

Eastern Michigan University
Office of Academic Human Resources
Memorandum

To: Michael Williams, Department Head
School of Nursing

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 School of Nursing 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 (DED)

School of Nursing

College of Health and Human Services

Date of Last DED Revisions: 10-21-2016

Date of Department Faculty Vote:

Yes: 25 No: 0 Abstain: 0

APPROVALS:

L. M. Raymond 11-3-16
Personnel Committee Chair (Date)

Michael P. Sullivan 11/3/16
School Director (Date)

M. Mahan 11/29/16
Dean (Date)

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

Judith A. Kullberg
Lucia McLaughlin

[Signature]
[Signature]

EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

School of Nursing

College of Health and Human Services

DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT (DED)

**Faculty Evaluation
Criteria, Procedures, and Techniques**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. CRITERIA & EVALUATED AREAS	3
II. APPOINTMENT STANDARDS	4
III. REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS	5
IV. PROMOTION STANDARDS: NURSING	7
V. EVALUATION TECHNIQUES	8
A. INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS	8
B. SCHOLARLY AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY	11
C. SERVICE ACTIVITY	15
APPENDIX A: Self, Peer, and Director Evaluation of Instructional Effectiveness: In Classroom or Clinical	18
APPENDIX B: Self, Peer, and Director Evaluation of Instructional Effectiveness: Online Classroom	21
APPENDIX C: Student evaluation items for inclusion on the University Instructor and Course Evaluation forms.	223

DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION DOCUMENT

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 & EVALUATED AREAS

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. EVALUATED AREAS

1. Instructional Effectiveness

Instructional Effectiveness will be evaluated for each faculty member utilizing the criteria set forth in the Agreement and this Departmental Evaluation Document that follows.

2. Scholarly/Creative Activity

Scholarly/Creative Activity will be evaluated for each faculty member utilizing the criteria set forth in the Agreement and this Departmental Evaluation Document that follows.

3. Service

Service Activities will be evaluated for each Faculty member utilizing the criteria set forth in the Agreement and this Departmental Evaluation Document that follows.

II. DEPARTMENT STANDARDS

A. APPOINTMENT STANDARDS

	ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS AND ADDITIONAL CRITERIA	EQUIVALENCIES or EXCEPTIONS
PROFESSOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doctorate in Nursing (or doctorate in a related field with a Master's in Nursing) • Current Unrestricted Nursing License in Michigan • 8 years combined clinical practice and teaching experience (at least 4 years teaching nursing) • Evidence of scholarly/creative activities commensurate with rank (see promotion standards for rank) 	None
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doctorate in Nursing (or doctorate in a related field with a Master's in Nursing) • Current Unrestricted Nursing License in Michigan • 6 years combined clinical practice & teaching experience (at least 2 years teaching nursing) • Evidence of scholarly/creative activities commensurate with rank (see promotion standards for rank) 	None
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doctorate in Nursing (or doctorate in a related field with a Master's in Nursing) • Current Unrestricted Nursing License in Michigan • 4 years combined clinical practice & teaching experience (at least 2 years teaching nursing) • Evidence of scholarly/creative activities commensurate with rank (see promotion standards for rank) 	None
INSTRUCTOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doctorate in Nursing (or doctorate in a related field with a Master's in Nursing) • Current Unrestricted Nursing license in Michigan • 2 years combined clinical practice & teaching experience (at least 1 year teaching nursing) 	None

III. REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS

The tables below each faculty rank represent the evaluation schedule and criteria for untenured faculty hired before September 1, 2015.

Rank: Professor

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

Rank: Associate Professor

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

Rank: Assistant Professor

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

Rank: Instructor

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

Legend: A = Average, DAA = Distinctly Above Average, X = Not Evaluated, * = Scholarly/Creative Activity is rated, but advisory only. Rank at initial appointment shall determine the evaluation schedule.

The tables below each faculty rank represent the evaluation schedule and criteria for untenured faculty hired on or after September 1, 2015.

