

Eastern Michigan University
Office of Academic Human Resources
Memorandum

To: Anders Linde-Laursen, Department Head
Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology

From: David Woike, Assistant Vice President
Academic Affairs

Date: April 25, 2013

Re: Approved DED

Attached is a copy of the revised Departmental Evaluation Document for the Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology Department approved by the University Standing Committee on April 12, 2013. 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 before Fall, 2013 begins. Thank you.

DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT

Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology

College of Arts and Sciences

Date of Last DED Revision: January 26, 2000

Date of Department Faculty Vote: March 11, 2011

Yes 11 No 0 Abstain 0

Amended and approved on 4/11/2012: 19-0-0

Amended and approved on 9/4/2012: 14-0-0

APPROVALS:

Kristie Agard 9-5-12

Personnel Committee Chair (Date)

Anderson 9/4/2012

Department Head/School Director (Date)

Ph K Venner 9/7/12

Dean (Date)

APPROVED BY THE DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT STANDING COMMITTEE ON: 4-12-13

[Signature]

Susan Haller

Mary Imblodi

Robert A. Jare

Julie Berger

EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Division of Academic Affairs

DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT

Department of Sociology, Anthropology & Criminology

College of Arts & Sciences

Faculty Evaluation

Criteria, Procedures and Techniques

Approved by Department Faculty: March 11, 2011;

amendments approved on April 11, 2012, and September 4, 2012

Approved by Department Faculty:  _____

Approved by SAC Department Head:  _____

DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT

Department of Sociology, Anthropology & Criminology
College of Arts & Sciences

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FACULTY EVALUATION	3
CRITERIA	3
Instructional Effectiveness	3
Scholarly Research and/or Creative Activity	3
Service Activity	5
STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE	5
Schedule	6
PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING EVALUATIONS	7
Interim Evaluation for Reappointment	7
Comprehensive Interim Evaluation	7
Full Evaluation for Reappointment and Tenure	7
Full Evaluation for Promotion	8
Professional Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty	9
PREPARATION OF APPLICATIONS	10
Directions for Preparing the Application for Interim Evaluations And Comprehensive Interim Evaluations	10
Directions for Preparing the Application for Full Interim Evaluations	11
Directions for Preparing the Application for Full Evaluations	12
Directions for Preparing PPEs of Tenured Faculty	14
Directions for Conducting a Full PPE of Tenured Faculty	15
DEPARTMENT STANDARDS	17
Rating Scale	17
Standards	17
Appointment Standards	19
Reappointment and Tenure Standards	20
Promotion Standards	22
EVALUATION TECHNIQUES	23
Instructional Effectiveness	23
Scholarly Research and/or Creative Activity	26
Service Activity	28
APPENDIX A	31

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.

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

Scholarly Research and/or Creative Activity

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

1. In the classroom, or
2. Among the 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 areas of specialization through scholarly research and/or creative activity which clearly contributes to the discipline through:

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

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

Retraining

In recognition of the need to encourage the retraining of faculty to assume professional responsibilities in areas where available expertise is in short supply, completion by the Faculty Member of a retraining program which brings him/her to a specified level of skill in such area of need may be applied toward satisfaction of the scholarly research and/or creative activity criterion for such purposed and for such period of time only as expressly approved in writing in advance by the Personnel Committee, the Department Head, the College Dean and the Provost and Vice President for academic affairs.

Each of the two activities below may, under the conditions specified, be considered as partially fulfilling the Scholarly Research and/or Creative Activity criterion. The Scholarly Research and/or Creative Activity criterion cannot be satisfied by either of these alone, or solely in combination with each other.

Professional Development

Professional development activities may be applied toward satisfaction of the Scholarly Research and/or Creative Activity criteria insofar as these activities are clearly in addition to those necessary to maintain the level of knowledge and/or expertise in the Faculty Member's discipline or area of specialization required to fulfill the Instructional Effectiveness standards.

Activities will be considered on a case by case basis. Specific outcomes and evaluation criteria shall be delineated in the proposal (as described below) as appropriate for consideration as Scholarly Research and/or Creative Activity. Examples of acceptable professional development activities include but are not limited to additional professional certification, working in professional positions (such as holding state or national office), additional professional experience in the discipline, training workshops and course work completion that provides training in an adjunct area (not coursework to update routine content in one's specialization).

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 Personnel Committee, the professional development, when completed, shall be evaluated to determine if it fulfills the criteria for such professional development.

