

EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Division of Academic Affairs

DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT

Department of Computer Information Systems

College of Business

Faculty Evaluation

Criteria, Procedures and Techniques

Approved by Department: _____
Revised and approved by Department _____
Approved by the Standing Committee
on Departmental Evaluation Documents,
System and Guidelines: _____

FACULTY EVALUATION

The evaluation process is intended to be collegial. The process has been developed to encourage departmental colleagues and Department Heads to provide colleagues information on meeting the criteria required to advance (i.e., achieve reappointment, tenure, promotion or a satisfactory Professional Performance Evaluation) at Eastern Michigan University.

Each department shall conduct faculty evaluations using criteria, procedures and techniques specified in its Departmental Evaluation Document and in the Agreement between Eastern Michigan University (EMU) and the EMU Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Article XV.

CRITERIA

Candidates must satisfy all elements of the evaluation criteria provided herein as well as all terms and conditions of the EMU-AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement. In case of conflict, the more stringent criteria shall apply.

Instructional Effectiveness

The required and most important criterion is instructional effectiveness. The teaching faculty shall give evidence of ability and commitment to lead students of varying capabilities into a growing understanding of the subject matter, tools, and materials of their disciplines. The faculty member shall demonstrate his/her continuing concern for instructional effectiveness through methods of presentation and evaluation by students. In support of teaching effectiveness, a faculty member must maintain a high level of knowledge and expertise in his/her discipline or area of specialization. In the case of non-teaching and library faculty, satisfactory professional performance shall be the equivalent of instructional effectiveness.

Evaluation techniques for all faculty members include, but are not limited to, self-evaluation, classroom visitations, student evaluations of teaching, Department Head evaluation, peer evaluations, and assessment of academic advising of students.

Scholarly and/or Creative Activity

A faculty member shall give documented evidence of his/her contributions to his/her discipline or area of specialization by scholarly investigation (e.g. research) and/or creative activity, and of its publication or other dissemination in one of the following ways:

1. in the classroom, or
2. among practitioners in his/her discipline, or
3. among a wider community.

It is intended that the faculty member shall use his/her expertise to address problems in his/her discipline or areas of specialization through scholarly and/or creative activity, which clearly contributes to the dis-

cipline, through:

1. scholarly investigation, creative activity and/or research of an original and/or previously unreported nature; or
2. applied research, investigation, or scholarly analysis of existing research, information, and creative endeavors resulting in the development of new data, information, applications, and or interpretations.

Except as herein provided, professional development shall not be an acceptable substitute for scholarly/creative activity.

Retraining

In recognition of the need to encourage the retraining of faculty to assume professional responsibilities in areas where available expertise is in short supply, completion by the faculty member of a retraining program which brings him/her to a specified level of skill in such an area of need may be applied toward satisfaction of the scholarly/creative activity criterion for such purposes and for such period of time only as expressly approved in writing by the appropriate departmental committee, the Department Head, the college Dean and the provost and vice president for academic affairs.

If a faculty member wishes his or her retraining to be considered as scholarly/creative activity, he or she must obtain written approval in advance of the retraining.

Grant Development/Administration

Faculty are encouraged to engage in the process of seeking, obtaining and administering grants from outside agencies. The preparation of grant proposals from outside agencies, whether funded or not, shall be considered as scholarly/creative activity if said preparation involves Scholarly/Creative Activity (e.g., research or teaching projects) of a substantial nature and the applicant provides an abstract documenting such activity and the importance of the endeavor to the discipline, the department, the college or the university. The above conditions may also apply for the administration of a grant project insofar as proper evidence is presented which documents that such grant administration meets the requirements as set forth in Article XV of the Agreement. The scholarly/creative activity criterion cannot be satisfied by grant activities alone.

Service Activity

The faculty member must satisfy one of the criteria below:

1. The faculty member shall give evidence of identifying new needs in the department and assisting colleagues in departmental activities; or

2. The faculty member shall give evidence of interest and activity that extend beyond the department into areas such as university and college-wide committees, student activities, and professionally related community affairs.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Instructional Effectiveness

Evaluation techniques for all faculty members shall include at least the following types of evaluation of teaching:

- Peer evaluations;
- Department Head evaluations;
- Student evaluations;
- Self-evaluations.

Departments shall utilize:

1. A set of approved questions for the Student Evaluation Form (Appendix 1).
2. A set of approved forms for Peer and Department Head Classroom Visitations (Appendix 2).
3. A procedure for classroom visitations (Appendix 3).

(Note: Peer and Department Head evaluations must be in writing and provided to the faculty member within ten (10) days following the visit. These written evaluations of classroom observations are just one part of the evaluation of instructional effectiveness.)

Scholarly/Creative Activity

Scholarly/Creative Activity will be evaluated for each faculty member utilizing the criteria set forth in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and the Departmental Evaluation Document.

Service

Service activities will be evaluated for each faculty member utilizing the criteria set forth in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and this Departmental Evaluation Document.

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE

The criteria for faculty evaluation must be applied to applicants in varying disciplines. Therefore, each document is unique. To clarify the role of Departmental Evaluation Documents in specifying the ways in which contract requirements may be met, EMU and the Association hereby reaffirm and make clear their intent that, in addition to satisfying the conditions set forth in the applicable Departmental Evaluation Documents, all candidates for reappointment, tenure and promotion must satisfy without exception and irrespective of the terms of any Departmental Evaluation Document, application form, or other document to the contrary, all elements of the evaluation criteria provided herein, and all other terms and conditions of the Agreement.

In those instances where a requirement set forth in the Agreement diverges from a requirement set forth in this Departmental Evaluation Document, the more stringent requirement shall apply, except as modified by the Agreement. Each faculty member must provide qualitative documented evidence that establish that he/she has, in fact, satisfied the appropriate evaluation criteria. No activity shall count towards fulfilling an evaluation criterion without such qualitative documentation.

Only work completed while a faculty member is in rank at EMU may be counted for purposes of reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions, unless in accordance with Article XIV. Partial service/rank credit is granted for experience prior to joining the faculty at EMU. The partial service/rank credit which a faculty member receives at the date of hire, and the scholarly/creative activity completed during the period of time for which he/she is given credit at the initial date of hire shall be creditable for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, insofar as: (a) the activity is consistent with the definition of scholarly/creative activity set forth in the Agreement; (b) the activity fulfills the standards of the faculty member's Departmental Evaluation Document; and (c) the faculty member's application for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion is in compliance with the terms and conditions of the Agreement.

PROCEDURES

Types of Evaluation

There are seven types of evaluation of faculty performance:

1. Interim Evaluation of probationary faculty members for reappointment (for all faculty);
2. Comprehensive Interim Evaluations (for faculty members hired after January 1, 1997);
3. Full Interim Evaluation (conducted only if required following Interim or Comprehensive Interim Evaluation)
4. First Full Evaluation of probationary faculty members (for all faculty);
5. Full Evaluation of probationary faculty members for reappointment or tenure (for all faculty);
6. Full Evaluation of faculty members applying for promotion;
7. Professional Performance Evaluation of tenured faculty members.