Rank: Professor

Year	2	3
Evaluation	Full/R*	Full/Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA	DAA
Scholarly Activity	A	DAA in one and A in other
Service	A	

Rank: Associate Professor

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

Rank: Assistant Professor

Year	3	5
Evaluation	Full/R*	Full/Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA	DAA
Scholarly Activity	X	DAA in one and A in other
Service	A	

Rank: Instructor

Year	3	6
Evaluation	Full/R*	Full/Tenure
Instructional Effectiveness	DAA	DAA
Scholarly Activity	X	DAA in one and A in other
Service	A	

Legend: A = Average, DAA = Distinctly Above Average, X = Not Evaluated, * = Scholarly/Creative Activity is rated, but advisory only. Rank at initial appointment shall determine the evaluation schedule.

IV. PROMOTION STANDARDS: NURSING

	YEAR ELIGIBLE	ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS	INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS	SCHOLARLY / CREATIVE ACTIVITY	SERVICE
TO PROFESSOR	5 years as Associate Professor at EMU	-Doctorate in Nursing (or doctorate in a related field with a Master's in Nursing) -Current Unrestricted Nursing License in Michigan	DAA	DAA	A
				A	DAA

TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	5 years as an Assistant Professor at EMU	-Doctorate in Nursing (or doctorate in a related field with a Master's in Nursing) -Current Unrestricted Nursing License in Michigan	DAA	DAA	A
				A	DAA

TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	2 years as Instructor at EMU	- Doctorate in Nursing (or doctorate in a related field with a Master's in Nursing) - Current Unrestricted Nursing license in Michigan	DAA	DAA	A
				A	DAA

Equivalencies accepted for appointment to initial rank apply to initial (i.e., first) promotion.

Legend: A = Average, DAA = Distinctly Above Average, E = Exceptional

V. EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

A. INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

With respect to Instruction (and advising), Faculty Members have responsibility to engage in pursuits that enable them to be current in their respective disciplines, to continually improve their understanding of the learning process and use of pedagogical methods that promote learning, to provide students with clear and explicit expectations, and to be available for consultation on academic matters with their students. The Faculty Member must maintain a high level of knowledge and expertise in his/her discipline.

1. Data Collection Procedures

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

Evaluation for all Faculty members shall include at least the following types of evaluation of teaching: Self-evaluations, Peer evaluations, School Director Evaluations, and Student evaluations.

To complete these evaluations the School of Nursing shall utilize:

- a. Approved forms for Self, Peer, and School Director Evaluations of Instructional Effectiveness (Appendix A for Clinical & In-Class Evaluation; Appendix B for Online Evaluation).
- b. A set of approved questions that are listed on the student's Instructor and Course Evaluation forms. They shall include the two core items plus no less than an additional six items appropriate for the course format as determined by a vote of faculty members. The items for face-to-face classroom courses, hybrid courses, fully online courses, and clinical courses are found in Appendix C.
- c. A procedure for classroom/clinical visitations.

2. Procedures of Classroom Visitation by Peers & Department Head

The School Director and the Personnel Committee evaluates the applicant in the classroom (In-Class or Online) and/or in the clinical setting as directed by the Agreement.

Individually, the School Director and assigned Personnel Committee peer evaluator communicate with the Faculty Member to plan for the evaluation. The faculty being evaluated and the peer/colleague evaluator and School Director agree upon the date and classroom setting, online lesson, and/or clinical to be visited. Like In-Class or clinical evaluations, if the visit is to an online unit, the specific unit must be indicated and all related material must be available upon request. The faculty being evaluated shall provide a copy of the objectives for the class or clinical at the beginning of the visit. The faculty being evaluated shall inform the students of the date, time and purpose of the peer/colleague and School Director classroom and/or clinical visit.

Copies of the written Peer/Colleague and School Director evaluations are provided to the Faculty Member within five working days of the visit before being placed in the School file. Rationale for the evaluative statements must be documented. Additionally, the Faculty Member shall be entitled to up to two additional peer/colleague evaluations by faculty chosen in mutual agreement of the Faculty Member and the School Director.