Grant Development/Administration

Faculty are encouraged to engage in the process of seeking, obtaining and administering grants from outside agencies. Whether funded or not, grant applications shall be considered as scholarly research and/or creative activity if said preparation involves scholarly research and/or creative activity (e.g., research or teaching projects) of a substantial nature and the applicant provides an abstract documenting such activity and the importance of the endeavor to the

discipline, the Department, the college or University. The above conditions may also apply for the administration of a grant project insofar as proper evidence is presented which documents such grant administration meets the requirements as set forth in Article XV of the Agreement.

Service Activity

The Faculty Member must satisfy 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 and professionally related community affairs.

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE

All candidates for reappointment, tenure and promotion must satisfy without exception and irrespective of the terms of the Departmental Evaluation Document, application form, or other document to the contrary, all elements of the evaluation criteria provided by the Agreement and all other terms and conditions of the Agreement.

In those instances where a requirement set forth in this Departmental Evaluation Document differs from that of the Agreement, the more stringent requirement shall apply. 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 the Agreement, partial service/rank credit which a Faculty Member receives at the date of hire and the Scholarly Research and/or 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 Research and/or Creative Activity set forth in the Agreement; (b) the activity fulfills the standards of the Faculty Member's Departmental Evaluation Document; and (c) the Faculty Member's application for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion is in compliance with the terms and conditions of the Agreement.

Schedule

Evaluations of probationary Faculty Members shall be conducted according to the following schedules:

Evaluation Schedule Year

<u>Initial Appointment Rank</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>Professor</u>	II	F	T			
<u>Associate Professor</u>	II	F	CI	T		
<u>Assistant Professor</u>	II	II	F	CI	T	
<u>Instructor</u>	II	II	F	CI	CI	T

1. II – Initial Interim Evaluation
2. F – Full Evaluation
3. CI – Comprehensive Interim Evaluation
4. T – Tenure Evaluation

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 by the Faculty

Member by October 15 (1) of the first calendar year of his/her appointment by Associate Professors and Professors, or (2) of the second calendar year of his/her appointment by Assistant Professors and Instructors. The Faculty Member shall notify the Department Head of his/her decision in writing by October 15.

PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING EVALUATIONS

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 Personnel Committee and shall focus primarily on Instructional Effectiveness.

In all other interim evaluation years, the Faculty Member shall submit an Annual Faculty Activity Report by October 15. Instructional materials, such as syllabi, exams, assignments, etc., should accompany the Annual Faculty Activity Report. The evaluation should cover all Instructional Effectiveness and Service Activities prior to the previous August 31 that were not evaluated in any prior evaluation. The Department Head and Personnel Committee shall 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 Research and/or Creative Activity is developing in a way consistent with departmental standards. Faculty are reappointed unless a potential performance problem in Instructional Effectiveness or Service is perceived and the department elects to conduct a formal, written Full Interim Evaluation.

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 Personnel Committee shall meet with the Faculty Member to discuss his/her Instructional Effectiveness and Service Activities. Scholarly Research and/or Creative Activity is evaluated for advisory purposes only. Faculty are reappointed in those years designated for a Comprehensive Interim Evaluation unless a potential performance problem in Instructional Effectiveness or Service is perceived and the Department elects to conduct a formal written Full Interim Evaluation.

Full Evaluation for Reappointment and Tenure

Each year that a Faculty Member is scheduled for 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 research and/or creative activities and service activities since the last full evaluation, or since his/her initial appointment, whichever is more recent (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 Research and/or Creative Activity which has been submitted for review, but which has not yet been 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 Research and/or Creative Activities for which documented acceptance in the originally specified form (including editorially required modifications) and forum of dissemination is received prior to March 15 shall satisfy the documentation requirement for the reappointment application.

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

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

Full Evaluation for Promotion

Applications for promotion are due by February 1 and shall include evidence of the Faculty Member's Instructional Effectiveness, Scholarly Research 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 October 15. Scholarly Research and/or 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 Research and/or 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 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.

Professional Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

Each year every probationary and tenured Faculty Member shall complete an Annual Faculty Activity Report which will be due Oct. 15th and covers the previous Sept. 1-Aug. 31. This completed form shall be placed in the Faculty Member's file as specified in the Agreement. These Annual Faculty Activity Reports and any other available relevant material are reviewed every four years by the Department Head to determine whether the Faculty Member's performance is satisfactory (i.e., the Faculty Member is performing at an average level in the three areas of performance) according to the Departmental Evaluation Document.

