

**Information Studies
2021-2022
DEPARTMENTAL APPLICATION
OF CRITERIA**

2021-2022 DEPARTMENTAL APPLICATION OF CRITERIA

The provisions set forth herein in the Department's Application of Criteria (DAC) will be used to evaluate the job performance of Unit A and Unit B faculty in the Department. Each employee seeking retention, promotion, tenure, or Professional Advancement Increase (PAI) will be required to meet the standards as articulated in this DAC. Provisions that follow describe materials and methods used in the Department to evaluate performance of employees eligible for retention, promotion, tenure, and professional advancement increases.

SECTION 1-PORTFOLIO SUBMISSION AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

1.1 Portfolio Submission:

The faculty member being evaluated must provide a portfolio, preferably in a digital format. The portfolio should include an updated vita, to be included as part of the evaluation. This portfolio must be submitted to the Chairperson of the Department Personnel Committee (DPC) by the date designated in the University schedule for personnel actions.

The DPC will be composed of Unit A teaching, resource, and clinical employees. The sole purpose of the Department Personnel Committee is to provide recommendations to the Department Chair concerning retention, reappointments, multiple-year appointments, promotion, PAI, or tenure of Department employees.

Professional Development

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

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

1.2 Performance

The degree of effectiveness of performance of each employee being considered will be evaluated in the areas of **teaching/performance of primary duties**, **research/creative activity**, and **service**.

For tenured and tenure-track faculty, teaching/performance of primary duties will be considered the most important of the three areas of evaluation. After teaching/performance of primary duties, research/creative activity and service will be given equal emphasis.

Clinical Faculty are responsible for supervising students in a clinical, experiential, or practicum setting, in addition to being engaged in teaching, research, and service depending on the nature of the appointment (See Article 16.b of contract). Clinical

faculty will be evaluated according to the guidelines outlined in Article 19.3.b in the Contract using the criteria outlined in this document.

Research Professor appointments are for individuals employed on research projects funded by external grants and contracts whose primary responsibility is to contribute to the research mission of the University. They may have limited teaching and/or service responsibilities as related to their research agenda. (See Article 16.c of contract). Research faculty will be evaluated according to the guidelines outlined in Article 19.3.b in the contract using the criteria outlined in this document.

SECTION 2- FACULTY EVALUATION

Evaluation of the faculty members' teaching/performance of primary duties includes consideration of his/her effectiveness in the execution of assigned responsibilities. This evaluation includes (1) command of the subject matter discipline; (2) oral English proficiency, as mandated by Illinois statute; (3) ability to organize, analyze and present knowledge or material in traditional and online settings, (4) ability to encourage and interest student in the learning process, (5) performance of CUE-bearing duties such as student advisement, counseling and directing individual student activities and (6) the availability of the faculty to students and for Departmental activities.

2.1 Methods Used to Evaluate Teaching I Performance of Primary Duties

2.1.a Considerations for Teaching Effectiveness

Methods used to evaluate faculty teaching/performance of primary duties include, but are not limited to (1) evaluation of teaching/advising and non-teaching duties (e.g., program coordination, lab supervision, etc.), (2) classroom observations, (3) course materials and design, (4) curriculum development, and (5) peer recognition of teaching. These considerations are categorized as follows:

- Category I Evaluations
 - 1. Teaching Responsibilities
 - a. Student evaluations of instructor's performance in classroom
 - 2. Non-teaching Responsibilities, as assigned
 - a. Student evaluation of advisor performance
 - b. Chair evaluation of program coordination
 - c. Chair evaluation of laboratory supervision
 - d. Chair evaluation of Department/College/University professional and assessment responsibilities
 - e. Other types of release time

- Category II Annual Classroom Observations
 - 1. Observations by peers
 - 2. Observations by Department Chairperson

Category III Course Materials and Design

1. Primary and supplementary materials distributed in class
2. Integration and use of technology
3. Revised course syllabus
4. Course syllabus for all courses

Category IV Curriculum Development

1. New programs
2. Expanded programs
3. Developing and teaching a new course
4. Updated programs
5. Alignment/realignment of program curriculums with standards

Category V Peer Recognition of Teaching

2.1.b Methods of Evaluating Teaching and Non-Teaching Primary Duty Effectiveness

Category I: Evaluations

1. Student Evaluation of Instructor

With reference to student evaluation of instructor performance in the classroom, the student course evaluations will be handled through the process administered by the University.