3. Ratings

When creating the narrative evidence for rating faculty should use headings that explicitly address each of the rating criteria for each level of rating they are writing in support of. Failure to organize content that directly addresses specific criteria jeopardizes the ability of the evaluator to determine the applicant's attainment of the specific criteria elements. It is not the evaluator's role to determine attainment for specific criteria elements if the applicant fails to directly address specific elements defined in this document. Criteria elements not addressed should be considered unmet by applicant. The evaluator shall give specific rationale for the ratings awarded (i.e., precisely how activities claimed do or do not meet criteria standards).

a. Exceptional (E):

Awarded when the faculty member fulfills all criteria for Average and Distinctly Above Average and:

- (1) Demonstrates strong interest in the teaching process by using a wide range of teaching techniques.
- (2) Develops original teaching material, e.g., assignments, slides, videotapes, overhead projector materials, games, exercises, simulations, case materials, innovative supplementary handouts for either the classroom or clinical use.
- (3) Maintains professional competence in area of expertise or specialization in nursing.
- (4) Stimulates student enthusiasm and interest in subject matter by encouraging student involvement in the teaching/learning experience and in mutual exploration of the subject matter.

b. Distinctly Above Average (DAA):

Awarded when the Faculty Member satisfactorily fulfills the criteria for Average (stated above) and:

- (1) Demonstrates flexibility in one's approach to class/clinical material and the methods used in presenting the material.

- (2) Identifies resources and learning experiences that will facilitate the student's own learning.
- (3) Promotes improved teaching by sharing knowledge, insights, methods, and materials with colleagues, clinical agency personnel, and with others in the health care/education profession.

c. Average (A):

Awarded when the Faculty Member fulfills the criteria stated below.

- (1) Prepares for teaching by performing activities such as on-going self-evaluation of one's teaching methods, techniques, procedures, tools and learning experiences and on-going self-development by remaining up-to-date with one's discipline through journals, professional conferences and collegial interaction.
- (2) Plans effectively for teaching by performing activities such as stating expectations for class/clinical/online including class/clinical/online objectives and description, specific requirements, grading procedures and content outlines and identifying clinical/class learning experiences that are supportive of the course/clinical objectives.
- (3) Practices effective teaching methods by performing activities such as delivering class/clinical/online content in a clear and organized way, teaching clinical/course content as specified in course syllabi and overall program objectives, demonstrating respect for students in the learning situation, expressing and demonstrating the philosophy and ethics of the represented professionals (e.g. Code of Ethics of the American Nurses Association and assisting in developing syllabus by identifying appropriate objectives required/ recommended reading for assigned topics and other requirements related to specific agency and learning experiences.
- (4) Shows commitment to students by performing activities such as meeting class/clinicals as scheduled, returning assignments promptly, being readily available to students in the clinical setting, holding office hours per agreement to assist students in functioning and performance related to course and clinical work.
- (5) Practices evaluation methods by performing activities such as fairly and objectively evaluating student performance in the clinical and classroom environment and demonstrating that evaluation measures adequately cover the material presented.
- (6) Gives evidence of a sense of responsibility to teaching by demonstrating an increasing knowledge of the content area being taught.

d. Below Average (BA):

- (1) Any Activity that falls below the criteria for average.

B. SCHOLARLY AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

With respect to Scholarly/Creative Activity, Faculty Members have responsibility to engage in pursuits that help to further organize and contribute to growth of the body of knowledge in their respective disciplines, and/or to explore interdisciplinary implications.

Within the discipline in nursing, scholarly and/or creative activities fall into three categories: Discovery, Applied Research and Clinical Nursing Practice. Discovery is research of an original and/or previously unreported nature (e.g., primary data collection and analysis & secondary data analysis using quantitative and/or qualitative methods, philosophical inquiry/theory development). Applied Research includes the scholarly analysis of existing research which results in the development of new data, information, applications and/or interpretation (e.g., integrative or systematic literature reviews, and meta-analyses). Lastly, Clinical Nursing Practices involves direct patient care and content developed using an evidence-based process (e.g., translational research) to improve the quality of health outcomes of individuals, families, groups or communities.

Retraining, professional development, grant development/administration, and doctoral dissertation research as defined by the AAUP/EMU contract may be used as acceptable substitutes for scholarly/creative activities.

