

Eastern Michigan University
Office of Academic Human Resources
Memorandum

To: Colleen Croxall, School Director
School of Health Sciences

From: David Woike, Assistant Vice President
Academic Human Resources

Date: July 21, 2016

Re: Approved DED

Attached is a copy of the revised Departmental Evaluation Document for the School of Health Sciences approved by the University Standing Committee on July 19, 2016. 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 website, under the DOCUMENTS tab.

Thank you.

DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT

Department/School of Health Sciences

College of Health + Human Services

Date of Last DED Revision: 3/14/11

Date of Department Faculty Vote: 4/7/16

Yes 23 No 1 Abstain 3

APPROVALS:

Lynne M. White-Ram 3/10/16
Personnel Committee Chair (Date)

Colleen Crowell 3/10/16
Department Head/School Director (Date)

M. M. Maffei 3/14/16
Dean (Date)

RECEIVED

MAR 16 2016

Library Resource
Eastern Michigan University

APPROVED BY THE DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT STANDING COMMITTEE ON: JULY 19, 2016

[Signature]

Julie Bergen

[Signature]

Jeannette Kunder

John Palladino

Susan Maellen

School of Health Sciences Evaluation Document

FACULTY EVALUATION

Each school 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.

I. 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.

II. SCHOOL STANDARDS

INITIAL APPOINTMENT STANDARDS

	Academic credentials and Additional Criteria	Equivalencies or Exceptions
Professor	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Doctorate in appropriate field- Five years teaching experience at the college or university level at the rank of Associate Professor	None
Associate Professor	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Doctorate in appropriate field- Four years teaching experience at the college or university level at the rank of Assistant Professor	None
Assistant Professor	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Doctorate in appropriate field	None
Instructor	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Doctorate in appropriate field	None

III. REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS
SCHOOL STANDARDS FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE FACULTY
Those hired before September 1, 2015

Professor

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

Associate Professor

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

Assistant Professor

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

Instructor

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

*Scholarly/Creative Activity is rated, but advisory only.
Rank at the date of hire shall determine the evaluation schedule.

III. REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS
SCHOOL STANDARDS FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE FACULTY
 Those hired after September 1, 2015

Professor

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

Associate Professor

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

Assistant Professor

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

Instructor

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

*Scholarly/Creative Activity is rated, but advisory only.
 Rank at the date of hire shall determine the evaluation schedule.

IV. PROMOTION STANDARDS FOR FACULTY

	Year Eligible*	Academic Credentials	Instructional Effectiveness	Scholarly/Creative Activity	Service
To Professor	5 years as associate professor at EMU	Doctorate in appropriate field	DAA	DAA	DAA
To Associate Professor	5 years as assistant professor	Doctorate in appropriate field	DAA	DAA in one and A in the other	
To Assistant Professor	2 years as instructor at EMU	Doctorate in appropriate field	DAA	A	A

*per EMU-AAUP Contract

V. EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

A. INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

1. Data Collection Procedures

Each applicant must include a personal report of activities and accomplishments as well as documentation that states in clear and explicit terms both the quantity and quality of the activity claimed.

Supportive to this criterion is evidence that the candidate:
(These are suggestions, not a limitation on what may be included)

a. Prepares for Teaching

1. Seeks the latest information in the subject area(s) taught, by reading, attending professional conferences and/or by communicating with colleagues.
2. Regularly evaluates his/her own teaching methods, procedures and course content.

b. Plans effectively for teaching

1. Has a clear conception of his/her course(s) within the School and within the University.
2. Has a clear conception of the long-term objectives for the course(s) and for the day-to-day classroom activities.
3. Has a clear conception of the evaluation procedures which will enable him/her to measure the attainment of objectives set forth.

c. Practices good teaching methods

1. Informs students of the objectives of the course(s) and of units of study in the course(s).
2. Informs students about methods of study applicable to the attainment of course objectives.
3. Informs students of specific course assignments (e.g., dates of exams, papers, etc.).
4. Attempts to establish a classroom environment conducive to learning.
5. Evaluates students so as to measure the attainment of course objectives.