Schedule of Evaluations

Evaluations of probationary faculty members hired before January 1, 1997 shall be conducted according to the following schedule:

Initial Appointment Rank	Years						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Professor	Interim	Full R/T	Interim	Full/T			
Associate Professor	Interim	Full/R*	Full R/T	Interim	Full/T		
Assistant Professor	Interim	Interim	Full/R*	Full R/T	Interim	Full/T	
Instructor	Interim	Interim	Full/R*	Interim	Full R/T	Interim	Full/T

* Scholarly/Creative Activity is rated, but advisory only.

(Rank at initial appointment shall determine the evaluation schedule.)

Evaluation of probationary faculty members hired after January 1, 1997, shall be conducted according to the following schedule:

Initial Appointment Rank	YEARS					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Professor	Initial Interim	Full/R	Full/ Tenure			
Associate Professor	Initial Interim	First Full/R	Comp. Interim	Full/ Tenure		
Assistant Professor	Initial Interim	Initial Interim	First Full/R	Comp. Interim	Full/ Tenure	
Instructor	Initial Interim	Initial Interim	First Full/R*	Comp. Interim.	Comp. Interim.	Full/ Tenure

(Rank at initial appointment shall determine the evaluation schedule.)

In those instances in which a faculty member is initially appointed in mid-academic year (i.e., at the beginning of the winter term), the duration between such initial appointment and the following September 1 shall be deemed the first (1st) year of appointment. The decision not to use this initial period as the first (1st) year of appointment shall be made: 1) by the faculty member by October 15 of the first calendar year of his/her appointment by associate professors and professors, or 2) by October 15 of the second calendar year of his/her appointment by assistant professors and instructors. The faculty member shall notify the Department Head of his/her decision in writing by October 15.

Procedures for Conducting Evaluations

1. Initial Interim Evaluation for Reappointment

In the faculty member's first year of employment at EMU, no Annual Faculty Activity Report is submitted. His/her interim evaluation during that year is conducted using information obtained through classroom visits, review of instructional materials and discussions with the Department Head and the appropriate departmental committee, and shall focus primarily on instructional effectiveness.

In all other interim evaluation years, the faculty member shall submit an Annual Faculty Activity Report by October 15. Instructional materials, such as syllabi, exams, assignments, etc., should accompany the Annual Faculty Activity Report. The evaluation should cover all instructional effectiveness and service activities prior to the previous August 31 that were not evaluated in any prior evaluation. The Department Head and appropriate departmental committee should meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her instructional effectiveness and service activities and review the results of evaluation techniques for instructional effectiveness, including, but not limited to, self-evaluation, classroom visitations, student evaluations of teaching, Department Head evaluations, peer evaluations, and, where appropriate, assessment of academic advising of students. The faculty member may request that the evaluators give some indication of whether his/her scholarly/creative activity is developing in a way consistent with departmental standards. Faculty are reappointed unless a potential performance problem in instructional effectiveness or service is perceived and the department elects to conduct a formal, written full interim evaluation.

2. Comprehensive Interim Evaluations

In all Comprehensive Interim Evaluation years, the faculty member shall submit an Annual Faculty Activity Report by October 15. The Department Head and appropriate departmental committee shall meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her Instructional Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service Activities, and review the results of the required evaluation techniques of Instructional Effectiveness. Scholarly/Creative Activity is evaluated for advisory purposes only. Faculty are reappointed in those years designated for a Comprehensive Interim Evaluation unless a potential performance problem in Instructional Effectiveness or Service is perceived and the department elects to conduct a formal, written Full Interim Evaluation.

3. Full Interim Evaluation

If a Department Head or department personnel committee perceive a problem in Instructional Effectiveness or Service during an Interim or Comprehensive Interim evaluation, the Department Head and personnel committee shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the perceived problem. Following the meeting, the faculty member may be required to submit to a Full Interim Evaluation. If so required, he/she must submit an Application for Full Interim Evaluation within thirty (30) calendar days of this notification. The application shall cover the record of Instructional Effectiveness and Service performed prior to the date of the Full Interim Application and not included in any prior evaluation.

If, following a review of the faculty member's Application for Full Interim Evaluation, the evaluators conclude that the faculty member's Instructional Effectiveness and/or Service fulfill the standards of performance required for reappointment, as provided in the Departmental Evaluation Document and the Agreement, the evaluation(s) shall be reduced to writing and given to the faculty member, with a copy to the Dean and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

If, following a review of the faculty member's Application for Full Interim Evaluation, the evaluators conclude that the faculty member's Instructional Effectiveness and/or Service does not fulfill the standards of performance required for reappointment as provided in the Departmental Evaluation Document and the Agreement, the evaluation (s) shall be reduced to writing, jointly if there is agreement between the Department Head and the committee, or separately if there is disagreement. The evaluation shall be given to the faculty member who may respond within five (5) working days of the receipt of the written results of the evaluation(s). The faculty member may include in response any and all evidence/documentation in support of his/her Instructional Effectiveness and/or Service that he/she deems appropriate.

The faculty member's response to his/her evaluation(s) and the evaluation(s) shall be forwarded in turn to the Dean and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for their review. If the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs determines, subject to the provisions of Article XV and Article XVI, that a probationary faculty member's appointment shall not be renewed, he/she shall notify the faculty member by no later than March 15 of his/her decision.

4. First Full Evaluation of Probationary Faculty Members

In the year the faculty member is scheduled for his/her first full evaluation, he/she shall submit, in addition to the Annual Faculty Activity Report, an application for evaluation by October 15 which provides a complete and documented statement of his/her Instructional Effectiveness, Scholarly and/or Creative Activity and Service Activity since his/her initial appointment.

In the first full evaluation for Associate Professor (Year 2), Assistant Professor (year 3) and Instructor (year 3), the Scholarly/Creative Activity evaluation is for advisory purposes only. A

rating will be assigned, but this rating shall not be utilized for determining whether the faculty member is qualified for reappointment.

Scholarly/Creative Activities which has been submitted for review, but which has not yet been accepted for publication or other dissemination, in a specific form and forum, may be included in the application if the faculty member has a reasonable expectation that it will be accepted prior to March 1 of the following year. Such Scholarly/Creative Activity for which documented acceptance in the originally specified form (including editorially required modifications) and forum of dissemination is received prior to March 1 shall be deemed to satisfy the documentation require for the full Evaluation.

Each faculty member must provide qualitative documented evidence that establishes that he/she has satisfied the appropriate evaluation criteria. Activities without such documentation shall not count toward fulfilling an evaluation criterion.

