

Department Evaluation Document: School of Social Work

PHILOSOPHY

The evaluation process is intended to be collegial. The procedures for evaluation outlined in the document are intended to be conducted so that school colleagues and School Directors provide faculty members with information that enables them to better meet the criteria for advancement (i.e., reappointment, tenure, promotion) and to recognize and enhance their contributions to the University and their fields of study.

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. 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 social work. In support of teaching effectiveness, a faculty member must maintain a high level of knowledge and expertise in the field of social work. The Faculty Member shall demonstrate continuing concern for Instructional Effectiveness through methods of presentation and evaluation of students.

In case of non-teaching and library faculty, satisfactory professional performance shall be the equivalent of Instructional Effectiveness.

Scholarly/Creative Activity

A faculty member shall give evidence of contribution of social work, an area of specialization within social work, or an interdisciplinary specialization by means of Scholarly/creative activity. Interdisciplinary contributions may draw upon and contribute to social work and on or more professional fields (for example social work and nursing, social work and education), social work and the liberal arts (for example, social work and psychology), or interdisciplinary specializations in which social work plays a part (for example, gerontology, women's studies, or minority studies programs).

Scholarly/Creative Activity may be published or disseminated in one of the following ways:

1. In the classroom, or;
2. Among practitioners, or;
3. Among a wider audience.

It is intended that the faculty member shall utilize expertise to address problems in social work or areas of specialization within social work or in an interdisciplinary specialization through:

1. Scholarly investigation, creative activity, or research of an original or previously unreported nature;
2. Applied research, investigation or scholarly analysis of existing research, information and creative endeavors resulting in the development of new data, information, applications, or interpretations;
3. Faculty involvement in student research which is subsequently jointly published or otherwise jointly disseminated, insofar as the faculty member plays a major substantive role in one of more of the phases of research, including the collection, analysis, interpretation or reporting of new data, information of practical

applications. In most instances, faculty support of student research is viewed as an aspect of their instructional roles:

4. Retraining, professional development, and grant development and administration may be credited as scholarly contribution when specific criteria are met which are outlined below.

Retraining

Completion by a faculty member of a retraining program which brings that individual to a specified level of skill in an area where available expertise is in short supply may be applied toward satisfaction of the Scholarly/creative activity criterion only for such purposes and period of time as expressly approved in writing by the Personnel Committee, the School Director, the College Dean, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. A faculty member who wishes to have such activity considered as Scholarly/creative activity must obtain written approval in advance.

Professional Development

Professional development activities may be applied toward satisfaction of the Scholarly/creative activity criterion insofar as these activities are clearly in addition to those necessary to maintain the level of knowledge and expertise in social work or an area of specialization required to fulfill the Instructional Effectiveness standards.

Prior to undertaking any professional development activity for which credit will be sought, a faculty member shall submit a written proposal for approval to the school. The proposal shall outline the professional development activity, its duration and the projected benefits of the activity. If approved by the School Director and the Personnel Committee, the professional development, when completed, shall be evaluated to determine if it fulfills the criteria for such professional development as contained in the DED.

Grant Development/Administration

Faculty is 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 such preparation requires scholarly work (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 school, the college or university. The above conditions may also apply for the administration of such grant projects insofar as proper evidence is presented which documents that such grants meet the requirements describes above, and in Article XV of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The Scholarly/creative activity criterion cannot be satisfied by grant activities alone, or solely in combination with Retraining and/or Professional Development. Grant Development and/or Administration that does not qualify as Scholarly/creative activity may be counted as service.

Doctoral Dissertation Work

The Ph.D. is not the recognized terminal degree in social work. Doctoral dissertation research shall be considered as scholarly/creative activity in the year(s) in which such research is undertaken, provided the applicant furnishes documentary evidence of the nature of the research and provides an abstract documenting the importance of the endeavor to the discipline and the Personnel Committee and School Director provide a qualitative statement supporting the importance of the doctoral research.

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 school and assisting colleagues in school activities.
2. The faculty member shall give evidence of interest and activity that extend beyond the school into areas such as university and college wide committees, AAUP service, 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 evaluation
School Director evaluation
Student evaluations
Self Evaluation

The School will utilize:

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

Faculty members must retain all student evaluation forms, summaries, and written comments for the period under evaluation and make them available to evaluators.

