

Eastern Michigan University
Office of Academic Human Resources
Memorandum

To: John Boyless, School Director
School of Technology Studies

From: David Woike, Interim Assistant Vice President
Academic Affairs

Date: September 15, 2011

Re: Approved DED

Attached is a copy of the revised Departmental Evaluation Document for the School of Technology Studies approved by the University Standing Committee on February 3, 2011. Please take steps to assure that faculty members are aware of these approved changes that are effective Fall, 2011. The revised copy will be posted for reference on the Academic Human Resources homepage

Thank you.

DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT

School of Technology Studies

College of Technology

Date of Last DED Revision: 2008

Date of Department Faculty Vote: January 21, 2011

Yes 24 No 0 Abstain 0

APPROVALS:

John Duggan 1/21/11
Personnel Committee Chair (Date)

John Boyler 1/21/11
Department Head/School Director (Date)

Maull Boone 1/21/11
Dean (Date)

APPROVED BY THE DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT STANDING COMMITTEE ON: February 3, 2011

Donald N. Tabzukei

Susan E. Moeller

[Signature]

Kenneth W. Pucina

Maull Boone

Richard M. Grotting

Mary Imblode

DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT

EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

School of Technology Studies Department Evaluation Document

FACULTY EVALUATION

Faculty evaluations shall be conducted using criteria, procedures and techniques specified in this 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 discipline. 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 assignments, satisfactory professional performance shall be the equivalent of Instructional Effectiveness. (§ 484)

Scholarly and/or Creative Activity

A Faculty Member shall give documented evidence of his/her contributions to his/her discipline(s) 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 one of the following ways: (§ 489)

1. In the classroom, or;
2. Among practitioners in his/her discipline(s), or;
3. Among a wider community. (§ 491-493)

It is intended that the Faculty Member shall utilize his/her expertise to address problems in his/her discipline(s) or areas of specialization or in an interdisciplinary specialization

through Scholarly and/or Creative Activity which clearly contributes to the discipline(s), through: (§ 494)

1. Scholarly investigation, Creative Activity and/or research of an original and/or previously unreported nature, (§ 495)
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 (§ 496)
3. Faculty involvement in student research which is subsequently jointly published or otherwise jointly disseminated shall be considered as appropriate Scholarly/Creative Activity, insofar as said faculty involvement is shown to fulfill the expectations in 1 - 2 above. (§ 497)

Retraining

In recognition of the need to encourage the retraining of faculty to assume professional responsibilities in areas where available expertise is in short supply, completion by the Faculty Member of a retraining program which brings him/her to a specified level of skill in such 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. This approval is binding upon future evaluations. (§ 499)

Each of the three activities below may, under the conditions specified, be considered as partially fulfilling the Scholarly and/or Creative Activity criterion. The scholarly/creative activity criterion cannot be satisfied by any of these alone, or solely in combination with each other. (§ 500)

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/or expertise in the Faculty Member's discipline or area of specialization required to fulfill the Instructional Effectiveness standards. (§ 503)

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. This approval is binding upon future evaluations. (§ 504)

The criteria to be used to evaluate the professional development activity is whether, as a result of the experience, the faculty member significantly increased their knowledge concerning the discipline or area of study previously identified.

Grant Development/Administration

EMU and the Association recognize the need to encourage Faculty to engage in the vital process of seeking, obtaining and administering grants from outside agencies. The preparation of grant proposals for outside agencies, whether funded or not, shall be considered as scholarly/creative activity if said preparation involves Scholarly/Creative Activity (e.g., research or teaching projects) of a substantial nature, the applicant provides an abstract documenting such activity and the importance of the endeavor to the discipline, the department, the college or University, and the appropriate departmental committee and department head provide a qualitative statement supporting the importance of the grant proposal to said discipline, department, college or University. The above conditions may also apply for the administration of a grant project insofar as proper evidence is presented which documents that such grant administration meets the requirements as set forth in Article XV of the EMU-AAUP Agreement. (§ 506)

