CHICAGO STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

DEPARTMENTAL APPLICATION OF CRITERIA

MANAGEMENT
MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS
MARKETING

2018 - 2022

i.   Chicago State University Mission Statement

Chicago State University (CSU) is a public, comprehensive university that provides access to higher education for students of diverse backgrounds and educational needs. The university fosters the intellectual development and success of its student population through a rigorous, positive, and transformative educational experience. CSU is committed to teaching, research, service and community development including social justice, leadership and entrepreneurship.

ii.   Strategic Plan Goals

Chicago State University's Strategic Plan uses the acronym "ACCESS" as a reminder of its central purpose to guide the University as it fulfills its commitment to the provision of access to quality education. The six strategic goals outlined in this plan are:

- Academic Excellence, Teaching and Research
- Community Service and Engagement
- Cost Efficiencies and Diverse Revenue Streams
- Enrollment, Retention and Graduation
- Strengthened Infrastructure
- Shared Accountability and Image

1

CHICAGO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

MANAGEMENT, MARKETING AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEPARTMENT
DEPARTMENTAL APPLICATION OF CRITERIA

SEPTEMBER 2018 - AUGUST 2022

Preamble

The purpose of the evaluative process is to assess fairly the performance of professional duties in line with established university policies and criteria. It is designed to recognize that the provision of quality education to our students is the reason for the existence of the department. The criteria included in this document are based on the teacher scholar model of academic life and on a recognition of the importance of faculty involvement in the life of the Department, College, University and Community. The document, therefore, addresses evaluation of professional activity in three parts: teaching/performance of primary duties, research/creative activities, and service.

I. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FACULTY MEMBER BEING EVALUATED

The faculty member being evaluated must provide documentation of his/her activities during the period being evaluated. This documentation will be in the form of a portfolio organized in the manner described in the University guidelines. The portfolio will be submitted to the chair of the Departmental Personnel Committee (DPC) at the time designated in the University schedule for personnel actions.

If the DPC, the departmental chairperson or any administrator fails to fulfill their responsibilities under the Faculty Agreement, or this document, the faculty member will not be disadvantaged by that failure.

II. EVALUATION OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE

    A. Performance Areas to be evaluated:

        The three areas of evaluation considered are:

                1. Teaching/ Performance of Primary Duties
                2. Research/Creative Activities
                3. Service

    B. Competence in areas to be evaluated:

Faculty members being evaluated for retention, promotion, tenure, or professional advancement increase must meet the requirements for each of the three areas at the levels of competence specified in the Faculty Agreement. A listing of those levels is included as Attachment #1 to this document and it shown in table 1 below.

Table 1: Requirements for Personnel Actions

Teaching Component	
Function/Activity	**Criteria**
Retention Year 1	Satisfactory
Retention Year 2	Satisfactory
Retention Year 3	Effective
Retention Year 4	Highly Effective
Retention Year 5	Significant
Promotion to Assistant Professor	Highly Effective
Promotion to Associate Professor	Superior
Promotion to Full Professor	Superior
Promotion to Tenure	Superior
PAI	Superior

Research Component	
Function/Activity	**Criteria**
Retention Year 1	Appropriate
Retention Year 2	Satisfactory
Retention Year 3	Highly Satisfactory
Retention Year 4	Effective
Retention Year 5	Highly Effective
Promotion to Assistant Professor	Satisfactory
Promotion to Associate Professor	Significant
Promotion to Full Professor	Superior
Tenure	Significant
PAI	*

Service Component	
Function/Activity	**Criteria**
Retention Year 1	Appropriate
Retention Year 2	Satisfactory
Retention Year 3	Highly Satisfactory
Retention Year 4	Effective
Retention Year 5	Highly Effective
Promotion to Assistant Professor	Satisfactory
Promotion to Associate Professor	Significant
Promotion to Full Professor	Superior
Tenure	Significant
PAI	*
* *Significant* in Research AND *Superior* in Service OR Superior in Research AND *Significant* in Service.	

C. Relative Importance of Areas to be Evaluated

The mission of Chicago State University, the College of Business and this department centers on teaching and instruction. Teaching and instruction will be the primary focus of any evaluation of faculty professional performance. Research/creative activities will be the secondary focus and service activities the last. This structure is included in the competence levels described in the Faculty Agreement. The faculty member must meet the minimum requirement in each of the three areas described above, and as defined in the Faculty Agreement and included as Attachment 1 to this document.