Evaluation Reports

1. Faculty member's own report of activities and accomplishments in this area, as well as specific evidence of his/her effectiveness in the teaching and advising processes.
2. Evaluation of teaching based on classroom observations and other evidence by a member of the Personnel Committee, (forms in Appendices A and B) as selected by the applicant. The procedure that must be used for classroom visitations is included below.

3. Student evaluation of teaching using the university-wide evaluation system, including faculty approved subset. (Appendix C)
4. Student evaluation of advising (Appendices D and E), if applicable.
5. Examples of teaching materials (e.g., course outlines, handouts, syllabi, etc.).
6. Record evidence of special education opportunities offered to students.
7. Support letters from students, colleagues and professionals beyond the university.
8. Field Agency evaluation of the faculty member's role as field liaison during semesters in which field placement liaison is part of teaching load.
9. Evidence of activities which have improved his/her teaching

2. Policy and Procedure for Classroom Visit by Peers

1. The Personnel Committee Chair will notify faculty in writing (email or letter) the window of time the committee members are to visit the classroom.
2. Faculty must inform the Personnel Committee Chair within three days of the notifications of class(es) not suited for visitations because of examinations, planned field trips, etc.
3. Personnel Committee members who cannot perform the class visitation within the indicated time must inform the faculty in writing of the specific day they plan to visit.

Length of Visits

The length of class visits and how many classes to visit is to be determined case-by-case by individual committee members. However, total visitations per evaluator will not be less than the equivalent of one class period of a regularly scheduled class (i.e., 75 minutes).

Number of Visitors

A majority of the Personnel Committee in the applicant's discipline will make class visitations.

Evaluation Report

3. Ratings

Exceptional (E): Awarded when the faculty member fulfills all criteria for Average and Distinctly Above Average (stated below) as well as:

1. Shows evidence of strong interest in the teaching process:
 - a. Expresses interest and concern about the quality of his/her teaching.
 - b. Presents facts and concepts from related fields.
 - c. Presents the origins of ideas and concepts.
 - d. Emphasizes ways of solving problems rather than providing solutions.
 - e. Develops and disseminates evaluations to gather data on one's own teaching effectiveness.
2. Develops original teaching materials (e.g., assignments, slides, video recordings, handouts) for use in the classroom or field agency.
3. Promotes improved teaching which is evidenced by:
 - a. Being sought by colleagues for advice on academic matters.
 - b. Seeking advice from others about the courses he/she teaches.
 - c. Discussing teaching in general with colleagues.
4. Maintains professional competency in area of expertise or specialization.

Distinctly Above Average (DAA): Awarded when the faculty member fulfills all criteria for Average (stated below) as well as:

1. Gives evidence of a sense of responsibility to teaching by demonstrating an ever increasing knowledge of the content area being taught.
2. Demonstrates a flexibility in one's approach to course materials and the methods used in presenting material.
3. Stimulates student enthusiasm and interest in subject matter by encouraging student involvement in the teaching-learning experience and in mutual exploration of the subject matter.
4. Fosters open communication with students around the subject matter, course content and process.
5. Maintains professional competency in area of expertise or specialization.

Average (A): Awarded when the faculty member fulfills criteria stated below:

1. Prepares for teaching by performing the following activities:
 - a. Gives evidence of on-going self-evaluation.
 - b. Gives evidence of on-going self-development by remaining up-to-date with one's discipline through journals, professional conferences and collegial interaction.
2. Plans effectively for teaching by performing the following activities such as:
 - a. Clearly states expectations in the course outlines, including course descriptions, objectives, specific requirements, grading procedures and content outlines.
3. Practices good teaching methods by performing the following activities such as:
 - a. Delivers course content in a clear and organized manner.
 - b. Demonstrates respect for students in the learning environment.
 - c. Develops additional bibliographical references.
 - d. Expresses the philosophy and ethics of the discipline.

4. Shows commitment to students by performing the following activities such as:
 - a. Meets classes regularly.
 - b. Returns graded material promptly.
 - c. Holds regular office hours in order to assist students in functioning and performance related to coursework.
 - d. Is readily available to field supervisors and students in field placement and keeps careful records on the liaison contacts made, when field liaison in part of the faculty member's teaching load.

Below Average (BA): Given when the faculty member does not fulfill the criteria for an average rating.

B. SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

For those hired September 1, 2015 or later

1. Data Collection Procedures

Each applicant must include a personal report of his/her Scholarly/Creative Activities and provide copies of papers, articles, books, publications, and/or other tangible documentation. Including a description of the following is suggested: the overall research plan, the manner in which the results of these activities were disseminated; the contribution the activities have made to the discipline; a description of any judgments which have been made about these activities; and the manner in which the applicant has met the school/contract criteria for scholarly/creative activity. Scholarly/Creative Activities supportive to this area of evaluation are divided into the following two categories:

Category 1

1. Publication (peer-reviewed, including books [scholarly publisher]), invited chapters of books (scholarly publisher), reviews (published review of the literature in a scholarly journal)
2. Receipt of extramural grant/fellowship/contract as Principal Investigator (PI) or co-PI (e.g., NSF, NIH, American Heart Association)

Category 2

1. Authorship of extramural grant proposal
2. Research seminar presented to professional organization, government agency, university
3. Presentation of research at national/regional/local meeting of professional organization
4. Publication (non-peer-reviewed professional publication)
5. Publication of educational material such as lab manual, educational module
6. Book review
7. A report based on research or scholarly activity, which results in an improvement in practices or policy changes or development of new programs or new learning on the part of an organization, professional society, or government agency
8. Undergraduate or graduate student research for which the Faculty Member can demonstrate significant contribution and is disseminated outside or within the university

(e.g., publication, national/regional meeting, Honors thesis, Undergraduate Symposium, Graduate Research Conference) as provided by the EMU-AAUP Agreement Article XV.B.2.

9. Evidence of retraining and study to improve one’s academic competencies in new areas needed by the school as provided by the school as provided in the EMU-AAUP Agreement

2. Ratings

To achieve a given rating, a faculty member must fulfill the activities for all categories listed within each rating block (e.g., Exceptional: 3 or more category 1 activities AND 3 or more category 2 activities); see table below. In the overall evaluation, to receive a rating of Average or above, the Faculty Member must include at least one activity in which Scholarly/Creative work is disseminated in some form. The Personnel Committee reserves the right to judge the quality of a particular Scholarly/Creative Activity. The committee will evaluate each item submitted under each category and will determine whether the submitted item qualifies for inclusion in that category. The decision will be based on the quality of each item, taking into account such criteria as: effort, impact and significance to the field, reputation of journal, etc. The Personnel Committee may find a single publication and/or grant to be of such significance as to satisfy the entire category 1 requirement.

APPLICATION OF STANDARD RATINGS FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION AT ALL LEVELS

RATING	ACTIVITIES
EXCEPTIONAL (E)	<u>Category 1</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three activities (Lead author on at least 2 publications) <u>Category 2</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three or more activities of varying types from this Grouping*
DISTINCTLY ABOVE AVERAGE (DAA)	<u>Category 1</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two activities (Lead author or significant contribution) on at least one <u>Category 2</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three or more from this Grouping*
AVERAGE (A)	<u>Category 1</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One Publication <u>Category 2</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One or more activities from this Grouping*

BELOW AVERAGE (BA)	Does Not Meet the Standards set Above

* Items from Category 1 can be substituted for any item from Category 2

C. SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Pre-2015 Revision and for those going up for promotion until 2019.

1. Data Collection Procedures

Each applicant must include a personal report of his/her Scholarly/Creative Activities and provide copies of papers, articles, books, publications, and/or other tangible documentation.

Examples of Scholarly/Creative Activities include, but are not limited to, the following (not in priority order):

1. Books published (author)
2. Articles published in peer-reviewed/edited journals
3. Book Chapters published
4. Books published (editor)
5. Critical reviews of articles or books published
6. Jury selected paper presentations—national, state, local levels
7. Articles published by non-peer-reviewed journals
8. Monographs accepted for publication
9. Journal referee
10. Non-jury selected paper presentations---national, state, local levels
11. Grant applications submitted, as specified in the EMU-AAUP Agreement
12. Grant development and management
 - a. Principal Investigator
 - b. Major leadership role in preparation and writing
 - c. Peer review of grants
 - d. Administration of grants that result in scholarly activity
13. Evidence of retraining and study to improve one's academic competencies in new areas needed by the school, as provided in the EMU-AAUP Agreement
14. Evidence of scholarly/creative activity associated with efforts to obtain research grants or funding for special projects which have substantial instructional or research components, as provided for in the current EMU-AAUP Agreement
15. Postdoctoral fellowships that result in dissemination of scholarly activity

