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  **DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING AND FINANCE**

**COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND TECHNOLOGY**

**DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA**

**Purpose of Evaluation**

The University is responsible for evaluating the performance of all employees. The purposes of evaluation are to judge the effectiveness of an employee’s performance, to identify areas of strength and weaknesses, and to improve employee performance. Additionally, it shall provide a basis for the University President and the Board, as appropriate, to make decisions concerning retention, promotion, tenure or professional achievement awards. It is the responsibility of all employees to submit the materials and follow the schedules identified in this document or in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

**The Departmental Personnel Committee and Co-Chairs**

The Departmental Personnel Committee (DPC) shall consist of all tenured faculty within the Department of Accounting and Finance except the Department Chair. Recognizing the distinct nature of the two disciplines within the Department, the DPC will have co-chairs from the accounting and finance areas. The DPC members in each area will elect a co-chair based on a secret, majority vote. The role of each co-chair is to facilitate the fair, efficient, and timely decision-making and flow of documentation in his/her area.

If there are less than three tenured faculty eligible in either area, additional tenured faculty will be chosen from the other area or from outside of the department. No faculty member, including DPC members, shall be present at DPC deliberations if his/her own evaluation portfolio or that of a family member is being discussed; and no one may evaluate a family member’s or his/her own file. The role of the DPC in retention, promotion, or tenure is to provide written recommendations to the Department Chair. Failure to constitute a committee or failure of a committee to make a recommendation shall not prevent decisions concerning retention, promotion, or tenure from being made. In the event of a tie, the decision would be in favor of the request.

Emphasizing the distinct nature of the two disciplines again, faculty are to be evaluated based on the Department Criteria (DC) established for the area in which they primarily teach. The next sections contain the DC for the accounting and finance areas. Only area faculty on the DPC, except as noted above, are allowed to vote on retention, tenure, and promotion decisions.

**DEPARTMENT CRITERIA-AREA OF ACCOUNTING**

**I. Criteria for Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty**

**A. General Terms and Conditions**

**1. Introduction**

The area of Accounting’s DC are based on Article 20 of the 2010‑2015 Collective Bargaining Agreement (Agreement) between the Western Illinois University Board of Trustees and the University Professionals of Illinois Local 4100. The DC describe the evaluation materials, areas of evaluation, performance standards, and the procedures which will be used to evaluate the performance of employees requesting retention, promotion or tenure. An employee’s performance is compared against the DC, and not against other employees’ performance.

The effectiveness of each employee being considered for retention, promotion or tenure, (see Article 20.4.), will be evaluated in the areas of Teaching/Primary Duties, Scholarly/Professional Activities, and Service Activities. Teaching/Primary Duties is the most important of the three areas of evaluation.

It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to provide evidence of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, Scholarly/Professional Activity, and Service in the evaluation portfolio. Each faculty member will be given a written copy of the evaluation submitted to the Department Chair by the Department Personnel Committee (DPC). If a faculty member so requests, the Department Personnel Committee will meet with the faculty member at a mutually agreeable time to discuss the actions of the committee. The DPC, the Department Chair, and subsequent evaluators may request and receive additional clarification or documentation to assist in the performance evaluation of an employee.

**2. Retention**

There shall be an annual evaluation of all non‑tenured tenure‑track faculty members for the purpose of making a recommendation concerning the retention of those faculty members. The performance standards/requirements are specified in Section B of this document. The evaluation period for retention is specified in Article 20.3.a-.c of the Agreement. A faculty member may elect a higher probationary year based on prior teaching experience, per Article 20.9.e and 20.10.g of the Agreement.

Primary emphasis will be placed on performance since the initial appointment date for first year employees; for all other probationary employees, primary emphasis will be placed on the period beginning with the semester they submitted their most recent evaluation portfolio. However, each evaluation period shall be considered not in isolation but in the context of the employee's total probationary performance record. Probationary employees will show improvement in Teaching/Primary duties and increased quantity and quality of performance in Scholarly/Professional and Service activities. Exceptions to this expectation may be made for faculty whose performance is sufficiently strong that significant improvement would be difficult to achieve.

Employees in PY1 and PY2 shall be evaluated in Teaching/Primary Duties. Employees in PY1 and PY2 will be required to submit plans for pursuit of Scholarly/Professional activities, and may list Scholarly/Professional activities for that evaluation period if applicable. Employees in PY1 and PY2 will demonstrate at least minimal service in each evaluation period. Service activities, Scholarly/Professional activities, and plans for Scholarly/Professional activities shall be included in the evaluation portfolio for written advisory comment from the Department Personnel Committee, department chair, and dean. A non-retention decision in PY1 and PY2 cannot be based on Scholarly/Professional or Service activities. PY1 and PY2 written advisory comments are intended for the faculty member’s professional development, and shall not be used as a basis for personnel decision making in PY1, PY2, or in future evaluation years.

Evaluation for PY 1 will consider documentation for fall semester of that year. Evaluation for PY 2 will consider documentation for spring semester of the first year (with a review of PY1 outline). Evaluation for PY 3 will consider documentation for fall and spring semesters of PY 2 (with a review of PY 1 and PY 2 outlines). Evaluation of PY 4 will consider documentation for fall and spring semesters of PY 3 (with a review of all previous years' outlines). Evaluation for PY 5 will consider documentation for fall and spring semesters of PY 4 (with a review of all previous semester outlines). This system is presented in the chart in Article 20.3 .c.

Employees who begin their employment after October 1st shall remain in PY 1 their entire second employment year. In January of their second employment year they will have the previous spring and fall evaluated. They then will fall into the normal cycle described above beginning with PY2.

**3. Tenure**

Faculty members who meet the education and time requirements for tenure specified in the Agreement may apply for tenure. Such a request shall be directed in writing to the Department Personnel Committee. The performance standards/requirements for the recommendation of tenure are specified in Section B of this document.

The evaluation period for tenure as specified in Article 20.3.d of the Agreement will include the total number of years employed as a probationary faculty member at the University, up to and including the date of submission of the tenure portfolio.

Education requirements for tenure in the area of accounting as follows:

* for faculty teaching tax courses Ph.D. in Business Administration with a

 major/emphasis in accounting; or Ph.D.

 in Accounting; or a DBA with a major/emphasis in accounting; or combination of graduate degrees in law and accounting.

* for faculty teaching other Ph.D. in Business Administration with a

 accounting courses major/emphasis in accounting; or Ph.D. in

 Accounting; or a DBA with a major/emphasis in accounting; or a doctoral degree in business other than accounting and sufficient professional development activities in accounting to include: intellectual contributions, participation in professional or academic meetings, consulting, and other professional development activities in the field.

In tenure evaluations, the performance standards/requirements will be used to judge whether an employee's performance has reached the required degree of effectiveness by the end of the evaluation period.

Any recommendations for tenure of faculty members who do not meet the educational requirements for tenure are made "by exception" as defined in Article 20.10.f (1) of the Agreement.

**4. Promotion**

Faculty members who meet the education and time requirements for promotion specified in Articles 20.9.a and .b of the Agreement may request a review. Such a request shall be directed in writing to the Department Personnel Committee. The performance standards/requirements for promotion are specified in Section B of this document. A faculty member shall apply for promotion to Associate Professor in the same year that she or he applies for tenure.

The evaluation period for promotions as specified in Article 20.3.e of the agreement will include the employee’s entire record since the initial hiring date in Unit A or since the year before the effective date of the last promotion, whichever is later. Beginning September 1, 2008, and through the end of this contract, the evaluation period for promotion (to both Associate Professor and Full Professor) will include the employee's entire record since the initial hiring date in Unit A up to and including the date of submission of the promotion portfolio.

An employee who has been employed full time in a tenured or tenure-track position at a regionally (or an equivalent international body) accredited baccalaureate degree-granting institution of higher education may elect to have counted toward promotion to Associate Professor one year or two consecutive years of full time service employment of the employee’s choice if the year(s) of previous of employment occurred within the last five years immediately prior to one’s initial appointment to a position at Western Illinois University. Faculty who count previous years of employment toward promotion may have their Scholarly/Professional activity record during that same one year or two years considered as part of their performance. The requirements are further explained in Article 20.9.e of the Agreement.

Any recommendations for promotion of faculty members who do not meet the educational requirements for promotion are made "by exception" as defined in Article 20.9.c of the Agreement.

For promotion, the performance standards will be used to judge an employee's performance in the aggregate over the evaluation period.