Upon determining that the Faculty Member's performance meets or exceeds the department's standards for satisfactory (or average in all three areas), as defined in this Departmental Evaluation Document, he/she shall so state in writing to the Faculty Member, the Dean and the Provost. (Note that the Faculty Member is not required to initiate this review or to provide any material for it other than the Annual Faculty Activity Reports.) If the Department Head perceives a problem, the Personnel Committee will be notified and the Department Head and Personnel Committee will meet to review the Annual Faculty Activity Reports and any relevant information (e.g., student evaluations). 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 will be informed of the problem in writing and given an opportunity to discuss the deficit and how it might be corrected. If possible, the Department Head, Personnel Committee

and Faculty Member will agree on a way of resolving the problem within one year and the Department Head will so inform the Dean of the Department's concern and provide a copy to the Faculty Member and the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The following year, the Department Head and Personnel Committee will meet with the Faculty Member and review that year's Annual Faculty Activity Report to determine whether the problem has been resolved. If it has been resolved, the Department Head will say so in writing and send copies to those who received the initial statement of concern. If the deficit still remains or is significant and cannot be resolved in one year the Department Head will initiate a Full Professional Performance Evaluation.

Note: For the purpose of Professional Performance Evaluations, a satisfactory rating shall be given to Faculty Members who achieve at least an average rating in each of the three areas of performance: instructional effectiveness, scholarly research and/or creative activity and service.

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.

PREPARATION OF APPLICATIONS

Directions for preparing the applications for (1) Interim Evaluations for Reappointment, (2) Full Evaluations for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, and (3) Professional Performance Evaluation of tenured faculty are included on the following pages.

Only work completed while a Faculty Member is in rank at EMU may be counted for purposes of reappointment, promotion and tenure decisions. However, a Faculty Member who has service as a full-time temporary employee outside the Bargaining Unit (e.g., Lecturer) or full-time tenure track professional experience at another institution of higher education or related professional experience may receive credit at the time of his/her initial appointment for a proportion of his/her experience for the purpose of tabulating service/rank credit to determine his/her eligibility for consideration for tenure and/or promotion, provided that the conditions set forth in the Agreement 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 research and/or creative activity completed elsewhere in years for which a Faculty Member has received service rank credit toward tenure and/or promotion may be counted for purposes for reappointment, tenure and promotion.

Directions for Preparing the Application for 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, and Scholarly Research and/or Creative Activity to be reviewed.

Evaluators

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

In all other Interim and Comprehensive Interim Evaluation years the Department Head and the Personnel Committee shall meet with the Faculty Member to discuss his/her Instructional Effectiveness and Service activities and review the results of the required evaluation techniques of Instructional Effectiveness set forth in the Agreement. They shall include in their discussion a review of both the positive elements they see as well as those elements of the Faculty Member's performance where improvement might reasonably be expected by the time the Faculty Member undergoes a Full Evaluation. For the Comprehensive Interim Evaluation, the Department Head and Personnel Committee shall review the Scholarly Research and/or 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 Research and/or 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 Personnel 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 Personnel Committee and/or the Department Head perceive(s) that a performance problem pertaining to a Faculty Member's Instructional Effectiveness or

Service may exist, they shall meet with the Faculty Member to discuss the perceived problem. Following the meeting, the Faculty Member may be required to submit to a Full Interim Evaluation.

It is recognized that the record of a probationary Faculty Member in his/her first year of employment will be necessarily incomplete. However, the Faculty Member should be able to write some narrative about his/her teaching and departmental service participation. The Personnel Committee and the Department Head shall evaluate the applicant in the classroom, examine handouts and observe him/her at meetings before the deadline to make a recommendation about continued employment. For complete contractual requirements, refer to the EMU-AAUP Agreement, Article XV.

Directions for Preparing the Application for Full Interim Evaluations

Applicants

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

1. Complete the annual Faculty Activity Report by October 15.
2. Complete the Application for Full Interim Evaluation.
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 the perceived problem exists in only one of the two areas, only that area need be addressed. Supporting materials should be included in an appendix. The narrative regarding Instructional Effectiveness should include: (1) courses taught, (2) results of student, peer and Department Head evaluations, to the extent these are available, and (3) any other information the applicant believes helpful for evaluating his/her teaching and (where appropriate) advising of students. Regarding point 3, such materials as sample syllabi and other classroom materials may be included in an appendix. If the applicant's Service is being evaluated, all Service activities should be listed and the manner in which they have contributed to the good of the appropriate unit should be indicated.