2. Ratings

The Evaluators will judge the quality of a particular scholarly and/or creative activity. Judgment will be based on these factors:

1. The effort required in the performance of the activity
2. In what respect the faculty member's activity has contributed to his/her discipline
3. How the faculty member's activity has advanced his/her own professional growth
4. In what respect the activity has benefited students, colleagues, the curriculum, university or community
5. In what form and for what audience it was published or disseminated:

- a. Nature of publication
 - b. Reputation of journal
 - c. Editorial board policy
 - d. Degree of dissemination (local, state, national, or international)
6. In what form other than publication the work was disseminated (e.g., lecture, consultative activity):
 - a. Nature of the audience (e.g., peers, practitioners, students)
 - b. Institution or agency (e.g., private, public, governmental)
 7. Do critical reviews of the work exist and the credentials of the reviewer
 8. The level of acceptance and/or evaluation by the audience for which it is intended.

Evaluation Reports

The Evaluators will evaluate the quality of a particular Scholarly/Creative Activity. Evaluation will be based on the quality of the work, taking into account the numbers of activities and the degree of depth in, and commitment to, each by the faculty member, and recognizing that circumstances and individuals vary. In developing the summary statements and deciding on ratings (i.e., average, distinctly above average, etc.) both the Department Head and Personnel Committee should consider such factors as the following (not in priority order):

- The degree to which the candidate's activity has advanced insight or knowledge in the discipline.
- The effort required in the performance of the activity.
- What distinguishes the activity from the contributions of others or from the candidate's previous work.

Exceptional (E):

Awarded when the evaluators can describe the whole of the applicant's scholarly/creative activity or research within the period being evaluated as having a significant impact on the knowledge base, insight, or understanding of the discipline by the intended audience, i.e., has led students beyond the level of current text book knowledge, provided the discipline with significant new facts or interpretation of old facts or directions of research, helped direct a publisher or granting agency to support good work or discourage bad, etc. Evaluators must describe in terms which show how quality and/or quantity exceed distinctly above average.

Distinctly Above Average (DAA):

Awarded when the whole of the applicant's scholarly/creative activity within the period being evaluated has produced results which make a difference in the level of knowledge or understanding of the intended audiences.

Average (A):

Awarded when the research and scholarly/creative activity offered by the applicant offers a relatively small increment of knowledge of understanding or has restricted dissemination.

Below Average (BA):

Awarded when the research and scholarly/creative activity offered by the applicant does not meet the criteria set for the average rating. A rating of below average is not acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

D. SERVICE ACTIVITY

1. Data Collection Procedures

The applicant will clearly identify his/her Service activities in a narrative text. Supportive evidence must be provided to indicate the quantity of different Service activities and the quality of the effort expended in those activities. The narrative should also speak to the specific activities being presented for evaluation, a description of the way the service contributed and the manner in which the applicant has met the school's criteria for service.

Service Activities

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

1. The maintenance and development of departmental disciplinary interest groups.
2. Contribution to the work of standing and temporary committees (including task forces and projects with release-time or honorarium compensation) at the school, college or university level
3. Curriculum development and refinement (but not course development, which is included in instructional effectiveness).
4. The maintenance and development of student organizations.
5. The completion of special assignments and/or projects for one of the above areas (1,2,3,4).
6. AAUP service

NOTE: Simple attendance at school and college meetings is the minimum expectation and no credit will be given for such attendance, though lack of attendance can detract from one's service rating.

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

1. The review/editing of material submitted by others for publication in professional or academic outlets.
2. Contributions to the work of committees, both standing and temporary, for professional organizations.
3. Contributions to a professional organization made as an officer or chairperson.

Service to business, political or community organizations must be related to the applicant's academic discipline and would include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Contributions to the improved functioning of the group/client in business, political or community service
2. Contributions to the products of the committees, both standing and temporary in business, political or community service.
3. Contributions made to an organization/group as an office holder or chairperson in business, political or community service. This area will be granted considerable considerably lower or no credit unless the applicant can demonstrate significant and direct contributions to the School, College or University. The determination of the value of these activities will be based on the assessment of the evaluators.