All Full Evaluations must include a review of the results of the required evaluation techniques for Instructional Effectiveness.

5. Full Evaluation of Probationary Faculty Members for Reappointment or Tenure.

Each year that a faculty member is scheduled for a Full Evaluation, he/she shall submit, in addition to the Annual Faculty Activity Report, an application for evaluation by October 15 which provides a complete and documented statement of his/her Instructional Effectiveness, Scholarly and/or Creative Activity and Service Activity since the last full evaluation or since his her initial appointment, whichever is more recent.

Scholarly/Creative Activity which has been submitted for review, but which has not yet been accepted for publication or other dissemination in a specific form and forum, may be included in the application if the faculty member has a reasonable expectation that it will be accepted prior to March 1 of the following year. Such Scholarly/Creative Activities for which modifications) and forum of dissemination is received prior to March 1 shall be deemed to satisfy the documented acceptance in the originally specified form (including editorially required documentation requirement for the Full Evaluation.

Each faculty member must provide qualitative documented evidence that establishes that he/she has satisfied the appropriate evaluation criteria. Activities without such documentation shall not count toward fulfilling an evaluation criterion.

All full evaluations must include a review of the results of the required evaluation techniques for Instructional Effectiveness.

Candidates can simultaneously apply for promotion, if applicable, by checking the appropriate box on the application form, or a faculty member applying for tenure can submit a separate promotion application under number 6 below.

6. Full Evaluation for Promotion

Applications for promotion are due by February 1, and shall include evidence of the faculty member's Instructional Effectiveness, Scholarly and/or Creative Activity, and Service since his/her last promotion or initial appointment (where applicable).

The faculty member who is not simultaneously a candidate for tenure shall inform the Department Head in writing of his/her intent to apply for promotion by the previous October 15. Scholarly/Creative activities that have been submitted for review, but which have not yet been accepted for publication or other dissemination in a specific form and forum (e.g., a specific journal, conference or exhibition), may be included in the February 1 application, if the faculty member has a reasonable expectation that it will be accepted prior to May 15. Such Scholarly/Creative Activities for which documented acceptance in the originally specified form (including editorially required modifications) and form of dissemination is received prior to May 15 shall be deemed to satisfy the documentation requirement for the promotion application.

The faculty member eligible simultaneously for tenure and promotion in the same academic year shall have the option of indicating via a check box on the Reappointment/Tenure application form that the application for Full Evaluation submitted on October 15 is also an application for promotion. An update covering any activities since October 15 may be provided on February 1.

Each faculty member must provide qualitative documented evidence that establishes that he/she has satisfied the appropriate evaluation criteria. Activities without such documentation shall not count toward fulfilling an evaluation criterion.

7. Professional Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty.

Every four-year period, the Department Head shall review a tenured faculty member's Annual Faculty Activity Reports for that period and any other available relevant materials, including Instructional Effectiveness evaluation materials set forth in the Agreement. Upon determining that the faculty member's performance meets or exceeds the department's standards for satisfactory (or average in all three areas), as defined in this Departmental Evaluation Document, he/she shall so state in writing to the faculty member, the Dean, and the Provost. (Note that the faculty member is not required to initiate this review or to provide any material for it other than the Annual Faculty Activity Reports.)

If, upon completing the review of the Annual Faculty Activity Reports, the Department Head determines that a faculty member's performance does not rise to the level of average in the Departmental Evaluation Document, he/she shall bring his/her concerns to the attention of the department's Personnel Committee. Together, the Department Head and the committee shall review the Annual Faculty Activity Reports and any relevant information/documents (e.g., student evaluations, letters received, etc.) available to them. If their joint review concludes that there appear to be no deficits in the faculty member's performance, they shall say so in writing and place a copy of this statement in the faculty member's departmental personnel file, with a copy to the faculty member, the College Dean, and the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for inclusion in the University personnel file.

If the joint review confirms that there appear to be deficits, the procedures in Article XV of the Agreement will be followed

Directions for Preparing Applications

Directions for preparing applications are on the following pages. Note that full interim evaluations and full professional performance evaluations are for special situations only and are not regularly scheduled events.

Only work completed while a faculty member is in rank at EMU may be counted for purposes of reappointment, tenure or promotion. However, a faculty member who has service as a full-time temporary employee outside the bargaining unit (e.g., lecturer) or full-time tenure track professional experience at another institution of higher education or related professional experience may receive credit at the time of his/her initial appointment for a proportion of his/her experience for the purpose of tabulating service/rank credit to determine his/her eligibility for consideration for tenure and/or promotion, provided that the conditions set forth in Article XIV are met. Service/rank credit for prior experience must be set forth in writing and granted prior to the faculty member's initial date of appointment, or it is barred from further consideration.

Scholarly work completed elsewhere in years for which a faculty member has received service rank credit toward tenure and/or promotion may be counted for purposes of reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

Directions for Preparing Interim Evaluations, and Comprehensive Interim Evaluations

Applicants

In a faculty member's first year of employment at EMU, no Annual Faculty Activity Report is required.

In all other Interim and Comprehensive Interim Evaluation years, a faculty member must submit an Annual Faculty Activity Report by October 15. The faculty member should make available his/her instructional materials, and for the Comprehensive Interim Evaluation, any Scholarly Activity to be reviewed.

Evaluators

In a faculty member's first year the evaluators use information obtained through classroom visits, review of instructional materials, and discussion with the faculty member to complete the review.

In all other Interim and Comprehensive Interim Evaluation years the Department Head and appropriate departmental committee shall meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her Instructional and Service activities, and review the results of the required evaluation techniques of Instructional Effectiveness set forth in Article XV of the Agreement. They shall include in their discussion a review of both the positive elements they see as well as those elements of the faculty member's performance where improvement might reasonably be expected by the time the faculty member undergoes a Full Evaluation. For the Comprehensive Interim Evaluation, the Department Head and personnel committee shall review the Scholarly/Creative Activity for advisory purposes only. During their Interim Evaluation the faculty member may request that the evaluators give some indication as to whether or not his/her Scholarly/Creative Activity is developing in a way that is appropriate for the department's standards.

If, in either the Initial Interim Evaluation, the Interim Evaluation, or the Comprehensive Interim Evaluation, the evaluators conclude that the faculty member's Instructional Effectiveness and Service fulfill the standards of performance required for reappointment, as provided in the applicable Departmental Evaluation Document and the Agreement, the committee and the Department Head shall complete and sign an Interim Evaluation/Recommendation for Reappointment form which shall be placed in the faculty member's personnel file, with a copy provided the faculty member.

By February 15 of each year the Department Head shall inform the Dean and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in writing that the Interim Evaluation has been completed and that the faculty member's performance has been deemed appropriate for reappointment for a subsequent probationary year.

