

Department of English
Western Illinois University

Department Criteria

2017-2021 Contract

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR UNIT A FACULTY

Every candidate for retention, tenure, or promotion in the department will be evaluated by the Department Personnel Committee and the department chair in three areas: Teaching/Primary Duties, Scholarly/Professional Activities, and Service. Of these three, and according to Article 20.4.a, pg. 42 of the current contract, the most important area is Teaching/Primary Duties.

Employees in PY1 and PY2 will be evaluated in Teaching/Primary Duties and 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 will be included in the evaluation portfolio for written advisory comment from the Department Personnel Committee (DPC), 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 will not be used as a basis for personnel decision-making in PY1, PY2, or future evaluation years.

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

PY Year	Semester to Be Documented
1	Fall PY1
2	Spring PY1*
3	Fall and Spring PY2*
4	Fall and Spring PY3*
5	Fall and Spring PY4*
6 (Tenure Year)	Fall PY1 to Date of Tenure Application*

*Plus outlines from previous years.

The evaluation period for tenure will include the total number of years employed as a probationary faculty member at the university. The evaluation period for promotion to both Associate Professor and Full Professor will include the employee's entire record since the initial hiring date.

DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

The DPC will be composed of five tenured faculty members.

Committee members will serve staggered two-year terms and will be elected by all tenured and tenure-track Unit A faculty members. The committee chair will be elected by the DPC and announced to the entire faculty upon her/his election.

The written recommendation of the committee will be determined by a simple majority vote. When members of the DPC or family members are to be evaluated, they will abstain from all discussion, voting, and other action on their case, but will be part of other committee decisions. When members recuse themselves for this or any reason, the remaining members of the committee will evaluate and vote on the candidate. In this situation, if the committee vote results in a 2-2 tie, a former DPC committee member will be chosen by lot to join the committee for the sole purpose of evaluating, discussing, and voting on the candidate. DPC will then reconvene to discuss and vote on the candidate.

DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

A Ph.D. in English or the equivalent earned doctorate is the required degree for tenure and promotion for all English faculty except those faculty who are hired to teach in the Creative Writing program. For Creative Writing faculty, a Ph.D. or M.F.A. in Creative Writing is the required degree for tenure and promotion.

AREAS OF EVALUATION

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

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

A. Materials

The following materials are required to be submitted for evaluation:

1. A narrative of teaching and non-teaching duties that conforms to the requirements of the Provost's instructions
2. Student course evaluations
3. Peer teaching evaluation(s)
4. A representative sample of course syllabi, representative assignment sheets, an evaluated paper with assignment sheet, and any other relevant materials pertaining to teaching.

Faculty members must submit a variety of teaching materials in order to accurately demonstrate their performance in teaching.

In addition, faculty who receive ACEs for administrative activities, advising, or other duties will have those activities evaluated as part of their primary duties. In addition to the above materials, they must submit a position description and an evaluation by the chair or other appropriate program coordinator, director, or administrator that addresses the non-teaching duties assigned.

Other material relevant to non-teaching primary duties may also be submitted for evaluation.

B. Procedures

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

Faculty members teaching in the Quad Cities will have a proctor or responsible student place evaluation materials in an envelope which the proctor or student seals and signs across the seal. The faculty member will then mail the sealed envelope to the department chair via campus mail.

Faculty members teaching classes after normal business hours will have a proctor or responsible student place evaluation materials in an envelope which the proctor or student seals and signs across the seal. The faculty member will then place the sealed envelope in the department chair's mailbox.

Faculty members teaching videoconference courses will have a proctor or responsible student in each location place evaluation materials in an envelope which the proctor/student seals and signs across the seal. The envelopes will be placed in the department chair's mailbox or mailed to department chair via campus mail as appropriate.

Faculty members teaching online courses will follow departmentally-approved procedures for administering course evaluations through the course website. Course evaluations from the course website will be accessible by the chair.

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

Peer teaching evaluations for probationary and tenured faculty are to be arranged by the faculty member with the prior approval of the department chair and chair of DPC. Peer teaching evaluations require observation of at least one class session or, for online courses, review of course materials

through access to the course site. For classroom courses, the faculty member being observed for evaluation must also inform the department chair of the scheduled observation prior to its completion. The evaluator will submit the evaluation as a letter covering the points in the evaluation criteria (listed below in section C). One peer teaching evaluation is required for each evaluation period. Associate Professors applying for Professor must submit at least 5 peer teaching evaluations since promotion from at least 3 different years, including one conducted in the two semesters immediately preceding application. Peer evaluators must submit the completed evaluation to the faculty member, chair of DPC, and the department chair. The evaluation must be submitted either within 30 days or by the last day of classes of the current semester if there are not 30 days left in the current semester. All completed peer teaching evaluations for an evaluation period must be submitted in the retention/promotion file.

