



<b>EVALUATION</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>I. APPOINTMENT STANDARDS</b>	<b>4</b>
A. RATING SCALE	4
B. STANDARDS	4
<b>II. REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS CHARTS</b>	<b>5</b>
A. RATING SCALE	5
B. STANDARDS	5
<i>Reappointment and Tenure Standards Chart</i>	5
<i>for Faculty hired before September 1, 2021 and who are not receiving the research release.</i>	5
<i>Reappointment and Tenure Standards Chart</i>	6
<i>for Faculty who fall in either of the following categories:</i>	6
1. <i>Hired after September 1, 2021;</i>	6
2. <i>Hired prior to September 1, 2021 and receiving the research release.</i>	6
<b>III. PROMOTION STANDARDS</b>	<b>7</b>
A. RATING SCALE	7
B. STANDARDS	7
<i>Promotion Standards Chart</i>	7
<i>for Faculty hired before September 1, 2021 and who are not receiving the research release.</i>	7
<i>Promotion Standards Chart</i>	8
<i>for Faculty who fall in either of the following categories:</i>	8
1. <i>Hired after September 1, 2021;</i>	8
2. <i>Hired prior to September 1, 2021 and receiving the research release.</i>	8
<b>IV. RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY RELEASE STANDARDS</b>	<b>8</b>
A. RATING SCALE	8
B. STANDARDS	8
<b>V. EVALUATION TECHNIQUES</b>	<b>9</b>
INTERIM MEETINGS WILL BE CONDUCTED PER THE CURRENT CONTRACT.	9
A. INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS	9
1. <i>Data Collection Procedures</i>	9
2. <i>Procedure of On-campus and Online Classroom Visitations by Peers and Department Head</i>	10
3. <i>Ratings</i>	10
4. <i>Evaluation Reports</i>	12
B. SCHOLARLY AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY	12
1. <i>Data Collection Procedures</i>	12
2. <i>Ratings</i>	13
3. <i>Approved Activities</i>	13
4. <i>Evaluation Reports</i>	16
5. <i>Scholarly and/or Creative Activity Quantity</i>	16
C. SERVICE ACTIVITY	20
1. <i>Data Collection Procedures</i>	20
2. <i>Ratings</i>	20
3. 22	
A. <i>Interim Meeting</i>	22
B. <i>Evaluation Report</i>	22
4. <i>Criteria</i>	22

<b>APPENDIX A: CLASSROOM (ON-CAMPUS AND ONLINE) VISITATION REPORT</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>A CLASSROOM VISITATION REPORT (FORM I) AND A CLASSROOM TEACHING OBSERVATION (FORM II) MUST BE COMPLETED BY EACH VISITOR FOR PEER AND DEPARTMENT HEAD CLASSROOM VISITATION.</b>	<b>23</b>
DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE	23
CLASSROOM VISITATION REPORT (FORM I)	23
<b>APPENDIX B: CLASSROOM (ON-CAMPUS AND ONLINE) TEACHING OBSERVATION FORM</b>	<b>25</b>
DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE	25
CLASSROOM TEACHING OBSERVATION (FORM II)	25
<b>APPENDIX C: STUDENT EVALUATION QUESTIONS (ON-CAMPUS AND ONLINE)</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>THE MINIMUM SET OF REQUIRED QUESTIONS FOR THE STUDENT EVALUATION FORM</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>APPENDIX D: STUDENT EVALUATION OF ADVISING FORM</b>	<b>27</b>
DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE	27
EVALUATION OF ADVISING FORM	27
<b>APPENDIX E: LIST OF APPLICANT'S MAJOR AND MINOR ACTIVITIES FOR RESEARCH/CREATIVE RELEASE</b>	<b>28</b>
A. INDIVIDUAL ACTIVITIES THAT COUNT AS TWO (2) MAJOR ACTIVITIES:	28
B. INDIVIDUAL ACTIVITIES THAT COUNT AS ONE (1) MAJOR ACTIVITY:	28
C. INDIVIDUAL ACTIVITIES THAT COUNT AS ONE (1) MINOR ACTIVITY:	30

## EVALUATION

The evaluation process is intended to be collegial. The process has been developed to encourage departmental colleagues and Department Heads to provide colleagues with information on meeting the criteria required to advance (i.e., achieve reappointment, tenure, promotion or a satisfactory Professional Performance Evaluation) at Eastern Michigan University.

The Computer Science 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.

For complete contractual requirements, refer to the EMU-AAUP Agreement.