In those instances where the department personnel committee and/or the Department Head perceive(s) that a performance problem pertaining to a faculty member's Instructional Effectiveness or Service may exist, they shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the perceived problem. Following the meeting, the faculty member may be required to submit to a Full Interim Evaluation.

Directions for Preparing the Application for Full Interim Evaluation

Applicants

Faculty members required to submit an application for Full Interim Evaluation must:

1. Complete the Application for Full Interim Evaluation Form .
2. Write a narrative which describes how their activities have fulfilled the Agreement's and this document's criteria for reappointment at the appropriate year in the areas of Instructional Effectiveness and/or Service. If the perceived problem exists in only one of the two areas, only that area need be addressed. Supporting materials should be included in an appendix. The narrative regarding Instructional Effectiveness should include: (1) courses taught, (2) results of student, peer and Department Head evaluations, to the extent these are available, and (3) any other information the applicant believes helpful for evaluating his/her teaching and (where appropriate) advising of students. Regarding point 3, such materials as sample syllabi and other classroom materials may be included in an appendix. If the applicant's service is being evaluated, all service activities should be listed and the manner in which they have contributed to the good of the appropriate unit should be indicated.

Evaluators

1. If, following the review of the faculty member's Application for Full Interim Evaluation, the evaluators conclude that the faculty member's Instructional Effectiveness and/or Service fulfill the standards of performance required for reappointment, the evaluation(s) shall be reduced in writing and given to the faculty member, with a copy to the Dean and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.
2. If, following a review of the faculty member's application for Full Interim Evaluation, the evaluators conclude that the faculty member's Instructional Effectiveness and/or Service does not fulfill the standards of performance required for reappointment as provided in the applicable Departmental Evaluation Document and the Agreement, the evaluation(s) shall be reduced to writing, jointly if there is agreement between the Department Head and the Personnel Committee, or separately if there is disagreement. The evaluation shall be given to the faculty response any and all evidence/documentation in support of his/her Instructional Effectiveness and/or Service that he/she deems appropriate.
3. The faculty member's response to his/her evaluation(s) and the evaluation(s) shall be forwarded in turn to the Dean and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for their review. If the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs determines, subject to the provisions of Article XV and XVI of the Agreement, that a probationary

faculty member's appointment shall not be renewed, he/she shall notify the faculty member by no later than March 15 of his/her decision.

Note: a positive Full Interim Evaluation does not insure that a subsequent Full Evaluation will result in reappointment or tenure. Applicants and evaluators should note the exact contract language regarding this point in Article XV.

Directions for Preparing the Application for Full Evaluation

Applicants

A faculty member applying for reappointment during years when a full evaluation is required shall:

1. Complete Annual Faculty Activity Report.
2. Complete the application for Full Evaluation Form
3. Describe in a narrative statement or essay how he/she has met the department's criteria in each of the three areas under consideration: instructional effectiveness, scholarly and/or creative activity and service. The applicant is responsible for describing and where appropriate, documenting, in terms of quantity and quality, the activities presented for evaluation. The narrative should describe the applicant's work in such a fashion that the reader can relate his/her performance to the established criteria and make an informed judgment about how well those expectations have been met. Student evaluations, samples of classroom materials, copies of articles, commendations etc., should be included as documentation in an appendix and referenced where appropriate. The essay itself, without supporting documents, should be freestanding and will become part of the applicant's personnel file. The essay should include the following:

Instructional Effectiveness

- Specific evidence of effectiveness in the teaching/advising process;
- Activities that have improved the applicant's teaching;
- Results of student, peer and Department Head evaluation; and
- The manner in which the applicant has met the criteria.

Scholarly and/or Creative Activity:

- A list of specific items presented for evaluation and other approved Activities with enough description to make them understandable to the reader;
- The manner in which the results of these activities were disseminated;
- The contribution the activities have made to the discipline;
- A description of any judgments which have been made about these activities; and
- The manner in which the applicant has met the criteria.

Service:

- The specific activities presented for evaluation;
- A description of the way in which they have contributed to the appropriate unit; and
- The manner in which the applicant has met the criteria.

Evaluators

The Personnel Committee and Department Head must complete his/her portion of the Full Evaluation and Recommendation Summary Form and an evaluation report which shall be supported by narrative statements which explain in clear and explicit terms how/why the applicant's activities do or do not satisfy the standards of performance in the Departmental Evaluation Document and the terms of the Agreement. Specifically, the departmental committee and the Department Head shall explain:

- 1) The evaluation efforts which were conducted and their individual results.
- 2) The qualitative and, where applicable, quantitative basis for all ratings which were assigned.
- 3) Precisely how and to what extent the activities claimed do or do not satisfy the standards of performance of the faculty member's Departmental Evaluation Document and the criteria of Article XV of the contract, and, in particular, how those activities claimed as Scholarly/Creative Activity have contributed to the discipline or area of specialization.

Full evaluations shall be reviewed by the Dean in accordance with the standards of performance in the Departmental Evaluation Document and the terms of the Agreement. The Dean shall submit a copy of his/her evaluation to the Faculty Member, who shall have five (5) working days to respond.

All materials, as well as any rebuttals provided by the applicant, should then be forwarded to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, who shall notify the faculty member no later than March 15 of his/her decision.

Directions for Preparing the Application for Promotion

Applicants. A faculty member applying for promotion is required to:

1. Complete an Annual Faculty Activity Report.
2. Complete the Application for Promotion Form by February 1, unless the applicant is simultaneously applying for tenure. If the applicant filed application for tenure on the previous October 15, he/she should check the promotion box on that application, and may provide an update including activities between October 15 and February 1 by February 1.
3. Describe in a narrative statement or essay how he/she has met the department's criteria in each of the three areas under consideration: Instructional Effectiveness, Scholarly and/or Creative Activity and Service. The applicant is responsible for describing and

where appropriate, documenting, in terms of quantity and quality, the activities presented for evaluation. It should describe the applicant's work in such a fashion that the reader can relate the applicant's performance to the established criteria and make an informed judgment about how well those expectations have been met. Student evaluations, samples of classroom materials, copies of articles, commendations, etc., should be included as documentation in an appendix and referenced where appropriate. The essay itself, without supporting documents, should be freestanding and will become part of the applicant's personnel file. The essay should include the following:

Instructional Effectiveness:

- Specific evidence of effectiveness in the teaching/advising process;
- Activities that have improved the applicant's teaching;
- Results of student, peer and Department Head evaluations; and
- The manner in which the applicant has met the criteria in the Agreement and the Department Evaluation Document.

Scholarly and/or Creative Activity:

- list of specific items presented for evaluation and other approved activities with enough description to make them understandable to the reader;
- the manner in which the results of these activities were disseminated;
- the contribution the activities have made to the discipline;
- a description of any judgments which have been made about these activities; and
- the manner in which the applicant has met the DED criteria.