**5. Promotion and Tenure by Exception**

Subject to conditions in Articles 20.9.c and 20.10.f (1) of the Agreement employees who do not meet the degree requirements and who apply for promotion or tenure on the basis of exception must meet the exceptional performance standards/requirements specified in part B of this document.

**6. Four Year Appraisal of Tenured Faculty**

Subject to conditions in Article 20.12 and the evaluation period specified in Article 20.3.g of the Agreement the Department Chair will review tenured faculty every four years.

**7**. **Professional Achievement Awards (PAA)**

As specified in Article 20.13.b in the Agreement all tenured/tenure-track faculty, beginning with PY1, are eligible for the PAA. Faculty may submit their points for a PAA every year of their employment and the PAA will be awarded whenever the threshold of 35 points is met. Points applied toward a PAA must be submitted on or around September 1 the year after they were earned in order for them to count toward a PAA.

The evaluation period for PAAs will be the academic year (first day of fall semester through the day preceding the first day of the following fall semester) repeatable until sufficient points are earned to obtain the award.

To earn a PAA, a faculty member needs to fulfill the following conditions:

* Meet or exceed 35 total points; and
* Meet or exceed 8 points in Teaching/Primary duties; 8 points in Scholarly/Professional activities; and 8 points in Service activities.

Or

Earn a total of 55 points regardless of the activity area,

There is no limit to the number of PAAs earned over the course of a faculty member’s career. A faculty member’s points continue to accumulate from one year to the next, until one of the conditions above are met and the person earns a PAA. In the following year, the faculty member’s pool of points would be set back to zero, and the process toward earning a PAA would begin again.

The Department of Accounting and Finance PAA Document specifies the PAA activities and points.

**B. Performance Standards/Requirements**

1. **Introduction**

Faculty are expected to demonstrate an appropriate level of performance in the area of Teaching/Primary Duties, Scholarly/Professional Activity area, and the Service area. Teaching/Primary Duties shall be the most important area of responsibility. All of these areas will be evaluated both quantitatively and qualitatively by all evaluators.

Where a faculty member does not meet the degree requirements for tenure or promotion and applies for such on the basis of exception, he/she will be required to demonstrate exceptional performance in Teaching/Primary Duties or Scholarly/Professional Activities. **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 two other areas of responsibility.**

 In the performance evaluation process consideration will be given to factors such as rank, years of teaching experience, related professional experience, and other factors that directly impact the expected level of performance.

**2. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties**

Given the Department’s commitment to excellence in teaching; the first area to be evaluated is the employee’s Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties. Evaluation of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties will include student evaluations and other Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties evidence.

**a. Student Evaluations:**

It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to coordinate the student evaluation process. The official area of accounting Student Evaluation instrument (attached to the end of this document) will be administered in all classes each semester (including the summer and inter‑session classes).

Faculty members for a team taught course can be evaluated separately.

All evaluations will be administered by an individual designated by the Department Chair. The forms completed by the students are to be turned over to an individual designated by the Department Chair for processing. Student course evaluations will be compiled for each class separately‑‑multiple course composites are not acceptable. On‑campus and off‑campus sections of the same class will be reported as separate classes. Student course evaluations with comments will not be returned to the faculty member. The department secretary will transcribe the student comments and a copy provided to the faculty member after grades have been reported. Summary statistics will also be compiled and given to each faculty member. Faculty members who question the accuracy of the transcription of student comments or the summary statistics may request that the DPC and/or Department Chair review the original evaluations within a month of receiving the feedback. A copy of the appropriate evaluation summaries for courses taught during the evaluation period must be submitted by the faculty member to the evaluators as required documentation for any formal performance evaluation.

Student evaluations should not be used as the lone measurement of teaching unless no other evidence is presented for consideration. Question #5 from the attached instrument should be used as an overall measurement. A minimum threshold for the first year evaluation should be 2.5 (on a 5 point scale). Candidates for tenure and/or promotion should have an average student score of at least 3.3 on question #5. These thresholds should be used as guidelines.

All official student course evaluations remain the property of the University. Only official student evaluations shall be used in the teaching evaluation process. Student and program assessment results will not be used in the evaluation of faculty performance.

Special consideration will be given to the evaluation of faculty teaching distance learning courses so that the inherent differences between these classes and regular classes do not adversely affect a faculty member’s evaluation. Items considered will include the following:

* type of distance learning
* number of sites and number of students
* faculty member’s prior experience with the type of distance learning and/or the course
* course format (lecture, discussion, types of assignments, examinations, etc.), and
* type and level of course (required, elective, graduate, undergraduate, major, non‑major, etc.).

Procedures for the administration of evaluations in distance learning courses will be identical to those specified above for non‑distance learning courses.

The evaluators shall review course evaluation summaries and make a professional judgment as to the level of teaching effectiveness (qualitatively and quantitatively) an employee has achieved during the evaluation period.

**b. Other Evidence of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties:**

* A copy of the faculty workload assignments must be included in the evaluation portfolio.
* In addition to student evaluations, the evaluators will consider the following evidence:
	+ inherent differences in form, content, or audience of courses
	+ syllabi and reading lists
	+ list of projects and assignments
	+ exams
	+ handouts
	+ use of instructional technologies
	+ application for and/or receipt of external or internal instructional grant(s)
	+ textbooks and lecture notes
	+ teaching‑oriented professional activities and workshop presentations
	+ teaching‑related contributions to professional journals
	+ attendance at Continuing Professional Education (CPE) programs
	+ self‑developed teaching aids (such as audio visual materials)
	+ videotapes of teaching
	+ new course development
	+ guest speakers
	+ field trips, and
	+ instructional innovations.

The evaluators shall assess the documentation of the above mentioned and other items submitted by the employee on the basis of their originality, relevance, and utility to the employee’ s Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties.The evaluators will also assess the comprehensiveness of course syllabi to determine if they reflect course topics expected to be covered.

**c. Classroom Visitations and Oral English Proficiency**

In addition to the above‑mentioned measurements of teaching effectiveness, an employee may also be evaluated through the process of classroom visitation at the request of the employee, the DPC Chair, or the Department Chair. All classroom visitations are arranged‑‑an employee will be consulted about the date, time, and place of the visit by the Department Chair and/or the DPC Chair. Oral English proficiency will be assessed during these visitations.

At the conclusion of a classroom visitation, the Department Chair and/or the Chair of the DPC will write separate evaluation narratives concerning their overall perceptions of the effectiveness of an employee’s teaching as observed in the class visitation. These evaluations shall be provided to the employee within one week of the class visitation. The employee may attach a written response to the evaluation narrative within one week after receiving the evaluation narratives. The Department Chair will retain a copy of the evaluations and responses. The classroom evaluation narrative(s) and the employee’s written response(s) must be included by the employee in his or her evaluation portfolio.

**d. Primary Duties Other Than Teaching (Other Assigned Primary Duties)**

In the event an employee is assigned primary duties in addition to teaching, the employee is required to provide documentation as to her or his performance of such duties. This documentation may include such itemsas a description of the nature of duties assigned and progress made or time frame for the completion of duties; and a written report or documentation showing progress or completion of duties with reference to the stated objectives of these duties. Other duties may include but are not limited to the following activities:

* + research projects
	+ participation in student recruitment and advising
	+ assistance to department teams taking part in competitions
	+ faculty advising of a student organization, and
	+ other activities which are part of the faculty workload assignment.

Assignments in non‑teaching/teaching‑related activities must be classified as primary duties and will be evaluated as such. The outcome of research projects, however, will also be counted within the Scholarly/Professional Activity category.

**e. Exceptional Performance Standards/Requirements**

For Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties to be considered exceptional an employee:

* + must meet the performance standards/requirements for promotion or tenure (other than degree)
	+ must have been consistently rated highly by students
	+ must have been consistently rated highly by the Department Chair and/or the Chair of the DPC in classroom visitations, and
	+ must provide documented evidence of creative and innovative instructional methods and technologies that enhanced student learning.

**3.** **Scholarly/Professional Activities**

The second area to be evaluated is the employee’s Scholarly/Professional Activities. An evaluation of an employee’s Scholarly/Professional Activities is not merely counting the number of books, articles, presentations, etc.; rather it involves a professional judgment by the evaluators about the quantitative and qualitative employee contributions in this area. Satisfaction of the minimum requirements below does not guarantee tenure or promotion.

Qualitative factors considered for the evaluation of Scholarly/Professional Activities include:

* + quality of journal/annual/proceedings or perceived reputation of the outlet
	+ refereed versus non‑refereed publication
	+ research versus professional publication
	+ international, national, regional, or local presentation
	+ number of co‑authors
	+ length of publication
	+ note versus article
	+ internal versus external grant
	+ size of grant received, and
	+ funded versus non‑funded grant application.