Doctoral Dissertation Research

Doctoral Dissertation Research undertaken by a tenure track faculty member in those instances where the doctorate is not recognized as the terminal degree or required for the purpose of achieving tenure shall be considered as scholarly/creative activity in the year(s) in which such research is undertaken, provided the faculty member 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 the department head provide a qualitative statement supporting the importance of the doctoral research. (§ 508)

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, AAUP service, student activities, professionally related community affairs, and grant activities, either disciplinary or interdisciplinary, that are not counted under Scholarly/Creative Activity.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Instructional Effectiveness

Under Directions for Preparing the Application for Full Evaluation; the narrative should include the following:

- 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.

Evaluation techniques for all Faculty Members shall include at least the following types of evaluation of teaching: (§ 485)

- Peer evaluations;
- Department Head evaluations;
- Student evaluations;
- Self evaluations;
- Up to two additional peer evaluators at the request of the faculty member and approval of the department head.

Departments shall utilize:

1. A set of approved questions for the Student Evaluation Form as approved by a vote of the faculty members in the Department (see Appendix A).
2. A procedure for classroom visitations (see Appendix C).
3. A set of approved forms for Peer and Department Head Classroom Visitations (see Appendix B).
4. A set of approved forms for advising evaluations (see Appendix D).

Note: Individual peer and 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. (§ 485)

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.

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

1. Committee work
2. Report preparation
3. Display presentations
4. Preparation of promotional/recruiting materials
5. Departmental representative (including AAUP)
6. Student association sponsor or advisor
7. Professional association officer (including AAUP)
8. Undergraduate or graduate program coordinator
9. Laboratory or classroom development coordination
10. Creating new Programs/Courses
11. Program Review/Accreditation
12. Programmatic fundraising, marketing, etc.

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

1. Committee work
2. College or university representation
3. Executive officer in associations or service clubs (professionally related)
4. Civic duty or public service functions (professionally related)
5. Professional assistance to public institutions, centers, and institutes (when not on release time)
6. Professional speeches and presentations to community groups

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE

All candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion must satisfy the terms of this Departmental Evaluation Document, all elements of the evaluation criteria provided herein, and all other terms and conditions of the EMU-AAUP 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, in accordance with Article XIV., partial service/rank credit is granted for experience prior to joining the faculty at EMU. The partial service/rank credit which a Faculty Member receives at the

date of hire, and the Scholarly/Creative Activity completed during the period of time for which he/she is given credit at the initial date of hire shall be creditable for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, insofar as: (a) the activity is consistent with the definition of Scholarly/Creative Activity set forth in the Agreement; (b) the activity fulfills the standards of the Faculty Member's Department 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;
2. Comprehensive Interim Evaluations;
3. Full Interim Evaluation (conducted only if required following Interim or Comprehensive Interim Evaluation) (see Art. XV of the EMU-AAUP Agreement);
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

Evaluation of probationary Faculty Members shall be conducted according to the following schedule:

Evaluation Schedule

Initial Appointment Rank	Years					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Professor	Initial Interim	Full	Tenure			
Associate Professor	Initial Interim	Full *	Comp. Interim	Tenure		
Assistant Professor	Initial Interim	Initial Interim	Full *	Comp. Interim	Tenure	
Instructor	Initial Interim	Initial Interim	Full *	Comp. Interim	Comp. Interim	Tenure

* 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 or 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. 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 re-appointed 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 Evaluation

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 re-appointed 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 and/or department Personnel Committee perceive a problem in Instructional Effectiveness and/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 evaluations 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 evaluations 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 receipt of the written results of the evaluations. 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 evaluations and the evaluations 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 narrative 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 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 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 Reports.)

