



**Departmental Criteria for Retention, Tenure, Promotion, and Five-Year Appraisal Adjustment (Full Professors)**

**Evaluation Criteria for Unit A Faculty**

***\*\* Faculty are responsible for familiarizing themselves with the current UPI Agreement, as well as the instructions, forms, and timetables available on the Provost's website at [wiu.edu/provost](http://wiu.edu/provost) under "Personnel" → "Documents and Forms." \*\****

Every candidate for retention, tenure, or promotion in the Department will be evaluated by the Department Personnel Committee (DPC) and the department chair in three areas: Teaching/Primary Duties, Scholarly/Professional Activities, and Service. Of these three, and according to Article 20.4 of UPI Agreement 2023-26, the most important area is Teaching/Primary Duties. Please see Article 20 of the Agreement for details on purpose (20.1), evaluation schedule (20.2), evaluation period (20.3), evaluation criteria including areas of evaluation and factors for consideration (20.4), evaluation portfolio and addition of new materials (20.6), and evaluation procedures common to all personnel applications (20.7). Also see procedures unique to retention decisions (20.8), to promotion decisions (20.9), to tenure decisions (20.10), to five-year appraisal for tenured faculty (20.12), to professor five-year appraisal adjustment (PFYAA) (20.13), and to distance education (20.15).

This document explains the following:

- Department Personnel Committee (DPC) composition and elections procedures
- Educational requirements for tenure
- Probationary year (PY) definitions, evaluation period (retention, tenure, promotion, appraisals)
- Areas of evaluation and factors to be considered in evaluation of each area (teaching/primary duties, scholarly/professional activities, and service) including required and optional materials, and characteristics and activities appropriate to each area
- Procedures for student and peer evaluations
- Application of criteria to specific levels of evaluation (i.e., retention, tenure, promotion, PFYAA)
- Guidance on PFYAA

**Department Personnel Committee Composition and Election Procedures (Article 20.5)**

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 their election.

The written recommendation of the committee will be determined by a simple majority vote. When members of the DPC or their family members or significant others 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. For more on the role of DPC, see Article 20.5.

## Educational Requirements for Tenure (Article 20.9-10)

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.

### Probationary Year (PY) Definitions, Evaluation Period (Retention, Tenure, Promotion, Appraisal) (20.3)

PY Year for Portfolio Purposes	Actual Semesters to Be Documented
1	Fall PY1 (or the beginning of the tenure-track contract to date of PY1 portfolio submission)+
2	Spring PY1* (or spring PY1 up until the contractual start of the fall PY2 semester)
3	Fall and Spring PY2* (up until the contractual start of the Fall PY3 semester)
4	Fall and Spring PY3* (up until the contractual start of the Fall PY4 semester)
5	Fall and Spring PY4* (up until the contractual start of the Fall PY5 semester)
6 (Tenure Year)	PY1 to Date of Tenure Application*

**Table 1.** Correspondence between PY Years and Actual Semesters to Be Documented

+ For example, if an employee begins tenure-track employment July 15 (with DWE primary duties as Writing Program Director), they would count that fall semester plus the previous weeks back to the tenure-track contract start date. If an employee who has been in a non-tenure-track position moves into a tenure-track position, PY1 would begin with their tenure-track appointment.

\*Plus outlines from previous years.

**Note:** The outline should be cumulative, reverse chronological order, with items for the current evaluation period bolded. Refer to the UPI Agreement as well as the Provost's webpage for additional information: [wiu.edu/provost](http://wiu.edu/provost).

For evaluation periods for retention, tenure, promotion, and five-year appraisals, see Article 20.3.

Employees who begin their employment after October 1 shall remain in PY1 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 (Article 20.3).

### Areas of Evaluation (20.4)

Candidates should consult the Provost's instructions for assembling the portfolio regarding matters of form. The Department Criteria addresses content only. Visit [wiu.edu/provost](http://wiu.edu/provost) and select "Documents and Forms" under "Personnel."