Employees being evaluated in this area must demonstrate an appropriate level of performance over the period of evaluation and meet the quantitative standards specified later in this document.

All of the Scholarly/Professional Activities included in the evaluation portfolio submitted to the evaluators must contain appropriate documentation (a brief description of each activity commenting on the quality factors listed above and a copy of the article, abstract of the book, acceptance or revision letter from the editor or program chair, or other appropriate documentation). It is the employee’s responsibility to provide clarification and documentation to justify the inclusion of a publication as a journal article versus a proceeding. The following shall apply in determining whether and/or when credit is received for Scholarly/Professional Activities and output (even though a particular year is emphasized here, the entire record is part of the evaluation process):

* **Proceedings publication:** cannot be also listed as a presentation and is not considered a journal article. A refereed journal article based on a proceedings publication is counted separately provided that the original publication has been significantly and substantially revised/updated to meet the publication requirements of the journal; however, it is the employee’s responsibility to provide justification and documentation to support the "double counting" of such a publication.
* **Work in progress:** may be cited in consecutive years, but only with documentation of the nature and extent of the progress.
* **Acceptance of a manuscript/article/paper for publication:** will count again even if counted in previous years as “work in progress.”
* **Actual publication:** will not count again if counted in the previous year as "accepted."

Minimum Scholarly/Professional Activities Requirements:

* **For retention:** demonstrated progress towards meeting the tenure requirement. Failure to demonstrate progress may result in denial of retention in any probationary year after PY2.
* **For tenure:** at least three refereed journal articles and evidence of three other Scholarly/Professional Activities during the period of evaluation in order to be considered for tenure.
* **For promotion to Associate Professor:** at least three refereed journal articles and evidence of ***three*** other Scholarly/Professional Activities during the period of evaluation in order to be considered for promotion.
* **For promotion to Professor:** an average of at least one refereed journal article and one ***other*** Scholarly/Professional Activity for every two years of the evaluation period after gaining the rank of Associate Professor, with a minimum of three of each, in order to be considered for promotion. Note that these requirements are in addition to those counted for promotion to, or appointment as, Associate Professor.

Evidence of Scholarly/Professional Activities may include but are not limited to the following:

* + books (professional or text)
	+ articles (refereed and non‑refereed)
	+ presentations (refereed and non‑refereed)
	+ proceedings of an international, national, or regional conference (refereed and non‑refereed)
	+ application for and/or receipt of external or internal research grant(s)
	+ formal written responses to exposure drafts
	+ monographs
	+ externally published cases, exercises, and software
	+ book/software reviews
	+ submissions
	+ documented work‑in‑progress
	+ professional certification(s)
	+ support materials for a textbook
	+ manuscript review for a referred journal

The evaluators shall assess the documentation of the above mentioned and other items submitted by the employee on the basis of their originality, relevance, and utility to the employee’ s Scholarly/Professional Activities.Continuing Professional Education (CPE) is required for some faculty due to professional licensing, certification, or membership in professional organizations. The Department Accounting and Finance encourages faculty participation and presentations in CPE programs to enrich both their teaching and scholarly/professional activities. CPE, however, does not satisfy the Scholarly/Professional Activity requirement.

**Exceptional Performance Standards/Requirements**

For Scholarly/Professional Activities to be considered exceptional an employee:

* + must meet the performance standards/requirements for promotion or tenure (other than degree)
	+ should provide documented evidence that some of the journal articles were published in high quality journals, and
	+ should provide documented evidence that some of the proceedings articles were presented and published in conference proceedings of leading academic or practitioners’ organizations/associations in the employee’s field.

**4. Service Activities**

The third area of evaluation is the employee’s Service activities. Such service activities must relate to the professional responsibilities of the employee. The review and evaluation of service activities will include both a qualitative and a quantitative evaluation of the efforts and contributions made by the employee during the period of evaluation.

The quantity and quality of service for a new faculty member is expected to be incremental. The level of service during the first year should be minimal and should increase gradually in subsequent years. For retention, a faculty member must show progress toward meeting the activies for tenure described below.

All candidates for tenure and/or promotion must demonstrate an excellent level of sustained service to the department. In addition, significant service in at least one of the following areas: college, university, professional, or community is required.

Qualitative Standards for evaluation of Service:

* + extent and nature of leadership and degree of participation
	+ quality of contribution and length of service, and
	+ extent and nature of any recognition of service.

In order to evaluate the nature and extent of the faculty member’s service, the evidential materials submitted should contain a descriptive statement of each service activity together with information concerning the above factors.

Service activities which are part of a faculty member’s assigned workload will be considered as part of the Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties*.*

All faculty members are expected to provide an appropriate level of service to the department, college, university, and/or community (subject to the feasibility of such services). Service may include, but is not limited to:

* + committees (chair and member)
	+ involvement in Executive Development programs
	+ on‑campus and community presentations
	+ student group advising
	+ independent study and thesis supervision
	+ student recruitment and retention activities
	+ consulting
	+ application for and/or receipt of external or internal service‑related grant(s)
	+ editorship of a professional journal, a book of readings, or conference proceedings
	+ membership on an editorial board of a refereed journal
	+ chairmanship of a program at an international, national, regional, or local conference
	+ discussant or reviewer for a conference
	+ honors student advising
	+ professional or university related work with community organizations
	+ efforts to assist in the placement of students and graduates
	+ presentations and assistance to student organizations
	+ involvement in assessment activities
	+ student mentoring
	+ participation in student organization programs, and
	+ advising students/teams participating in campus/regional/national competitions.

Faculty assigned to WIU-Quad Cities can meet college and university service requirements via active participation on WIU-Quad Cities committees or Macomb-based college and university committees.

The evaluators shall assess the documentation of the above mentioned and other items submitted by the employee on the basis of their originality, relevance, and utility to the employee’ s Service activities. **II. Evaluation of Associate Faculty in the Bargaining Unit**

**Introduction**

Associate faculty are evaluated on the basis of the degree of effectiveness in Teaching/ Performance of Primary Duties. Associate Faculty will be evaluated every year and must receive a “satisfactory” rating from the Department Chair. Associate Faculty promoted to Senior Associate Faculty status will be evaluated every three years as long as they maintain a highly effective rating. A Senior Associate Faculty member who receives a satisfactory rating will be evaluated annually until receiving a highly effective rating, at which time he/she returns to the three-year evaluation cycle.

Associate Faculty may be promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor and/or Senior Associate Faculty, as defined in Article 33.1.d .(1) and (2) of the Agreement. Associate Faculty in their ninth year of service who have received highly effective ratings in the last three years will achieve Senior Associate Faculty status.

Associate Faculty who meet Department Criteria may apply for promotion to Assistant Professor. To be promoted to Assistant Professor, an Associate Faculty member should have a professional record comparable to those who would be seriously considered for employment if a Unit A Assistant Professor vacancy were to be advertised. Specific criteria for promotion to Assistant Professor is included in the section below entitled: “Unit B: Associate Faculty Promotion to Assistant Professor.”

The categories of evaluation are student evaluations, and evidence of other Teaching/ Performance of Primary Duties.

**a. Student Evaluations:**

It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to coordinate the student evaluation process. The official Area of Accounting Student Evaluation instrument (attached to the end of this document) must be administered to all classes during each semester (including the summer and inter‑session classes) by an individual designated by the Department Chair. The forms completed by the students are to be turned over to an individual designated by the Department Chair for processing. Student course evaluations will be compiled for each class separately. On‑campus and off‑campus sections of the same class will be reported as separate classes. Student course evaluations with comments will not be returned to the faculty member. The department secretary will transcribe the student comments and a copy provided to the faculty member after grades have been reported. Summary statistics will also be compiled and given to each faculty member. Faculty members who question the accuracy of the transcription of student comments or the summary statistics may request that the Department Chair review the original evaluations within a month of receiving the feedback. A copy of theevaluation summaries for courses taught during the evaluation period must be submitted by the faculty member to the Department Chair as required documentation for any formal performance evaluation.

Faculty members from a team taught course can be evaluated separately.

Student evaluations should not be used as the lone measurement of teaching unless no other evidence is presented for consideration. Question #5 from the attached instrument should be used as an overall measurement. A minimum threshold for the first year evaluation should be 2.5 (on a 5 point scale). After five years of experience associate faculty members should receive as an average score from the previous three years of at least 3.3 on question #5 (see the attached student evaluation instrument).