D. Professional Development Plan

To facilitate the faculty professional development process and to better align the DAC to the University Strategic Plan, the Professional Development Plan, PDP (Refer to Appendix C) can be used by faculty and the Chairperson as a developmental tool. Under this option, the PDP can be used at the beginning of the annual review process and submitted along with the faculty's portfolio as governed by the Academic Personnel University Timetable. This document may be used as an optional tool in the professional development process and in no way replaces or adds to the assessment process set forth in this DAC and Article 19 of the Contract.

III. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND DOCUMENTATION

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

Teaching and instruction forms the foundation of the institution and, therefore, commands the highest of priority and evaluation. The evaluation of teaching performance is dictated primarily by student evaluations, classroom performance evaluations, and course materials. For the purpose of this document, and the corresponding charts contained within, teaching activities are denoted by "T" and primary duties by "PD". Materials to be evaluated that are listed in this document are examples and are not intended to serve as an exhaustive listing.

Table 2: Teaching

Teaching Activities (T)	Materials to be Evaluated
(A) Classroom performance	1. Student course evaluations. 2. Peer class evaluations. 3. Department Chair class evaluations. 4. Yearlong assignment for the period of the evaluation. 5. Course material, including: all syllabi, classroom handouts, exams, computer exercises and any other documentation of performance in teaching/instruction. Material that presents evidence of the development of new course material and/or the employment of new pedagogical methods by the faculty member is of special importance.

1. Categories of Materials and Activities:

    a) Student course evaluations.
    b) Reports of peer class visitations.
    c) Reports of Department Chair class visitations/evaluations.
    d) Yearlong assignment for the period of evaluation.
    e) Course material, including: syllabi, classroom handouts, exams, computer exercises and any other documentation of performance in teaching/instruction. Teaching/instructional material that presents evidence of the development of new course material and/or the employment of new pedagogical methods by the faculty member is of special importance.
    f) Documentation of performance of primary duties outside of the area teaching/instruction.

2. Evaluation

    a) Year 1- Satisfactory: In order to meet the requirements for Satisfactory performance of teaching/instruction the faculty member must supply documentation of satisfactory, or better, reviews in the areas described in Section III.A.1. a, b, and c (student evaluations, peer evaluations and chair classroom visitations/ evaluations). This entails Satisfactory (or better) reviews in at least two of the sections described Section III.A.1.a, b, and c (student evaluations, peer evaluations and chair classroom visitations/ evaluations).

    b) Year 2- Satisfactory: In order to meet the requirements for Satisfactory performance of teaching/instruction the faculty member must supply documentation of satisfactory, or better, reviews in the areas described in Section III.A.1.a, b, and c (student evaluations, peer evaluations and chair classroom visitations/ evaluations). This entails Satisfactory (or better) reviews in at least two of the sections described Section III.A.1.a, b, and c (student evaluations, peer evaluations and chair classroom visitations/ evaluations).

    c) Year 3- Effective: Effective performance of teaching/instruction will be demonstrated by exceeding the criteria for satisfactory performance set forth in Section III.A.2.a. This entails Effective (or better) reviews in at least two of the sections described Section III.A.1.a, b, and c (student evaluations, peer evaluations and chair classroom visitations/ evaluations).

    d) Year 4 & Promotion to Assistant - Highly Effective: Highly Effective performance of teaching/instruction will be demonstrated by exceeding the criteria for satisfactory performance set forth in Section III.A.2.b. This entails Highly Effective (or better) reviews in at least two of the sections described Section III.A.1.a, b, and c (student evaluations, peer evaluations and chair classroom visitations/ evaluations).

    e) Year 5- Significant: Significant performance of teaching/instruction will be

demonstrated by exceeding the criteria for satisfactory performance set forth in Section III.A.2.c. This entails significant (or better) reviews in at least two of the sections described Section III.A.1.a, b, and c (student evaluations, peer evaluations and chair classroom visitations/ evaluations).

f) Year 6, Tenure, Promotion to Associate, Promotion to Full & PAI – Superior: Superior performance will be demonstrated by exceeding the criteria for highly effective performance set out in Section III.A.2.d. This entails presenting documentation of Superior reviews in at least two of the sections described in Section III.A.1.a, b, and c (student evaluations, peer evaluations and chair classroom visitations evaluations). Tenure and promotions on the basis of exceptionality will require same standards or above as mentioned in the contracts.