If, upon completing the review of the Annual Faculty Activity Reports, the Department Head determines that a Faculty Member's performance does not rise to the level of average in the Departmental Evaluation Document, he/she shall bring his/her concerns to

the attention of the department's Personnel Committee. Together the Department Head and the committee shall review the Annual Faculty Activity Reports and any relevant information/documents (e.g., student evaluations, letters received, etc.) available to them. If their joint review concludes that there appear to be no deficits in the Faculty Member's performance, they shall say so in writing and place a copy of this statement in the Faculty Member's departmental personnel file, with a copy to the Faculty Member, the College Dean, and the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for inclusion in the University personnel file.

If the joint review confirms that there appear to be deficits, the procedures in Article XV of the EMU-AAUP 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 received 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/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 Interim Evaluations

Applicants

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

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

Evaluators

In a Faculty Member's first year the evaluator shall 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 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 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 perceives 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 an Annual Faculty Activity Report by October 15.
2. Complete the Application for Full Interim Evaluation Form.
3. Write a narrative which describes how his/her 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 a 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 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 evaluations 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 evaluations 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 receipt of the written results of the evaluations. 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 evaluations and the evaluations shall be forwarded in turn to the Dean and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for their review. If the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs determines, subject to the provisions of Article XV. and XVI. of the Agreement, that a probationary Faculty Member's appointment shall not be renewed, he/she shall notify the Faculty Member by no later than March 15 of his/her decision.

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

Directions for Preparing the Application for Full 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 Agreement's and 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 or area of specialization.

Full evaluations shall be reviewed by the Dean in accordance with the standards of performance in the Departmental Evaluation Document and the terms of 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.

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

Directions for Preparing the Application for Promotion

Applicants

Faculty Members applying for Promotion are required to:

1. Complete the Annual Activity Report by October 15.

2. 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 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 profession;
- ◆ A description of 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 Departmental 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 Articles XV of the contract, and, in particular, how those activities claimed as Scholarly/Creative Activity have contributed to the discipline or area of specialization.

Full evaluations shall be reviewed by the Dean in accordance with the standards of performance in the Departmental Evaluation Document and the terms of 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.

All materials, as well as any rebuttals provided by the applicant, should then be forwarded to the Provost and the 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

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 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 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 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 evaluations.

In those instances where the Dean concurs with the department's evaluations 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 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

The following standards apply to appointments, reappointments, tenure, and promotion.

Appointment Standards

	Academic Credentials and Additional Criteria	Equivalencies or Exceptions
Professor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Doctoral Degree, and · Must have completed five scholarly/creative activities during the previous five (5) years, and · Previous employment as associate professor or professor at an accredited college or university 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal Assistant Program: J.D. Degree - Masters of Fine Arts or Equivalent
Associate Professor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Doctoral Degree, and · Must have completed five scholarly/creative activities during the previous five (5) years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal Assistant Program: J.D. Degree - Masters of Fine Arts or Equivalent
Assistant Professor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Doctoral candidacy or equivalencies If doctoral candidacy, completion of all coursework toward doctorate and dissertation proposal accepted by the doctoral committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal Assistant Program: J.D. Degree - Masters of Fine Arts or Equivalent - For initial appointment at Assistant Professor level, other exceptions or equivalencies demonstrating sufficient background in academic research and/or professional accomplishments as may be approved by the department on a case-by-case basis.
Instructor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Master's degree plus <u>30</u> semester hours 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal Assistant Program: J.D. Degree - Masters of Fine Arts or Equivalent - For initial appointment at instructor level, other exceptions or equivalencies demonstrating sufficient background in academic research and/or professional accomplishments as may be approved by the department on a case-by-case basis.