All official student course evaluations remain the property of the University. Only official student evaluations shall be used in the teaching evaluation process. Student and program assessment results will not be used in the evaluation of faculty performance.

Special consideration will be given to the evaluation of faculty teaching distance learning courses so that the inherent differences between these classes and regular classes do not adversely affect a faculty member’s evaluation. Items considered will include the following:

* + type of distance learning
	+ number of sites and number of students
	+ faculty member’s prior experience with the type of distance learning and/or the course
	+ course format (lecture, discussion, types of assignments, examinations, etc.), and
	+ type and level of course (required, elective, graduate, undergraduate, major, non‑major, etc.)

Procedures for the administration of evaluations in distance learning courses will be identical to those specified above for non‑distance learning courses.

**b. Other Evidence of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties:**

 A copy of the faculty workload assignments must be included in the evaluation portfolio.

 In addition to student evaluations, the Chair will consider the following:

* + inherent differences in form, content, or audience of courses
	+ syllabi and reading lists
	+ list of projects and assignments
	+ use of instructional technologies
	+ textbooks and lecture notes
	+ teaching‑oriented professional activities and workshop presentations
	+ teaching‑related contributions to professional journals
	+ attendance at Continuing Professional Education (CPE) programs
	+ self‑developed teaching aids (such as audio visual materials)
	+ videotapes of teaching
	+ new course development
	+ guest speakers
	+ field trips
	+ faculty advising of a student organization
	+ instructional innovations
	+ joint faculty/student research projects
	+ participation in student recruitment and advising, and
	+ assistance to department teams taking part in competitions

 .

The Department Chair shall evaluate the documentation of the above mentioned and other items submitted by the employee on the basis of their originality, relevance, and utility to employee’s Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties.

 **Classroom Visitations and Oral English Proficiency**

In addition to the above‑mentioned measurements of teaching effectiveness, Associate Faculty may also be evaluated through the process of classroom visitation at the request of either the faculty member or the Department Chair. All classroom visitations are arranged‑‑an employee will be consulted about the date, time, and place of the visit by the Department Chair. Oral English proficiency will be assessed during these visitations.

At the conclusion of a classroom visitation, the Department Chair will write an evaluation narrative concerning the effectiveness of an employee’s teaching as observed in the class visitation. This evaluation shall be provided to the employee within one week of the class visitation. The employee may attach a written response to the evaluation narrative within one week after receiving the evaluation narrative. All classroom visitation narrative(s), and the employee’s written response(s), if any, will be forwarded to the employee’s official Personnel File. The Department Chair will also keep a copy. The classroom evaluation narrative(s) and the employee’s written response(s) must be included by the employee in his or her evaluation portfolio.

 **Primary Duties Other Than Teaching (Other Assigned Primary Duties)**

In the event an employee is assigned primary duties in addition to teaching, the employee is required to provide documentation as to her or his performance of such duties. This documentation will include such things as a description of the nature of the duties assigned and progress made or time frame for the completion of duties; and a written report or documentation showing progress or completion of duties with reference to the stated objectives of these duties.

***Unit B: Associate Faculty Promotion to Assistant Professor Criteria***

To be considered for promotion to Assistant Professor, Associate Faculty are expected to demonstrate an appropriate level of performance in the area of Teaching/Primary Duties, Scholarly/Professional Activity, and Service. These areas will be evaluated both quantitatively and qualitatively by all evaluators.

In the area of Teaching/Primary Duties Associate Faculty must meet the same criteria as Unit A faculty applying for tenure.

Associate Faculty must also achieve the same minimum Scholarly/Professional Activities Requirements for promotion to Assistant Professor as required for Unit A faculty.

The minimum Scholarly/Professional Activities requirements for promotion to Assistant Professor are: at least two refereed journal articles and evidence of three other Scholarly/Professional Activities during the period of evaluation in order to be considered for promotion.

In the area of Service, the Associate Faculty must demonstrate an excellent level of sustained service to the department prior to applying for the promotion. In addition, demonstration of significant service in at least one of the following areas: college, university, professional, or community is required throughout the three years prior to the applying for promotion.

**DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING AND FINANCE (Area of Accounting)**

**STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION**

Course Number: Acct \_\_\_\_\_\_ Section: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Instructor Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Please respond to each of the following questions by circling the appropriate response. In addition, please transfer your responses to the computer answer sheet. BE SURE THE ANSWERS YOU CIRCLE ON THIS SHEET CORRESPOND WITH THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER ON THE COMPUTER SHEET. This sheet will not be given to the faculty, but the summary statistics and transcribed comments will be provided to the faculty after your course grades are posted to help faculty prepare for future courses. All marks on the computer sheet must be made in pencil.

1. Extent to which the instructor clearly presents and explains material.

 (1) Poor (2) Fair (3) Good (4) Excellent (5) Outstanding

2. Apparent knowledge of subject matter.

 (1) Poor (2) Fair (3) Good (4) Excellent (5) Outstanding

3. Apparent preparation for lectures.

 (1) Poor (2) Fair (3) Good (4) Excellent (5) Outstanding

4. Usefulness of homework assignments in this course.

 (1) Not useful (2) Slightly useful (3) Somewhat useful (4) Useful (5) Very useful

5. Your overall rating of the instructor in this course.

 (1) Poor (2) Fair (3) Good (4) Excellent (5) Outstanding

What comments do you have about this instructor? (If additional space is necessary, please continue on the back of this page.)

Thank you for taking the time to complete this evaluation. The results will help improve the quality of accounting education provided at WIU.

(March, 2011)

**DEPARTMENT CRITERIA – AREA OF FINANCE**

#### Introduction

The area of Finance’s "Department Criteria" are based on Article 20 and Article 33 of the 2010-2015 Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Western Illinois University Board of Trustees and the University Professionals of Illinois Local 4100. The DC describes the evaluation materials, areas of evaluation, performance standards, and the evaluation procedures that will be used to evaluate the performance of employees submitting their portfolios for retention, promotion, tenure, and/or four-year appraisal. The evaluations are to compare an employee's performance against the DC, and not other employees.

With the diversity of professional activities, interests, and academic disciplines represented in the area of finance, the DC must be implemented with professional interpretation and judgment. Considerable responsibility is therefore incumbent on the evaluators to implement both the letter and intent of the DC in terms of the qualitative and quantitative contributions of Unit A employees in the three areas of evaluation: Teaching/Primary Duties, Scholarly/ Professional Activities, and University/Community Service, or Unit B associate faculty in the area of Teaching/Primary Duties and any materials the employee chooses to submit showing involvement in scholarly/professional activities and service . This responsibility extends to the consideration of questions concerning professional ethics in matters of teaching/primary duties, scholarly/professional activities, and university/community service as they relate to the recommendations for retention, promotion, tenure, or the four-year appraisal of the tenured faculty. Breach of ethical behavior or violation of policy/regulations can enter the evaluation only if such violations are documented in a faculty member’s official personnel file. Such documentation occurs after proper procedural requirements are followed in accordance with Articles 21 or 38, as appropriate, of the UPI/WIU Agreement 2010-15. While the Departmental Personnel Committee (DPC) will be involved in evaluating the performance of Unit A employees (excepting the four-year appraisal of the tenured faculty), it shall not be involved in evaluating the performance of the Unit B associate faculty or temporary faculty.

It is the responsibility of all faculty to submit portfolios containing written documentation and other relevant materials in support of their application for retention, promotion, and tenure. All tenured faculty who are required to be evaluated in any given year for purposes of “four-year appraisal of tenured faculty” must submit a portfolio containing four years of performance documentation and any other relevant materials in all three areas of evaluation, in accordance with the timetable established by the appropriate administrative officials. All Unit B Associate Faculty, likewise, must submit a portfolio containing the performance documentation in the area of teaching/primary duties and any other relevant materials as specified in Article 33.1.b. for the previous year (Spring semester and Summer sessions of the last academic year and the Fall semester of the current academic year) in accordance with the University evaluation timetable.

The professional obligation of all faculty is composed of both assigned and unassigned duties and activities. An assigned duty or activity is reflected on an assignment of duties form and all assigned duties during the period of evaluation are to be evaluated as teaching/primary duties. All faculty must demonstrate oral and written English proficiency and the responsibility of monitoring rests with the department chairperson.

The evaluation portfolio should include a table of contents to ensure adequate security of the contents, and should be organized according to the guidelines developed jointly by the Academic Vice President and the Union.

An employee who has submitted a resignation or has received a terminal contract shall not be eligible to apply for retention, promotion, or tenure.

