Department of English & Journalism
Western Illinois University

Department Criteria for Unit A Faculty

2008-2011 Contract

Every candidate for retention, tenure, or promotion in the department will be evaluated by the Department Personnel Committee and the Department Chair in three areas: Teaching, Scholarly/Professional Activities, and Service. Of these three, the most important area is Teaching/Primary duties.

Employees in PY1 and PY2 shall be evaluated in Teaching/Primary Duties and will be required to submit plans for pursuit of Scholarly/Professional activities and demonstrate at least minimal service in each evaluation period. Service activities and plans for Scholarly/Professional activity shall be included in the evaluation portfolio for written advisory comment. A non-retention decision in PY1 and PY2 cannot be based on Scholarly/Professional and Service activities.

Evaluation for PY1 will consider documentation for fall semester of that year. Evaluation for PY2 will consider documentation for spring semester of the first year (with a review of PY1 outline). Evaluation for PY3 will consider documentation for fall and spring semester of PY2 (with a review of PY1 and PY2 outlines). Evaluation of PY4 will consider documentation for fall and spring semesters of PY3 (with a review of all previous years' outlines). Evaluation for PY5 will consider documentation for fall and spring semesters of PY4 (with a review of all previous semester outlines). This system is presented in the chart below.

PY Year	Semester to Be Documented
1	Fall PY 1
2	Spring PY 1*
3	Fall & Spring PY2*
4	Fall & Spring PY 3*
5	Fall & Spring PY 4*
6 (Tenure Year)	Fall PY 1 –Date of Tenure Application*

*Plus outlines from previous years.

The evaluation period for promotion will include the employee's entire record since the initial hiring date or since the year before the effective date of that last promotion, whichever is later.

> An employee may apply for promotion to Associate Professor in her or his fourth or fifth year of full-time service at the University at the rank of Assistant Professor if hired before September 1, 2007.
>
> Faculty hired after September 1, 2007 shall apply for promotion to Associate Professor in

September 1, 2007, will include the employee's entire record since the initial hiring date up to and including the date of submission of the promotion portfolio (Article 20.3.e)

DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

The DPC will be composed of five tenured faculty, one at least to be from the journalism faculty. Committee members will serve staggered two-year terms and will be elected by members of Unit A, the committee chair to be elected by the DPC

When members of the DPC are to be evaluated, they will abstain from all discussion, voting, and other action on their case, but will be part of other committee decisions. When members recuse themselves for this reason, an alternate chosen by lot from former committee members will join the committee, but only to discuss and vote on the abstaining member's evaluation. In all cases, the written recommendation of the committee will be determined by a simple majority vote.

DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

The following are the educational requirements for tenure and promotion:

> For English/Writing faculty : Ph.D. in English or the equivalent earned doctorate;
> For Journalism faculty: Ph.D in Journalism; Ph.D. or other terminal degree in a related field; or a master's in Journalism or a related field with significant experience in a journalism-related field.

EXCEPTIONALITY

An employee who does not satisfy the degree or educational requirements for tenure or promotion may apply for consideration on the basis of exceptional teaching/performance of primary duties, or exceptional scholarly/professional activity. In addition to exceptional performance in the employee's chosen area, the employee will be expected to meet or exceed regular promotion requirements in each of the other two areas of responsibility.

AREAS OF EVALUATION

Candidates should consult the "Provost instructions for portfolio" regarding matters of form. The Department Criteria addresses content only.

I. <u>TEACHING/PERFORMANCE OF PRIMARY DUTIES</u> (file #2)

A. Materials

The following are required to be submitted for evaluation:

1. A narrative that conforms to the requirements of the "Provost instructions for portfolio"
2. Self-evaluations (separate from the narrative required by the "Provost instructions for portfolio")
3. Student evaluations

4. Peer evaluation reports
5. A representative sample of course syllabi and other handouts

Faculty are encouraged to submit any other material to indicate proficiency in teaching.

Faculty who receive ACEs for administrative activities, advising, or other duties will have those activities evaluated as part of their primary duties. They must submit the following:

1. Job description
2. Evaluation by appropriate person(s)
3. Self-evaluation

Other relevant material may also be submitted for evaluation (such as teaching honors or awards).