Reappointment and Tenure Standards for Faculty

PROFESSOR

Year	1	2	3
Evaluation	Interim	Full/R	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	A	DAA	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X	A	DAA in one and A in the other
Service	A	A	

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Year	1	2	3	4
Evaluation	Interim	Full/R*	CI	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	A	DAA	DAA	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X	Advisory	Advisory	DAA in one and A in the other
Service	A	A	A	

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Year	1	2	3	4	5 ¹
Evaluation	Interim	Interim	Full/R*	CI	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	A	A	DAA	DAA	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X	X	Advisory	X	DAA in one and A in the other
Service	A	A	A	A	

INSTRUCTOR

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6 ²
Evaluation	Interim	Interim	Full/R*	CI	CI	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	A	A	DAA	A	A	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity		X	Advisory	X	X	DAA in one and A in the other
Service	A	A	A	A	A	

¹Earned doctoral or MFA degree. Legal Assistant Program: J.D. Degree

²Doctoral Candidacy required. Completion of all coursework toward doctorate and dissertation proposal accepted by the doctoral committee.

Promotional Standards

	<i>YEAR ELIGIBLE</i>	<i>ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS</i>	INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS	SCHOLARLY /CREATIVE ACTIVITY	SERVICE
TO PROFESSOR	5 years as associate professor at EMU	Doctoral degree Legal Assistant Program: J.D.	DAA	DAA in one and A in the other	
TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	*4 years as assistant professor at EMU **5 years as assistant professor at EMU	Doctoral degree Legal Assistant Program: J.D.	DAA	DAA*	A
				* Program Coordinators: DAA in one and A in the other	
TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	2 years as instructor at EMU	Doctoral candidacy required: Completion of all coursework toward doctorate and dissertation proposal accepted by the doctoral committee. Legal Assistant Program: J.D. Degree	DAA	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.

Criteria

Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness will be based on the following criteria. These criteria specify the minimum requirements; however, applicants are not limited to the stated criteria. (See page 32 of this document for ratings).

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.
 - c. Includes development of materials with appropriate teaching.
2. Plans effectively for teaching
 - a. Has a clear conception of his/her course(s) within the Program and/or Department and within 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. Incorporates current information and recent developments in the discipline.
 - d. Has a clear conception of the evaluation procedures that will enable him/her to measure the attainment of objectives set forth.
3. Practices good teaching methods
 - a. Informs students of objectives of the course(s), assignments, and units of study, and evaluation criteria (e.g., dates of exams, papers, etc.).
 - b. Helps students develop methods of study and skills in self-direction.
 - c. Keeps students informed of specific course assignments (e.g., dates of exams, papers, etc.).
 - d. Informs students about required objectives, learning experiences, and evaluations of outcomes.
 - e. Establishes a classroom environment conducive to learning.
 - f. Evaluates students so as to measure the attainment of course objectives.
4. Commits to students.
 - a. Makes him/herself available to students outside the classroom.

- b. Works beyond the regular classroom responsibilities to help students with independent learning experiences (e.g., special problems, independent studies, thesis publications, etc.).
- c. Keeps up-to-date regarding practices and procedures necessary for academic advising if applicable.
- d. Assist students with academic problems.
- e. Assists students in securing co-op placements if applicable.

Evaluating Reports

- 1. The faculty member's own report of activities and accomplishments in this area.
- 2. Department Head evaluations of teaching, including classroom visits.
- 3. Colleague evaluations of teaching, including classroom visits (see Appendix B).
- 4. Student evaluations of teaching (see Appendix A for approved questions).
- 5. Student evaluations of advising, when applicable (see Appendix E).

Rating

The Personnel Committee and the Department Head will evaluate all the evidence submitted giving equally weighted consideration to 1) Faculty Member's own report of activities; 2) Department Head's evaluations of teaching, 3) Colleagues' evaluations of teaching; 4) Students' evaluations of teaching; and considering students' evaluation of advising (if assigned advising responsibilities, forms should be issued at advising session). 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 quality of instruction offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of a truly superior teacher. Evaluators must describe (or in the case of student evaluations, quantify) performance as better in quality than distinctly above average.

Distinctly Above Average (DAA):

Awarded when the quality of instruction offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of an outstanding teacher. Evaluators must describe (or in the case of student evaluations, quantify) performance as better in quality than average.

