

**Eastern Michigan University**  
*Office of Academic Human Resources*  
**Memorandum**

To: Steven Pernecky, Department Head  
Chemistry

From: David Woike, Interim Assistant Vice President  
Academic Affairs

Date: July 16, 2012

Re: Approved DED

Attached is a copy of the revised Departmental Evaluation Document for the Chemistry Department approved by the University Standing Committee on April 12, 2012. Please take steps to assure that faculty members are aware of these approved changes. The revised copy will be posted for reference on the Academic Human Resources homepage within a few days. Thank you.

## DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT

Department/School of CHEMISTRY

College of ARTS & SCIENCES

Date of Last DED Revision: 3/23/01


Date of Department Faculty Vote: 4/20/12

Yes 19 No 0 Abstain 0


### APPROVALS:

 4-26-12  
Personnel Committee Chair (Date)

Ross Nord 4/26/12  
Department Head/School Director (Date)

 5/3/12  
Dean (Date)

APPROVED BY THE DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT STANDING  
COMMITTEE ON: 4-12-12

  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Mary Tenbrink  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY**

**Division of Academic Affairs**

**DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT**

**Department of Chemistry**

**College of Arts and Sciences**

**Faculty Evaluation**

**Criteria, Procedures and Techniques**

**EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY**  
**Division of Academic Affairs**

**DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT**  
**Department of Chemistry**  
**College of Arts & Sciences**

**Table of Contents**

FACULTY EVALUATION.....	1
CRITERIA.....	1
Instructional Effectiveness.....	1
Scholarly and/or Creative Activity.....	1
Service Activity.....	3
PROCEDURES.....	4
Purposes.....	4
Schedule.....	4
1. Interim Evaluation for Reappointment.....	5
2. Comprehensive Interim Evaluation.....	5
3. Full Evaluation for Reappointment and Tenure.....	5
4. Interim Evaluation for Promotion.....	6
5. Professional Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty.....	6
Guidelines for Applicants and Evaluators.....	6
Directions for the Interim Evaluation.....	7
Directions for the Full Evaluation.....	8
Directions for the Promotion Evaluation.....	9
Directions for the Professional Performance Evaluation.....	10
Rating Scale.....	11
Standards.....	11
Appointment Standards.....	12
Reappointment and Tenure Standards.....	13
Promotion Standards.....	14
TECHNIQUES.....	16
Instructional Effectiveness.....	16
Data Collection Procedures.....	16
Evaluation Reports.....	17
Ratings.....	18
Scholarly and/or Creative Activity.....	19
Data Collection Procedures.....	19
Evaluation Reports.....	19
Ratings.....	20
Service Activity.....	24
Data Collection Procedures.....	24
Service Activities.....	24
Ratings.....	25
APPENDIX.....	26
Professional Performance Evaluation Standards.....	26
List of Required Questions for Student Evaluations.....	32
Classroom Visitation Forms.....	33



## FACULTY EVALUATION

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.

Evaluation techniques for all Faculty Members include, but are not limited to self-evaluation, classroom visitations, student evaluations of teaching, department head evaluation, peer evaluations, and, where appropriate, assessment of academic advising of students.

All Full Evaluations (including Full Professional Performance Evaluations of Tenured Faculty) must include classroom visitations by the department head and members of the appropriate departmental committee.

#### Scholarly and/or Creative Activity

A Faculty Member shall give documented evidence of his/her contributions to his/her discipline or area of specialization within the discipline 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:

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

It is intended that the Faculty Member shall utilize his/her expertise to address problems in his/her discipline or in an area of interdisciplinary specialization through scholarly and/or creative activity that clearly contributes to the discipline, specialization or interdisciplinary area 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. in disciplines where practice and tradition include faculty involvement in student research which is subsequently published or otherwise disseminated, such research shall not be barred from consideration as appropriate scholarly activity, insofar as said faculty involvement is shown to fulfill the expectations in 1 or 2 above.

#### 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. In those instances where written approval of a retraining program is not obtained in advance, retraining shall be barred from consideration when the Faculty Member's scholarly/creative activity is evaluated.

#### Professional Development.

Faculty are encouraged to participate in workshops, institutes, advanced courses, additional degree programs, etc. to enhance their delivery of classroom instruction and/or expand their professional knowledge base. In order to encourage this type of activity, the completion of such activity 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. In those instances where written approval of a program of professional development is not obtained in advance, professional development shall be barred from consideration when the Faculty Member's scholarly/creative activity is evaluated. Upon completion of the professional development activity, the Faculty Member is expected to provide written documentation of the effect that this activity had upon his/her instructional effectiveness or other professional activity. This documentation will be evaluated using the criteria described under the ratings for Scholarly and/or Creative Activity on pages 20-23 of this document. The scholarly/creative activity criterion cannot be satisfied by professional development alone.

Prior to undertaking any professional activity for which credit may be sought, a Faculty Member shall submit a written proposal for preapproval to his/her department. The proposal shall outline the professional 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 for outside agencies, whether funded or not, and/or the administration of a grant project shall be considered as scholarly/creative activity if said preparation involves scholarly activity (e.g., research or teaching projects) of a substantial nature. The applicant must document such activity and the importance of the endeavor to the discipline or interdisciplinary area, the department, the college and/or University as set forth in Article XV of the Agreement. The scholarly/creative activity criterion cannot be satisfied by grant activities alone.



**Service Activity**

The Faculty Member must satisfy one of the criteria below.

1. The Faculty Member shall give evidence of identifying new needs in the department and assisting colleagues in departmental activities.
2. The Faculty Member shall give evidence of interest and activity that extends beyond the department into areas such as University and college-wide committees, student activities, professionally related community affairs, and grant activities, either disciplinary or interdisciplinary if not counted as scholarly/creative activity.

## PROCEDURES

### Purposes.

There are five purposes for evaluation of faculty performance:

1. Interim Evaluation of probationary Faculty Members for reappointment;
2. Comprehensive Interim Evaluations of probationary Faculty Members for reappointment;
3. Full Evaluation of probationary Faculty Members for reappointment or tenure;
4. Full Evaluation of Faculty Members applying for promotion;
5. Professional Performance Evaluations of tenured Faculty Members.