Faculty who receive ACEs for other kinds of activities (e.g., chairing the Faculty Senate, assigned research) will have those activities evaluated under the appropriate area (scholarly/professional activities or service).

B. Procedures

Faculty shall submit student evaluations for all sections of all courses taught fall and spring semesters beginning fall 2007. Student evaluations are to be administered on the departmentally-approved form (see Attachment 1). Faculty being evaluated are not to be in the room at the time of the evaluation. Evaluations shall be returned to the department office directly or by mail by a disinterested party such as a proctor or responsible student. Faculty are not to see the results of the evaluations until final grades are turned in. Family members of those being evaluated cannot serve as proctors. All materials received as part of the official evaluation process are to be submitted.

Faculty members teaching in the Quad Cities will have students seal evaluation materials in an envelope to be mailed to the department. Because of the complexity of developing technology, evaluation of online courses is a complicated matter, especially in terms of class evaluations. Faculty who teach online courses and who administer course evaluations are to separate on-campus evaluations from online evaluations. The DPC and the Chair will review all distance learning evaluations separately, taking into consideration mitigating factors and unique features, which may include but are not limited to the following: the mode of delivery, the number of sites and types of students, the faculty member's prior experience with this type of learning, and the type of course.

All official student course evaluations remain property of the university. Copies of all course evaluation summaries will be provided to each faculty member and kept in the department office for a minimum of 10 years.

Peer evaluations for probationary faculty are to be arranged by the faculty member in consultation with the Department Chair and/or members of the DPC. Peer evaluations for tenured faculty are to be arranged by the faculty member. The evaluator will submit the report in a letter covering the points in the peer evaluation criteria (listed below in section D). One peer observation is required for each evaluation period.

Self-evaluations should be consistent with department criteria and should include supporting evidence.

C. Characteristics

Each candidate is expected to demonstrate the following characteristics in teaching, and to indicate in the official narrative how the submitted materials demonstrate these qualities. Characteristics 1-4 are quantitatively measured by means of the student evaluation instrument and qualitatively considered by means of the peer evaluation criteria (see Attachments A1 and A2).

1. Command of, currency in, and commitment to the subject matter/discipline.

   a. Thorough and current knowledge of the subject area.

   b. Genuine interest in the subject matter and effective and methods of presenting it engagingly.

2. Ability to organize, analyze, and present knowledge.

   a. Presentation to each class of an informative syllabus and clear goals and objectives.

   b. Clear and coherent course organization.

   c. Clear and coherent class organization and presentation, regardless of format or mode of delivery.

3. Receptiveness to students and ability to encourage them in the learning process.

   a. Genuine concern for students and willingness to address their academic needs, both in and outside of class.

   b. Encouragement of students to participate actively in their own learning.

4. Evaluation of student work with fairness and pertinence to course objectives.

   a. Fairness and appropriateness of evaluation instruments.

   b. Clarity of grading system which allows students to assess their standing throughout the semester.

      c. Willingness to provide explanation and guidance about grades and other types of evaluation of student work.

Involvement in documented professional growth activities contributing to enhanced teaching (e.g., professional meetings, workshops) is a way faculty can demonstrate continuing involvement in and development of their teaching.

All candidates must be proficient in oral and written English as mandated by state law.

D. Evaluation

The DPC and the Chair will review all submitted material to arrive at their independent evaluation of the quality of the faculty member's teaching. Faculty member's evaluation will consist of

1. student evaluations

2. peer evaluations

3. self evaluations and other material submitted.

Faculty shall be evaluated on the basis of more than one measurement of teaching effectiveness. Numerical scores on student evaluations shall not be the sole determinant in tenure, promotion, and 4-year appraisal recommendations. Evaluators should not render negative personnel decisions based on one or a few low scores or one or a few classes, but rather evaluators should interpret numerical scores from student evaluations in terms of clear and consistent "patterns" that have developed over the appropriate evaluation period.

Quantitatively, teaching effectiveness will be based on a pattern of performance, and not on isolated performances in one class or for one se

courses during the review period, a pattern of marked improvement, a pattern of good scores on certain key items). The DPC and Chair will consider the inherent difference in form, content, or audience of individual courses that might affect evaluation results. Overall mean scores of online courses of 3.50 will meet the teaching requirement.