Service:

- the specific activities presented for evaluation;
- a description of the way in which they have contributed to the good of the appropriate unit; and
- the manner in which the applicant has met the DED criteria.

Evaluators

The Personnel Committee and Department Head must complete his/her portion of the Promotion Recommendation Summary Form and an evaluation report which shall be supported by narrative statements which explain in clear and explicit terms how/why the applicant's activities do or do not satisfy the standards of performance in the Departmental Evaluation Document and the terms of the Agreement. Specifically, the departmental committee and Department Head shall explain:

- 1) The evaluation efforts which were conducted and their individual results.
- 2) The qualitative and, where applicable, quantitative basis for all

ratings which were assigned.

- 3) Precisely how and to what extent the activities claimed do or do not satisfy the standards of performance of the faculty member's Departmental Evaluation Document and the criteria of Article XV of the contract, and, in particular, how those activities claimed as Scholarly/Creative Activity have contributed to the discipline or area of specialization.

All materials, as well as any rebuttals provided by the applicant, should then be forwarded to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs who shall notify the faculty member by no later than May 31 of his/her decision.

Note: This evaluation covers all activity since initial appointment OR the last promotion, whichever is most recent.

Directions for Conducting Professional Performance Evaluations

Applicants

The Faculty Member files an ANNUAL FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORT with the Department Head by October 15. See marginal paragraph (365).

Evaluators

The Department Head shall review the Annual Activity Reports applicable to the four (4) year evaluation period [i.e. the last four (4) years' performance of a tenured faculty member] to determine whether the faculty member's performance is satisfactory. (If the Department Head has information that indicates a significant problem in Instructional Effectiveness or if the faculty member has no record of Service, the Department Head may conduct a review more frequently.) If, upon completing a review of four Annual Activity Reports and available relevant material, the Department Head (guided by the Departmental Evaluation Document) determines that a faculty member's performance meets or exceeds the Department's standards for average, he/she shall so state in writing and place a copy of this statement in the faculty member's Departmental personnel file, with a copy to the faculty member, the College Dean, and the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for inclusion in the University personnel file.

If, upon completing the review of the Annual Activity Reports, the Department Head determines that a faculty member's performance does not rise to the level of average in the Departmental Evaluation Document, he/she shall bring his/her concerns to the attention of the Department's Personnel Committee. Together the Department head and the committee shall review the Annual Activity Reports and any relevant information/documents (e.g., student evaluations, letters received, etc.) available to them. If their joint review concludes that there appear to be no deficits in the faculty member's Departmental

personnel file, they shall say so in writing and place a copy of this statement in the faculty member's Departmental personnel file, with a copy to the faculty member, the College Dean, and the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for inclusion in the University personnel file.

If the joint review confirms that there appear to be deficits in the faculty member's performance, he/she shall be given the opportunity to discuss his/her situation with the Personnel Committee and the Department Head in order to determine how deficits might be corrected. If the deficits in the faculty member's performance are minor in nature and appear to be correctable within a period of one (1) academic year or less, the Department head shall inform the Dean in writing of the Department's concern, with a copy to the faculty member, the College Dean, and the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for inclusion in the University personnel file.

The following year the Department Head and the Department Personnel Committee shall meet with the faculty member and review that year's Annual Activity Report to determine if the deficit(s) in performance has/have been corrected. If the deficit(s) has/have been corrected, they shall say so in writing and place a copy of the statement in the faculty member's Departmental personnel office, a copy to the faculty member, the College Dean, and the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for inclusion in the University personnel file.

Directions for Conducting a Full Professional Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

If after completing a Professional Performance Evaluation of a tenured faculty member, and implementing all provisions under the contract for correcting deficits, the performance problems remain; or if the deficits identified in the Professional Performance Evaluation are so serious as to take more than one year to correct, the Department shall initiate a Full Professional Performance Evaluation. This Full Professional Performance Evaluation is to be conducted according to the standards and processes, and with the possible sanctions outlined in the contract.

It is expressly agreed that Full Professional Performance Evaluations are not to be substituted for routine Professional Performance Evaluations, but only implemented where serious or long-term problems exist.

If the Department Head and Personnel Committee disagree concerning the performance of the faculty member, the Department Head may call for a Full Professional Performance Evaluation.

During the Full Professional Performance Evaluation of a faculty member not seeking promotion, the Personnel Committee and Department Head shall meet with the tenured faculty member to discuss his/her Instructional Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activity and Service Activity, the Annual Activity Reports applicable to the period under review, and the results of the required evaluation techniques set forth in Article XV B1 and any documentation the faculty member wishes to provide, to determine whether the faculty member's performance is determined to be satisfactory, the Department Head shall provide a written report that shall detail the evaluation and the basis for the determination that the faculty

member is performing at a satisfactory level, which shall include appropriate reference to Department standards set forth in the Departmental Evaluation Document and specific accomplishments of the faculty member in each of the three (3) areas of evaluation.

In those instances where the evaluators conclude that a faculty member has not performed at a satisfactory level, the Department Head shall reduce the evaluation to writing, clearly stating the basis for the determination. The Personnel Committee members shall signify their concurrence or non-concurrence and sign the evaluation, which shall then be given to the faculty member who may respond within five (5) working days of his/her receipt of the evaluation. The faculty member may include in his/her response any and all evidence/documentation in support of his/her performance that he/she deems appropriate.

Upon completion of any Full Professional Performance Evaluation the Department Head shall meet with the College Dean to review the results of the evaluation(s).

In those instances where the Dean does not concur with the Department's evaluation(s) of satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance, the Dean shall reduce his/her objections to writing, and shall return the evaluation to the Department for further consideration. The Department and/or the faculty member may respond to the Dean within five (5) working days of receipt of the

Dean's objection and may include in the response any and all evidence/documentation in support of the evaluation of a faculty member's performance.

If, after this further consideration, the Dean concurs with the Department's evaluation of satisfactory, he/she shall say so in a letter to be placed in the Department's Personnel file, with a copy to the faculty member, the Department Head, and the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for inclusion in the University personnel file.

Unsatisfactory Performance-Programs for Improvement

In the event there is a final determination by the Dean of the College that the Faculty member's performance for the period covered by the Full Professional Performance Evaluation is unsatisfactory, the Dean shall schedule a meeting to consult with the Department Head, the Personnel Committee, the faculty member, the Director, Academic Human Resources and a representative of the EMU-AAUP, to explore the structure for a program to assist the faculty member in correcting his/her unsatisfactory performance, which shall be set forth in a program and timetable for improvement of not less than one year's duration. The Program for Improvement shall set out expectations and assessment procedures based on the criteria in the Departmental Evaluation Document and the Agreement. If there is a disagreement between any of the aforementioned parties as to: a) whether a Program for Improvement should be written; b) the contents of the Program for Improvement; or c) the assessment of the faculty member's performance, the College Dean shall have the final responsibility for developing the Program for Improvement.

