

**DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT (DED)**

Department/School of ECONOMICS  
College of ARTS and SCIENCES  
Date of Last DED Revision: 10/07/2016

Date of Department Faculty Vote: 03/27/2022

Yes 4 No 0 Abstain 0

**APPROVALS:**

Christopher J. Elias 04/02/2022  
Personnel Committee Chair (Date)

Mehmet E. Yaya 04/01/2022  
Department Head/School Director (Date)

Dana Heller 4/04/22  
Dean (Date)

Department of Economics Decision Evaluation Document

Approved by the Department Evaluation Document (DED) Standing Committee on March 23, 2022.

1) Sarah Ebi

2) Am

3) Alankanta Pandey

4) Chase

5) Chase

6) Karen Ann Gray

7) Katella V. Stacey

8) Kenneth Ford

## FACULTY EVALUATION

Each department shall conduct faculty evaluations using criteria, procedures and techniques specified in its Departmental Evaluation Document developed and/or subsequently modified in accordance with the Faculty input system as provided for in Article XIV of the Master Agreement between EMU and EMU-AAUP.

### I. 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:

The standards for 1) appointment, 2) reappointment and tenure and 3) promotion are summarized in the following charts (pages 2-5).

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

#### A. APPOINTMENT STANDARDS

	ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS AND ADDITIONAL CRITERIA	EQUIVALENCIES or EXCEPTIONS
Professor	Ph.D. in Economics, and 10 years experience with evidence of quality teaching, extensive scholarly, publication in refereed journals, and service.	None
Associate Professor	Ph.D. in Economics, and 5 years experience with evidence of quality teaching, extensive scholarly, publication in refereed journals, and service.	None
Assistant Professor	Ph.D. in Economics	None
Instructor	Ph.D. in Economics	None

**B. REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS, FACULTY HIRED PRIOR TO 9/1/2015**

**PROFESSOR**

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

**ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

Year	1	2	3	4
Evaluation	Interim	Full/R	CI	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA	DAA	DAA	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X	X*	X*	DAA
Service	A	A	DAA	DAA

**ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**

Year	1	2	3	4	5
Evaluation	Interim	Interim	Full/R	CI	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	A	A	DAA	DAA	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X	X	X*	X*	DAA
Service	A#	A	A	DAA	DAA

**INSTRUCTOR**

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

\* Scholarly/creative activity rating is advisory only.

# The department realizes that a somewhat reduced expectation for a rating of average in service may be appropriate in the first year, due to the relatively short time the person being rated has been employed.

**C. REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS, FACULTY HIRED AFTER 9/1/2015**

**PROFESSOR**

Year	2	3
Evaluation	Full/R	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	DAA	DAA
Service	DAA	DAA

**ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

Year	2	4
Evaluation	Full/R	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X*	DAA
Service	A	DAA

**ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**

Year	3	5
Evaluation	Full/R	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X*	DAA
Service	A	DAA

**INSTRUCTOR**

Year	3	6
Evaluation	Full/R	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X*	DAA
Service	A	DAA

\* Scholarly/creative activity rating is advisory only.

**D. REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS, FACULTY HIRED AFTER 9/1/2021**

**PROFESSOR**

Year	2	3
Evaluation	Full/R	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	DAA	E
Service	DAA	DAA

#### ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Year	2	4
Evaluation	Full/R	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X*	E
Service	A	DAA

#### ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Year	3	5
Evaluation	Full/R	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X*	E
Service	A	DAA

#### INSTRUCTOR

Year	3	6
Evaluation	Full/R	Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X*	E
Service	A	DAA

\* Scholarly/creative activity rating is advisory only.

#### E. PROMOTION STANDARDS FACULTY HIRED BEFORE 9/1/2021

	Year Eligible	Academic Credentials	Instructional Effectiveness	Scholarly/Creative Activity	Service
TO PROFESSOR	5 years as Associate Professor	Ph.D. in Economics	DAA	DAA	DAA

TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	5 years as Assistant Professor	Ph.D. in Economics	DAA	DAA	DAA
TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	2 years as Instructor	Ph.D. in Economics	DAA	DAA	DAA