For peer teaching evaluations of online classes, the faculty member will grant the observer access in order to comprehensively review the course online.

When a candidate has had non-teaching primary duties, a written evaluation of non-teaching primary duties is to be requested by the candidate from the appropriate program coordinator, director, or administrator with sufficient advance notice. One evaluation per evaluation period, per non-teaching assignment, is required. Evaluators must submit the completed evaluation to the faculty member, chair of DPC, and the department chair. If non-teaching primary duties are not ongoing, the evaluation must be completed within 30 days of completion of duties.

C. Characteristics: Teaching

Each candidate is expected to demonstrate the following characteristics in teaching, and to clearly indicate in the teaching/primary duties narrative (A.1) how the student evaluations, peer evaluations, and submitted materials demonstrate these qualities.

1. Command of, currency in, and commitment to the subject matter/discipline.
 - a. Thorough and current knowledge of the subject area.
 - b. Effective and engaging methods of presenting subject matter.
 - c. Genuine interest in the subject matter.
2. Ability to organize, analyze, and present knowledge.
 - a. Presentation to each class of an informative syllabus and clear goals and objectives.
 - b. Clear and coherent course organization.
 - c. Clear and coherent class organization and presentation, regardless of format or mode of delivery.
3. Receptiveness to students and ability to encourage them in the learning process.
 - a. Genuine concern for students and willingness to address their academic needs, both in and outside of class.
 - b. Encouragement of students to participate actively in their own learning.
4. Evaluation of student work with fairness and pertinence to course objectives.

- a. Fairness and appropriateness of evaluation instruments.
- b. Clarity of grading system which allows students to assess their standing throughout the semester.
- c. Willingness to provide explanation and guidance about grades and other types of evaluation of student work.

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

D. Evaluation of Teaching ACEs

The DPC and the department chair will independently review and evaluate all submitted material to determine the quality of the faculty member's teaching. A faculty member's evaluation will be based on

1. student course evaluations (40%),
2. peer teaching evaluations (40%), and
3. other materials submitted (20%).

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

The DPC and the department chair will independently review all distance learning evaluations separately, taking into consideration mitigating factors and unique features, which may include but are not limited to the following: the mode of delivery, the number of sites and types of students, low response rate, the faculty member's prior experience with this type of teaching, and the type of course.

Faculty must present student course evaluation scores according to the following scale:

1. For retention in PY1 and PY2, faculty must have an overall mean of 3.75 or above in courses taught during each review period.
2. For retention in PY3, PY4, and PY5, faculty must have an overall mean of 4.00 or above in courses taught during each review period.
3. For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, faculty must have an overall mean of 4.00 or above in courses taught during the review period.
4. For promotion to Professor, faculty must have an overall mean of 4.00 or above in courses taught during the review period.

Student course evaluations will be reviewed by the DPC and department chair to consider patterns of effectiveness, which may be demonstrated in various ways (e.g., a preponderance of good scores in most courses during the review period, a pattern of marked improvement, a pattern of good scores on certain key items). The DPC and department chair will consider the inherent difference in form, content, or audience of individual courses that might affect evaluation results.

Peer teaching evaluations (minimum 750 words) should evaluate the candidate based on the characteristics outlined above. At a minimum, evaluations are expected to comment explicitly on at least three of the four Characteristics 1-4 in section C.

Student assessment results will not be used in evaluating faculty.

Faculty members are also expected to contribute to teaching in the department through additional activities including but not limited to mentorship of graduate teaching assistants, serving on graduate exit option committees, and offering independent studies.

E: Evaluation of Non-Teaching ACEs

The DPC and the department chair will independently review and evaluate, based on individual position descriptions, all material submitted regarding non-teaching ACEs and will determine whether the evidence supports a positive recommendation.

II. SCHOLARLY/PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES (file #3)

A. Materials

The following materials are required to be submitted for evaluation:

1. A narrative of scholarly/professional activity that conforms to the requirements of the Provost's instructions.
2. Written documentation for scholarly/professional activities, including relevant pages from conference programs, acceptance letters, etc.
3. Copies of all published material, copies of all presentations, and supporting documents demonstrating publication and/or presentation date, place, etc. must be included in a supplementary file that will remain in the department unless requested by additional evaluators.

Vanity publications and publications in predatory journals will not be accepted for consideration.

