

DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT

Department of Teacher Education

College of Education

Eastern Michigan University

Adopted _____

Revised _____

Alane Starko, Head
Department of Teacher Education

Date

Jerry Robbins, Dean
College of Education

Date

Ronald Collins, Provost and
Vice President, Academic Affairs

Date

Department Evaluation Document

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 with 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 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 of 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.

Scholarly and/or Creative Activity

A Faculty Member shall give documented evidence of his/her contributions to his/her discipline or area of specialization or in an interdisciplinary specialization by Scholarly investigation (e.g. research) and/or Creative Activity, and of its publication or other dissemination in the following ways:

1. In the classroom, and;
2. Among practitioners in his/her discipline, and;
3. Among a wider community.

It is intended that the Faculty Member shall utilize his/her expertise to address problems in his/her discipline or areas of specialization or in an interdisciplinary specialization through Scholarly and/or Creative Activity which clearly contributes to the discipline 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, or;
3. Faculty involvement in student research which is subsequently jointly published or otherwise jointly disseminated shall be considered as appropriate Scholarly Activity, insofar as said faculty involvement is shown to fulfill the expectations in 1 - 2 above.

Except as provided in this document, professional development shall not be an acceptable substitute for Scholarly/Creative Activity.

Retraining

Either of the two activities below may, under the conditions specified, be considered as partially fulfilling the scholarly/creative activity criterion. The scholarly/creative activity criterion cannot be satisfied by either of these alone or in combination with each other.

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 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.

Professional Development

Professional development activities may be applied toward satisfaction of the Scholarly/Creative Activity criteria insofar as these activities are clearly in addition to those necessary to maintain the level of knowledge and/or expertise in the Faculty Member's discipline or 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 pre-approval to his/her department. The proposal shall outline the professional development activity, its duration, and the projected benefits of the activity. If approved by the Department Head and the appropriate departmental committee, the professional development, when completed, shall be evaluated to determine if it fulfills the criteria for such professional development contained in the Departmental Evaluation Document.

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 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 university. The above conditions may also apply for the administration of such 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.

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.
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 A).
2. A set of approved forms for Peer and Department Head Classroom Visitations (Appendix B).
3. A procedure for classroom visitations (Appendix C).

(Note: Peer & Department Head evaluations must be in writing and provided to the Faculty Member within ten (10) days following the visit. This written evaluation of the classroom observation is 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 this 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 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, 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

Evaluations

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

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

Evaluation Schedule
(Hired prior to January 1, 1997)

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:

Evaluation Schedule
(Hired after January 1, 1997)

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

Instructor	Interim	Interim	Full/R*	Comp. Interim	Comp. Interim	Full/T
------------	---------	---------	---------	------------------	------------------	--------

* Scholarly/Creative Activity is rated, but advisory only

(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, 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 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. 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 and/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 and/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 and 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/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 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 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, 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 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 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 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 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 which 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 forum 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 Reappointment/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 the Agreement will be followed (See Article XV).

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 (Appendix E) 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.

Evaluators

In a Faculty Member's first year the evaluator's 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. 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 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 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 to 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 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 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 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 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 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 contract 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. Submit Application for Full Evaluation form by October 15.
2. Describe in a narrative statement, 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 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, samples of classroom materials, copies of articles, commendations, etc. should be included as documentation in an appendix and referenced where appropriate. The narrative itself, 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 Department Head 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 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 Personnel 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 of 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 no later than March 15 of his/her decision.

Full evaluations shall be reviewed by the dean in accordance with the standards of performance in the Departmental Evaluation Document and the terms of this Agreement. The dean shall submit a copy of his/her evaluation to the Faculty Member, who shall have five (5) working days to respond. The recommendation at this level, together with any response from the Faculty Member, together with all prior recommendations and other materials previously forwarded by the department head, shall be forwarded to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Directions for Preparing the Application for Promotion

Applicants

Faculty Members applying for Promotion are required to:

1. Submit an Annual Faculty Activity Report by October 15 and notify the department of intent to apply for promotion.
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 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 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. The narrative itself, 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 Department Head 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 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 Personnel 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 of 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 Professional Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

Applicants

The tenured Faculty Member up for Professional Performance Evaluation shall provide the Department Head with his/her Annual Faculty Activity Reports.

