EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
600 LINCOLN AVENUE | OLD MAIN CHARLESTON, IL
61920-3099
OFFICE: 217-581-2121
FAX: 217-581-6053
eiu.edu/acaffair

To: Dr. Farhad Sadeh, Interim Chair, School of Business

From: Ryan C. Hendrickson, Provost

Date: August 13, 2024

Cc: Brad Tolpannen, AVPAA

Austin Cheney, Dean, Lumpkin College of Business and Technology

I am writing to thank the School of Business for submitting the 2024 revisions to the Departmental Application of Criteria. As required by the EIU-UPI agreement, I have reviewed the materials and am pleased to approve the revised DAC..

Please note that with this approval the revised DAC is now in effect. Unit A faculty members who elect to be evaluated under the previous Departmental Application of Criteria must give notice to the Chair, Dean, and Provost prior to October 1, 2024 (Article 8.7.f.3).

The current Departmental Application of Criterias are available at: https://www.eiu.edu/acaffair/DACnew.php

School of Business
Lumpkin College of Business and Technology

Application of Criteria for Retention, Promotion, Tenure and Professional Advancement Increase

Approved by School of Business Faculty on July 30, 2024

I. Introduction

The School of Business includes faculty members from a variety of disciplines. In evaluating faculty members, the evaluators shall recognize the diversity of these disciplines and respect their disparate natures including any differences reflected in teaching, research/creative activity and service.

A. University-Wide Purposes and Standards

In performing evaluations, evaluators shall consider the following information concerning purposes and standards as outlined in the EIU-UPI Faculty Agreement.

1. Purposes of Evaluation (See EIU-UPI Faculty Agreement, Article 8)

2. Evaluation Periods (See EIU-UPI Faculty Agreement, Article 8)

B. Evaluation Portfolio

By the date specified in the University Schedule for Personnel Actions, each Unit B faculty member and each Unit A faculty member to be evaluated for retention, promotion, tenure, professional advancement increase, or annual evaluations after tenure, shall submit evaluation portfolio(s) containing the materials required by this School Application of Criteria. All evaluation portfolios shall include the following:

1. The assignment of duties report(s) for each academic year during the evaluation period;

2. A copy of the School Application of Criteria;

3. A copy of the faculty member's curriculum vitae;

4. A copy of Form A; and

5. A detailed table of contents of the portfolio.

In addition, faculty are encouraged to include a content summary for each of the three areas of evaluation (teaching/performance of primary duties, research/creative activity, and service).

C. Other General Considerations

1. All assigned duties shall be evaluated as part of the evaluation process.

2. All evidence submitted by the faculty member shall be considered as part of the evaluation process.

3. To assist in evaluating a portfolio, evaluators may:

   a. request the faculty member to submit additional evidence concerning teaching/performance of primary duties, research/creative activity, and/or service.
   b. discuss with the faculty member any evidence submitted by the faculty member.

4. Regarding Section I.C.3., any additional submitted evidence so obtained and used by evaluators in their evaluation of the faculty member shall be in writing and shall be made a part of the faculty member's portfolio.

5. Materials and activities will be evaluated only under the area (Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, Research/Creative Activity, or Service) and category in which they are listed in this School Application of Criteria. Except as provided in I.C.4., no material or activity shall be evaluated in more than one area or category, unless the material or activity can be clearly, and reasonably, separated, such that there is no double counting.

6. Faculty members should designate the following materials and activities to the area(s) (Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, Research/Creative Activity, and/or Service) deemed appropriate by the faculty member:

   a. Consulting activities;
   b. Fellowships;
   c. Grants;
   d. Interaction with external business or non-profit organizations;
   e. Interaction with non-academic professionals;
   f. International exchange, study or travel abroad;
   g. Internships;
   h. Software (other than instructional software) development;
   i. Union duties, responsibilities, and projects; and
   j. Other activities not listed in a specific area in this School Application of Criteria.

   The faculty member is required to provide sufficient explanation to justify the area(s) to which the material or activity was designated.

D. Relative Emphasis of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, Research/Creative Activity, and Service

In general, teaching/performance of primary duties is the most important category; research/creative activity is ranked second in importance; and service is ranked last in importance.

II. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

For faculty members, duties include regular teaching activities (i.e., courses or combined/cross-listed courses that total two or more credit units assigned), as well as other teaching and non-teaching activities for which credit units are assigned and for which a course release is given other than research and sabbatical assignments. When duties include activities for which credit units are assigned, but for which a course release is **not** given, the faculty member has the option to have each of these activities evaluated under one of the following appropriate areas: Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, Research/Creative Activity, or Service.

Regular teaching activities (i.e., courses or combined/cross-listed courses that total two or more credit units assigned) will be evaluated using the criteria in Section II.E. For additional duties for which credit units are assigned other than research or sabbaticals and that are either required or selected by the faculty member to be evaluated under Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties (such as reassigned time for school or university related assignments), the faculty member shall provide appropriate documentation such as evaluations by supervisor(s) or others(s), or a brief narrative of the work responsibilities of the assigned duties and the accomplishment of those duties, based on the nature of the assignment.