3. Evaluation of non-teaching primary duties.

If the faculty member has been assigned primary duties other than teaching/instruction that account for less than one third of that faculty member's assigned work load for the period under evaluation, those duties should be included in the research/creative activities and/or service section of the faculty evaluation.

If the faculty member has been assigned non-teaching duties, like additional cues, then Significant documentation of re-assigned time activities should be included to determine performance and completion of duties.

4. Method of evaluation

a) Effective fall 2013, each employee who teaches a course or other Instructional activity shall ensure that all of his/her students have the opportunity to evaluate her/his teaching effectiveness using an electronic evaluation form in accordance with methods and procedures specified in the approved statement of Departmental Application of Criteria. All official student evaluations remain the property of the University. The faculty member will provide a detailed synopsis of the scores received in all courses evaluated during the period of evaluation, including means of all scale items.

b) The department chair will conduct at least one classroom visitation to a class of the faculty member being evaluated during the period of evaluation. The class (or classes) will be mutually agreed on by the faculty member and the Chair. The Chair will provide a written report of the visit, a copy of which will be included in the portfolio by the faculty member. The Chair will rate the performance of the faculty member unsatisfactory, appropriate, satisfactory, highly satisfactory, effective, highly effective, significant, superior, or exceptional.

c) During the period under review, at least two of the faculty member's classes will be visited by members of the DPC, one to be chosen by the faculty member and one to be chosen by the Chair of the DPC. Each visit will be mutually agreed to by the faculty

member and the DPC member. The evaluator will rate the performance of the faculty member unsatisfactory, satisfactory, effective, highly effective, significant or superior. The evaluator will provide the faculty member with a written copy of the evaluation, a copy of which the faculty member will include in the portfolio.

The faculty member will have the option of drawing attention to the supporting material in the portfolio as described in Section 3; A, 1: d, of this document. The material would include, but not be limited to, evidence of innovative teaching, new course development, and introduction of new course materials and/or assistance to other faculty members in teaching improvement. The DPC would have the option of reviewing this material and assigning a score equal to one peer class visit. This would supplement required class visits, not replace them. If the DPC decided to provide an evaluation of the material, it would provide a written report and a score on the same scale as class visits.

d) Methods of Evaluations.

The faculty member will include in the portfolio a numeric analysis for each of the areas described in Section III.A.4.a, b and c (Student course evaluations, Chair evaluation(s), and Peer evaluations). Scoring each as follows:

(Descriptive Rating, Numeric Score): (Exceptional, 4.75 – 5.0), (Superior, 4.35 – 4.74), (Significant, 4.0 – 4.34), (Highly Effective 3.75 – 3.99), (Effective, 3.50 – 3.74), (Highly Satisfactory, 3.25 – 3.49), (Satisfactory, 3.0 – 3.24), (Appropriate, 2.75 – 2.99), (Unsatisfactory, >2.74).

The faculty member will include in his/her portfolio a mean score for each category, including all of the evaluations received in that category during the period of evaluation. Two out of the three scores will be used to meet the criteria listed in Section III.A.2.a thru f.

Table 3: Descriptive Rating and Scores

Descriptive Rating	Mean of Student Course Evaluation Score	Mean of Chair Evaluation Score	Mean of Peer Evaluation Score
Exceptional	4.75 – 5.00	4.75 - 5.00	4.75 – 5.00
Superior	4.35 – 4.74	4.35 – 4.74	4.35 – 4.74
Significant	4.0 - 4.34	4.0 - 4.34	4.0 - 4.34
Highly Effective	3.75 - 3.99	3.75 - 3.99	3.75 - 3.99
Effective	3.50 – 3.74	3.50 - 3.74	3.50 - 3.74
Highly Satisfactory	3.25 – 3.49	3.25 – 3.49	3.25 – 3.49
Satisfactory	3.0 - 3.24	3.0 - 3.24	3.0 - 3.24
Appropriate	2.75 - 2.99	2.75 – 2.99	2.75 - 2.99
Unsatisfactory	<2.74	<2.74	<2.74

B.   Research/Creative Activities

The performance of faculty members in the area of Research/Creative Activities will be measured in four parts:

a.)   Refereed publications, presentations, and peer reviewed funded grant;
b.)   Non-refereed publications and presentations and non-peer reviewed funded grant writing;
c.)   Continuing education/faculty development;
d.)   Professional involvement in research and creative activities.