**Note:** Faculty in PY1 and PY2 will be evaluated only in the area of teaching/primary duties. For subsequent evaluations, faculty 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 (Article 20.4.d).

## **Factors to Be Considered in Evaluation of Each Area (Article 20.4.e)**

### **I. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties (file #2)**

#### **A. Materials.**

The following materials are required of all candidates to be submitted for evaluation:

1. A narrative of teaching and non-teaching duties (if applicable) that conforms to the requirements of the Provost's instructions
2. Student course evaluations (Articles 20.4.f and 20.11)
3. Peer teaching evaluation(s)
4. A representative sample of course syllabi, assignment sheets, an evaluated paper with assignment sheet, and any other relevant materials pertaining to teaching.

#### ***Teaching Primary Duties***

Faculty members must submit a variety of teaching materials in order to accurately demonstrate their performance in teaching. Candidates are encouraged to note and document new preparations, development of new courses, general education courses taught, WID courses taught, different delivery modes, as well as other activities that fall under teaching like working with students on internships, research projects, thesis and exit options, and mentoring student presentations of research.

#### ***Non-Teaching Primary Duties***

Faculty who receive ACEs for non-teaching primary duties (e.g., advising, coordinating, administering) will have those activities also evaluated as part of their primary duties. Along with the above materials, they must submit:

1. A position description or the approved DWE document.
2. An evaluation by the chair or other appropriate current or former program coordinator, director, or administrator that addresses the non-teaching duties assigned.
3. Additionally, some combination of the following materials (as appropriate to their duties) is required of all faculty who have received ACEs for non-teaching primary duties, in order to demonstrate their performance in non-teaching duties:
  - a. An administrative or advising philosophy that relates to the candidate's non-teaching duties.
  - b. Emails and/or letters from individuals on or off campus that speak to specific partnerships, collaborations, or other work by the candidate with that individual or their unit.
  - c. An annual report, strategic planning document, and/or other reports the candidate's duties require.
  - d. Other supporting evidence related to duties, initiatives, projects, and accomplishments cited in the outline and/or narrative with respect to the candidate's non-teaching duties.

#### **B. Characteristics to Be Evaluated for 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.

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

### **C. Evaluation of Teaching ACEs**

Faculty will be evaluated on the basis of more than one measurement of teaching effectiveness. 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 the following:

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

**Note:** Assessment of student learning and program assessment will not be used in evaluation of faculty performance (Article 20.4.b.1.c).

Faculty must present student course evaluation scores according to the following measures on a scale of 1-5 (1 being the lowest score and 5 being the highest score):

1. For retention in PY1 and PY2, faculty must have an overall mean of 3.75 or above in courses taught during each evaluation 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 evaluation 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 evaluation period.
4. For promotion to Professor, faculty must have an overall mean of 4.00 or above in courses taught during the evaluation period.
5. For professor five-year appraisal adjustment (PFYAA), faculty must have an overall mean of 4.00 or above in courses taught during the evaluation period.

Student evaluations will be reviewed by the DPC and department chair to consider patterns of effectiveness, which may be demonstrated in various ways. Numerical scores on student evaluations will not be the sole determinant in retention, tenure, promotion, and five-year appraisal/appraisal adjustment 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 department chair will consider the inherent difference in form, content, or audience of individual courses that might affect evaluation results, such as mode of delivery, general education or WID courses, faculty experience with the subject matter, and new preparations.

The DPC and the department chair will independently review all student evaluations for online courses separately, taking into consideration 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, the type of course, and any other unique or mitigating factors.

Peer teaching evaluations should evaluate the candidate based on the characteristics outlined under I.B. Peer evaluators may write a letter citing the specific characteristics or use the department peer teaching evaluation form (Appendix B). At a minimum, evaluations are expected to comment explicitly on at least three of Characteristics 1-4 in I.B. Peer evaluations will be reviewed by the DPC and department chair to consider evidence of effectiveness as demonstrated within a course and observed by peers.

Faculty members are also expected to contribute to teaching in the department through other teaching activities, including but not limited to mentorship of graduate teaching assistants, serving on graduate exit option committees,

directing independent studies, and supervising undergraduate research.

