courses, conferences and workshops, attainment of additional degrees, sabbaticals, fellowships, and other teaching related, educational experiences. Documentation of participation must be provided for consideration.

Primary Duty Materials to be Evaluated for Type B Categories

Table V

Types of B Activities	Materials to be Evaluated
(a) Research Release Time	Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty
(b) Program Coordinator or Administrative Release Time	Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty
(c) Academic Release Time	Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty
(d) Assessment Release Time	(i) Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty, (ii) representative assessment reports, and (iii) evidence of attendance at assessment meetings
(e) Advising Release Time	(i) Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty and (ii) summary of completed advisor surveys (where available)
(f) Other Type of Release Time	Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty.

Relative Importance of *Primary Duty* (B) Activities and Methods of Evaluation

The *performance of primary duties* (beyond required classroom activities) are as central to the teaching function of the institution as direct instruction. The acquisition of resources, activities directed at program improvement and other professional development activities that are associated with these activities must be evaluated. The division of CUEs between teaching and *primary duties*, as listed on the approved and revised faculty workload assignment, will dictate the relative importance between these two categories where required. Compensated duties or other activities where release time has been provided do not diminish the importance of direct instructional activities, but should be viewed as significant in accord with one's professional development and the mission of the university.

Below are specific instructions regarding the evaluation of B activities:

Letters of Evaluation

A letter of evaluation for each primary duty should include a statement of assigned duties, a listing of goals and objectives for the release time, and an assessment of the faculty's member performance of the duty. An evaluation should be completed and included in the portfolio by the direct supervisor of the activity for whom re-assigned time has been provided. For activities spanning multiple years, only one letter of evaluation for each activity is required. If the direct supervisor of the activity is the chairperson, the chairperson may include their evaluation of the primary duty in their overall narrative of the candidate.

Synopsis of Activities Related to the Primary Duty

Documentation of attendance at activities related to the assigned primary duties is required. Additional documentation that may be required includes: the maintenance of appropriate and accessible records, copies of progress reports submitted, attendance at workshops, training courses or other development programs related to the primary duty. If release time has been granted for research, then a narrative summary of the research performed must be included in this section even if details of the conduct and product of research is reported in the research section. If release time has been granted for being a program coordinator, then the results of being a program coordinator may still be reported in the service section.

Program Improvement/Acquisition of Resources

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

Professional Development for Program Improvement

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

VI. Categories of Materials and Activities, Relative Importance, and Methods of Evaluation for Research /*Creative Activities*

Research and *creative activity* is critical to the success of the university and to the career advancement of individual faculty members who comprise the university. A record of all research activities, supporting evidence, and summative narrative should be organized according to the categories listed on the following page. The list in Table V is not meant to be exhaustive, rather illustrative of the types of research/*creative activities* to be included in the portfolio.

Table V
Classification of Research/*Creative Activities*

Scholarly Activities	Achievement Level A1:	Achievement Level A2:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Writing a research agenda ▪ Reporting progress in research ▪ Attending a research conference or a research skills workshop ▪ Completing a literature review in a research related area ▪ CSU presentation/performance ▪ Panel discussant ▪ Unsuccessful or submitted internal grant proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstration of significant progress on research (draft chapters, full revisions) ▪ Completing a book review ▪ Serving as a grant/manuscript reviewer ▪ Editor of a research related refereed journal ▪ Presentation/performance at a local/regional conference ▪ Invited review of research-related or original creative works ▪ Non-peer reviewed e-media publication ▪ Participatory research project ▪ Organizing a research-related professional conference
Research Productivity	B1:	B2:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Submitted external grant ▪ Submitted peer-reviewed manuscript ▪ Successful internal grant ▪ Invited conference presentation ▪ Presentation/performance at a national/international conference ▪ Successful non-peer reviewed journal article/external grant ▪ Student research/training ▪ Student thesis supervision or project supervision ▪ Activities related to a multi-year grant not claimed as B2 ▪ Original translation of scholarly importance ▪ Published short-form essay in a peer-reviewed book or journal (such as an encyclopedia) ▪ Patent application ▪ Activities related to the successful submission of a grant not claimed as B2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Published book/ novel/ monograph/ chapter in discipline related research area ▪ Published peer reviewed journal article in a discipline-related research area ▪ Funded peer-reviewed external grant related to research agenda <p>Note: Not all required B2 activities can be fulfilled by successful grants, at least one activity must be in another B2 area for promotion and/or tenure.</p>

