Eastern Michigan University Office of Academic Human Resources Memorandum

To:

Rhonda Fowler, University Librarian

From:

David Woike, Assistant Vice President

Academic Affairs

Date:

June 18, 2018

Re:

Approved DED

Attached is a copy of the revised Departmental Evaluation Document for the University Library approved by the University Standing Committee on June 15, 2018. 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
College of University Library
Date of Last DED Revision: July 21, 2016
Date of Department Faculty Vote: April 20, 2017
Yes 11 No 10 Abstain 0
APPROVALS: APPROVALS: Personnel Committee Chair (Date)
Department Head/School Director (Date)
Rhanda Esther Fowler 5/19/2018 Dean (Date)
APPROVED BY THE DEPARTMENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT STANDING COMMITTEE ON: 6/5/18
Julio Berger Charle Cini
Antilet
Jan Chan

EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Division of Academic Affairs University Library

DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION DOCUMENT

Table of Contents

EVALUATION

CRITERIA	2
A. Instructional Effectiveness	2
	2
C. Service Activity	2
APPOINTMENT STANDARDS	3
REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS	4
PROMOTION STANDARDS	6
EVALUATION TECHNIQUES	7
Instructional Effectiveness	7
Data Collection Procedures/Evaluation Reports	7
Ratings	8
Scholarly and/or Creative Activity	8
Data Collection Procedures/Evaluation Reports	8
Ratings	9
Service Activity	11
Data Collection Procedures/Evaluation Reports	11
Ratings	12
	A. Instructional Effectiveness B. Scholarly and/or Creative Activity C. Service Activity APPOINTMENT STANDARDS REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS PROMOTION STANDARDS EVALUATION TECHNIQUES Instructional Effectiveness Data Collection Procedures/Evaluation Reports Ratings Scholarly and/or Creative Activity Data Collection Procedures/Evaluation Reports Ratings Service Activity Data Collection Procedures/Evaluation Reports

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. <u>Instructional Effectiveness</u>

The required and most important criterion is performance of University Library responsibilities. As stated in Article XV, section B, of the contract "in the case of non-teaching and library Faculty satisfactory professional performance shall be the equivalent of Instructional Effectiveness". Because of this distinction, and because the roles included in professional performance vary, evaluation techniques for library faculty are not determined by the standard evaluation techniques for instructional effectiveness as outlined in the AAUP contract.

Evaluation techniques for the professional performance of library faculty members may include, but are not limited to, self-evaluation, classroom evaluations, student evaluations of teaching, and contractual Department Head evaluations.

B. <u>Scholarly and/or Creative Activity</u>

Scholarly/Creative Activity will be evaluated for each Faculty Member utilizing the criteria set forth in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and this Departmental Evaluation Document.

C. Service Activity

Service Activities will be evaluated for each Faculty Member utilizing the criteria set forth in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and this Departmental Evaluation Document.

II. APPOINTMENT STANDARDS

	ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS AND ADDITIONAL CRITERIA	EQUIVALENCIES OR EXCEPTIONS
PROFESSOR	ALA accredited master's degree in library or information science, and;	
	2) at least 10 years professional library experience.	
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	ALA accredited master's degree in library or information science, and;	
	2) at least 5 years professional library experience.	
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	ALA accredited master's degree in library or information science	
INSTRUCTOR	ALA accredited master's degree in library or information science	

III. REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS For Untenured Faculty Hired Before 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

1100001111011001					
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 (or A if DAA in Scholarly)			

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

ABSISTANT I KOY ESSOR				
Year	3	5		
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)		

INSTRUCTOR

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

^{*} Scholarly/Creative Activity rating is advisory only.

Note: 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	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 (or A if DAA in Scholarly)

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Year	3	5
Evaluation	Full/R	Full/T
Instructional Effectiveness	Α	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.

Note: Rank at initial appointment shall determine the evaluation schedule.

IV. PROMOTION STANDARDS

	YEAR ELIGIBLE	ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS	INSTRUCTIONL EFFECTIVENESS	SCHOLAR LY /CREATIV E ACTIVITY	SERVICE
FULL	10 years as	ALA accredited	DAA	DAA	DAA
PROFESSOR	full professor at	master's degree in library or information	DAA	E in one/A in	the other
SALARY	EMU	science	Е	DAA in one/A in the other	
ADJUSTMENT					
ТО	5 years as	ALA accredited master's	DAA	DAA	DAA
PROFESSOR	associate professor at	degree in library or information science	DAA	E in one/A in the other	
	EMU	information science	Е	DAA in one/A in the other	
TO	5 years as	ALA accredited master's	DAA	DAA	DAA
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	assistant	degree in library or	DAA	E in one/A in the other	
I KOI ESSOK	ROFESSOR professor at information science EMU	<u>E</u>	DAA in one/A	in the other	
TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	2 years as instructor at EMU	ALA accredited master's degree in library or information science	DAA E	DAA in one/A	in the other

^{* &}quot;years ... at the EMU Library" includes years of prior service credit granted at time of hire. Applicants who have been granted prior service credit at time of hire must provide documentation of such credit.

V. EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

A. Instructional Effectiveness

Attendance at conferences, workshops, etc. is considered Professional Performance. Active participation in a professional event may also constitute scholarship and/or service. For example, giving a presentation at a conference is scholarship, while organizational work for the association hosting that conference is service. When mentioning a single event under more than one of the three evaluative categories, the applicant should explain and document why the applicant's activities satisfied the criteria for more than one of the categories.

1. Data Collection Procedures

Each applicant must include a personal report of activities and accomplishments. Where appropriate, qualitative and quantitative documentation can be useful to judge the applicant's effectiveness in his/her professional duties. The performance of each individual is assessed in activities such as those enumerated below. No individual is expected to perform all of these activities; they are representative of the scope of University Library professional responsibilities.

- 1. Research Instruction: Knowledge of the University Library collections, as well as information resources outside the Library; effectiveness in working with users of the Library to analyze and meet their varying informational needs; instructing them in the use of resources, and encouraging the critical use of information in their continuing intellectual development.
- 2. Cataloging: Knowledge and proper application of cataloging rules, interpretations and techniques for all formats; ability to make sound judgments in resolving cataloging problems; ability to manage large online databases and authority files; and ability to organize and supervise staff involved in cataloging and database maintenance activities.
- 3. Acquisition of Books and Serials: Knowledge and use of standard business and accounting procedures; effective communication with vendors, gift donors, and bibliographers; knowledge and application of modern binding and preservation techniques; skillful use of the library's automated system; and ability to organize the efforts of staff who carry out acquisitions, serials control, and preservation activities.
- 4. Systems: Expertise in University Library automated systems as a whole, their operations and interrelation, for public services, technical services and materials access; ability to implement, support and provide training for University Library computerized systems and services.
- 5. Collection development: Knowledge of the University Library collections, awareness of the needs of the university community, and selection of materials to meet those needs.
- 6. Media selection: Knowledge of media producers, distributors, rental sources and media equipment; effective use of media equipment and materials.
- 7. Electronic resources: Expertise in the management of electronic resources throughout their life cycle; ability to troubleshoot and resolve subscription and licensed electronic resource access problems; effective in maximizing and providing optimal access to electronic resources; ability to organize and supervise staff involved in serials control and maintenance of electronic resources.
- 8. Archives: Knowledge and expertise in collecting, preserving and providing access to records of enduring value. Administers collections of historical records acquired from individuals, families, or organizations; ability to organize and supervise staff involved in archival functions.
- 9. Production of instructional media: Ability to produce items such as audio-visual materials, video programs, art and photographic work, computer graphics and multimedia.
- 10. Other responsibilities applicable to the position.

Evaluation Reports

The Personnel Evaluation Committee and the Department Head will evaluate all evidence submitted. For interim evaluations, the Personnel Evaluation Committee and the Department Head will together meet with the applicant to discuss his/her performance and suggest appropriate directions for improvement, if such direction is necessary. Written reports will be made separately by the Personnel Evaluation Committee and the Department Head giving the rationale for the ratings awarded for full evaluations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

2. Procedures of Classroom visitation by peers and department head.

3. Ratings

Every individual must demonstrate the ability to work effectively within a library faculty environment. This includes working cooperatively with one's coworkers and other personnel, and showing initiative in identifying and analyzing problems, and developing and implementing solutions. In addition, the performance of University Library responsibilities by each individual is substantiated according to the applicable sections(s) enumerated in Data Collection Procedures. No individual performs within all of these categories; rather, the categories are intended to be used when applicable to the individual's responsibilities. Those that are applicable must be practiced at a level to justify at least an average rating in performance of University Library responsibilities. The rating given is ultimately based on observation and evaluation of the quality, or degree of success, achieved in performance of the activities, not merely their presence.

Exceptional (E): Performance that exceeds expectations and is consistently outstanding.

Distinctly Above Average (DAA): Performance that consistently fulfills the job requirements and exceeds expectations.