Scholarly/Creative Activity

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

Service

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

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 Department 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 Department Evaluation Documents, all candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion must satisfy without exception and irrespective of the terms of any DED, 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 DED, the more stringent requirement shall apply, except as modified by the Agreement. Each Faculty Member must provide qualitative documented evidence that establishes 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. Prior service rank credit may be granted for Instructional Effectiveness, Scholarly/creative activity, and/or Service. The partial service/rank credit which a Faculty Member receives at date of hire, and the Instructional Effectiveness, Scholarly/creative activity, and/or Service 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 Instructional Effectiveness, Scholarly/creative activity, and/or Service set forth in the Agreement; (b) the activity fulfills the standards of the faculty Member's DED; 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) (see article XV);
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

The evaluation schedule appears on the next page. Note that the schedule depends on date of hire (before or after January 1, 1997) and rank at initial appointment.

Evaluation Schedule S

Evaluation of probationary faculty hired BEFORE January 1, 1997 shall be conducted according to the schedule below. Rank at initial appointment shall determine the evaluation schedule.

Initial appointment rank	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year6	Year7
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.

Evaluation of probationary Faculty Members hired AFTER January 1, 1997 shall be conducted according to the schedule below. Rank at initial appointment shall determine the evaluation schedule.

Initial appointment rank	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Professor	Interim	Full/R	Full/Tenure			
Associate Professor	Interim	Full/R*	Comp. Interim	Full/Tenure		
Assistant Professor	Interim	Interim	Full/R*	Comp. Interim	Full/Tenure	
Instructor	Interim	Interim	Full/R*	Comp. Interim	Comp. Interim	Full/Tenure

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

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, unless the Faculty Member decides not to use this initial period as 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 Associate Professors and Instructors. The Faculty Member shall notify the School Director of his/her decision in writing by October 15.

Procedures for Conducting Evaluations

1. 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 the year is conducted using information obtained through classroom visits, review of instructional materials and discussions with the School Director and the Personnel 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 School Director and Personnel 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, School Director 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 school standards. Faculty are reappointed unless a potential performance problem in Instructional Effectiveness of Service is perceived and the school 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 School Director and Personnel 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 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 school elects to conduct a formal, written Full Interim Evaluation.

3. Full Interim Evaluation

If a School Director or Personnel Committee perceives a problem in Instructional Effectiveness and/or Service during an Interim or Comprehensive Interim Evaluation, the School Director 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 a Full Interim Evaluation within thirty (30) calendar days of notification. The application shall cover the record of Instructional Effectiveness and/or 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 DED 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 the 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 reduce to writing, jointly if there is agreement between the School Director and the Personnel Committee, or separately if there is disagreement. The evaluation shall be given to the Faculty Member who may respond within five (5) days of t he receipt of the written results of t he 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 reviews. If the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs determines, subject to the provisions of Articles XV. and 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, and 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 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 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 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.

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 completed 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 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 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 appointment (where applicable).

A Faculty member who is not simultaneously a candidate for tenure shall inform the School Director in writing of his/her intent to apply for promotion by the previous October 15. 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 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 requirement for the Full Evaluation.

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 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 School Director 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 school's standards for satisfactory (or average in all three areas), as defined in this DED, he/she shall so state in writing to the Faculty Member, the Dean, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. (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 Report.

If, upon completing the review of the Annual Faculty Reports, the School Director determines that a Faculty Member's performance does not rise to the level of average in the Departmental Evaluation Document, he/she concerns to the attention of the school's Personnel Committee. Together the School Director 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 school 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 the inclusion in the University personnel file.

If the joint review confirms that there appear to be deficits, the procedures in Act XV 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. Unless 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 set forth in writing and granted prior to the Faculty Member's initial date of appointment, or it is barred from further consideration.

Scholarly/Creative 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 Evaluations

Applicants

In a Faculty Member's first year of employment at EMU, no Annual Faculty 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 Creative Activity to be reviewed.

Faculty Members must retain all student evaluation forms, summaries, and hand written comments for the period under evaluation and make them available to evaluators.

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 School Director and Personnel 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. 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 School Director and Personnel Committee shall review the Scholarly/Creative Activity for advisory purposes only. During the 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 school'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 DED and the Agreement, the committee and the School Director 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 to the Faculty Member.

By February 15 of each year the School Director 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 Personnel Committee and/or the School Director perceive(s) that a performance problem pertaining to a Faculty Member's Instructional Effectiveness and/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 School Director evaluations, to the extent these are available,
 - (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. Faculty Members must retain all student evaluation forms, summaries, and hand written comments for the period under evaluation and make them available to evaluators.

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 to 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 Evaluator's 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 DED and the Agreement, the evaluation(s) shall be reduced to writing, jointly if there is agreement between the School Director and the Personnel 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 his/her 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 language regarding this point in Article XV.

