

Eastern Michigan University
Office of Academic Human Resources
Memorandum

To: Martha Kinney-Sedgwick, Department Head
Teacher Education

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 Teacher Education 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.

DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT

Department/School of Teacher Education

College of Education

Date of Last DED Revision: April, 2012

Date of Department Faculty Vote: 10/14/2016

Yes 17 No 1 Abstain 3

APPROVALS:

[Handwritten Signature]

10-14-16

Personnel Committee Chair (Date)

[Handwritten Signature] 10-21-16

Department Head/School Director (Date)

[Handwritten Signature] 11/3/16

Dean

(Date)

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

[Handwritten Signature]

[Handwritten Signature]

[Handwritten Signature]

[Handwritten Signature]

DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT

Department of Teacher Education

College of Education

Eastern Michigan University

Adopted _____

Revised _____

Martha Kinney-Sedgwick, Head
Department of Teacher Education

Date

Michael Sayler, Dean
College of Education

Date

Rhonda Longworth, Interim Provost and
Executive Vice President, Academic and
Student Affairs

Date

Table of Contents

FACULTY EVALUATION	3
I. CRITERIA	3
II. DEPARTMENT APPOINTMENT STANDARDS	4
III. REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS	5
IV. PROMOTION STANDARDS	7
V. DEPARTMENTAL TECHNIQUES FOR MEASURING ACHIEVEMENT OF EVALUATION CRITERIA AND EXPLANATIONS OF RATINGS	7
<i>Instructional Effectiveness</i>	7
<i>Scholarly and/or Creative Activity</i>	9
<i>Service Activity</i>	10
Appendix A-1: Approved Questions for Student Evaluation of Faculty Member	12
Appendix A-2: Approved Questions for Online Student Evaluation of Faculty Member	13
Appendices B and C: Department Head and Peer Classroom Visitation Forms	15
Appendix B – 1: Faculty Observation Form	16
Appendix B – 2: Teacher Education Department, Faculty Online Observation Form	19

Department Evaluation Document

FACULTY EVALUATION

Each department shall conduct faculty evaluations using criteria, procedures and techniques specified in its Departmental Evaluation Document and the Agreement between Eastern Michigan University (EMU) and the EMU Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Article XV.

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. DEPARTMENT APPOINTMENT STANDARDS

	ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS and ADDITIONAL CRITERIA	EQUIVALENCIES or EXCEPTIONS to TEACHING EXPERIENCE
PROFESSOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earned doctorate, and • Five years college-level teaching experience as Associate Professor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience as an educational administrator, instructional director, etc.; or • Scholarly/creative activity acceptable as for tenured Associate Professor • P-12
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earned doctorate, and • Five years college-level teaching experience as Assistant Professor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience as an educational administrator, instructional director, etc.; or • Scholarly/creative activity acceptable as for tenured Assistant Professor • P-12
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earned doctorate or ABD • Earned doctorate expected within 2 years* 	None
INSTRUCTOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earned doctorate 	None

*Earned doctorate is required for tenure.

III. REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS
(For Untenured Faculty Hired Prior to September 1, 2015)

PROFESSOR

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

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Year	1	2	3	4
Evaluation	Interim	Full/R	Interim	Full/T
Instructional Effectiveness	A	A	A	DAA
Scholarly/creative Activity		*		A
Service	A	A	A	A

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Year	1	2	3	4	5
Evaluation	Interim	Interim	Full/R	Comp Interim	Full/T
Instructional Effectiveness	A	A	A	A	DAA
Scholarly/creative Activity			*		A
Service	A	A	A	A	A

INSTRUCTOR

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6
Evaluation	Interim	Interim	Full/R	Comp Interim	Comp Interim	Full/T
Instructional Effectiveness	A	A	A	A	A	DAA
Scholarly/creative Activity			*			A
Service	A	A	A	A	A	A

*Scholarly/Creative Activity is rated for advisory purposes only
 (Rank at initial appointment shall determine the evaluation schedule.)

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

PROFESSOR

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

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

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

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

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

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	Earned doctorate	DAA	DAA	DAA
TO PROFESSOR	5 years as associate professor at EMU	Earned doctorate	DAA	DAA	DAA
TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	5 years as assistant professor at EMU	Earned doctorate	DAA	DAA	DAA
TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	2 years as instructor at EMU	Earned doctorate	DAA	DAA in one and A in the other	
	4 years as instructor at EMU	Earned doctorate	DAA	A	A

V. DEPARTMENTAL TECHNIQUES FOR MEASURING ACHIEVEMENT OF EVALUATION CRITERIA AND EXPLANATIONS OF RATINGS

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.

Instructional Effectiveness

Supportive to this criterion is evidence that the candidate:

1. Prepares for teaching

- a. Seeks latest information in the subject area(s) taught, by reading, attending professional conferences and/or by communicating with colleagues.
- b. Participates creatively in the subject area through the development of teaching materials such as course outlines, preparation of handbooks, development of videotapes, preparation of annotated bibliographies, and other similar activities.
- c. Regularly evaluates his/her own past teaching methods, procedures, and course content.