#### **D. Evaluation of Non-Teaching ACEs**

The DPC and the department chair will independently review and evaluate, based on the appropriate DWE description of duties, all material submitted regarding non-teaching ACEs, and will determine whether the evidence supports a positive recommendation based on the duties assigned and the ways in which, and extent to which, the candidate carried out those duties, as well as the quality of their work and performance. A faculty member's evaluation with respect to non-teaching ACEs/primary duties in reference to their DWEs will be based on the following:

1. Evaluation(s) by the chair or other appropriate current or former program coordinator, director, or administrator that address the non-teaching duties assigned. (40%)
2. Additional required and optional materials submitted. (60%)

Peer evaluations of non-teaching primary duties should evaluate the candidate based on the assigned DWEs. Peer evaluators should write a letter citing the DWE document. Peer evaluations will be reviewed by the DPC and department chair to consider evidence of effectiveness in performance of duties and quality of work.

1. For retention in PY1 and PY2, faculty with non-teaching primary duties must demonstrate accomplishment of duties and, for duties not feasible to complete in the particular probationary period, a plan for addressing those duties.
2. For retention in PY3, PY4, and PY5, faculty with non-teaching primary duties must demonstrate accomplishment of duties and, for duties not feasible to complete in the particular probationary period, a plan for addressing those duties.
3. For tenure and promotion to associate professor, faculty with non-teaching primary duties must demonstrate accomplishment of duties and, for duties not feasible to complete in the particular evaluation period or duration of assignment, a plan for addressing those duties in the future or explanation of the scope of their work.
4. For promotion to full professor, faculty with non-teaching primary duties must demonstrate accomplishment of duties and, for duties not feasible to complete in the particular evaluation period or duration of assignment, a plan for addressing those duties in the future or explanation of the scope of their work.
5. For PFYAA, faculty with non-teaching primary duties must demonstrate accomplishment of duties and, for duties not feasible to complete in the particular evaluation period or duration of assignment, a plan for addressing those duties in the future or explanation of the scope of their work.

#### **E. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluations (Article 20.11)**

##### ***Student Course Evaluations***

Faculty shall submit student evaluations from all courses taught except in the following cases: Evaluations for Summer Session and intersession courses are optional (Article 20.11.f).

Student course evaluations are to be administered using the departmentally-approved form (see attached).

According to Article 20.11.a, for evaluations conducted in person, faculty being evaluated are not to be in the room at the time of the evaluation, and evaluations should be returned to the department/school 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.

Faculty members teaching online courses will follow departmentally- and university-approved procedures for administering course evaluations through the course website.

Faculty are not to receive the results of student evaluations until after grades have been submitted (20.11.c).

For consideration specific to reporting of quantitative course evaluation results, especially when data is missing, minimal, or otherwise limited, see Article 20.4.f.

### ***Peer Evaluations for Teaching***

Peer evaluations are a critical component to the evaluation of teaching effectiveness and a crucial component considered in the performance of primary duties. Peer course observations and evaluations are designed to help instructors improve their teaching and engage the WIU student population. The need for peer observation and evaluation is important throughout faculty's time at WIU, but we emphasize more frequent evaluation early in the faculty member's career. To that end:

1. For PY1 and PY2, faculty will arrange for at least one course to be evaluated each semester (i.e., each evaluation period).
2. For PY3, PY4, PY5, and PY6, faculty will arrange for at least one course to be evaluated each academic year (i.e., each evaluation period).
3. For Associate Professors applying for Full, faculty will arrange for at least two courses to be evaluated over three academic years for every five years since tenure, including the year preceding application.

Faculty should plan to have evaluations from different faculty across their probationary years and when applying for full. Faculty will arrange their own peer observations, obtaining prior approval of the Department Chair and the DPC. Observations generally do not take place in the last two weeks of classes. For courses in person or livestream, observation should be of a class session. For online courses, the faculty should arrange course access for their peer evaluator for a set period of time to review materials.