2. Ratings

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

1. Leading, chairing, or effectively maintaining the functions of major departmental, college, university or professional community committees.
2. Developing significant plans and procedures to meet major departmental needs.

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

1. Assuming responsibility for major tasks in departmental, college, university or professional community committees.
2. Effectively organizing special sessions or programs for department, college, university or professional community committees.

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

1. Regular attendance at all scheduled meetings.
2. Acceptance and completion of assigned duties.
3. Willingness to participate in non-teaching related activities of the department.

Below Average (BA): Awarded when the quality and quantity of service do not meet criteria set for average rating.

**Eastern Michigan University
College of Health and Human Services
SCHOOL OF HEALTH SCIENCES**

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION REPORT

Person Observed: _____ Date: _____

Date of Observation: _____

Evaluator(s): _____ Course: _____

Purpose: The purpose of this classroom observation is: (1) to provide data for more accurate and equitable decisions on reappointment, tenure, and promotion; and (2) to improve faculty performance.

Instructions: Please consider each item carefully and assign the highest scores only for unusually effective performance. It is suggested that the observer(s) arrange a pre-visit and post-visit meeting with the instructor.

	HIGHEST	SATISFACTORY	LOWEST	NOT APPLICABLE
	5	4	3	2
1. _____				
2. _____				
3. _____				
4. _____				
5. _____				
6. _____				
7. _____				
8. _____				
9. _____				

Considering the previous items, how would you rate this instructor?

What specific suggestions would you make concerning how this particular class could have been improved?

Observer's recommendation to Personnel Committee on teaching effectiveness for this class session:

Ratings:	Below Average	Average	Distinctly Above Average	Exceptional

Did you have a pre-visit conference? _____ post-visit conference? _____

Signature of the Evaluator: _____

Signature of the Instructor: _____

Eastern Michigan University
College of Health and Human Services
SCHOOL OF HEALTH SCIENCES

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

Person Observed: _____ Date: _____

Date of Observation: _____

Evaluator(s): _____ Course: _____

Lesson Topics Presented: _____

1. The visitor met with the instructor on _____ to discuss the course and the goals of the session to be visited.
2. Method of presentation, including use of teaching aids, audiovisuals, etc.
3. Voice, vocabulary, mannerisms.
4. Quality of presentation, including apparent preparation, evident interest in subject matter, degree of organization, and ability to adapt concepts to the level of the course.
5. The nature of the instructor's interaction with the students.
6. Visitor met with instructor on _____ to discuss the above evaluation.
7. Visitor's overall rating of the teaching effectiveness of the instructor. _____
8. Suggestions: _____

Signature of the Evaluator: _____

Signature of the Instructor: _____

Eastern Michigan University
College of Health and Human Service
School of Health Sciences

Scale: Y = Yes N = No D = Difficult to Evaluate N/A = Not applicable to this course

Online Course Observation

Date: _____

Faculty/Instructor Observed: _____

Course #: _____ Name: _____

Evaluator: _____

	Y	N	D	N/A
Student Management/Communication Aspects				
Student expectations are clearly defined and available.				
Instructor contact information is posted in the syllabus.				
The instructor clearly states which communication tools should be used and how.				
The syllabus is complete, by the starting date of the course, and contains textbook requirements, a grading policy, and assignment/ project/ discussion deadlines.				
A statement concerning the online student resources (i.e., Student Orientation Course, Distance Education, Librarian, Access Services, etc.) is provided in the syllabus, an announcement or an initial content item within the course.				
Pedagogical Aspects				
Learning objectives and performance expectations are identified for each unit as well as the course.				
Course content is relevant to the course and unit objectives.				
Learning objects accommodate multiple learning styles.				
Assignment expectations and directions are clearly stated and supported with examples and/or grading rubrics.				
Assignment submission instructions are included with assignment directions.				
Navigation is clear, consistent, familiar and intuitive.				
Learning content is segmented and made available at the appropriate time.				
Course tools are used to maximize student and instructor efficiency and effectiveness.				