With reference to evaluation of non-teaching duties and responsibilities, the Department's approved evaluation form and process will be used to evaluate employees.

The numerical rating for all student evaluations for all courses, advisor evaluations, and non-teaching duties evaluations (as decided upon by the DPC) will be averaged and rounded to the nearest tenth using standard rounding conventions and then ranked using the following scale:

- Superior = 4.0 < ratings ≤ 5.0
- Significant = 3.5 < ratings ≤ 4.0
- Highly Effective = 3.0 < ratings ≤ 3.5
- Effective = 2.6 < ratings ≤ 3.0
- Satisfactory = 2.5 ≤ ratings ≤ 2.6

2. Non-teaching Responsibilities, as assigned

Type of Activity	Materials to be Evaluated
a. Student evaluation of advisor performance	1. Student evaluations of advisor 2. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty provided by faculty

	member
b. Chair evaluation of program coordination	1. Letter of evaluation by Chair. 2. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty.
c. Chair evaluation of laboratory supervision	1. Letter of evaluation by Chair. 2. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty.
d. Chair evaluation of Assessment Coordination	1. Assessment Report
e. Other Type of Release Time	1. Letter of evaluation. 2. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty.

Relative Importance of Non-Teaching Responsibilities and Methods of Evaluation

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

Letters of Evaluation

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

Synopsis of Activities Related to the Primary Duty

Documentation of attendance at activities related to the assigned primary duties is required. Additional documentation may include: the maintenance of appropriate and accessible records, copies of progress reports submitted, attendance at workshops, training courses or other development programs related to the primary duty. If release time has been granted for research, then a narrative summary of the research performed

must be included in this section even if details of the conduct and product of research is reported in the research section. If release time has been granted for being a program coordinator, then the results of being a program coordinator may still be reported in the service section.

Non-Teaching Primary Duties

The DPC will weigh the evidence and decide on the appropriate ranking for Non-Teaching Primary Duties.

Category II. Annual Peer and Chairperson Classroom Observations:

The faculty member being evaluated will have annual classroom observations during the evaluation period; one each by the Department Chairperson, and by a peer faculty member. Peer evaluations are to be conducted by faculty members of equal or higher rank and have at least two years of experience. The classes to be observed shall be agreed upon by the faculty member and the observer(s) and should span across the courses taught by the faculty member. These observers (faculty members and Department chairperson) will rate the faculty member and provide a written summary of their observation using the approved Departmental forms and process for peer and chairperson evaluations.

The average rating on the items of the Department's Classroom Observation Form should be used as a guideline to determine the level of teaching effectiveness and will be considered using the following rating scale:

Superior =	4.0 < ratings ≤ 5.0
Significant =	3.5 < ratings ≤ 4.0
Highly Effective =	3.0 < ratings ≤ 3.5
Effective =	2.75 < ratings ≤ 3.0
Satisfactory =	2.5 ≤ ratings ≤ 2.75

Category III: Course Materials and Design

The DPC will be responsible for determining if teaching materials are current, reflective of the course syllabi, and address required accreditation standards. The faculty member being evaluated will provide a packet of materials representative of those used in teaching, which demonstrates the following:

- a. Integration and use of technology into the classroom
- b. Original materials created and distributed in class
- c. Supplemental materials distributed in class
- d. Revised course syllabus demonstrating updated content and/or assignments/activities
- e. Course syllabus created for a new course offering

The following will be used to rate classroom materials:

Ranking	Requirement
Superior (highest)	Evidence of at least one item from each of the following categories for multiple courses (a, b, c, and d) and at least one syllabus for a new course offering (e).
Significant	Evidence of at least one item from each of the first three categories from multiple courses (a, b, and c) and at least one item from either d or e.
Highly Effective	Evidence of at least one item from the first three categories from multiple classes (a, b, and c).
Effective	Evidence of at least one item from each of the first three categories (a, b, and c).
Highly Satisfactory	Evidence of at least one item from the first two categories for multiple classes (a and b).
Satisfactory	Evidence of at least one item from the first two categories (a and b).
Appropriate (lowest)	Evidence of at least one item from the first category (a).

Category IV: Curriculum Development

The faculty member being evaluated may present materials to document changes and revisions to existing programs and the development of new programs. Items that can be included in this category are:

- a. New Programs (certificate, endorsement, degree, etc.)
- b. Expand programs
- c. Design and teach a new course
- d. Program changes (curriculum updates)
- e. Alignment/realignment of program courses and curricula with standards

The following will be used to rate curriculum development:

Ranking	Requirement
Superior (highest)	Successful creation and implementation of a new program that is aligned with standards (a and e)
Significant	Evidence of efforts to create a new program that is aligned with standards (a) or expand an existing program to new markets (b).
Highly Effective	Successful creation and teaching of a new course (c).