Faculty peer evaluations must comply with the WIU Consensual Amorous Relationships Policy and any conflicts of interests should be avoided in all peer evaluations.

Following the observation, the faculty member should meet with the evaluator to discuss strengths, areas for improvement, and pedagogical suggestions. Once an evaluation takes place and faculty member and evaluator meet, the evaluator will submit the Department Evaluation Form or evaluation letter in a timely fashion.

Faculty members who have received peer evaluations about which they, the DPC, or the department chair are concerned are strongly encouraged to obtain additional observations during the evaluating period. For this reason, it is strongly recommended that faculty schedule observations early enough in the semester to allow for rescheduling due to unforeseen conflicts or to accommodate additional observations prior to the semester's end.

### ***Peer Evaluations for Non-Teaching Primary Duties***

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 current or former program coordinator, director, or administrator with sufficient advance notice. For faculty in PY1 through PY6, one evaluation per evaluation period, per non-teaching assignment, is required. For faculty applying for full professor, one evaluation per non-teaching assignment held since tenure 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, an evaluation must be completed within 30 days of completion of duties.

## **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 and indicates nature, quality, and extent of activities (as appropriate).
2. 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. Candidates should consult with the department chair and DPC to confirm a particular publishing venue is acceptable.

**B. Activities to Be Evaluated for Scholarly/Professional.** Recognized scholarly/professional activities are as follows:

*(Note: outline should indicate how each of the activities corresponds to items in the list below.)*

### **Category 1 – Scholarly Activities**

- a. Scholarly publication (refereed): monographs, edited collections/special issues, articles, book chapters, expansive textual editions, and digital or multimodal compositions, accompanied by an explanation that indicates the quality of the publication as well as the publication venue.
- b. Creative publication (refereed/juried/editorial board reviewed): novels, poems, stories, essays, plays, film scripts, and digital or multimodal compositions, accompanied by an explanation that indicates the quality of the publication as well as the publication venue.
- c. Invited scholarly address, keynote presentation, etc.
- d. Public reading of original creative work (refereed, invited, or otherwise arranged), excluding promotional events, accompanied by an explanation that indicates the nature of the event as well as the prestige of the venue (for example, a nationally or internationally recognized venue or event).
- e. Other publications (non-refereed): popular journalism in national or international publications, textbooks, study guides, instructor manuals, reviews, notes, papers published in conference proceedings, reprints, professional/academic websites or blogs, and popular anthologies.
- f. Presentation at professional academic conference (refereed or invited).
- g. Competitive funded grant, institute, seminar, fellowship.
- h. Other items submitted for consideration (note: consult with the DPC and department chair).

### **Category 2 – Professional Activities**

- a. Chairperson/planner/session leader at a scholarly meeting.
- b. Non-juried creative or scholarly presentation, reading, or workshop at, for example, a local venue or as part of a local event (i.e., for creative work, something not at the same level of prestige as Category 1.d).
- c. Organizer of professional workshops, meetings, conferences, performances, or readings.
- d. Member of professional journal editorial board.
- e. Reviewer of manuscripts for a professional journal.
- f. Reviewer of conference proposals for a professional or academic conference.
- g. Program evaluator.
- h. Leadership in a professional organization.
- i. Evaluator of grant proposals.

- j. Competitive, non-funded grant proposal.
- k. Noncompetitive funded grant, institute, seminar, or fellowship
- l. 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 Conference Work: Discussant on panels, moderator, roundtable participant, workshop leader, etc.
- q. Other items submitted for consideration (note: consult with the DPC and department chair).

## **B. Evaluation of Scholarly/Professional Activities**

The DPC and the department chair will independently review all materials submitted to evaluate the quality and importance of the work, as well as the extent and nature of the candidate's contribution to each activity. If necessary, the DPC will consult with experts in the field. The DPC and the department chair will determine if activities are of sufficient quality and appropriate nature to count for tenure, promotion, and PFYAA.

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.

For tenure and promotion, candidates are expected to sustain excellence in scholarly/professional activities. (For PY years, refer to Table 1.)