Directions for Preparing the Application for All Full Evaluations

Applicants

Faculty Members applying for reappointment or tenure during years when they are required to undergo a Full Evaluation are required to:

1. Complete an Annual Faculty Activity Report by October 15.
2. Complete the Application for Full Evaluation Form by October 15
3. Describe in a narrative statement, how he/she has met the school's criteria in each of the three areas under consideration: Instructional Effectiveness, Scholarly and/or Creative, and Service. The applicant is responsible for describing and documenting, where appropriate, the activities presented for evaluation in terms of quantity. It should describe his/her 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. Faculty Members must retain all student evaluation forms, summaries, and hand written comments for the period under evaluation and make them available to evaluators. The narrative, without supporting documents should be free-standing and will become part of the applicant's personnel file. The narrative should include the following:

Instructional Effectiveness:

- Specific evidence of effectiveness in the teaching/advising process;
- Activities which have improved the applicant's teaching;
- Results of student, peer and School Director evaluations; and
- The manner in which the applicant has met the DED criteria

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 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 School Director must complete his/her portion of the Full Evaluation and Recommendation Summary Form and an evaluation report which is 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 DED and the terms of the Agreement. Specifically, the Personnel Committee and the School Director 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 DED 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 standards of performance in the DED and the terms of this Agreement. The dean shall submit a copy of his/her evaluation to the Faculty Member, explaining why a particular judgment was made. The Faculty Member shall have five (5) working days to respond. The recommendations at this level, together with any response from the Faculty Member, together with all prior recommendations and other materials previously forwarded by the School Director, shall be forwarded to the Provost and the Vice President of 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

Faculty Members applying for Promotion are required to:

1. Complete an Annual Faculty Activity Report by October 15
2. Notify the School Director by October 15 of intent to apply for promotion. Complete the application for Promotion Form by February 1, unless the applicant is simultaneously applying for tenure. If the applicant files application for tenure on the previous October 15, he/she should check the promotion box on the application, and may provide an update including activities between October 15 and February 1 by February 1.
3. Describe in a narrative statement how he/she has met the school'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 documenting, where appropriate, the activities presented for evaluation in terms of quantity and quality. It should describe his/her 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, etc. should be included as documentation in an appendix and referenced where appropriate. Faculty Members must retain all student evaluation forms, summaries, and hand written comments for the period under evaluation and make them available to evaluators.

The narrative, without supporting documents, should be free-standing and will become part of the applicant's personnel file. The narrative should include the following:

Instructional Effectiveness:

- Specific evidence of effectiveness in the teaching/advising process;
- Activities which have improved the applicant's teaching;
- Results of student, peer and School Director evaluations; and
- The manner in which the applicant has met the DED criteria

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 School Director 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 Personnel Committee and School Director shall explain:

- 1) The evaluation efforts which were conducted and their individual results.
- 2) The qualitative and, where applicable basis for all rating which were assigned.
- 3) Precisely how and to what to the activities claimed do or do not satisfy the standards of performance of the Faculty Member's DED 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 area specialization.

Full evaluations shall be reviewed by the dean in accordance with the standards of performance in the DED and the terms of this Agreement. The dean shall submit a copy of his/her evaluation to the Faculty Member, explaining why a particular judgment was made. The Faculty Member shall have five (5) working days to respond. The recommendations at this level, together with any response from the Faculty Member, together with any prior recommendations and other materials previously forwarded by the School Director shall be forwarded to the Provost and the Vice President of Academic Affairs who shall notify the Faculty Member by no later than May 31 of his/her decision.

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 Professional Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

Applications

The tenured Faculty Member up for Professional Performance Evaluation shall provide the School Director with his/her Annual Faculty Activity Report. Faculty Members must retain all student evaluation forms, summaries, and hand written comments for the period under evaluation and make them available to evaluators.

Evaluators

The School Director shall review the Annual Faculty 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 School Director has information which indicates a significant problem in Instructional Effectiveness or if the Faculty Member has no record of Service, the School Director may conduct a review more frequently.) If, upon completing a review of four Annual Faculty Activity Reports and available relevant material, the School Director (guided by the DED) determines that a Faculty Member's performance meets or exceeds the school's standards for average, he/she shall so state in writing and place a copy 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 Faculty Reports, the School Director determines that a Faculty Member's performance does not rise to the level of average in the DED, he/she shall bring his/her concerns to the attention of the school's Personnel Committee. Together the School Director 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 appears to be no deficits in 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 School Director 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 School Director shall inform the Dean in writing of the school's concern, with a copy to the Faculty Member, and the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for inclusion in the University personnel file.

The following year the School Director and the school Personnel Committee shall meet with the Faculty Member and review that year's Annual Faculty 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 school personnel file, with a copy to the Faculty Member, the 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 Performance 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 school 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 outlines in the contract.