For the purpose of this document, and the corresponding charts contained within, research activities are denoted by "R". The following categories and materials to be evaluated that are referenced in this document are examples and are not intended to serve as an exhaustive listing.

Table 4: Research / Creative

Research / Creative Activity Categories (R)	Specific Activities to be Evaluated
(A) Refereed activities	1. Book or monograph. 2. Journal article or book chapter. 3. Funded grant. 4. Article / abstract in conference proceeding.
(B) Non-Refereed activities	1. Journal article or book chapter. 2. Funded grant. 3. Article / abstract in conference proceeding.
(C) Professional development / continuing education	1. Advanced degree or certification in the faculty member's discipline at an accredited university. 2. Continuing education courses and programs offered through professional organizations or other universities. 3. Seminars and presentations sponsored by the University. 4. Seminars and presentations, trade shows within the field; outside of the University. 5. Consulting activities which increase the faculty member's knowledge of the field.
(D) Professional involvement in research / creative activities	1. Reviewer, discussant, editor, session chair or panel moderator for professional conferences, symposia, journals or proceedings. 2. Student research training and development.
(E) Citations of faculty member's work.	Citations of faculty member's work.
(F) Research in progress.	Unpublished research, research in progress, or other work that substantiates significant scholarly effort and progress

Each of these is considered to be of equal weight in annual retention reviews, but Part 1 will be considered separately for promotion, tenure, and PAI reviews.

1. Refereed Publications and Presentations and peer reviewed funded grant:

This area would include only those writings, presentations, software and other faculty product that has been through a peer review process. Peer review is the quality control process for academic product. The form of peer review differs from field to field and even each journal or conference. Peer review, as stated here means that the work has been examined by colleagues at other institutions and has been deemed of high enough quality for inclusion in the venue. Books, monographs and book chapters will be considered refereed if they are accepted by a university press or by a reputable publisher who uses outside reviewers and consultants. Since an earned doctorate is a requirement for promotion and tenure, dissertations will not be counted as publications unless they are reprinted by a reputable publisher. Self publication and "vanity" presses will not count in this area.

Peer reviewed funded grants for which the faculty member is the primary investigator will be awarded 75 points, and those for which the faculty member is a participant, but not the primary investigator will be awarded 50 points. If the grant supports research which leads to publications, those publications are eligible for points in section III, B-1 if the publication is refereed or in III, B-2 if the publication is not refereed.

2. Non-refereed Presentations, Publishing and non-peer reviewed funded grant Internal Writing:

This area includes papers and presentations directly related to the field in which the faculty member teaches. This would include articles in the general press, presentations to professional groups, articles in the trade press and any other published work, distributed software or public presentation directly related to the faculty member's field. The DPC will consider the relationship of the presentation or publication to the faculty member's area in considering items for this category. This category would also include papers under review, or in progress that can be reviewed by the DPC. The DPC would accept or reject items for consideration based on quality and on the relationship to the faculty member's field. This area would also include presentations made for faculty development sessions. Book reviews and Grant requests could also be considered in this section. The DPC will award between 5 and 15 points for each non-refereed publication/presentation/ software.

Non-peer reviewed funded grants for which the faculty member is the primary investigator will be awarded 50 points, and those for which the faculty member is a participant, but not the primary investigator will be awarded 30 points. If the grant supports research which leads to publications, those publications are eligible for points in section III, B-1 if the publication is refereed or in III, B-2 if the publication is not refereed.

3. Continuing Education/Faculty Development:

This area would include activities in which the faculty member has taken part, which improve, broaden or update the professional knowledge or teaching skills of the faculty

member. Points will be awarded. Please refer to the table. There will be maximum of 50 points could be awarded in this area. This area would include, but not be limited to:

- Graduate level classes in the faculty member's discipline at an accredited university.
- Continuing education courses and programs offered through professional organizations or other universities.
- Seminars and presentations sponsored by the University.
- Seminars, presentations, trade shows within the field; outside of the University
- Consulting activities which increase the faculty member's knowledge of the field.