### Schedule.

Evaluations of probationary Faculty Members shall be conducted according to the following schedule.

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

Service as a full-time temporary employee outside the Bargaining Unit (e.g. Lecturers) may be considered as satisfying a portion of the required years of service specified in this Agreement. A Faculty Member who has full-time teaching or related professional experience at an institution of higher education or equivalent may receive credit at the time of his/her initial appointment for a portion of his/her teaching experience for the purpose of tabulating service/rank credit to determine his/her eligibility for consideration for tenure, provided he/she meets the criteria specified in the Agreement.

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 of the Agreement, 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 instructional effectiveness, scholarly/creative activity and service documented 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 activities are consistent with the definitions set forth in the Agreement, (b) the activities fulfill 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. It is incumbent upon the applicant to document that the quality and quantity of these activities are commensurate with the expectations for an EMU Faculty Member over the credited time period.



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.

### **1. Interim Evaluation for Reappointment**

Each year (except his/her first) every Faculty Member shall complete an Annual Faculty Activity Report which summarizes his/her instructional effectiveness and service activities. (Actual deadlines specified in the Agreement.) Scholarly and/or creative activity is not evaluated during initial interim evaluations, unless the Faculty Member so requests.

### **2. Comprehensive Interim Evaluation**

Comprehensive Interim Evaluations provide an evaluation of a Faculty Member's Instructional Effectiveness Service, and Scholarly/Creative Activity. The evaluation of Scholarly/Creative Activity is for advisory purposes only. Comprehensive Interim Evaluations occur in the year(s) following the Faculty Member's first Full Evaluation, but prior to the Full Evaluation for Tenure.

### **3. Full Evaluation for Reappointment and Tenure**

Each year that a Faculty Member is scheduled for full evaluation, he/she shall submit an application for evaluation which provides a complete and documented statement of his/her instructional effectiveness, scholarly and/or creative activities and service activities since the last full evaluation. (Actual deadlines specified in the Agreement.)

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.

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.

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.

A tenure evaluation is a de-novo review of a Faculty Member's entire performance record, which requires that any application for tenure include both narrative statements and supporting documentation that details performance since the date of appointment as a bargaining unit member.



#### **4. Full Evaluation for Promotion**

Application for promotion shall include evidence of the Faculty Member's instructional effectiveness, scholarly and/or creative activity and service since his/her last promotion or date of hire, whichever is later. (Actual deadline specified in the Agreement.)

The Faculty Member who is not simultaneously a candidate for tenure and promotion 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 they 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.

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.

#### **5. Professional Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty**

Each year every tenured Faculty Member shall complete an Annual Faculty Activity Report. This completed form shall be placed in the Faculty Member's file as specified in the Agreement. During the fifth year after a Faculty Member receives tenure, his/her faculty activity reports for the preceding four years are reviewed by the department head. A written report by the department head detailing his/her evaluation shall be placed in the Faculty Member's personnel file. These evaluations will be repeated tetraennially, each time evaluating the Faculty Member's performance during the preceding four years.

#### **Guidelines for Applicants and Evaluators.**

Procedures for preparing the applications for (if necessary) and conducting (1) interim evaluations for reappointment, (2) full evaluations for reappointment and tenure, (3) promotion evaluations, and (4) professional performance evaluations of tenured faculty are included on the following pages (pages 7 - 11).

Directions for the Interim Evaluation.

Applicants. Faculty members applying for reappointment during years when they are not required to undergo a full evaluation are required to:

1. Complete an Annual Faculty Activity Report (except in the first year).
2. Meet with the personnel committee and the department head to discuss performance. At this interview, the topic of scholarly and/or creative activity will be discussed with a view to giving the Faculty Member appropriate guidance and advice about the department's expectations in these areas. However, scholarly and/or creative activity is not part of the interim evaluation. The presence or absence of scholarly and/or creative activity will not affect the interim evaluation recommendation for reappointment.

Evaluators.

1. The department head and the personnel committee shall review the Annual Faculty Activity Report, any other relevant documents, and complete the required evaluation of Instructional Effectiveness using the required techniques set forth in the Agreement. They shall then prepare a written statement which shall be provided to the Faculty Member.
2. The department head and the personnel committee shall then meet with the Faculty Member undergoing an interim evaluation to review and discuss the report of activities and suggest appropriate directions for improvement if such direction is necessary. The written statement may be modified as a result of this meeting.
3. If both the department head and the personnel committee agree upon a positive recommendation, they shall complete and sign an Interim Evaluation/Recommendation for Reappointment form which shall be placed in the Faculty Member's personnel file, with a copy provided the Faculty Member. The final written statement will be attached to this form.
4. If either or both of the recommendations is negative, the evaluators shall meet with the Faculty Member to discuss the perceived problem. Following said meeting the Faculty Member may be asked to submit to a Full Interim Evaluation.
5. If, following a review of the Faculty Member's Application for Full Interim Evaluation (if necessary), the evaluators conclude that the Faculty Member's Instructional Effectiveness and/or Service does not fulfill the standards of performance required for reappointment, the evaluation shall be reduced to writing. The evaluation shall be given to the Faculty Member who may respond. The response and the evaluation shall be forwarded, in turn, to the Dean and Provost for their review.

For complete contractual requirements, refer to the EMU-AAUP Agreement, Articles XIII, XIV and XV.



Directions for the Full Evaluation.

Applicants. Faculty members applying for reappointment during years when they are required to undergo a full evaluation are required to:

1. Complete the Application for Full Evaluation Form.
2. Describe in a narrative statement or essay, how he/she has met the department's criteria in each of the three areas under consideration: instructional effectiveness, scholarly and/or creative activity and service. The applicant is responsible for describing and 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 essay itself, without supporting documents, should be free-standing and will become part of the applicant's personnel file. The essay should include the following:

Instructional Effectiveness:

- specific evidence of effectiveness in the teaching/advising process;
- activities 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 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. If an item is based partly upon work performed either before coming to EMU or in collaboration (other than with his/her own research students), the applicant should indicate which portion of the work is to be considered;
- the manner in which the results of these activities were disseminated;
- the contribution the activities have made to the discipline;
- a description of any judgments which have been made about these activities; and
- the manner in which the applicant has met the criteria.