Specific Details Regarding “B” Activities

1. Publications, monographs, books, and articles count as a B2 activity if they have been reviewed in a peer-reviewed competitive process and have either appeared or been accepted for publication. All items in this category must list Chicago State University as the author’s resident institution to be counted as a “B2” activity.
2. A competitive grant renewal would count as a B2 activity, whereas a non-competitive renewal would count as a B1 activity. This permits faculty with multi-year grants to count the successful grant in more than one year.
3. All successful peer reviewed external grant proposals count as a B2 activity regardless of the amount of the grant. All earmarks, gifts, and other non-competitive awards are not B2 activities. A successful peer reviewed grant from another institution for which a CSU faculty member is a listed Co-PI on the grant counts as a B2 activity. If they are listed as a subcontractor, the grant is a B1 activity.
4. In order for a “manuscript or grant in progress” to be counted as a B1 activity in a subsequent year, the candidate must demonstrate that reasonable progress has been made on the manuscript or grant since it was last claimed as a “B1” activity.
5. For publications for which the candidate is not a primary/corresponding author or for grants for which the candidate is a Co-PI, the activity may or may not be a B2 activity. The DPC will determine if such activities will count as a B2 activity on a case by case basis. 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. In cases where the activities are carried out early in a candidate’s CSU career, it is important that the DPC make an early determination if such activities will count in the B2 category.
6. A B1 activity can be the completion of one phase of a multi-year long-form creative/research project such as a scholarly book, novel, play, musical, feature-film or other long-form media project will be granted to projects typically requiring many years of research time to complete. Faculty shall demonstrate the scope and long-form nature of the project to the DPC.

Research/*Creative Activity* Materials to be Evaluated

Materials which may be submitted in the evaluation portfolio include the following but are not limited to:

1. A research/*creative activities* agenda if it is being used to fulfill a performance standard
2. A narrative of research/scholarly progress since the last evaluation, including how students were involved in research projects
3. Copies of all successful publications and abstracts
4. Cover page, abstract, and grant award letters for all successful grants
5. Conference proceedings which list the candidate's presentations and/or contributions
6. Documentation of attendance at research conferences, workshops, or other developmental activities, with a narrative explaining how the activity assisted in advancing their research
7. Letter of invitation to serve as a reviewer for grants, books, monographs, or articles
8. Representative samples of research, grants, or manuscripts in progress
9. Book/performance reviews
10. Evidence of improvements made to research infrastructure
11. Cover page, abstract and reviewer comments of unsuccessful grants
12. Professional correspondence

Relative Importance of Research/*Creative Activities* and Methods of Evaluation

No limits are to be placed on the kinds of research or *creative activities* selected, as long as there is a demonstrable relationship between the candidate's contribution and their academic area. Each faculty member is encouraged to consult with a member of the DPC concerning their activities and the appropriate category to be used given the documentation presented.

All research and *creative activities* submitted in the portfolio must be clearly identified according to the four categories listed on the previous page: A1, A2, B1, or B2. Activities in B1 and B2 represent a higher level of research achievement by clearly documenting the product of research while activities in A1 and A2 are those scholarly activities necessary for and leading to scholarly productivity. The ranking of the categories of research/*creative activities* is B2 > B1 > A2 > A1. For the purposes of fulfilling the performance standard, extra activities in a higher category can be used to fulfill the performance requirements of a lower category.

University and renowned publishers will be recognized as more significant than popular publications and presses; published work as more significant than presented work; nearly completed research activity has more significant than ongoing or newly originated research. Consideration will be given to the prestige of the conference, institution or granting agency as well as the audience for whom the research-related or *creative activity* is presented. Those research and *creative activities* that enhance the reputation of the university are more significant than those that enhance a unit of the university.

In all categories, the quality, scope, and professional stature of the activity will be judged by the DPC and chairperson as to whether the performance standard indicated has been fulfilled. Candidates will not only be judged on meeting the minimum quantity of activities required to fulfill the performance standard indicated, but also the quality of the activities. It shall be the responsibility of the candidate to clearly articulate how they meet the performance standard. In cases where the quantitative standard has not been met, a candidate can make an argument as to why their activities meet it qualitatively, and when demonstrated may be deemed acceptable.