Since the activities described above are of vastly different length, the DPC should assign weights to each activity based on the number of contact hours. The faculty member will be credited with one point for each contact hour. (Graduate courses completed will carry 10 points per credit hour.) Consulting activities will be awarded 1 point for each day, to a maximum of ten points.

4. Professional Involvement in Research and Creative Activities:

This area would include acting as a reviewer, discussant, editor, session chair or panel moderator for professional conferences, symposia, journals or proceedings (or similar functions). The DPC will review the activity for relevance to the faculty member's field and for level of involvement. Generally, the faculty member would be awarded 5 points for each conference and/or journal for which he/she reviews, 5 points for each conference at which he/she is a reviewer, moderator or session chair and 30 points for each journal and/or proceedings of which he/she is an editor or coeditor.

List of research activities and their weights:

Book or Monograph	125 points
Advanced degree or Certification in Related Area	100 points
Journal article	65 points
Journal article	65 points
Book Chapter	65 Points
Conference Proceedings & Presentation	60 points
Conference Presentation (no proceedings)	30 points
Conference Proceedings (no Presentation)	30 points
Membership in Professional Organization	30 points
Lecture at Community Development Forum	20 points
Attending Developmental Workshops	20 points
Serving on Professional or NFP Board/Commission	20 points
Research in Progress	20 points

The points listed above are for the refereed publications. Non-refereed publications

weight half the points assigned to the refereed publications.

Table 5 REQUIRED SCORES FOR PERSONNEL ACTIONS:

Category	Retention	Tenure / Promotion
Appropriate	Proof of Active Agenda	
Satisfactory	30 pts	
Highly Satisfactory	50 pts	
Effective	75 pts	
Highly Effective	100 pts & one Journal Article	100 pts **at least** 60 from III,B-1 & one Journal Article
Significant	125 pts & one Journal Article	125 pts **at least** 90 from III,B-1 & one Journal Article
Superior	175 pts & one Journal Article	175 pts **at least** 125 from III,B-1 & one Journal Article
Exceptional		50% points extra of the required category and one additional Journal Article

Category	PAI
Significant	125 pts **at least** 75 from III,B-1
Superior	175 pts **at least** 125 from III,B-1

C.   Service

The application of one's skills and knowledge in unpaid or volunteer capacity, to the betterment of the University and society is much desired, and is encouraged, as it is a vital element of the institution's mission. Membership on a committee or task force, attendance at Department, College, or University meetings – while a necessary condition of service.

For the purpose of this document, and the corresponding table contained within, service activities are denoted by "S". The following categories and materials to be evaluated that are referenced in this document are examples and are not intended to serve as an exhaustive listing.

a. Relative Importance of Service Activities

Service activity at the department and college levels is deemed to be most important, followed by service at the university level; these are all deemed to be 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

b. Evaluation and Ratings of Service Activities

In general, an activity for which a faculty member receives credit in area of the evaluation is for non-compensated activity. The completed and documented activities shall result in the following ratings as indicated in Table 9, below.

1. Documentation

    The faculty member must provide documentation of his/her activities in this area. Membership on a committee or task force and attendance at meetings, while a necessary condition of service, are not evidence of service performance. Documentation required for this area would include, but not be limited to:

    a. Minutes including descriptions of the faculty member's participation/ contribution.
    b. Reports and other written material developed/authored by the faculty member. When co-authorship is involved, the level of contribution by each participant (especially the faculty member being evaluated) should be described.
    c. Evaluation of service participation by committee chairs, department chairs and/or other administrators.
    d. Copies of letters thanking the faculty member for participation, other than form letters sent to all attendees.

2. Types of Activities

    a. Service to the department, college and/or University on committees, task forces, boards etc. Service as a academic advisor, assessment coordinator, coordinator, etc. Participation in pre-college initiatives, alumni relations, community outreach, and/or initiatives to build relationships with the business community.
    b. Advisor/moderator of student organizations.
    c. Advisor/evaluator for BOG program and UWW.
    d. Service to the profession; through participation in professional organizations, including but not limited to, active participation as member on boards and committees, session chair at conferences, etc.
    e. Service to the community, involving professional skills.