**F. PROMOTION STANDARDS FACULTY HIRED AFTER 9/1/2021**

	Year Eligible	Academic Credentials	Instructional Effectiveness	Scholarly/Creative Activity	Service
TO PROFESSOR	5 years as Associate Professor	Ph.D. in Economics	DAA	E	DAA
TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	5 years as Assistant Professor	Ph.D. in Economics	DAA	E	DAA
TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	2 years as Instructor	Ph.D. in Economics	DAA	E	DAA

**PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION STANDARDS**

	Instructional Effectiveness	Scholarly/Creative Activity	Service
Required Rating	A	A	A

**II. TECHNIQUES**

An important source of information in any evaluation of a Faculty Member is written material prepared by the Faculty Member him or herself. One important source of information provided by the Faculty Member is the Annual Faculty Activity Report. Other sources include the application for reappointment, tenure or promotion that the Faculty Member prepares. Since information provided by the Faculty Member will become the main source of the Faculty Member's input into his/her evaluation, the Faculty Member submitting the forms should furnish the requested information as comprehensively and thoroughly as possible. The present section gives specific detail as to the sort of information that is relevant, and gives the rating scales that will be used by evaluators in judging Instructional Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative

activity, and Service in applications for reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

## **A. INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS**

### **I. Data Collection**

Factors to be included in rating instructional effectiveness include the following:

- a) The instructional objectives of a course are clearly stated.
- b) Agreement between announced objectives of a course and the actual presentation of the course is clearly evident.
- c) The materials for a course are clearly organized and presented.
- d) Course content is up to date.
- e) The instructor is willing and able to answer appropriate questions.
- f) The instructor encourages class discussion and student thinking.
- g) The exams are fair and complete in covering course materials and in measuring student competence.
- h) The instructor fulfills his/her obligations to students by meeting classes and being available for office hours and conferences.
- i) The instructor is available for and committed to advising students.
- j) The instructor is willing to direct a reasonable number of independent studies, master's papers, and thesis projects.
- k) The instructor is available to help and advise students in appropriate extracurricular activities.
- l) The number of preparations an instructor has and whether or not any of these are new preparation.
- m) The mix of graduate, upper level and lower level undergraduate courses an instructor has at a time or over time.
- n) The size of an instructor's individual classes, recognizing that classes filled to capacity are more difficult and time consuming to teach than those of more moderate size. For example, for any given course, the administrative and grading demands of a larger class exceed those of a smaller class.

### **II. Evaluation Reports**

- a) Colleague evaluations (including evaluation by the departmental personnel committee) of teaching based on classroom visitations and other evidence.
- b) Student evaluations of teaching utilizing the university-wide evaluation system, including the departmentally approved set of questions. (The department's questions are included in the appendix to this document.)
- c) Department head evaluations of teaching based on classroom visitations and other evidence.
- d) Student evaluation of advising, if applicable.
- e) Other supporting documents, such as course syllabi, exams, supplementary instructional materials.
- f) Classroom visitations by personnel committee members and department head shall be conducted according to the following procedure:
  - i) Faculty to be evaluated shall be consulted prior to dates for visitation being set.



- ii) Personnel Committee and department head evaluations of classroom visitation shall be in writing and provided to the faculty member within five (5) working days following the classroom visit with copy to the department head.
- iii) Both Personnel Committee and department head should complete a classroom visitation report (see Appendix: Classroom Observation Report Form).

### III. Ratings

The personnel committee and the department head will evaluate all evidence submitted. For interim evaluations, the personnel committee and the department head will together meet with the applicant to discuss his/her performance and suggest appropriate directions for improvement, if such direction is necessary. Written reports will be made separately by the personnel committee and the department head giving the rationale for the ratings awarded for full evaluations for reappointment, tenure and promotion.

**Below Average (BA):** Denotes performance below that of a reasonably good teacher.

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

**Distinctly Above Average (DAA):** Awarded for instruction of outstanding quality. Evaluators must describe the manner in which performance is better in quality than average.

**Exceptional (E):** Awarded when the quality of instruction offered by the applicant is evaluated as that of a truly superior teacher. Evaluators must describe the manner in which performance is better in quality than distinctly above average.

#### Criteria for Determining the Rating to be Assigned Faculty of Various Ranks

- a) The detailed list of criteria (a. through f. above) that are to be considered in judging instructional effectiveness is not to be considered an exhaustive list.
- b) The department believes that the listed criteria are essential to effective teaching. In order for an average or better rating to be awarded, there must be evidence that each of these criteria is satisfied to some degree. The rating ultimately awarded will be based on the quality of achievement, that is, on the degree of success with respect to the criteria.