Category 1 – Scholarly Activities

- a. Scholarly Publications (refereed): monographs, articles, book chapters and textual editions, accompanied by an explanation that indicates the quality of the publication as well as the publication venue.
- b. Creative Publications (refereed/juried/editorial board reviewed): novels, poems, stories, essays, plays, or film scripts, accompanied by an explanation that indicates the quality of the publication as well as the publication venue.
- c. Invited Scholarly Addresses, Keynote Presentations, etc.
- d. Public readings of original work (refereed/juried or invited), excluding promotional events.
- e. Minor Publications: popular journalism in national or international publications, textbooks, study guides, instructor manuals, reviews, notes, papers published in conference proceedings, reprints, and edited collections.

- f. Presentation at Professional Academic Conferences (refereed or invited).
- g. Funded grants, institutes, seminars, fellowships.
- h. Primary editor of a collection, special issue, academic publication or creative publication.
- i. Other items submitted for consideration.

Category 2 – Professional Activities

- a. Chairperson/planner/session leader at a scholarly meeting.
- b. Non-juried creative or scholarly presentation or workshop.
- c. Organizer of professional workshops, meetings, conference, performances, or readings.
- d. Member of professional journal editorial board.
- e. Reviewer of manuscripts for a professional journal.
- f. Reviewer of professional conference proposals.
- g. Program evaluator.
- h. Leadership in professional organizations.
- i. Evaluator of grant proposals.
- j. Non-funded grant.
- k. Honors and awards for scholarly, creative, or professional activities.
- l. WIU or community presentation that requires substantial scholarly research and reading.
- m. Invited textbook evaluation for publication.
- n. Consultation demonstrating professional expertise and achievement.
- o. Attendance at professional meetings, documented by notes submitted from sessions attended.
- p. Other items submitted for consideration.
- q. Other Conference Work: Discussant on panels, moderator, roundtable participant, workshop leader, etc.

B. Evaluation

The DPC and the department chair will independently review all written materials submitted (including copies of presentations given at scholarly meetings) to evaluate the quality and importance of the work; if necessary, the DPC will consult with experts in the field. The DPC and the department chair will determine if the work is of sufficient quality to count as an activity for tenure and promotion.

If items submitted for Category 1.a and/or 1.b are outside of the faculty member's area of specialization as defined by terminal degree and/or teaching responsibilities, the faculty member must include justification for their inclusion in the scholarly narrative. The DPC and the department chair will determine if the item merits inclusion. If faculty members intend to publish outside of their specialization, they are strongly encouraged to meet with DPC and the department chair to discuss how this publication might be justified.

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

1. Employees in PY1 and PY2 will be required to submit plans for pursuit of Scholarly/Professional Activities and will list Scholarly/Professional Activities for that evaluation period for written advisory comment from the DPC, department chair, and dean. A non-retention decision in PY1 and PY2 cannot be based on Scholarly/Professional Activities. PY1 and PY2 written advisory comments are intended for the faculty member's professional development and will not be used as a basis for personnel decision-making in PY1, PY2, or future evaluation years (20.8.a).
2. By PY3, candidates must give evidence of three or more accumulated activities, at least one from Category 1.
3. By PY4, candidates must give evidence of six or more accumulated activities, two of which must be from Category 1, one of which should be a submission for Category 1.a or 1.b.
4. By PY5, candidates must give evidence of eight or more accumulated activities, three of which must be from Category 1, one of which should be a submission for Category 1.a or 1.b.
5. For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, candidates must give evidence of at least eight activities since being appointed, three of which should be from Category 1. Two of the activities must be from Category 1.a or 1.b.
6. For promotion to Full Professor, candidates must give evidence of at least four activities since the last promotion. Two activities must be from Categories 1.a or 1.b.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and for promotion to Professor, publications from Categories 1.a and 1.b that have been accepted for publication, but have not yet been published, will only be considered if the candidate provides a letter from the editor which includes the editor's complete and accurate contact information and a publication timeline.

III. SERVICE ACTIVITIES (file #4)

A. Materials

Service Activities includes department, college, and University-wide activities as well as service to the region and state.

The following materials are required to be submitted for evaluation:

1. A service narrative that conforms to the requirements of the Provost's instructions and describes the amount and significance of the service activities.
2. Written documents for service activities, which may include letters from committee chairs, professional organizations, etc.

Faculty are encouraged to contact the department chair or chair of DPC for questions regarding appropriate documentation of service.

Activities from the categories below for which the candidate receives ACEs are considered under Teaching/Primary Duties and will not be considered as service.

If a probationary faculty member intends to use an “Equivalent Activity” for service, they are strongly encouraged to meet with both DPC chair and department chair to see if this equivalent activity will count toward service.

