

Eastern Michigan University
Office of Academic Human Resources
Memorandum

To: Ron Flowers, Department Head
Leadership & Counseling

From: David Woike, Assistant Vice President
Academic Human Resources

Date: February 21, 2017

Re: Approved DED

Attached is a copy of the revised Departmental Evaluation Document for the Leadership & Counseling Department approved by the University Standing Committee on February 17, 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.

EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT

Department of Leadership & Counseling
College of Education
Date of Last DED Revision: April 2016

Date of Department Faculty Vote: 10/26/2016

Yes 17 No 0 Abstain 0

APPROVALS:

June M. Ametkano

Personnel Committee Chair

10/26/2016
Date

Tom Jones

Department Head/School Director

10/26/16
Date

Nike Sfe

Dean

11/3/16
Date

APPROVED BY THE DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT STANDING
COMMITTEE ON: 17 Feb 2017

Judith A. Kueberg

[Signature]

Lucia McTague

[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.

A. Instructional Effectiveness

B. Scholarly and/or Creative Activity

C. Service Activity

II APPOINTMENT STANDARDS

	ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS AND ADDITIONAL CRITERIA
PROFESSOR	Doctorate in appropriate discipline and either five (5) years' successful and appropriate experiences in the discipline <u>or</u> expertise in a highly specialized field.
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Doctorate in appropriate discipline and either four (4) years' successful and appropriate experiences in the discipline <u>or</u> expertise in a highly specialized field.
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Doctorate in appropriate discipline and either four (4) years' successful and appropriate experiences in the discipline <u>or</u> expertise in a highly specialized field.
INSTRUCTOR	A.B.D. (The doctorate must be granted within one year of appointment.)
	Documentation of prior successful teaching experiences, <u>or</u> successful and appropriate experience in the discipline <u>or</u> expertise in a highly specialized field.
	Documentation which may be presented as necessary for meeting
	<p>Departmental appointment standards may include but not be limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Copies of written and signed teacher appraisal documents developed at another institution of higher education b. Copies of official student appraisal documents developed at another institution of higher education c. Evidence of recognition and/or honor for teaching excellence from any adult educational institution d. Evidence of at least five years successful and appropriate experience in the discipline or field in which the instructor will be assigned teaching duties e. Professional certification from a recognized agency and/or expertise in the professional field in which the instructor will be assigned teaching duties

**III REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS
For Untenured Faculty Hired After September 1, 2015**

PROFESSOR

Year	2	3
Evaluation	Full/R	Full/T
Instructional Effectiveness	A	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X*	DAA (or A if DAA in Service)
Service	A	DAA (or A if DAA in Scholarly)

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Year	2	4
Evaluation	Full/R	Full/T
Instructional Effectiveness	A	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X*	DAA (or A if DAA in Service)
Service	A	DAA in one/A in the other

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Year	3	5
Evaluation	Full/R ²	Full/T
Instructional Effectiveness	A	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X*	DAA (or A if DAA in Service)
Service	A	DAA (or A if DAA in Scholarly)

INSTRUCTOR

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

** Scholarly/Creative Activity rating is advisory only.*

IV. PROMOTION STANDARDS

	YEAR ELIGIBLE	ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS	INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS	SCHOLARLY /CREATIVE ACTIVITY	SERVICE
FULL PROFESSOR SALARY ADJUSTMENT	10 years as full professor at EMU				
TO PROFESSOR	5 years as associate professor at EMU	Doctorate in appropriate discipline	DAA in two out of three and E in the other		
TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	5 years as assistant professor at EMU	Doctorate in appropriate discipline	E in either Instructional Effectiveness or Scholarly/Creative Activity and DAA in the other		DAA
TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	2 years as instructor at EMU	Doctorate in appropriate discipline	DAA	DAA	DAA

V. EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

A. Instructional Effectiveness

Quantitative Rating

Consistent with the professional literature on student evaluations, global items will be utilized for summative purposes related to tenure and promotion. Although evaluation forms may also include specific items (related to factors such as curriculum, instruction, and evaluation), these specific items should be used only for formative purposes to improve one's effectiveness. The rating scale for Instructional Effectiveness is as follows:

1. Data Collection Procedures

Category 1: Student Evaluations

Student Evaluations					
"Overall, I rate this instructor as an effective teacher." AND "As a result of this course, I learned a significant amount."	8 pts	6 pts	4 pts	2 pts	0 pts
Percentage of Student Responses to the Items Above	60% "A"	60% "A" or "B"	60% "A", "B", or "C"	60% "A", "B", "C", or "D"	Other