A. Categories of Materials and Activities

The following materials and activities (which are *not* listed in order of importance) are appropriate for evaluation of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties:

1. Classroom visitation evaluations;
2. Statistical summaries of student evaluations;
3. Course materials;
4. Course syllabi;
5. Curriculum development;
6. Evidence of class activities that enhance teaching and learning;
7. Professional development activities;
8. Summaries of course grades;
9. Unsolicited evaluation materials from current and/or former students;
10. Application of technology in the teaching/learning process;
11. Participation in primary duties on an interdisciplinary, interdepartmental, and intercollegiate basis;

12. Participation in instructional and other outreach activities including student engagement and mentoring, recruitment, or off-campus instruction;
13. Evidence of activities to assess student learning;
14. Other supporting documentation.

B. Methods of Evaluation

1. Student Evaluations

a. Number and Frequency

(1) Tenured faculty must submit statistical summaries of student evaluations from at least one class each semester during the evaluation period for which the faculty member was assigned teaching duties.
(2) All annually contracted and tenure track faculty must submit statistical summaries of student evaluations for all classes taught during the year of evaluation.
(3) Faculty may, but are not required to, submit comments written by students on the evaluation forms.

b. Procedure

(1) Student evaluations generally should be administered anytime between the midpoint in the course schedule and the last day of class.
(2) Student evaluations will be conducted using the approved School of Business Student Evaluation form. Each faculty member may add four or fewer questions to the form.
(3) Each class may evaluate an instructor only once using the approved form.
(4) A staff member, graduate assistant, or faculty member other than the faculty member being evaluated, shall distribute, collect, and seal the student evaluations. The faculty member being evaluated should not be in the classroom while the student evaluations are being administered. The completed student evaluations must be returned in the sealed envelope to the chair's office staff member responsible for handling student evaluations.
(5) For off-campus classes, student evaluations should be conducted in the same spirit as the on-campus evaluations. While reasonable modifications of the student evaluations procedures are acceptable, the faculty member being evaluated should not administer the evaluations or handle unsealed completed evaluations.
(6) Upon receipt of the evaluations and statistical summaries from Testing Services, the Chair shall distribute all evaluations and a statistical summary to the appropriate faculty member. The Chair shall retain one

statistical summary as a backup copy. The backup copy may be used for evaluation only as authorized by the faculty member.

(7) Written comments on student evaluations, if submitted by the faculty member as part of the portfolio, may be used for evaluation purposes; however, statistical summaries of student evaluations shall be more important than written comments.

2. Classroom Visitation

a. Number and Frequency

(1) For retention, for promotion before or at the same time as tenure, and for tenure, one annual classroom visitation by the Chair or Associate Chair, and at least one annual classroom visitation by a faculty peer (a member of the School of Business Unit A faculty) are required of all tenure-track faculty.

(2) For promotion after tenure and for professional advancement increase, one classroom visitation by the Chair or Associate Chair, and one classroom visitation by a faculty peer are required for the evaluation period.

(3) For annually contracted faculty with less than eight years of seniority, one annual classroom visitation by the Chair or Associate Chair is required.

(4) For annual evaluations of annually contracted faculty with at least eight years of seniority, a Chair, Associate Chair or peer evaluation (a member of the School of Business Unit B faculty with at least three years of teaching experience at EIU or a member of the School of Business Unit A faculty) is required each year. However, at least one Chair or Associate Chair evaluation is required every three years.

(5) In addition to the evaluations from the required visitations, any faculty member may submit evaluations from no more than two additional visitations by faculty peers for each year during the evaluation period.

b. Procedure for face-to-face courses

(1) If a classroom visitation may be conducted by the chair or associate chair, the faculty member shall determine whether the chair or the associate chair will conduct the classroom visitation. Evaluations by the chair/ associate chair may be conducted using the approved School of Business Classroom Evaluation Form or in a format determined by the chair/associate chair.

(2) The faculty member will select the faculty member(s) who will complete the peer classroom visitation. The faculty member shall select at least two different peers to conduct classroom visitations during the evaluation period for tenure. Whenever possible, the faculty member shall select senior faculty members to conduct peer classroom visitations. Peer

evaluations will be conducted using the approved School of Business Classroom Evaluation Form.

(3) The faculty member shall coordinate visits to their classes with the visiting Chair or Associate Chair and peer performing the evaluations. No visit shall be conducted on a day on which a written examination is administered.

(4) All evaluators shall provide a signed, completed copy of the evaluation to the faculty member and the chair no later than four weeks after the visit or December 15, whichever occurs sooner. If any evaluator fails to do so, then the faculty member shall note the failure in the appropriate section of the portfolio. Such failure shall not prevent decisions concerning retention, promotion, tenure, or professional advancement increases.

c. Procedure for evaluation of Distance Learning/On-line synchronous courses: Evaluation of distance learning or on-line synchronous courses will be conducted in the same spirit as the evaluation of on-campus courses, using the School of Business student evaluation form.

d. Procedure for evaluation of online asynchronous courses: Evaluations should be conducted according to the procedures contained in the attached policy.

e. For hybrid courses, the faculty member may choose either face-to-face or online procedures as appropriate.

3. Professional Development Activities

While professional development activities are not a requirement for portfolio evaluation, it is highly encouraged and can be considered for qualitative assessment of teaching performance. Professional development activities may include participation in relevant seminars, workshops, fieldwork practica, professional organizations, achieving or maintaining professional certification, or any other continuing education undertakings.

C. Relative Importance

1. Primary duties will be evaluated in light of credit unit assignments as shown on the assignment of duties form.

2. In general, in evaluating teaching, evaluations from classroom visitations by the chair/associate chair, evaluations from classroom visitations by faculty peers, evidence of class activities that enhance teaching and learning, and student evaluations shall be considered equal in importance and shall be considered most important. In general, in evaluating teaching, other materials and activities shall be considered of secondary importance.

3. In evaluating primary duties other than teaching, the relative importance of materials and activities shall depend on the nature of the duties.

D. Documentation

1. Each faculty member is responsible for providing sufficient documentation for both quantitative and qualitative assessments of teaching/performance of primary duties.

2. Documentation of professional development activities and curriculum development should include a brief description of each activity.

3. The following documentation is required of all faculty members:

   a. Classroom visitation evaluations as required under II.B.2
   b. Course syllabi; and
   c. Statistical summaries (documenting the average of the medians and/or means) of student evaluations for each class evaluated during the evaluation period. The faculty member should indicate which method of averages (i.e., either average of the means, average of the medians or both) shall be used by the evaluator.

4. Student evaluations must be submitted for all classes in which the evaluations are administered during the evaluation period. If written comments from any student evaluations are included in the portfolio, all comments from that particular class must be included. Results from responses to all questions on the evaluation form, including responses to questions added by the faculty member, must be submitted.

5. All classroom visitation evaluations during the evaluation period must be submitted.

E. Assessing Teaching Performance

1. Evaluation of the faculty member's teaching/performance of primary duties will include both quantitative and qualitative assessments. In assessing the quality of teaching/performance of primary duties, the evaluators shall consider not only the factors required under II.D.3, but also additional factors if documented by the faculty member, such as:

   a. Average class GPA (Evaluators should avoid making causal connections between class GPA and student evaluations);
   b. Class size (e.g., extremely large or small);
   c. Course level (e.g., lower level, graduate);
   d. Documented recognition of quality such as awards;

e. Nature and scope of any professional development activities;
f. Nature of the course (e.g., online, hybrid, quantitative, writing centered or intensive);
g. Number of course preparations during the evaluation period;
h. Number of classes taught during the evaluation period;
i. Stated teaching objectives;
j. Use of innovative or non-traditional teaching methods;
k. Whether a course is a new preparation;
l. Whether a course is required (i.e., business core, major core);
m. Evidence of activities to assess student learning and academic quality improvement;
n. Evidence of achievements in integrative learning;
o. Evidence of achievements in mentoring student research;
p. Evidence of achievements to support university or School of Business honors programming;
q. Percentage of students completing evaluations;
r. Other appropriate factors.

2. All evidence submitted will be considered as part of the evaluation.

3. Subject to the Number and Frequency guidelines in Section II.B., evaluation of the faculty member's teaching activities shall be based on the quantitative criteria listed below. However, if a faculty member has not met the quantitative guideline for a specific performance standard, evaluators nevertheless may assess the faculty member as having achieved that performance standard based on other relevant qualitative or quantitative factors. When classroom visits are required or when classroom visits have nevertheless been conducted at the request of the faculty member, then the following criteria apply (see Section II.E.5, for evaluation criteria when classroom visits are not required or conducted.).

   a. A rating of **Satisfactory** requires documentation of at least *two* of the following:

      (1) Chair/associate chair classroom visitation evaluations indicating at least satisfactory performance;
      (2) Peer classroom visitation evaluation indicating at least satisfactory performance;
      (3) Evidence of satisfactory class activities that enhance teaching and learning; or
      (4) Student evaluations indicating at least satisfactory performance (generally an average of 3.20 to 3.59, but considering factors in section II.E.1).

   b. A rating of **Highly Effective** requires documentation of at least *two* of the following:

(1) Chair/associate chair classroom visitation evaluations indicating at least highly effective performance;
(2) Peer classroom visitation evaluation indicating at least highly effective performance; or
(3) Evidence of highly effective class activities that enhance teaching and learning; or
(4) Student evaluations indicating at least highly effective performance (generally an average of 3.60 to 3.99, but considering factors in section II.E.1).

c. A rating of **Superior** requires documentation of at least *two* of the following:

(1) Chair/associate chair classroom visitation evaluations indicating superior performance;
(2) Peer classroom visitation evaluation indicating superior performance;
(3) Evidence of superior class activities that enhance teaching and learning; or
(4) Student evaluations indicating superior performance (generally an average of 4.00 and above, but considering factors in section II.E.1).

d. If a rating of Satisfactory, Highly Effective, or Superior has not been met, then a rating of **Unsatisfactory** shall be given as long as the faculty member has not made a convincing case based on other relevant qualitative or quantitative factors.

4. In using the guidelines in Section II.E.3. for evaluating promotion from assistant professor to associate professor for an untenured employee and for tenure evaluations, faculty members must at a minimum achieve the rating of Superior during the fifth retention year and sustain this level through the sixth retention year. In addition, the student evaluations must average at least 3.50 in both the fifth and sixth retention years.

5. For annual evaluations of tenured faculty members where classroom visitation evaluations are not performed, the guidelines in Section II.E.3. will be adjusted as follows:

a. A rating of **Satisfactory** requires documentation of at least *one* of the following:

(1) Evidence of satisfactory class activities that enhance teaching and learning; or
(2) Student evaluations indicating at least satisfactory performance (generally an average of 3.20 to 3.59, but considering factors in section II.E.1).

b. A rating of **Highly Effective** requires documentation of at least *one* of the following:

(1) Evidence of highly effective class activities that enhance teaching and learning; or
(2) Student evaluations indicating at least highly effective performance (generally an average of 3.60 to 3.99, but considering factors in section II.E.1).

c. A rating of **Superior** requires documentation of at least *one* of the following

(1) Evidence of superior class activities that enhance teaching and learning; or
(2) Student evaluations indicating superior performance (generally an average of 4.00 and above, but considering factors in section II.E.1).

d. If a rating of Satisfactory, Highly Effective, or Superior has not been met, then a rating of Unsatisfactory shall be given as long as the faculty member has not made a convincing case based on other relevant qualitative or quantitative factors.

III. Research/Creative Activity

The outputs of a faculty member's research/creative activity may include discipline-based scholarship, learning and pedagogical research, and contributions to practice. Outputs with multiple authors, as well as cross-functional and cross-disciplinary research, are accepted and encouraged. In evaluating research/creative activity, the evaluators shall recognize the diversity of the various business disciplines and shall respect their differing natures and research methods.

A. Categories of Materials and Activities

The following materials and activities are illustrative only. They should not be considered exhaustive, nor are they listed in order of importance. Research activities may include, but are not limited to

1. Published works (including works accepted for publication)

a. Articles
(1) Articles in in-house journals
(2) Articles in pedagogical journals
(3) Articles in professional journals
(4) Articles in public/trade journals
(5) Articles in scholarly journals
(6) Other published articles

b. Books

(1) Chapter(s) in scholarly books or monographs
(2) Monographs
(3) Scholarly books
(4) Other published books

c. Instructional materials
(1) Cases with instructional materials
(2) Instructional software
(3) Instructor's manuals
(4) Student guides
(5) Textbooks
(6) Other published instructional materials

d. Proceedings
(1) Proceedings of pedagogical meetings
(2) Proceedings of professional meetings
(3) Proceedings of scholarly meetings
(4) Other published proceedings

e. Other published works or works accepted for publication

2. Grants

a. Grants originating outside the University
b. Grants awarded by the Council on Faculty Research
c. University-level awards for research

3. Presentations

a. Presentations at professional meetings or conferences
b. Presentations at research seminars
c. Presentations at scholarly meetings or conferences
d. Presentations at workshops
e. Serving as panel member or discussant at scholarly meetings, professional meetings, or research seminars
f. Other presentations

4. Works in Progress

a. Completed works submitted for publication or for presentation
b. Works not yet completed

5. Other Materials and Activities

a. Membership on editorial board of scholarly, professional, or pedagogical journals

b. Serving as referee or reviewer for proceedings of scholarly, professional, or pedagogical meetings
c. Serving as referee or reviewer for scholarly, professional, or pedagogical journals
d. Participation in legal proceedings as an expert witness
e. Acting as a consultant to a private or governmental body
f. Public lectures of personal research
g. Creating technologies to improve the teaching/learning process
h. Writing for the local, national, or international media in area of expertise
i. Other research/creative activities or intellectual contributions.

B. Relative Importance

Published works, grants, and presentations (including works accepted for publication or presentation) shall be considered the most important. Among published works, those works that have been subject to a review process, either peer-review or editorial review, and that are available for public scrutiny (e.g., indexed) shall be considered the most important.

Works in progress and other materials and activities are of secondary importance.

C. Documentation

Each faculty member is responsible for providing sufficient documentation for assessment of research/creative activity.

D. Assessing Research/Creative Activity

1. Evaluation of the faculty member's research/creative activity will include both qualitative and quantitative assessments.

2. All evidence submitted will be considered as part of the evaluation.

3. Evaluators should recognize that research/creative activities involve a building process and outputs from those activities may vary from year to year. Evaluators, therefore, should remember that retention decisions are based on activities in shorter evaluation periods than tenure, promotion, and professional advancement increase decisions which are based on cumulative results of research/creative activities.

4. For quantitative assessment, evaluators shall use the following criteria:

   a. The publication of a journal article in a top-tier journal as evidenced by an acceptance rate of 10% or lower or other highly credible evidence offered by the faculty member shall be considered the equivalent of two journal articles.

Examples of “other highly credible evidence” that the faculty member could document include citation rates (e.g., using Google Scholar), journal quality (e.g., using Australian Business Deans Council Journal Quality List) or impact ratings, etc.

b. Publications of journal articles with acceptance rate of greater than 50% shall be treated as other published works unless the faculty member presents credible evidence of its quality.

5. Evaluation of the faculty member’s research activities shall be based on the quantitative criteria listed below. However, if a faculty member has not met the quantitative guideline for a specific performance standard, evaluators nevertheless may assess the faculty member as having achieved that performance standard based on other relevant qualitative or quantitative factors.

   a. For purposes of **retention** evaluations and **annual** evaluations after tenure:

      (1) A rating of **Satisfactory** requires documentation of work in progress.

      (2) A rating of **Significant** requires documentation of at least one intellectual contribution (defined in Sections III.A.1, III.A.2, or III.A.3) or acceptance or one submission of a work for peer-review during the evaluation period.

      (3) A rating of **Superior** requires documentation of at least one journal publication or acceptance as a result of a peer-review process during the evaluation period.

      (4) If a rating of Satisfactory, Significant, or Superior has not been met, then a rating of **Unsatisfactory** shall be given as long as the faculty member has not made a convincing case based on other relevant qualitative or quantitative factors. A rating of **Appropriate** may also be given if the faculty member is in their first probationary year as defined in Article 8.4.b of the Unit A 2022-2026 Contract.

      (5) Note that given the nature of research as described in Section III.D.3., the standards are lower for retention and annual evaluations, than they are for promotion and tenure because the review periods are short. Thus, for example, receiving a series of annual evaluations of significant where all of the research contributions are conference proceedings or presentations would not lead to a rating of significant for the purposes of tenure or promotion as those require journal publications or acceptances. Therefore, while not changing the rating assessed by evaluators using the evaluation criteria in this Section, evaluators are encouraged to provide additional narrative guidance to probationary faculty members as to whether or not the faculty member seems to be making sufficient progress toward achieving tenure and promotion. Such narrative

guidance should not be construed by the faculty member as a promise or guarantee of a future performance rating. In addition, the Chair of the School of Business is encouraged to meet with all tenure-track faculty approximately halfway through their tenure-track progression in a process which is separate from the portfolio review process, to discuss whether that faculty member is making appropriate progress towards meeting the requirements for tenure.

b. For purposes of promotion after tenure, and professional advancement increase evaluations:

(1) A rating of **Satisfactory** requires documentation of at least two intellectual contributions including at least one work (published or accepted for publication) or one presentation (or acceptance) during the evaluation period.

(2) A rating of **Significant** requires documentation of at least four intellectual contributions during the evaluation period including at least two journal publications or acceptances as a result of a peer-review process.

(3) A rating of **Superior** requires documentation of at least six intellectual contributions during the evaluation period including at least three journal publications or acceptances as a result of a peer-review process.

(4) If a rating of Satisfactory, Significant, or Superior has not been met, then a rating of **Unsatisfactory** shall be given as long as the faculty member has not made a convincing case based on other relevant qualitative or quantitative factors.

c. For purposes of promotion from assistant professor to associate professor for an untenured faculty member and for tenure evaluations, a faculty member must at a minimum achieve a rating of Significant during the evaluation period:

(1) A rating of **Satisfactory** requires documentation of at least two intellectual contributions including at least one work (published or accepted for publication) or one presentation (or acceptance) during the evaluation period.

(2) A rating of **Significant** requires documentation of at least four intellectual contributions during the evaluation period including at least two journal publications or acceptances as a result of a peer-review process.

(3) A rating of **Superior** requires documentation of at least six intellectual contributions during the evaluation period including at least three journal publications or acceptances as a result of a peer-review process.

(4) If a rating of Satisfactory, Significant, or Superior has not been met, then a rating of **Unsatisfactory** shall be given as long as the faculty member has not made a convincing case based on other relevant qualitative or quantitative factors.

IV. Service

All faculty members should be engaged in service activities appropriate to the faculty member's discipline and to the missions of the academic program, School of Business, and/or Eastern Illinois University.