Average (A): Performance that consistently fulfills the job requirements

Below Average (BA): Performance that does not consistently meet the job requirements

B. Scholarly and/or Creative Activity

1. Data Collection Procedures

Each applicant must include a personal report of his/her Scholarly/Creative Activities and provide copies of papers, articles, books, publications and/or other tangible documentation. Scholarly/Creative Activity is not evaluated during Interim Evaluations (except the Comprehensive Interim Evaluation, and then, the rating is for advisory purposes only).

Evaluation Reports

- 1. 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.
- 2. The Personnel Evaluation Committee should comment on the applicant's activities and state clearly how and to what extent each activity and the activities collectively meet the criteria in the Departmental Evaluation Document and the Agreement, including the points assigned for each activity.
- 3. The Department Head should comment on the applicant's activities and state clearly how and to what extent each activity and the activities collectively meet the criteria in the Departmental Evaluation Document and the Agreement, including the points assigned for each activity.

2. Ratings

No minimum or maximum number of activities is established as a set requirement for a particular rating in scholarly and/or creative activity. The rating will be based on the quality of work as judged on the number of activities and quality of each activity, following the considerations and point system outlined below. Both individual and collaborative scholarly/creative activities are valued, with neither preferred over the other. Since open access scholarship aligns strongly with values of librarianship related to equality and the promotion of civil society, publication in quality open access journals is encouraged. Open access publication via EMU's Digital Commons or other open access repositories is also valued, when standards for quality scholarship and dissemination are achieved.

In developing the summary statement regarding scholarly and/or creative activity and designating a qualitative rating (such as average, etc.), the Personnel Evaluation Committee and the Department Head should consider:

- 1. The effort required in the performance of the activity, including degree of contribution to works with multiple contributors.
- 2. In what respect the candidate's activity might have advanced insight or knowledge in his/her discipline.
- 3. In what respects the activity has benefited the University Library, University or community, etc.
- 4. What distinguishes the scholarly activity from contributions of others or from the candidate's previous work.
- 5. In what form and for what audience was the work published or disseminated, considering in addition:
 - a. Degree of dissemination
 - b. Nature of the work
 - c. Nature of the audience (such as professional librarians, students, faculty)
 - d. Reputation of the journal, conference, publication, or organization
 - e. Editorial review (such as peer reviewed, refereed, juried)
- 6. Critical reviews of the work and the credentials of the reviewer.
- 7. The level of acceptance and/or evaluation by the audience for which it was intended (such as citations, altmetrics, or audience evaluations).
- 8. Additional degrees, honors, awards, or other recognition for scholarly activity.

Using the criteria above, points are assigned by the Personnel Evaluation Committee to each scholarly contribution using the following scale:

Points Writing

- 5-9 Authoring a book or its equivalent accepted for publication.
- 3-5 Authoring a refereed article published in a journal or the equivalent in creative production.
- 3-5 Authoring a book chapter or equivalent creative production in a collection accepted for publication by a professional publisher.
- 2-3 Authoring a substantial critical review (3 or more pages) published in a professional journal or authoring a substantial document (such as a report or set of organized data).
- 1-3 Authoring a non-refereed article published in a professional journal.
- 1-3 Authoring a dissertation [refer to contract marginal paragraph 586].
- 1-3 Creating exhibits, online tutorials, or online tools disseminated beyond the University.
- 1-3 Preparing a revised edition of an authored or edited book that involves new research and addition of new material equivalent to at least one chapter and reorganization of present material, or the equivalent in authoring and editing a revised edition in creative production.
- 1-2 Authoring three book reviews published in a professional journal.

Points Presenting

- Giving a presentation; or acting as a respondent on a panel; or the equivalent in creative production at a regional or national professional conference or organizational meeting.
- Giving a presentation; or acting as a respondent on a panel; or the equivalent in creative production at a local or state professional conference or organizational meeting.
- 2-4 Proposing, organizing, and moderating a topic panel at a **regional or national** professional conference or organizational meeting.
- 1-3 Proposing, organizing, and moderating a topic panel at a **local or state** professional conference or organizational meeting.
- 1-2 Presenting a poster at a professional conference or organizational meeting.

Points Editing

- 4-6 Editing or translating a book or its equivalent accepted for publication by a professional publisher.
- 3-5 Editing a multivolume, refereed, professional journal.
- 1-2 Editing a special issue of a refereed, professional journal.
- 1-2 Editing a conference proceeding.
- 1-2 Designing, writing and/or editing a regularly published organizational newsletter.