Effective	Evidence of efforts to make a change in an existing program. Evidence must be present that all changes align with standards (d and e).
Highly Satisfactory	Evidence of efforts to align or realign curriculum with state standards (d).
Satisfactory	Not applicable for this category
Appropriate (lowest)	Not applicable for this category

Category V: Peer Recognition of Teaching

Faculty may provide evidence of peer recognition for excellence in teaching, beyond the standard peer observations. Evidence that may be included in this category includes awards for excellence in teaching (e.g. CSU's Faculty Excellence Awards), nominations for recognition in teaching by local, state, and national organizations, etc. Nominations into Who's Who publications are not considered for this area.

Should a faculty member provide evidence of peer recognition for excellence in teaching, the highest rating for this category will be "highly effective."

The following applies to Retention, Promotion, Tenure, and Professional Advance Increases:

Ranking	Requirement
Superior (highest)	At least 2 Superior ratings and 2 Highly Effective ratings in any of the five categories described above.
Significant	At least 1 Superior, 1 Significant, and 1 Highly Effective rating in any of the five categories described above.
Highly Effective	At least 1 Significant and 2 Highly Effective ratings in any of the five categories described above.
Effective	At least 1 Highly Effective and 2 Effective ratings in any of the five categories described above.
Highly Satisfactory	At least 1 Effective and 2 Highly Satisfactory ratings in any of the five categories described above.
Satisfactory	At least 1 Highly Satisfactory and 2 Satisfactory ratings in any of the five categories described above.
Appropriate (lowest)	At least 1 Highly Satisfactory, 1 Satisfactory, and 1 Appropriate rating in any of the five categories described above.

2.2 Methods Used to Evaluate Research/Creative Activities

Evaluation of the effectiveness of an employee's research/creative activity will include consideration of:

- a. The quality and quantity of research/creative activity
- b. Contributions to the employee's discipline or field
- c. Extent and nature of national, state, or local recognition of research/creative activity
- d. Nature of research presentations at professional conferences

The groups that follow describe relative rankings of activities. Activities listed within each group are illustrative of the kinds of activities that may be considered in each group. A faculty member may suggest the appropriate group in which a particular activity should be counted, if not listed.

NOTE: Formal documentation from the sponsoring agency such as professional organizations, publishers, state agencies, etc., should be submitted as evidence (e.g., minutes, letters of receipt, acceptance, completion or approval, evaluation summaries of activities).

When indicating publications are to be part of the portfolio, a copy of the publication must be available for review during the evaluation period. This can be accomplished by including a copy of the publication or link to the website.

Group One

1. Attendance at a professional conference.
2. Submission of a proposal for presentation at a professional conference or seminar.
3. Evidence of progress towards appropriate professional certification or other professional development activity.
4. Preparation of proposals for funding from internal sources.
5. Submission of research proposal to IRB.
6. Create a plan to guide your research agenda.

Group Two

1. Presentations at meetings, conferences, seminars, workshops, webinars, etc. of local or state professional organizations (not including presentations at K-12 institutions).
2. Evidence of a research project approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB).
3. Submission of manuscripts for publication in refereed journals, edited books, etc.
4. Presentation at teacher/librarian in-service and staff development programs.
5. Presentation of a faculty member's unpublished research at departmental seminar or workshop.
6. Evidence of submission of proposal for grant to external source for funding.
7. Planning a professional local meeting, conference, seminar, or workshop.
8. Publication in a non-refereed, professional printed or electronic literature.
9. Creation and distribution of digital materials relating to research area that

have significant following or acknowledgement from the field (e.g., webliography, LibGuide, blogs, videos, films, etc.).

10. Invitations to speak at organizations outside of CSU regarding research areas.
11. Awards of grants from internal sources, including research CUES, etc.
12. Utilization of research knowledge to engage community and/or students in service learning.