A. Categories of Materials and Activities

The following materials and activities (which are *not* listed in order of importance) are appropriate for evaluation of Service activities:

1. Service to the School of Business including, for example:

   a. Chairing a School committee;
   b. Contributing to School-sponsored events;
   c. Developing and/or maintaining external relationships between the School of Business and the business community;
   d. Serving as an advisor or co-advisor to a School student organization;
   e. Serving as a member of a School committee;
   f. Contributing to Discipline/School assessment activities;
   g. Contributing to Discipline/School recruitment activities;
   h. Attending presentations (job candidates, research, brown bags, etc.), Open Houses (Academic and Student Services Fairs), or Graduation Ceremonies and/or
   i. Serving the Discipline Unit.

2. Service to the College of Business and Technology including, for example:

   a. Chairing a College committee;
   b. Organizing a conference, symposium, or workshop;
   c. Contributing to College assessment activities;
   d. Contributing to College recruitment activities;
   e. Serving as an advisor or co-advisor to a College student organization; and/or
   f. Serving as a member of a College committee.

3. Service to the University including, for example:

   a. Chairing a University committee or faculty governance organization;

b. Organizing a University conference, symposium, or workshop;
c. Serving as an advisor or co-advisor to a University student organization;
d. Serving as a member of a University committee or faculty governance organization;
e. Contributing to University assessment activities;
f. Contributing to University recruitment activities;
g. Serving as an officer, representative or committee member in chapter or local levels of the union; and/or
h. Serving as an evaluator of the Electronic Writing Portfolio.

4. Service to Professional Organizations including, for example:

    a. Serving on a committee;
    b. Serving in a leadership role such as officer, standing committee chair, or other position;
    c. Serving as a member of a professional organization;
    d. Serving as a session chair, discussant, or program chair at a professional meeting;
    e. Otherwise planning, coordinating, or directing professional presentations or organization meeting;
    f. Serving as referee or reviewer for proceedings of scholarly, professional, or pedagogical meetings; and/or
    g. Serving as referee or reviewer for scholarly, professional, or pedagogical journals.

5. Other Service Activities including, for example:

    a. Guest lecturing in a class;
    b. Presentation of paper or lecture to a group or organization other than professional organizations;
    c. Presenting public lecture on topics related to faculty member's discipline;
    d. Relevant community service; and/or
    e. Other relevant service.

B. Relative Importance

Although the five general categories of service listed in Section IV.A. are of equal importance, some service to the School of Business is expected. Because faculty members will document widely differing activities and emphases in their service contributions, the nature and importance of those activities will be considered on the basis of the factors listed in Section IV.D.2, after accounting for the quantitative assessment in Section IV.D.1.

C. Documentation

Each faculty member is responsible for providing sufficient documentation for assessments of service. Examples may include:

1. Listing of committee meetings, preparation, and other time spent;
2. Letters from committee chairs (or others) describing the nature and scope of work;
3. Listing of RSO events and activities sponsored;
4. Listing of professional organization activities;
5. Letters from professional organization officers/organizers; and/or
6. End of year committee reports (annotated with individual contributions).

D. Assessing Service

1. For quantitative assessment, evaluators will use the following criteria:

   a. Exceptional participation and/or leadership while serving on an active committee or other service activity shall count as two service activities (Double Count).
   b. Normal participation while serving on an active committee or other service activity shall count as one service activity (Single Count).
   c. Participation on a less active committee or other service activity shall count as one half of a service activity (Half Count).
   d. Participation on a committee or other service activity that only meets once or is a single event activity shall count as one fourth of a service activity. Committees that are on stand-by shall also count as one fourth of a service activity (Quarter Count). For annual evaluations, the number of these quarter count service activities shall not exceed eight .
   e. Participating on a special service activity within another service activity, such as (1) serving on a subcommittee of an active committee, (2) participating as a faculty advisor on an RSO trip for a conference or on a tour of a business, or (3) other similar special service activity, would count as a separate service activity.
   f. Participation in activities that directly support student engagement and/or student recruitment is especially encouraged. Such participation will count for one and one half times the number of service activities as those allowed in IV.D.1. (a-d, but not e).
   g. In addition to the documentation required by Section IV.C., faculty members must provide a summary listing of each service activity and a narrative justifying how much each service activity should count. Note that failure to provide this information may result in evaluators returning a portfolio to the faculty member for proper completion of this requirement.
   h. In advance of the deadline for submission of portfolios, the Chair of the School Personnel Committee is encouraged to send an email to the faculty members being evaluated by this committee for retention, promotion, tenure,

or PAI reminding these faculty members of the requirements in this Section IV.D.1.