VII. Categories of Materials and Activities, Relative Importance, and Methods of Evaluation for Service Activities

Service activities are as important to the life of the university as other professionally related duties. As part of service, faculty are encouraged to participate in campus cultural activities, athletic events, college meetings, town hall meetings, commencement, and other related activities. Participation in these activities can be mentioned by chairpersons in faculty evaluations to demonstrate a candidate's dedication to the university, but these activities should not be included in the portfolio as service activities.

A record of all service activities, supporting evidence, and summative description should be organized according to the five categories listed below. The list is not meant to be exhaustive, rather illustrative of the types of service activities to be included in the portfolio. Faculty members applying for promotion or retention should review the language in the DAC and consult with colleagues and DPC members to ensure that items included in the portfolio are appropriate for one of the following groups:

- A. Service to the Department
- B. Service to Areas of Enrollment, Recruitment, Retention, and Graduation
- C. Service to the College and the University
- D. Service to the Profession, Discipline, or Field
- E. Service to the Community

Classification of Service Activities

The candidate should submit a portfolio that includes documentation organized according to the following list of activities. The list on the next page, in Table VI, is not meant to be exhaustive but illustrative of the types of service activities which may be included. A Category 1 departmental service activity would be referred to as an "A1" service activity.

Table VI
Service Activities

Service Group	Category 1 (lower level of effort)	Category 2 (higher level of effort)
A. Service to the Department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation in department committees ▪ Administrative functions as assigned by the chair or dean such as departmental webmaster, departmental newsletter editor, or departmental seminar coordinator ▪ Maintenance of departmental equipment ▪ Lending professional skills or expertise to the department for the advancement of the departmental mission ▪ Advisor to student clubs or groups ▪ Classroom observation of peers ▪ Mentoring faculty ▪ Lending professional skills or expertise to the department for the advancement of the departmental mission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Chairing a department committee which met regularly and required effective planning and organization ▪ Organizing public events sponsored by the department ▪ Developing written material for, or performing evaluation of, new initiatives in the department ▪ Service on a department committee which met regularly and required significant work of its members outside the meetings, such as program review committees and accreditation committees ▪ Service on a department committee which required authorship of significant documents, such as a grant or NEPR committees ▪ Organizing departmental seminars
B. Service to Areas of Enrollment, Recruitment, Retention, and Graduation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Career counseling and internship supervision of students ▪ Assistance with departmental promotional activities ▪ Participation in departmental recruitment/ admission activities ▪ Formal involvement in the recruitment of students ▪ Preparing ERG documents or reports as assigned by the chair or program coordinator ▪ Serve as an advisor to a student club 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Developing an articulation agreement with another institution ▪ Developing and organizing a marketing strategy for the college or university ▪ Serving as an advisor to student club requiring significant contributions of time and effort ▪ Organizing campus events which promote departmental/ university ERG goals
C. Service to the College and University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation on college/ university committees ▪ Faculty union service ▪ Speaker at college/ university seminars ▪ Formally representing the University at external events ▪ Lending professional skills or expertise to the college/ university in advancement of college/ university mission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Chairing a university or college committee which met regularly and required effective planning and organization ▪ Service on a university or college committee which met regularly and required significant work of its members outside the meetings, such as accreditation committees, UPC, and the IRB ▪ Service on a university or college committee which required authorship of significant documents

D. Service to the Profession, Discipline, or Field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation in planning and implementing professional conference or activities ▪ Assisting in the publication of professional newsletters ▪ Maintaining active membership in a professional organization through attendance at meetings or participation in public forums ▪ Editing/reviewing journal articles and books not directly related to research activities ▪ Invitation to review grants or manuscripts from a professional agency or journal ▪ Invitation to review creative works from a professional agency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Holding offices in professional organizations ▪ Serving on boards, accreditation teams, committees, councils, task forces, or advisory boards of professional organizations ▪ Serving as a leader on a review panel
<hr/>		
E. Service to the Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Involvement in community activities which draw upon one's professional skills ▪ Professionally related volunteer work ▪ Professional speaking engagement in the community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Board membership in community agencies related to the individual's professional discipline or specialization ▪ Completing a major project with a community organization