It is expressly 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 School Director and Personnel Committee disagree concerning the performance of the Faculty Member, the School Director 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 School Director 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 and any documentation the Faculty Member wishes to provide, to determine whether the Faculty Member's performance is satisfactory. If the Faculty Member's performance is determined to be satisfactory, the School Director 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 school standards set forth in the DED 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 School Director 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 deems appropriate.

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

In those instances where the Dean concurs with the school's evaluation(s) of satisfactory performance, the written report shall be forwarded to the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for inclusion in the Faculty Member's University personnel file and a copy provided to the Faculty Member.

In those instances where the Dean does not concur with the school's evaluation(s) of satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance, the Dean shall reduce his/her objections to writing, and shall return the evaluation to the school for further consideration. The school 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 school's evaluation of satisfactory, he/she shall say so in a letter to be placed in the school personnel file, with a copy to the Faculty Member, the School Director, 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 School Director, 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 that one year's duration. The Program for Improvement shall set out expectations and assessment procedures based on the criteria in the DED and the Agreement. If there is 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 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 for Academic Affairs and the Association.

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

- A meeting of all parties (School Director, Personnel Committee, and Faculty Member) shall be convened to discuss a proposed extension.
- Specific reasons for the desirability of an extension shall be presented by the School Director.
- 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. A copy shall be provided to the Association.

In the event there is a dispute pertaining to the appropriateness of a particular Program for Improvement, a Grievance may be filed commencing at 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 timelines provided therein. For purposes of determining the timelines for filing grievances at Step Three of the Grievance Procedure, University actions in the Full Professional Performance Evaluation process shall be constructed 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, timelines 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 School Director in consultation with the school Personnel Committee at assessment points specified in the Program for Improvement.

The School Director shall report the results of evaluations 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.

SCHOOL STANDARDS

School of Social Work Appointment Standards appears below. These provide information on credentials and qualifications necessary for appointment at each rank.

The School of Social Work Reappointment and Tenure Standards appear on the next two pages. Note that the evaluation schedules depend on date of hire (before or after January 1, 1997) and on rank at initial appointment.

Finally, this section includes the School of Social Work Standards for Promotion. Note that the Evaluation schedules depend on date of hire (before or January 1, 1997) and on rank.

APPOINTMENT STANDARDS

Rank	Credentials/Criteria	Equivalencies/Exceptions
Professor	Doctorate	OR Master's Degree from a school accredited by CSWE plus five years professional experience*
Associate Professor	Doctorate	OR *Masters Degree from a school accredited by CSWE plus 5 years professional experience
Assistant Professor	Doctorate	OR *Masters Degree from a school accredited by CSWE plus 5 years professional experience
Instructor	Doctorate	OR *Masters Degree from a school accredited by CSWE plus 5 years professional experience

*Professional experience is defined as post MSW social work experience for the equivalent of 5 years at full-time doing interpersonal social work practice and/or community practice.

Reappointment and Tenure Standards

Evaluation of untenured Faculty Members hired **BEFORE** January 1,1997 shall be conducted according to the standards below. Rank at initial appointment shall determine the evaluation schedule.

PROFESSOR

Year Evaluation	1 Interim	2 Full/2	2 Tenure	3 Interim	4 Interim
Instructional Effectiveness	A	A	DAA (E)*	A	DAA(E)8
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X	A	A(E)	X	A(E)
Service	A	A	A(E)	A	A(E)

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

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

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Year Evaluate	1 Interim	2 Interim	3 Full R	4 Full R	4 Tenure	5 Interim	6 Tenure
Instruct Effect	A	A	A	A	DAA or E*	A	DAA or E*
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X	X	X**	A	A(E)	X	A(E)
Service	A	A	A	A	A(E)	A	A(E)

INSTRUCTOR

Year Eval	1 Interim	2 Interim	3 Full R	4 Interim	5 Full R	5 Tenure	6 Interim	7 Tenure
Instruct	A	A	A	A	A	DAA	A	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X	X	X**	X	A	A	X	A
Service	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A

* There must be an E in at least one of these three categories.

**Scholarly Creative/Activity is reviewed for advisory purposes only.

Evaluation of untenured Faculty Members hired **AFTER** January 1, 1997 shall be conducted according to the standards below. Rank at initial appointment shall determine the evaluation schedule.

PROFESSOR

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

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Year Evaluation	1 Interim	2 Interim	3 Comp. Interim	4 Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	A	A	A	DAA(E)**
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X	X*	X*	A(E)
Service	A	A	A	A(E)

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

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

INSTRUCTOR

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

*Scholarly/Creative Activity is reviewed for advisory purposes only
 ** There must be an A and an E in one of these three categories.

PROMOTION STANDARDS

If hired **BEFORE** January 1, 1997, the following standards apply.