When the Program for Improvement is finalized, it shall be presented to the affected faculty member. Copies shall be forwarded to the Office of the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Association.

Extensions of Programs for Improvement beyond the timeliness originally established shall be possible, under the following conditions:

1. A meeting of all the parties (Department Head, Personnel Committee, and faculty member) shall be convened to discuss a proposed extension.
2. Specific reasons for the desirability of an extension shall be presented by the Department Head.
3. An extension proposal must be finalized by the Dean of the College and presented to the faculty member no later than thirty (30) days prior to the expiration of the original Program for Improvement.

In the event there is a dispute pertaining to the appropriateness of a particular Program for Improvement, a Grievance may be filed commencing a Step Three of the Grievance Procedure set forth in Article VII. However, grievances of procedural violations in the Full Professional Performance Evaluation process must be filed at the appropriate step of the Grievance Procedure (Step One, Two) as provided for in Article VII, subject to the timeliness provided therein. For purposes of determining the timeliness for filing grievances at Step Three of the Grievance Procedure, University actions in the Full Professional Performance Evaluation process shall be construed to have occurred when the Association receives a copy of the Program for Improvement (original or extension) from the Dean.

Once a Program for Improvement has been established, timeliness in the program shall govern any further evaluation of areas of deficiency or extensions of the program. The faculty member's progress shall be assessed by the Department Head in consultation with the Department Personnel Committee at assessment points specified in the Program for Improvement.

The Department Head shall report the results of evaluations conducted at any interim assessment points provided in a Program for Improvement, and the final results of the assessment of a faculty member's compliance with a Program for Improvement to the Dean of the College who shall determine if the faculty member has satisfactorily completed the Program for Improvement. If he/she so concludes, he/she shall inform the faculty member in writing and provide a copy to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the faculty member, and the Association.

Professional Performance Evaluation Criteria

Tenured faculty members in the Department of Computer Information Systems should engage in scholarly activity on a continuing basis. Professional Performance evaluations shall be conducted for each four years of a tenured faculty member's employment. The Department Personnel Committee shall rate

the faculty member's performance as SATISFACTORY or BELOW SATISFACTORY. This rating will be based on Faculty Activity Reports and other available information made available to the Department Personnel Committee, referred to as the committee. Material used by the committee that are not presented, or made available by the faculty member, must be of known and documented authorship. The committee will base its evaluation on the faculty member's performance, during the four (4) years under review, on the three (3) areas of Instructional Effectiveness, Scholarly and/or Creative Activity and Service.

To achieve an overall rating of SATISFACTORY, the faculty member must achieve a rating of Average in Instructional Effectiveness, Scholarly an/or Creative Activity, and Service.

The Personnel Committee will assign Scholarly and/or Creative Activity ratings. The Committee will evaluate all materials related to Scholarly and/or Creative Activity permitted by the EMU-AAUP contract agreement. The Committee will assign a Scholarly and/or Creative Activity rating of Average if a minimum of 15 points is accumulated from the list below.

- a.** Refereed papers published in a text or journal including empirical articles, literature reviews, and cases depending upon the nature and quality of the journal (14 points).
- b.** Non-refereed but works published under editorial scrutiny including empirical articles, literature reviews and cases (7 points).
- c.** A monograph or book published by a college publisher paying royalties or a reputable professional or scholarly organization (16 points).
- d.** Refereed convention papers or cases (7 points).
- e.** In evaluating grant proposals and/or grant administrative activity of publishable quality, the Personnel Committee will judge the level of depth, completeness, and quality and use these as criteria (2 points).
- f.** Standard that is published by a recognized professional organization (14 points).
- g.** The development of original software for public use (7 points).
- h.** Training courses (5 points).
- i.** Professional certification (7 points).
- j.** Book/paper review (2 points).
- k.** Written cases with Instructional Material (5 points).
- l.** Design and Development of new course/seminar material (5 points).

Any scholarly and/or creative activity not listed above will be assigned points by the Personnel Committee.

This requirement shall become effective at the start of next PPE evaluation period for each faculty member. It will be effective immediately for anyone hired after this document is approved.

STANDARDS

APPOINTMENT STANDARDS

	ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS AND ADDITIONAL CRITERIA	EQUIVALENCIES OR EXCEPTIONS
PROFESSOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> °Appropriate Ph.D. or D.B.A. from an AACSB accredited school or its equivalent. °Scholarly Activity: Commensurate with rank 	°None
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> °Appropriate Ph.D. or D.B.A. from an AACSB accredited school or its equivalent. °Scholarly Activity: Commensurate with rank. 	°Ph.D. in related area with at least 15 Graduate credit hours in an appropriate major subject to majority faculty approval.
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	°Appropriate Ph.D., D.B.A., or A.B.D. from an AACSB accredited school or its equivalent, leading to appropriate Ph.D. or D.B.A.	°Ph.D. in related area with at least 15 Graduate credit hours in an appropriate major subject to majority faculty approval.
INSTRUCTOR	A.B.D.* from an AACSB accredited school or its equivalent, appropriate MS or MBA with enrollment in an appropriate Ph.D. or DBA program in a AACSB accredited school.	°None

* All But Dissertation

REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS
 Pre-January 1997 Hires

PROFESSOR

Year	1	2	2	3	4
Evaluation	Interim	Full R	Tenure	Interim	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	A	A	DAA	DAA	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X	A	DAA	X	DAA
Service	A	A	A	A	A

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Year	1	2	3	3	4	5
Evaluation	Interim	Full	Full R	Tenure	Interim	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	A	A	A	DAA	DAA	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X	X*	A	DAA	X	DAA
Service	A	A	A	A	A	A

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Year	1	2	3	4	4	5	6
Evaluation	Interim ¹	Interim ¹	Full ²	Full R	Tenure	Interim	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	A	A	A	A	DAA	DAA	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X	X	X*	A	DAA	X	DAA
Service	A	A	A	A	A	A	A

* Scholarly/Creative Activity is advisory only. Rank at initial appointment determines the evaluation schedule of a faculty member.

- 1 All but dissertation hires must provide measurable evidence of progress toward completion of the Ph.D. (Statement from Dissertation Chair required).
- 2 Proof of Completion of all requirements for the Ph.D. by the date of application or by the date the Provost notifies or August 31.

REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS

Post-January 1997 Hires

PROFESSOR

Year	1	2	3
Evaluation	Init. Int.	Full R	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	A	A	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X	A	DAA
Service	A	A	A

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Year	1	2	3	4
Evaluation	Init. Int.	Full R	Comp. Int.	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	A	A	A	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X	X*	X	DAA
Service	A	A	A	A

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Year	1	2	3	4	5
Evaluation	Init. Int. 1	Init. Int. 1	Full R 2	Comp.Int.	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	A	A	A	A	DAA
Scholarly Activity	X	X	X*	X	DAA
Service	A	A	A	A	A

*Scholarly/Creative Activity is advisory only

- 1 All but dissertation hires must provide measurable evidence of progress toward completion of the Ph.D. (Statement from Dissertation Chair required).
- 2 Proof of Completion of all requirements for the Ph.D.

PROMOTION STANDARDS

	YEAR ELIGIBLE	ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS	INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS	SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITY	SERVICE
TO PROFESSOR	5 years as associate professor at EMU	Appropriate Ph.D. or D.B.A. from an AACSB accredited school or its equivalent	DAA	DAA	DAA
TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	4 years as assistant professor at EMU	Appropriate Ph.D. or D.B.A. from an AACSB accredited school or its equivalent	DAA	DAA	DAA
TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	4 years as instructor at EMU	Appropriate Ph.D. or D.B.A. from an AACSB accredited school or its equivalent	DAA	DAA	DAA

TECHNIQUES

Instructional Effectiveness

Data Collection Procedures

1. Faculty member must write a report of activities and accomplishments for all Full Evaluations. Each applicant must include a personal report of activities and accomplishments (see pages 5-8 for specific instructions concerning format). Such a report may include, but is not limited to, evidence indicating the extent to which the applicant does the following:

- A. Prepares for teaching
 - a. Knows subject matter and keeps current.
 - b. Participates creatively in the subject area through the development of teaching materials and program coordination.
 - c. Seeks the latest information in the subject area(s) taught, by reading, attending professional conferences and/or by communicating with colleagues.
 - d. Regularly evaluates his/her own past teaching methods, procedures and course content.

- B. Plans effectively for teaching
 - a. Has a clear idea of the function of his/her course(s) within the Department, within the University and/or community, and of its role in preparing students for careers.
 - b. Has a clear idea of the long term objectives for the course(s) and for the day-to-day classroom activities as evidenced by course syllabi.
 - c. Evaluates students so as to measure the attainment of objectives set forth.

- C. Practices good teaching methods
 - a. Clearly informs students of the purposes and objectives of the course(s) and of units of study in the course(s).
 - b. Helps students develop methods of study and skills in self-direction.
 - c. Keeps students informed of specific responsibilities (e.g., equipment usage, study requirements).
 - d. Provides students with regular and prompt performance evaluations.
 - e. Informs students of specific course assignments (e.g., dates of exams, papers, etc.)
 - f. Attempts to establish a classroom environment conducive to learning.
 - g. Evaluates students so as to measure the attainment of course objectives.

- D. Is committed to students
 - a. Helps students who need his/her help.

- b. Works beyond regular classroom responsibilities to help students with independent learning experiences (e.g., special problems, independent study, thesis, publication).
 - c. Keeps up-to-date regarding practices and procedures necessary for academic advising.
 - d. Assists students with academic problems.
 - e. Holds office hours on a regular basis.
- E. Quality standards are set
- a. Academic level of the material presented is appropriate.
 - b. Grading and performance standards of the profession and department are met.
 - c. A high quality-learning environment is being developed in the classroom.
2. Department Head evaluations, including classroom visitations. (See Appendix for Classroom Visitation Evaluation Forms.)
 3. Department Personnel Committee evaluations, including classroom visitations.
 4. Student evaluations from university-wide evaluation system and those required departmental questions, if any, as selected by the department personnel committee. (The Department of Computer Information Systems elected not to require Departmental-specific questions.)
 5. Student evaluations of advising, if applicable.
 6. Teaching awards.
 7. Peer evaluations. (Majority or at least three members of the Personnel Sub-committee in the applicant's discipline)
 8. Other areas.

Ratings

The Personnel Committee and the Department Head will evaluate all evidence submitted. The most important factor in rating instructional effectiveness is the quality of the learning experience for students. For interim evaluations, the Personnel Committee and the Department Head will together meet with the applicant to discuss his/her performance and suggest appropriate directions for improvement, if such direction is necessary. Written reports will be made separately by the Personnel Committee and the Department Head giving the rationale for the ratings awarded

for full evaluations for reappointment, tenure, promotion and four (4) year Professional Performance Evaluations.

Exceptional (E): Awarded when the quality of instruction offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of a truly superior teacher. Evaluators must describe performance as better in quality than distinctly above average.

Distinctly Above Average (DAA): Awarded when the quality of instruction offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of an excellent teacher. Evaluators must describe performance as better in quality than average.

Average (A): Awarded when the quality of the instruction offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of a good teacher. This is the minimum level of performance.

Below Average (BA): Awarded when the quality of instruction offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of a weak teacher. Evaluators must describe performance as poorer in quality than average.

Scholarly and/or Creative Activity

Data Collection Procedures

For all Full Evaluations each applicant must include a personal report of his/her scholarly and/or creative activities and provide copies of papers, articles, books publications and/or other tangible documentation (see 5-8 for specific instructions concerning format). Scholarly and/or creative activity is not evaluated during interim evaluations.

Evaluation Reports

1. For all Full Evaluations the applicant must provide a narrative statement for each activity describing in clear and explicit terms how and to what extent the activity has met the criteria in the Department Evaluation Document and the Agreement.
2. The Personnel Committee should comment on each activity including a statement that clearly indicates how and to what extent the activity meets the criteria in the Department Evaluation Document and the Agreement.

3. The Department Head should comment on each activity including a statement that clearly indicates how and to what extent the activity has met the criteria in the Department Evaluation Document and the Agreement.

Ratings

Exceptional (E): Faculty member must accomplish Scholarly/Creative Activity, which places the individual's achievement clearly above the distinctly above average rating.

Distinctly Above Average (DAA); Faculty member must accomplish the following:

1. Three refereed journal articles in an academic/professional publications; or
2. Two refereed journal articles in academic/professional publications and
3. One of the following:
 - a. Three refereed papers published in academic/professional proceedings or
 - b. Three presentations at national and regional meetings.
 - c. One professional monograph or textbook published by a reputable college publisher paying royalties or by a reputable professional or scholarly organization.
 - d. A reasonable quality and quantity combination of the following types of activities as determined by the Personnel Committee and Department Head.
 - (i) Publication of articles, proceedings, monographs, textbooks, software, or text-book supplements.
 - (ii) Preparation and presentation at professional seminars, workshops, or conferences.
 - (iii) Preparation of working papers, including those resulting from grants.
 - (iv) Published critical reviews of professionals materials.
 - (v) Serving as an editorial referee for a professional journal.
 - (vi) Serving as a consultant in some area of professional specialization.

Average (A): Faculty member must accomplish the following

1. One refereed journal article in academic/professional publication; or
2. One of the following:
 - a) Two refereed papers published in academic proceedings, or
 - b) Two presentations at national and regional meetings.
 - c) One professional monograph or textbook published by a college publisher paying royalties or by a reputable professional or scholarly organization.
 - d) A reasonable quality and quantity combination of the following types of activities as determined by the Personnel Committee and Department Head.