### I. APPOINTMENT STANDARDS

#### A. Rating Scale

- **Exceptional (E)** denotes performance far in excess of the expectations for present rank.
- **Distinctly Above Average (DAA)** denotes performance well above the expectations for present rank.
- **Average (A)** denotes performance commensurate with the expectations for present rank.
- **Below Average (BA)** denotes performance below the expectations for present rank.

#### B. Standards

	ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS AND ADDITIONAL CRITERIA
PROFESSOR	Ph.D. in appropriate field <sup>1</sup> Shall have demonstrated significant scholarly/creative activity.
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Ph.D. in appropriate field <sup>1</sup> Shall have demonstrated significant scholarly/creative activity.
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Ph.D. in appropriate field <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Computer Science, Computer Science Education, Computer Engineering or a field related to the needs of the Department.

## II. REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE STANDARDS CHARTS

### A. Rating Scale

- **Exceptional (E)** denotes performance far in excess of the expectations for present rank.
- **Distinctly Above Average (DAA)** denotes performance well above the expectations for present rank.
- **Average (A)** denotes performance commensurate with the expectations for present rank.
- **Below Average (BA)** denotes performance below the expectations for present rank.

### B. Standards

**Reappointment and Tenure Standards Chart**  
 for Faculty hired before September 1, 2021 and who are not receiving the research release.

#### 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	A	DAA
Scholarly/Creative Activity	X*	DAA (or A if DAA in Service)
Service	A	DAA (or A if DAA in Scholarly)

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

**Reappointment and Tenure Standards Chart  
 for Faculty who fall in either of the following categories:**

**1. Hired after September 1, 2021;**

**2. Hired prior to September 1, 2021 and receiving the research release.**

For Scholarly/Creative Activity, faculty must complete 2 major and one minor activities, and those activities may also be applied towards obtaining the rating in the table below.

**PROFESSOR**

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

**ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

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

**ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**

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

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

### III. PROMOTION STANDARDS

#### A. Rating Scale

- **Exceptional (E)** denotes performance far in excess of the expectations for present rank.
- **Distinctly Above Average (DAA)** denotes performance well above the expectations for present rank.
- **Average (A)** denotes performance commensurate with the expectations for present rank.
- **Below Average (BA)** denotes performance below the expectations for present rank.

#### B. Standards

#### Promotion Standards Chart

for Faculty hired before September 1, 2021 and who are not receiving the research release.

	YEAR ELIGIBLE	ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS	INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS	SCHOLARLY / CREATIVE ACTIVITY	SERVICE
FULL PROFESSOR SALARY ADJUSTMENT	10 years as Full Professor at EMU	Ph.D. in appropriate field <sup>1</sup>	DAA	DAA in one, A in the other.	
TO PROFESSOR	5 years as Associate Professor at EMU	Ph.D. in appropriate field <sup>2</sup>	DAA	DAA in one, A in the other.	
TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	5 years as Assistant Professor at EMU	Ph.D. in appropriate field <sup>2</sup>	DAA	DAA in one, A in the other.	

<sup>2</sup> Unless the equivalency paragraphs in the appointment standards apply. The appropriate fields are Computer Science, Computer Science Education, Computer Engineering or a field related to the needs of the Department.

**Promotion Standards Chart**  
**for Faculty who fall in either of the following categories:**

**1. Hired after September 1, 2021;**

**2. Hired prior to September 1, 2021 and receiving the research release.**

For Scholarly/Creative Activity, faculty must complete 2 major and one minor activities, and those activities may also be applied towards obtaining the rating in the table below.

	YEAR ELIGIBLE	ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS	INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS	SCHOLARLY / CREATIVE ACTIVITY	SERVICE
FULL PROFESSOR SALARY ADJUSTMENT	10 years as Full Professor at EMU	Ph.D. in appropriate field <sup>3</sup>	DAA	DAA	A
TO PROFESSOR	5 years as Associate Professor at EMU	Ph.D. in appropriate field <sup>3</sup>	DAA	DAA	A
TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	5 years as Assistant professor at EMU	Ph.D. in appropriate field <sup>3</sup>	DAA	DAA	A

**IV. RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY RELEASE STANDARDS**

**A. Rating Scale**

Faculty receiving the Research/Creative Activity Release must:

- Complete two (2) major and one (1) minor research/creative activity per five-year evaluation period; and
- Meet the Scholarly/Creative Activity Promotion standard for faculty hired after September 1, 2021 of Distinctly Above Average (DAA) for the rank of Assistant Professor.

Faculty receiving the Research/Creative Activity Release shall be evaluated for eligibility every five years.

**B. Standards**

Appendix E lists the approved activities defined as major and minor activities.