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

- a. Books published (author, co-author or editor)
- b. Book chapters published (author or co-authored).
- c. An authored or co-authored article published in a peer-reviewed journal, e-text or online form
- d. An authored or co-authored article published in a non-peer reviewed journal. Jury selected paper or podium presentations - international, national, state, local levels
- e. Non-jury selected paper presentations - international, national, state, local levels
- f. Jury selected poster presentations - international, national, state, local levels
- g. Production of instructional media software (videotape, audiotape, computer assisted instruction, interactive video) for use outside the university.
- h. A grant involving substantial and significant scholarly/creative activity as defined by the Agreement.
- i. Retraining program as defined by the AAUP contract and approved by the appropriate departmental committee, the School Director, the College Dean, and the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs.

- j. Editorial referee for a publisher of a journal, which results in a Scholarly/Creative Activity such that dissemination occurs (e.g., publication in a professional journal or book review, critique of a published article in a letter to the editor section).
- k. Development and use of an evidence-based clinical practice guideline for use outside the university to improve the quality of health outcomes of individuals, families, groups or communities.
- l. Development and implementation of evidence-based clinical policies and/or procedures for use outside the university to improve the quality of health outcomes of individuals, families, groups or communities.
- m. Clinical practice innovation implemented outside the university.

1. Data Collection Procedures

The applicant must provide a narrative statement for each activity describing in clear and explicit terms how and to what extent the activity has met the criteria in the Departmental Evaluation Document and the Agreement. The template example below highlights the content topics to be discussed. The following template example format should be used to help facilitate adherence to the guidelines. It is not the evaluator's role to determine attainment for specific criteria if the applicant fails to directly address in detail the specific elements required. Criteria elements not addressed should be considered unmet by applicant, and may yield a rating of Below Average.

Template Example:

Activity Title:
Category: Discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Applied Research <input type="checkbox"/> Clinical Nursing Practice <input type="checkbox"/>
Alternatively as appropriate per the Agreement: Retraining <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Development <input type="checkbox"/> Grant Development/Administration <input type="checkbox"/>
Description of Activity:
Contribution to Discipline/Others:
Dissemination:
Self-rating (i.e., Exceptional, Distinctly Above Average, Average, Below Average) and as appropriate a brief closing summary of rationale for rating relative to manner in which the DED criteria were met:

After giving the activity a title, the applicant must first identify the category of their scholarly and/or creative activities in respect to the three nursing categories (i.e., discovery, applied research, clinical nursing practice) or retraining, professional development, or grant development/administration) as defined in the agreement to meet scholarly activity standards. The activity should then be described in depth, including the specific efforts of the faculty applicant. The effort required in the performance of the activity includes detailing specific

work performed (e.g., data collection, data analysis, literature review, manuscript/poster development, process and products of clinical nursing practice activity).

A faculty member shall discuss their contribution to the discipline or area of specialization resulting from their scholarly activity. The degree to which the candidate's activity has advanced insight or knowledge in the discipline is typically demonstrated through identification of the presence of gaps (e.g. in the literature) and discussion of how the described activity addresses that knowledge gap, advances scholarly knowledge, or improves patient care practices. This would include what distinguishes the activity from the contributions of others or from the candidate's previously completed work.

The faculty member then needs to identify how the activity was disseminated. Dissemination of an activity is required. This should include in what form and for what audience it was disseminated. In regard to form, this should include the nature of the dissemination (e.g., manuscript publication, oral presentations, poster presentation, clinical practice materials). This may also include appropriate detail on the attributes of the dissemination source such as the peer-reviewed/refereed or non-refereed status, conference or publication type (e.g., high-ranked nursing scholarship forums, specialty forums, trade journals, newsletters, blog-sites), and available comparative ranking data or publication/rejection rates of source. Additionally, the scope of dissemination of the identified dissemination source as being local, state, national, or international. This should also include the intended audience for the dissemination: 1) among practitioners in his/her discipline; 2) among interdisciplinary communities, or 3) among a wider community. When available the following types of evidence may bolster the rating of the activity; published critical reviews of the disseminated work, citation of the disseminated work in the published work of others, and additional honors, awards or recognition that were bestowed on the applicant in recognition of the activity.

The applicant should close the discussion of an activity by self-rating the activity. As appropriate, a closing summary of the highlights of the activity that support the rationale for the rating may also be included.