Qualitatively, teaching effectiveness will be based on peer and self-evaluation reports which are determined by the following criteria. Self-evaluations and peer evaluations will cover at least a majority of the following criteria, which illustrate that teachers should:

> Demonstrate thorough and current knowledge of subject area
> Show genuine interest in subject matter
> Use effective methods of presenting subject matter engagingly
> Present informative syllabus with clear goals and objectives
> Provide a clear grading system that allows students to assess their standing throughout the semester
> Organize the course clearly and coherently
> Organize the class meetings clearly and coherently
> Encourage students to engage in their own learning process
> Respond flexibly to classroom situations
> Develop good rapport with the students in this class meeting

EVALUATION OF NON-TEACHING ACES

The DPC and the Chair will evaluate, based on individual job descriptions, all material submitted regarding work other than teaching done for ACEs and will determine whether the evidence

category is appropriate for the submission, determination will be made by consultation between the DPC/ and the Chair and the candidate.

Copies of all published material and copies of all presentations will be included in the Scholarly/Professional Activities file.

The following lists are not to be considered exhaustive but are intended to be used as a guide.

<u>Category 1 – Scholarly Activities</u>

1. English

   a. Publications (refereed): books, monographs, articles, textual editions.

   Note: If an individual faculty member can demonstrate that another activity in the Scholarly/Professional area, such as "invited or virtual publications" or "refereed articles in scholarly editions," is of at least equal rigor and importance to the discipline, the DPC and Chair may consider this activity as substituting for one of the publications.

   b. Publications (print or virtual): Articles in books, textbooks, study guides, instructor manuals, reviews, notes, papers published in conference proceedings, republications of articles or chapters.

   c. Presentations (refereed or invited): academic conference papers, keynote addresses, discussant/respondent duties, panel member, workshop leader.

   d. Editing for print or virtual scholarly publications

   e. Funded grants, institutes, seminars, fellowships

   f. Development of professionally-recognized CD-ROM, DVD, or Web Site

   g. Substantial (both in quality and quantity) work in progress*

   h. Other items submitted for consideration

2. Creative Writing

   a. Publications (refereed/juried): novels, poems, stories, essays, plays, or film scripts

   Note: If an individual faculty member can demonstrate that another activity in the Scholarly/Professional area, such as "invited or virtual publications" or "refereed works in collections," is of at least equal rigor and importance to the discipline, the DPC and Chair may consider this activity as substituting for one of the publications.

b. Publications (print or virtual): Textbooks, study guides, instructor manuals, reviews, notes, papers published in conference proceedings, republications of articles or chapters

c. Public readings of original work (refereed/juried or invited)

d. Editing for a print or virtual creative publication

e.

      d.   Reviewer of manuscripts for a professional journal

      e.   Reviewer of professional conference proposals

      f.   Program evaluator

      g.   Leadership in professional organizations

      h.   Non-funded grant

      i.   Honors and awards for scholarly and professional activities

      j.   WIU or community presentation that requires substantial scholarly research and reading

      k.   Invited textbook evaluation for publication

      l.   Consultation demonstrating professional expertise and achievement

      m.   Attendance at professional meetings, documented by notes submitted from sessions attended

      n.   Other items submitted for consideration

2. Creative Writing

      a.   Performance in a film, play, or reading

      b.   Planner of professional meetings or performances (other than as director

      c.   Director of professional workshops

      d.   Membership on editorial board

      e.   Reader for a scholarly journal

      f.   Evaluator of grant proposals

      g.   Non-funded grant

      h.   Honors and awards for scholarly, professional, or creative activities

      i.   Invited textbook evaluation for publication

      j.   Consultation demonstrating professional expertise and achievement

      k. Attendance at professional meetings documented by notes submitted from sessions attended

      l. Other items submitted for consideration

3. Journalism

a. Chairperson/planner/session leader at scholarly/professional meetings

b. Organizing/directing professional/corporate workshops or conferences

c. Member of professional journal editorial board

d. Reader for a scholarly journal

e. Reviewer of professional conference proposals

f. Start-up or publication/management of own newspaper, magazine, newsletter, website, BLOG, or other media system to deliver content to audiences

g. Work in or for an established advertising or public relations agency

h. Advertising/public relations/news/editorial consulting activities

i. Evaluation of grant proposals

j. Leadership in professional activities

ls

The DPC and the Chair will review all written materials (including drafts of presentations given at scholarly meetings) to determine the quality and importance of the work; if necessary, the DPC will consult with experts in the field.