Evaluation Period for Unit A (Tenure/Tenure-Track) Employees

*(Article 20.3)*

1. Retention: Material submitted for an evaluation will include activity from the first day of the fall semester to the day preceding the beginning of the next fall semester (except in PY 1 & PY 2 – see below). The year in which one submits an evaluation portfolio is not evaluated for the personnel action under consideration but will be evaluated during a subsequent evaluation period. Primary emphasis will be placed on performance since the initial appointment date for the first year employees; for all other probationary employees, primary emphasis will be placed on the period beginning with the semester they submitted their most recent evaluation portfolio. However, each evaluation period shall be considered not in isolation but in the context of the employee’s total probationary record. Probationary employees will show improvement in teaching/primary duties and increased quantity and quality of performance in scholarly/professional activities and University/community service. Exceptions to this expectation may be made for faculty whose performance is sufficiently strong that significant improvement would be difficult to achieve.
2. Employees in PY 1 and PY 2 shall be evaluated in Teaching/Primary Duties 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 advisory comment. A non-retention decision in PY 1 and PY 2 cannot be based on Scholarly/Professional and Service Activities.

Evaluation for probationary year PY 1 will consider documentation for fall semester of that year. If a PY 1 faculty member began employment in middle of an academic year (January), the PY 1 evaluation will include the spring and fall semesters. Evaluation for PY 2 will consider documentation for spring semester of the first year (with a review of PY 1 outline). Evaluation for PY 3 will consider documentation for fall and spring semesters of PY 2 (with a review of PY 1 and PY 2 outlines). Evaluation of PY4 will consider documentation for fall and spring semesters of PY 3 (with a review of all previous years’ outlines). Evaluations for PY 5 will consider documentation for fall and spring semesters of PY 4 (with a review of all previous semester outlines). This system is presented in the chart below.

 *PY Semesters to be documented*

 1 Fall PY 1 (unless mid-year start – see above)

 2 Spring PY 1\*

 3 Fall & Spring PY 2\*

 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 with the most recent year/new material highlighted in bold.

3. Tenure: the evaluation period for tenure will include the total number of years employed as a probationary faculty member at the university.

4. Promotion: 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 the last promotion, whichever is later. Beginning September 1, 2008, and through the end of this contract, the evaluation period for promotion (to both Associate Professor and Full Professor) will include the employee’s entire record since the initial hiring date up to and including the date of submission of the promotion portfolio.

5. Four-Year Appraisal of Tenured Faculty: the evaluation period will include the four years prior to appraisal application.

Evaluation Period for Unit B (Associate Faculty) Employees

*(Article 33.1)*

No Associate Faculty member shall be evaluated until she or he has completed one full semester of service at the University as an Associate Faculty member.

Associate Faculty receiving “satisfactory” ratings will be evaluated every year. Associate Faculty promoted to Senior Associate Faculty status will be evaluated every three years as long as they maintain a highly effective rating. A senior associate faculty member who receives a satisfactory rating will be evaluated annually until they receive a highly effective rating.

**Educational Requirements for Tenure**

The Educational Requirements for tenure in the area of finance is an earned doctorate from an AACSB-International or comparable accredited university in the field appropriate to the academic disciplines offered in the department. An employee who does not satisfy the educational requirements for tenure may apply for consideration on the basis of exceptional teaching/performance of primary duties, exceptional research/creative activity (scholarly/professional activity).

# Years of Service Requirement for Promotion or Tenure

For Unit A Employees

Promotion (Article 20.9)

1. **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 the same year that she/he applies for tenure. (Article: 20.9.b.1)**
2. 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 the last promotion, whichever is later. Beginning September 1, 2008 and through the end of this contract, the evaluation period for promotion (to both Associate Professor and Full Professor) will include the employee’s entire record since the initial hiring date. (Article: 20.3.e)

Tenure (Article 20.10)

1. An employee may not apply for tenure before her or his sixth probationary year.
2. All employees shall be placed in probationary year one at the time of initial appointment.
3. **Applying prior years of experience:**
	1. **An employee who has been employed full time in a tenured or tenure-track position in a regionally accredited baccalaureate degree-granting institution of higher education (or equivalent from an international accrediting body) may elect to have counted toward tenure one year or two consecutive years of full time employment of the employee’s choice if the year(s) of previous employment occurred within the last five years immediately prior to one’s initial appointment to a position at Western Illinois University. Faculty who count previous years of employment toward tenure may have their scholarly/professional activity record during that same one year or two years considered as part of their performance. (Article: 20.10.g.1)**
	2. **Employees should discuss their interest in applying prior years of experience toward tenure with their Department Chair prior to initiating the application process.**
	3. **Tenure applicants who elect to count previous years of employment toward tenure may do so with the understanding that only the scholarly/professional activity record is entered into the tenure and retention portfolios. (Article: 20.10.g.2)**
	4. **The scholarly/professional activity record included in the tenure portfolio will be those activities that occurred during the specified period of time identified in the Academic Vice President’s letter approving the faculty member’s request to count previous years of employment toward promotion. (Article: 20.10.g.2)**
	5. **An employee applying prior years of experience toward tenure must simultaneously apply those same prior years of experience toward retention and promotion to Associate Professor. (Article: 20.10.g.3)**
	6. **An employee who is eligible for placement in a higher PY and who elects to be placed in a higher PY must notify the Academic Vice President in writing by September 1 of the employee's PY 2. (Article: 20.10 g.4)**
4. After successful completion of probationary year 1, an employee may elect to be placed in a higher probationary year as follows:

 Previous Years of Experience WIU Probationary Year

 1 3

 2 4

1. Faculty hired before September 1, 2007 will fall under the former contract with regard to bringing in prior years of service. Faculty hired after September 1, 2007 will fall under the new language requiring “full time tenure track service at another university” (see 20.9.6.1 and 20.10.7.1).
2. **A tenured/tenure-track employee may be granted, upon request, a one-year extension of the evaluation period for tenure as a consequence of exceptional circumstances. Exceptional circumstances may include, but are not limited to: disruption of research facilities; birth or adoption of a child; need to devote substantial time to the care of a seriously ill or injured person; significant personal illness or injury; or other severe domestic issue. Such request may be granted by the Academic Vice President, in consultation with the Dean and the Department Chairperson. Because the extension of the evaluation period is intended to address exceptional circumstances, such an extension shall not be granted merely because a faculty member has failed to meet the Department Criteria. Once the tenure application is submitted it shall be evaluated on its own merit, in relation to the Department Criteria. No more than one extension of the probationary period shall be granted. The request must be made within one year after commencement of the exceptional circumstance, and prior to the submission date for the tenure application. The employee will be able to submit any work accomplished during the one-year extension period in any future retention, promotion, tenure, portfolio, or PAA application. (Article: 20.10.j)**

# Areas of Evaluation and Materials Required

The degree of effectiveness of performance of an employee being considered for retention, promotion, or tenure will be evaluated in the areas of teaching/primary duties, scholarly/ professional activities, and university/community service. Teaching/primary duties shall be the most important of these three areas of responsibilities. It must be emphasized here that there are not three separate routes to retention, promotion, and tenure, but rather a single path that requires documented evidence of appropriate levels of performance in the areas of Teaching/ Primary Duties, Scholarly/Professional Activities, and University/Community Service. The evaluators must evaluate all of these areas both quantitatively and qualitatively, and take into consideration inherent differences in form, content or audience of courses. An evaluation of a request for the old PAA shall be limited to performance in teaching/primary duties and in one other evaluation area (scholarly/professional activity, or service). Teaching/ primary duties will also be considered the most important of these areas in the old PAA evaluations.

**Evaluation Criteria**

The effectiveness of each employee being considered for retention, promotion, and tenure (see 20.4), will be evaluated in the areas of teaching/performance of primary duties, scholarly/ professional activities, and University/community service. Teaching/ performance of primary duties is the most important of the three areas of evaluation (Article 20.4.e.). The evaluation is to judge an employee’s performance against the Department Criteria (DC), and not in comparison to other employees.

##### Teaching/Primary Duties

It is recognized that the area of finance is comprised of a wide diversity of academic fields of study. While the methods used by faculty to improve and document teaching performance are expected to vary, it is expected that each faculty member will strive to continually improve his/her instructional abilities. Evaluation of Teaching/Primary Duties dictates that the faculty member provides some documentary evidence of these efforts.

Items that may be considered in evaluation of Teaching/Primary Duties include: student course evaluations, oral English proficiency, course syllabi, classroom visitations, other evidence, and moderating factors. These items are discussed in more detail below.

*A. Student Course Evaluations*

All faculty employees must submit official student course evaluations (see appendix for copy of form) for all courses taught, with the exception of independent study or internship type classes, and also for summer and intersession courses. Submitting course evaluations for summer classes is optional. These evaluations shall remain the property of Western Illinois University. A copy of the statistical summary of all course evaluations and a transcription of written student comments will be, however, provided to each employee. Student course evaluations will be compiled for each class separately; multiple‑course composites are not acceptable. The faculty member may review the original evaluation questionnaires in the presence of the Department Chair and/or DPC Chair. He/she may also request photocopies of all evaluations except for sections containing handwritten comments. Faculty who question the accuracy of the transcription of student comments may request that the DPC Chair and/or Department Chair review the original evaluations.

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 retention, tenure, promotion, and four-year review recommendations. (Article 20.11).

The following procedure will be utilized in administering and processing student evaluations:

1. Evaluations should be conducted during the last three weeks of a term but shall not include finals week.
2. The Purdue Cafeteria System is to be used by all faculty. A faculty member may use the general department form or create their own. However, the form must contain the departmental core questions from which one question will evaluate the overall effectiveness of the instructor.

1. Faculty being evaluated are not to be in the room at the time of the evaluation and evaluations should be returned to the department office directly or by mail by a disinterested party such as a proctor or responsible student. Family members of faculty being evaluated cannot serve as proctors. If necessary, faculty may transport completed evaluations that have been placed in a sealed envelope by a proctor or responsible student with the seal signed by the proctor or student.
2. Instructors teaching classes in locations other than the Macomb or QC campuses should be evaluated using the same procedures that are applied to on-campus instructors. If conditions require special arrangements, provisions for evaluation will be made between the instructor and the Department Chair.
3. The students must be informed that the instructor will not look at the evaluations until after final grades are assigned and submitted. Additionally, the students cannot be asked to sign their names on the evaluation sheet. Students should be given sufficient time to complete the evaluations and be provided pencils so that evaluations are properly completed.
4. After grades are turned in to the University Registrar's Office, and the course evaluation analysis is completed, a copy of each course evaluation statistical summary will be given to the faculty member and the Department Chair will retain a copy. If a faculty member does not receive a course statistical summary, the Department Chair must be informed as soon as possible. The omission of any course evaluation due to circumstances beyond the control of a faculty member shall not be considered in violation of the requirement that all courses be evaluated.

 An employee may wish to augment the summaries (quantitative analysis) by submitting a concise written explanation and/or clarification for any statistical scores included in the summaries.

 The evaluators shall review course evaluation summaries along with other teaching measurements provided and make a professional judgment based on the criteria as to the level of teaching effectiveness (qualitatively and quantitatively) an employee has achieved during the evaluation period. The evaluators must judge whether an employee has or has not met the requirements for retention, promotion, or tenure. An evaluator may request additional documentation/evidence of teaching/performance of primary duties to complete the review of an employee's portfolio.

*B. Oral English Proficiency*

 An employee must provide evidence of his/her oral proficiency in the English language. For this purpose, the official departmental course evaluation instrument/form will contain a question pertaining to evaluating an employee's proficiency in the English language.

###### C. Course Syllabus

 Each employee must develop a course syllabus for each course taught. For probationary employees (PY 1 through PY 6), all course syllabi for classes taught during the evaluation period will be submitted to assist in the evaluation of an employee's teaching/primary duties. For promotions, four-year appraisals, and PAAs, only representative samples of course syllabi are required. Syllabi submitted for the purpose of evaluation must be exact copies of the same syllabi given to students, along with any other written or oral clarification/documentation (such as additional guidelines and policies announced in the classroom that do not appear on course syllabi) which will aid the evaluators in its evaluation of course syllabi, and an employee's teaching effectiveness.

 All course syllabi (for a given evaluation period) and any supporting documentation provided by an employee, or requested by the evaluators, will be reviewed as part of the evaluation of an employee's teaching/primary duties. The following syllabus guidelines are considered basic:

1. Course title, course and section number, meeting days and times.
2. Instructor’s name, office number, office hours, office phone.
3. Books and other materials required.
4. Specific learning goals for the course.
5. Basis for grading.
6. Tentative test schedule.
7. Outside work required such as readings and field experiences.
8. Nature of papers required, if any.

 The evaluators will also evaluate the comprehensiveness of a courses syllabus to determine if it reflects course coverage of topics generally expected in the course (as indicated in the course objectives and outline).

*D. Classroom Visitation*

An employee may also be evaluated through the process of classroom visitation. The visitation, which may be conducted by the Department Chair, the DPC Chair, and/or a member of the DPC committee, will be held at a time, date and place mutually agreeable to the faculty member and the person conducting the visitation. The following procedure will apply to classroom visitation:

Tenured faculty: Optional at the request of the employee or the

Department Chair.

 Tenure‑track faculty: Each employee may have one classroom visitation per fall and spring semesters by the Department Chair and/or the Chair (or a member) of the DPC. Summer visits may be conducted at the faculty member's request.

 Associate faculty: Each employee may have one classroom visitation per fall and spring semesters by the Department Chair. Summer visits may be conducted at the faculty member's request.

Temporary faculty: Each employee may have one classroom visitation per fall

and spring semesters by the Department Chair. Summer visits may be conducted at the faculty member's request.

At the conclusion of a classroom visitation, the Department Chair and/or the Chair (or a member) of the DPC will complete an evaluation of the employee's teaching effectiveness as observed during the classroom visit. The factors to be considered may include, but are not limited to: (1) a command of and currency in subject matter/ discipline, (2) oral English proficiency, (3) the ability to organize, analyze and present knowledge or material, (4) the ability to encourage and engage students in the learning process, and (5) the application of methodologies and technologies of instruction. The evaluation should be provided to the employee within one work week of the classroom visitation. He/she may attach a written response to the evaluation within one week after receiving the evaluation. All classroom visitation evaluations, and the employee's written response(s), if any, may be forwarded to the employee's official Personnel File. Copies of the evaluations and the employee's response(s) may also be provided to the Dean of the College of Business and Technology. The classroom evaluation and the employee's written response may be included by the employee in his/her evaluation portfolio.

###### E. Other Evidence

Other evidence of teaching effectiveness that may be submitted include:

1. Assigned and related teaching responsibilities
2. Command of and currency in subject matter/discipline
3. Ability to organize, analyze and present knowledge or material
4. Ability to encourage and engage students in the learning process
5. Application of new methodologies and technologies of instruction
6. Documented participation in professional growth activities contributing to enhanced teaching and contributions to the University or profession
7. Direction of individual student activities
8. Directed study courses
9. Handouts
10. Class projects
11. Student advising
12. Visual and audio aids
13. Course revisions
14. Guest speakers
15. Course development
16. Field trips
17. Career guidance counseling
18. Employer contacts on behalf of students
19. Curriculum development
20. Laboratory exercises
21. Professional association contacts on behalf of students
22. Computer aided or managed instruction
23. Programmed learning materials
24. Experimental exercises
25. Student performance on standard measures
26. Other items deemed appropriate by the DPC

The evaluators shall evaluate the documentation on the above-mentioned items on the bases of their originality, relevance and utility to the course.

###### F. Moderating Factors

The essence of effective teaching is adapting to the learning environment present in each class, and every class is likely to have unique circumstances. However, additional information on factors that might influence the recommendation of the evaluators also will be considered. These factors may include:

1. Class size
2. Course level
3. Class meeting conditions (location, time of day, etc.)
4. Course difficulty
5. Overload assignments
6. Short notice of teaching assignment
7. Overall class grades that are above or below average
8. Higher than average ACE assignments
9. Required or elective status of course
10. Experimental course
11. Experimental or new teaching techniques or designs
12. Other items deemed appropriate by the DPC

*Primary Duties Other Than Teaching (Other Assigned Primary Duties)*

 In the event a faculty member is assigned primary duties other than teaching, the evaluators shall have the latitude to use appropriate items in lieu of student evaluation and syllabus evaluation in the evaluation of performance of primary duties. This information shall be submitted at the discretion of the faculty member, but the evaluators retain the right to ask for and receive further clarification or documentation.

Distance Teaching

A. Distance Education Definition

Distance Education refers to distance teaching and learning where the faculty member and the students are not in the same classroom or location. The course may be synchronous or asynchronous: Delivery of instruction is accomplished by one or more technological media or can be print-based materials, sent through the mail. Technology media include live or recorded satellite broadcasts, live 2-way video (CODEC), computer or internet technology (such as web based instruction), digital and/or analog videotape, CD-ROM, or other electronic means, now known or hereafter developed, utilized to provide instruction.