Feedback to student assignments and inquiries is constructive and provided in a timely manner.				
	Y	N	D	N/A
Student-to-instructor interaction is mandatory and facilitated through the appropriate communication tools.				
Opportunity for student feedback and questions is integrated throughout the course shell.				
Student-to-content interaction is mandatory and facilitated through the course shell and online environment.				
Learning objectives and assessment techniques are closely aligned.				
Links to Internet resources, articles, etc. are provided when applicable.				
Course discussions reflect course content and encourage participation from all students.				
Mechanism for student feedback exists.				
Technical Aspects				
Hyperlinks to websites, downloadable files, etc, work properly.				
Course content is accessible to all students on any computer that meets the minimum technical requirements.				
Multimedia objects serve an instructional purpose and are compliant with the minimum technical requirements of the course management system.				
Technical support acquisition instructions are noted throughout the course.				
Technology is used to support, promote and enhance learning by providing additional learning objects. content, presenting content in a variety of formats to address multiple learning styles, and by leveraging online resources for practical application and real-world examples				

Strengths: _____

Suggestions for improvement: _____

Overall Rating:	Below Average	Average	Distinctly Above Average	Exceptional

Post evaluation date: _____

Evaluator signature: _____

Faculty/Instructor Signature: _____

Approved questions for the Student Evaluation Form

1. What is your overall rating of the teaching effectiveness of this instructor?
2. What is your overall rating of this course?

Supplemental questions:

1. This course has clearly stated objectives.
2. This course has effectively challenged me to think
3. My instructor evaluates often.
4. My instructor provides help where needed.
5. The climate of this class is conducive to learning.
6. My instructor has an effective style of presentation.

Eastern Michigan University
College of Health and Human Services
SCHOOL OF HEALTH SCIENCES

**PROTOCOL FOR COLLECTION, PROCESSING AND UTILIZATION
OF STUDENT ADVISING EVALUATION DATA**

In order to assure that all SHS faculty receive regular and complete feedback from their advisees about the quality of advising, the following procedure will be completed each semester.

- 1) Faculty members will receive an envelope of student evaluation forms from the Personnel Committee for distribution in classes.
- 2) The sealed envelope will be given to the student whom the faculty member asks to monitor the evaluation process.
- 3) In each class, the assigned student will monitor the distribution and collection of forms. The faculty member will not be present in the classroom during this process.
- 4) The student will place the completed forms in the envelope, seal it, sign it, and take it to a school secretary in room 313 Marshall.
- 5) These envelopes will then be given to the Chair of the Personnel Committee.
- 6) Their Personnel Committee will tabulate the data and prepare a summary of the student ratings for each faculty member.
- 7) The summaries will be forwarded to each faculty member for inclusion in his or her reappointment, tenure, and promotion document. Tenured faculty can include this information in their annual activity reports.

Eastern Michigan University
College of Health and Human Services
SCHOOL OF HEALTH SCIENCES

STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY ADVISING

Advisor's Name: _____ Date: _____

In an effort to make advising in the School of Health Sciences more responsive to your needs, we are asking you to provide us with feedback on any advising you have received by phone, email, or in-person from your program faculty advisor.

How many times have you scheduled and attended a meeting (phone, email, in-person) with your current advisor this past semester? Check one:

- I have not met with my advisor
 Once
 Two or three times
 Four or five times
 Six or more

Read the description of each factor listed below:

SA **A** **U** **D** **SD**
Strongly Agree **Agree** **Undecided** **Disagree** **Strongly Disagree**

Draw a circle around the number that indicates your rating of your program faculty advisor.

	SA	A	U	D	SD
1. Keeps scheduled appointments.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Has current and thorough knowledge of program courses and requirements	5	4	3	2	1
3. Has current knowledge of basic studies courses and requirements.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Helps me problem-solve when I have special needs	5	4	3	2	1
5. Refers me for information I need on University requirements and registration procedures.	5	4	3	2	1
6. Professional and interested.	5	4	3	2	1
7. Considering everything, I would give my faculty advisor an overall rating of:	A	B	C	D	E

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: (e.g., What did your faculty advisor do that was particularly helpful? What could your advisor have done to be more helpful?)