Service:

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

3. Meet with the personnel committee and the department head to discuss performance, unless the evaluation is for tenure.

Evaluators. Each evaluator (personnel committee and department head) must complete his/her portion of the Full Evaluation and Recommendation Summary Form and attach a narrative statement which explains why these particular judgments have been made.

A full evaluation for tenure is *de novo*. Everything since hire is reviewed.

For complete contractual requirements, refer to the EMU-AAUP Agreement, Articles XIII, XIV and XV.

Directions for the Promotion Evaluation.

Applicants. Faculty members applying for Promotion are required to:

1. 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.
2. Describe in a narrative statement or essay, how he/she has met the department's criteria in each of the three areas under consideration: instructional effectiveness, scholarly and/or creative activity and service. The applicant is responsible for describing and 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 essay itself, without supporting documents, should be free-standing and will become part of the applicant's personnel file. The essay should include the following:

Instructional Effectiveness:

- specific evidence of effectiveness in the teaching/advising process;
- activities 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 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. If an item is based partly upon work performed either before coming to EMU or in collaboration (other than with his/her own research students), the applicant should indicate which portion of the work is to be considered;
- the manner in which the results of these activities were disseminated;
- the contribution the activities have made to the discipline;
- a description of any judgments which have been made about these activities; and
- the manner in which the applicant has met the criteria.

Service:

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

Evaluators. Each evaluator (personnel committee and department head) must complete his/her portion of the Full Evaluation and Recommendation Summary Form and attach a narrative statement which explains why these particular judgments have been made.

For complete contractual requirements, refer to the EMU-AAUP Agreement, Articles XIII, XIV and XV.



Directions for the Professional Performance Evaluation.

1. Tenured Faculty Members will undergo a Professional Performance Evaluation once every four years.
2. The Faculty Member shall meet with the Department Head to discuss their performance at the midpoint of the Professional Performance Evaluation cycle, two years prior to undergoing a Professional Performance Evaluation.
3. The department head shall review the Annual Faculty Activity Reports submitted during the past four years and any other relevant documents. Additionally, the department head will evaluate Instructional Effectiveness using the techniques set forth in the Agreement.
4. For evaluations conducted prior to 9/1/15: To be rated as satisfactory, the Faculty Member must meet the Department Evaluation Document's criteria for an Average rating in the areas of Instructional Effectiveness, Service, and Scholarly/Creative Activity as specified on pages 16-25 of the document.

For evaluations conducted after 9/1/15: To be rated as satisfactory, the Faculty Member must meet the Professional Performance Evaluation Standards specified in the appendix to the Department Evaluation Document. It is incumbent upon the department head to recognize that this is the evaluation of a tenured faculty member who has previously demonstrated the ability to perform at a satisfactory level over an extended period of time. Consequently, this is not a *de novo* evaluation and there should be significant and compelling evidence in order for the department head to rate a faculty member as unsatisfactory.

5. The department head shall prepare a written statement briefly summarizing the Faculty Member's performance and give a copy of the statement to the Faculty Member.
6. The department head shall then meet with the Faculty Member undergoing the Professional Performance Evaluation to discuss the results of the evaluation. This meeting will be held no sooner than three working days after the Faculty Member receives the written statement.
7. If the department head determines that a Faculty Member's performance is satisfactory, he/she shall state so in the written statement, which may be modified as a result of the meeting with the Faculty Member. The Faculty Member will receive a copy of the final written statement and be given five working days to prepare a written response, if desired. A copy of the statement and the Faculty Member's response, if any, will be placed in the Faculty Member's departmental personnel file, with copies to the college dean, and the office of the Provost.
8. If the department head determines that a Faculty Member's performance is not satisfactory, 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 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, provide an opportunity for Faculty Member response, and distribute copies as in (6) above.
9. 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 committee and the department head in order to determine how the deficits might be corrected. If the deficits are minor in nature and appear to be correctable within a period of one academic year or less, the department head shall write a report detailing the department's concern, provide opportunity for Faculty Member response, and distribute copies as in (6) above.



10. If deficits 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, described in Article XV of the Agreement.

### **Rating Scale**

**Exceptional (E)** denotes performance far in excess of the expectations for present rank.

**Distinctly Above Average (DAA)** denotes performance well above the expectations for present rank.

**Average (A)** denotes performance commensurate with the expectations for present rank.

**Below Average (BA)** denotes performance below the expectations for present rank.

### **Standards**

The criteria for faculty evaluation must be applied to applicants engaged in varying disciplines. Therefore, each department evaluation document is unique to its discipline: However, these standards are presented in a uniform format which is consistent with the requirements of Article XV of the Agreement.

The standards for 1) appointment, 2) reappointment and tenure and 3) promotion are summarized in the following charts (pages 12 - 15).

Measurement of these standards for this department is summarized and detailed in the Evaluation Techniques section of this document.

### APPOINTMENT STANDARDS

	Academic Credentials and Additional Criteria	Equivalencies or Exceptions*
PROFESSOR	Ph.D. or doctorate in chemistry education or discipline appropriate to the needs of the department.  Demonstration of effective teaching & scholarly/creative activities.	Distinguished credentials in a non-academic career.
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Ph.D. or doctorate in chemistry education or discipline appropriate to the needs of the department.  Demonstration of effective teaching & scholarly/creative activities.	Distinguished credentials in a non-academic career.
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Ph.D. or doctorate in chemistry education or discipline appropriate to the needs of the department.	Distinguished credentials in a non-academic career.
INSTRUCTOR	M.A. or M.S.  Demonstrates potential to be effective teacher.	Distinguished credentials in a non-academic career will be considered.

\* Equivalencies for either the degree requirement or the demonstration of effective teaching & scholarly/creative activities.

## REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS

### PROFESSOR

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

### ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

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

### ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

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

### INSTRUCTOR

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6
Evaluation	Initial Interim	Initial Interim	Full	Comprehensive Interim	Comprehensive Interim	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	A	A	A	A	A	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X	X	X	X	X	DAA in one & A in other
Service	A	A	A	A	A	

PROMOTION STANDARDS  
 For Evaluations Conducted Prior to 9/1/15

	To Assistant Professor	To Associate Professor	To Professor		
Year Eligible	2 years as Instructor at EMU	5 years as Assistant Professor at EMU	5 years as Associate Professor at EMU		
Academic Credentials	Ph.D. or doctorate in chemistry education or discipline appropriate to the needs of the department or equivalencies	Ph.D. or doctorate in chemistry education or discipline appropriate to the needs of the department or equivalencies	Ph.D. or doctorate in chemistry education or discipline appropriate to the needs of the department or equivalencies		
			or or		
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA	DAA	DAA	DAA	E
Scholarly/ Creative Activity	DAA in one & A in the other	DAA	DAA	E in one & A in the other	DAA in one & A in the other
Service		A	DAA		



PROMOTION STANDARDS  
 For Evaluations Conducted after 9/1/15

	To Assistant Professor	To Associate Professor	To Professor	
Year Eligible	2 years as Instructor at EMU	5 years as an Assistant Professor at EMU	5 years as Associate Professor at EMU	
Academic Credentials	Ph.D. or doctorate in chemistry education or discipline appropriate to the needs of the department or equivalencies	Ph.D. or doctorate in chemistry education or discipline appropriate to the needs of the department or equivalencies	Ph.D. or doctorate in chemistry education or discipline appropriate to the needs of the department or equivalencies	
			or	
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA	DAA	DAA	E in one & DAA in the other
Scholarly/ Creative Activity	DAA in one & A in the other	DAA	DAA	
Service		A	DAA	



## TECHNIQUES

### Instructional Effectiveness

#### Data Collection Procedures.

Each applicant must include a personal report of activities and accomplishments (see pages 8-12 for specific instructions concerning format).

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. Regularly evaluates his/her own past teaching methods, procedures, and course content.
  - c. Attends professional meetings and seminars.
  - d. Holds membership in professional societies.
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 (their) 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. Evaluates 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).
  - 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.
  - 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 (keeps office hours, advises students, writes letters of recommendation).
  - b. Helps students with independent learning experiences (e.g., special problems, independent study, thesis, publication(s)).
  - c. Keeps up-to-date regarding practices and procedures necessary for academic advising.
  - d. Assists students with academic problems.
5. Maintains quality standards
  - a. Presents material at an appropriate academic level.
  - b. Meets the grading and performance standards of the profession and department.
  - c. Develops a high quality learning environment in the classroom.

Evaluation Reports.

An evaluation report shall be prepared by the evaluator(s) which shall take into consideration the following information (if available):

1. Faculty Member's own report of activities and accomplishments in this area.
2. Colleague evaluations of teaching based on classroom visitation and other evidence.
  - (a) Prior to the start of the evaluation, the Personnel Committee will notify the Faculty Member that unannounced classroom visitations may occur at any time during the evaluation period.
  - (b) 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.
  - (c) The Faculty Member will be asked to provide a syllabus, for each course, briefly stating the dates of any exams and what material will be covered.
  - (d) During the classroom visit, the evaluator is expected to remain unobtrusive and should not participate in any activities or enter into any discussions with students in the class. The evaluator should, whenever possible, remain for the entire class period.
  - (e) After the classroom visitation occurs, the evaluator will be expected to provide the Faculty Member with written feedback using the appropriate department evaluation form, see Appendix A. Rationale for evaluative statements must be explained or documented. This feedback will be provided within ten working days of the visit. In the event that there are multiple visits, the evaluator may choose to wait until after the final visit to provide the final written feedback. In such cases, the Faculty Member will be notified of the anticipated delay.
  - (f) The evaluator will visit a class a second time if the applicant requests it and the evaluator's schedule allows for it (without unduly delaying the completion of the evaluation).
3. Student evaluations of teaching utilizing the University-wide evaluation system. At the minimum, this will include the two core items and items 7, 21, 41, 44, 125, and 203 in lecture courses and items 7, 44, 125, 172, 173, and 203 in laboratory courses. (See the Appendix for the list of actual questions.)
4. Department head evaluations of teaching based on classroom visitations and other evidence. The department head is expected to follow the same procedure as other evaluators outlined under (2), above.
5. Faculty Member's course syllabi, examinations and other written course materials.
6. Teaching awards.
7. Other relevant information/documents available to the committee and/or department head.



### Ratings.

The personnel committee and the department head will evaluate all evidence submitted. The rating given is based ultimately on judgments of the quality, or degree of success achieved, in performance of the activities, not merely their presence. For interim evaluations, the personnel committee and the department head will meet together 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.

**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). This may be achieved through very good performance in the classroom AND significant, meritorious activity in support of the educational process (e.g., course/curricular development, advising, supervision of research students, ...).

**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 case of student evaluation, quantify) performance as better in quality than average. This may be achieved through very good performance in the classroom OR good performance in the classroom coupled with significant, meritorious activity in support of the educational process (e.g., course/curricular development, advising, supervision of research students, ...).

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

**Below Average (BA):** Awarded when the quality of the instruction offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as below that necessary to achieve a rating of average.

All five of the supporting activities for Instructional Effectiveness, described earlier, are essential elements of teaching. These must all be practiced at some level to justify at least an Average rating in Instructional Effectiveness.

There are no differentials by rank for meeting these criteria except those implicit in the rating scale.

It should be emphasized that the detailed lists of supportive measures, or activities, under Instructional Effectiveness, are not all-inclusive. In other words, the absence of any other evidential activity listed above does not preclude its being judged supportive of the criteria.



### **Scholarly and/or Creative Activity**

#### **Data Collection Procedures.**

Each applicant must include a personal report of his/her scholarly and/or creative activities and provide copies of papers, articles, books, publications and/or other tangible documentation (see pages 8-12 for specific instructions concerning format). Scholarly and/or creative activity is not evaluated during interim evaluations. Examples of scholarly and/or creative activities include the following:

1. Articles, books, or reviews published and/or in press.
2. Papers presented at professional meetings, colloquia, etc. Guest lectureships given, workshops taught, etc.
3. Individual research grants obtained and/or applied for (from outside the University), as specified in the Agreement.
4. Current research and scholarly/creative activity in progress or completed, but not yet published, but otherwise disseminated to an appropriate audience.
5. Supervision of research students who disseminate scholarly activity which occurred as the result of collaboration with the Faculty Member.
6. Creatively participates in the subject area through writing, research, development of instructional materials which are disseminated in at least the classroom.
7. Patents obtained and/or applied for (using the same guidelines as specified for research grants in the Agreement).
8. Retraining and/or professional development activities, with prior written approval from both the department head and Personnel Committee. See the Agreement for specific details.
9. Consultantships and editorships, which involve the dissemination of one's scholarly/creative work.
10. Serving as a consultant in some area of professional specialization.
11. Activity within a professional organization which leads to the dissemination of the results of scholarly/creative activity.
12. Acting as editorial referee of published professional materials.