Average (A):

Awarded when the quality of the instruction offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of a good teacher. This is the minimum acceptable level of performance.

Below Average (BA):

Given when the quality of the instruction offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as less than that of a good teacher.

Scholarly and/or Creative Activity

Data Collection Procedures and Point values

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 is not evaluated during Interim Evaluations (except the Comprehensive Interim Evaluation, where it is evaluated for advisory purposes only). Of the Scholarly/Creative Activities, at least one must come from group one below.

Examples of acceptable Scholarly/creative works

Scholarly/Creative activity includes, but is not limited to, the following:

Group 1	Points per item/activity
Articles in refereed journals authored or co-authored, published or accepted for publication.	3-5 points
Books authored or co-authored, published or accepted for publication.	3-5 points
Journal editorship.	5 points
Books edited or co-edited, published or accepted for publication.	3-5 points
Book chapters authored or co-authored, published or accepted for publication	3-5 points
Original scholarly monograph, peer-reviewed	3-5 points
Articles in non-refereed journals authored or co-authored, published or accepted for publication	1-2 points
Group 2	
Abstracts in refereed proceedings authored or co-authored, published or accepted for publication.	1 point
Presentations at professional meetings, colloquia, or workshops; other lectures or presentations describing scholarly or creative contributions.	1-2 points
Articles in refereed proceedings authored or co-authored, published or accepted for publication	3 points
Creative participation in the subject area through development of instructional materials which are of an original and previously unreported nature and which result in the development of new applications and/or interpretations accompanied by dissemination of these new instructional materials, in workshops, in symposia, or by publication.	1-2 points
Reviews authored or co-authored, published or accepted for publication.	1 point
Computer software.	1-2 points
U.S. and foreign patents applied for and/or issued.	1-2 points
Professional retraining that complies with the EMU-AAUP contract as described in Article XV.	1 point
Grant development and administration as described in Article XV of the EMU-AAUP contract.	2-3 points
Significant fellowships and awards that recognize scholarly and/or creative achievement.	2-3 points
Editorial referee on a manuscript or other scholarly endeavor.	2-3 points
Professional development activities as described in Article XV of the EMU-AAUP contract.	1 point
Preparing proposals for grants from outside agencies, whether funded or not, as described in Article XV of the EMU-AAUP contract.	1-2 points
Letter or comment in scholarly journal	1 point

Criteria

Evaluation of scholarly and/or creative activity will be based on the following criteria:

1. Scholarship or creative activity must be original work.

2. Scholarship or creative activity must add to the body of knowledge of the discipline.
3. Scholarship or creative activity must be refereed/peer reviewed; if the applicant requests consideration of scholarly or creative activity that is not refereed/peer reviewed, the applicant must meet the alternative for refereed/peer reviewed by indicating:
 - a. Extent of effort and research required to produce the activity.
 - b. Extent of dissemination and the impact of the activity on students, colleagues, the profession, and/or the community.
 - c. Reputation of the publisher, journal, conference, or audience.
 - d. Independent assessment ratings or evaluations, published critical review of activity, etc.
 - e. Advancement of the discipline or profession.
4. Scholarship or creative activity must be disseminated and retrievable.

In those instances where a Faculty Member has cited activities which appear in refereed journals or are published by reputable sources, or are presented in a clearly refereed format, reference to these activities and inclusion of copies of these materials (where feasible) shall be deemed to satisfy the documentation requirements.

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 does or does not meet 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 does or does not meet the criteria in the Departmental Evaluation Document 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 Department Head and Personnel Committee should consider such factors as the following (not in priority order):

- The degree to which the candidate's activity shows 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.
- Scholarly/creative activities, submitted by the applicant, involving more than one author shall include a description of the specific contributions made by the applicant to the activity. If it is determined that the applicant contributed their "fair share" to the work, the Scholarly/Creative Activity may be considered sole authorship.