Each faculty member must provide evidence that establishes that he/she has, in fact, satisfied the appropriate evaluation criteria. No activity shall count toward fulfilling the evaluation criteria without documentation unless otherwise provided herein. The fact that an applicant may cite an activity which is included in Departmental Evaluation Document does not mean that it will automatically count toward fulfilling obligations in the areas of scholarly/creative activities. Evaluations will be based on the quality of the work supported by the applicant's narrative, evaluation will also take into account the number of activities. Written reports by evaluators will give specific rationale for the ratings awarded (i.e., precisely how activities claimed do or do not meet criteria standards) for Full Evaluations for reappointment, tenure and promotion and Full Professional Performance evaluations.

2. Ratings

On the basis of the forgoing considerations, one of the following ratings will be assigned to each activity submitted based on the level of contribution to the discipline. The criteria for awarding the overall rating in the category of Scholarly/Creative Activity is based on the quantitative criteria noted.

- a. **Exceptional:** The overall category rating criteria require attainment of one exceptional scholarly/creative activity per 2 years. Exceptional is awarded when the scholarly/creative activity provides a significant contribution to the discipline of nursing or related disciplines. Examples of a significant contribution would include; a. manuscript publication of Discovery or Applied Research in peer-reviewed/refereed nursing or similarly ranked allied health journals, or b. an international peer-reviewed/refereed conference presentation of Discovery or Applied Research, or c. a book or book chapter that reflects the use of an evidence-base for content development.
- b. **Distinctly Above Average:** The overall category rating criteria require attainment of one Distinctly Above Average scholarly/creative activity per 2 years. Distinctly Above Average is awarded when the scholarly/creative activity provides an important contribution to the discipline of nursing or related disciplines. Examples of an important contribution would include; a. a national or state peer-reviewed/refereed conference presentation of Discovery or Applied Research, b. Clinical Nursing Practice activities with clear documentation of evidence-based development, current practice integration and institutional letters of support.
- c. **Average:** The overall category rating criteria require attainment of one Average scholarly/creative activity per 2 years. Average is awarded when the scholarly/creative activity provides a contribution to the discipline of nursing or related disciplines. Examples of a contribution would include; a. a University-level conference presentation of Discovery or Applied Research supported by conference proceedings, b. publication of a critique of a published article in a letter to the editor section, c. resubmission of a previously published chapter in a book which has minimal revisions.
- d. **Below Average:** Below Average is awarded when the scholarly/creative activity does not meet the standard for average.

Clarification Notes

Authorship: While the effort for a single authored activity (e.g., manuscript, oral or poster presentation) may appear clearer than multi-authored activities, the rating evaluation is based on the effort presented and documented by the faculty narrative. There is no default deduction in rating for multi-authored materials. It is the faculty applicant's documentation of

effort/activity contributions that are evaluated. Failure of the applicant to document efforts/contributions would make rating the activity impossible and result in a Below Average rating for the specific activity.

Accounting for Extra Activities: While impossible to define all possible combinations of rated activities, it is expected that exceeding the quantitative requirements for a given rating level can lead to the next rating level. For example, where two DAA activities are required every four years for a DAA rating, the performance of four DAA activities in four years may merit the rating of Exceptional. Given the lower effort for Average activities, where two Average activities would be required every four years, the performance of six Average activities in four years may merit the rating of DAA.

C. SERVICE ACTIVITY

1. Data Collection Procedures

The applicant will clearly identify his/her Service activities in a narrative text. Supportive evidence must be provided to indicate the quantity of different Service activities and the quality of the effort expended in those activities.

Faculty are strongly encouraged to include a table that itemizes Service activities. Use of columns that represent academic years under which individual activity titles are noted can help to clarify Service efforts over the evaluation period. It is understood that Service opportunities vary over time, and likewise for effort from year to year. Consideration is given to the cumulative Service narrative for the evaluation period. Note that the table is not sufficient evidence, but presents a visual overview of annual activities. The supporting Service Activity narrative must be explicit regarding attributes of the activity (e.g., participation dates, activity roles, accomplishments, etc.) to facilitate the qualitative evaluation of the Service Activity.

Table Layout Example:

2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Activity Title	Activity Title	Activity Title	Activity Title	Activity Title
Activity Title	Activity Title	Activity Title	Activity Title	Activity Title
Activity Title	Activity Title	Activity Title	Activity Title	Activity Title
Activity Title	Activity Title	Activity Title	Activity Title	Activity Title

It is essential that the applicant clearly discuss and provide evidence (for service outside of the School of Nursing) that identifies their contributions and individual effort expended relative named Service activities. Supportive evidence may include documents such as meeting minutes and reports that identify the applicants' participation in specific activity contributions

claimed in their narrative. Additionally, activities may be verified in support letters from committee chairpersons, or other personnel actively involved in the activity. The detailed narrative and evidence is essential for the evaluator to rate the activity. Claimed activities for which no evidence and no descriptive narrative are presented may be unable to be rated and thereby rated as below average.

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

- a. Participates actively in departmental committees (Faculty as a Whole and Standing Committees).
- b. Accepts specific departmental activity assignments beyond the contractual requirement when it does not compromise primary responsibilities to instructional effectiveness and scholarly/creative activity and service.
- c. Provides professional and career advising of students.
- d. Journal/Conference editor, referee, or peer reviewer.
- e. Participates in departmental, college, and university activities, such as orientation, pinning, commencement, and/or honors convocation.
- f. Assumes position(s) of leadership, (e.g., chairperson, president, director, coordinator), of departmental, college, university, professional, community, any or task force committees or activities.
- g. Serves as a representative/member on departmental, college, university, professional, community, and/or task force committees and/or activities.
- h. Participates in student and/or alumni activities (e.g., Student Nurses' Association, Class Advisor).
- i. Participates as an officer and/or active member of professional organizations at the local, state, regional, and/or national level.
- j. Participates in professionally related community activities.
- k. Serves as a coordinator for organizing professional presentations at the local, state, and/or national level (e.g., conferences, meetings, symposia, workshops, and so forth).
- l. Serves as a consultant to health care agencies or other appropriate health care organizations.

2. Ratings

The activity rating given is ultimately based on judgments of the quality, or degree of success achieved, in performance of the activities, not merely their presence. Both intradepartmental and extra-departmental activities vary greatly in level of responsibility, frequency of meetings, and workload. Also, there is often a significant difference in the responsibilities of leaders and members of committees. The quality of participation is more important than length of service. The faculty narrative should detail activity elements accordingly.

- a. **Exceptional (E):** Awarded when the quality and quantity of service shall be evaluated, in addition to the basis described for distinctly above average, as far beyond that normally expected of faculty. This shall be evidenced by such factors as:
- Holding a volunteer position and fulfilling that role on a committee outside the university (e.g., CCNE site visitor, conference committee member, etc).
 - Holding a leadership position and fulfilling that role (e.g., director, officer, board member) on a professional organization that benefits the School, College, University, or professional discipline.
 - Holding a leadership position and fulfilling that role on a committee within the School, College, University and outside the university.
- b. **Distinctly Above Average (DAA):** Awarded when the quality of service shall be evaluated, in addition to the basis described for average, as substantially more than one's fair share. This shall be evidenced by such factors as:
- Assumes responsibility for major tasks (e.g., drafting policies or reports),
 - Organizes special programs/events within the Department, College or University,
 - Organizes professional programs/events within the community that benefits the School, College, University, or professional discipline,
 - Identifies and responds to Program, Departmental, College or University needs (e.g., Explore Eastern, Presidential Scholarship Competition, Grade Grievance Committee, Fall Major Fest, Freshman Orientation, School of Nursing Student Orientation, eFellows committee participation, IPE fellows/Steering Committee, etc).
 - Serving as a member of a state-level committee serving the nursing profession.
- c. **Average (A):** Awarded when the quality and quantity of service shall be evaluated as that normally expected; one's fair share. This shall be evidenced by such factors as:
- Participates actively in departmental committees (Faculty as a Whole and Standing Committee(s)).
 - Accepts and completes specific assignments related to departmental activities.
 - Provides professional and career advising of students.
 - Participates in departmental, college, and university activities, such as orientation, pinning, commencement, and/or honors convocation.
- d. **Below Average (BA):** Awarded when the Service activity does not meet the standard for Average.