For Retention

Candidates are expected to sustain excellence in scholarly/professional activities. (For PY years, refer to the table on the first page of the Department Criteria.)

1. Employees in PY1 and PY2 will be required to submit plans for pursuit of Scholarly/Professional Activities and will list Scholarly/Professional Activities for that evaluation period for written advisory comment from the DPC, department chair, and dean. A non-retention decision in PY1 and PY2

1. committees (at the department and either the college or university level)
2. recruitment/retention activities
3. sponsorship or advising of student organizations
4. mentoring faculty or students
5. community or regional agency work or consultation
6. judging writing contests
7. assessing and reviewing programs

For faculty assigned to the WIU-Quad Cities campus, the DPC and department chair will recognize alternatives to Macomb-based committee service.

Submitted material must include a self-evaluative description of the amount and significance of the service involved (which may be included in the service narrative). Faculty are encouraged to obtain written documentation for all service activities.

Department of English and Journalism
Western Illinois University

Evaluation Criteria for Associate Faculty

Associate faculty are evaluated according to the procedures appearing in Article 33 of the contract. The following points summarize the procedures for Associate Faculty as they are applied by the Department of English and Journalism.

1. Evaluation of Associate Faculty does not occur until the completion of one academic semester of service as an Associate Faculty member at the university and consists of a review by the department chair and the college dean of the employee's performance of teaching/primary duties. Senior Associate Faculty are only evaluated every three years as long as they continue to receive highly effective ratings.

2. In accordance with Article 33.1.b.1 of the contract, the department chair and the dean will review

    Student course evaluations of all courses taught, as well as documentation of any other instructional activities/primary duties.

    All Associate Faculty will attempt to have at least three-quarters of the students in each class participate in the evaluation. Faculty are not to be in the room during the evaluation, nor are they to see the results of the evaluations until final grades are turned in. Faculty may have the evaluation process proctored by another faculty member or by a graduate student. Summaries of course evaluations and all materials will be kept on file by the Chair; copies will be provided to the employee. The employee may submit a written analysis of evaluations.

3. The department chair and the dean will also consider additional evidence offered by the employee, including the course syllabus and at least one of the following:
    a self-evaluation;
    class visitation by the chair and/or by designated members of the department faculty, selected by mutual consent of the employee and department chair;
    samples of relevant course materials (handouts, assignments, test questions, student answers, and so on);
    graded or evaluated student writing;
    description of student conference procedures;
    student testimonials;
    material demonstrating involvement in scholarly/professional activities and service;
    evidence of innovative and effective teaching methods.

4. In evaluating the evidence of teaching effectiven

x

    2) effective methods of presentation;

ability to communicate effectively with students as evidenced by
    1) oral and written proficiency in English as mandated by state law
    2) willingness to meet with students to address their academic needs;

clarity of class procedures and objectives of course as evidenced by
    1) clearly stated course objectives and course assignments
    2) stated goals that fall within the learning objectives of the Writing Program (where applicable);

clear organization as evidenced by
    1) a syllabus providing necessary information for the course
    2) materials presented in a logical sequence;

encouragement of students' participation in class as evidenced by
    1) providing students opportunities to participate in their own learning
    2)

determine a pattern of effectiveness, which may be demonstrated in various ways (e.g., a preponderance of good scores in most courses during the review period, a pattern of marked improvement, or a pattern of good scores on certain key issues).

number of sites and types and number of students, the faculty member's prior experience with this type of learning, the course format, and the type of course.

EVALUATION OF TEAM-TAUGHT COURSES

The department encourages faculty involved in team-teaching to administer course evaluations (primarily for their own self-assessment). These evaluations will not be used in evaluating the faculty member.