Evaluators

The Department Head 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 Department Head has information which 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 Faculty 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 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 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, 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 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 departmental 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 Professional 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 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 Faculty Activity Reports applicable to the period under review, and the results of the required evaluation techniques, 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 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 concurs with the department'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 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 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 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 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 the parties (Department Head, 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 Department Head.
- 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 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, 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 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.

DEPARTMENT STANDARDS**APPOINTMENT STANDARDS**

	ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS AND ADDITIONAL CRITERIA	EQUIVALENCIES or EXCEPTIONS
PROFESSOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earned doctorate, and • Five years college-level teaching experience as Associate Professor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience as an educational administrator, instructional director, etc; or • Scholarly activity acceptable as for tenured Associate Professor
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earned doctorate, and • Three years college-level teaching experience as Assistant Professor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience as an educational administrator, instructional director, etc; or • Scholarly activity acceptable as for tenured Assistant Professor
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earned doctorate or ABD • Earned doctorate expected within 2 years* • Earned doctorate required for tenure* 	
INSTRUCTOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master's degree 	

*Required of faculty hired January 2000 and later.

**REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS
(Hired prior to January 1, 1997)**

• **PROFESSOR**

Year	1	2
Evaluation	Interim	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA	DAA
Scholarly Activity	X	DAA
Service	A	A

• **ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

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

• **ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**

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

• **INSTRUCTOR**

Year	1	2	3	4	5		6	7
Evaluation	Interim	Interim	Full R	Interim	Full R	Tenure	Interim	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	A	A	A	A	A	DAA	DAA	DAA
Scholarly Activity	X	X	A	X	A	A	A	A
Service	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A

**REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS
(Hired January 1, 1997 and thereafter)**

• **PROFESSOR**

Year	1	2	3
------	---	---	---

Evaluation	Interim	Full/R	Full/T
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA	DAA	DAA
Scholarly Activity	X	DAA	DAA
Service	A	A	A

• **ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

Year	1	2	3	4	5
Evaluation	Interim	Full/R	Comp Interim	Full/T	Full/T
Instructional Effectiveness	A	A	A	DAA	DAA
Scholarly Activity	X	A	(A)	A	A
Service	A	A	A	A	A

• **ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**

Year	1	2	3	4	5
Evaluation	Interim	Interim	Full R	Comp Interim	Full/T
Instructional Effectiveness	A	A	A	A	DAA
Scholarly Activity	X	X	A	(A)	A
Service	A	A	A	A	A

• **INSTRUCTOR**

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6
Evaluation	Interim	Interim	Full R	Comp Interim	Comp Interim	Full/T
Instructional Effectiveness	A	A	A	A	A	DAA
Scholarly Activity	X	X	A	(A)	(A)	A
Service	A	A	A	A	A	A

PROMOTIONAL STANDARDS

	YEAR ELIGIBLE	ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS	INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS	SCHOLARLY/ CREATIVE ACTIVITY	SERVICE

TO PROFESSOR	5 years as associate professor at EMU	Earned doctorate	DAA	DAA	DAA
TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	4 years as assistant professor at EMU	Earned doctorate	DAA	DAA	DAA
TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	2 years as instructor at EMU	Earned doctorate	DAA	DAA in one and A in the other	
			After 4 years:	A	A