3. Evaluation

    a. To be considered appropriate, the faculty member must present evidence of active participation in at least one departmental, college or University service assignments.

b. To be considered satisfactory, the faculty member must present evidence of active participation in at least two departmental, college or University service assignments.

c. To be considered highly satisfactory, the faculty member must present evidence of active participation in more than two departmental, college or University service assignments.

d. To be considered effective, the faculty member must present evidence of service activity at a level exceeding that required for highly satisfactory. Active participation in more than two service assignments, position(s) of leadership, evidence of work output and/or other indications of quality service should be included in the documentation.

e. To be considered highly effective, the faculty member must present evidence of service activity at a level exceeding that required for effective. Active participation in more than three service assignments, position(s) of leadership, evidence of work output and/or other indications of quality service should be included in the documentation.

f. To be considered significant, the faculty member must present evidence of service beyond that required for highly effective. This would include evidence of leadership/officer positions in service activities and/or evidence of work output/results from service activities. The level of participation in work output should be included in documentation.

a. To be considered superior, the faculty member must present evidence of service beyond that required for significant. This would include major positions of leadership in service assignments, major work product/results from service activities, evidence of assistance to other faculty members in their conduct of service assignments, awards or other recognition for excellence in service, innovations in service etc.

b. To be considered exceptional, the faculty member must present evidence of service beyond that required for superior. This would include major positions of leadership /office in national or international organizations / associations in service assignments, major work product/results from service activities national or international organizations / associations, evidence of assistance to other faculty members in their conduct of service assignments, awards or other recognition for excellence in service, innovations in service etc.

IV. EVALUATION OF TEMPORARY, FULL-TIME FACULTY

Each temporary full time faculty member will be evaluated by the Department Chair once each academic year in accordance with Article 30 Section 1 of the contract. The Chair will provide a written evaluation of the faculty member, which will rate the performance of the faculty member as "highly effective, satisfactory or unsatisfactory." A copy of the evaluation will be sent to the faculty member being evaluated. In the case of an unsatisfactory evaluation, the chair will state reasons for awarding that evaluation, referencing appropriate sections of this section of the Departmental Application of Criteria. No faculty member will be evaluated during the first full term of service in the department.

All full time temporary faculty will submit a portfolio including the following:

1. A cover letter stating that the portfolio is being submitted for the purposes of the annual evaluation.

2. A copy of the faculty member's year long schedule.

3. Copies of student evaluations.

4. Copies of chair classroom visits and peer/ DPC member classroom visits.

5. Evidence of performance of activities for which the faculty member received CUEs. (Primary Duties)

6. Other documents, at the option of the faculty member being evaluated, that give evidence of activities performed by the faculty member benefiting the department, the college and the University and of the quality of those activities.

The Department Chair will evaluate one class of each full time temporary faculty member, each year. The class being evaluated will be selected jointly by the faculty member and the chair. The Chair will provide a written evaluation of the classroom visit to the faculty member being evaluated. The chair will evaluate the performance of the faculty member as "highly effective," "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory."

The approved form for student evaluation of classes will be administered in all of an instructor's students each academic term, according to the procedures approved by the department faculty. The faculty member will provide a detailed synopsis of the scores received in all courses evaluated during the period of evaluation, including means of all scale items.

In evaluating the student evaluations provided by the faculty member being evaluated, the chair will use the following scale:

Table 6: Unit B Faculty Ratings Based on Classroom Evaluations

Descriptive Rating	Mean of Course Evaluation (Student, Peer or Chair)
Highly Effective	> 4.25
Satisfactory	3.25 – 4.25
Unsatisfactory	< 3.25

Instrument for student evaluations is now online which will be used across the board.

In most cases, the chair will use two elements to determine an over-all rating of the faculty member. Those would be the student course evaluations, the chair classroom evaluations. If the faculty member produces evidence of "highly effective" performance in both of the areas, the chair will assign a rating of "highly effective." If the faculty member being evaluated produces evidence of "unsatisfactory" performance in both areas, the chair will assign a rating of "unsatisfactory." In cases in which the above conditions are not met, the chair will assign a rating of satisfactory.