Category 2: Peer and Department Head Evaluations

Peer and Department Head Evaluations					
“Overall, I rate this instructor as an effective teacher.”	4 pts	3 pts	2 pts	1 pts	0 pts
Percentage of Peer and Department Head Responses to the Item Above	60% “A”	60% “A” or “B”	60% “A”, “B”, or “C”	60% “A”, “B”, “C”, or “D”	Other

Category 3: Connecting Teaching to Scholarly Activity

The committee recommends that faculty be awarded points for connecting teaching activities to scholarship and practice:

	Connecting Teaching to Scholarly Activity	Points per activity
1	Creative or scholarly work that is disseminated in the classroom	Max. 1 point
2	Participation in Clinical Supervision activities (not a part of assigned course load) that are used to support instruction	1 point Max: 4 points
3	Participation in clinical or field-based practice activities that are used to support instruction	1 point Max: 4 points
4	Participation in independent study, masters, and/or specialist student research	1 point Max: 5 points
5	Participation on doctoral dissertation committees	1 point (Comm Member) 2 points (Chair) Max: 10 points

Category 4: Analysis of Instruction and Plans for Improvement

In addition to providing the quantitative evidence of instructional effectiveness, a positive recommendation for promotion or tenure in the Department of Leadership and Counseling also requires qualitative evidence of instructional effectiveness. Specifically, the faculty member must provide a narrative statement about his or her instructional effectiveness. To support this statement, the personnel committee recommends that the following “supplied questions” be added to the two overall core items:

ANALYSIS OF INSTRUCTION AND PLANS FOR IMPROVEMENT	
CONTENT (Curriculum)	
1	The instructor is knowledgeable about the course content.
2	The course content is useful and relevant.
3	The instructor demonstrates awareness of recent developments in the field.
4	The instructor is interested and enthusiastic about the course content.
METHODS (Instruction)	
5	The instructor is prepared for class sessions as reflected in the clarity and organization of classroom activities.

6	The instructor uses a variety of instructional methodologies in line with the needs of adult learners, including active engagement of students in their own learning.
7	The instructor fosters deep reflection relative to course content.
8	The instructor establishes mutual respect and rapport with students.
ASSESSMENT (Evaluation)	
9	The instructor presents clear course goals, objectives and expectations as evident in course materials (e.g., syllabus, readings/assignments, etc.) and course activities.
10	The instructor uses fair and reasonable methods of assessing student learning.
11	The instructor provides individualized and specific feedback to students.

The faculty member should draw upon the student responses to these “supplied questions” in their narrative. The narrative should include evidence of teaching strengths, areas of improvement, efforts to enhance instructional delivery (e.g., course modifications, mid-semester/early feedback from students, etc.) and professional development plans/activities to enrich instructional capacity in alignment with the areas of content, methods, and assessment.

Sample Rubric for Category 4 of Instructional Effectiveness

5 points	3 points	1 point
The narrative demonstrates that the faculty member has a clear conceptual framework which guides his/her instruction and connects theory to practice. The narrative includes a thorough analysis of strengths and areas of improvement using all 11 supplied items from the student evaluation forms, as well as additional sources of evidence (such as midterm evaluations and/or comments from students, peers, or the department head). This analysis leads logically to a clear and comprehensive plan for improvement, as well as evidence of efforts to implement this plan.	The narrative demonstrates that the faculty member connects theory to practice in their instruction. The narrative identifies instructional strengths and areas of improvement using most of 11 supplied items from the student evaluation forms. There is a plan for improvement, but no evidence of implementing this plan.	The narrative fails to demonstrate that the faculty member has a conceptual framework which guides instruction or connects theory to practice. The narrative identifies only one or two strengths or areas of improvement, and it fails to base any strengths or areas of improvement on the 11 supplied student evaluation items. There is no plan for improvement, or evidence of attempts to enhance instructional delivery.

The committee can award 4 points if they feel that the quality of the narrative fits between the first two columns or 2 points if the quality of the narrative fits between the last two columns.

2. Procedures of Classroom and/or Online Course visitation by peers and department head.

Committed to the goal of Instructional Effectiveness by all members of the Department, this Procedure for Classroom and or Online Course Visitations has been articulated in order to provide for a reasonable, orderly and effective visitation process by Peers and the Department Head. Classroom/Online Course visitations shall be conducted in compliance with the requirements of the Agreement between Eastern Michigan University (EMU) and the EMU Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Article XV.

The Classroom/Online Course Visitation Form (Appendix B) shall be used to evaluate and document the level of Instructional Effectiveness.