---

<sup>3</sup> Unless the equivalency paragraphs in the appointment standards apply. The appropriate fields are Computer Science, Computer Science Education, Computer Engineering or a field related to the needs of the Department.

## V. EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Interim meetings will be conducted per the current contract.

### A. Instructional Effectiveness

#### 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.

Supportive to this criterion is evidence that the candidate: *(These are suggestions, not a limitation on what may be included)*

##### a. Prepares for teaching

- 1) Seeks the latest information in the subject area(s) taught, by reading, attending professional conferences and/or by communicating with colleagues.
- 2) Regularly evaluates his/her own past teaching methods, procedures and course content.

##### b. Plans effectively for teaching

- 1) Has a clear conception of his/her course(s) within the Department and within the University.
- 2) Has a clear conception of the long-term objectives for the course(s) and for the day-to-day classroom activities.
- 3) Has a clear conception of the evaluation procedures which will enable him/her to measure the attainment of objectives set forth.

##### c. Practices good teaching methods

- 1) Informs students of the objectives of the course(s) and of units of study in the course(s).
- 2) Informs students about methods of study applicable to the attainment of course objectives.
- 3) Informs students of specific course assignments (e.g., dates of exams, papers, etc.)
- 4) Attempts to establish a classroom environment conducive to learning.
- 5) Evaluates students in ways that measure the attainment of course objectives.

## **2. Procedure of On-campus and Online Classroom Visitations by Peers and Department Head**

- a. Each person to be evaluated will be visited by
  - Two (2) members of the Evaluation Committee
  - The Department Head
  - At the option of the person being evaluated, up to two (2) other faculty members chosen by mutual agreement of the Faculty Member and the Department Head.
- b.
  - 1) On-campus Classroom Visitation: At least 48 hours prior to the visitation, the evaluator will meet with the person being evaluated and decide upon a particular class to visit, taking into account tests and mutual schedules.
  - 2) Online Classroom Evaluation: At least 48 hours prior to the online classroom evaluation, the evaluator will meet with the person being evaluated and decide upon a particular class to evaluate, taking into account tests and mutual schedules. The evaluation should be limited to a single lesson or unit of the course, equivalent to one face-to-face course meeting during which the faculty member shall be present.
- c. The evaluator will arrive before class starts (so as not to interrupt) and stay for the entire class period for on-campus visits.
- d. Each evaluator will use the departmentally approved class visitation forms (See Appendix B)
- e. Each evaluator will provide a copy of the evaluation forms to both the Evaluation Committee and the person being evaluated within five (5) working days of the visitation.

## **3. Ratings**

The Evaluation Committee and the Department Head will evaluate all evidence submitted. Written reports will be made separately by the Evaluation Committee and the Department Head giving the rationale for the ratings awarded for Full Evaluations for reappointment, tenure and promotion and Full Professional Performance evaluations.

- **Exceptional (E):**

This rating should be given to teachers who are considered excellent teachers by the students and the faculty. For this the faculty member must satisfy the following:

- 1) The faculty member must receive at least 70% weighted average rating in the top two categories (A and B) for teaching effectiveness in student evaluations.

- 2) The faculty member must receive an Exceptional rating from majority of classroom visitations by peers and/or the Department Head.
- 3) The faculty member meets the criteria (3a) – (3e) listed below under Average for an Average rating.
- 4) Performs most of the criteria listed in one through three of Data Collection Procedures.

- **Distinctly Above Average (DAA)**

This rating should be given to teachers who are considered better teachers by the students and the faculty. For this the faculty member must satisfy the following:

- 1) The faculty member must receive an above average rating in student evaluations.
- 2) The faculty member must receive at least a Distinctly Above Average rating in majority of classroom visitations by peers and /or the Department Head.
- 3) The faculty member meets the criteria 3.a – 3.e listed below under Average for an Average rating.
- 4) Performs some of the criteria listed in one through three of Data Collection Procedures.

- **Average (A):**

This rating should be given to teachers who are considered good teachers by the students and the faculty. For this the faculty member must satisfy the following:

- 1) The faculty member must receive an average rating in student evaluations.
- 2) The faculty member must receive at least an average rating in majority of classroom visitations by peers and /or the Department Head.
- 3) The faculty member must meet most of the criteria listed below:
  - a. The students are given course syllabus and course requirements in writing at the beginning of the semester. This should include course objectives, course outlines, number of tests, approximate number of programming and homework assignments and also the grading standards. This should also include regular office hours and office hours available for appointments.
  - b. The exams and the assignments should reflect the course content and the grading standards provided to the students are followed.
  - c. Regular office hours are maintained and students have access to the instructor by making appointments during office hours reserved for such appointments.
  - d. The faculty member meets the class regularly and covers most of the material listed in the syllabus.

- e. The faculty member creates a learning environment in the class by encouraging students to ask questions and adequately answering their questions.

- **Below Average (BA):**

This rating shall be given to applicants who demonstrate less than what is required for the Average rating.

#### **4. Evaluation Reports**

- a. The Faculty Member's own report of activities and accomplishments in this area. (Provided by the applicant.)
- b. Department Head evaluations of teaching, including classroom visits. (Provided by the Department Head.)
- c. Colleague evaluations of teaching, including classroom visits. See Appendix A for the Classroom (On-campus and Online) Visitation Report and Appendix B for the Classroom (On-campus and Online) Teaching Observation form. (Provided by the evaluators.)
- d. Student evaluations of teaching. See Appendix C for the student evaluation questions. (Provided by the applicant, if available.)
- e. Student evaluation of advising if applicable. See Appendix D for the student evaluation of advising form. (Provided by the applicant.)

The Faculty Member shall be entitled to up to two additional peer evaluations by faculty chosen by mutual agreement of the Faculty Member and the Department Head.

### **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.

The outline below lists different categories of scholarly activities and examples within each category. Each activity is rated E (Exceptional), DAA (Distinctly Above Average), or A (Average), depending on the estimated value of the activity. To attain a particular rating, a faculty member must carry out a prescribed number of activities that have that rating, as discussed in the next section.

This outline is intended to provide guidelines for the evaluation of activities. It is possible for the Evaluation Committee to count activities that are not listed here if they involve sufficient scholarly/creative activity.

## 2. Ratings

For activities not listed in the Approved Activities (V.B.3), the Evaluation Committee reserves the right to judge the quality of a particular Scholarly/Creative Activity according to the criteria described in this DED. 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 Evaluation 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.

The following standards shall apply for purposes of determining scholarly/creative activity ratings in the **Professional Performance evaluation (PPE)** process:

- **Exceptional** - Two or more scholarly/creative activities judged to be Exceptional in quality.
- **Distinctly Above Average** - Two or more scholarly/creative activities judged to be Distinctly Above Average in quality, or one activity judged to be Exceptional.
- **Average** - Two or more scholarly/creative activities judged to be Average in quality, or one activity judged Distinctly Above Average.
- **Below Average (BA)**: Performance below the requirement for the Average rating.

## 3. Approved Activities

- **Exceptional Activities:**

- a. Publication:

- Commercially published text or monograph that is favorably reviewed by referees or in published reviews.
- Refereed journal articles in high-quality journals.
- At a high-quality professional conference, where acceptance is based on a formal review process of a complete paper, and the paper is published.

- b. Presentations of one's scholarly investigation:
  - At a high-quality professional conference, where acceptance is based on a formal review process of a complete paper, and the paper is published.
  - At a high-quality professional conference, where the speaker is invited to present.
- c. Professional Interactions:
  - Serves as editor of a professional journal if editing requires dissemination of scholarly/creative activity.
- d. Grant Proposals:
  - Grant proposals funded involving substantial and significant scholarly/creative activity as defined by the AAUP contract (although grant activities alone will not meet any requirement).
- **Distinctly Above Average Activities:**
  - a. Software or Hardware Development:
    - If used outside of the department or favorably reviewed by outside referees or organization.
  - b. Publications (excluding conference proceedings):
    - Self-publication of textbook or monograph-length work if used outside of the department.
    - Commercially published text or monograph.
    - Articles in commercial magazines.
    - Unrefereed articles (e.g., in a SIG newsletter).
    - Departmental technical reports.
  - c. Presentations of one's scholarly investigation:
    - At a professional conference (such as the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts & Letters, and the Michigan Association of Computer Users in Learning) where acceptance is based on an abstract.
    - At a local professional meeting (such as the ACM) or at another university.

- d. Professional Interactions:
  - Significant involvement with the scholarly aspects of the organization of a large professional conference that involve the dissemination of the results of the faculty member's scholarly/creative activity.
  - Substantial scholarly contributions to a teleconference that deals with computer science.
- e. Grant Proposals:
  - Involving substantial scholarly/creative activity as defined by the AAUP contract although grant activities alone will not meet any requirement.
- f. Retraining:
  - Retraining program approved by the appropriate department committee, the department head, the college dean, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- g. Professional Development:
  - Professional development program approved by the appropriate departmental committee and the departmental head. Professional Development alone will not satisfy the scholarly/creative activity criterion.
- **Average Activities:**
  - a. Software or Hardware Development:
    - If used regularly by others in the department, or demonstrated otherwise to be significant.
  - b. Publications (excluding conference proceedings):
    - Self-publication of textbook or monograph-length work if used by others in the department, or demonstrated otherwise to be significant.
  - c. Presentations of one's scholarly investigation:
    - To department faculty or to another EMU organization.
  - d. Professional Interactions:
    - Contribute regularly to a teleconference that deals with significant issues in computer science.

- Solicited, unpublished review of a book or manuscript in an area related to computer science.

e. Faculty Involvement in Student Research:

- Directing a completed Masters' study that culminates in a presentation of the results where the faculty member is involved in the research/creative activity and contributes to the product dissemination.

- **Below Average (BA):**

This rating shall be given to applicants who demonstrate less than what is required for the Average rating.

#### 4. Evaluation Reports

- a. 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.
- b. The Evaluation Committee should comment on each activity including a statement that clearly indicates how and to what extent the activity meets the criteria in the Departmental Evaluation Document and the Agreement.
- c. The Department Head should comment on each activity including a statement that clearly indicates how and to what extent the activity meets the criteria in the Departmental Evaluation Document and the Agreement.

#### 5. Scholarly and/or Creative Activity Quantity

Only years in rank at Eastern Michigan University will be considered for reappointment, tenure and promotion (unless the Faculty Member has received service/rank credit at the time of appointment in accordance with AAUP Agreement). This chart reflects the minimum quantities; judgments of quality will also be made.

- **Reappointment and Tenure:** Number of activities from the preceding list of approved scholarly and/or creative activities since appointment.
- **Promotion:** Number of activities from the preceding list of approved scholarly and/or creative activities since appointment or promotion to current rank (whichever occurred last). Number of activities refers to the rank for which promotion is being sought.

### Reappointment and Tenure Chart for Scholarly/Creative Activity

The following charts give numerical requirements for attaining the various ratings. Each cell contains the minimum number of activities necessary to attain the rating listed in the row heading. The activities should be of the appropriate type. For example, for an Associate Professor to get a rating of A in year 4, he or she must carry out 4 activities that have the rating A. Distinct activities of the same type may count as separate activities. No number of A's can count for a DAA and no number of DAAs can count for an E. However, an E can count for 2 DAAs and a DAA may count for 2 As.

**Faculty on the research release track or hired after September 1, 2021 must complete 2 major activities and one minor activity as listed in Appendix E.** Those activities may also be applied towards obtaining the ratings in the table below.

#### PROFESSOR

Year	1	2	3
Evaluation	No Evaluation	Full Reappointment	Full Tenure
Exceptional		X	2
Distinctly Above Average		X	3
Average		X	3

#### ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Year	1	2	3	4
Evaluation	No Evaluation	Full Reappointment	Interim	Full Tenure
Exceptional		X	Y	2
Distinctly Above Average		X	Y	3
Average		X	Y	4

**ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**

<b>Year</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>No Evaluation</b>	<b>Interim</b>	<b>Full Reappointment</b>	<b>Interim</b>	<b>Full Tenure</b>
Exceptional		Y	X	Y	2
Distinctly Above Average		Y	X	Y	3
Average		Y	X	Y	3

The reappointment and tenure charts above are to be interpreted as follows: X means that the evaluation is for advisory purposes only. Y means no rating is given.

The numbers indicate the minimum number of activities (listed in V.B.3) required for that rating. For example, at the Professor level, 2-Exceptional or 3 DAA's or 3 Average scholarly activities are required at year 3 for tenure.

### Promotion Chart for Scholarly/Creative Activity

Faculty on the research release track or hired after September 1, 2021 must complete 2 major activities and one minor activity as listed in Appendix E. Those activities may also be applied towards obtaining the ratings in the table below.

#### PROMOTION TO

	<b>Assistant Professor</b>	<b>Associate Professor</b>	<b>Full Professor</b>
Exceptional	1	2	3
Distinctly Above Average	2	3	4
Average	2	3	4

The numbers indicate the minimum number of activities required for that promotion. For example, for promotion to the Full Professor level, 3 Exceptional or 4 DAA's or 4 Average scholarly activities (listed in V.B.3) are required.

## **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.

### **2. Ratings**

- **Exceptional (E):** Awarded when the quantity and quality of service shall be evaluated, in addition to the basis described for Distinctly Above Average, as far beyond that normally expected of faculty. This may be evidenced by such factors as:
  - a. At least 2 years of high-quality service in leadership roles such as:
    - 1) Chairmanship on the Evaluation or Executive Committee, or
    - 2) Extensive work on the Evaluation or Executive Committee; or
  - b. A considerable quantity of high-quality departmental work such as:
    - 1) Heavy involvement in important committees of the department, or
    - 2) The identification of and working toward meeting new departmental needs, or
    - 3) The satisfaction of existing needs, such as developing new courses and new programs.
  - c. A continued record of high-quality service beyond the department which may include such activities as:
    - 1) Involvement in college and university-wide councils or committees.
    - 2) Involvement in professionally related community service,
    - 3) Assistance in student activities,
    - 4) Availability to other departments for consultations, etc.

Leadership roles in college-or university-level activities or in professionally related community service are to be considered equivalent to a considerable quantity of involvement in the other areas mentioned.
  - d. A continued record of high-quality service on both the departmental level and beyond which would earn at least a rating of Distinctly Above Average in each area.
  - e. A continued record of high-quality service in leadership role in a professional organization at a state or national level.
  - f. Actively involved in AAUP contract negotiations while serving on the Contract Negotiations Team of the AAUP.

- **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. This may be evidenced by such factors as:
  - a. Frequent membership on, and active participation in committees which demand at least twenty (20) hours of work in an academic year.
  - b. Development of new courses, teaching methods, or teaching facilities.
  - c. The willingness to teach a wide variety of courses.
  - d. Identifying departmental needs and work toward meeting those needs.
  - e. Set up and/or maintenance of labs.
  - f. Willingness to undertake special tasks and assignments and accomplish them in a competent manner.
  - g. Leadership role in a professional organization.
  - h. Serving as an elected officer in the AAUP.
  - i. Refereeing an article for a professional journal or conference paper.
- **Average (A):** Awarded when the quantity and quality of service shall be evaluated as that normally expected; one's fair share. This may be evidenced by such factors as:
  - a. Accepting assignments from Executive Committee, Evaluation Committee and the Department Head.
  - b. Volunteering/accepting nominations to serve on departmental, college-wide and university-wide committees and councils.
  - c. Attending departmental meetings.
  - d. Identifying departmental needs and working toward meeting those needs.
  - e. Satisfactory work on those areas of departmental or university service in which the individual is involved.
  - f. Leadership role in a professional organization.
  - g. Attendance at Commencement exercises.
  - h. Representing the department at University functions.
  - i. Department AAUP Steward or member of the AAUP Bargaining Council.
  - j. Refereeing an abstract for a professional journal or conference paper.
- **Below Average (BA):** This rating shall be given to applicants who demonstrate less than the requirement for the Average rating.

**3.**

**A. Interim Meeting**

For Interim meeting, the 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. No written report will be made with interim meetings.

**B. Evaluation Report**

The Evaluation Committee and the Department Head will evaluate all evidence submitted.

Written reports will be made separately by the 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.

**4. Criteria**

Service activities may be fulfilled by, but are not limited to, the following:

- Attendance at, and participation in, departmental meetings.
- Membership in the Evaluation Committee or Executive Committee.
- Membership in a departmental committee.
- Service in the capacity of undergraduate or graduate coordinator.
- Membership in an interdepartmental committee or council.
- Membership in a council, committee or sub-committee as established by the faculty input system at the college level.
- Membership in a council, committee or sub-committee at the university level.
- Other intra-departmental or extra-departmental service at the college or university levels or in the community. The Evaluation Committee will decide the appropriateness on a case-by-case basis.
- Setting up and/or maintaining of department computer equipment/labs.

It should be emphasized that the detailed lists of supportive measures, or activities under Service are not all inclusive. In other words, the failure of any other evidential activity to be listed does not preclude its being judged supportive of the criteria. If the faculty member has released time, service credit may be given only for activities beyond what was expected through the granting of released time.

## Appendix A: Classroom (On-Campus and Online) Visitation Report

A Classroom Visitation Report (Form I) and a Classroom Teaching Observation (Form II) must be completed by each visitor for peer and department head classroom visitation.

### Department of Computer Science Classroom Visitation Report (Form I)

To be completed by each visitor each time a class is visited.