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 latest information in the subject area(s) taught, by reading, attending professional conferences and/or by communicating with colleagues.
 - b. Participates creatively in the subject area through the development of teaching materials such as course outlines, preparation of handbooks, development of videotapes, preparation of annotated bibliographies, and other similar activities.
 - c. Regularly evaluates his/her own past teaching methods, procedures, and course content.
2. 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.
 - c. Has a clear and relevant plan of action to accomplish both long and short-term objectives.
 - d. Uses acceptable evaluation procedures in evaluating students so as to measure the attainment of objectives set forth.
3. 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) through course outlines, etc.
 - 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. Endeavors to establish good communication with students. Example: returns student papers promptly.
 - e. Promotes classroom procedures and surroundings, which encourage learning.
 - f. Regularly seeks information from students regarding their levels of attainment and informs them of his/her estimation of their performance.
4. Is committed to students
 - a. Available to 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, and publication(s)).
 - c. Keeps up-to-date regarding practices and procedures necessary for academic advising.
 - d. Assists students with academic problems.
5. Program or Course Development
 - a. Takes an active role in preparing new courses or programs.

Evaluation Reports

1. The Faculty Member's own report of activities and accomplishments in this area.
2. Department Head evaluations of teaching, including classroom visits (*see Appendices B and C for Department Head classroom visitation form and visitation procedures*).

3. Colleague evaluations of teaching, including classroom visits (*see Appendices B and C form for Peer classroom visitation form and visitation procedures*).
4. Student evaluations of teaching (*see Appendix A for Student evaluation questions*).
5. Student evaluation of advising.

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 the personnel committee and the Department Head 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 overall quality of instruction offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of a truly superior teacher. Evaluators must describe performance in terms of selected supporting activities as better in quality than distinctly above average (DAA).

Distinctly Above Average (DAA):

Awarded for outstanding quality of instruction in some supportive activities. Evaluators must describe performance in terms of selected supporting activities as noticeably better in quality than average (A).

Average (A):

The minimal acceptable level of performance for a good teacher. All listed supporting activities must be present in applicant's teaching performance at an acceptable level. Evaluators must describe performance in these terms.

Below Average (BA):

Awarded for unacceptable level of performance. Considering all listed supporting activities, the applicant's teaching performance is determined to be at an unacceptable level. Evaluators must describe performance in terms of unacceptability.

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 (print or electronic) and/or other tangible documentation. Scholarly/Creative Activity is not evaluated during Interim Evaluations (except the Comprehensive Interim Evaluation where it is evaluated for advisory purposes only). Examples of Scholarly/Creative Activities include, but are not limited to, the following (not in priority order):

1. Lectures and/or university appropriate consultative activities for professional organizations, government agencies, other universities, etc., pertaining to the faculty member's area(s) of specialization.
2. Post-doctoral fellowship.

3. Research in progress which has been disseminated to others.
4. Publication of scholarly and/or creative works: research, books, articles, proceedings, columns, instructional materials, and lab manuals.
5. Written critical reviews of published professional materials that advance the knowledge base of the discipline.
6. Contribution of data, chapters, or illustrative material to another's publication.
7. Acting as editor on a manuscript for a publisher or journal.
8. Participation in the development of research grant proposals as specified in the Agreement.
9. Creative or scholarly work disseminated in public performance or presentation at professional meetings.
10. Co-authorship of publications.
11. Local and other activities that involve any type of inquiry or creative activities enhancing or informing the profession of education.

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 Departmental 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 Departmental 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 meets the criteria in the Departmental Evaluation Document and the Agreement.

Criteria

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 Department Head 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.
- What distinguishes the activity from the contributions of others or from the candidate's previous work.

Ratings

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 subject area by the intended audience (i.e., has led students beyond the level of current textbook knowledge, provided the discipline with significant new facts or interpretation of old facts, or directions of research, helped direct a publisher or a granting agency to support good work or discourage bad, etc). Evaluators must describe in terms which show how 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 being 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 activity offered by the applicant offers a relatively small increment of knowledge or understanding or has restricted dissemination of work in progress in early stages of development.