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

Exceptional (E):	Exactly 15 points and above
Distinctly Above Average (DAA):	Exactly 10 to 14.99 points
Average (A):	Exactly 5 to 9.99 points
Below Average (BA):	Less than 5 points

Service Activity

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. The narrative must include the following:

- The specific activities presented for evaluation;
- A description of the way in which they have contributed to the good of the Program, Department, College, University, and/or the profession; and
- The manner in which the applicant has met the DED criteria.

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 Performance Evaluations.

Overall Service 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. This shall be evidenced by such factors as:

1. Consistently assuming and executing leadership roles in committees, councils, boards, program reviews, accreditations, or other similar roles.
2. Identifying, initiating the actions for, and satisfying the needs of the department and university or community.
3. A continuing record of involvement.

Distinctly Above Average (DAA): Awarded when the quality and quantity of service shall be evaluated, in addition to the basis described for average, as substantially more than one's fair share. This shall be evidenced by such factors as:

1. Frequent membership on committees that demand a commitment in excess of that required for an average rating.
2. Development of new teaching facilities such as the planning, securing and implementation of laboratory equipment needs.
3. Identifying departmental, university, and/or organizational needs and working towards fulfillment of those needs.

Average (A): Awarded when the quality and quantity of service shall be evaluated as that normally expected: one's fair share. This shall be evidenced by such factors as:

1. Accepting assignments and executing the prescribed duties.
2. Volunteering or accepting nominations to serve on committees or councils, or executive positions.
3. Regularly attending meetings of the department and of other organizations to which the applicant belongs.
4. Regular contributions to the worth of the organization.
5. Preparedness at meetings.

Below Average (BA): Awarded when the quality and/or quantity of service shall be evaluated as less than that normally expected: less than one's fair share. This rating shall be awarded when the person does not meet the requirements of average.

APPENDICES

Appendix A - Approved Questions for the Student Evaluation Form

Appendix B - Peer, Colleague, and Department Head Classroom Visitation Form

Appendix C - Procedure for classroom visitations

Appendix D - Professional Performance Evaluation Standards

Appendix E - Advisor Evaluation Form

Appendix F - Evaluation of School Director

APPENDIX A

The following questions must be included on the Course Evaluation Form for each course:

- (2) My instructor displays a clear understanding of course topics.
- (6) My instructor has an effective style of presentation.
- (7) My instructor seems well prepared for class.
- (16) My instructor stimulates interest in the course.
- (41) My instructor makes good use of examples and illustrations.
- (57) My instructor returns assignments quickly enough to benefit me.
- (161) My instructor used a variety of teaching methods in this course.
- (187/188) I would highly recommend this instructor.
- (205) My instructor presents the course in a well-organized manner.
- (207) My instructor is helpful when I have a question.
- (222/223) My instructor respects students from diverse backgrounds.
- (216) The instructor is reasonably accessible outside the classroom.

**APPENDIX B
INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION**

School of Technology Studies
Department Evaluation Document
Instructor Evaluation Form

Applicant _____

Course visited _____

Evaluator _____

Date _____

Type of class activity: () Lecture; () Demonstration; () Laboratory; () On-Line
The observer is to comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the observed instructional activities. These include but may not be limited to the following:

Planning and Teacher Organization	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Well prepared for class- Begins class on time in an orderly, organized fashion- Reviews topics from previous class as transition, if appropriate- States learning objectives for the class session- Makes clear transition from one topic to another- Summarizes periodically points previously made- Makes use of teachable moments- Summarizes, gives closures at end of topic/class	

Presentation Techniques & Methods	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Selects appropriate teaching methods to enhance student learning- Arranges classroom for appropriate instruction- Incorporates appropriate visual support tools to increase student comprehension- Varies pace of class to enhance student attentiveness- Demonstrates creativity in instructional delivery- Defines new or unfamiliar terms- Uses concrete examples to explain concepts- Communicates a sense of enthusiasm about topic- Encourages critical thinking/analysis	

Classroom Management & Rapport	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encourages student involvement & interaction with instructor and/or classmates - Encourages & responds to questions/comments during class - Recognizes & responds when students do not understand - Answers student questions appropriately - Receptive to student suggestions - Able to admit error and/or insufficient knowledge when applicable - Demonstrates enthusiasm during lesson - Incorporates students' ideas into lecture/discussion when appropriate - Shows tolerance for other points of view, treats students equitably 	

Concluding remarks:

I have met and discussed this evaluation with the applicant.