Points Grant writing and administration

- 1-3 Authoring a grant proposal to a funding agency outside the university [refer to contract marginal paragraph 584].
- Administering a grant project [refer to contract marginal paragraph 584]. (Articles, presentations, and substantial reports developed out of grant work may be counted separately.)

Points Scripting

- 2-4 Authoring a computer software application accepted for distribution by a professional publisher.
- 1-3 Authoring an application, script, or code disseminated beyond the University.

Points Research

Preparing significant scholarly research or creative activity, such as manuscripts readied for 1-2 submission, assembled bodies of research data, or research accumulated in preparation for a major publication project or exhibit.

When a faculty member desires to undertake an innovative form of scholarship that is not clearly included in the above, they are encouraged to meet with the Personnel Evaluation Committee and the Department Head to discuss whether that activity would qualify as scholarly activity and how that activity might be evaluated.

The table below shows the minimum number of scholarly/creative activity points required for particular ratings. Over a Professional Performance Evaluation period 4 points are required for an Average in Scholarly/Creative Activity. Because the required points in the chart below incorporate this regularly required scholarly activity, the number of required points for ratings increases by the number of years in that rank. The table refers to the applicant's current rank, not the rank applied for in a promotion application.

For Instructors:	Year 2:	2 for A, 4 for DAA, 6 for E
	Venre 2 5.	4 for A 9 for DAA 10 C D

4 for A, 8 for DAA, 10 for E Years 3-5: Year 6+: 6 for A, 12 for DAA, 18 for E

For Assistant Professors: Year 3 in rank: 4 for A, 8 for DAA, 10 for E

Year 5 in rank: 6 for A, 12 for DAA, 18 for E Year 6 in rank: 7 for A, 14 for DAA, 20 for E Years 7+ in rank: 8 for A, 15 for DAA, 21 for E

For Associate Professors: Year 2 in rank: 3 for A, 5 for DAA, 8 for E

> Year 4 in rank: 6 for A, 10 for DAA, 16 for E Year 5 in rank: 6 for A, 12 for DAA, 18 for E Years 6-8 in rank: 7 for A, 14 for DAA, 20 for E Years 9+ in rank:

10 for A, 16 for DAA, 24 for E

Year 2 in rank: 4 for A, 6 for DAA, 8 for E Year 3+ in rank: 6 for A, 9 for DAA, 12 for E Year 10+ in rank: 10 for A, 16 for DAA, 24 for E

C. Service Activity

For Professors:

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.

Evaluation Reports

The Personnel Evaluation Committee and the Department Head will evaluate all evidence submitted. For Interim Evaluations, the Personnel Evaluation Committee and the Department Head will together meet with the applicant to discuss his/her performance and suggest appropriate directions for improvement, if such direction is necessary. Written reports will be made separately by the Personnel Evaluation Committee and the Department Head giving the rationale for the rating awarded for Full Evaluations for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion and Full Professional Performance Evaluations.

Criteria

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

- Membership and participation in University Library elected and appointed committees.
- Membership and participation in a council, task force, committee, or sub-committee at interdepartmental or university level.
- Membership and participation in a state, regional, national or international professional association.
- Participation in individual service opportunities.
- Other relevant service at the university level or in the profession or community.

2. Ratings

No minimum or maximum number of activities is established as a set requirement for a particular rating in service. Evaluation will be based on the quality of work as judged on the balance between number of activities and the degree of commitment to each by the faculty member.

Exceptional (E):

The Exceptional rating is awarded when both the quality and quantity of service activity are outstanding. Evaluators must describe service in terms of the applicant's consistently assuming and executing leadership or other active roles to identify and satisfy the needs of the department, and/or university and/or community.

Distinctly Above Average (DAA):

The Distinctly Above Average rating is awarded for a strong overall record of service, involving either a much higher quantity of service activities, or a more prominent service engagement than those required for the Average rating. Evaluators must describe service in terms of the balance in quality and number of the applicant's service activities.

Average (A):

To earn a rating of Average, the applicant must have served on voluntary/elective committees and participated in service events, but without prominent service engagement. Evaluators must describe service in terms of the applicant's having accepted assignments and volunteering or accepting the nominations to serve.

Below Average (BA):

Below Average service is characterized by a low level of participation in service events, and by minimal effort to volunteer for service opportunities on voluntary/elective committees. Awarded when the balance between number of activities and the quality of participation is evaluated as less than that required for an Average rating. Evaluators must describe service in terms of the applicant's lack of accepting assignments and volunteering or accepting the nominations to serve.