- (i) Publications or articles, proceedings, monographs, textbooks, software, or textbook supplements.
- (ii) Preparation and presentation at professional seminars, workshops or conferences.
- (iii) Preparation of working papers, including those resulting from grants.
- (iv) Published critical reviews of professional materials.
- (v) Serving as an editorial referee for a professional journal.
- (iv) Serving as a consultant in some area of professional specialization.

Service Activity

Data Collection Procedures

The applicant will clearly identify his/her service activities related to the department and the university in a narrative text (see pages 5-8 for specific instructions concerning format). Supportive evidence must be provided to indicate the quantity of different service activities and the quality of the effort extended in those activities.

Service Activities

Service to the department, university or community may include, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Departmental, college and university committee activities.
2. Work with student organizations.
3. Contributions toward curriculum development.
4. Special assignments.
5. Offices held at Eastern Michigan University.
6. Service to professional organizations and honor societies.
7. Consulting performed as volunteer or contributed services in professionally related activities.
8. Other professionally related service activities.

Ratings

The Personnel Committee and the Department Head will evaluate all evidence submitted. For interim evaluations, the Personnel Committee and the Department Head will together meet with the applicant to discuss his/her performance and suggest appropriate directions for improvement, if such direction is necessary. Written reports will be made separately by Personnel Committee and the Department Head giving the rationale for the rating awarded for Full Evaluations for reappointment, tenure, promotion and Professional Performance Evaluations of tenured faculty.

Exceptional (E): Awarded when the quantity and quality of service shall be evaluated, in addition to the basis described for distinctly above average, as far beyond that normally expected of faculty. This shall be evidenced by the faculty member serving the department, the college, the university or the wider community with distinction.

Distinctly Above Average (DAA): Awarded when the quality and quantity of service shall be evaluated, in addition to the basis described for average, as substantially more than one's fair share. This shall be evidenced by the faculty member serving the department, the college, the university or the wider community over and above the normal requirements. Service to the department as well as other service must be substantially more than one's fair share to obtain this rating.

Average (A): Awarded when the quality and quantity of service to the department, the college, the university or the community shall be evaluated as that normally expected; one's fair share. One's fair share of service to the department includes adequate service, both in the scope of faculty member's service activities ("fair share") and in the quality of his/her contribution to service undertaken. Service is a normal part of one's professional responsibilities.

APPENDIX 1

STUDENT EVALUATION

The Student Evaluation form for the Department of Computer Information Systems shall consist of the University-wide standard two questions plus at least six questions from the University-wide list of approved questions. Faculty members will be free to select the questions beyond the standard two questions. The department of Computer Information Systems recognizes all the questions from the University-wide questions as approved questions for selection.

The University-wide standard questions are:

- ◆ What Is Your Overall Rating of the Teaching Effectiveness of This Instructor?
- ◆ What Is Your Overall Rating of This Course?

APPENDIX 2

CLASSROOM TEACHING OBSERVATION

Rating scale = (1 = below average, 2 = average, 3 = distinctly above average, 4 = exceptional, NA = not applicable)

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>RATING</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
 <u>LEARNING ENVIRONMENT</u>		
1. Uses a variety of teaching techniques.	1 2 3 4 NA	
2. Motivates students through enthusiasm for the subject matter.	1 2 3 4 NA	
3. Develops student participation.	1 2 3 4 NA	
4. Emphasizes the development of student's thinking & analytical skills, rather than simple memorization.	1 2 3 4 NA	
 <u>SUBJECT MATTER</u>		
1. Shows evidence of background preparation	1 2 3 4 NA	
2. Teaches the application of knowledge and knowledge & theory themselves.	1 2 3 4 NA	
3. Uses professional experience as examples in teaching.	1 2 3 4 NA	
4. Gives evidence of maintaining up-to-date course material.	1 2 3 4 NA	
5. Covers topic at the appropriate level.	1 2 3 4 NA	
6. main ideas are clear and specific.	1 2 3 4 NA	
 <u>VERBAL/NON-VERBAL</u>		
1. Articulation and pronunciation clear.	1 2 3 4 NA	
2. Volume sufficient to be heard.	1 2 3 4 NA	
3. Rate of delivery was appropriate.	1 2 3 4 NA	
 <u>ORGANIZATION</u>		
1. States the purpose of the class session.	1 2 3 4 NA	
2. Defines terms, concepts and principles.	1 2 3 4 NA	

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|----|
| 3. Arranges and discussed the content in a systematic and organized fashion. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NA |
| 4. Presents clear and simple examples to clarify abstract and difficult ideas. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NA |

USE OF QUESTIONS

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1. Asks questions to see what the students knew about the lecture topic. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NA |
| 2. Uses questions to gain student's attention. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NA |
| 3. Receives student questions politely and enthusiastically. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NA |
| 4. Pauses after all questions to allow students time to think of an answer. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NA |

INTERACTION

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1. Listens carefully to student comments and questions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NA |
| 2. Instructor feedback was informative. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NA |
| 3. Noted and responded to signs of puzzlement, boredom, curiosity, etc. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NA |
| 4. Encouraged student questions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NA |

USE OF MEDIA

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1. Writing on board/overhead/slides was legible. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NA |
| 2. Information presented on board/overhead/slides was organized and easy to follow. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NA |
| 3. The AV-materials used added to the student's Comprehension of the concept(s) being taught. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NA |

OVERALL RATING

_____ EXCEPTIONAL

_____ DISTINCTLY ABOVE AVERAGE

_____ AVERAGE

_____ BELOW AVERAGE

APPENDIX 3

Procedure for Classroom Visits

Notice of Visit

1. The Personnel Committee Chair and Department Head will notify faculty in writing at least one week in advance that committee members and Department Head are to be expected during specified two-week periods.
2. Faculty must inform the Personnel Committee Chair and Department Head within three days of the notifications of class(es) not suited for visitations during the specified two-week periods, because of examinations, planned field trips, etc.
3. Personnel Committee members need not provide individual notification to the faculty if they visit within the two-week period identified by the Personnel Committee Chair. They are encouraged, however, to inform faculty in advance (oral or written).
4. Personnel Committee members who cannot perform the class visitation within the two-week period indicated by the Personnel Committee Chair must inform the faculty in writing, one week in advance, of the specific day they plan to visit. The same applies to the Department Head if he/she cannot visit within the period indicated in Step 1.

Length of Visits

The length of class visits is to be determined case-by-case by individual committee members. However, visitations will not be less than the equivalent of one class period of a regularly scheduled class.

Peer and Department Head evaluations of classroom visitations must be in writing and provided to the faculty member within ten (10) days following the classroom visit.

Number of Visitors

The majority, or at least three members of the Personnel Sub-committee in the applicant's discipline, will make class visitations.