#### **Evaluation Reports.**

An evaluation report shall be prepared by the evaluator(s) which shall take into consideration the following information (if available):

1. Faculty member's own report of activities and accomplishments. This should include an explanation of the significance of the work.
2. Complete bibliographical references to the publication or presentation of any scholarly/creative activity.
3. Corroboration and/or evaluations of the candidate's performance in this area by students or other informed parties (including publishers, editors, reviewers, and any other professional sources).

### Ratings.

It is the perception of the Department that there is only one degree of performance in scholarly/creative activity. That is, an excellent publication is an excellent publication whether produced by an Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Full Professor. Similarly, it is difficult to see how the development of exciting new classroom techniques, which are shown to have demonstrable effects on learning, could be less effective when applied by a Professor, as opposed to an Instructor. Consequently, the criteria will remain the same for the various ranks.

Evaluation will be based on the quality of work as judged on the individual balance between the number of activities and degree of depth in and commitment to each by the Faculty Member, recognizing that circumstances and individuals vary. In developing the summary statements regarding scholarly/creative activity and designating a qualitative rating (i.e., E, DAA, A, BA) the department head and personnel committee should consider and address such factors as those listed below (wherever and whenever applicable):

1. The effort required in the performance of the activity.
2. In what respects the Faculty Member's activity has advanced insight or knowledge in his/her discipline.
3. How the Faculty Member's activity has advanced his/her own professional growth.
4. In what respects the activity has benefited students, colleagues, the curriculum, the university, or the community.
5. What distinguishes the scholarly/creative activity from contributions of others or from the Faculty Member's previous work.
6. In what form and for what audiences it was published or disseminated, considering in addition:
  - a. the nature of the publication
  - b. the reputation of the journal
  - c. editorial board and policy
  - d. degree of dissemination (i.e., local, state, national, international).
7. In what form other than publication the work was disseminated (e.g., lecture, grant application, consultative activity), considering in addition:
  - a. nature of the audience (e.g., scientists, students)
  - b. institution, agency, or organization (private, public, governmental)
  - c. degree of dissemination.
8. Whether critical reviews of the work exist and, if so, the credentials of the reviewer(s).
9. The level of acceptance and/or evaluation by the audience for which it was intended.
10. Additional degrees, honors, or awards bestowed on the applicant in recognition of the activity.

The department recognizes that the types of investigation (e.g., research) and/or creative activity and the publication or other dissemination of such activities, which contribute to the Faculty Member's discipline or area of specialization, and for which he/she gives documented evidence, necessarily involve differences in the theoretical, practical, methodological, and substantive scholarly/creative activities and results.

The ratings below should be understood to reflect the average level of activity over the entire time period for which the evaluation is occurring. For the full evaluation of a tenured Faculty Member for promotion, the scholarly/creative activity during the six most recent years will be weighted the most heavily in determining the appropriate rating (if the period being evaluated is longer than six years).

In order to achieve a superior rating (E or DAA) it is expected that the applicant maintains an active, ongoing program of research, that is, a search for new knowledge (not solely the repackaging of old). The results of this program of research must be of sufficient quantity and



quality, as specified below, and must be appropriately disseminated. The following qualifiers apply to these two ratings:

The quantity of work is expressed in terms of the amount necessary to generate a full research article. This is necessarily ambiguous, but it serves as a useful point of reference. It does not mean that only work published in a journal will be considered, instead it simply quantifies the amount of work done.

When determining the quantity of work to be credited due to the publication of a journal article, only the work carried out while in rank at EMU will be counted. If an article or grant application is based partly upon work performed either before coming to EMU or in collaboration (other than with his/her own research students), the applicant must clearly explain what their contribution was to the submission. This does not preclude that the applicant's contribution to such a submission may be equivalent to a full submission.

The quality of the work will normally be proved by its publication in respected, refereed journals. A very strong case will need to be made to demonstrate comparable quality of unpublished work.

When determining the amount of dissemination, the publication of a full research article may be used as a substitute for two presentations. The supervision of a M.S. thesis, and accompanying student seminar, may be used as a substitute for one presentation. (This assumes active collaboration between the applicant and the M.S. student, which is the norm in the Chemistry Department.) Presentations made by collaborators (other than the applicant's own research students) will be prorated.

As stated in the Agreement (article XV.B.2.e), "the preparation of grant proposals for outside agencies, whether funded or not, and/or the administration of a grant project, shall be considered as Scholarly/Creative Activity if said preparation involves scholarly activity (e.g., research or teaching projects) of a substantial nature." While it is incumbent upon the applicant to document such activity, it is anticipated that such prior activity would be necessary in order to submit a strong proposal. Examples include **but are not limited to** federal funding sources such as the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, , the Department of Energy, the Department of Defense, etc., , organizations and foundations such as the American Chemical Society, Research Corporation, Kellogg Foundation, Kresge Foundation, etc., and industrial sponsors such as Ford, Amgen, Pfizer, etc. Further, strong proposals to such funding sources would necessarily demonstrate the applicant's consideration of the future direction of his/her research program.

**Exceptional (E):** For evaluations conducted prior to 9/1/15, the applicant must satisfy the first three guidelines listed below. Effective 9/1/15, all four guidelines must be satisfied.

1. The minimum quantity of work completed and disseminated to receive this rating is that associated with the generation of two full research articles per four-year time period (two since initial appointment for untenured faculty).

2. The quality of the research program/work must be demonstrated by one or more of the following:

- (i) the publication of the work in refereed nationally/internationally-recognized professional journals;
- (ii) publication of the work in an alternate refereed format (of equivalent stature to a professional journal);
- (iii) the receipt of one or more significant external grants (that meet the criteria defined in the Agreement);



- (iv) extraordinary documentation from critical and reputable sources.