All service activities in the five groups (A-E) above will be placed in a category based on the effort required of that activity. Category 1 activities shall consist of activities that require time and effort commensurate with the reasonable expectation of the faculty member involved in the activity. Category 2 consists of service activities that require time and effort above and beyond that expected in the normal performance of a category 1 activity in the same service group. For a service activity to reach the level of category 2, members of the DPC must accept the faculty member's claim that his/her performance of the activity rose to the level of leadership or extraordinary effort. For example, serving as a member of a committee (category 1) requires a lower level of effort when compared to chairing the same committee (category 2).

Service Activity Materials to be Evaluated

All service related activities must be clearly documented in the portfolio in any of the following ways:

1. Meeting minutes with attendees listed
2. Letters of appreciation from committee chairs
3. Certificates of appreciation from institutional bodies
4. Flyers and announcements with the candidate's name listed
5. Copies of prepared documents (reports, proposals) with candidate's name listed

Relative Importance of Service Activities and Methods of Evaluation

While the nature and degree of service activities depend on many factors, some general principles can guide their evaluation. Service activities should be public, purposive and professionally related to one's academic training. Service should be uncompensated and voluntary (other than *honoraria* received as a result of certain professional activities). The nature and degree of participation, length of service, and relationship of service to the individual's assigned responsibilities to the university will be considered and should be clearly articulated by the candidate. Finally, the expectation of service to the larger community and within one's professional affiliation increases (rather than decreases) over time. As one becomes more engaged in one's profession, the quantity and quality of professional contacts should naturally increase. Service enhancing the reputation of the university is more significant than service to a unit of the university.

At all times the candidate for promotion and retention can propose to the DPC that certain activities be given special consideration, be counted in a different category, or be included in the portfolio though the activity seems outside the acceptable realm. Such requests must be made in writing within the portfolio and the DPC should, in its evaluation, explain its decision to accept the candidate's appeal of the ranking and/or inclusion of a particular service activity.

VIII. Evaluation of Unit A Research Faculty

Research faculty are faculty hired as experienced, independent researchers who have qualifications comparable to those expected of tenurable ranks, but are not tenure track. The appointee is expected to make significant contributions to the research mission of the university, and they are appointed on a non-tenurable basis based upon available grant funding. The chair/director and dean will evaluate the performance of research faculty annually. The timetable for portfolio submission will be published in the university evaluation timetable.

The degree of effectiveness of performance of each employee being considered for reappointment or promotion as a research faculty member will be evaluated in the areas of research activity and possibly teaching/*performance of primary duties* and service as defined by the appointment and work assignments. If teaching/*primary duties* or service requirements are specified in the letter of appointment and annual work assignments, accomplishments in these areas will be considered of less importance than his or her research productivity.

Performance Standards for Research Faculty

The performance standard for continued annual appointments is defined as “highly effective” for all activities in the appointment for the first three years. The details of the “highly effective” standards are described in this DAC. After three years, it is expected that research faculty will demonstrate performance at the “significant” level for research/*creative activities* in every year thereafter for continued annual appointments. The details of the “significant” standards for a one-year evaluation period are described in this DAC.

Research faculty are also eligible for rank and promotion in titles such as term professor, assistant research professor, associate research professor, and research professor.

1. For promotion to research assistant professor: highly effective research/*creative activities*; highly effective teaching/*performance of primary duties* and/or highly effective service through the evaluation period.
2. For promotion to research associate professor: significant research/*creative activities*; significant teaching/*performance of primary duties* and/or significant service through the evaluation period.
3. For promotion to research professor: superior research/*creative activities*; superior teaching/*performance of primary duties* and and/or significant service through the evaluation period.

IX. Evaluation of Unit A Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty are hired to supervise students in a clinical, experiential, or practicum setting, in addition to being engaged in teaching, research, and service depending on the nature of the appointment. Clinical faculty qualifications shall be comparable to those expected of tenurable ranks and their promotion pathways parallel those of the tenurable ranks. They are eligible for annual reappointment and multiple-year appointments contingent upon, successful performance evaluations, program need and availability of funds. They are not, however, eligible for tenure. The DPC, chair, and dean will evaluate the performance of clinical faculty annually. The timetable for portfolio submission will be published in the university evaluation timetable.