The follow-up actions to be expected after the visitation include a review of materials and development of a written evaluation of the classroom observations and is to be provided to the Faculty Member within five (5) working days following the visit

It is to be understood that the evaluation of Instructional Effectiveness shall include but not be limited to classroom/online course visitations by Peers and the Department Head, and may also include self-evaluation, student evaluations of teaching, assessment of academic advising of students, where appropriate, and other procedures identified elsewhere in the Document.

3. Ratings

RATING	SCALE
Exceptional (E):	8 points in Category 1, and a minimum of 26 points
Distinctly Above Average (DAA):	4 points (or more) in Category 1, and a minimum of 22 points
Average (A):	2 points (or more) in Category 1, and a minimum of 18 points
Below Average (BA):	Less than 2 points in Category 1, and less than 18 points

B. Scholarly and/or Creative Activity

1. Data Collection Procedures

Category 1	Juried Scholarship	Points per activity
1	Articles authored or co-authored, published in press or accepted in peer reviewed journals	3-5 points
2	Book/Texts authored or co-authored, edited or co-edited published, in press or accepted for publication	3-5 points
3	Book chapters authored or co-authored, published, in press or accepted for publication	3-5 points
4	Peer-Reviewed Handbook, Manual/Workbook, Monograph or Report	2-5 points
5	Journal Editing Responsibilities	2-5 points Max: 10 points
6	Peer-Reviewed Book Review authored or co-authored, published or accepted for publication	2 points

7	Paper, Presentation or Poster Session at professional conferences/colloquia	1-3 points Max: 12 points
Category 2	Other Scholarly Activity (maximum 10 points)	Points per activity
1	Development of projects, modules or training materials which are widely disseminated	1-2 points
2	Proposals for grants as specified in Article XV of the EMU-AAUP Agreement	1-3 points
3	Fellowships and awards that recognize scholarly achievement	2-3 points
4	Book Reviews authored or co-authored, published or accepted for publication (not peer reviewed, or juried)	1 point Max: 3 points
5	Pre-approved professional development activities related to program goals as specified in Article XV of the AAUP-EMU Agreement	Max. 1 point
6	Pre-approved professional retraining that complies with program goals as specified in Article XV of the AAUP-EMU Agreement	Max. 1 point
7	Other non-juried publications (including but not limited to newsletters, research briefs, bulletins)	1 point Max: 5 points

2. Ratings

RATING	SCALE
Exceptional (E):	A minimum of 20 points with at least one item from Category 1
Distinctly Above Average (DAA):	A minimum of 15 points with at least one item from Category 1
Average (A):	A minimum of 10 points with at least one item from Category 1
Below Average (BA):	Less than 10 points

RUBRIC FOR SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

**Sample Rubric for Quality Criteria for Scholarly/Creative Activity
Category 1 - Scholarly/Creative Activity**

Criteria	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points
1	X	X	Peer reviewed and published, in press or accepted for publication	National/International or lead/solo author or wide readership or < 50 percent acceptance rate or numerous citations or blind reviewed or empirical	National/International or lead/solo author or wide readership or < 50 percent acceptance rate or numerous citations and blind reviewed or empirical
2	X	X	Peer reviewed and published, in press or accepted for publication	1 of the following: lead/solo author, wide readership, or < 50 percent acceptance rate	2 or more of the following: lead/solo author, wide readership, or < 50 percent acceptance rate
3	X	X	Peer reviewed and published, in press or accepted for publication	1 of the following: lead/solo author, wide readership, or < 50 percent acceptance rate	2 or more of the following: lead/solo author, wide readership, or < 50 percent acceptance rate
4	X	Peer reviewed and published, in press or accepted for publication	1 of the following: National/International, lead/solo author, wide readership, < 50 percent acceptance rate, numerous citations, blind reviewed or empirical	2 or more of the following: National/International, lead/solo author, wide readership, < 50 percent acceptance rate, numerous citations, blind reviewed or empirical	3 or more of the following: National/International, lead/solo author, wide readership, < 50 percent acceptance rate, numerous citations, blind reviewed or empirical
5	X	Editorial responsibilities (guest reviewer) for a peer reviewed journal	Editorial Board responsibilities (article reviewer or guest editor) for a peer reviewed journal	National/International or wide readership or < 50 percent acceptance rate or numerous citations or managing editor	National/International or wide readership or < 50 percent acceptance rate or numerous citations and managing editor
6	X	Peer Reviewed Integrates additional professional literature	X	X	X
7	Peer Reviewed poster session OR Invited local, state or regional presentation based on your expertise	Invited national presentation based on your area of expertise OR Peer reviewed paper at local, state or regional conference OR Keynote address at local, state or regional conference based on area of expertise	Peer Reviewed Paper at National/International conference OR Keynote speaker at National/International conference based on area of expertise	X	X