Evaluator

Date

Applicant

APPENDIX C

Procedure for Classroom Visitation

Prior to the class visit:

1. The evaluator, a member of the Personnel Committee and the Department Head will contact the faculty member to arrange a specific class to visit. The faculty member shall be entitled to up to two additional peer evaluations by faculty chosen by mutual agreement of the faculty member and the department head. (The visit should last a minimum of 50 minutes.)
2. The faculty member being evaluated will provide the evaluators with the dates and times of several possible classes to visit. The evaluator will indicate to the faculty member what class they plan to attend.
3. The faculty member will provide the evaluator with a course syllabus, handouts that relate to the class session, and a brief description of the planned class activity. Classes where little observable activity takes place (students taking exams, or completing an individual writing assignment) should be avoided.

During the Visit:

1. The evaluator should arrive before the start of class and locate himself/herself in the back or side of the classroom.
2. The faculty member may determine if he/she wants to introduce the visitor and/or describe the purpose of the visit.
3. The evaluator should refrain from participation in class discussion and/or activities unless called upon by the faculty member.

After the Visit:

1. The evaluator must complete the classroom observation form.
2. The evaluator must make arrangements for a meeting with the faculty member to discuss the observation and evaluation.
3. The faculty member must sign the evaluation form indicating that he/she has reviewed the completed evaluation form and had an opportunity to ask questions about it.
4. The faculty member shall receive a copy of this evaluation form, within ten (10) days following the classroom visit.

Appendix D
Professional Performance Evaluation Standards

	INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS	SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITY	SERVICE
PROFESSOR	The quality of the instruction Offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of an Average teacher	Must have completed at least three (3) scholarly/creative activities during the preceding four years.	The quality and quantity of service shall be evaluated as normally expected; one's fair share.
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	The quality of the instruction Offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of an Average teacher	Must have completed at least three (3) scholarly/creative activities during the preceding four years.	The quality and quantity of service shall be evaluated as normally expected; one's fair share.
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	The quality of the instruction Offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of an Average teacher.	Must have completed at least three (3) scholarly/creative activities during the preceding four years.	The quality and quantity of service shall be evaluated as normally expected; one's fair share.
INSTRUCTOR	The quality of the instruction Offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of an Average teacher	Must have completed at least two (2) scholarly/creative activities during the preceding four years.	The quality and quantity of service shall be evaluated as normally expected; one's fair share.

Appendix E
Advisor Evaluation Form
School of Technology Studies

Advisor's Name _____

Student's Major

Date

Comments

Comment	Rating (Please circle one)		
1. The advisor was available during office hours for consulting or scheduling appointments.	Good	Average	Poor
2. The advisor was dependable and punctual in keeping appointments.	Good	Average	Poor
3. The advisor seemed interested in helping me.	Good	Average	Poor
4. The advisor demonstrated knowledge of program requirements.	Good	Average	Poor
5. The advisor demonstrated knowledge about University requirements.	Good	Average	Poor
6. The advisor was helpful with information about career opportunities.	Good	Average	Poor
7. If the advisor could not answer a question, an attempt was made to refer me to someone who had the answer.	Good	Average	Poor
8. The advisor was professional in his/her manner.	Good	Average	Poor
9. The advisor was courteous.	Good	Average	Poor

Additional Comments:

Please leave this form with the secretary in the departmental office or fold, staple, and drop into campus mail, addressed to School of Technology Studies, Advisor Evaluation Form, Room 122 Sill Hall.