Person Observed \_\_\_\_\_ Semester \_\_\_\_\_

Visitor \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Observation \_\_\_\_\_

Course and Section \_\_\_\_\_

Lesson Topics Presented \_\_\_\_\_

Rate the instructor at or between the two extremes

1. Well-organized    A    B    C    D    E    Disorganized

2. Interesting        A    B    C    D    E    Dull

3. Understandable    A    B    C    D    E    Confusing

4. Enthusiastic        A    B    C    D    E    Unenthusiastic

5. Did the instructor clarify the objectives of the day's lesson?

Totally                A    B    C    D    E    Not at all

6. Did the instructor encourage students to ask questions?

Very much so    A    B    C    D    E    Not at all

7. Did the instructor encourage student participation?

Very much so    A    B    C    D    E    Not at all

8. Did the instructor vary the presentation and provide a change of pace from time to time?

Very much so    A    B    C    D    E    Not at all

9. How did this instructor use instructional materials and equipment?

Effectively    A    B    C    D    E    Ineffectively

10. Did the instructor treat the students impartially?

Totally    A    B    C    D    E    Not at all

11. What is your overall rating of this particular class?

Superior    A    B    C    D    E    Inferior

## Appendix B: Classroom (On-campus and Online) Teaching Observation Form

### Department of Computer Science Classroom Teaching Observation (Form II)

To be completed by each visitor at the conclusion of all visitations.

Person Observed \_\_\_\_\_

Semester \_\_\_\_\_

Visitor \_\_\_\_\_

Provide summary statements in each of the following areas:

1. What are the instructor's observed major strengths?
2. What are this instructor's observed major weaknesses?
3. What should the instructor do to improve his/her instructional weaknesses?
4. Overall rating of the teaching effectiveness of this instructor.

## **Appendix C: Student Evaluation Questions (On-campus and Online)**

The minimum set of required questions for the student evaluation form

Core Items:

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

Items Added by the Department for On-Campus Classes:

- a. Instructor seems well prepared for class
- b. Instructor displays enthusiasm when teaching
- c. Instructor is actively helpful when students have problems
- d. The objectives of this course were clearly explained to me
- e. Grades are assigned fairly and impartially
- f. I learned a lot in this course

Items Added by the Department for Online Classes:

- a. Course materials were well organized
- b. Instructor is actively helpful when students have problems
- c. Instructor provided timely feedback to questions and course assignments.
- d. Course materials are delivered in a timely manner.
- e. Grades are assigned fairly and impartially
- f. I learned a lot in this course

## Appendix D: Student Evaluation of Advising Form

### Department of Computer Science Evaluation of Advising Form

Advisor's Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Your Major \_\_\_\_\_

Please complete the evaluation form by circling the appropriate rating for each item. Return the evaluation to the Department office immediately.

1. The advisor was cooperative in finding a mutually convenient time for the appointment.

*True*      *More true than false*      *More false than true*      *False*

Comment:

2. The advisor supplied or secured the general information which I needed concerning university requirements and registration procedures.

*True*      *More true than false*      *More false than true*      *False*

Comment:

3. The advisor supplied or secured the information which I needed concerning the requirements for my major and minor.

*True*      *More true than false*      *More false than true*      *False*

Additional comments by advisee:

## **Appendix E: List of Applicant's Major and Minor Activities for Research/Creative Release**

### **A. Individual activities that count as two (2) Major activities:**

1. Publication of authored or co-authored first edition book (except textbooks) by a reputable publisher. (Counts as two major activities if there are at least two distinct chapters, not including the introduction and conclusion, that reflect original research activity.)

### **B. Individual activities that count as one (1) Major activity:**

1. A Major Scholarly/Creative Activity must meet all of the following criteria:
  - a. be a scholarly/creative activity;
  - b. be disseminated external to EMU's community;
  - c. be documented; and,
  - d. be reviewed and accepted by an external-to-EMU organization of peers or practitioners within the discipline. The term "review" is specific to the best practices of each discipline. For scholarly work, this can include refereed or peer reviewed work; for creative activities, this can include acceptance of submitted work by reputable sources widely recognized in the discipline; and for applied research, this can include acceptance of submitted work by reputable organizations widely recognized in the discipline(s).
2. Applying these criteria to grants, grant development must:
  - a. involve scholarly/creative activity of a substantial nature in preparing the grant proposal itself where the Faculty Member is the primary author or co-author;
  - b. document a new scholarly/creative activity within the proposal and its importance to the discipline or interdisciplinary area, the department, the college, or University;
  - c. be prepared and submitted to an external-to-EMU organization of international, national, regional (multi-state), or state recognition; and,
  - d. be funded.