	Year Eligible	Academic Credentials	Instructional Effectiveness	Scholarly/Creative Activity Service
To Professor	5 Years as an associate at EMU	*Doctorate OR *Masters degree plus 5 years professional experience	E	E in one area and A in the other
To Professor	After 6 years in Rank as an associate at EMU	*Doctorate OR *Masters degree plus 5 years professional experience	E or----- DAA	DAA in one and A in the other ----- E in one and A in the other
To Associate Professor	4 years as assistant at EMU	*Doctorate OR *Masters degree plus 5 years professional experience	E or----- DAA	DAA in one and A in the other ----- E in one and A in the other
To Associate Professor	After 5 years as assistant EMU	*Doctorate OR *Masters degree plus 5 years professional experience	DAA	DAA in one and A in the other
To Assistant Professor	2 years as an instructor at EMU	*Doctorate OR *Masters degree plus 5 years professional experience	DAA	DAA in one and A in the other
To Assistant Professor	After 3 years as Instructor at EMU	*Doctorate OR *Masters degree plus 5 years professional experience	DAA	A in one and A in the other

PROMOTION STANDARDS

If hired **AFTER** January 1, 1997, the following standards apply.

	Year Eligible	Academic Credentials	Instructional Effectiveness	Scholarly/Creative Activity Service
To Professor	5 Years as an associate at EMU	*Doctorate OR *Masters degree plus 5 years professional experience	E	E in one area and A in the other
To Professor	After 6 years as an associate at EMU	*Doctorate OR *Masters degree plus 5 years professional experience	E or----- DAA	DAA in one and A in the other ----- E in one and A in the other
To Associate Professor	5 years as assistant at EMU	*Doctorate OR *Masters degree plus 5 years professional experience	E or----- DAA	DAA in one and A in the other ----- E in one and A in the other
To Associate Professor	After 6 years as assistant EMU	*Doctorate OR *Masters degree plus 5 years professional experience	DAA	DAA in one and A in the other
To Assistant Professor	2 years as an instructor at EMU	*Doctorate OR *Masters degree Plus 5 years professional experience	DAA	DAA in one and A in the other
To Assistant Professor	After 3 years as instructor at EMU	*Doctorate OR *Masters degree plus 5 years professional experience	DAA	A in one and A in the other

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Instructional Effectiveness

Data Collection Procedures

Each applicant must include a personal report of activities and accomplishments as well as documentation that states in clear and explicit terms both the quantity and quality of the activity claimed.

Supportive to this criterion is evidence that the candidate:

1. Prepares for teaching
 - a. Seeks the latest information in the subject area(s) taught, by reading, attending professional conferences and/or by communicating with colleagues.
 - b. Regularly evaluates his/her own past teaching methods, procedures and course content.
2. Plans effectively for teaching
 - a. Has a clear conception of his/her course(s) within the School and with the University.
 - b. Has a clear conception of the long term objectives for the course(s) and for the day-to-day classroom activities.
 - c. Has a clear conception of the evaluation procedures which will enable him/her to measure the attainment of objectives set forth.
3. Practices good teaching methods
 - a. Informs students of the objectives of the course(s) and of units of study in the study of the course(s).
 - b. Informs students about methods of study applicable to the attainment of course objectives.
 - c. Informs students of specific course assignments (e.g., dates of exams, papers, etc.)
 - d. Attempts to establish a classroom environment conducive to learning.
 - e. Evaluates students so as to measure the attainment of course objectives.

If assigned administrative release time to play a director's role, the faculty member carries out this roll successfully as demonstrated by data collection procedures.

Evaluation Reports

1. The Faculty Member's own report of activities and accomplishments, including documented office hours and a description of advising activities.

2. School Director evaluations of teaching, including classroom visits. These written evaluations shall be provided to the Faculty Member within ten (10) working days following the visit. Rationale for evaluative statements must be explained and/or documented.

3. Colleague evaluations of teaching, including classroom visits. These written evaluations, naming the observer, shall be provided to the Faculty Member within ten (10) working days following the visit. Rationale for evaluative statements must be explained and/or documented.

4. Student evaluations of teaching.

5. Student evaluation of advising, if applicable.

6. Field agency evaluation of the faculty person's role as field liaison during the semester(s) in which field placement liaison is a component of the teaching load.

7. If assigned administrative release time to serve as MSW, BSW or field placement director, or Gerontology Program Director, evaluation of that role will be carried out in accord with the procedures outlined in DED.

Appendix 1 contains the school approved questions for the student evaluation of teaching. Appendix 2 and Appendix 3 contain the school approved procedures for classroom visits, and classroom visit report form.

Ratings

The Personnel Committee and School Director will evaluate all evidence submitted. For Interim Evaluations, the Personnel Committee and the School Director 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 School Director giving the rationale for the ratings awarded for Full Evaluations for reappointment, tenure and promotion and Full Professional Performance evaluations.