Group Three

1. Presentations at meetings, conferences, seminars, workshops, webinars, etc. of regional or national or international professional organizations.
2. Awards of grants or contracts from external sources.
3. Publication in refereed scholarly journals (online or print).
4. Publication of books and/or book chapters.
5. Citation of published works or other professional recognition of significant accomplishment or contribution to the field.
6. External recognition for the creation of digital materials relating to research area.
7. Production of instructional materials for national or international professional organizations.
8. Chairing a doctoral dissertation committee.
9. Development of instructional material for national or international schools, or industries.
10. Planning and organizing a professional national or international conference or colloquium.
11. Translation of a scholarly/creative book, published by a non-variety press, in either print or electronic format.
12. Service as editor or co-editor responsible for the intellectual content of a book, or journal in either print or electronic format.
13. Visiting professor, visiting lecturer, or visiting scholar to another institution of higher learning of at least equivalent status with CSU in the area of the individual's expertise.

2.2.a Relative Importance and Weight for Research I Creative Activities

Note: A higher group item may be considered in the place of a lower group item.

Ranking	Requirement
Superior (highest)	He/she must provide evidence of at least six items. These must contain at least 3 items from group three of which 2 are refereed publications, at least 2 items from group two, and at least 1 item from group one.
Significant	He/she must provide evidence of at least five items. These must contain at least 2 items from group three, of which one must be a refereed publication and at least 2 items from group two, and at least 1 item from group one.

Highly Effective	He/she must provide evidence of at least 3 items from groups two or three.
Effective	He/she must provide evidence of at least three items. These must contain at least 2 items from group two or three and at least 1 item from group one.
Highly Satisfactory	He/she must provide evidence of at least three items. These must contain at least 1 item from group two or three and at least 2 items from group one.
Satisfactory	He/she must provide evidence of at least two items. These must contain at least 1 item from group two or three and at least 1 item from group one.
Appropriate (lowest)	He/she must provide evidence of at least two items from any of the groups.

2.3 Methods Used to Evaluate Service

Evaluation of the effectiveness of an employee's unit, College, University, community, or professional service will include consideration of:

- a. Extent and nature of leadership
- b. Degree of participation
- c. Quality and length of service
- d. Extent and nature of participation in professional organization
- e. Extent and nature of national, state, or local recognition of service
- f. The relationship of the service to the employee's assigned responsibilities and to the University

The groups that follow describe relative rankings of activities. Activities listed within each group are illustrative of the kinds of activities that may be considered in each group. A faculty member may suggest the appropriate group in which a particular activity should be counted, if not listed.

NOTE: Service activities for which an employee receives compensation will not be included for consideration. The employee should also provide formal documentation as evidence (e.g., meeting minutes, letters from professional organizations, etc.).

It is expected that service will be included at the Department, College, University, and professional levels.

Group One

1. Membership on and active participation in Department committees.
2. Membership in and active participation in a professional organization.
3. Volunteer work to support the goals of the University or its surrounding community.

Group Two

1. Service on a College or University committee.
2. Sponsorship of student organizations.
3. Active participation on search committees.
4. Serving as an officer of a Departmental committee.
5. Participation on program review committees.
6. Service through union activities.
7. Conducting a program review.
8. Service on committees for ALA, HLC, ABET, or other accrediting agencies.
9. Mentoring a new faculty member.
10. Serving as a peer evaluator for a faculty member in another department.
11. Service on a committee in a professional organization.
12. Service as referee, juror, or editor for professional publications or organizations
13. Supervision of master's thesis or service on a doctoral dissertation committee, where no compensation or CUEs are given.
14. Active participation in recruitment and retention efforts.
15. Effectively assisting the Department Chair in the preparation of University materials.

Group Three

1. Serving as an officer in a professional organization.
2. Speaking engagement on campus or in the community relating to the faculty member's field of study.
3. Providing services to students beyond the requirements of one's teaching assignments.
4. Volunteer work that draws upon one's academic skills.
5. Assistance in ongoing University special programs beyond that of assigned workload.
6. Workshop presentations to teachers, librarians, and other professionals in the community.
7. Serving as an officer on a College or University committee.
8. Serving on an accreditation team.
9. Serving as a member of a school district-wide committee.
10. Serving on a local school council/library board or other local organization's board.
11. Participation in school, library, or relevant professional reform activities.
12. Participation in committees or activities designed to increase cooperation with other institutions.
13. Writing reports for ALA, HLC, ABET, or other applicable accrediting agencies.

2.3.a Relative Importance and Weight for Service

Ranking	Requirement
Superior (highest)	He/she must provide evidence of at least four items. These must contain at least 2 items from group three, at least 1 item from group two, and at least 1 item from group one.

Significant	He/she must provide evidence of at least four items. These must contain at least 1 item from group three, at least 2 items from group two, and at least 1 item from group one.
Highly Effective	He/she must provide evidence of at least 3 items from groups two or three.
Effective	He/she must provide evidence of at least three items. These must contain at least 2 items from group two or three and at least 1 item from group one.
Highly Satisfactory	He/she must provide evidence of at least three items. These must contain at least 1 item from group two or three and at least 2 items from group one.
Satisfactory	He/she must provide evidence of at least two items. These must contain at least 1 item from group two or three and at least 1 item from group one.
Appropriate (lowest)	He/she must provide evidence of at least two items from any of the groups.

2.4 Requirements for Tenure or Promotion Based on Exceptionality

To be considered for tenure or promotion on the basis of exceptional performance the candidate must meet:

- Criteria for tenure or promotion
- Exceptional performance in two of the three areas of evaluation as listed below

2.4.a Exceptionality in the Area of Teaching:

- Faculty Excellence Award in teaching from Chicago State University or other professional bodies
- Development of at least three new courses,
- Development of at least one new program of study
- Students' evaluations consistently rating the faculty member at 4.2 - 5.0 during the entire evaluation period

Method of Evaluation: The faculty member submits a representative sample providing evidence of any three of the above exceptionality criteria.

2.4.b Exceptionality in the Area of Research:

- Faculty Excellence Award in research from Chicago State University or other professional bodies
- Award of a federal grant
- Award of two or more externally funded grants or contracts

- Invitation to serve as a keynote speaker at a national or international conference
- National/international professional or scholarly fellowship
- Publish a scholarly book
- At least two publications in refereed research journals
- Service as editor of a refereed journal

Method of Evaluation: The faculty member submits a representative sample providing evidence of any three of the above exceptionality criteria

2.4.c Exceptionality In the Area of Service:

- Faculty Excellence Award in service from Chicago State University or other professional bodies
- Service as officer of professional organizations at the national or international level
- Chair of planning committee for a state or national conference
- Chair of an accreditation team
- Participation in reviewer development of a state/federal /international policy/program/standard related to one's specialization
- Service on school or library board, executive board, or institution of higher learning governing board

Method of Evaluation: The faculty member submits a representative sample providing evidence of any three of the above exceptionality criteria.

2.5 Professional Advancement Increase

Any tenured employee shall be eligible for consideration for a Professional Advancement Increase if the employee has completed at least five years of service at the University at the rank of Professor and has submitted annual evaluation material in accordance with 19.4.c in each of the previous five (5) years.

2.6 Evaluation Periods and Criteria for Faculty

The performance criteria listed below will be used to reach judgments about the degree of effectiveness of a faculty member's performance. The evaluation period for retention shall be the period since the beginning of the employee's last evaluation for retention, except for employees in their second year of employment in the bargaining unit who shall have their entire period of employment evaluated. In promotion evaluations, the standards used will be those to judge the employee during the entire evaluation period. In tenure evaluations, the performance standards used will be those used to judge whether an employee's performance has reached the required degree of effectiveness by the end of the evaluation period.

Personnel Action	Teaching/Primary Duty	Research/Creative Activity	Service
First-year retention	Satisfactory	Appropriate	Appropriate
Second-year retention	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Third-year retention	Effective	Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory
Fourth-year retention	Highly effective	Effective	Effective
Fifth-year retention	Significant	Highly effective	Highly effective
Tenure	Superior	Significant	Significant
Assistant Professor	Highly Effective	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Associate Professor	Superior	Significant	Significant
Full Professor	Superior	Superior	Superior
Post-Tenure Review	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate
PAI	Superior	Significant	Significant

- **Professional Advancement Increase**

An employee shall be eligible for consideration for a professional advancement increase if the employee has completed at least five years of service at the University at the rank of Professor and has submitted annual evaluation material in accordance with the contract.

2.7 Annual Evaluation of Tenured Employees

The following are the criteria for the evaluation of tenured faculty members:

- **Adequate**

For a rating of Adequate, the tenured faculty member must meet the criteria for a tenure-track faculty member in retention year three.

- **Exemplary**

For a rating of Exemplary, the tenured faculty member must meet the criteria for a tenure-track faculty member in retention year five.

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 described in the contract in section 19.4.c(3).

SECTION 3 - EVALUATION OF UNIT B FACULTY

Unit B faculty members (lecturers) shall not be formally evaluated until they have completed one full academic term of service at the University; however, student evaluations and classroom observations shall be conducted and reviewed each semester. The responsibility for evaluating Unit B faculty members shall reside with the Department Chair.

3.1 Categories of Materials and Activities

- Student evaluations
- Classroom observations
- Course materials and design
- Other materials and/or activities for which they receive compensation

3.2 Methods of Evaluation

3.2.a Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

The criteria used to evaluate the lecturer's student evaluations shall be the same as the criteria used to evaluate Unit A faculty's student evaluations.

3.2.b Classroom Observation

The faculty member being evaluated will have annual classroom observations during the evaluation period, i.e., one annual evaluation by the Department Chairperson, and one annual evaluation by a peer faculty member. The criteria used to evaluate the lecturer's classroom observations shall be the same as the criteria used to evaluate Unit A faculty's classroom observations.

3.2.c Evaluation of Course Materials and Design

The criteria used to evaluate the lecturer's student evaluations shall be the same as the criteria used to evaluate Unit A faculty's student evaluations.

3.2.d. Evaluation of Other Materials and/or Activities

This is an optional category which the faculty member may use to show additional efforts beyond the common duties and to earn a rating of superior. It is encouraged for Lecturers to submit items similar to those identified in Section 2 for Unit A faculty in terms of curriculum development, peer recognition of teaching, research and creative activities, and service.

Materials submitted in this category will be evaluated according to the criteria outlined for Unit A faculty.

3.3 Relative Importance and Weight for Teaching I Performance of Primary Duties

Ranking	Requirement
Superior (highest)	He/she must receive at least 2 Superior ratings and 1 Highly Effective rating in the first three categories described above and evidence of optional materials and/or activities.
Significant	He/she must receive at least 1 Superior, 1 Significant, and 1 Highly Effective rating in any of the first three categories described above.
Highly Effective	He/she must receive at least 1 Significant and 2 Highly Effective ratings in any of the first three categories described above.
Effective	He/she must receive at least 1 Highly Effective and 2 Effective ratings in any of the first three categories described above.
Highly Satisfactory	He/she must receive at least 1 Effective and 2 Highly Satisfactory ratings in any of the first three categories described above.
Satisfactory	He/she must receive at least 1 Highly Satisfactory and 2 Satisfactory ratings in any of the first three categories described above.
Appropriate (lowest)	He/she must receive at least 1 Highly Satisfactory, 1 Satisfactory, and 1 Appropriate rating in any of the first three categories described above.

3.4 Lecturer Promotion

Lecturers may be promoted to Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, or Visiting Professor, if their performance or credentials support such promotions. The Provost will assign the designated rank.

3.5 Multi-Year Contracts

Lecturers who have attained 10 or more years of instructional service with the Department are eligible for five-year contracts if they have earned "Highly Effective" performance evaluation for two of the preceding five years. Once the five-year appointment status has been achieved, lecturers must receive "Highly Effective" performance evaluations in all DAC categories listed under teaching/primary duties at least two of the next five years to continue renewing the five-year multi-year appointment.

Lecturers on multi-year appointments must continue to earn a minimum level of "Effective" performance on annual evaluations to continue in the current multi-

year contract.

SECTION 4- EVALUATION OF ADJUNCT FACULTY

The evaluation of adjunct faculty members will be at the discretion of the Department Chair. However, the Chair will use evaluation methods that are similar to those for Unit A and Unit B faculty, focusing on the student evaluations and classroom observations.

SECTION 5- DISTANCE EDUCATION

5.1 Evaluating Web-Based Courses

The process for evaluating distance education courses will be the same as traditionally taught courses, which include student evaluations, peer evaluations, and chair evaluations. The exception will be that evaluators will need to be granted non-grading instructor access to the course for an agreed upon period of time. In addition, online and hybrid courses are open to evaluation by the Distance Education Committee using the process that is published on the Center for Teaching and Research Excellence's website.

The Department's By-Laws will address the standards for online courses. As the Department is moving towards fully online degrees, there will need to be a level of conformity to course structure, assessment, and facilitation.

5.2 Process for selecting faculty to teach Internet courses

Prior to teaching any online course faculty and instructors need to complete the Online Certification Training offered through the Center for Teaching and Research Excellence or equivalent outside training or experience.

SECTION 6 - DAC REVISION

This DAC conforms to provisions set forth in the Chicago State University and UPI Local 4100, Units A, Band C 2010-2015 Contract and, when approved, will remain in effect until the contract ends and/or a new one has been negotiated and approved.