Sample Rubric for Quality Criteria for Scholarly Activity Category 2 - Scholarly/Creative Activity			
Criteria	1 point	2 points	3 points
1		Wide Distribution/Readership OR Published by ___ OR Lead or Solo Author OR Grant Funded	X
2	Application/Proposal submitted	Substantial application/proposal submitted (e.g., NSF, NIMH, Kellogg, SAMSHA or DOE) OR Funded grant proposals	Funded grant proposals in excess of \$100,000 OR Large-scale dissemination
3		National/International fellowship AND Highly prestigious (e.g., Fulbright)	X
4	Non-peer reviewed book reviews that are co/authored and published. (Peer reviewed book reviews are included in Category I)	X	X
5	Professional development activities related to program goals as specified in Article XV of the AAUP-EMU Agreement	X	X
6	Professional retraining that complies with program goals as specified in Article XV of the AAUP-EMU Agreement	X	X
7	Non-peer reviewed publications		

C. Service Activity

1. Data Collection Procedures

Service Activity includes but is not limited to the following:

Criterion	Description	Points per activity per year
Internal to Eastern Michigan University		
1.	Attendance and Participation at Department and Program Meetings	1 point Max: 1 point
2.	Participation in program standing or ad-hoc committees, including but not limited to input committees and task groups.	1-3 points Max: 6 points
3.	Participation in departmental standing or ad-hoc committees, including but not limited to input committees and task groups.	1-3 points Max: 6 points
4.	Participation in college standing or ad-hoc committees, including but not limited to input committees and task groups.	1-3 points Max: 6 points
5.	Participation in university standing or ad-hoc committees, including but not limited to input committees, task groups, and AAUP	1-3 points Max: 6 points
6.	Participation in preparation of self-study, program review, and accreditation processes including department research such as student surveys and follow-up studies	1-3 points Max: 6 points
7.	Professional assistance/service to program, department, college and university programs and projects, including but not limited to classroom presentations and in-service activities	1 point Max: 6 points
8.	Student advising load (which is significantly higher than department average), as evidenced by number of assigned advisees, and advising/recruitment sessions at external sites	3 points
9.	Major advising responsibilities for student organizations	1 point Max: 4 points
External to Eastern Michigan University		
10.	Leadership in professional associations, such as elective offices, active involvement in major committees, and/or acceptance of major responsibilities	3 points Max: 6 points
11.	Selection for ongoing, professional consulting/service activities to educational or community agencies pertaining to the faculty members' area of specialization	1-3 points Max: 6 points
12.	Counseling services provided to individuals, group, or the community	1 point Max: 3 points
13.	Participation in grant-funded activities	1 point Max: 3 points

2. Ratings

RATING	SCALE
Exceptional (E)	A minimum of 35 points including item 1
Distinctly Above Average (DAA)	A minimum of 25 points including item 1
Average (A)	A minimum of 15 points including item 1
Below Average (BA)	Less than 15 points

Sample Rubric for Quality Criteria for Service Activity

Criteria	1 point	2 points	3 points
2 - 6	Membership	Significant Responsibilities	Formal leadership role (Chair, Secretary, etc.)
11	Single day, unpaid, or small honorarium	Includes a formal contractual agreement (as evidenced by a contract, memorandum of agreement, 1099 tax forms) OR represents ongoing work over a multiple year period	Includes a formal contractual agreement (as evidenced by a contract, memorandum of agreement, or 1099 tax forms) AND represents ongoing work over a multiple year period.

APPENDIX A

Classroom and Online Course Visitation Reports

Procedures for Classroom or Online Course visitation by peers and department head.

Committed to the goal of Instructional Effectiveness by all members of the Department, these Procedures for Classroom or Online Course Visitations have been articulated in order to provide for a reasonable, orderly and effective visitation process by Peers and the Department Head. Classroom or Online Course visitations shall be conducted in compliance with the requirements of the Agreement between Eastern Michigan University (EMU) and the EMU Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Article XV.

It is to be understood that the evaluation of Instructional Effectiveness shall include but not be limited to classroom/online course visitations by Peers and the Department Head, and may also include self-evaluation, student evaluations of teaching, assessment of academic advising of students, where appropriate, and other procedures identified elsewhere in the Document.

APPENDIX B

Classroom/In Person Course Observation

The observer will discuss with the instructor the general intent of the course, general course goals, specific goals of the instructor for the session, and topical area of discussion. The instructor will provide materials which may be helpful to the observer. In the case of an online course visitation, the visitor shall review only one module of the online course.