2. Plans effectively for teaching

- a. Has a clear idea of the function of his/her course(s) within the Department, within the University and/or community, and of its role in preparing students for careers.

- b. Has a clear idea of the long-term objectives for the course(s) and for the day-to-day classroom activities.
 - c. Has a clear and relevant plan of action to accomplish both long and short-term objectives.
 - d. Uses acceptable evaluation procedures in evaluating students so as 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 of units of study in the course(s) through course outlines, etc.
 - b. Helps students develop methods of study and skills in self-direction.
 - c. Keeps students informed of specific responsibilities (e.g., equipment usage, study requirements).
 - d. Endeavors to establish good communication with students. Example: returns student papers promptly.
 - e. Promotes classroom procedures and surroundings, which encourage learning.
 - f. Regularly seeks information from students regarding their levels of attainment and informs them of his/her estimation of their performance.
4. Is committed to students
- a. Available to students who need his/her help.
 - b. Works beyond regular classroom responsibilities to help students with independent learning experiences (e.g., special problems, independent study, thesis, and publication(s)).
 - c. Keeps up-to-date regarding practices and procedures necessary for academic advising.
 - d. Assists students with academic problems.
 - e. Serves as Academic Advisor, Program Coordinator, or Graduate Coordinator when released time is provided. When released time is not provided, see service.
5. Program or Course Development
- a. Takes an active role in preparing new courses or programs.

Evaluation Reports

1. The Faculty Member's own report of activities and accomplishments in this area.
2. Department Head evaluations of teaching, including classroom visits (*see Appendices B and C for Department Head classroom visitation form and visitation procedures*).
3. Colleague evaluations of teaching, including classroom visits (*see Appendices B and C form for Peer classroom visitation form and visitation procedures*).
4. Student evaluations of teaching (*see Appendix A for Student evaluation questions*).
5. Student evaluation of advising.

Ratings

Exceptional (E):

Awarded when the overall quality of instruction offered by the applicant shall be evaluated as that of a truly superior teacher. Evaluators must describe performance in terms of selected supporting activities as better in quality than distinctly above average (DAA).

Distinctly Above Average (DAA):

Awarded for outstanding quality of instruction in some supportive activities. Evaluators must describe performance in terms of selected supporting activities as noticeably better in quality than average (A).

Average (A):

The minimal acceptable level of performance for a good teacher. All listed supporting activities must be present in applicant's teaching performance at an acceptable level. Evaluators must describe performance in these terms.

Below Average (BA):

Awarded for unacceptable level of performance. Considering all listed supporting activities, the applicant's teaching performance is determined to be at an unacceptable level. Evaluators must describe performance in terms of unacceptability.

Scholarly and/or Creative Activity**Data Collection Procedures**

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

1. Lectures and/or university appropriate consultative activities for professional organizations, government agencies, other universities, etc., pertaining to the faculty member's area(s) of specialization.
2. Post-doctoral fellowship.
3. Research in progress which has been disseminated to others.
4. Publication of scholarly and/or creative works: research, books, articles, proceedings, columns, instructional materials, and lab manuals.
5. Written critical reviews of published professional materials that advance the knowledge base of the discipline.
6. Contribution of data, chapters, or illustrative material to another's publication.
7. Acting as editor on a manuscript for a publisher or journal.
8. Participation in the development of research grant proposals as specified in the Agreement.
9. Creative or scholarly work disseminated in public performance or presentation at professional meetings.
10. Co-authorship of publications.
11. Local and other activities that involve any type of inquiry or creative activities enhancing or informing the profession of education.

Criteria

The Personnel Committee reserves the right to judge the quality of a particular Scholarly/Creative Activity. Evaluation will be based on the quality of the work, taking into account the number 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.

Ratings

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

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 subject area by the intended audience (i.e., has led students beyond the level of current textbook knowledge, provided the discipline with significant new facts or interpretation of old facts, or directions of research, helped direct a publisher or a granting agency to support good work or discourage bad, etc). Evaluators must describe in terms which show how quality and/or quantity exceed distinctly above average.

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

Average (A): Awarded when the research and scholarly activity offered by the applicant offers a relatively small increment of knowledge or understanding or has restricted dissemination of work in progress in early stages of development.

Below Average (BA): Awarded when the research and scholarly activity presented by the applicant is less than that required for an average rating.

Service Activity

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.

Criteria

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

- A. Attendance at, and participation in, departmental and program area meetings.
- B. Membership in departmental standing or ad hoc committees.
- C. Serving as undergraduate or graduate academic advisor when released time is not provided.
- D. Serving in a leadership capacity in various co-curricular student activities of the department.
- E. Evidence that the applicant has assisted colleagues in departmental activities and in identifying needs in the department.
- F. Serving as Program Area Coordinator or Graduate Coordinator when released time is not provided.
- G. Serving as a mentor for new faculty or lecturers.
- H. Serving on review panel for grant proposals for EMU or outside agencies.
- I. Grant related service activities at EMU, schools and communities, including grants, funded or unfunded grant proposals, and grant administration which do not meet the criteria for Scholarly/Creative Activity.
- J. Other appropriate departmental service.