APPENDIX A: Self, Peer, and Director Evaluation of Instructional Effectiveness: In Classroom or Clinical

APPENDIX A
 EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
 School of Nursing
 Evaluation of Instructional Effectiveness: In Classroom or Clinical

Evaluation is for (Check One): In Class Teaching, Clinical Teaching
 Evaluation is completed by (Check One): Peer, Self, School Director

 Faculty Member Being Evaluated _____
 Date

Instructions: Circle the number of the response which best describes the faculty member's performance for each item. If an item is not applicable, circle "NA."

Response Scale:

1-Below Average 2 -Average 3 -Distinctly Above Average 4- Exceptional

1. Establishes clear objectives for the class/clinical session.	1	2	3	4	NA
2 Organizes the class/clinical session to meet course objectives.	1	2	3	4	NA
3. Communicates clearly and effectively.	1	2	3	4	NA
4. Content reflects class/clinical and course objectives.	1	2	3	4	NA
5. Emphasizes conceptual understanding.	1	2	3	4	NA
6. As appropriate, accommodates varied learning styles of students.	1	2	3	4	NA
7. Uses a variety of methods to achieve class/clinical objectives.	1	2	3	4	NA
8. Encourages students to share knowledge and ask questions.	1	2	3	4	NA
9. Uses effective methods to evaluate student learning.	1	2	3	4	NA

Comments:

OVERALL RATING OF CLASSROOM OR CLINICAL OBSERVATION (Circle One):

Below Average Average Distinctly Above Average Exceptional

 Signature of Evaluator

 Date

Complete the below sign off for Peer and School Director evaluations.
 This evaluation was reviewed by the evaluator and faculty under review on: _____

Date

 Signature

 Signature

**APPENDIX B: Self, Peer, and Director Evaluation of Instructional Effectiveness:
Online Classroom**

APPENDIX B
EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
School of Nursing
Evaluation of Instructional Effectiveness: Online Classroom

Evaluation is completed by (Check One): Peer, Self, School Director

Faculty Member Being Evaluated

Date

Instructions: Circle the number of the response which best describes the faculty member's performance for each item. If an item is not applicable, circle "NA."

Response Scale:

1-Below Average 2 -Average 3-Distinctly Above Average 4- Exceptional

1. Unit objectives are posted, applicable to class content and course objectives.	1	2	3	4	NA
2. Clear specific expectations of student assignments, due dates, method of submission, and evaluative components are provided.	1	2	3	4	NA
3. Regular faculty input on unit activities is evident.	1	2	3	4	NA
4. Instructions regarding online netiquette are provided.	1	2	3	4	NA
5. Class session utilizes multiple tools within the course management system (i.e. threaded discussion; chat room; webliography; internet links; online video; drop box; doc sharing; YouTube; or other technologies.	1	2	3	4	NA
6. Student to student interaction is required and evaluated.	1	2	3	4	NA
7. Emphasizes conceptual understanding.	1	2	3	4	NA
8. Instructions regarding mechanisms to communicate with instructor regarding concerns and questions regarding the class session are provided.	1	2	3	4	NA
9. Clear statement, or rubric, of how unit activities will be evaluated is provided.	1	2	3	4	NA

Comments:

OVERALL RATING OF ONLINE CLASSROOM OBSERVATION (Circle One):
Below Average Average Distinctly Above Average Exceptional

Signature of Evaluator

Date

Complete the below sign off for Peer and School Director evaluations.

Date this evaluation was reviewed by the evaluator and faculty under review: _____

Signature of Evaluator

Signature of Faculty Evaluated

APPENDIX C: Student evaluation items for inclusion on the University Instructor and Course Evaluation forms.

APPENDIX C

Below are the faculty approved standard items for student course evaluations as used on the Instructor and Course Evaluation Form. These apply to face-to-face classroom courses, hybrid courses, fully online courses, and clinical courses.

Items:

1. This course has effectively challenged me to think.
2. This course builds understanding of concepts and principles.
3. Challenging questions are raised for discussion.
4. My instructor respects divergent viewpoints.
5. Assignments are related to goals of this course.
6. Instructor engages students in their own learning.

Response scale offered:

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

Below for reference, the form contains two University required core items that are listed first.

Items:

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

Response scale offered:

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

Finally at the bottom of the form the University includes open ended *Comment* items.

Items:

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