Date:

Name of Observer:

Instructor:

Course Prefix and Number (e.g., EDLD 509):

Course Title:

Please evaluate this instructor on the following statement:

"Overall, the effectiveness of this instructor is..."

- A. Much Above Average
- B. Above Average
- C. Average
- D. Below Average
- E. Much Below Average

Please provide the instructor with any observations or feedback in the following areas:

1. Course Content/Curriculum (knowledge, relevance, awareness, etc.)

2. Teaching/Instructional Methods (preparation, diversity of approaches, student/instructor engagement, etc.)

3. Student Feedback/Assessment (clarity of goals, appropriateness of assessment, individualized feedback, etc.)

Signature of Instructor _____ Date _____

Signature of Observer _____ Date _____

Online Course Observation

The observer will discuss with the instructor the general intent of the course, general course goals, specific goals of the instructor for the session, and topical area of discussion. The instructor will provide materials which may be helpful to the observer. In the case of an online course visitation, the visitor shall review only one module of the online course.

Date:

Name of Observer:

Instructor:

Course Prefix and Number (e.g., EDLD 509):

Course Title:

Please evaluate this instructor on the following statement:

"Overall, the effectiveness of this instructor is..."

- F. Much Above Average
- G. Above Average
- H. Average
- I. Below Average
- J. Much Below Average

Please provide the instructor with any observations or feedback in the following areas:

4. Course Content/Curriculum (knowledge, relevance, awareness, etc.)

5. Teaching/Instructional Methods (preparation, diversity of approaches, student/instructor engagement, etc.)

6. Student Feedback/Assessment (clarity of goals, appropriateness of assessment, individualized feedback, etc.)

Signature of Instructor _____ Date _____

Signature of Observer _____ Date _____

APPENDIX C

Student Evaluation Questions

Instructor and Course Evaluation Form For use in on ground/in person courses

Core Items:

WHAT IS YOUR OVERALL RATING OF THE TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS OF THIS INSTRUCTOR?

WHATE IS YOUR OVERALL RATING OF THIS COURSE?

LEADERSHIP & COUNSELIG DEPARTMENTAL QUESTION SET

As a result of this course, I have learned a significant amount.

The instructor is knowledgeable about the course content.

The course content is useful and relevant.

The instructor demonstrates awareness of recent developments in the field.

The instructor is interested in and enthusiastic about the course content.

The instructor is prepared for class sessions as reflected in the clarity and organization of classroom activities.

The instructor uses a variety of instructional methodologies in line with the needs of adult learners, including active engagement of students in their own learning.

The instructor fosters deep reflection relative to course content.

The instructor establishes mutual respect and rapport with students.

The instructor presents clear course goals, objectives and expectations as evident in course materials (e.g., syllabus, readings/assignments, etc.) and course activities.

The instructor uses fair and reasonable methods of assessing student learning.

The instructor provides individualized and specific feedback to students.

Student Evaluation Questions

Instructor and Course Evaluation Form For use in online courses

Core Items:

WHAT IS YOUR OVERALL RATING OF THE TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS OF THIS INSTRUCTOR?

WHAT IS YOUR OVERALL RATING OF THIS COURSE?

LEADERSHIP & COUNSELING DEPARTMENTAL QUESTION SET

As a result of this course, I have learned a significant amount.

The instructor is knowledgeable about the course content.

The course content is useful and relevant.

The instructor demonstrates awareness of recent developments in the field.

The instructor is interested in and enthusiastic about the course content.

The instructor is prepared for class sessions as reflected in the clarity and organization of classroom activities.

The instructor uses a variety of instructional methodologies in line with the needs of adult learners, including active engagement of students in their own learning.

The instructor fosters deep reflection relative to course content.

The instructor establishes mutual respect and rapport with students.

The instructor presents clear course goals, objectives and expectations as evident in course materials (e.g., syllabus, readings/assignments, etc.) and course activities.

The instructor uses fair and reasonable methods of assessing student learning.

The instructor provides individualized and specific feedback to students.

APPENDIX D

Procedures for Faculty Evaluation

Evaluations shall be initiated in order that all reappointment, tenure, promotion, Professional Performance Evaluations of tenured Faculty, and termination decisions may be made in accordance with the time schedules provided the Faculty Contract.

It is recognized that the evaluation process is a continuing one, intended for constructive purposes. The Department Head shall provide regular opportunity to discuss professional evaluation and to offer assistance to the Faculty Member in the improvement of his/her professional performance.

Evaluations shall not be conducted during a term that a Faculty Member is on leave (as provided for in Articles XI and/or XII) of the Faculty Contract.