2. For qualitative assessment, evaluators will review all materials submitted by the faculty member to document service and will consider factors such as:

   a. The nature and extent of leadership provided;
   b. The degree of participation and/or contribution;
   c. The depth, scope, quality, and length of service;
   d. The extent and nature of local, state, national, or international recognition of service;
   e. The relationship of the service to the missions of the academic program, School of Business, and University; and/or
   f. Other appropriate factors.

3. Evaluation of the faculty member's service activities shall be based on the quantitative criteria listed below. However, if a faculty member has not met the quantitative guideline for a specific performance standard, evaluators nevertheless may assess the faculty member as having achieved that performance standard based on other relevant qualitative or quantitative factors. In addition, service is not expected when a faculty member is on sabbatical or leave. Therefore, if a faculty member is on sabbatical or leave during the evaluation period, then the quantitative criteria listed below shall be adjusted downward to account for this time.

   a. For purposes of retention evaluations and annual evaluations after tenure:

      (1) A rating of **Satisfactory** requires documentation of at least one service activity (defined in Section IV.D.1) during the evaluation period;

      (2) A rating of **Significant** requires documentation of at least three service activities (defined in Section IV.D.1) during the evaluation period; and

      (3) A rating of **Superior** requires documentation of at least five service activities (defined in Section IV.D.1) during the evaluation period.

      (4) If a rating of Satisfactory, Significant, or Superior has not been met, then a rating of **Unsatisfactory** shall be given as long as the faculty member has not made a convincing case based on other relevant qualitative or quantitative factors. A rating of **Appropriate** may also be given if the faculty member is in their first probationary year as defined in Article 8.4.b of the Unit A 2022-2026 Contract.

   b. For purposes of promotion when tenured, and professional advancement increase evaluations:

(1) A rating of **Satisfactory** requires documentation of at least an <u>average</u> of one service activity (defined in Section IV.D.1) for each year of the evaluation period;

(2) A rating of **Significant** requires documentation of at least an <u>average</u> of three service activities (defined in Section IV.D.1) for each year of the evaluation period; and

(3) A rating of **Superior** requires documentation of at least an <u>average</u> of five service activities (defined in Section IV.D.1) for each year of the evaluation period.

(4) If a rating of Satisfactory, Significant, or Superior has not been met, then a rating of **Unsatisfactory** shall be given as long as the faculty member has not made a convincing case based on other relevant qualitative or quantitative factors.

c. For purposes of promotion from assistant professor to associate professor for an untenured employee and for tenure evaluations, faculty members must at a minimum achieve the rating of Significant during the fifth retention year and sustain this level through the sixth retention year:

(1) A rating of **Satisfactory** requires documentation of at least one service activity (defined in Section IV.D.1) during each of the fifth and sixth retention years;

(2) A rating of **Significant** requires documentation of at least three service activities (defined in Section IV.D.1) during each of the fifth and sixth retention years; and

(3) A rating of **Superior** requires documentation of at least five service activities (defined in Section IV.D.1) during each of the fifth and sixth retention years.

(4) If a rating of Satisfactory, Significant, or Superior has not been met, then a rating of **Unsatisfactory** shall be given as long as the faculty member has not made a convincing case based on other relevant qualitative or quantitative factors.

School of Business Policy Regarding Online Asynchronous Classroom Visitations

Guiding Principles:

1. Online classroom visitation requirements should mirror, as much as possible, the requirements and standards for face-to-face classroom visitations that are listed in the DAC, Section II.B.2. under which the faculty member is held. As such, this policy applies solely to the adjustments to the applicable DAC procedures that are necessary to account for the inherent differences between face-to-face courses and online asynchronous courses.
2. Evaluations of on-line courses will be conducted in the same spirit as evaluations of face-to-face courses.
3. The number and frequency of online visitations shall be the same as those for face-to-face classroom visitations listed in the DAC Section II.B.2.a.

Procedures for Conducting Online Asynchronous Course Visitations: The following is an adjustment to the face-to-face classroom visitation procedures listed in the DAC Section II.B.2.b. solely to account for the inherent differences between face-to-face and asynchronous online courses. Evaluators will also note the Guiding Principles listed above.

1. If a classroom visitation may be conducted by the chair or associate chair, the faculty member shall determine whether the chair or the associate chair will conduct the online course visitation. Evaluations by the chair/ associate chair may be conducted using the approved School of Business Classroom Evaluation Form or in a format determined by the chair/associate chair.

2. The faculty member will select the faculty member(s) who will complete the peer classroom visitation. The faculty member shall select at least two different peers to conduct classroom visitations during the evaluation period for tenure. The faculty member shall select a School of Business faculty peer who has successfully completed the OCDi training course or has taught an online asynchronous course. Peer evaluations will be conducted using the approved School of Business Classroom Evaluation Form.

3. The faculty member shall coordinate visits to their online courses with the visiting Chair or Associate Chair and peer performing the evaluations. So as to provide sufficient time for the assessment, the faculty member will give the evaluator access to the online course for a limited, but reasonable, period of time (e.g., 8 hours, 24 hours, etc.).