Exceptional (E): Awarded when the faculty member satisfactorily fulfills the criteria listed under Average below, as well as the following:

1. Demonstrates strong interest in the teaching process using a range of teaching techniques.
2. Develops original teaching materials, e.g. assignments, slides videotapes, overhead projector materials, games, exercises, stimulations, case materials, innovative supplementary handouts for either classroom or field agency use.
3. Promotes improved teaching by sharing knowledge, insights, method, and materials with colleagues, field agency personnel, and with others in the helping professions.
4. Is available to work with students on independent studies and/or graduate theses. These items can be considered either under instructional effectiveness or service.

Distinctly Above Average (DAA):

Satisfactorily fulfills the criteria under Average below, as well as the following:

1. Gives evidence of a sense of responsibility to teaching by demonstrating an ever increasing knowledge of the content area being taught.
2. Demonstrates flexibility in approach to course material and the methods used in presenting material.
3. Stimulates student enthusiasm and interest in subject matter by encouraging student involvement in the teaching/learning experience and in mutual exploration of the subject matter.

4. Fosters open communication with students around the subject matter, course content and process.

Average (A): Awarded when the faculty member satisfactorily fulfills the following criteria:

1. Responsibility to teaching

- a. Meets classes regularly.
- b. Returns graded materials promptly.
- c. Is readily available to field supervisors and students in field placement and keeps records on the liaison contacts made, when liaison is part of the faculty member's teaching load.
- d. Holds regular office hours in order to assist students' functioning and performance related to coursework.
- e. Fulfills Academic Advising obligation.

2. Course Content

- a. Clearly states expectations in course outlines, including course description, objectives, specific requirements, grading procedures, and content outlines.
- b. Develops appropriate bibliographical references.
- c. Teaching content is as specified in course description.

3. Classroom Delivery

- a. Is capable of delivering course content in a clear and organized way.
- b. Demonstrates respect for the student in the learning situation.

4. Transmission of the values of the profession:

- a. Expresses the philosophy and the ethics of the profession as identified in the current National Association of Social Worker's Code of Ethics through teaching and professional behavior. (Refer to the NASW Code of Ethics)

5. Evaluation:

- a. Gives evidence of continuous self evaluation of teaching.
- b. Strives to fairly and objectively evaluate student performance.
- c. Demonstrates that evaluation measures adequately cover the material presented.

Below Average (BA): Is awarded when the applicant has not met the criteria specified for the ranking of average.

Scholarly and/or Creative Activity

Data Collection Procedures

Each applicant must include a personal report of his/her Scholarly/Creative Activities and provide copies of papers, articles, books, publications and/or other tangible documentation. 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 or 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 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 requirement for the Full Evaluation.

Scholarly/creative activity is not evaluated during Interim Evaluations (except the Comprehensive Interim Evaluation for advisory purposes only). Examples of Scholarly/creative activities include, but are not limited to, the following (not in priority order):

1. Publications

- a. Books
- b. Monographs
- c. Journal articles
- d. Chapter in books
- e. Papers published in proceedings
- f. Manuals and workbooks
- g. Media materials, including videotapes, films, audio cassettes and other teaching materials when disseminated outside the university.
- h. Book reviews
- i. Miscellaneous publications, including editorials, letters, newsletter articles, pamphlets, brochures, project summaries and reports.

2. Editorships

- a. Books
- b. Manuals
- c. Journals
- d. Conference proceedings
- e. Monographs (series editor)
- f. Media and other instructional materials when disseminated outside the university
- g. Miscellaneous publications, including newsletters, pamphlets, brochures, project summaries and reports.
- h. Peer review for professional journals.

3. Grant development (as specified in the AAUP contract)

- a. Principal investigator
- b. Major leadership role in preparation and writing
- c. Participation in preparation and writing
- d. Peer review of grants
- e. Administration of grants which result in scholarly/creative activity

4. Presentations

- a. Papers delivered at conferences
- b. Workshops and/or in-service training sessions
- c. Panel participation
- d. Classroom presentations
- e. Other conference presentations
- f. Non-conference presentations—professional, community university.

5. Dissemination in the classroom

Develops and disseminates original teaching materials, e.g., assignments, slides, videotapes, overhead project materials, games exercises, simulations, case materials, innovative supplementary handouts for either classroom or field agency.

Evaluation Reports

1. 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 DED 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 DED and the Agreement.
3. The School Director should comment on each activity including a statement that clearly indicates how and to what extent the activity meets the criteria in the DED and the Agreement.