Evaluators

1. If following the review of the Faculty Member's Application for Full Interim Evaluation, the evaluators conclude that the Faculty Member's Instructional Effectiveness and/or Service fulfill the standards of performance required for reappointment, the evaluation(s) shall be reduced to writing and given to the Faculty Member, with a copy to the Dean and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.
2. If following a review of the Faculty Member's application for Full Interim Evaluation, the evaluators conclude that the Faculty Member's Instructional Effectiveness and/or Service does not fulfill the standards of performance required for reappointment as provided in the applicable Departmental Evaluation Document and the Agreement, the evaluation(s) shall be reduced to writing, jointly if there is agreement between the

Department Head and the Personnel Committee, or separately if there is disagreement. The evaluation shall be given to the Faculty Member who may respond within five working days of the receipt of the written results of the evaluation(s). The Faculty Member may include in his/her response any and all evidence/documentation in support of his/her Instructional Effectiveness and/or Service that he/she deems appropriate.

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

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

Directions for Preparing the Application for Full Evaluation

Applicants

Faculty Members applying for reappointment or tenure during years when they are required to undergo a Full Evaluation are required to: (1) complete the annual Faculty Activity Report by October 15, (2) complete the Application for Full Evaluation Form by October 15, and (3) describe in a narrative statement or essay how he/she has met the department's criteria in each of the three areas under consideration. The applicant is responsible for describing the documenting, where appropriate, the activities presented for evaluation in terms of quantity and quality. The narrative should describe activities and 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, recommendations, 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 Research 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;
- The specific activities presented for evaluation;
- A description of the way in which these activities have contributed to the good of the appropriate unit; 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 these activities have contributed to the good of the appropriate unit; and
- The manner in which the Faculty Member 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. The Personnel Committee and Department Head must complete an evaluation report 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 the Agreement, and in particular, how those activities claimed as Scholarly Research and/or 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 working days to respond. The recommendation at this level, together with any response from the Faculty Member, together with all prior recommendations and other material previously forwarded by the Department Head, shall be forwarded to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

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.

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

Directions for Preparing Profession Performance Evaluations of Tenured Faculty

Evaluators

The Department Head shall review the Annual Faculty Activity Reports applicable to the four year evaluation period (i.e., the last four 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 a 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 Committee and the Department Head in order to determine how deficits may 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 academic year or less, the Department Head shall inform the Dean in writing of the department's concern, with a copy to the Faculty Member and the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for inclusion in the University personnel file. The following year, the Department Head and the Department Personnel Committee shall meet with the Faculty Member and review that year's Annual Faculty Activity Report to determine if the deficit(s) in performance has been corrected. If the deficit(s) has been corrected, they shall say so in writing and place a copy of the statement in the Faculty Member's department 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.

If the Faculty Member's record over the period specified for correcting shortcomings indicates that performance problems remain, or if deficits are so serious as to take more than one year to correct, the Department shall initiate a Full Professional Performance Evaluation.

Directions for Conducting a Full Professional Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

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 Research and/or Creative activities, Service, the Annual Faculty Activity Reports applicable to the period under review, the results of the required evaluation techniques set forth in the Agreement 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 the department standards set forth in the Departmental Evaluation Document and specific accomplishments of the Faculty Member in each of the three 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 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(s).

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

In those instances where the Dean does not concur with the Department's evaluation(s) of satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance, the Dean shall reduce his/her objections to writing and shall return the evaluation to the department for further consideration. The Department and/or the Faculty Member must respond to the Dean within five 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 of 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 days prior to the expiration of the original Program for Improvement, with a copy 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 Procedures set forth in the Agreement, 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

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 Departmental Evaluation Document is unique to its discipline. However, these standards are presented in a uniform format which is consistent with the requirements of the Agreement.

The standards for (1) appointment, (2) reappointment, (3) tenure, and (4) promotion are summarized in the following charts.

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

APPOINTMENT STANDARDS

	<u>Academic Credentials</u>	<u>Exceptions</u>	<u>Minimum Years of Professional Experience*</u>
PROFESSOR	Ph.D. in appropriate discipline for the open posting	None	8
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Ph.D. in appropriate discipline for the open posting	None	4
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	ABD in appropriate discipline for the open posting**	None	0
INSTRUCTOR	Master's Degree in appropriate discipline for the open posting**	None	0

*Professional experience is defined as a tenure-track faculty position in Anthropology, Criminology, or Sociology or a combination of post-secondary teaching, research and leadership.