1. Candidates 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 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 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 (Article 20.3.c).
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. Publication of a single- or dual-authored, peer reviewed scholarly book that contributes to the literature in the discipline (excluding anthologies, edited volumes, textbooks, and the like) may be substituted for two category 1.a activities.
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. Publication of a single- or dual-authored, peer reviewed scholarly book that contributes to the literature in the discipline (excluding anthologies, edited volumes, textbooks, and the like) may be substituted for two category 1.a activities.
7. For satisfactory performance in scholarly/professional activities for professor five-year appraisal adjustment (PFYAA), candidates must give evidence of at least five activities since the last promotion or appraisal from either Category 1 or Category 2. Publication of a single- or dual-authored, peer reviewed scholarly book that contributes to the literature in the discipline (excluding anthologies, edited volumes, textbooks, and the like)



may be substituted for two category 1.a activities.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to Professor, and PFYAA, 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 (as appropriate) the extent and nature of activities, degree of participation, quality and length of service, and relationship of service to the candidate's assigned responsibilities.
2. Documentation for service activities, which may include letters from committee chairs, professional organizations, meeting minutes, reports, and other materials as appropriate.

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 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.

**B. Activities to Be Evaluated for 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.
- f. Advising a student organization that meets at least once per month.
- g. Organizing recruitment/retention activities.
- h. Coordinator of local conference.
- i. Organizing program assessment or writing assessment report.
- j. Chair or member of a regional or state academic organization that meets at least once a month.
- k. 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.

### **C. Evaluation of Service Activities**

Candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to sustain excellence in service activities. The DPC and the department chair will independently review and evaluate all submitted materials to determine the quality and importance of the work, as well as the extent and nature of the candidate's participation and contribution to each activity. The DPC and the department chair will determine if the work is of sufficient quality to count as a service activity for tenure, promotion, or PFYAA.

Probationary faculty should consult with the department chair and the chair of DPC to develop a plan for their

service activities. (For PY years, refer to Table 1.)

1. Candidates 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 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 (Article 20.3.c).
2. By PY3, candidates must give evidence of at least three accumulated activities, at least one of which must be from Category 1.
3. By PY4, candidates must give evidence of at least six 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 at least seven 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.
7. For satisfactory performance for PFYAA, candidates must give evidence of at least five activities since the last promotion or appraisal from either Category 1 or 2.

### **Professor Five-Year Appraisal Awards**

For full guidance on PFYAAs, please see the UPI Agreement Article 20.12 as well as the Memorandum of Understanding (MOA) on Professor Five-Year Appraisal Awards.

Satisfactory evaluation in the area of Teaching/Primary Duties is required for PFYAA consideration. Professors in years 1, 10, or 15 receiving a satisfactory evaluation in all three areas of consideration (Teaching/Primary Duties, Scholarly/Professional Activities, and Service Activities) are eligible to receive an 8% PFYAA increase on their base salary. Those receiving satisfactory evaluations in just the Teaching/Primary Duties area will receive a 3% PFYAA increase on their base salary. Satisfactory performance in Teaching/Primary Duties and one other area (either Scholarly/Professional Activities or Service Activities) are eligible to receive a 6% PFYAA increase on their base salary.

**Materials.** The evaluation shall consist of the review of the following by the department chair:

1. Student evaluations (see Article 20.11)
2. Materials submitted by the faculty member in outline form (similar to the outlines for retention, tenure, and promotion) to substantiate a reasonable level of performance in the areas of Teaching/Primary Duties, Scholarly/Professional Activities, and Service Activities
3. Materials in the faculty member's personnel file

**Evaluation.** Following review of the documents, the department chair shall write a brief evaluation statement and send it to the dean for review and to the Academic Vice President for inclusion in the employee's personnel file. A copy of the evaluation statement shall be sent to the employee, who may attach a written response to the evaluation statement for inclusion in the personnel file. Guidance for evaluation in each area can be found under the evaluation section in this document for Teaching/Primary Duties, Scholarly/Professional Activities, and Service Activities.