Ratings

The Personnel Committee reserves the right to judge the quality of a particular Scholarly/Creative Activity. Evaluation will be based on the quality of the work, taking into account the number of activities and the degree of depth in and commitment to each by the Faculty Member, and recognizing that circumstances and individuals vary. In developing the summary statements and deciding on ratings (i.e., average, distinctly above average, etc.) both the School Director and Personnel Committee should consider such factors as the following (not in priority order):

- The degree to which the candidate's activity has advanced insight or knowledge in the discipline.
- The effort required in the performance of the activity.
- Qualities which distinguishes the activity from the contributions of others or from the candidate's previous work.

On the basis of the foregoing considerations, one of the following ratings will be assigned:

Exceptional (E): Awarded when the evaluators can describe the whole of the applicant's Scholarly/Creative Activity or research within the period being evaluated as having a significant impact on the knowledge base, insight or understanding of the school discipline by the intended audience (i.e., had led students beyond the level of current textbook knowledge, provided the discipline with significant new facts or interpretations or directions or research, helped direct a publisher or a granting agency to support good work or discourage bad, etc.). Evaluations must describe in terms which show quality and/or quantity exceed distinctly above average.

Distinctly Above Average (DAA): Awarded when the whole of the applicant's Scholarly/Creative Activity or research within the period evaluated has produced results which make a difference in the level of knowledge or understanding of the intended audience. Evaluators must describe how quality and/or quantity exceed average.

Average (A): Awarded when the research and Scholarly/Creative Activity offered by the applicant offers a relatively small increment of knowledge or understanding or has restricted dissemination.

Below Average (BA): Is awarded when the applicant has not met the criteria specified for the ranking of average.

Service Activity

Data Collection Procedures

The applicant will clearly identify his/her Service activities in a narrative text. Supportive evidence must be provided to indicate the quantity of different Service activities and the quality of the effort expended in those activities.

Evaluation Report

The Personnel Committee and the School Director will evaluate all evidence submitted. For Interim Evaluations, the Personnel Committee and the School Director 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 School Director giving the rationale for the rating awarded for Full Evaluations for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion and Full Professional Evaluations.

Criteria

The applicant will clearly identify service activities related to the school and the university in a narrative text. Supportive evidence must be provided to indicate the quantity of different service activities and the quality of the effort extended in those activities.

Data will be collected from:

1. Faculty member's written self-evaluation.
2. Evaluation by faculty colleagues.
3. Collateral documentation, where available.
4. School Director.

Service Activities

The Faculty Member will clearly identify service activities related to the school and the university in a narrative text. Supportive evidence must be provided to indicate the quantity of different service activities and the quality of the effort extended in those activities.

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

1. Chairs one or more committee, e.g., school, college, university, professional, community.
2. Accepts and complete specific assignments related to school activities.
3. Serves as representatives to professional, community committees, task forces and/or other activities.
4. Provides service to the AAUP.
5. Serves as representative to professional, community committees, task forces and/or other activities.
6. Participates in student and/or alumni activities (e.g. Student Social Work Organization, Alumni Association).

7. Participates in professionally related community affairs
8. Member of professional organizations at the local, state, or national level.
9. Fulfills leadership responsibilities for professional meeting/presentation at the local, state or national level.
10. Serves as a consultant to social agencies or other social welfare organizations.

Ratings

Exceptional (E): Awarded when the quantity and quality of service shall be evaluated, in addition to the basis describes for distinctly above average, as far beyond that normally expected of faculty.

Distinctly Above Average (DAA): Awarded when quality and quantity of service shall be evaluated, in addition to the basis describes for average, as substantially more that one's fair share.

Average (A): Awarded when the quality and quantity of service shall be evaluated as that normally expected: one's fair share. The faculty member must:

1. Participate in school meetings
2. Participate in school committees
3. Hold office hours for students for professional and career advising.
4. Participate in such activities as orientation, registration, and in ceremonial academic functions, such as convocations and commencements.

Below Average (BA): Is awarded when the applicant has not met the criteria specified for the ranking of average

Additional service activities required for rank and rating

Rank	Exceptional	Distinctly Above Average
Instructor	2	1
Assistant Professor	3	2
Associate Professor	4	3
Professor	5	4

Appendices

Appendix 1: Approved Questions for the Student Evaluation Form

Appendix 2: A Procedure for Classroom Visitations

Appendix 3: Approved Forms for Peer and School Director Visitations

Appendix 1: Approved Questions for the Student Evaluation Form

What is your overall rating of the teaching effectiveness of this instructor?
What is your overall rating of this course?