4. In conducting a face-to-face classroom visitation, an evaluator visits a single class session. For an online asynchronous course visitation, the evaluator will assess a single course Module, as well as any additional components of the online course the faculty member would like to be included in the evaluation. The faculty member will select the Module to be evaluated. However, the Module (and any additional course components) should be representative of the faculty member's use of a variety of pedagogical methods and tools. As such, the Module selected shall not include an examination as the main purpose of the Module.

5. Since these courses are taught asynchronously, the selected Module may be evaluated at any mutually agreed to time period during the semester and after the Module is available to the students.

6. In using the approved School of Business Classroom Evaluation Form, evaluators will use their judgment in terms of the wording on the form to account for unique differences between evaluating an online Module and face-to-face class session. For example, for “Oral English proficiency,” if the faculty member has no narrated videos in the Module being evaluated, the evaluator may substitute “written” for “oral” English proficiency by crossing out “oral” on the form and replacing it with the word “written.” Likewise, on the final item on the form, “Overall rating of presentation,” the evaluator will consider the word “presentation” to be synonymous with “Module.” Finally, in the signature area, the “Time of class” may be adjusted to “Time of Evaluation.”

7. All evaluators shall provide a signed, completed copy of the evaluation to the faculty member and the chair no later than four weeks after the visit or December 15, whichever occurs sooner. If any evaluator fails to do so, then the faculty member shall note the failure in the appropriate section of the portfolio. Such failure shall not prevent decisions concerning retention, promotion, tenure, or professional advancement increases.

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
STUDENT EVALUATION FORM

Respond to each of the following questions based on a scale of 1 through 5 where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree

		Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
1.	The course syllabus clearly states what is expected of students in this course.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	The instructor demonstrates command of the subject matter or discipline.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	The instructor effectively organizes knowledge or material for learning.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	The instructor presents knowledge or material effectively.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	The instructor delivers feedback/grading within a reasonable timeframe.					
6.	The instructor communicates effectively using the English language.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	This material presented in the classroom contributed to my understanding of the subject matter of the course.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	The instructor encourages students to participate in the learning process.	1	2	3	4	5
9.		1	2	3	4	5
10.		1	2	2	3	5
11.		1	2	3	4	5
12.						
		1	2	3	4	5
		1	2	3	4	5

Each faculty member may include 4 or fewer additional questions.

School of Business
Classroom Visitation Evaluation Form

U=Unsatisfactory S=Satisfactory HE=Highly Effective SP=Superior N/O=Not Observed

Activity (All activities may not be observed.)	**U**	**S**	**HE**	**SP**	**N/O**	**Comments** (Additional comments may be included on the back or on an attachment.)
Command of subject matter						
Ability to organize material/knowledge for teaching and learning						
Ability to present material/knowledge for teaching and learning (for example, use of examples to clarify points, use of questions to enhance clarity, use of technology)						
Ability to analyze material/knowledge for teaching and learning (including logical synthesis of information)						
Ability to encourage and interest students in the learning process						
Oral English proficiency						
Overall rating of presentation (not an average of the above)						

Professor: ____ Evaluator: ______________________________

Class: ____________ Section: __________ Date: __________ Day: _____________ Time of class: ______________

Evaluator's signature: _______________________________ Professor's Signature: _________________________

Procedures for Student Evaluations[1]

1. Make sure that the instructor is NOT in the room.

2. Verify with the students that you are giving evaluations for the correct class and instructor, according to the information on the front of the packet.

3. After everyone is seated, pass out the evaluation forms.

4. Read the following to the students:

   "Hello, my name is ________, and I am administering student evaluations for this class. Please complete all questions honestly and fairly; the information from these evaluations will be provided to the instructor only after final grades have been turned in. Mark the boxes as indicated in the example at the top of the form. If you provide comments, they **MUST be written in the "Comments" box**—if you write comments elsewhere on the forms, they will not be recorded. "

5. Remind students that they **must use either a # 2 pencil, or blue or black ink, or their responses will not be recorded**.

Returning the evaluations:

When students have finished, place all evaluations, written comments, and pencils, in the envelope and return all materials to LH 4025.

Do not review the evaluations for any reason.

You must turn in the packet as soon as the evaluations are completed and get a staff member or administrator (i.e., the Chair or Associate Chair) to initial receipt of the packet. If no one is in LH 4025, go to LH 4009 to find someone. DO NOT JUST LEAVE THE PACKET IN THE OFFICE WITHOUT GETTING AN AUTHORIZED PERSON TO SIGN FOR IT.

If you are doing an evaluation after office hours (after 4:30 p.m. or on the weekend), return the packet to the mailbox marked "Student Evaluations" on the west wall of LH 4025, and a staff member will initial the packet as soon as the office reopens.

[1]Note that these directions apply to student evaluations done on paper and not those done online.