B. Procedures Unique to Distance Education Courses

1. The intent of this section is to recognize inherent differences between distance education courses and regular courses; distance education courses/classes should not, therefore, adversely affect a faculty member's evaluation. The evaluators will pay careful attention to distance education courses when evaluating an employee’s performance in teaching/primary duties.
2. For purposes of evaluating a faculty member's teaching, on-and off­-campus sections of the same class will be regarded as different classes.
3. The evaluators will carefully consider the following items when evaluating an employee’s performance:
	* Type of distance education;
	* Number of sites and number of students;
	* Faculty member's prior experience with this type of distance education and/or this course;
	* Course format (lecture, discussion, types of assignments, examinations, etc.); and
	* Type and level of course (required, elective, graduate, undergraduate, major, non-major, pass-fail etc.,), and any other considerations that is appropriate in evaluating the performance of an employee in teaching/primary duties.

C. Student Evaluations from Distant Sites

In all distance education courses the procedures used in administering and processing student evaluations shall be, to the extent possible, the same as those used for on-campus courses (see section on Student Course Evaluations).

Documentation of Teaching/Primary Duties

It is the responsibility of the employee to fully document the nature of his/her efforts in all of the measurement areas under this category of the employee's job duties: student course evaluations, course syllabi, proficiency in the English language, classroom visitation, other items related to enhancing teaching effectiveness and student learning, and other assigned primary duties (if any). The impact of these efforts on overall effectiveness of Teaching/Primary Duties and on his/her enhanced abilities in teaching specific topics should also be documented.

It is emphasized that the intent is for the evaluators to have sufficient documentary evidence upon which to base professional judgments as to the faculty member's performance level. With the exception of the clarifying materials that can be requested by the evaluators, the evaluation shall be limited to a review of those documentary materials submitted prior to the beginning of the evaluation process. Faculty members are encouraged to seek guidance from the DPC or Department Chair as to appropriate documentation, but the ultimate responsibility for documentation submission rests with the employee. Faculty members should retain documentation for all claims. However, only documentation that is relevant and representative should be submitted for evaluation.

##### Scholarly/Professional Activities

The Department of Accounting and Finance recognizes the need for faculty in the areas of finance to remain active in the area of scholarly/professional activities. By remaining active in scholarly/professional activities, faculty members remain up-to-date within their discipline. Scholarly/professional activities help faculty to retain/develop analytic skills and to remain current with key theoretical and practical developments within our fields. An active engagement in scholarly/professional activities enables each participating faculty member to remain current through synthesizing ideas, data, and analytical procedures.

Scholarly/Professional activities are important for several reasons.

1. Active participation in scholarly/professional activities can enhance teaching performance by immersing a faculty member in current knowledge and processes.
2. Active participation in scholarly/professional activities can serve external constituencies by producing new knowledge, insight, analysis that is useful to external groups.
3. By actively participating in scholarly/professional activities, we further the goals of the College and the University as they apply to accreditation by NCA and AACSB International.

Appropriate levels of scholarly/professional activities are moderated by several factors, including the mission of the university, the college, and the department; teaching and service loads; and the level of support within the university, college and department for scholarly/professional activities.

Each faculty member needs to produce a level of academic research that is appropriate to the expectations and environment of the College of Business and Technology at Western Illinois University. Beyond that level, each faculty member should choose to pursue what fits their interests and expertise. Some are likely to choose basic research to advance knowledge, while others may choose professional/applied research or instructional development research. Within these categories, faculty may choose to present findings through books, academic or professional presentations, or reviews/critiques of others’ works.

A. Category I (two required for tenure)

1. Journal article (refereed)

B. Category II (three required for tenure)

1. Additional journal articles beyond the two required for Category I.
2. Author of a book
3. Editor of a publication
4. Obtaining an external grant
5. Refereed proceedings or refereed professional paper
6. Obtaining an internal grant
7. Externally published ancillary materials in conjunction with a published text
8. Serving as a blind reviewer for papers for a journal or conference
9. Serving as a discussant of a professional paper at a conference
10. Reviewing a book for a publisher
11. Serving as a track chair for an academic conference
12. Serving on a panel at a professional meeting
13. Making a presentation at an academic/professional conference
14. Making a presentation at a conference/seminar for professionals
15. Other items deemed acceptable by the DPC and Department Chair.

Scholarly/professional activities are expected to be substantive to be counted towards promotion, tenure, and retention. Faculty should be prepared to document the substantive nature of scholarly research activities, such as providing copies of reviews.

*Documentation of Research*

All of the scholarly/professional activities submitted in an employee’s portfolio must include a concise explanation and documentation (a brief narrative and a copy of the title page of the article, abstract of a book, letter from the editor of a journal or program chair of a conference, etc.). Additionally, it is the employee’s responsibility to provide clarification and sufficient documentation to justify the inclusion of a publication as a journal or proceedings article. The following shall apply in determining when to credit scholarly production (even though one year is emphasized here, the entire record is part of the retention process):

* Work in progress: May be cited in the portfolio in consecutive years but employees must document the extent and nature of the “progress.”
* Acceptance of a manuscript/article/paper for publication: Will count (again) even if cited in previous year(s) as “work in progress.”
* Actual publication: May not count (again) if counted in previous year(s) as “accepted for publication.”
* No double counting of a presentation and a proceedings publication if the paper was presented at and published by the same conference. Employees must select only one item for inclusion in the portfolio under scholarly/professional activities, either the proceedings publication or the presentation, not both.
* Some scholarly/professional activities may result in more than “one item” as identified in the DC. For example, a proceedings article at a conference may be “selected as one of the Best Papers” for inclusion in a refereed journal sponsored by the same professional organization.
* It should be emphasized here that an evaluation of an employee’s scholarly/professional activities is not merely counting the number of books, articles, presentations, etc., rather it involves a professional judgment by the evaluators about the quantitative and qualitative employee contributions in this area.

##### University/Community Service Activities

The third area to be evaluated is the employee's performance of his/her University/ Community Service Activities. The evaluators must make qualitative and quantitative professional judgments based on the criteria as to meeting the requirements for retention, promotion, or tenure. Service activities must relate to the professional responsibilities of the employee. In other words, only service activities that are provided by virtue of the professional expertise of the employee will be included in this area of an employee's job duties.

The evaluation of the effectiveness of an employee's service to the university, college, department, community, or profession (academic and practitioners' organizations) will include the following: extent and nature of leadership; degree of participation and active involvement; the quality of contributions and the length of service; the extent and nature of local, state, regional, national, or international recognition of service; and the relationship of service to the employee's assigned responsibilities and to the department, college, and university.

The evaluators will recognize and evaluate acceptable alternatives to Macomb based committee service activities for faculty permanently assigned to the WIU-Quad Cities campus.

# Service Criteria

A. General Service

1. Public speeches related to professional responsibilities.
2. Writing letters of recommendation for students and graduates.
3. Academic guest lecturer
4. Consulting (compensated as well as non-compensated)
5. External professional recognition and/or rewards
6. Serving as a session chair at a professional meeting/academic conference
7. American National Business Hall of Fame activities
8. Officer in a professional organization
9. Other activities as deemed appropriate by the DPC and Department Chair

B. CBT/University Service

University service:

1. Presentations for the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research
2. Participation in a University alumni program or event
3. Advisor to a student organization
4. Service on Faculty Senate
5. Service on a standing university committee
6. Service on an ad hoc or search committee outside the department or CBT
7. Recognition and/or award at the university level
8. Other activities as deemed appropriate by the DPC and Department Chair

CBT Service

1. Presentations for the Executive Studies Center.
2. Participation in a CBT alumni program or event
3. Service on a standing CBT committee
4. Service on an ad hoc or search committee within the CBT but outside the department
5. Recognition and/or award at the college level
6. Participation in two or more “Discover Western” programs.
7. Other activities as deemed appropriate by the DPC and Department Chair

Department Service

1. Service on a standing department committee
2. Service on a departmental ad hoc committee
3. Participating in an alumni program or event
4. Hosting an event in which one or more employers are brought to campus for purposes of recruitment (beyond participation in a career fair)
5. Service as a mentor of a new faculty member (as designated by a department or DPC chair)
6. Other activities as deemed appropriate by the DPC and Department Chair

*Documentation of Service*

 Service activity documentation should focus on the specific contributions that are made by the faculty member. Documentation may include: evaluation by the organization(s) served; extent and nature of leadership and/or participation; quality and length of service (in general, each academic year of service to a committee or organization will constitute one service activity); extent of recognition accorded for service; and peer, colleague, chairperson, or other evaluations of service. The evaluators retain the right to ask for additional clarification in making its judgment as to the acceptability of a particular service item.