In rare situations in which material presented by the faculty member describing non-teaching primary duties (Section 6 of the material to be included in the portfolio), material presented by the faculty member presented showing other activities (Section 7) or included in the faculty member's personnel file are of such a major consequence that the chair believes these should be given major weight, the chair can include these in the evaluation of the faculty member and assign a rating not consistent with the process described above (student, chair, faculty course evaluations). The chair cannot use these materials exclusively without taking into regard the three areas of evaluation described above. If the chair uses any material other than the three evaluations described above, the chair must describe how these materials were used, what weight they were given in the evaluation process and the source of those materials. The faculty member being evaluated must have been notified prior to the evaluation of any negative material in his/her personnel file and given a chance to rebut the material, if this material is used in an evaluation.

ATTACHMENT #1

FACULTY AGREEMENT REQUIREMENTS FOR PERSONAL ACTIONS
TEACHING COMPONENT

RETENTION YEAR:	CRITERIA		PROMOTION TO:	CRITERIA
1	Satisfactory		Assistant	Highly Effective
2	Satisfactory		Associate	Superior
3	Effective		Full	Superior
4	Highly Effective		Tenure:	Superior
5	Significant		PAI	Superior

RESEARCH COMPONENT

RETENTION YEAR:	CRITERIA		PROMOTION TO:	CRITERIA
1	Appropriate		Assistant	Satisfactory
2	Satisfactory		Associate	Significant
3	Highly Satisfactory		Full	Superior
4	Effective		Tenure	Significant
5	Highly Effective		PAI	* See note

SERVICE COMPONENT

RETENTION YEAR:	CRITERIA		PROMOTION TO:	CRITERIA
1	Appropriate		Assistant	Satisfactory
2	Satisfactory		Associate	Significant
3	Highly Satisfactory		Full	Superior
4	Effective		Tenure	Significant
5	Highly Effective		PAI	* See note

* Criteria for PAI in Research & Service: Significant in Research and Superior in Service OR Superior in Research and Significant in Service.

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION SUMMARY FORM

Faculty Member Being Evaluated: _____

Nature of Evaluation: [ ] Retention   [ ] Tenure

                          [ ] PAI   [ ] Promotion to rank of _____

Evaluation Questions	Rating
The instructor has a command of the subject matter or discipline. 5 - Strongly Agree 4 - Agree 3 - Somewhat Agree 2 - Disagree 1 - Strongly Disagree	
The instructor was effective at organizing, analyzing, and presenting the knowledge or material. 5 - Strongly Agree 4 - Agree 3 - Somewhat Agree 2 - Disagree 1 - Strongly Disagree	
The instructor was effective at encouraging and engaging students in the learning process. 5 - Strongly Agree 4 - Agree 3 - Somewhat Agree 2 - Disagree 1 - Strongly Disagree	
The instructor communicates well, with a proficient command of the English language. 5 - Strongly Agree 4 - Agree 3 - Somewhat Agree 2 - Disagree 1 - Strongly Disagree	
Overall, this instructor demonstrated teaching effectiveness. 5 - Strongly Agree 4 - Agree 3 - Somewhat Agree 2 - Disagree 1 - Strongly Disagree	

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Evaluator's Signature: _____   Date: _____

Peer [ ]   Chair [ ]

Appendix B

September 2018 – August 2022

MANAGEMENT, MARKETING, MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEPARTMENT

APPLICATION OF CRITERIA
TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

REASSIGNED TIME ACTIVITY EVALUATION FORM

FACULTY MEMBER EVALUATED_____ DATE_____

NATURE OF EVALUATION: _____ RETENTION_____TENUTRE

_____PAI   _____ Promotion to the Rank of: _____

Activity_____

Overall Evaluation (Circle One):

Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Highly Effective	Superior
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

Activity_____

Overall Evaluation (Circle One):

Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Highly Effective	Superior
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

Activity_____

Overall Evaluation (Circle One):

Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Highly Effective	Superior
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

Appendix C

Chicago State University

Faculty Development Plan

Academic Year _____

NAME _____ TITLE _____

The form below is designed to represent a faculty member's plan for professional development in his or her work at Chicago State University.

Criteria (as applicable)	Goal for the Year	Resources Needed to Attain Goal	Vehicles to Accomplish by the End of the Year
Teaching (as applicable)			
Other Primary Duties (specify)			
Research/Creative Activity			
Service Department Level College Level University Level			

_____

Employee   Date

_____

Chairperson/Program Director   Date

_____

Dean   Date

**Department of Management, Marketing and Management Information Systems (MMIS)
Distances Education Policy**

Department Distance Education Policy for web-based courses and hybrid courses.