Any faculty member who disagrees with their department chair's evaluation will be allowed to submit an appeal to the dean and the CPC chair for resolution. If a faculty member wishes to submit an appeal, then the faculty member must submit a written letter to their dean, specifying the item(s) in dispute and the faculty member's justification. The faculty member will have at least one week to write the letter of appeal. If the dean and CPC chair cannot resolve the dispute, the Academic Vice President will make the final determination in those disputed cases. The Academic Vice President must notify both the member and UPI Chapter President of the basis for the decision.

**Department of English**  
**Western Illinois University**

**2023-26**

**Departmental Criteria for Retention and Promotion**

**Evaluation Criteria for Unit B Associate Faculty**

***\*\* Faculty are responsible for familiarizing themselves with the current UPI Agreement, as well as the instructions, forms, and timetables available on the Provost's website at [wiu.edu/provost](http://wiu.edu/provost) under "Personnel" → "Documents and Forms." \*\****

Associate faculty are also encouraged to review Articles 30 (Employee Appointments) and 32 (Professional Responsibilities and Assignment of Duties) in the UPI Agreement.

Associate faculty are evaluated according to the procedures appearing in Article 33.1 of the UPI Agreement. The following points summarize the procedures for Associate Faculty as they are applied by the Department of English.

**A. Evaluation Schedule**

No Associate Faculty member shall be evaluated until she/he has completed one full semester of service at the University as an Associate Faculty member. Evaluation consists of a review of the employee's performance of teaching/primary duties by the department chair and the college dean.

According to Article 33.1.d.6, 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.

**B. Materials.** The following materials are required of all employees to be submitted for evaluation:

1. A teaching/primary duties narrative that addresses teaching and (if applicable) non-teaching duties
2. Student course evaluations of all courses taught during the evaluation period
3. Peer teaching evaluations (at least 1 peer teaching evaluation required per evaluation period)
4. Syllabi for all courses taught during the evaluation period
5. Representative assignment sheets
6. Three or more examples of graded or evaluated student writing

Optional materials may include:

1. Additional materials to demonstrate innovative and/or effective teaching, including but not limited to teaching philosophy, student testimonials, description of student conference procedures
2. Material demonstrating involvement in scholarly/professional activities or service activities

**C. Characteristics to Be Evaluated for Teaching**

Each employee is expected to demonstrate the following characteristics in teaching, and to clearly indicate in the teaching/primary duties narrative 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.

#### **D. Evaluation of Teaching ACEs**

Faculty will be evaluated on the basis of more than one measurement of teaching effectiveness. The department chair and college dean 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 the following:

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

Student evaluations, along with other materials, will be reviewed by the department chair and college dean to consider patterns of effectiveness, which may be demonstrated in various ways. Numerical scores on student evaluations will not be the sole determinant in evaluating performance. 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 department chair will consider the inherent difference in form, content, or audience of individual courses that might affect evaluation results, such as mode of delivery, general education or WID courses, faculty experience with the subject matter, and new preparations.

The department chair will review all student evaluations for online courses separately, taking into consideration 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, the type of course, and any other unique or mitigating factors.

Peer teaching evaluations should evaluate the faculty member based on the characteristics outlined under section C. Peer evaluators may write a letter citing the specific characteristics or use the department peer teaching evaluation form (Appendix B). At a minimum, evaluations are expected to comment explicitly on at least three of Characteristics 1-4 in section C. Peer evaluations will be reviewed by the department chair and college dean to consider evidence of effectiveness as demonstrated within a course and observed by peers.

In terms of student evaluation scores, highly effective, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory performances are defined as follows:

- Highly effective: mean score of at least 4.00-5.00 on student evaluations.
- Satisfactory: mean score of at least 3.75-3.99 on student evaluations.
- Unsatisfactory: mean score of less than 3.75 on student evaluations.