Recognized service activities are as follows:

Category 1: Higher-Level Activities

- a. Chair or Member of a major University or College Council/Committee that meets at least once a month.
- b. Significant leadership positions in one’s professional organization.
- c. Chair or member of a search committee.
- d. Chair or member of DPC.
- e. Chair or member of active department committee that meets at least once per month.
- f. College excellence award in a service area.
- g. Advising a student organization that meets at least once per month.
- h. Organizing recruitment/retention activities.
- i. Coordinator of local conference.
- j. Organizing program assessment or writing assessment report.
- k. Chair or member of a regional or state academic organization that meets at least once a month.
- l. Equivalent service activity.

Category 2: Lower-Level Activities

- a. Chair or Member of a department/College/University committee that meets less than once per month.
- b. Officially assigned and actively engaged as faculty mentor.
- c. Advising a student organization that meets less than once per month.
- d. Non-juried presentation or workshop, delivered in a non-scholarly venue.
- e. Organizing panel for local conference.
- f. Judging contests and awards.
- g. Participating in program assessment.
- h. Chair or member of a regional or state academic organization that meets less than once a month.
- i. Equivalent service activity.

B. Evaluation

The DPC and the department chair will independently review and evaluate all submitted written materials to determine the quality and quantity of the faculty member’s participation in service activities. The DPC and the department chair will determine if the work is of sufficient quality to count as a service activity for tenure and promotion.

Candidates are expected to sustain excellence in service activities. (For PY years, refer to the table on the first page of the Department Criteria.) Probationary faculty should consult with the department chair and the chair of DPC to develop a plan for their service activities.

1. Employees in PY1 and PY2 will be required to demonstrate at least minimal service in each evaluation period for written advisory comment from the DPC, department chair, and dean. A non-retention decision in PY1 and PY2 cannot be based on Service Activities. PY1 and PY2 written advisory comments are intended for the faculty member's professional development and will not be used as a basis for personnel decision-making in PY1, PY2, or future evaluation years (20.8.a).
2. By PY3, candidates must give evidence of three or more accumulated activities, at least one from Category 1.
3. By PY4, candidates must give evidence of six or more accumulated activities, two of which must be from Category 1. Activities must include both departmental and either college or university service.
4. By PY5, candidates must give evidence of eight or more accumulated activities, three of which must be from Category 1. Activities must include both departmental and either college or university service.
5. For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, candidates must give evidence of at least eight activities since being appointed, four of which must be from Category 1. Activities must include both departmental and either college or university service.
6. For promotion to Full Professor, candidates must give evidence of at least eight activities since the last promotion, four of which must be from Category 1. Activities must include both departmental and either college or university service.

Department of English Western Illinois University

Department Criteria

2017-2021 Contract

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR UNIT B FACULTY

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

1. Evaluation of Associate Faculty does not occur until the completion of one academic semester of service as an Associate Faculty member at the university and consists of a review of the employee's performance of teaching/primary duties by the department chair and the college dean.

Associate Faculty receiving "satisfactory" ratings will be evaluated every year. Associate Faculty promoted to Senior Instructor and Unit B Assistant Professors will be evaluated every three years as long as they maintain a highly effective rating. A Senior Instructor and Unit B Assistant Professor who receives a satisfactory rating will be evaluated annually until receiving a highly effective rating, at which time they return to the three-year evaluation cycle.

2. In accordance with Article 33.1 of the contract, the department chair and the dean will review student course evaluations of all courses taught, as well as documentation of any other instructional activities/primary duties.

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

Faculty members teaching in the Quad Cities will have a proctor or responsible student place evaluation materials in an envelope which the proctor or student seals and signs across the seal. The faculty member will then mail the sealed envelope to the department chair via campus mail.

Faculty members teaching classes after normal business hours will have a proctor or responsible student place evaluation materials in an envelope which the proctor or student seals

and signs across the seal. The faculty member will then place the sealed envelope in the department chair's mailbox.

Faculty members teaching videoconference courses will have a proctor or responsible student in each location place evaluation materials in an envelope which the proctor/student seals and signs across the seal. The envelopes will be placed in the department chair's mailbox and mailed to department chair via campus as appropriate.

Faculty members teaching online courses will follow departmentally-approved procedures for administering course evaluations through the course website. Course evaluations from the course website will be accessible by the chair.

3. The department chair and the dean will also review additional evidence offered by the employee. In addition to student evaluations, faculty in the English department of English must submit the following:
 - a. a syllabus for each course taught
 - b. representative assignment sheets
 - c. a peer teaching evaluation (or a chair teaching evaluation) arranged by the faculty member with the prior approval of the department chair. Peer teaching evaluations require observation of at least one class session or, for online courses, review of course materials through access to the course site. For classroom courses, the faculty member being observed for evaluation must also inform the department chair of the scheduled observation prior to its completion. The evaluator will submit the evaluation as a letter covering the points in the evaluation criteria (listed below in section 4). One peer observation is required for each evaluation period. Peer evaluators must submit the completed observation to the faculty member and the department chair. The observation must be submitted either within 30 days or by the last day of classes of the current semester if there are not 30 days left in the current semester. All completed observations for an evaluation period must be submitted to the department chair. For peer evaluations of online classes, the faculty member will grant the observer access in order to comprehensively review the course online.
 - d. Three or more examples of graded or evaluated student writing.
- 3.1 The employee may also choose to include additional materials, which could include but are not limited to:
 - a. a self-evaluation
 - b. a description of student conference procedures
 - c. student testimonials
 - d. evidence of innovative and effective teaching methods
 - e. material demonstrating involvement in scholarly/professional activities and service.
4. In evaluating the evidence of teaching effectiveness, the department chair and the dean will consider the employee's:

- a. demonstrated knowledge of subject as evidenced by
 - i. interest in subject taught and
 - ii. effective methods of presentation;
 - b. ability to communicate effectively with students as evidenced by
 - i. oral and written proficiency in English as mandated by state law and
 - ii. willingness to meet with students to address their academic needs;
 - c. clarity of class procedures and objectives of course as evidenced by
 - i. clearly stated course objectives and course assignments and
 - ii. stated goals that fall within the learning objectives of the Writing Program (where applicable);
 - d. clear organization as evidenced by
 - i. a syllabus providing necessary information for the course and
 - ii. materials presented in a logical sequence;
 - e. encouragement of students' participation in class as evidenced by
 - i. providing students opportunities to participate in their own learning and
 - ii. showing concern for students and their academic progress; ability to supplement the assigned texts in the course;
 - f. clarity of grading procedures.
5. In terms of student evaluations, highly effective, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory performances are:
- a. highly effective Associate Faculty must have a mean score of at least 4.0 in their student course evaluations.
 - b. satisfactory Associate Faculty must have a mean score of at least 3.75 in their student evaluations.
 - c. unsatisfactory Associate Faculty have mean scores of less than 3.75 on student course evaluations.
6. In evaluating non-teaching assigned primary duties, the department chair and the dean will consider evidence such as the following: fulfillment of assigned duties; evaluation by appropriate departmental, college, or university administrator or supervisor; evaluations by the appropriate committee; self-evaluation (which may be combined with the self-evaluation of teaching); peer teaching evaluations from co-workers, editors, or colleagues from other universities; student evaluations, if appropriate; evidence of innovative administrative, editorial, or other job-related projects; and, record of time spent, such as calendar or diary.
- The department chair and dean will review all materials submitted for evaluation of non-teaching primary duties and will consider a) demonstrated effectiveness, b) responsiveness to faculty and student needs, and c) quality of other projects.
7. After reviewing the student course evaluations (40%), peer teaching evaluation (40%), and other evidence submitted by the employee (20%) according to the criteria presented in section 4 above, the department chair and dean will write an evaluation of the employee's teaching/primary duties, stating whether the performance has been highly effective, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.

- a. highly effective performance fulfills all of the contractual obligations plus shows excellence in one or more of the evaluation areas. Highly effective Associate Faculty must have a mean score of at least 4.0 in their student course evaluations.
- b. satisfactory performance fulfills all of the contractual obligations. Satisfactory Associate Faculty must have a mean score of at least 3.75 in their student evaluations.
- c. unsatisfactory performance does not fulfill all of the contractual obligations and shows weakness in one or more of the evaluation areas. Mean scores of less than 3.75 on student course evaluations are considered unsatisfactory.

Numerical scores on student course evaluations shall not be the sole determinant in evaluating performance. Evaluators should interpret numerical scores from student course evaluations in terms of clear and consistent patterns that have developed over the appropriate evaluation period.

Student assessment results will not be used in evaluating faculty performance.

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

8. If an employee receives an evaluation that he or she disagrees with, the employee should appeal the evaluation following procedures outlined in the UPI contract, section 33.1.c.
9. Promotion (33. 1. c.2)

EVALUATION OF DISTANCE LEARNING COURSES

The department chair will independently review all distance learning evaluations separately, taking into consideration mitigating factors and unique features, which may include but are not limited to the following: the mode of delivery, the number of sites and types of students, low response rate, the faculty member's prior experience with this type of teaching, and the type of course.