### B. SCHOLARLY AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

#### Faculty Hired Prior to 9/1/2021

##### I. Data Collection

Examples of scholarly and/or creative activities in Economics include but are not limited to the following, by category:

- a) Peer Reviewed Articles in Recognized Journals, which receive primary importance in tenure and promotion evaluation. The recognized journals include those listed in Research Papers in Economics (RePEc) or Social Science Citation Index (SSCI)

- b) Other Publications from Recognized Publishers
  - Books
  - Articles or chapters in books
  - Monographs
- c) Unpublished Research
  - Research papers presented at professional meetings
  - Research papers written for public or private agencies

## II. Ratings

The personnel committee reserves the right to judge the quality of a particular scholarly and/or creative activity. Judgment will be based on such factors as:

- a) Contribution to the discipline
- b) Audience to which the work is disseminated
  - among practitioners in the discipline.
  - among a wider community

Each member of an evaluation team will consider the above activities and assess the overall performance of a faculty member in order to give that faculty member a rating in the area of scholarly/creative activity. In developing supporting statements and qualitative ratings for a candidate, the department head and personnel committee should consider:

- a) The effort required in doing the activity
- b) The degree to which the activity has advanced knowledge in the candidate's discipline
- c) The degree to which the activity has advanced the candidate's own professional growth

**Below Average (BA):** Denotes performance below that of a reasonably productive scholar.

**Average (A):** Awarded when the quality of the scholarly/creative activity offered by the applicant is evaluated as that of a reasonably productive scholar. This is the minimum acceptable level of performance.

**Distinctly Above Average (DAA):** Awarded when the quality of scholarly/creative activity offered by the applicant is that of a scholar productive to an outstanding degree. Evaluators must describe the manner in which performance is better than average. Primary among the examples of scholarly/creative activity listed on the previous page are refereed journal publications. Additional consideration will be given for articles published in the most highly ranked journals of the economics profession, sole authorship, and length of articles.

**Exceptional (E):** Awarded when the quality of scholarly/creative activity offered by the applicant is that of a truly superior scholar. Evaluators must describe the manner in which performance is better in quality than distinctly above average. Primary among the examples of scholarly/creative activity listed on the previous page are refereed journal publications. Additional consideration will be given for articles published in the most highly ranked journals of the economics profession, sole authorship, and length of articles.

## Faculty Hired After 9/1/2021 and Faculty Applying for Research/Creative Release

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Activities</b>
Average (A)	One major activity or two minor activities
Distinctly Above Average (DAA)	Two major activities and one minor activity
Exceptional (E)	Three or more major activities or two major activities based on journal rankings and number of co-authors and one minor activity

Research/Creative Release has to attain Distinctly Above Average rating with two major activities and one minor activity. The list for each category is non-inclusive under the Scholarly/Creative Activity. The P&F committee and Department Head may consider other evidential activity.

A rating of “Exceptional” may be achieved with only two peer-reviewed publications (or in press) from major activities based on journal ranking (e.g., ranking based on impact factor) and number of co-authors. One major activity can substitute for two minor activities. See Appendix 1 for major and minor activity definitions. Tenure and promotion will require a rating of “Exceptional” in Scholarly and/or Creative Activity.

### C. SERVICE

#### I. Data Collection

The applicant will clearly identify his/her service activities related to the department and the university in a narrative. Supportive evidence must be provided to indicate the quantity of different service activities and the quality of the effort extended in those activities. Identified service activities external to the university must be related to his or her professional expertise.

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

- a) Active and constructive participation in committee work
- b) Serving as chair for committees
- c) Participation in program development, evaluation, or supervision for which release time is not provided.

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

- a) Active and constructive participation in committee work
- b) Service on councils, task forces and similar bodies
- c) Serving as chair for any of the above
- d) Participation in program development, evaluation or supervision
- e) Service on advisory councils for private or public agencies and/or individuals in public office.
- f) Holding office or organizing meetings of professional societies.

#### II. 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.

**Below Average (BA):** Denotes performance that has fallen short of doing one's fair share.

**Average (A):** Awarded when the quality and quantity of service shall be evaluated as that normally expected; one's fair share. This shall be evidenced by attendance at department meetings and in addition such factors as:

- a) Accepting assignments and executing the prescribed duties
- b) Serving on committees or councils, perhaps occasionally in an executive position
- c) Attending meetings of committees, councils, and community service organizations to which the applicant belongs.