3. The work must be disseminated. On average, the applicant should present his/her work at a professional meeting and/or research seminar (other than at EMU) twice per year (eight presentations since initial appointment for untenured faculty). In lieu of some, or all, of the presentations, the dissemination may also occur through the generation of published articles or theses. See the equivalencies described immediately preceding the heading for an Exceptional rating, above.

4. The submission of one or more external proposals or grant applications, to which the applicant's contribution is integral and demonstrates his/her consideration of the future direction of his/her program of scholarly activity.

**Distinctly Above Average (DAA):** For evaluations conducted prior to 9/1/15, the applicant must satisfy the first three guidelines listed below. Effective 9/1/15, all four guidelines must be satisfied.

1. The minimum quantity of work completed and disseminated to receive this rating is that associated with the generation of one full research article per four-year time period (one since initial appointment for untenured faculty).

2. The quality of the research program/work must be demonstrated by one or more of the following:

- (i) the publication of the work in refereed nationally/internationally-recognized professional journals;
- (ii) publication of the work in an alternate refereed format (of equivalent stature to a professional journal);
- (iii) the receipt of one or more significant external grants (that meet the criteria defined in the Agreement);
- (iv) extraordinary documentation from critical and reputable sources.

3. The work must be disseminated. On average, the applicant should present his/her work at a professional meeting and/or research seminar (other than at EMU) once per year (four presentations since initial appointment for untenured faculty). In lieu of some, or all, of the presentations, the dissemination may also occur through the generation of published articles or theses. See the equivalencies described immediately preceding the heading for an Exceptional rating, above.

4. One or more external grant applications or proposals, to which the applicant's contribution is integral and demonstrates his/her consideration of the future direction of his/her program of scholarly activity.

**Average (A):** The applicant participates in some scholarly/creative activity which results in some dissemination. The applicant must disseminate the results of his/her scholarly/creative activity either in the classroom or through presentation, publication or other means as described above. An appropriate amount of scholarly/creative activity would result in any ONE of the following, during a four-year time period (since initial appointment for untenured faculty):

- 1. A significant improvement in the contents of one or more chemistry department courses.
- 2. The presentation of one paper or seminar at a professional meeting and/or research seminar.

3. The acceptance for publication of the above scholarly/creative activity in a professional journal. Publication in an alternate format (of equivalent stature) is an acceptable substitute for journal articles.

4. The completion of one M.S. thesis, and accompanying student seminar. This assumes the applicant actively collaborated with the M.S. student.

5. A successful external grant application (that meets the criteria defined in the Agreement).

6. Significant scholarly analysis of existing research.

7. A combination of other scholarly/creative activities of comparable merit. See the list on page 20 for examples of these types of activities.

**Below Average:** The applicant does not participate in enough scholarly/creative activity to obtain a rating of Average.

### Service Activity

#### Data Collection Procedures.

The applicant will clearly identify his/her service activities related to the department and the university in a narrative text (see pages 8-12 for specific instructions concerning format). Supportive evidence must be provided to indicate the quantity of different service activities and the quality of the effort expended in those activities.

#### Service Activities.

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

1. participation on departmental committees
2. course and/or curriculum development
3. special program coordination/participation
4. recruitment
5. preparation of grant proposals directed toward departmental needs.
6. positions of leadership on departmental committees
7. work with the Chemistry Club
8. identification and resolution of new needs within the department
9. course/area coordination
10. extensive writing activities on behalf of the department (preparing reports, award nominations, handbooks, newsletters, ...)
11. providing significant faculty input into administrative decisions through writing or other participatory forms
12. developing workshops or written material to share expertise with colleagues
13. serving as a coordinator for a special area such as advising, assessment, co-op, departmental Honors program, seminars, or tutoring
14. serving as the departmental representative on college and university committees and councils
15. working on issues regarding laboratory safety

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

1. participation on college and university committees and councils
2. involvement in special cross-disciplinary programs
3. community relations
4. other activities that serve the university as a whole
5. activities in state, national, or international professional organizations, committees, task forces, etc. as well as those activities that serve the local or wider community as a whole
6. evidence of professionally-related community affairs
7. work with student organizations (outside of the department)
8. activity as a consultant
9. activity within the AAUP
10. coordination of, or participation in, special programs (e.g., Summer Quest, ...)



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 rating awarded for full evaluations for reappointment, tenure and promotion.

The determination of each rating category shall be based on the quality of the work as judged on the individual balance between the number of activities and the degree and depth in and commitment to each by the Faculty Member, recognizing that circumstances and individuals vary. In determining the final rating the department head and personnel committee should consider the factors listed below:

1. The effort required in the performance of the activity.
2. In what respects the activity has benefited students, colleagues, programs, the college, the university, the community, professional organizations, etc.
3. What is the quality of the participation in the activity offered.
4. For what committee, organization, group, etc., the service activity was performed, including the scope of the activity.
5. Whether or not evaluations of the activity exist and the credentials of the evaluator(s).
6. Degrees, honors, or awards bestowed on the Faculty Member in recognition of the activity.

**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. The norm for such a rating would be to perform the amount of service appropriate for a distinctly above average rating AND significantly participate in one additional activity per year.

**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. The norm for such a rating would be to perform the amount of service appropriate for an average rating AND significantly participate in one additional activity per year.

**Average (A):** Awarded when the quality and quantity of service shall be evaluated as that normally expected; one's fair share. This includes performing one's fair share of assigned departmental responsibilities and regular participation in departmental meetings each year. Mere attendance at committee meetings does not, in and of itself, merit an Average rating. The Faculty Member must also demonstrate that he/she made significant contributions to the committee's activity and/or other activities described above. The norm for such a rating would be to significantly participate in at least two (one for untenured faculty) of the above activities per year.

**Below Average:** Awarded when the quality and quantity of service shall be evaluated as insufficient to obtain a rating of Average.

The equivalent unit, to significantly participate in one activity, corresponds to performing the average amount of work expected when serving on (and appropriately contributing to the work of) a major departmental committee for one year. Therefore, it may be necessary to participate in several activities to perform the work expected in order to achieve one unit of service.