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

1. Membership in an interdepartmental committee or council.
2. Membership in the Advisory Council of the College of Education
3. Membership in a council, committee or subcommittee as established by the faculty input system at the college level.

4. Membership in a council, committee or subcommittee at the university level.
5. Other extra-departmental service such as:
 - a. activities in support of college and university committees
 - b. student activities
 - c. professionally related community affairs
 - d. service to professional educational organizations

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.

Distinctly Above Average (DAA):

Awarded when the quantity and quality 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; one's fair share.

Below Average: (BA):

Awarded when the quality and quantity of service shall be evaluated as less than average.

Appendix A-1: Approved Questions for Student Evaluation of Faculty Member

1. Overall rating of the teaching effectiveness of this instructor. (Please check one)

A B C D E

2. Overall rating of this course. (Please check one)

A B C D E

3. My instructor displays a clear understanding of course topics. (Please check one)

A B C D E

4. My instructor seems well prepared for class. (Please check one)

A B C D E

5. My instructor has stimulated my thinking. (Please check one)

A B C D E

6. My instructor readily maintains rapport with this class. (Please check one)

A B C D E

7. I can apply information/skills learned in this course. (Please check one)

A B C D E

8. Grades are assigned fairly and impartially. (Please check one)

A B C D E

9. Assignments are of definite instructional value. (Please check one)

A B C D E

10. My instructor respects students from diverse cultural backgrounds. (Please check one)

11. My instructor respects students regardless of sex, age or race. (Please check one)

A B C D E

Faculty may elect to add optional items to the EMU Instructor and Course Evaluation Form.

Appendix A-2: Approved Questions for Online Student Evaluation of Faculty Member

Using Graham, Cagiltay, Lim, Craner and Duffy's (2001) framework which includes seven principles of effective online teaching (and is based on Chickering and Gamson's 1987 work), the following proposed online questions are consistent with the best practices in online learning.

Establishing student-faculty contact guidelines

1. The instructor was present in the course in a manner that supported student learning. (multiple sources)
2. The instructor attempted to build rapport with the class during the first weeks of the course. (multiple sources)

Encouraging cooperation among students

3. The instructor created a sense of community in the course that supported student learning.
4. Expectations regarding student interaction (frequency and quality) were clearly stated. (multiple sources)

Encouraging active learning

5. The course content and assessments were appropriate for online course delivery. (multiple sources)
6. The course design made good use of online tools for communication and learning. (multiple sources)

Feedback

7. The instructor provided timely feedback to questions and course assignments. (multiple sources)
8. The instructor provided feedback in a time period that supported student learning (Michigan Community College Association Virtual Learning Collaborative, n.d.)

Time on Task

9. The instructor listed deadlines for course assignments. (multiple sources)
10. Content was organized and course materials were visually and functionally consistent throughout the course (USM Learning Enhancement Center, n.d.)

Communicating high expectations

11. Course expectations/activities were clear. (multiple sources)
12. Course instructions made it clear how to get started and where to find various course components. (CMU, n.d.)

Respecting diverse talents and ways of learning

13. Appropriate visual and auditory tools were integrated within the course to achieve learning objectives (USM Learning Enhancement Center, n.d.)
14. Multimedia files have a specific purpose in line with course goals and objectives (Illinois Online Network, n.d.)

Appendices B and C: Department Head and Peer Classroom Visitation Forms

Activity/Lesson Observed:

Comments/Conference:

Appendix B – 1: Faculty Observation Form
Eastern Michigan University
Teacher Education Department

Faculty Observation

Name: _____ Date/Time: _____

Course: _____ Class Format: _____

Number of Students in Attendance: _____

I. *Purposes and Objectives:*

II. *Requested Areas for Feedback:*

Observer's Signature: _____

Observee's Signature: _____

Appendix B – 1
Teacher Education Department, EMU
Faculty Observation Form (continued)

Using the preceding topics, discuss:

A. Areas of Strength:

B. Areas for Development:

Appendix B – 2
Teacher Education Department, EMU
Faculty Online Observation Form

Name: _____ Date/Time Accessed: _____

Course: _____ Class Format: **Online**

Number of Students Registered: _____

Additional instructional materials the instructor desired the observer to witness (e.g. threaded discussion, chat logs, evidence of feedback of interactions within the course and without violating student privacy, announcements, online resources).

I. *Purposes and Objectives:*

II. *Requested Areas for Feedback:*

Observer's Signature: _____

Observee's Signature: _____

Appendix B – 2
Teacher Education Department,
EMU Faculty Observation Form (continued)

The following topics are suggested as areas for analysis and discussion:

- A. **Organization of content (e.g. clarity of purpose and instruction, logical sequence of instruction and appropriate pacing, online lesson navigation)**
- B. **Knowledge of subject matter (both theoretical and practical issues)**
- C. **Interpersonal interactions and rapport (demonstrations of both teacher-student interactions and interaction among students through such mediums of online discussions, logs of interactions, evidence of feedback)**
- D. **Use of teaching methods and resources which engage students actively in the learning process**
- E. **Other observation notes:**