# Performance Standards and Evaluation Procedures

The performance standards presented below will be used to judge the effectiveness of an employee's performance. In retention and promotion evaluations, the performance standards will be used to judge an employee's performance during the entire evaluation period. In tenure evaluation, the performance standards will be used to judge an employee's performance at the end of the evaluation period (term of employment in probationary status at Western Illinois University).

The evaluators shall independently review the statistical summaries of student course evaluations and other items. The evaluators will then make a qualitative and quantitative professional judgment as to whether the level of teaching effectiveness an employee has achieved during the evaluation period was acceptable or not acceptable.

Evaluation of an employee's effectiveness shall be based on consideration of the employee's professional responsibilities in teaching/primary duties, scholarly/professional activities, and university/community service. Teaching/primary duties shall be the most important of these three responsibilities.

##### Teaching/Primary Duties

*A. Retention in PY 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 (for each year)*

* Quantitative summaries and student comments for all courses to be evaluated, at minimum, a 3.0 out of 5.0 average for all of the questions on the form.
* Evaluation of the Department Chair and/or the Chair (or a member) of the DPC, and faculty response(s), if any, about classroom visitations; and
* Two items of evidence documenting teaching effectiveness from Category E (Other Evidence).

B. For Promotion to Assistant Professor

* Same as in retention in PY 1.

*C. For Promotion to Associate Professor*

* Quantitative summaries and student comments for all courses to be evaluated, at minimum, a 3.75 out of 5.0 average for all of the questions on the form;
* Evaluation of the Department Chair and/or the Chair (or a member) of the DPC, and faculty response(s), if any, about classroom visitation; and
* Six items of evidence documenting teaching effectiveness from Category E (Other Evidence).

*D. For Tenure (PY 6)*

* Same as for promotion to Associate Professor; and
* Evidence of continued activity toward improving teaching effectiveness.

*E. For Promotion to Professor*

* Quantitative summaries and student comments for all courses to be evaluated;
* Seven items of evidence documenting teaching effectiveness from Category E (Other Evidence); and
* Evidence of continued activity toward improving teaching effectiveness.

*F. For Retention of Associate Faculty*

* Quantitative summaries and student comments for all courses to be evaluated, at minimum, 3.0 out of 5.0 average for all of the questions on the form;
* Evaluation of the Department Chair and/or the Chair (or a member) of the DPC, and faculty response(s), if any, about classroom visitation;
* Four items of evidence documenting teaching effectiveness from Category E (Other Evidence); and
* Evidence of continued activity toward improving teaching effectiveness rising to 3.75 out of 5.0 average on all of the questions on the form by the fourth year.

**Scholarly/Professional Activities**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PY** | **Scholarly/Professional Activity Standard** |
| 1 | Faculty are required to submit plans for the pursuit of scholarly/professional activities. Department Chair and DPC may make advisory comments on faculty scholarly/professional activities, but may not make a non-retention decision based on PY1 scholarly/professional activities. |
| 2 | Faculty are required to submit plans for the pursuit of scholarly/professional activities. Department Chair and DPC may make advisory comments on faculty scholarly/professional activities, but may not make a non-retention decision based on PY2 scholarly/professional activities. |
| 3 | Two activities from Category I or II, and documented evidence of work in progress for publication of an article in an academic journal. If the faculty lacks the appropriate terminal degree, documented evidence of advanced progress toward degree completion. |
| 4 | Three activities from Category I or II. If the faculty member does not possess a Category I activity, documented evidence of work in progress for publication of an article in an academic journal is required. If the faculty lacks the appropriate terminal degree, documented evidence of advanced progress toward degree completion. |
| 5 | One Category I activity and at least two total activities from Category II. Faculty member must possess a terminal degree in the field. |
| Associate Professor | Two Category I activities, three Category II activities. 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 the last promotion, whichever is later. Beginning September 1, 2008, and through the end of this contract, the evaluation period for promotion 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) |
| 6 | Same as associate professor |
| Professor | Two additional Category I activities, and three additional Category II activities since being promoted to Associate Professor. 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 the last promotion, whichever is later. Beginning September 1, 2008, and through the end of this contract, the evaluation period for promotion 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) |

##### University/Community Service Activities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PY** | **Scholarly/Professional Activity Standard** |
| 1 | Faculty are required to demonstrate minimal service activity. Department Chair and DPC may make advisory comments on faculty service activities, but may not make a non-retention decision based on PY1 service activities. |
| 2 | Faculty are required to demonstrate minimal service activity. Department Chair and DPC may make advisory comments on faculty service activities, but may not make a non-retention decision based on PY2 service activities. |
| 3 | A minimum of four service activities, including two departmental service activities and one service activity at the college/university level. |
| 4 | A minimum of six service activities, including three departmental service activities and one service activities at the college or university level. |
| 5 | A minimum of eight service activities, including four departmental service activities and two service activities at the college or university level. |
| Associate Professor | A minimum of ten service activities, including four departmental service activities and three service activities at the college or university level.  |
| 6 | Same as associate professor |
| Professor | A minimum of ten service activities, including five departmental service activities and four service activities at the college or university level. 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 the last promotion, whichever is later. Beginning September 1, 2008, and through the end of this contract, the evaluation period for promotion 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) |

##### Exceptional Performance

It is emphasized here that quantity alone, i.e., "more items/number of activities/counting" will not be considered exceptional performance. Rather, the evaluators will apply the same quantitative and qualitative criteria provided in this document (DC) when making a professional judgment as to the effectiveness of an employee's performance in the evaluation areas. Exceptional performance for promotion and tenure will be based on the following considerations:

A. Teaching/Primary Duties

1. An employee must meet the evaluation criteria requirements for promotion or tenure (other than degree or years of service);
2. Must have been consistently rated (all courses all years of service during the evaluation period) very high by students;
3. Must have consistently high evaluations from the evaluators; and
4. Must provide documented evidence of creative and innovative instructional methods and technologies that enhanced teaching, student learning and involvement.

*B. Scholarly/Professional Activities*

1. An employee must meet the evaluation criteria requirements for promotion or tenure (other than degree or years of service);
2. Must provide documented evidence that the majority of proceedings articles were presented and published in conference proceedings of leading academic or practitioners' organizations/associations in the employee's field; and
3. Must provide documented evidence that as a result of the employee's scholarly/professional activities, the employee has received international or national recognition (such as invited articles, participation on panels of various professional organizations or private/public sectors agencies, and/or speaking to the media on issues/areas as an expert in one's field of study).

##### Four-Year Appraisal for Tenured Employees

Every four years an appraisal is required of all tenured faculty not applying for promotion. The appraisal cycle will begin in an employee's fourth year after being awarded tenure. It will be repeated every fourth year after that, except as in Section 20.12.

The purpose of this process is to identify areas of strength and weakness and to improve performance. The process is not to be construed as a review of either individual or collective tenure. The evaluation should consist of the review of the following by the Department Chair. (Article 20.12)

1. Student course evaluations for all courses during the appraisal period.
2. Materials submitted by the employee to substantiate a reasonable level of performance in the areas of teaching/primary duties, scholarly/professional activity, and service.
3. Materials in the employee’s personnel file.

The DPC is not involved in the four-year appraisal of tenured employees. Faculty members are encouraged to review contractual requirements for four-year reviews in Article 20.12 and to consult with either the Department Chair and/or the appropriate Union official for guidance in preparing for the review.

If there is documented evidence of a need for improvement, the Department Chair shall meet with the faculty member in order to identify strengths and weaknesses and, if necessary, to develop an appropriate Professional Improvement Plan. One year after completion of the Professional Improvement Plan, the employee will be evaluated again. If a faculty member successfully completes her/his Professional Improvement Plan then a new appraisal cycle will begin immediately after that evaluation. (Article: 20.12.d)

If, during the four year cycle, a Chair or Dean has documented evidence that there is a problem with a faculty member's performance, the Chair will discuss the situation with the faculty member and, if necessary, develop with the employee's input, an appropriate Professional Improvement Plan. (Article: 20.12.e)

If a faculty member fails to participate in the development and implementation of a Professional Improvement Plan a sanction may be initiated (see Article 21). (Article: 20.12.f)

**Student Assessment and the Department Criteria**

It is emphasized here that student and program assessment results will not be used in the evaluation of faculty performance.
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