- I understand easily what my instructor is saying.
- My instructor displays a clear understanding of course topics.
- My instructor has an effective style of presentation.
- My instructor seems well-pre-pared for this class.
- In this course, many methods are used to involve me in learning.
- I understand what is expected of me in this course.
- The amount of material covered was reasonable.
- My instructor develops classroom discussions skillfully.
- Grades are an accurate assessment of my knowledge in this course.
- Assignments are related to the goals of this course.
- My instructor respects students from diverse cultural backgrounds.
- My instructor respects students regardless of sex, age, or race.

Appendix 2: Approved Procedures for Classroom Visitations

Philosophy of Class Visits

Our goal is to establish a classroom visit process, centered on encouragement and inspiration. The premises on which our classroom visit process is based, is as follows.

Class visits are about determining the views that students, the instructor, and others take on Social Work and teaching;
Class visits involves a multi-dimensional process including preparation discussion between visitor and instructor, class visits, and post visit discussions;
Class visits are viewed as a part of a continuous and continuing process which is collegial and cooperative;
Class visits are not threatening but instead serve as an opportunity to assess strengths and areas for continued growth;
Class visits serve as an opportunity to inform the department in how it can assist in improving reaching outcomes.

Steps in the Class Visit Process

The faculty member will identify the colleague who will serve as a classroom visitor. The colleague chosen will provide at least one week notice of the date of the intended visit.

Visitor contacts faculty member in advance to confirm class visit date and place and to arrange pre-visit.

Faculty member prepares for pre-visit via self appraisal and ensures that visitor receives relevant course materials.

Faculty member and visitor discuss: 1) General information about the class including what is the topic of the class? What teaching approaches will be used (lecture, homework discussion, handouts, video presentation, computer demonstrations)?; 2) Objectives of the specific session to be observed; 3) Activities that will occur in the session; 4) Any specific areas in which the faculty member desires feedback; 5) The specific checklist or form to be used by the visitor; 6) Will the class be generally typical? If not, what will be different?

Class visit takes place.

After the class visit the faculty member and visitor independently analyze or review the class visit. The visitor drafts initial report or report outline.

Faculty member and visitor discuss the class visit, including strengths and any suggestions for improvement.

A separate written class report completed by each visitor is delivered to the faculty member within ten days of the classroom visit.

Recommendations for how the School can assist in strengthening classroom outcomes are directed to the School Director, Personnel Committee, and Instruction Committee for action within two weeks of the visit. The candidate may request a second visit and the procedure will be repeated. (This procedure is adapted from Ramaden (1992) Formative Faculty Peer Reviews: A Framework for Implementation).

(Appendix 2, continued)

Visitor Preparation: Points to Consider Before the Visit

What is the topic of the class?
What teaching approaches will be used?
What kind of students are in the class?
What are the goals of the class session?
What will students be doing to reach the goals?
What should students gain from the session?
What have students been asked to do to prepare for this class?
What was done in earlier classes to lead up to this one?
Will this class be generally typical? If not, what will be different?

Possible Questions for After the Visit

In general, how do you think the class went?
How did you feel about your teaching during the class?
Did students accomplish the goals that you had planned for this class?
Is there anything that worked well for you in the class today that you particularly liked?
Does that usually go well?
Is there anything that did not work well in the class? Is that a typical problem for you?
What were your teaching strengths?
Did you notice anything that you improved on or any personal goals that you met?
What are your teaching problem areas that still need improvement?
Do you have any suggestions or strategies for improvements?

(Adapted from Ramaden (1992) Formative Faculty Peer Reviews: A Framework for Implementation).

Appendix 3: Approved Forms for Peer and School Director Visitations

COLLABORATIVE CLASSROOM VISIT REPORT OUTLINE

Instructor:
Visitor:
Date of Observation:
Date of this Report:
Course Name:
Class Time:
Class Meeting Room:

- I. Report on pre-visit preparation, during which instructor shares in advance objectives, materials, and strategies with the visitor. Pre-consultation is successful when visitor understands plans and approaches of instructor.
 - Date of preparation:
 - Matters discussed:

- II. Classroom visit feedback. Feedback is successful when it leads to a written draft of a report from the visitor to the instructor that includes observations on the following:
 - A. How successful was the instructor in reaching objectives?
 - B. How adequate were the objectives to the course?
 - C. What observations were made about classroom tone and interactions (student attentiveness, control of the interaction process, and respect for student contributions)?
 - D. What structural factors (room, timing, curriculum, others) impacted the ability of the instructor to succeed? Any recommendations to the School for improvement?
 - E. Particular instructional strengths noted.
 - F. Any suggestions for improvement in instructional effectiveness.

- III. Post-visit consultation. Visitor then discusses with the instructor the initial draft report during a post-visit conference. A collaborative classroom visit has been successful when this process of collaboration is documented and it leads to a report that both the visitor and the instructor can sign.
 - Date of post-visit consultation:
 - Final signed report: