

Eastern Michigan University
Office of Academic Human Resources
Memorandum

To: Carol Freedman-Doan, Department Head
Psychology

From: David Woike, Assistant Vice President
Academic Human Resources

Date: May 12, 2017

Re: Approved DED

Attached is a copy of the revised Departmental Evaluation Document for the Psychology Department approved by the University Standing Committee on May 11, 2017. 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 Psychology

College of Arts & Sciences

Date of Last DED Revision: Apr 15, 2013



Date of Department Faculty Vote: 12/13/16

Yes 23 No 0 Abstain 1

APPROVALS:

[Signature] 2/7/17
Personnel Committee Chair (Date)

Carl Hood - Dec 2/7/17
Department Head/School Director (Date)

[Signature] 2/12/17
Dean (Date)

APPROVED BY THE DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT STANDING COMMITTEE ON: May 11, 2017

[Signature] [Signature]
Judith Kullberg [Signature]
[Signature] [Signature]
Kenneth W. Rusinski [Signature]

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.

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. APPOINTMENT STANDARDS

	ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS AND ADDITIONAL CRITERIA	EQUIVALENCIES OR EXCEPTIONS
PROFESSOR	Ph.D. from Department of Psychology at an accredited university	Ph.D. from an accredited university/interdisciplinary program/department that includes psychology training as a major component (e.g., Behavioral Neuroscience)*
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Ph.D. from Department of Psychology at an accredited university	Ph.D. from an interdisciplinary program/department of an accredited university where psychology training is a major component (e.g., Behavioral Neuroscience)*
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Ph.D. from Department of Psychology at an accredited university	Ph.D. from an interdisciplinary program/department of an accredited university where psychology training is a major component (e.g., Behavioral Neuroscience)*
INSTRUCTOR	Ph.D. from Department of Psychology at an accredited university (NOTE: If hired as ABD, all doctoral degree requirements must be completed within one year of hire date.)	Ph.D. from an interdisciplinary program/department of an accredited university where psychology training is a major component (e.g., Behavioral Neuroscience)*

***The Department and University will decide on the adequacy of this equivalence at the time of hire.**

**IIIa. REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS
For Faculty Hired before September 1, 2015**

PROFESSOR

Year	1	2	3
Evaluation	Initial Interim	Full/R	Full/T
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA	DAA	DAA
Service	A	A	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	----	*Advisory only	DAA

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Year	1	2	3	4
Evaluation	Initial Interim	Full/R	Comprehensive Interim	Full/T
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA in one; A in other	DAA	DAA	DAA
Service		A	DAA	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	----	*Advisory only	----	DAA

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Year	1	2	3	4	5
Evaluation	Initial Interim	Initial Interim	Full/R	Comprehensive Interim	Full/T
Instructional Effectiveness	A	DAA in one	DAA	DAA	DAA
Service	A	A in other	A	DAA	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	---	----	*Advisory only	---	DAA

INSTRUCTOR

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6
Evaluation	Initial Interim	Initial Interim	Full/R	Comprehensive Interim	Comprehensive Interim	Full/T
Instructional Effectiveness	A	DAA in one	DAA	DAA	DAA	DAA
Service	A	A in other	A	DAA	DAA	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	---	----	*Advisory only	---	---	DAA

*Scholarly activity is rated, but advisory only. An advisory rating of DAA indicates adequate progress.

**IIIb. REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS
For Faculty Hired after September 1, 2015**

PROFESSOR

Year	2	3
Evaluation	Full/R	Full/T
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA	DAA
Service	A	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	*Advisory only	DAA

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Year	2	4
Evaluation	Full/R	Full/T
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA	DAA
Service	A	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	*Advisory only	DAA

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Year	3	5
Evaluation	Full/R	Full/T
Instructional Effectiveness	A	DAA
Service	A	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	*Advisory only	DAA

INSTRUCTOR

Year	3	6
Evaluation	Full/R	Full/T
Instructional Effectiveness	A	DAA
Service	A	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	*Advisory only	DAA

*Scholarly activity is rated, but advisory only. An advisory rating of DAA indicates adequate progress.

IV. PROMOTION STANDARDS

	YEAR ELIGIBLE	ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS	INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS	SCHOLARLY/ CREATIVE ACTIVITY	SERVICE
TO: FULL PROFESSOR SALARY ADJUSTMENT	10 years as full professor at EMU	Ph.D.	DAA	DAA	DAA
TO: PROFESSOR	5 years as associate professor at EMU	Ph.D.	DAA	DAA	DAA
TO: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	5 years as assistant professor at EMU	Ph.D.	DAA	DAA	DAA
TO: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	2 years as instructor at EMU	Ph.D.	DAA	DAA	DAA

V. EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

A. Instructional Effectiveness

1. Data Collection Procedures

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 Psychology Department shall utilize:

1. A set of approved questions for the Student Evaluation Form (Appendix E for traditional courses; Appendix F for online courses).
2. A standard online system for conducting Supervision Evaluations in anonymous fashion (Appendix G).
3. A set of approved forms for Peer and Department Head Classroom Visitations (Appendices A and B for in person visits; Appendices C and D for online reviews).
4. A procedure for classroom visitations (see page 11).

The applicant shall describe in a narrative statement or essay, how he/she has met the department's criteria. The applicant is responsible for describing and documenting, where appropriate, the activities presented for evaluation in terms of quantity and quality. The narrative should describe his/her work in such a fashion that the reader can relate his/her performance to the established criteria and make an informed judgment about how well those expectations have been met. Student evaluations, samples of classroom materials, copies of articles, commendations, etc. should be included as documentation in an appendix and referenced where appropriate. The essay itself, without supporting documents, should be free-standing and will become part of the applicant's personnel file. The essay should address the following:

- Specific evidence of effectiveness in the teaching/advising process;
- Activities that have improved the applicant's teaching;
- Results of student, peer and Department Head evaluations; and
- The manner by which the applicant has met the DED criteria.

Each applicant must include a personal report of activities and accomplishments that document the applicant's instructional effectiveness. The applicant shall provide evidence of the extent to which he/she (1) prepares for teaching, (2) plans effectively for teaching, (3) practices good teaching methods, and (4) is committed to students. Examples of the types of activities and accomplishments that constitute such evidence are stated below.

1. **Prepares for Teaching**
 - a. Seeks latest information in the subject area(s) taught, by reading, attending professional conferences, communicating with colleagues, additional relevant coursework above that required for academic rank held or sought, seminar attendance at other universities, and/or attending workshops or public lectures given by recognized authorities.
 - b. Develops new instructional materials.
 - c. Regularly evaluates his/her own past teaching methods, procedures and course content.
 - d. Based on his/her own evaluation, introduces changes to improve instruction.

2. **Plans effectively for teaching.**
 - a. Has a clear definition of the function of his/her course(s) within the Department, the University, and/or community, as well as its role in preparing students for careers.
 - b. Has clearly articulated long-term objective(s) for his/her course(s) and for day-to-day classroom activities.
 - c. Has a clear and relevant plan of action to accomplish these objectives.
 - d. Evaluates students to measure the attainment of objectives set forth.

3. **Practices good teaching methods.**
 - a. Clearly informs students of the purposes and objectives of the course(s) and the units of study in the course(s).
 - b. Keeps students informed of specific responsibilities (e.g., equipment usage, course requirements, dates and deadline).
 - c. Establishes and maintains good communication with students.
 - d. Promotes classroom procedures that encourage learning.
 - e. Regularly seeks information from students regarding their levels of performance/achievement, and informs them of his/her estimation of their performance.
 - f. Recognizes problems or deficiencies in his/her instructional effectiveness and takes actions to address problems.

4. **Is committed to students.**
 - a. Available to students who need help.
 - b. Works beyond regular classroom responsibilities to help students with independent learning experiences (e.g., special projects, independent study projects, theses, qualifying examinations, student co-authored publications and presentations, and other appropriately justified activities).

2. **Evaluation Reports.**

1. **Self Report.** The faculty member's own report of instructional activities and accomplishments that address the major criteria of instructional effectiveness. It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide a satisfactory self report by the

specified deadline.

2. **Student Evaluations.** Results of the University-wide evaluation system supplemented by the departmental set (see Appendices E and F) shall be reported. In addition, if relevant, student evaluations of clinical supervision shall also be included (Appendix G).
3. **Peer Evaluations.** Colleague evaluations of teaching based on classroom visitations, evaluation of instructional materials, and other relevant evidence (e.g., student complaints or accolades). An overall rating will be obtained by averaging ratings across all categories of the peer evaluations conducted. (See the form in Appendix B/D.)
4. **Department Head Evaluations.** Department Head evaluations of teaching based on classroom visitations, evaluation of instructional materials, and other evidence (e.g., student complaints or accolades). In addition to any narrative, the Department Head will provide an overall rating. (See the form in Appendix A/B).
5. **Advising.** Faculty member's report on the amount and type of advising provided, if applicable.

A (CD). Professional Effectiveness (For Clinic Director Only)

Data Collection Procedures

The Clinic Director must include a personal report of his/her clinic activities and provide evidence of effectiveness of supervision along with any other documentation. The following areas should be addressed in the report and documentation provided:

1. **Training and supervision of students.** Include number of students supervised, number of cases each student presented, methods of supervision used, evidence of effectiveness of supervision, including any student evaluations.
2. **Evidence of successful direction of the clinic.** Provide information about scheduling, billing, budgeting, personnel management, and reports needed by the Director of Clinical Training for purposes of APA accreditation. Prepare a financial accounts statement.
3. **Evidence that the array of clinic programs developed meet curricular goals and needs.** Include information on the number and kinds of programs offered, the diversity of the populations served, the treatment and assessment modalities used, and the effectiveness of those programs.
4. **Evidence of successful marketing of the clinic.** Provide information about number of clients served, types of services provided, areas from which clients are

recruited, future recruitment plans.

5. Evidence of establishment of relationships with other institutions. Provide information about student placements (practica, internships, jobs) at various institutions, programs developed, relationships established, etc. Include future plans for relationship building.
6. Evidence of successful therapy outcomes and/or program evaluation at clinic. Include evidence of client satisfaction and outcome studies.
7. Evidence of service or training grant activity relevant to clinic services and training. Provide texts of grants applied for and/or received.

In the special circumstance involving the evaluation of the Professional Effectiveness of the Clinic Director, the Personnel Committee and the Department Head reserve the right to judge the quality of a particular directing/clinic activity. Proportionately greater importance will be given to items #1, 2, and 3 in the list above. In general, evidence of successful clinic activity will include trainee, staff, faculty, and client satisfaction. Fiscal responsibility in directing the clinic and marketing of services available at the clinic will also be given important consideration.

3. Procedures of Classroom visitation by peers and Department Head

- a. All probationary faculty and those applying for promotion must demonstrate evidence of instructional effectiveness during all Full and Tenure Evaluations. When conducting classroom visitations, peers and the Department Head shall use the approved Departmental Peer Visitation Forms (see Appendices A and B for classroom visitation and Appendices C and D for online reviews).
- b. At least two weeks in advance, the Personnel Committee Chair and/or the Department Head shall schedule classroom visits by at least two members of the Personnel Committee and the Department Head.

5. Procedures for Online Course Evaluation by peers and Department Head

During the semester the Faculty Member is to be evaluated for an online course, the Faculty Member is to send the Department Head the course syllabus and content to be covered for one lesson/unit from the course, including all materials available to students. Online instruction will be evaluated by the observer sitting in during one unit of instruction as the instructor is delivering it. This instruction must be conducted from an on-campus office to facilitate observation by the faculty member or Department Head.

5. Ratings

Exceptional (E):

Awarded when the quality of instruction/professional effectiveness offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of a truly superior teacher/clinic director. Evaluators must describe (or in the case of student evaluations, quantify,) performance as better in quality than distinctly above average.

Distinctly Above Average (DAA):

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

Average (A):

Awarded when the quality of instruction/professional effectiveness offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of a good teacher/clinic director.

Below Average (BA):

Awarded when the quality of instruction/professional effectiveness is unacceptable in content or execution.

B. Scholarly and/or Creative Activity

1. Data Collection Procedures

The applicant shall describe in a narrative statement or essay, how he/she has met the department's criteria. The applicant is responsible for describing and documenting, where appropriate, the activities presented for evaluation in terms of quantity and quality. The narrative should describe his/her work in such a fashion that the reader can relate his/her performance to the established criteria and make an informed judgment about how well those expectations have been met. Copies of journal articles, chapters, book reviews, abstracts, presentations, grants, and other scholarly work, etc. should be included as documentation in an appendix and referenced where appropriate. The essay itself, without supporting documents, should be free-standing and will become part of the applicant's personnel file. The essay should address the following:

- List of specific items presented for evaluation and other approved activities with enough description to make them understandable to the reader;
- The manner by which the results of these activities were disseminated;
- The contribution the activities have made to the discipline;
- A description of any judgments that have been made about these activities; and
- The manner by which the applicant has met the DED criteria.

Each applicant must include a personal report of his/her Scholarly/Creative Activities and provide proper citations, copies of papers, articles, books, publications and/or other tangible documentation. Scholarly/Creative Activity is not evaluated during Interim Evaluations (except the Comprehensive Interim Evaluation). The scholarly work must be related to the discipline of psychology. In cases of interdisciplinary work it is the obligation of the Faculty Member to specify precisely how the work contributes to the discipline of psychology. Each interdisciplinary work shall be judged on its own merit and relevance, and shall not be construed as establishing precedents for later work.

In order of their impact on the evaluation process, examples of Scholarly/Creative Activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Published or in press works such as scholarly research or review articles, or books or book chapters, with the understanding that peer-reviewed contributions and those produced under contract with a publisher tend to have higher significance and impact. However, as for all scholarly contributions, it is incumbent on the applicant to explain the importance and scope of the project's impact on the field. Published abstracts that reiterate conference presentations (i.e., items 3 and 4, below) do not add incrementally to this domain. Works for which the individual is the principal or equally contributing author will be evaluated as greater impact than those for which the individual played a lesser role. Again, it is incumbent on the individual to explain the significance of each contribution, with the understanding that order of authorship implies different levels of contribution across different subspecialties/disciplines and across different types of publication; therefore, order of authorship, per se, is less important than explication of the applicant's role/contribution and impact of the product on the discipline.
2. Scholarly extramural research grants applied for and/or obtained as the Agreement provides. Grants for which the individual is a principal or co-investigator will be evaluated more highly than those for which the individual serves in a staff or consulting role.
3. Oral presentations of a scholarly nature, such as papers presented at conventions, colloquia, guest lectures given, workshops taught, etc. Invited presentations and symposium contributions, particularly those made to national audiences, will be regarded as having greater impact than other types of oral presentations.
4. Poster presentations at conferences, with greater impact presumed for those presented at national conventions relative to those made to regional or local audiences.

The above examples are presented in rank order with respect to how they are considered in applying the ratings delineated below.

Criteria

To be awarded tenure and/or to be promoted, the applicant must receive a rating of Distinctly Above Average or higher.

2. Ratings

The Personnel Committee and Department Head reserve the right to judge the quality of a particular Scholarly/Creative Activity as well as the overall record of scholarly activity. Evaluation of the quality of work will take into account the number of activities and the degree of depth in and commitment to each by the Faculty Member, 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 activity has advanced insight or knowledge in the discipline. Dissemination through publication in peer-reviewed journals, books, and book chapters will be considered to have greatest impact, and such dissemination is essential for tenure and promotion.
- The complexity and difficulty of an activity and effort required in the performance of the activity.
- What distinguishes the activity from the candidate's previous work.

In applying the ratings below, work will be evaluated in accordance with priorities delineated above under Examples of Scholarly/Creative Activities. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are expected to average one or more high impact items (i.e., items falling under 1 and 2, above) for each year under consideration. Works in which the individual is the principal author or an equally contributing co-author will be evaluated as being of greater impact than works in which the applicant plays a secondary role. Small adjustments to this one-per-year guideline may be made if the overall quantity and/or quality of scholarly and/or creative activities are substantial.

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

Exceptional (E):

To be considered exceptional, the overall record of scholarly activity should constitute an unusually significant contribution to knowledge in basic or applied psychology. It is expected that the scholarly work comprising this contribution will consist of new empirical findings, methodology or theoretical developments that have recognized impact on the field. A rating of E is granted when the individual has averaged more than one high impact item (i.e., items falling under 1 and 2, above) for each year under consideration over the evaluation period, typically in combination with a number of lesser impact activities.

Distinctly Above Average (DAA):

To be considered distinctly above average, the overall record of scholarly activity should constitute a significant contribution to knowledge in basic or applied psychology. A rating of DAA is granted when the individual has averaged at least one high impact item

(i.e., items falling under 1 and 2, above) for each year under consideration. For example, a collection of presentations (i.e., typically, three or more) made to scientific audiences, reflecting a programmatic line of research likely to yield future scholarly products, may be judged to equal one high impact item. Although in some cases, high productivity on individually lesser impact activities may collectively equate to a high impact item, it is incumbent on the individual to justify this in his/her narrative and supporting materials.

Average (A):

To be considered average, the overall record of scholarly activity should constitute a contribution to knowledge in basic or applied psychology that, while substantial, falls below the distinctly above average category. That is, the individual has failed to average at least one high impact item per year (or its equivalent through collective lesser impact activities) over the evaluation period.

Below Average (BA):

An overall record of activity that fails to make a contribution in quality, quantity or both.

C. Service Activity

1. Data Collection Procedures

The applicant shall describe in a narrative statement or essay, how he/she has met the department's criteria. The applicant is responsible for describing and documenting, where appropriate, the activities presented for evaluation in terms of quantity and quality. The narrative should describe his/her work in such a fashion that the reader can relate his/her performance to the established criteria and make an informed judgment about how well those expectations have been met. Copies of meeting minutes, acknowledgements of service, etc. should be included as documentation in an appendix and referenced where appropriate. The essay itself, without supporting documents, should be free-standing and will become part of the applicant's personnel file. The essay should address the following:

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

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. It is the applicant's responsibility to describe and document where possible the nature of the service, the time involved, the complexity of the work, the impact or importance of the service for students, faculty, the college or university, the field of psychology or the community (whichever is applicable).

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

1. Chairperson of a major departmental committee (Instruction, Finance, Personnel, etc.)

2. Chairperson of an ad hoc departmental committee (i.e., search committee)
2. Member of standing or ad hoc department committee.
3. Coordinator of Introductory Psychology Human Subjects Research Pool.
4. Directing or serving on hoc projects, e.g., department research, certain grant writing (e.g., obtain funds for department equipment) curricular development, preparation of department reports.
5. Providing technical, e.g., computer or research design, expertise to department faculty.
6. Providing professional assistance to other EMU faculty or staff in instructional, research or administrative matters
7. Chairperson of Honors Program.
8. Director of a graduate program
9. Coordinator of Colloquium Series.
10. Advisor to Psychology Club/Psi Chi or other student organization
11. Edit department newsletter.
12. Representing department at college and university meetings.
13. Development of curricular/program innovations.
14. Conducting or coordinating program assessment.

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

1. Chairperson of or a large contribution to university councils, committees or task forces
2. Member of college and university councils or committees.
3. Chairperson or member of ad hoc college or university committees and task forces.
4. Representing the university at community functions.
5. Participation in student orientation, recruiting and advising projects (e.g., Fast Track, Explore Eastern).
6. Presentations at community forums (e.g., PTO's)
7. Holding office in international, national, state or local organizations related to the field of psychology
8. Consultantships (formal and informal), editorships, uncompensated private practice for the community, and other positions the duties of which involve the production, evaluation, and/or facilitation of scholarly research. Examples outside the production of scholarly work include serving as a referee or as planner of a research conference.
9. Providing professional service to the community at large (e.g., government agencies or nonprofit organizations).

In general, activities for which there is direct remuneration are not considered service. However, because remuneration may not be commensurate with the service provided, some portion of these activities may be considered service. Examples of such situations would include the receipt of token compensation, such as honoraria, or receipt of a partial course reduction for a task that required far much more work than the corresponding reduction. Arrangements for service credit in such circumstances cannot always be made in advance of the service performed, because the full scope and/or duration of the task frequently cannot be

anticipated. And, while the service may continue through the completion of the task, resources for remuneration for the extended service may not be available. In such cases, decisions about whether or not to give service credit will be made jointly by the Department Head and the Personnel Committee.

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. A rating of Exceptional signifies a consistent acceptance and execution of major professional service responsibilities either within 1) the department, college, or university; 2) the discipline of psychology or related discipline; 3) and/or the community at large. In particular, evidence of assuming leadership role(s) is customary to warrant granting a rating of Exceptional

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.

Average (A):

Awarded when the quality and quantity of service shall be evaluated as that normally expected, i.e., one's fair share.

This shall be evidenced by factors such as: annual participation on a standing department committee (Instruction, Personnel, Finance or Graduate) or college or university committee (College Advisory Council, Faculty Council, Graduate Council) or its equivalent in time and effort. Thus all faculty are expected to provide consistent active service to the department and/or the college or university by accepting assignments and executing prescribed duties.

Below Average (BA):

Awarded when either the quality and/or quantity of service does not fulfill the criteria listed above for an Average rating.

APPENDIX A

DEPARTMENT HEAD VISITATION EVALUATION FORM

Instructor: _____ Course: _____

Observer: _____ Date of Observation: _____

Prior to the actual classroom visit, the observer is to: a) obtain from the instructor copies of any introductory materials distributed to the students in the class, particularly the course outline; b) arrange with the instructor a mutually convenient date for the observation; c) confer with the instructor concerning 1) the general objectives, procedures, and format of the course, and 2) the subject matter and format of the particular class session to be observed.

During the classroom visit, the observer is to remain as unobtrusive as possible and is expected to remain in the class for the entire period. After each visit, a brief follow-up conference is to be held between the instructor and the observer as soon as possible. During the meeting, the observer will review the completed form with the instructor. The instructor has the option of providing additional comments concerning his or her classroom performance at this time. The original copy of the form is then given to the Personnel Committee and copies to the instructor and Department Head.

Rating Descriptions from the Department Evaluation Document

Exceptional (E): Awarded when the quality of instruction offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of a truly superior teacher. Evaluators must describe (or in the case of student evaluations, quantify) performance as better in quality than distinctly above average.

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

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

Below Average (BA): Awarded when the quality of instruction is unacceptable in content or execution.

I. Course Objectives: Subject matter in class session conformed to instructor's description of the syllabus and conference held prior to the observation

Below average	Average	Distinctly Average	Above	Exceptional
---------------	---------	-----------------------	-------	-------------

II. Competence with Subject Matter: Instructor demonstrated substantive knowledge of the subject matter presented

Below average	Average	Distinctly Average	Above	Exceptional
---------------	---------	-----------------------	-------	-------------

III. Manner of presentation: Subject matter presented clearly and in well-organized fashion

Below average	Average	Distinctly Average	Above	Exceptional
---------------	---------	-----------------------	-------	-------------

IV. Subject matter presented at a level appropriate to the competence of the majority of the students to facilitate learning

Below average	Average	Distinctly Average	Above	Exceptional
---------------	---------	-----------------------	-------	-------------

Written comments of the observer should be made on the attached page.

This should be a full narrative.

Comments of the instructor (optional) should also be made on that page.

APPENDIX B

PEER VISITATION EVALUATION FORM

Instructor: _____ Course: _____

Observer: _____ Date of Observation: _____

Prior to the actual classroom visit, the observer is to: a) obtain from the instructor copies of any introductory materials distributed to the students in the class, particularly the course outline; b) arrange with the instructor a mutually convenient date for the observation; c) confer with the instructor concerning 1) the general objectives, procedures, and format of the course, and 2) the subject matter and format of the particular class session to be observed.

During the classroom visit, the observer is to remain as unobtrusive as possible and is expected to remain in the class for the entire period. After each visit, a brief follow-up conference is to be held between the instructor and the observer as soon as possible. During the meeting, the observer will review the completed form with the instructor. The instructor has the option of providing additional comments concerning his or her classroom performance at this time. The original copy of the form is then given to the Personnel Committee and copies to the instructor and Department Head.

Rating Descriptions from the Department Evaluation Document

Exceptional (E): Awarded when the quality of instruction offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of a truly superior teacher. Evaluators must describe (or in the case of student evaluations, quantify) performance as better in quality than distinctly above average.

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

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

Below Average (BA): Awarded when the quality of instruction is unacceptable in content or execution.

I. Course Objectives: Subject matter in class session conformed to instructor's description of the syllabus and conference held prior to the observation

Below average	Average	Distinctly Average	Above	Exceptional
---------------	---------	-----------------------	-------	-------------

II. Competence with Subject Matter: Instructor demonstrated substantive knowledge of the subject matter presented

Below average	Average	Distinctly Average	Above	Exceptional
---------------	---------	-----------------------	-------	-------------

III. Manner of presentation: Subject matter presented clearly and in well-organized fashion

Below average	Average	Distinctly Average	Above	Exceptional
---------------	---------	-----------------------	-------	-------------

IV. Subject matter presented at a level appropriate to the competence of the majority of the students to facilitate learning

Below average	Average	Distinctly Average	Above	Exceptional
---------------	---------	-----------------------	-------	-------------

Written comments of the observer should be made on the attached page.

This should be a full narrative.

Comments of the instructor (optional) should also be made on that page.

APPENDIX C

DEPARTMENT HEAD ONLINE COURSE EVALUATION FORM

Instructor: _____ Course: _____

Observer: _____ Date of Observation: _____

During the semester in which the faculty is to be evaluated, the observer is to: a) obtain from the instructor copies of any introductory materials distributed to the students online, particularly the course outline; b) receive all online instructional materials for one lesson/unit; c) confer with the instructor concerning 1) the general objectives, procedures, and format of the course, and 2) the subject matter and format of the particular class session to be observed.

After review of the materials, a brief follow-up conference is to be held between the instructor and the reviewer as soon as possible. During the meeting, the reviewer will review the completed form with the instructor. The instructor has the option of providing additional comments concerning his or her course materials at this time. The original copy of the form is then given to the Personnel Committee and copies to the instructor and Department Head.

Rating Descriptions from the Department Evaluation Document

Exceptional (E): Awarded when the quality of instruction offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of a truly superior teacher. Evaluators must describe (or in the case of student evaluations, quantify) performance as better in quality than distinctly above average.

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

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

Below Average (BA): Awarded when the quality of instruction is unacceptable in content or execution.

I. Course Objectives: Subject matter in lesson/unit conformed to instructor's description of the syllabus and conference held prior to the observation

Below average	Average	Distinctly Average	Above	Exceptional
---------------	---------	-----------------------	-------	-------------

II. Competence with Subject Matter: Instructor demonstrated substantive knowledge of the subject matter presented

Below average	Average	Distinctly Average	Above	Exceptional
---------------	---------	-----------------------	-------	-------------

III. Manner of presentation: Subject matter presented clearly and in well-organized fashion

Below average	Average	Distinctly Average	Above	Exceptional
---------------	---------	-----------------------	-------	-------------

IV. Subject matter presented at a level appropriate to the competence of the majority of the students to facilitate learning

Below average	Average	Distinctly Average	Above	Exceptional
---------------	---------	-----------------------	-------	-------------

Written comments of the observer should be made on the attached page.
This should be a full narrative.
Comments of the instructor (optional) should also be made on that page.

APPENDIX D

ONLINE COURSE EVALUATION FORM

Instructor: _____ Course: _____

Observer: _____ Date of Observation: _____

During the semester in which the faculty is to be evaluated, the observer is to: a) obtain from the instructor copies of any introductory materials distributed to the students online, particularly the course outline; b) receive all online instructional materials for one lesson/unit; c) confer with the instructor concerning 1) the general objectives, procedures, and format of the course, and 2) the subject matter and format of the particular class session to be observed.

After review of the materials, a brief follow-up conference is to be held between the instructor and the reviewer as soon as possible. During the meeting, the reviewer will review the completed form with the instructor. The instructor has the option of providing additional comments concerning his or her course materials at this time. The original copy of the form is then given to the Personnel Committee and copies to the instructor and Department Head.

Rating Descriptions from the Department Evaluation Document

Exceptional (E): Awarded when the quality of instruction offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of a truly superior teacher. Evaluators must describe (or in the case of student evaluations, quantify) performance as better in quality than distinctly above average.

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

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

Below Average (BA): Awarded when the quality of instruction is unacceptable in content or execution.

I. Course Objectives: Subject matter in lesson/unit conformed to instructor's description of the syllabus and conference held prior to the observation

Below average	Average	Distinctly Average	Above	Exceptional
---------------	---------	-----------------------	-------	-------------

II. Competence with Subject Matter: Instructor demonstrated substantive knowledge of the subject matter presented

Below average	Average	Distinctly Average	Above	Exceptional
---------------	---------	-----------------------	-------	-------------

III. Manner of presentation: Subject matter presented clearly and in well-organized fashion

Below average	Average	Distinctly Average	Above	Exceptional
---------------	---------	-----------------------	-------	-------------

IV. Subject matter presented at a level appropriate to the competence of the majority of the students to facilitate learning

Below average	Average	Distinctly Average	Above	Exceptional
---------------	---------	-----------------------	-------	-------------

Written comments of the observer should be made on the attached page.
This should be a full narrative.
Comments of the instructor (optional) should also be made on that page.

APPENDIX E

Student Evaluation Questions for Traditional Courses

Core Item Rating Scale:

A = Much above average
B = Above average
C = Average
D = Below Average
E = Much Below Average

Supplied Item Rating Scale:

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

Core Items

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

Supplied Items

My instructor has an effective style of presentation.
My instructor seems well-prepared for class.
My instructor stimulates interest in the course.
My instructor displays enthusiasm when teaching.
My instructor is actively helpful when students have problems.
I understand what is expected of me in this course.
Exams are fair.
Grades are assigned fairly and impartially.
I would recommend this course to another student.
I would recommend this instructor to another student.
I learned a lot in this course.
I looked forward to taking this course before it began.
The grade I expect to receive in this course is (A=SA, B=A, C=U, D=D).

Comments

What did you like most about this instructor and course?
What did you dislike most about this instructor and course?
What constructive suggestions do you have for this instructor or course?

APPENDIX F

Student Evaluation Questions for Online Courses

Core Item Rating Scale:

A = Much above average
B = Above average
C = Average
D = Below Average
E = Much Below Average

Supplied Item Rating Scale:

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

Core Items

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

Supplied Items

The online delivery format was effective.
The page layout and online navigation of the course was easy to follow.
My instructor seems well-prepared.
My instructor stimulates interest in the course.
My instructor displays enthusiasm for this course.
My instructor demonstrates consistent and active engagement with the course.
My instructor is actively helpful when students have problems.
I was able to consistently access online materials.
I understand what is expected of me in this course.
Exams are fair.
Grades are assigned fairly and impartially.
I would recommend this course to another student.
I would recommend this instructor to another student.
I learned a lot in this course.
I looked forward to taking this course before it began.
The amount of effort required to succeed in this course was about the same as for other college courses.
The grade I expect to receive in this course is (A=SA, B=A, C=U, D=D).
On average, how many hours per week did you spend on this course? Include time spent working online, doing readings, reviewing discussions, writing papers, and any other course-related work. Answers: 0-5; 6-10; 11-15; 16-20; 21-25; 26-30; More than 30

Comments

What did you like most about this instructor and course?
What did you dislike most about this instructor and course?
What constructive suggestions do you have for this instructor or course?

APPENDIX G
APPROVED QUESTIONS FOR INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP SUPERVISION

Evaluation of Clinical Supervision (Individual)
 Administered online via SurveyMonkey.com

Thanks for taking the time to rate your current EMU Psychology Clinic supervisor. If you would like to complete an evaluation on past supervisors in this anonymous manner, you are also free to do so. Also, if you have had more than one supervisor this semester, please complete a separate survey for each supervisor. Just log out and log back into the survey using the URL that was emailed to you if you would like to provide feedback for additional supervisor(s).

- 1) Please indicate which supervisor you are rating on this evaluation. _____
- 2) Please rate your EMU Psychology Clinic supervisor on each item using the scale outlined below.

	Inadequate	Minor, but occasional noticeable problems	Adequate	Good	Excellent	N/A
1. Supervisory Responsibilities (e.g., punctuality, keeping appointments, availability, chart reviews, sign-offs, etc.)						
2. Interest in Supervision (i.e., involvement, concern in the student's development as a clinician)						
3. Supportiveness/Positive Regard for Students						

4. Ability to Listen/Adjust to Students							
*5. Adequacy of Teaching Methods (e.g., discussion demonstrations, reading materials, A/V use, etc.)							
6. Level of Relevant Knowledge							
7. Adequate Pacing of Demands on Students (i.e., requires enough, but not too much independence)							

***3. Overall, including – but not limited to – the above areas, how would you rate the quality of supervision you received from this supervisor?**

4. Please comment on aspects of supervision that you found particularly helpful.

5. Please comment on aspects of supervision that could be improved.

6. Please comment on Psychology Clinic policies and procedures relevant to clinical supervision that could be improved. These comments will be viewed by the Clinic Director, but not necessarily by your supervisor.

***Core items**

Evaluation of Clinical Supervision (Group)
 Administered online via SurveyMonkey.com

Thanks for taking the time to provide feedback on your experience in Group Supervision this semester. If you would like to complete an evaluation on past group supervision experiences in this anonymous manner, you are encouraged to do so. Also, if you participated in more than one group supervision this semester, please complete a separate survey for each supervisor. Just log out and log back into the survey using the URL that was emailed to you if you would like to provide feedback for additional supervisor(s).

- 1) Please indicate which supervisor you are rating on this evaluation. _____
- 2) If this Group Supervision had a "theme", please specify what it was: _____
- 3) Please rate your experiences in Group Supervision, using the scale outlined below.

	Inadequate	Minor, but occasional noticeable problems	Adequate	Good	Excellent	N/A
1. Value/importance and relevance of the material covered in group supervision						
2. Supervisor's interest and enthusiasm in conducting Group Supervision (i.e., involvement, concern in the student's development as a clinician).						

3. Supervisor's Administrative and Professional Responsibilities (e.g., punctuality, effective use of time in group, group facilitation/structure, and ability to give constructive feedback in the group setting).						
4. Supportiveness/Positive Regard for Students						
5. Ability to Listen/Adjust to Students						
*6. Adequacy of Teaching Methods (e.g., discussion, role plays, case presentations, demonstrations, reading materials, AV use, etc.)						
7. Level of Relevant Knowledge						
8. Adequate Pacing of Demands on Students (i.e., requires enough, but not too much independence)						

- *4. Overall, including -- but not limited to -- the above areas, how would you rate the quality of this group supervision experience?**
- 5. Please comment on aspects of group supervision that you found particularly helpful or valuable.**
- 6. Please comment on aspects of group supervision that could be improved.**
- 7. Please comment on Psychology Clinic policies and procedures relevant to clinical supervision that could be improved. These comments will be viewed by the Clinic Director, but not necessarily by your supervisor.**

***Core items**