## APPENDIX

### Professional Performance Evaluation Standards

The following scheme will be used to determine whether or not a faculty member is satisfactory during a Professional Performance Evaluation (PPE). The scale below is designed such that anyone achieving the Minimum number of points in an area (or more), would satisfy the contractual requirement for a rating of Average in that area.

To be evaluated as Satisfactory during a PPE, a tenured faculty member must satisfy all four of the following:

- (i) Produce quality of instruction that is evaluated to be that of a very good teacher. This may be achieved through very good performance in the classroom OR good performance in the classroom coupled with significant, meritorious activity in support of the educational process (e.g., course/curricular development, advising, supervision of research students, ...).
- (ii) Earn at least the Minimum number of points (4 points) in Scholarly/Creative Activity
- (iii) Earn at least the Minimum number of points (6 points) in Service
- (iv) Achieve one of the following:
  - A) Earn enough points in either Scholarly/Creative Activity or Service to be rated as a Specialist (16 points) in that area.
  - B) Earn a combined total of 22 points in Scholarly/Creative Activity and Service.

The determination of the number of points earned is based upon the review of the faculty member's Annual Activity Reports for the four-year period under review. If a faculty member has inadvertently omitted items from his/her report, s/he has the right to bring those items to the attention of the Department Head (and/or Personnel Committee) during the review process. The points earned by any such items will necessarily be counted during the evaluation.

If a faculty member spends a significant fraction of the review period on leave or alternate assignment which precludes them from earning points, the points required will be pro-rated appropriately.

The assignment of points reflects historical averages and is to be done as objectively as possible based primarily upon the quantity of work as defined below. However, as in all evaluations, the quality of work is an important consideration. Certain activities are difficult to quantify *a priori* and so there is no specific point award listed for those activities. The points awarded in those cases will be based upon the quantity and quality of the work involved in that activity, using point awards for the most comparable activities as guidelines. In all cases, a faculty member has the right to make a case demonstrating that additional points are warranted.

Additionally, PPEs are evaluations of faculty members who have individually proven themselves in order to achieve tenure and are long-term members of the departmental team. As such, we wish to encourage collaboration since it is one way to help foster instructional innovations, sustain research programs, and spread major service responsibilities. Consequently, activities done in collaborations will not be strictly pro-rated as they are for tenure and promotion decisions. Those who are the driving force behind the collaboration (67% or more) should expect to receive full points for the activity. Major contributors (33-66%) should expect to receive most of the points for the activity. Minor contributors (under 33%) should expect a more modest number of points. Collaborations may be interdisciplinary, with departmental colleagues, or with appropriate persons external to the University.

For each area (criteria), points may be earned in any or all of the categories listed below. The total number of points that can be earned in a single category during a four-year review cycle

is capped for all categories, except Category I in each area. There are also caps on certain activities within a category. If no cap is indicated for an activity, then points may be earned for that activity up to the cap for that activity's category.

### Scholarly/Creative Activity

#### Category I – Peer Reviewed Publications/Grants (Unlimited points may be earned)

A peer-reviewed publication of work equivalent to a full research article is worth 8 points. Shorter or longer publications (articles, books, book chapters, reviews) will have points adjusted accordingly.

A successful external grant application to which the applicant's contribution is integral will earn points commensurate to the magnitude and competitiveness of the award (up to 8 points per grant). Some representative values would be that an award of \$20,000 is worth 4 points, \$50,000 is worth 5 points, and \$100,000 is worth 6 points. The significance of the award to a particular program of scholarly activity may increase the number of points awarded for a grant of a particular magnitude.

Patents obtained (4 points would be typical).

Work can also be considered where there is extraordinary documentation from critical and reputable sources.

#### Category II – Non-Peer Reviewed Publications/Grants (5 points maximum)

A successful external grant application that does not go through the peer-review process can count up to 3 points.

Work published or disseminated that does not go through the peer review process can count up to 3 points. This includes instructional materials disseminated in the classroom.

Theses supervised each count 1 point. This includes both Honors and Masters theses.

Funded Sabbatical Leave applications or release-time FRF awards normally count 1 point (1 point maximum).

#### Category III – Unsuccessful or Pending Grant or Patent Applications (3 points maximum)

External proposals or grant applications, to which the applicant's contribution is integral and demonstrates his/her consideration of the future direction of his/her program of scholarly activity can count up to three points.

A patent application can count up to two points.

#### Category IV – Presentations (5 points maximum)

Invited or peer-reviewed papers presented at professional meetings, conferences, colloquia, etc each count 1 point.

Other presentations including those at the UG Symposium or Grad Research Fair (or similar venues) each count one-half of a point, up to 3 points maximum.

#### Category V – Miscellaneous (2 points maximum)



Guest lectureships given, workshops taught, etc.

Retraining and/or professional development activities, with prior written approval from both the department head and Personnel Committee. See the Agreement for specific details.

Consultantships and editorships, which involve the dissemination of one's scholarly/creative work.

Serving as a consultant in some area of professional specialization.

Activity within a professional organization which leads to the dissemination of the results of scholarly/creative activity.

Acting as editorial referee of published professional materials.

### **Service Activity**

In determining the number of points to award for activities within this area, the following guideline will be used in situations where there are no comparable activities:

30 hours per year = 1 point

*Except where noted below, for all activities where release time is awarded, work must be done in excess of that commensurate with the release time in order for points to be awarded.*

Category I – Roles that Demonstrate Leadership or Initiative (Unlimited points may be earned)

Chair of Departmental Personnel, Instruction, Finance or Search Committee (1 point per year). This point is in addition to the points earned for serving on the committee.

Chair of a significant ad hoc committee (such as Assessment) typically is worth ½ point per year.

Graduate Coordinator or Undergraduate Advising Coordinator (1 point per year). This assumes they continue to receive release-time at the historical level.

Course/Area Coordination (1 point per year).

Tutoring, Seminar, or Award coordination (1/2 point per year).

Leadership roles in academic review (program review), certification processes (ACS, NCATE or equivalent), assessment, outreach, or similar activities (points proportional to work accomplished, after consideration of any release time awarded).

Leadership roles in local, state, national, or international professional organizations, committees, task forces, etc..

Leadership roles in University or College committees, task forces, organizations, etc. (Honors College, AAUP, Faculty Senate, Graduate Council, ...) .