General Definitions

Center for Teaching and Research Excellence (CTRE) – when used throughout this document, the term shall mean the unit within Chicago State University's Library Instruction Services that is consists of faculty development, online learning, and academic advising.

Distance Education Policy – when used throughout this document, the term shall mean the document that communicates the course of action and procedures adopted by the Chicago State University Department of MMIS (i.e., hybrid and Internet) course offerings and that provides a faculty guide for developing and implementing distance education courses.

Online Certification Training (OCT) – when used throughout this document, the term shall mean the six-week online certification course designed to train faculty members interested in online course instruction regarding preparation of online course instructional design, preparation of content and course materials for an online environment, and understanding national best practices for online course development and facilitation.

Hybrid Course – when used throughout this document, the term shall mean any course facilitated with the use of the University's course management system (CMS) where students and instructors are required to actively engage in completing various components of the course and consists of regularly scheduled on-campus class sessions.

Online Course – when used throughout this document, the term shall mean any course facilitated entirely with the use of the University's course management system (CMS) where students and instructors are required to actively engage in completing various components of the course via asynchronous instructional methods where students and instructors are not required to be available at specific times or in specific locations and/or predetermined synchronous instructional methods.

1. **COURSES IN A CURRICULUM TO BE OFFERED VIA THE WEB**

   Any course to be offered online within the department's curriculum will need to be first approved by the department's curriculum committee.

2. **THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF DISTANCE EDUCATION COURSES (OFFERED BY CSU AND/OR TRANSFERRED TO CSU) THAT A STUDENT MAY APPLY TOWARD A DEGREE**

   The number of online courses a student may apply towards his/her degree depends on

department, college and IBHE guidelines.

3. THE NUMBER OF DISTANCE EDUCATION COURSES A FACULTY MEMBER MAY TEACH PER TERM

Faculty members need to be present and active on campus regardless of the format of the courses they teach. There is no limit to the number of online/hybrid courses a faculty member may teach each semester.

4. CRITERIA FOR DEPARTMENT APPROVAL PROCESS OF COURSES AND CURRICULUM WHEN APPROVING

The department will determine which MMMIS courses are offered within the CSU distance education program.

a. As part of the ongoing curriculum assessment, the chairperson of the department shall collaborate with faculty on identifying courses in the curriculum that can be offered within the distance education program.

b. Faculty who demonstrate the technical ability and expertise to teach such courses will be asked to submit a proposal for the distance education course to the chairperson and department faculty. To offer a distance education course, departmental curriculum approval, college curriculum approval, and college administrative approval are required.

c. The faculty member who developed the distance education course will be given first preference for teaching the course he/she developed. If an online course has been previously developed but will be taught by another instructor, the new instructor will receive 1-3 CUEs based on the amount of work needed to revise the course. The number of CUEs will need to be agreed upon by the instructor that will be teaching the course, the instructor's Chairperson, and the Provost.

5. METHOD FOR EVALUATING INTERNET COURSES AND CURRICULUM

The Department will evaluate the effectiveness of a Distance Education course by the use of two groups of evaluators.

a. The Department Personnel Committee shall assess the quality and currency of the materials. The course materials should contain a syllabus summarizing information concerning the objectives, operation, and management of the course.

b. Enrolled students shall assess the effectiveness of the course offerings, materials and the timely responses of the instructor and support staff. A student assessment form shall be developed which will provide effective evaluation of the use of the instruction medium by the instructor.

6. **PROCESS FOR SELECTING FACULTY TO TEACH INTERNET COURSES**

Faculty assigned to teach on-line distance education courses must either complete the On-line Certification Training offered by Center for Teaching and Research (CTRE) or they had obtained an equivalent certificate from an external institution. This certificate will also be required for faculty proposing the development of a distance-learning course. Faculty are selected to teach based on area of expertise and proficiency in distance education instruction

7. **CONSIDERATIONS OF ONLINE INSTRUCTION FOR THE RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE AWARD PROCESSES**

Courses taught in an online or hybrid format carry the same consideration as any traditionally offered course.