Performance Standards for Clinical Faculty

For reappointments (retention), clinical faculty must meet the standards stated in the *Contract* germane to their appointment. Reappointment standards for the first five years are identical to the retention standards for tenure-track faculty for this first five years. These standards are listed in section IV of this document. Reappointment is subject to available funding.

The performance standard for annual reappointment in clinical year six and beyond: “effective” teaching/*performance of primary duties*; “effective” research/creative activity; and “effective” service during the evaluation period.

Clinical faculty who have attained five or more years of instructional service with the university are eligible for renewable three-year contracts if they have earned “superior” performance evaluations for their teaching/*primary duties* and “significant” performance evaluations for either their research/*creative activity* or service in the preceding five-year period, and “highly effective” in the remaining area. The performance standards for maintaining three-year renewable clinical appointments are: “highly effective” teaching/*performance of primary duties*, “highly effective” research/creative activity, and “highly effective” service.

Clinical faculty are eligible for clinical rank and promotion in titles such as clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, and clinical professor; however, they are not eligible for tenure.

1. For promotion to clinical associate professor: superior teaching/*performance of primary duties*; significant research/*creative activity*; and significant service through the evaluation period.
2. For promotion to clinical professor: superior teaching/*performance of primary duties*; superior research/*creative activity*; and superior service through the evaluation period.

X. Evaluation of Unit B Faculty

Unit B faculty will be evaluated only on teaching/*performance of primary duties*. After one full year of service, an evaluation portfolio of their activities is to be prepared, following the schedule laid out in the university timetable. Unit B faculty will be evaluated on:

- (1) Student evaluations
- (2) Chair observation
- (3) Syllabi, and any other supporting teaching materials
- (4) Evaluation of CSWE competencies for designated required courses listed in the curriculum assessment matrix
- (5) Peer evaluations

Evidence of CSWE assessment in the course syllabus should include the following:

- (a) Competencies and practice behaviors to be assessed
- (b) The assignment that will be used to assess the practice behaviors
- (c) The rubric used to assess the practice behaviors
- (d) The points assigned for the assessment of practice behaviors
- (e) Documentation illustrating how the assessment points are tied to the overall points given for that assignment

Unit B faculty will only be awarded the “unsatisfactory,” “satisfactory,” or “highly effective” ratings, as stipulated in the faculty agreement.

XI. Distance Education

The Department of Social Work is not offering distance education courses. Therefore, the policies and procedures of the departmental distance education are not included in the DAC 2018-2022.

The Department of Social Work can add a distance education program option through either submitting substantive change reports to the Council of Social Work Education (CSWE) or including an online program option in the CSWE’s reaffirmation review. The Department of Social Work will consider distance education courses to be, but not limited to, video conferencing, web-enhanced courses, hybrid courses, web-based/online courses, or any combination of these multimedia delivery systems. These systems may be synchronous or asynchronous. When a faculty member in the Department of Social Work teaches a distance education course that involves learning new technologies, he or she should seek and be provided with the opportunity to be trained in those technologies.

**Appendix:
Chicago State University Faculty Development Plan**

Academic Year: _____

Name: _____ **Title:** _____

The form below is designed to represent a faculty member's plan for development in his or her work at Chicago State University. It should be developed with a conscious effort to be measurable and to represent fulfillment of contractual obligations as specified by the relevant Departmental Application of Criteria. Complete the form below in your position and submit to your chairperson as an input for your annual evaluation. The plan iteration should be prospective, not retrospective. That is, it should be written in Year N as a statement of the plan for Year N+1 and following.

Criteria (as applicable)	Goal for the Year	Resources Needed to Attain Goal	Vehicles to Accomplish by the End of the Year	Relationship to Strategic Plan (Specify)	Relationship to Relevant Professional Standards
Teaching (as applicable)					
Other Primary Duties (Specify)					
Research/Creative Activity Presentations Publications Grantsmanship (Submitted, Implementation Involvement, Progress Reports)					
Service Department Level College L University Level Profession Level Community Level					

Employee Date

Chair/Director Date Dean Date