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

- a) Frequent membership on committees that demand a commitment in excess of that required for an average rating together with some verification of the contribution made.
- b) Evidence of substantial work to satisfy needs of the department, university, or community.

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

- a) Consistently assuming and executing leadership roles in committees, councils, boards or other relevant organizations.
- b) Identifying needs of the department, university, or community and initiating actions to satisfy those needs.
- c) A continuing record of involvement.

## Appendices

## Definition of Major and Minor Research Activities

**Major project:** equivalent to one item from Category 1

**Category 1:**

Peer-reviewed journal publications that are listed on ABDC, RePEc, and/or SSCI.

Book based on original research that is published by a reputable publisher (e.g., MIT Press, Yale University Press, etc.).

**Minor project:** equivalent to one item from Category 2 or two items from Category 3.

**Category 2:**

Recipient of an extramural research grant from a reputable organization.

Oral research presentation at a professional conference.

Invited seminar presentation at another college or university.

Publication of a textbook, monograph, or book chapter by a reputable publisher.

**Category 3:**

The supervision of an undergraduate/graduate scholarly endeavor must comply with MP 576 in so far as that the supervision includes original scholarly/creative work of the faculty member.

Authorship of an extramural research grant proposal.

A book review for a reputable publisher.

Poster research presentation at a professional organization.

Invited seminar presentation within the university or in other non-academic settings.

Publication in popular press.

## Classroom Observation Report (Traditional Classes)

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. Please use this list as a guide to making observations, not as a list of required behaviors. Any behavior noted by an evaluator as Below Average should be accompanied by a written rationale supporting the rating.

	E	DAA	A	BA	NA
1. States objectives for class presentation	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
2. Effectively organizes presentation	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
3. Presents material appropriate to class level	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
4. Explains important ideas simply and clearly	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
5. Presents examples and/or relevant research to clarify points	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
6. Demonstrates command of subject	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
7. Encourages student participation	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
8. Responds appropriately to student questions and comments	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
9. Communicates clearly, audibly, and effectively	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
10. Demonstrates enthusiasm for subject	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

### General Comments:

1. What were the instructor's major strengths as demonstrated in this observation?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
2. Consistent with the instructor's preferred teaching method (lecture, Socratic dialectic, in-class workshops, etc.), what (if any) suggestions do you have for improvement?

## Classroom Observation Report (Online Classes)

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. Please use this list as a guide to making observations, not as a list of required behaviors. Evaluator should observe the course content for a single lecture material (rather than entire course content) with the presence of the instructor. Any behavior noted by an evaluator as Below Average should be accompanied by a written rationale supporting the rating.

	E	DAA	A	BA	NA
1. States objectives for class presentation	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
2. Effectively organizes presentation	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
3. Presents material appropriate to class level	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
4. Explains important ideas simply and clearly	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
5. Presents examples and/or relevant research to clarify points	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
6. Demonstrates command of subject	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
7. Encourages student participation	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
8. Responds appropriately to student questions and comments	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
9. Communicates clearly, and effectively	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
10. Demonstrates enthusiasm for subject	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

### General Comments:

1. What were the instructor's major strengths as demonstrated in this observation?
  
  
  
  
2. Consistent with the instructor's preferred teaching method (lecture, Socratic dialectic, in-class workshops, etc.), what (if any) suggestions do you have for improvement?



ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT QUESTIONS ON THE STUDENT EVALUATION FORM  
(Traditional Classes)

1. My instructor presents the course in a well-organized manner.
2. My instructor displays enthusiasm when teaching.
3. My instructor presents material clearly.
4. My instructor is helpful when I have questions.
5. The goals of the course are clearly stated and consistently pursued.
6. I learned a lot in this course.
7. For this course, assignments are reasonable.
8. Grades are assigned fairly and impartially.

ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT QUESTIONS ON THE STUDENT EVALUATION FORM  
(Online Classes)

1. My instructor presents the course materials in a well-organized manner.
2. My instructor displays enthusiasm when teaching.
3. My instructor presents material clearly.
4. My instructor is helpful and available when I have questions.
5. The goals of the course are clearly stated and consistently pursued.
6. I learned a lot in this course.
7. For this course, assignments are reasonable.
8. Grades are assigned fairly and impartially.