**The Ph.D. is required to be promoted or tenured.

REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS

PROFESSOR**

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
<i>Year</i>			
<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Interim</i>	<i>Full</i>	<i>Tenure</i>
Instructional effectiveness	A	A	DAA
Scholarly /Creative Activity	X	A	DAA
Service	A	A	DAA

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
<i>Year</i>				
<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Interim</i>	<i>Full</i>	<i>Comp Interim</i>	<i>Tenure</i>
Instructional effectiveness	A	A	DAA	DAA
Scholarly /Creative Activity	X	X*	X*	DAA in one &
Service	A	A	A	A in other

*Scholarly Research and/or Creative Activity rating is advisory only ** Ph.D. needed to be promoted or tenured

DAA = Distinctly Above Average A = Average X = Not Applicable

REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS, CONT.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**

Year	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Interim</i>	<i>Interim</i>	<i>Full</i>	<i>Comp Interim</i>	<i>Tenure</i>
Instructional effectiveness	A	A	A	A	DAA
Scholarly /Creative Activity	X	X	X*	X*	DAA in one &
Service	A	A	A	A	A in other

INSTRUCTOR**

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Interim</i>	<i>Interim</i>	<i>Full</i>	<i>Cl</i>	<i>Cl</i>	<i>Tenure</i>
Instructional effectiveness	A	A	A	A	DAA	DAA
Scholarly /Creative Activity	X	X	X*	X	X	DAA in one &
Service	A	A	A	A	A	A in other

*Scholarly Research and/or Creative Activity rating is advisory only ** Ph.D. needed to be promoted or tenure

DAA = Distinctly Above Average A = Average X = Not Applicable

PROMOTION STANDARDS

YEAR	ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS	INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS	SCHOLARLY/ CREATIVE ACTIVITY	SERVICE
To: PROFESSOR	5 years as Associate Professor at EMU Ph.D.	DAA	DAA	DAA
To: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	4 years as Assistant Professor at EMU if hired prior to 1/1/97: 5 years as Assistant Professor at EMU if hired after 1/1/97 Ph.D.	DAA	DAA in one and A in the other	
To: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	2 years as Instructor at EMU Ph.D.	DAA	A	A

*The Ph.D. is required to be promoted.

PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS STANDARDS

Required Rating	Instructional Effectiveness	Scholarly and/or Creative Activity	Service
	Satisfactory*	Satisfactory*	Satisfactory*

*Satisfactory shall be defined as Average in Instructional Effectiveness, Scholarly Research and/or Creative Activity and Service

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Instructional Effectiveness

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

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

The Department shall utilize:

1. A set of approved questions for the Student Evaluation Form, in this case, the 2 Standard or "Core" University Questions: (1) What is your overall rating of the teaching effectiveness of this instructor? (2) What is your overall rating of this course?
2. A set of no fewer than six additional items determined by a vote of Faculty members in the Department for the Student Evaluation Form.
3. An approved form for Peer and Department Head Classroom Visitations (Appendix A).
4. A procedure for classroom visitations:

Each applicant shall be observed on a minimum of three occasions during each evaluation cycle, twice by Personnel Committee Members and once by the Department Head. The Personnel Committee members shall serve as the pool of evaluators. If the Personnel Committee does not contain a member of the Faculty member's own discipline (i.e., sociology, anthropology, or criminology), the Faculty Member may ask the Personnel Committee before the evaluation process begins to appoint a member of the SAC faculty in that discipline to participate in the classroom observation.

Evaluators will meet with the Faculty Member and agree on a class and date within the following two weeks for the classroom observation. The evaluator shall also communicate with the Faculty Member before the class and obtain relevant syllabi, handouts and other information about the class. Evaluators will use the classroom visitation form agreed upon by the Department and which shall name the observer.

The evaluators will meet with the Faculty Member after the class and discuss the class visit. Peer and Department Head observations of classroom teaching shall also be in writing and provided to the Faculty member within ten (10) working days of the visit. The Faculty Member has five (5) working days to respond to the written observations and shall obtain an extension of five (5) working days upon notifying the evaluator in writing.

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. Data Collection Procedures

Self-evaluation: Each applicant must include a personal report of activities and accomplishments in Instructional Effectiveness.

Such a self-report should include evidence of the extent to which the candidate: (These are suggestions, not limitations on what may be included.)

1. Prepares for teaching
 - a. Seeks latest information in the subject area(s) taught by reading, attending professional conferences and/or by communicating with colleagues.
 - b. Participates creatively in the subject area through development of teaching materials.
 - c. Regularly evaluates his/her own teaching methods, procedures, and course content.
2. Plans effectively for teaching
 - a. Has a clear idea of the function of his/her course(s) within the Department, within the University and/or community, and of its role in preparing students for careers.
 - b. Has a clear idea of the long-term objectives for the course(s) and for the day-to-day classroom activities.
 - c. Has a clear and relevant plan of action to accomplish both long and short term objectives.
 - d. Evaluates students so as to measure the attainment of objectives set forth.
 - e. Attempts to reorganize a course to experiment with new or innovative techniques.
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 course assignments (e.g., dates of exams, papers, etc.)
 - d. Endeavors to establish good communication with students.
 - e. Promotes a classroom environment which encourages learning.
 - f. Regularly seeks information from students regarding their levels of attainment and informs them of his/her estimation of their performance.
4. Is committed to students
 - a. Available to students who need his/her help.
 - b. Works beyond regular classroom responsibilities to help students with independent learning experiences (e.g., special problems, independent study, thesis, publications).
 - c. Keeps up-to-date regarding practices and procedures necessary for academic advising, if applicable.
 - d. Assists students with academic problems.

Evaluations Reports

1. The Faculty Member's personal report of activities and accomplishments.
2. Syllabi, bibliographies, tests and other materials that the Faculty Member uses in his/her instruction.

3. Student evaluations of teaching utilizing the University-wide evaluation system and the two "core" questions. The Faculty Member may include other questions if desired.
4. Colleague evaluations of teaching based on classroom visitation and other evidence (see procedure above).
5. Department Head evaluations of teaching based on classroom visitation and other evidence.

The Personnel Committee and the Department Head will evaluate all evidence submitted. 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, and Professional Performance Evaluation.

Evaluation Ranking for Instructional Effectiveness

Exceptional (E): Awarded when the quality of instruction shall be evaluated as that of a superior teacher. Evaluators must describe through specific details (or in the case of student evaluations, quantify) performance as better in quality than distinctly above average. In addition to meeting all of the criteria for Distinctly Above Average, this shall be evidenced by such factors as:

1. Takes a leadership role in curriculum planning and enhancement.
2. Participates creatively in the subject area through the development of new teaching materials.
3. Demonstrates a high degree of organizational knowledge of the discipline.

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 through specific details (or in the case of student evaluations, quantify) performance as better in quality than average. In addition to the criteria for an Average rating, this shall be evidenced by such factors as:

1. Seeks latest information in the subject area(s) by reading, attending professional conferences and communicating with colleagues.
2. Actively involved in the development of new courses.
3. Has a significant impact on student learning.
4. Demonstrates a very good degree of organizational knowledge of the discipline.

Average (A): Awarded when the quality of instruction offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of a good teacher. This shall be evidenced by such factors as:

1. Thorough preparation and planning for teaching.
2. Practices effective teaching methods.
3. Demonstrates commitment to students.

Satisfactory (S): At least an Average rating (see above) will be expected to receive a satisfactory rating on a Professional Performance Evaluation.

Below Average (BA): Denotes performance below the expectations for present rank as specified by student and peer evaluations.

Scholarly Research and/or Creative Activity

Data Collection Procedures

Scholarly Research and/or Creative Activity will be evaluated for each Faculty Member utilizing the criteria set forth in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and this Departmental Evaluation Document. Each applicant must include a personal report of his/her scholarly research and/or creative activities and provide copies of papers, articles, books, publications and/or other tangible documentation. Scholarly research and/or creative activity is not evaluated during interim evaluations. Examples of scholarly research and/or creative activities include but are not limited to the following:

1. Published books and monographs. Unpublished research disseminated in the classroom. (The Department recognizes that keeping abreast of current literature and compiling information for lectures and class presentations are routine activities expected of a teacher and should not be considered research. "Research disseminated in the classroom" is interpreted as in-depth, original research that contributes to the discipline or area of specialization by scholarly investigation.)
2. Published articles in professional journals (as well as a letter of intent to publish an already completed work from a publisher other than a vanity press).
3. Published manuals and guides.
4. Published book reviews.
5. Work published in the proceedings of conferences (e.g., published papers).
6. Editorial work, if it involves dissemination of scholarly research and/or creative activity.
7. Participation in conference programs, both internal and external to the university (papers, organization of research sessions, and discussant).
8. Papers delivered at professional meetings.
9. Participation at professional meetings which involves dissemination of scholarly research and/or creative activity.
10. Completion of classes in the discipline or related disciplines and retraining efforts as permitted by the Agreement, that are approved in advance.
11. Participation in the development of research grant proposals as the Agreement language permits.
12. Seminar participation and professional involvement with others in the discipline, in which one's own scholarly research and/or creative activity is disseminated.
13. Scholarly research and/or creative activity disseminated in the classroom.
14. Extensive research in curriculum development resulting in dissemination of scholarly research and/or creative activity.