Below Average (BA):

Awarded when the research and scholarly activity presented by the application demonstrates severely limited knowledge/understanding or has severely limited dissemination of work.

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 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 the Personnel Committee and the Department Head giving the rationale for the rating awarded for Full Evaluations for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion and Full Professional Performance Evaluations.

Criteria

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

- A. Attendance at, and participation in, departmental and program area meetings.
- B. Membership in departmental standing or ad hoc committees.
- C. Serving as undergraduate or graduate academic advisor.
- D. Serving in a leadership capacity in various co-curricular student activities of the department.
- E. Evidence that the applicant has assisted colleagues in departmental activities and in identifying needs in the department.

- F. Serving as Program Area Coordinator or Graduate Coordinator.
- G. Serving as a mentor for new faculty or lecturers.
- H. Serving on review panel for grant proposals for EMU or outside agencies.
- I. Grant related service activities at EMU, schools and communities.
- J. Other appropriate departmental service.

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

1. Membership in an interdepartmental committee or council.
2. Membership in the Advisory Council of the College of Education
3. Membership in a council, committee or subcommittee as established by the faculty input system at the college level.
4. Membership in a council, committee or subcommittee at the university level.
5. Other extra-departmental service at the college or university levels or in the community or student activities, designated as appropriate by the department as a whole, the Personnel Committee, and/or the Department Head.

Ratings

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.

Distinctly Above Average (DAA):

Awarded when the quantity and quality of service shall be evaluated, in addition to the basis described for average, as substantially more than 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.

Below Average: (BA):

Awarded when the quality and quantity of service shall be evaluated as substantially less than one's fair share.

(Appendix A)

Approved Questions for Student Evaluation of Faculty Member

1. Overall rating of the teaching effectiveness of this instructor. (Please check one)

A B C D E

2. Overall rating of this course. (Please check one)

A B C D E

Faculty may elect to add optional items to the EMU Instructor and Course Evaluation Form.

Appendices B and C
Department Head and Peer Classroom Visitation Form

Activity/Lesson Observed:

Comments/Conference:

Appendix B – 1
Eastern Michigan University
Teacher Education Department

Faculty Observation

Name: _____ Date/Time: _____

Course: _____ Class Format: _____

Number of Students in Attendance: _____

Required Data Provided, copy of:

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| _____ syllabus | _____ assigned class readings |
| _____ philosophy of teaching/or teaching style | _____ lesson plan overview |
| _____ other materials which would indicate teaching effectiveness | |

I. *Purposes and Objectives:*

II. *Requested Areas for Feedback:*

III. *Rejoinder:*

Observer's Signature: _____

Observee's Signature: _____

Appendix B – 3
Teacher Education Department, EMU
Faculty Observation Form

Using the preceding topics, discuss:

A. Areas of Strength:

B. Areas for Development:

(Appendix C)
Procedures for Colleague/Department Head
Classroom Visits

It is anticipated that the purpose of the classroom visitation is to inform the Department Head of the teaching effectiveness of the Faculty Member according to his/her stated philosophy and style of teaching.

Prior to the visit, the Faculty Member shall give the Department Head/Colleague any information relevant to the Faculty Member's teaching style and philosophy of teaching that should be evident during the visit. The Faculty Member should also give the visitor a copy of the assigned readings, objectives, lesson plan overview, syllabus, and any other material that will inform the visitor's evaluation of the Faculty Member's teaching effectiveness.

The Department Head shall notify the Faculty Member of the visit at least ten days in advance. Visits by colleagues can be scheduled for mutually beneficial times at least five days before the visit.

The completed observation forms for Colleague and Department Head observations will be provided to the Faculty Member within ten days of the observation. The Department Head/Colleague and the Faculty Member shall meet within ten to fourteen days after the visit to discuss the observation. Within five days of the discussion, the faculty member may choose to provide a writing response to the observation(s). Upon request, the Faculty Member shall be entitled to additional observational visits.