DEPARTMENT APPLICATION CRITERIA (DAC) FOR HEALTH INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION (HIA)

Effective July 1, 2021

Table of Contents

Preamble
The purpose of this document is to provide guidelines for identifying the areas of strength and weakness of all faculty employees and to improve their performance where required. The core elements contained in the evaluative measures of the faculty performance are. organized into the following eight broad sections:

A. Establishment and Membership of the Personnel Committee
B. Conditions for Employment
C. Teaching/Primary Duties
D. Research/Creative Activities
E. Service
F. Post Tenure Review
G. Criteria for Promotion
H. Unit B Faculty

Each section identifies the categories of accepted materials and activities, their relative importance, and methods of evaluation.

A. MEMBERSHIP OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION (HIA) DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL COMMITTEE(DPC)

The Department of HIA currently has an administrative program director and one Unit B lecturer. According to the CSU-UPI contract, Unit B faculties are not qualified to vote on personnel action and they are not qualified to evaluate their peer's classroom teaching effectiveness.

The Department of HIA, as a practical matter, will have to utilize tenure/tenure track faculty (a minimum of two) from the other College of Health Science departments to serve as peer reviewers for the Unit B Lecturer and any future tenure track faculty. Unit B faculties will be evaluated by the Department of HIA Program Director and forwarded to Dean of the College of Health Sciences for Approval.

Establishment of Evaluation Criteria
The Department of HIA Personnel Committee will evaluate the faculty being reviewed using the following materials: supporting materials, and materials in the employee's personnel file except confidential materials submitted in connection with the employee's initial appointment. All parties who are required to review the faculty's portfolio may seek clarification or additional materials from the faculty.

Responsibilities of the Chair of the Personnel Committee

The chair of the Department of HIA, Departmental Personnel Committee will be elected by the members of the Committee. The chair will schedule a meeting of the Committee to evaluate members of bargaining Unit A according to the schedule published by the university. The chair of the Committee may accept proxy votes prior to this meeting. The chair will designate a member of the Committee to submit a written report of their deliberation and recommendations for each faculty who is evaluated. The Committee will submit a copy of this recommendation to the academic department chair and a copy to the faculty within the time limits established by the university.

Responsibilities of the Faculty Members Being Evaluated

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

1. A current signed and dated curriculum vitae.
2. Evidence of academic and current professional credentials.
3. Documentation of original materials representative of the following categories: Teaching/Primary Duties, Research/Creative Activity, and Service.
4. Current yearlong assignments for the period of evaluation.
5. Signed professional development plan by faculty and department chair.

Chicago State University and UPI Local 4100 Unit A and Unit B contract Section19.3a (2)(a) states: "the evaluation period for retention shall be the period since the beginning of the employee's last evaluation for retention, with the exception that employees in their second year of employment in the bargaining unit shall have their entire period of employment evaluated. In tenure evaluations, the performance standards will be used to judge whether an employee's performance has reached the required degree of effectiveness by the end of the evaluation period."

B. CONDITIONS FOR CONTINUING EMPLOYMENT

(Required for all appointment categories- Unit A: Tenured, Tenure track, Clinical/Research Faculty and Unit B: Lecturers)

	Activity	Example(s) of Evidence or Documentation to Submit in the Portfolio
1	On-line Ethics training – State requirement	Printout of certificate of completion
2	Attendance of regular department meetings and mandatory department meetings to meet program accreditation expectations	Page of meeting minutes showing attendance
3	Attendance of College meetings (College Assembly and Annual Retreat)	Page of meeting minutes showing attendance
4	American Health Information Management Association (AHIMA) certification	RHIA certification-initial & RHIA certification-maintenance-cycle
5	Educational Qualification: Earned doctorate degree in the health sciences or in a related field. For Unit B faculty a minimum of a master's degree is required.	Academic transcript or degree certificate

Documentation must be provided in the portfolio to demonstrate compliance with the above criteria as evidence in the annual evaluation process in order for the portfolio be considered complete.

For both Unit A (tenured, tenured track and clinical faculty) and B faculty members, teaching is considered the primary duty and most important of the three domains of evaluation. Research/creative activity and service are considered of equal importance. Research faculty can select either service or teaching as their area of evaluation. The materials and activities listed in this document are only illustrative of the types of materials and activities, which may be included. The lists are not intended to be all-inclusive.

Personnel Actions and Expectations in Teaching/Primary Duties, Research/Creative and Service

The categories of evaluation of Unit A (tenured, tenure track, clinical and research) faculty and the minimum level of performance expectation are shown in the table below:

Personnel Action*	Teaching/Primary Duties	Research/Creative Activity	Service
1st Year Retention	Satisfactory	Appropriate	Appropriate
CF Reappointment	Satisfactory	Appropriate	Appropriate
RF Reappointment	Highly Effective	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
2nd Year Retention	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
CF Reappointment	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
RF Reappointment	Highly Effective	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
3rd year Retention	Effective	Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory
CF Reappointment	Effective	Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory
RF Reappointment	Highly Effective	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
4th Year Retention	Highly Effective	Effective	Effective
CF Reappointment-Annual	Highly Effective	Effective	Effective
RF Reappointment	Significant	Significant	Significant
5th Year Retention	Significant	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
CF Reappointment	Significant	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
RF Reappointment	Significant	Significant	Significant
6th Year Tenure	Superior	Significant	Significant
6th Year & Beyond			
CF Annual reappointment	Effective	Effective	Effective
CF 3-year reappointment	Superior	Significant	Significant
CF 3-year reappointment maintained	Highly Effective	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
RF Annual reappointments	Significant	Significant	Significant
Post Tenure Review	Adequate/Exemplary	Adequate/Exemplary	Adequate/Exemplary
Professional Advancement Increase	Superior	Superior	Superior
Promotion to Assistant Professor			
TF/TTF	Highly Effective	Highly Effective	Satisfactory
CF	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
RF	Highly Effective	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
Promotion to Associate Professor			
TF/TTF	Superior	Significant	Significant
CF	Superior	Significant	Superior
RF	Significant	Significant	Significant
Promotion to Full Professor			
TF/TTF	Superior	Superior	Superior
CF	Superior	Superior	Superior
RF	Superior	Superior	Significant

*TF = Tenured Faculty
TTF = Tenured Track Faculty
CF = Clinical Faculty
RF = Research Faculty

C. TEACHING/ PRIMARY DUTIES

Teaching is the most important of all performance areas and it applies to both Unit A and Unit B faculty.

DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTIVITIES NEEDED FOR TEACHING/ PRIMARY DUTIES

1. Evaluations of Teaching Performance

i. Chairperson reports of class visitation (One per academic year)
The chairperson will evaluate the teaching effectiveness of the faculty in the classroom setting and provide a copy to the faculty. All completed course visitation forms completed by the chair will be included in the portfolio.

ii. Peer reports of class visitation (during the fall and spring semesters)
Faculty is expected to invite one tenured or tenure track faculty from his/her department or other departments from the College of Health Sciences to observe a class at least once *each* semester. The faculty may not be reviewed by the same peer for two consecutive semesters. The peer evaluators shall complete a written evaluation of the class visitations on the appropriate form. The evaluation shall be submitted to the chairperson of the department with a copy to the faculty.

iii. Summary of student evaluations
Students have a 100% opportunity to evaluate their instructors via the internet. The validity of which is predicated on the majority of the students participating in the online evaluation. Faculty are expected to submit a summary of student course evaluations and comments from courses taught each academic year and include at least one course in each semester in which courses are taught. Only summaries and student comments (not computer printouts) should be included in the Faculty's portfolio. Summaries shall be reviewed and signed by the department chair.
The faculty member, if he/she feels a response to negative evaluations, can write such as response and have it included in the portfolio under review.

The HIA Department goal is that student class evaluations of the instructor will be a minimum of 4 out of 5 points overall on a five-point Likert Scale with 5 as the highest score.

2. Teaching Materials

i. Syllabi (required from all courses taught on campus and online)

Faculty is expected to provide copies of course syllabi and course schedules for all courses taught during the evaluation period.

Each syllabus must include Course Number and Title, Co- or Pre-requisites, Instructor contact information, textbook/lab purchases required, AHIMA HIM entry-level curriculum competencies related to each course or a table that defines which competencies are seen in each course, Course Objectives, Course Schedule and Evaluation Methods including a weighted scale if points or percentages are used for grading.

ii. Original supplemental materials, examinations, and/or assignments (Samples are required from all courses taught)

Evidence should include original materials for courses taught during the evaluation period. Faculty shall provide a representative sample of materials (2-3) for each course taught that demonstrate a variety of learning activities. Materials that are the outcome of team collaboration should be clearly designated as such.

iii. Evidence of course revisions and/or development

(If completed during the period of review)
Content of syllabi or other course materials that the faculty member revised or developed during the evaluation period should be clearly indicated. The Faculty should indicate what he/she based the revisions on (examples not limited to changes in the professional information covered in the course, assessment data, student feedback, or other sources of information).

iv. Teaching Awards (Relevant only if awarded during the evaluation period)

3. Faculty Development Plan

The faculty development plan must include goals to improve the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. Faculty development plans may address the accreditation standards of the discipline and should be consistent with the University and program's strategic plan. The plan must be approved at the beginning of the academic year by the department chairperson. Faculty development plan/experiences should:

1. Support-teaching assignments and professional development
2. Demonstrate attendance at continuing education specific to teaching/learning
3. Show evidence of progress toward attaining goals stated at the beginning of the academic year.

Faculty are expected to provide evidence/documentation of activities related to enhancement of knowledge and skills pertaining to effective teaching performance and maintenance of current information and clinical skills in areas of practice related to assigned duties. This evidence must include but is not limited to evidence of progress on goals described in the faculty development plan related to teaching, participation in lectures, professional workshops, academic conferences, institutes and seminars, certification of completion or enrollment in courses related to professional development. The faculty's narrative for teaching should include a description of progress toward meeting the goals on previous faculty development plans.

4. Evaluation of Clinical Courses or Fieldwork Supervision, if applicable
Faculty should provide student evaluations of clinical courses or fieldwork supervision conducted during the evaluation period, if applicable.

5. Performance of Other Assigned Primary Duties
Other primary duties may include professional and/or pre-professional student advisement (this duty may be eliminated if the University changes to the professional advisor model), departmental program assessment, fieldwork supervision, fieldwork site development and other assigned duties for which Credit Unit Equivalent (CUE) workloads are assigned. The faculty must provide evidence of CUEs awarded for other primary duties and evidence of performance of these duties. If a faculty member receives CUEs for research or mentoring a student research project, appropriate documentation for these primary duties should be provided in the teaching/primary duties section. Any products resulting from this (such as presentations, publications, etc.) should be reported in the research/creative activities domain.

Evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness is based on a variety of activities as described above. The expected activities and corresponding samples of evidence of performance to be included in the portfolio for each activity are presented below:

Activities	Items	Example(s) of Evidence or Documentation to Submit in the Portfolio
Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness	Chair's Evaluation	Chair's classroom evaluation form target goal is a minimum rating of 4 out of 5 on a 5- point Likert Scale. One evaluation per year. Narrative on the faculty members co-curricular roles
	Peer's Evaluation	Two classroom evaluation forms by tenured or tenured track peers during the fall and spring semesters. Peer's classroom evaluation form target goal is a ranking of 4 out of 5 on a 5-point Likert Scale.
	Student's Evaluation	Summary of the printout from the online student's evaluation in the courses taught. Accuracy of the narrative must be reviewed and endorsed by the chair. Students' classroom evaluation form target goal is a ranking of 4 out of 5 on a 5-point Likert Scale.

Activities	Items	Example(s) of Evidence or Documentation to Submit in the Portfolio
Teaching Materials	Evidence of Course Revision	New syllabus highlighted to show information added
	Supplemental Materials	Samples of updated supplemental materials developed to foster student learning and demonstrate current knowledge of course content
	Development of a New Course	Syllabus of the new course developed
Teaching Award	Award Recognition	Award letter or photograph of the plaque presented
Innovation in Teaching and use of Advanced Technology	Narrative on strategies adopted to enhance student learning in selected courses taught by the faculty during the evaluation period	Faculty must submit a write up and samples of evidence in the portfolio on how they use technology in the classroom to enhance student learning during the evaluation period. In addition, the faculty must discuss teaching methods used in selected courses and present his/her assessment of the effectiveness of the teaching methods (assessment of student learning outcomes). For example, the faculty may present comparative pre-and-post test data, or present end of course standardized test results compared to norm (where available) may be used as evidence or use online assessment tools to assess student learning. The method used to assess student learning is the prerogative of the faculty.
Faculty Development	Development Plan	Approval of the faculty development plan for the academic year by the department chairperson
	Acquisition of new knowledge/clinical skills	Continuing Education Units (CEUs.) credits, Certificate of attendance of workshops, conferences, and seminars
Academic Advising	Applicable only to faculty advisors (this category will no longer be applicable if the University changes to the "Professional Advisor Model".	Advising logs or roster, correspondence with students
Other Assigned Duties	Tutoring to enhance retention/graduation rates	Description of the assistance provided to students with academic difficulties. Logs signed by the students may be used as evidence
	Program Assessment	Copy of the department program assessment report for the academic year
	Fieldwork Supervision	Log showing clinical/fieldwork visits—showing date, clinic and list of students supervised
	Clinical/Fieldwork Coordinator	Logs listing the number of new clinical site developed during the year highlighted on the comprehensive list of the department clinical/fieldwork sites and students rotation roster

METHODS OF EVALUATION OF TEACHING/PRIMARY DUTIES

All tenure-track, clinical faculty, research faculty, and Unit B lecturers will be evaluated with the same criteria for teaching. The teaching activities standards--Evaluations of Teaching Performance, Teaching Materials, Teaching Awards, Innovation, Faculty Development, Academic Advising and Other Assigned Duties-- have different weightings (score) attached to each as indicated in the table below. The effectiveness of the faculty's performance on the teaching/primary duties activities will be evaluated using the guidelines specified in the table below:

METHODS OF EVALUATION OF TEACHING/PRIMARY DUTIES			
Score	**Activities**	**Items**	**Scoring Guidelines**
10	Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness	Chairperson's Evaluation	Chair's classroom evaluation form (5 points). Use the 5-point Likert scale on the evaluation form for the overall score. During classroom visitation, the chair must evaluate the faculty's command of the subject matter, expertise, use of technology and ability to communicate effectively with students. Chair's classroom evaluation form target goal is a minimum rating of 4 out of 5 on a 5- point Likert Scale. The remaining 5 points will be based on the chair's assessment of the faculty member's overall co-curricular performance taking into consideration their willingness to accept assigned duties, multiple roles, and responsibilities in the department, going beyond the call of duty, accessibility and availability to students during the posted office hours.
5		Peer's Evaluation	Two classroom evaluation forms by tenured or tenured track peers. 2.5 points for each peer evaluator. Peers must comment on faculty's command of subject matter, expertise, use of technology and ability to communicate effectively with students, Peer's classroom evaluation form target goal is a ranking of 4 out of 5 on a 5-point Likert Scale.
5		Student's Evaluation	Summary of the print from the online student's evaluation in the courses taught. Must be reviewed and endorsed by the chair. Students' classroom evaluation form target goal is a ranking of 4 out of 5 on a 5-point Likert Scale.
2.5	Teaching Materials	Evidence of Course Revision	New syllabus highlighted to show information added
6		Supplemental Materials	Samples of supplemental materials developed to foster student learning
2		Development of a New Course	Grade the syllabus on a Likert scale from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent) taking into consideration the format (recently approved College format), appropriateness of the learning objectives, course contents, and cited references
1	Teaching Award	Award Recognition	College teaching award is 0.5 point and University/external award is 1 point.