15. Fellowships and awards which result in dissemination of scholarly research and/or creative activity.
16. Interdisciplinary scholarly research and/or creative activity.
17. Faculty involvement in student research which is subsequently published.
18. Professional development is demonstrated by, for example, attendance at an NEH (or similar type of) seminar, developing a new skill, or participating in training for further research.

Ratings

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 research and/or creative activity and designating a qualitative rating (i.e., Average, Distinctly Above Average, etc.), the Department Head and Personnel Committee will consider and address such factors as those listed below (wherever and whenever applicable). The following will be used in evaluating scholarly research and/or creative activity:

1. The effort required in the performance of the activity.
2. In what respects the candidate's activity has advanced insight or knowledge in his/her discipline or area of specialization.
3. How the candidate's activity has advanced his/her own professional growth.
4. In what respects the activity has benefited students, colleagues, the curriculum, the university, or a wider community.
5. What distinguishes the scholarly research and/or creative activity from contributions of others from the candidate's previous work.
6. In what form and for what audience 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, and
 - d. The degree of dissemination (i.e., local, state, national, international).
7. In what form other than publication the work was disseminated (e.g., lecture, consultative activity, workshop), considering in addition:
 - a. The nature of the audience (e.g., scientists, students)
 - b. The institution, agency, or organization (private, public, governmental), and
 - c. The degree of dissemination.
8. Whether or not critical reviews or assessments of published work exist, the credentials for the reviewer(s), and the evaluation by the audience for which it was intended.
9. Degrees, honors or awards bestowed on the applicant in recognition of the activity.
10. Other relevant material.

Ratings (Assigned on the basis of the foregoing considerations)

Exceptional (E): A continued record of high quality publications as evidenced by peer review, editorial board decisions, critical reviews or awards. The evaluators can describe the whole of the applicant's scholarly research and/or creative activity within the period being evaluated as having a significant impact on the knowledge base, insight or understanding of the discipline (e.g., provided the discipline with significant new facts or interpretations of old facts or directions of research, helped direct a publisher or a granting agency to support good work or discourage bad, etc.). Evaluators must describe in terms which show how quality and/or quantity exceed distinctly above average.

Distinctly Above Average (DAA): Awarded when there is a continued record of publication and the whole of the applicant's scholarly research and/or creative activity or research within the period being evaluated has produced results which make a difference in the level of knowledge or understanding of the intended audience. Evaluators must describe how quality and/or quantity exceed average.

Average (A): Awarded when there is a continued record of significant professional activities (lectures, papers, participation in professional conferences, etc.) that shows active involvement in the candidate's field of specialization.

Satisfactory (S): At least an Average rating is necessary to receive a satisfactory rating on a Professional Performance Evaluation. Average is the same as that noted above.

Below Average (BA): Denotes performance below the expectations for present rank (i.e., the lack of a continued record of significant professional activities such as lectures, papers, participation in professional conferences, etc.).

Service Activity

Data Collection Procedures

Service activities will be evaluated for each Faculty Member utilizing the criteria set forth in the Agreement and this Departmental Evaluation Document. The applicant will clearly identify his/her service activities related to the department, the university and the community in a narrative text. Supportive evidence must be provided to indicate the quantity of different service activities and the quality of the effort extended in those activities.

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

Service to the Department

1. Continued attendance at, and participation in, Department meetings.
2. Membership in a Department area of concentration committee.
3. Membership in an *ad hoc* committee (e.g., Search Committee).
4. Membership on standing Department committees such as Personnel, Finance, Research & Ethics, etc.

5. Serving in a leadership capacity in various co-curricular student activities of the Department (e.g., sponsoring or assisting student activities, speeches made in dormitories).
6. Other appropriate department service.

Service to the University

1. Membership on interdepartmental committees or councils.
2. Membership in a Council, Committee or Sub-Committee at the University level and offices in such a committee or the EMU-AAUP.
3. Membership in a Council, Committee or Sub-Committee at the University level.
4. Organizing or presenting at university programs and activities.
5. Development of cross-discipline curricula and programs.

Service to the Profession and the Community

1. Committee activity in professional organizations, including holding elected offices.
2. AAUP activity at chapter, state or national level.
3. Organizing external meetings or programs.
4. Participation in community educational activities or action (e.g., giving speeches, disseminating knowledge on radio, television, etc.).
5. Serving as editor, reviewer of manuscripts or grants or referee in external tenure/promotion decisions.

Evaluation Reports may include the following:

1. Faculty Member's own report of activities and accomplishments in this area.
2. Evaluations of intradepartmental service by colleagues, including evaluation by the Departmental Personnel Committee.
3. Evaluations of intradepartmental service by the Department Head.
4. Evaluations of college or university service by university officials and/or Faculty Members qualified to judge.
5. Evaluations, whenever feasible and appropriate, by persons qualified to judge the Faculty Members professionally-related community activities and accomplishments.