Leadership roles in identifying and/or addressing specialized departmental need (outreach events, web site, ...).

Category II – Committee Work (10 points maximum)

For each year of service on the department's personnel committee (two points),  
Instruction or Finance Committee (one point), graduate or significant ad hoc  
committee, e.g., Assessment (one-half point).

Serving on major college and university committees and councils, e.g. CAC, CCRSL, Faculty  
Senate (1 point per year).

Category III – Advising/Outreach (4 points maximum)

Actively working with the Chemistry Club (or other student group).

Regularly volunteering at Fast Track or other advising events .

Participating in outreach or recruitment activities such as Chemistry or Science Olympiad,  
Explore Easterns, bringing groups to campus, or giving talks at high  
schools/community colleges.

Category IV – Miscellaneous (4 points maximum)

Course and/or curriculum development other than as course coordinator

Special program coordination/participation

Serving as Library liaison

Preparation of grant proposals directed toward departmental needs.

Identification and resolution of new needs within the department

Extensive writing activities on behalf of the department (preparing reports, award  
nominations, handbooks, newsletters, ...)

Providing significant faculty input into administrative decisions through writing or other  
participatory forms

Developing workshops or written material to share expertise with colleagues

Serving as a coordinator for a special area such as co-op, departmental Honors program,

Volunteering in the departmental tutoring room

Working on issues regarding laboratory safety

Involvement in special cross-disciplinary programs, e.g., Environmental Science

Community relations activity

Other activities that serve the university as a whole

Activities in state, national, or international professional organizations, committees, task  
forces, etc. as well as those activities that serve the local or wider community as a whole  
Evidence of professionally-related community affairs



Activity as a consultant

Activity within the AAUP

Coordination of, or participation in, special programs (e.g., Summer Quest, ...)

## Possible Scenarios for Obtaining Satisfactory PPE in Scholarly/Creative Activity and Service

*Please note that these are only examples. Many options are possible under each category for obtaining the required points.*

**Example of a mix of research and service:** Total of 22 points with a minimum of 4 points in Scholarly/Creative Activity and 6 points in Service

- Scholarly/Creative Activity = **9 points total for the PPE period**
  - Supervise two Honors theses or 2 Masters theses (or 1 of each) = **2 points**
  - Present four student co-authored presentations at Undergraduate Symposia and three presentations at regional or national professional meetings = **5 points**
  - Review several research articles for a journal over 4 years = **2 points**
- Service = **13 points total**
  - Serve on either Instruction, Graduate, or Finance Committee (or some combination) each year = **4 points**
  - Volunteer 1-2 hours per week (of office hours) per year to the tutoring room = **4 points**
  - Actively participate in the American Chemical Society local section = **2 points**
  - Volunteering for Fast Track or Explore Eastern = **2 points**
  - Working with a standing committee or Department Head on a project, e.g. helping the Assessment Committee formulate questions for one's discipline = **1 point**

**Example of a Service Specialist:** A minimum of 16 points in Service and a minimum of 4 points in Scholarly/Creative Activity

- Scholarly/Creative Activity = **4 points total**
  - Design and implement a new lab that is used throughout a course = **2 points**
  - Review several research articles for a journal over four years = **2 points**
- Service = **16 points total**
  - Serve on two regular department committees each year OR Personnel Committee for four years = **8 points**
  - Chair a department committee for one year = **1 point**
  - Serve as department award coordinator for four years = **2 points**
  - Volunteer 1-2 hours per week (of office hours) per year to the tutoring room = **4 points**
  - Serve on a university-level committee (e.g. CCRSL) for one year = **1 point**

**Example of a Research Specialist:** A minimum of 16 points in Scholarly/Creative Activity and a minimum of 6 points in Service

- Scholarly/Creative Activity = **16 points total**
  - Publish a paper = **8 points**
  - Supervise a Master's thesis and an Honors thesis = **2 points**
  - Present five student co-authored presentations at regional or national meetings = **5 points**
  - Receive an Faculty Research Fellowship = **1 point**
- Service = **6 points total**
  - Serve on either Instruction, Graduate, or Finance Committee (or some combination) each year = **4 points**
  - Volunteer 1 hour per week (of office hours) for four semesters to the tutoring room = **2 points**



**List of Required Questions for Student Evaluations**

**Lecture Courses**

- 7 – My instructor seems well-prepared for class.
- 21 – In this course, I always felt challenged and motivated to learn.
- 41 – My instructor makes good use of examples and illustrations.
- 44 – My instructor is actively helpful when students have problems.
- 125 – Grades are assigned fairly and impartially.
- 203 – I learned a lot in this course.

**Laboratory Courses**

- 7 – My instructor seems well-prepared for class.
- 44 – My instructor is actively helpful when students have problems.
- 125 – Grades are assigned fairly and impartially.
- 172 – Lab procedures are clearly explained to me.
- 173 – My instructor thoroughly understands lab experiments/equipment.
- 203 – I learned a lot in this course.

**Classroom Visitation Forms**

## EMU Chemistry Department Classroom Visitation Evaluation Form

Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Topic: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

	Excellent	Good	Poor	Comments
--	-----------	------	------	----------

Organization					
--------------	--	--	--	--	--

Appropriateness/ Level of Material					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Command/ Accuracy of Material					
-------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Pace/Amount of Material Covered					
---------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Use of Examples					
--------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Use of Chalkboard/ Overhead					
-----------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Use of Visual Aids/ Demonstrations					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Voice: Loudness & Clarity					
---------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Asking for/ Handling of Questions					
---	--	--	--	--	--

Attentiveness/ Rapport with Students					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Additional Comments (continue on back, if necessary):



**EMU Chemistry Department Classroom Visitation Evaluation Form  
(Group Work Format)**

Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Topic: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

	Excellent	Good	Poor	Comments
Organization of Period and Activities	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>			
Appropriate Amount of Material	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>			
Circulates Among All of the Groups	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>			
Keeps Students Focused on Group Assignments	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>			
Maintains Control of Classroom	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>			
Use of Chalkboard or Overhead (if applicable)	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>			
Leading of Class Discussion	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>			
Voice: Loudness & Clarity	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>			
Handling of Questions	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>			
Rapport with Students	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>			

Additional Comments (continue on back, if necessary):