METHODS OF EVALUATION OF TEACHING/PRIMARY DUTIES			
Score	**Activities**	**Items**	**Scoring Guidelines**
10	Innovation in Teaching and use of Advanced Technology	Narrative on the strategies used to enhance student learning in the various courses taught by the faculty	Faculty must discuss and include samples of evidence in the portfolio on how they use technology in the classroom to enhance student learning during the evaluation period (three points). Description of the teaching methods used in the course (three points). Assessment of the effectiveness of the teaching methods, i.e., assessment of student learning in the course (four points).
2.5	Faculty Development	Development plan for the academic year	Evaluate faculty development plan on a Likert scale from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent) for completeness, depth and breadth of the plan, support of the University and program strategic plans, ability to identify and address personal areas of academic weakness. Divide Likert scale score by two to obtain faculty development plan score.
5		Acquisition of knowledge or clinical skills	Submission of C.E.U credits, Certificate of attendance of workshops, conferences, and seminars. 10 contact hours = 5 points.
3	Other Assigned Duties (score comprised of only the other assigned duties applicable to the faculty being reviewed)	Tutoring	Review the depth and breadth of the logs provided. Number of students tutored and time spent with all the students
		Program Assessment	Evaluate the comprehensiveness of the program assessment report
		Professional Practice Experience (PPE) Coordinator	Review log of number of new clinical site developed, students' rotation rosters, site visits and/or contacts with sites.
		Academic Advising (this category will no longer be applicable if the University changes to the "Professional Advisor Model".	Advising logs or roster, copies of correspondence (including e-mail). Evaluate logs and supporting documents submitted on a Likert scale from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent) for number of students advised relative to the assigned CUEs, and quality of the positive feedback provided by students. Divide the Likert scale score by five to obtain advising score.
1 **(This is not a part of the 50 Points)**	Teaching Award*	Award Recognition	College teaching award is 0.5 point and University/external award is 1 point.
50**			

*Faculty may gain a maximum of one extra point for teaching award(s) received.
**Maximum regular possible score for Teaching/Primary Duties performance is 50.

Establishment of the Criteria for Teaching/Primary Duties

The faculty's total score will be obtained by summation of the scores obtained for the Evaluations of Teaching Performance, Teaching Materials, Innovation, Faculty Development, and Other Assigned Duties sub-scores. The total maximum possible score for Teaching/Primary Duties performance is 50. The faculty may attain an additional one point based upon receipt of a teaching award. Based on the faculty members total teaching/primary duties score, his/her level of performance (range from Satisfactory to Superior) will be ascertained from the table below:

Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching/Primary Duties	
Level of Performance	**Total Teaching/Primary Duties Score**
Acceptable (Necessary for retention in years one for tenure track and clinical and research faculty and lecturers) **19.3(2) a.1 list teaching as satisfactory,** **This is not listed a part of the grading rubrics for the portfolio document, p. 48-49 of Contract**	20-24
Satisfactory (Necessary for retention in years two for tenure track and clinical and research faculty and lecturers)	25-29
Highly Satisfactory (Necessary for retention in years two for tenure track and clinical and research faculty and lecturers)	
Effective (Necessary for retention in year three and for annual reappointment for clinical /research faculty in year 6 and beyond)	30-34
Highly Effective (Necessary for retention in year four for tenure track and clinical faculty and for extended contract for lecturers, promotion to assistant professor, or maintaining 3-year appointment for clinical faculty)	35-39
Significant (Necessary for retention in year 5 for tenure track and clinical faculty)	40-44
Superior (Necessary for tenure or eligibility for 3-year appointment for clinical faculty)	45-50

Exceptionality Criteria: An eligible faculty member may apply for consideration for tenure or promotion on the basis of exceptional performance based upon the relevant University evaluation described in Sections 19.a.(2)(a)a.6 or 7. (pp. 49-50 of Contract)

D. RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES
(Applies to Unit A -Tenured, Tenure Track, Clinical and Research Faculty)

CATEGORIES OF MATERIALS AND ACTIVITIES

Performance in the research/creative activities domain is evaluated at Category levels I and II and must be based on research work substantially done or completed at Chicago State University. Category II is judged to be more rigorous than Category I. The expected activities and corresponding samples of evidence of performance for each activity are presented below:

Category I (Lower Level of Performance)-Materials and Activities			
	Activities	**Items**	**Example(s) of Evidence or Documentation to Submit in the Portfolio**
1	Presentation	Non-peer reviewed professional conference	Letter of acceptance from the professional organization or a copy of the conference program
		Coordination and presenting at clinical specialty interest group	Letter of acceptance from the professional organization or a copy of the conference program
2	Publications	Publication of article in a non-peer reviewed journal	Copy of the publication from the periodical
		Submission of manuscript in a peer reviewed journal	Letter of acknowledgement of manuscript from the journal editor
3	Research	Research in progress	Copy of the research proposal (purpose, methodology, timeline for implementation) and IRB approval
		Chair of a student capstone project within the department	Cover and signature page of the student capstone project
		Mentorship of a student capstone project outside the department	Cover and signature page of the student capstone project
		Critical review of the literature in an area of interest	Copy of the literature review
		Co-PI on a multicenter research	Letter of invitation to participate in the research
4	Grants	Intramural grant award	Letter of award. Travel grants not considered
		Submission of a competitive external grant for funding	Letter of acknowledgement from the external grant agency, Institute or foundation
5	Others	Nomination on a national or regional committee to develop policies/guidelines for the profession	Letter of nomination from the professional organization. It is expected that faculty name will be listed on the publication that will emerge from this project.
		Advance training or course work in a University or Institute aimed at enhancing research/clinical skills	Letter from the partnering University or Institute
		Course work towards AHIMA specialty certifications	Copy of payment towards course work

Category II (Higher Level of Performance) -Materials and Activities			
	Activities	**Items**	**Example(s) of Evidence or Documentation to Submit in the Portfolio**
1	Presentation	Presentation at a peer reviewed national conference	Letter of acceptance from the professional organization or a copy of the conference program
		Keynote speaker or presenter at a national lecture series	Invitation letter to present at the lecture series
		Presentation of a workshop at a national conference	Letter of acceptance from the professional organization or a copy of the conference program
2	Publications	Author or co-author of a book or chapter in a book	Contract letter from a reputable publishing house. Books published by "vanity press" is not acceptable
		Author or co-author of manuscript in peer reviewed journal	Letter of acceptance from the journal editor. Manuscript cannot be counted again when it is published or in print
		Author or co-author of an assessment tool with reputable publisher	Contract letter from a reputable firm publishing the assessment tool
		Creation of a learning tool (i.e., games, computer programs, or videotapes)	Contract letter from a reputable firm publishing the learning tool
		Editor or co-Editor of a clinical specialty compendium or monograph	Contract letter from a reputable firm or professional organization publishing the compendium or monograph
		Copyright or patent of an instrument/tool	Certified copy of the copyright or patent certificate issued by the federal government
3	Grants	Submission of a competitive external grant with funding level score	Letter from the funding agency, Institute or Foundation including the reviewer's score
		Award of a competitive external grant	Letter of award from the funding agency, Institute or Foundation.
4	Others	Fellowship award in recognition of scholarly contribution to the professional literature	Certificate of the fellowship award
		Completion of an AHIMA specialty certification	Certificate of Board credentialing

METHODS OF EVALUATION OF RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Performance in the research/creative activities must be work that is completed while employed at CSU. All tenured, tenure-track, clinical and research faculty will be evaluated in the research/creative activity domain using the following key evaluative performance measures:

METHODS OF EVALUATION OF RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES			
	Performance Descriptor	**Tenure Track/Research Faculty Key Evaluative Performance Measures**	**Clinical Faculty Key Evaluative Performance Measures**
1	Appropriate (Year 1)	Articulation of research agenda with documentation and timeline of implementation	Articulation of research agenda with documentation and timeline of implementation
2	Satisfactory (Year 2)	One item from Category I	Articulation of research agenda with documentation and timeline of implementation and IRB approval
3	Highly Satisfactory (Year 3)	One item from Category I and one from Category II	One item from Category I
4	Effective (Year 4)	Cumulatively must have at least one publication or grant from Category I or II	Two items from Category I
5	Significant (Year 5)	Cumulatively must have at least two publications or external grants (or a combination) from Category I or II since employment at CSU	Two items from Category I and one item from Category II
6	Superior (Tenure and Promotion)	Cumulatively must have at least three publications (or a combination) from Category I or II since employment at CSU	Must have at least one publication or grant from Category I or II

Relative Importance

For Unit A (tenured, tenure-track, clinical and research) faculty, research/creative activities are considered of secondary importance to teaching/primary duties. Research/creative activities and service are considered of equal importance. Research and creative activities that involve student participation are highly encouraged. A competitive external grant that is funded is considered of equal importance to publication in a peer-reviewed journal. All tenured, tenure-track and clinical/research faculty will be evaluated in the research/creative activities domain.

E. SERVICE

(Applies to Unit A -Tenured, Tenure Track, Clinical and Research Faculty)

Service to the institution, profession or community is an important element of professional development. Service to the profession and communities positively influences teaching/primary duties and research/creative activities. Any activity in which the faculty member receives payment, stipend or part of assigned workload will not be counted as service. Performance in the service domain is evaluated at five levels and at two broad categories of importance. The expected activities at each level and relevant example of each activity are presented below:

Categories of Service -Category I (Lower Level of Performance		
	Activity	**Example(s) of Evidence and Documentation to Submit in the Portfolio**
a. Department Level		
1	Service on a Standing or Ad-hoc Committee	Letter from the Committee chairs(s) confirming active participation, attendance record and roles
2	Seminar or presentation to faculty and/or workshop to enhance student development	Letter from the department chair confirming role and Power-point presentation slides
3	Guest lecturer in a class taught by a peer	Letter from the peer faculty confirming participation and Power-point presentation slides
4	Mentorship of a junior faculty member or students	Meeting log signed by the mentor and mentee including dates and activities at each session
5	Reader of a capstone project within the department	Letter from the capstone project faculty mentor and signature page of the capstone project
6	Faculty advisor for a professional student organization on campus (this category will no longer be applicable if the University changes to the "Professional Advisor Model".	Letter from the chair attesting to the effectiveness of the faculty in this role
b. College Level		
1	Service on a College Standing or *Ad-hoc* Committee, or recruitment activities	Letter from the Committee chair confirming active participation, attendance record and roles
2	Guest lecturer/invited speaker at another department within the College	Letter from the peer faculty confirming participation and Power-point presentation slides
3	Member of a capstone project committee outside the department	Letter from the capstone project faculty mentor and signature page of the capstone project
c. University Level		
1	Guest lecturer or invited speaker for a department outside of the College and within the University	Letter from the peer faculty confirming participation and Power-point presentation slides
2	Service on a University Standing or *Ad-hoc* Committee	Letter from the Committee chair confirming active participation, attendance record and roles
3	Faculty supervision of students participating in recruitment activities for	Letter from the organization/agency confirming roles and outcome of the service learning or

Categories of Service -Category I (Lower Level of Performance		
	Activity	**Example(s) of Evidence and Documentation to Submit in the Portfolio**
	the University	recruitment activities
d. Professional		
1	Advisory Board member for local, state, or national professional organization	Letter from the organization confirming active participation, attendance record and roles
2	Service to a local or state professional organization or agency	Letter from the organization confirming roles and outcome of the service
3	Invited speaker for a professional organization, institution or agency	Letter from the organization/institution/agency confirming roles and outcome of the service
4	Award for service from a local or state professional organization or agency	Letter from the organization/agency confirming service award recognition
5	Book reviewer for a reputable publishing house	Letter from the book publisher
e. Community		
1	Member of a Community Advisory Board related to health or education	Letter from the organization confirming active participation, attendance record and roles
2	Guest lecturer/ speaker related to topics of health or education for community organization or agencies	Letter from the organization confirming invitation and power-point presentation slides/speech to the organization or agencies
3	Faculty supervision of students participating in service activities related to health or education within the community	Letter from the community organization confirming participation and outcome of the event

Categories of Service -Category II (Higher Level of Performance)		
	Activity	**Example(s) of Evidence and Documentation to Submit in the Portfolio**
a. Department		
1	Recording secretary of the department meeting minutes for at least a semester	Letter from the Chair of the department confirming the role of recording secretary and term of office
2	Administrative duty/project assigned by the department Chair	Letter from the department Chair confirming duty or project assigned and successful completion
3	Leadership on a department Standing or *Ad-hoc* Committee	Letter from the Chair confirming leadership role and committee
b. College		
1	Recognition by College for service-centered activity/project	Letter from the dean confirming service recognition
2	Leadership in a College Standing or *Ad-hoc* Committee	Letter from the peer faculty confirming participation and Power-point presentation slides
3	Administrative duty/project assigned by the dean to advance the College strategic plan	Letter from the dean confirming duty or project assigned and successful completion
c. University		
1	Recognition by the University for specific service-centered activity/project	Letter from the University Committee chair, Provost/President confirming service project
2	Leadership on a University Standing or *Ad-hoc* Committee	Letter from the Provost/President confirming leadership appointment
3	Active Participation on a University Standing or *Ad-hoc* Committee	Letter from the University Committee chair confirming Committee service
d. Professional		
1	Service to a national professional organization	Letter from the organization confirming duration of service and roles. Attendance page of the minutes of the meetings
2	Service award from a local, state or national professional organization	Letter from the organization confirming service award
3	Leadership within a local, state or national professional organization or agency	Letter from the organization, institution or agency confirming leadership roles. Attendance page of the minutes of the meetings
4	External grant reviewer or manuscript reviewer for a peer refereed journal	Letter from the external agency or journal editor confirming appointment as a reviewer
5	Item writing for the AHIMA national certification examination	Letter from the organization confirming appointment and no payment
6	Member of a professional organization accreditation team	Letter from the organization confirming appointment and terms, visit announcement letters
7	Examiner on a thesis /dissertation committee outside the department and other universities	Letter from the chair of the thesis /dissertation committee and signature page of the thesis /dissertation

Categories of Service -Category II (Higher Level of Performance)		
	Activity	**Example(s) of Evidence and Documentation to Submit in the Portfolio**
e. Community		
1	Leadership in a community organization or agency related to health or education	Letter from the organization confirming active participation, attendance record and roles
2	Award for consistent and impactful community service related to health or education	Letter from the organization confirming recognition and description of the impact of the service roles

METHODS OF EVALUATION OF SERVICE

Tenured, tenure-track and clinical faculty will be evaluated in the service domain. Research faculty has an option to be evaluated in the service or teaching domain. The service performance for tenure track, clinical and research faculty will be evaluated using the following key performance measures:

METHODS OF EVALUATION OF SERVICE			
	Performance Descriptor	**Tenure Track Key Evaluative Performance Measures**	**Clinical and Research Faculty Key Evaluative Performance Measures**
1	Appropriate (Year 1)	Two activities from Category I within the department (a)	Two activities from Category I within the department (a)
2	Satisfactory (Year 2)	Two activities from Category I within the department (a) and one item from Category I from any level (b-e)	Three activities from Category I within the department (a) and two items from Category I from any level (b-e)
3	Highly Satisfactory (Year 3)	Three activities from Category I within the department (a) and two activities from Category I from any level (b-e)	Three activities from Category I within the department (a) and three activities from Category I from any level (b-e)
4	Effective (Year 4)	Three activities from Category I within the department (a) and three activities from Category I from any level (b-e)	Three activities from Category I within the department (a) and two activities from Category II from any level (a-e)
5	Significant (Year 5)	Three activities from Category I and one activity from Category II from any level (a-e)	Three activities from Category I and three activities from Category II from any level (a-e)
6	Superior (Tenure and Promotion)	Three activities from Category I, two activities from Category II from any level (a-e) and must have leadership responsibility in at least one level.	Four activities from Category I, three activities from Category II from any level (a-e) and must have leadership responsibility in at least one level.

Relative importance

It is expected that individuals will document widely differing activities and emphasis in their service contributions. The importance of such activities will be considered based on degree of participation, quality and length of service, depth and type of responsibilities within the committee, types of leadership activities and responsibilities such as but not limited to chair, co-chair, secretary, executive board member, or coordinator of an event. Activities in Category II are judged to be more important than Category I. Service will also be judged in terms of its relevance to the employee's assigned responsibilities, and to the University. Generally, the quality and depth of participation (such as leadership or other meaningful contribution) is seen as more important than the quantity of participation. It is also anticipated that service activities engaged in by a faculty member may vary from year to year, often based on the teaching/primary duties assignments and workload.

F. POST TENURE REVIEW (ANNUAL EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY)

The annual evaluation of tenured faculty members not being considered for promotion or professional advancement increases is a process designed to evaluate work performance and accomplishments and shall review the following (Article 19.4c):

i. Student course evaluations
ii. Materials completed or developed since the last evaluation to
iii. substantiate performance in teaching/primary duties, research/creative activity and service; and
iv. Materials in the faculty members' personnel files.

The annual evaluation of tenured faculty will also include review of the "Condition of Continuing Employment" documents since the last evaluation. Tenured faculty will be evaluated in the area of teaching/primary duties, research/creative activities and service using the standards of "Adequate" and "Exemplary" performances. The standard for "*adequate"* performance requires "effective" teaching/primary duties; "highly satisfactory" research/creative activities; and "highly satisfactory" service during the evaluation period as specified in the UPI contract.

The standard for "*Exemplary"* performance requires "significant" teaching/primary duties; "highly effective" research/creative activities; and "highly effective" service during the evaluation period as specified in the UPI contract.

Teaching

The department chairperson will evaluate the effectiveness of the tenured faculty using previously established guidelines describe in this document. Performance in the teaching/primary duties domain is expected to be "Adequate or Exemplary." Adequate performance in teaching/primary duties is equivalent to the "Effective" level of performance with a total teaching/primary duty score of 30-34. Exemplary performance is equivalent to the "Significant" level of performance with a total teaching/primary duty score of 40-44.

Research/Creative Activities

Performance in the research domain is expected to be Adequate or Exemplary. *Adequate* in the research/creative activities domain is equivalent to the "highly satisfactory" level of performance, i.e., three activities from Category I within the department (a) and two activities from Category I from any level (b-e). *Exemplary* performance is equivalent to the "highly effective" level of performance, i.e., one publication or grant from Category I or II.

Service

Performance in the service domain during the evaluation period is expected to be Adequate or Exemplary. *Adequate* service is equivalent to the "highly satisfactory" level of performance, i.e., three activities from Category I within the department (a) and two activities from Category I from any level (b-e). *Exemplary* performance is equivalent to the "highly effective" level of performance, i.e., three activities from Category I and one activity from Category II from any level (a-e).

Extenuating circumstances, such as teaching workload in excess of 30CUEs and medical emergencies, will be taken into consideration when the research/creative activities and service productivity did not meet the performance criteria. Following review of the documents and materials provided by the tenured faculty, the department chairperson will prepare a written evaluation statement that is provided to the faculty and subsequently forwarded to the dean for review. After the review, the dean will forward his/her recommendation to the provost. The faculty may attach a written response to the chair or dean's recommendation.

Failure to meet the *adequate* standard for two consecutive years in any given area shall trigger a one-year appraisal and professional development process, as developed by the University's Professional Development Monitoring Committee. The Committee's process will start during the 2012-2013 academic year. * However, the first appraisal/faculty development process will not start until after 2013-2014 evaluations are completed. The Committee shall consist of seven members. There shall be three administrative appointed and three UPI appointed members who shall jointly choose an additional member. The Committee will vote to select a chairperson.

* This statement is an attempt to clarify an unclear statement on page 51 of the 2012-2015 UPI contract.

The Professional Development Monitoring Committee shall meet regularly to develop a mentoring process to assist any tenured faculty member who fails to meet the *"Adequate"* level of performance standard as described above. The Committee shall draft language describing in detail the policy and procedures, monitoring process, including a procedure for identifying mentors and for determining appropriate benchmarks for assessing development. They will include:

- Identification and development of the appropriate resources
- Development of the mentoring process and identification of the mentors, and
- Determination of appropriate benchmarks and evaluation process for assessing development.

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

G. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

Teaching

When submitting materials for promotion, the faculty should provide syllabi, evaluations, and teaching materials for all courses taught within the last five years. Only a few representative samples of courses older than five years or from previous curriculum designs should be included. The materials submitted should demonstrate (highlight changes in different colors) how the faculty has made changes to courses taught multiple times.

Promotion to Assistant Professor: For tenured, tenure track and research faculty appointments, the faculty must meet the criteria for "highly effective" teaching which is equivalent to teaching/primary duties total score of 35-39. Clinical faculty is not applicable.

.

Promotion to Associate Professor: Tenured, tenure track and clinical faculty must maintain "superior" teaching/primary duties total score of 45-50 for a ***two-year*** period. Research faculty must maintain "significant" teaching/primary duties total score of 40-44 for a ***two-year*** period.

Promotion to Professor: Tenured, tenure track, clinical and research faculty must maintain "superior" teaching/primary duties total score of 45-50 for a ***three-year*** period.

Research

Promotion to Assistant Professor: Tenured, tenure track and research faculty must maintain "highly effective" research. Cumulatively, the faculty must have at least two publications or (or a combination of publication and competitive external grant funding) from Category I or II since employment at CSU; or two items from Category I or II of research criteria post the tenure review. Clinical faculty is not evaluated for this rank.

Promotion to Associate Professor: Tenured, tenure track and research faculty must meet the criteria for "superior" research. Cumulatively, the faculty must have at least three publications (or a combination of publication and competitive external grant funding) from Category I or II since employment at CSU; or two items from Category I or II of the research criteria, one of which is a peer-reviewed publication or competitive external grant after the tenure review. Clinical faculty must meet the criteria for "significant" research. Cumulatively, the faculty must have two items from Category I and one item from Category II.

Promotion to Professor: Tenured, tenure track and research faculty must meet the criteria for "superior" research. Cumulatively, the faculty must have at least three publications (or combination of publication or competitive external grant) from Category I or II since employment at CSU; or four items from Category I of research criteria; two of which are peer-reviewed publication or competitive external grant after the associate professor promotion review. Clinical faculty must meet the criteria for "superior" research. Cumulatively, the faculty must have at least one publication or competitive external grant from Category I or Category II; or three items from Category II of the research criteria after the associate professor review.

Service

Promotion to Assistant Professor: Tenured and tenure track faculty must meet the criteria for "satisfactory" service; two activities from Category I within the department (a) and one item from Category I from any level (b-e). Research faculty must meet the criteria for "highly effective" service; three activities from Category I and one activity from Category II from any level (a-e). Clinical faculty is not evaluated for this rank.

Promotion to Associate Professor: Tenured and tenure track faculty must meet the criteria for "significant" service; three activities from Category I and one activity from Category II from any level (a-e) and must have leadership responsibility in at least one level of service after the tenure review. Research faculty must meet the criteria for "significant" service; three activities from Category I and three activities from Category II from any level (a-e).

Clinical faculty must meet the criteria for "superior" service; four activities from Category I, three activities from Category II from any level (a-e) and must have leadership responsibility in at least one level.

Promotion to Professor: Tenured, tenure track and clinical faculty must meet the criteria for "superior" service. For tenured and tenure track faculty "Superior" service is three activities from Category I, two activities from Category II from any level (a-e) and must have leadership responsibility in at least one level. "Superior" service for clinical faculty requires four activities from Category I, three activities from Category II from any level (a-e) and must have leadership responsibility in at least one level. Research faculty must meet the criteria for "significant" service; three activities from Category I and three activities from Category II from any level (a-e).

H. UNIT B FACULTY

Unit B faculty appointment as a lecturer will be offered to qualified candidates with a Master's degree or individuals enrolled in doctoral programs in a health or related discipline. Following completion of the doctoral degree, the individual may apply for tenure track or clinical faculty appointment in the relevant department in the College. Consideration for such appointment will depend on availability of a vacant line and funding for the position.

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

For teaching/primary duties performance, Unit B faculty will be evaluated using the same criteria and guidelines as Unit A faculty. However, Unit B faculty will only be awarded the "unsatisfactory", "satisfactory" or "highly effective" ratings. In addition to meeting the “Condition for Employment” described in this document, Unit B faculty must maintain “satisfactory” (a total score of 25-29) performance in the teaching/primary duties for their contract to be renewed. Refer to Section III of the contract to identify the standards to be used in evaluating Unit B faculty (Article 33.1). Conditions for multi-year contract for Unit B Lecturers are specified in the UPI contract (Article 30.2).