Ratings

The Personnel Committee and the Department Head will evaluate all evidence submitted. 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 rating awarded for full evaluations for reappointment, tenure and promotion, and Professional Performance Evaluations.

The Department intends that no minimum or maximum of activities should be set as requirements for evaluation of Service. Evaluation will be based on the quality of work as

judged on the individual balance between the number of activities and the degree of depth in and commitment to each by the Faculty Member, recognizing that circumstances and individuals vary. However, some service to the department is required for a rating of Average or better.

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 normal department expectations. This shall be evidenced by such factors as:

1. Consistently assuming and executing leadership roles in committees, council, and/or boards.
2. Identifying, initiating the actions for, and satisfying the needs of the Department, University or Community.
3. A continuing record of involvement in service activities benefiting the Department, the University or the discipline.

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 Department expectations. This shall be evidenced by such factors as:

1. Frequent membership on committees and assuming major responsibilities for the successful conclusion of their work; sometimes assumes leadership roles.
2. Developing new solutions for the needs of the Department and seeing them through committees and administrative procedures.
3. Expanding the resources available to the Department.
4. Recognizing Departmental, University and Community 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 or 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.
3. Attending and contributing to meetings of the Department and of other organizations to which the applicant belongs.
4. Performing other department service as needed.

Satisfactory (S): (Professional Performance Evaluation) To achieve a Satisfactory ranking, the Faculty Member shall achieve at least an Average ranking in service as noted above.

Below Average (BA): Denotes performance below the expectations for present rank (i.e., less than that normally expected, such as failure to accept assignments and executing duties, volunteering or accepting committee or council nominations, attending and contributing to Department meetings, and performing other department service).

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

APPENDIX A

PEER AND DEPARTMENT HEAD CLASSROOM VISITATION FORM

Instructor evaluated _____
 Course _____
 Number of Students _____
 Date _____
 Evaluator _____

Directions: Below is a list of instructor behaviors that may occur within a given class or course. Numbers 19 and 20 have deliberately been left blank. The instructor being evaluated and the evaluator are encouraged to add their own instructional characteristics. Each instructor shall be observed on two occasions, once by a Personnel Committee Member and another time by the Department Head. If the evaluator ranks the instructor other than "always" or "sometimes" on the scale, the evaluator should make comments below. The instructor will share syllabi and other available materials with the evaluator and the two will decide on a mutually agreeable time, within a 2-week time span, for the classroom observation. After the observation, the evaluator is to share his/her ratings with the instructor.

	Always	Sometimes	Not Sure	Rarely	Never
Organization and Clarity					
1. Defines objectives for class presentation	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Is organized and clear	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Presents material appropriate to class level	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Explains important ideas simply & clearly	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Presents relevant examples	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Summarizes major points of lesson	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Overall ranking in this category	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(comments)	_____				

	Always	Sometimes	Not Sure	Rarely	Never
Communication with and Responsiveness to students					
7. Communicates clearly & audibly	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. Demonstrates enthusiasm for subject	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. Appropriate use of audio visual aids	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10. Encourages student participation	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
11. Responds appropriately to student questions and comments	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Always	Sometimes	Not Sure	Rarely	Never
12. Responds to nonverbal cues	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
13. Presents material in more than one way	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
14. Uses humor appropriately	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Overall ranking in this category	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(comments)	_____				

Knowledge

15. Demonstrates command of subject	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
16. Refers to relevant research	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
17. Translates knowledge into appropriate lecture preparation	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
18. Encourages critical thinking/analysis	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Overall ranking in this category	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(comments)	_____				

Other

19.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
20.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

General comments:

1. What were the instructor's major strengths

2. What suggestions do you have for improvement

Open-ended questions:

Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology

Student evaluation questions

SAC in-class evaluation questions:

"My instructor seems well-prepared for class"

"My instructor displays enthusiasm when teaching"

"My instructor is readily available for consultation"

"This course has clearly stated objectives"

"The grading system was clearly explained"

"Directions for course assignments are clear and specific"

SAC online class evaluation questions:

"My instructor seems to have prepared the course well"

"My instructor displays enthusiasm for this course through the posted content and/or personal interactions (online or offline)"

"My instructor is readily available for consultation (i.e. email, office hours, instant chat, course discussion board, etc.)"

"This course has clearly stated objectives"

"The grading system was clearly explained"

"Directions for course assignments are clear and specific"