3. Examples of pre-approved Major Scholarly/Creative Activities may include, but are not limited to:
  - a. Publications:
    - 1) Publication of an authored or co-authored textbook by a reputable publisher (if there are at least one chapter, not including the introduction and conclusion, that reflect original research activity.)
    - 2) First edition original scholarly monograph published by a reputable publisher, peer-reviewed that contributes to the faculty member's discipline and is consistent with their scholarly agenda.
    - 3) Publication of original scholarly work in a refereed journal.
    - 4) Peer-reviewed publication of original scholarly work in a professional conference, where acceptance is based on a formal review process of a complete paper, if not counted as a major activity subject to A.3.b. below.
  - b. Presentation of an original work authored by the Faculty Member at an international, national, recognized regional (across multiple states), or state (such as MASAL or MACUL) conference in the Faculty Member's discipline where the application or submission process was competitive and either:
    - 1) the body responsible for holding the conference reviewed and accepted a paper equivalent in rigor to 3.a. above.  
OR
    - 2) the body responsible for holding the conference reviewed and accepted an abstract or proposal, and consistent with Article XV, the Faculty Member provided documentation to the satisfaction of the Personnel Committee, Department Head and Dean that the work was equivalent in rigor to 3.a. above.
  - c. Professional Interactions:
    - 1) Edited or co-edited journals, monograph or books published or accepted for publication that contribute to the faculty member's discipline and are consistent with their scholarly agenda. The contribution should include a foreword or introduction by the faculty member providing original scholarship through analysis of works presented in the journal, monograph, or book.

d. Software or Hardware Development:

Has significant impact in the field which resulted in or used outside the university, as demonstrated by number of downloads (20+) or number of users (20+) or degree of problem solved or patent acceptance or is made commercially available.

e. Approved patent.

**C. Individual activities that count as one (1) Minor activity:**

1. Minor Scholarly Creative Activity must meet all of the following criteria:
  - a. be a scholarly/creative activity;
  - b. be disseminated; **and**,
  - c. be documented
2. Applying these criteria to grants, grant development must:
  - a. involve scholarly/creative activity of a substantial nature in preparing the grant proposal itself where the Faculty Member is the primary author or co-author
  - b. documents the importance of the grant to the discipline or interdisciplinary area, the department, the college or University;
  - c. and, be prepared for and submitted to an outside agency, whether funded or not.
3. Examples of pre-approved Minor Scholarly Creative Activities are department-specific and **may include, but are not limited to**
  - a. Publications:
    - 1) Commercially published text or monograph.
    - 2) Articles in commercial magazines.
    - 3) Unrefereed articles (e.g., in a SIG newsletter).
  - b. Presentations of one's original scholarly investigation:
    - 1) At a local professional meeting or at another university, even if the paper that goes with the presentation is counted as a major.
  - c. Professional Interactions:
    - 1) Significant involvement in the organization of a large professional conference that involves the dissemination of scholarly/creative activity. This can be demonstrated by serving as an officer or on the board or steering committee of the organization, where expected workload is 20+ hours a year.
  - d. Software or Hardware Development:
    - 1) Adopted or regularly used as part of a class or research by someone other than the author.
    - 2) Adopted or regularly used by an external organization, if not counted as a major activity.

e. Retraining:

- 1) In recognition of the need to encourage the retraining of Faculty to assume professional responsibilities in areas where available expertise is in short supply, completion by the Faculty Member of a retraining program which brings him/her to a specified level of skill in such area of need may be applied toward satisfaction of the Scholarly/Creative Activity criterion for such purposes and for such period of time only as expressly approved in writing by the appropriate departmental committee, the Department Head, the college Dean and the Provost and Vice President. In those instances where written approval of a retraining program is not obtained in advance, retraining shall be barred from consideration when the Faculty Member's Scholarly/Creative Activity is evaluated.

f. Professional Development:

- 1) EMU and the Association recognize the value of substantive professional development activities that may be undertaken by Faculty to enhance their delivery of classroom instruction and/or expand their professional knowledge base. In order to encourage Faculty to engage in such endeavors, professional development activities may be applied toward satisfaction of the Scholarly/Creative Activity criterion insofar as these activities are clearly in addition to those necessary to maintain the level of knowledge and/or expertise in the Faculty Member's discipline or area of specialization required to fulfill the Instructional Effectiveness standards (Article XV.B.1.) of this Agreement, subject to the following conditions: Prior to undertaking any professional activity for which credit may be sought, a Faculty Member shall submit a written proposal for pre-approval to his/her department. The proposal shall outline the professional activity, its duration and the projected benefits of the activity. If approved by the Department Head and the appropriate departmental committee, the professional development, when completed, shall be evaluated to determine if it fulfills the criteria for such professional development contained in the Departmental Evaluation Document.

g. Faculty Involvement in Student Research:

- 1) The supervision of an undergraduate/graduate scholarly endeavor that complies with MP 576 in so far as that the supervision includes original scholarly/creative work of the faculty member.
- 2) These include presentations at professional conferences, invited academic talks and undergraduate or graduate student presentations for which the Faculty Member can demonstrate a significant contribution.

h. Community outreach activities such as organizing programming contests, hackathons, or summer camps.