#### **E. Evaluation of Non-Teaching ACEs**

The department chair will review and evaluate, based on the appropriate DWE description of duties, all material submitted regarding non-teaching ACEs, and will determine whether the evidence supports an evaluation of highly effective, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory based on the duties assigned and the ways in which and extent to which the faculty member carried out those duties, as well as the quality of their work and performance. A faculty member's evaluation with respect to non-teaching ACEs/primary duties in reference to their DWEs will be based on the following:

1. Evaluation(s) by the chair or other appropriate current or former program coordinator, director, or administrator that address the non-teaching duties assigned. (40%)
2. Additional required and optional materials submitted. (60%)

For a rating of highly effective, faculty must demonstrate excellence in the accomplishment of duties and, for duties not feasible to complete in the particular probationary period, a clear, specific plan for addressing those duties.

For a rating of satisfactory, faculty must demonstrate competence in the accomplishment of duties and, for duties not feasible to complete in the particular probationary period, a clear, specific plan for addressing those duties.

A rating of unsatisfactory may be given if the faculty member is not performing their duties completely, competently, and/or in a timely fashion, or if significant concerns or problems with performance of those duties or quality of work is evident via peer evaluation or other materials submitted.

## **F. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluations**

### ***Student Course Evaluations***

Faculty shall submit student evaluations from all courses taught except in the following cases: Evaluations for Summer Session and intersession courses are optional.

Student course evaluations are to be administered using the departmentally-approved form (see attached).

For evaluations conducted in person, faculty being evaluated are not to be in the room at the time of the evaluation, and evaluations should be returned to the department/school 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.

Faculty members teaching online courses will follow departmentally- and university-approved procedures for administering course evaluations through the course website.

Faculty are not to receive the results of student evaluations until after grades have been submitted.

For consideration specific to reporting of quantitative course evaluation results, especially when data is missing, minimal, or otherwise limited, see Article 33.1.b.

### ***Peer Evaluations for Teaching***

Faculty should arrange to have evaluations from different faculty across their career. Peer evaluations are a critical component to the evaluation of teaching effectiveness and a crucial component considered in the performance of primary duties. Peer course observations and evaluations are designed to help instructors improve their teaching and engage the WIU student population. The need for peer observation and evaluation is important throughout faculty's time at WIU, but we emphasize more frequent evaluation early in the faculty member's career. To that end, faculty are required to have one peer teaching evaluation per evaluation period.

Faculty will arrange their own peer observations, obtaining prior approval of the Department Chair. Observations generally do not take place in the last two weeks of classes. For courses in person or livestream, observation should be of a class session. For online courses, the faculty should arrange course access for their peer evaluator for a set period of time to review materials.

Faculty peer evaluations must comply with the WIU Consensual Amorous Relationships Policy and any conflicts of interests should be avoided in all peer evaluations.

Following the observation, the faculty member should meet with the evaluator to discuss strengths, areas for improvement, and pedagogical suggestions. Once an evaluation takes place and faculty member and evaluator meet, the evaluator will submit the Department Evaluation Form or evaluation letter in a timely fashion.

Faculty members who have received peer evaluations about which they or the department chair are concerned are strongly encouraged to obtain additional observations during the evaluating period. For this reason, it is strongly recommended that faculty schedule observations early enough in the semester to allow for rescheduling due to unforeseen conflicts or to accommodate additional observations prior to the semester's end.

### ***Peer Evaluations for Non-Teaching Primary Duties***

When a faculty member has had non-teaching primary duties, a written evaluation of non-teaching primary duties is to be requested by the faculty member from the appropriate current or former 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 and the department chair. If non-teaching primary duties are not ongoing, the evaluation must be completed within 30 days of completion of duties.

#### **G. Unsatisfactory Performance Evaluation**

If an employee's performance is judged unsatisfactory, the department chair and/or dean, as appropriate, shall provide written reasons, based on the statement of Department/School Criteria. The employee may forward the decision of the department chair/school director and/or dean for review by an Associate Faculty Appeals Committee. See Article 33.1.C for details on the appeals procedure.

#### **H. Promotion**

For promotion procedures, see UPI Agreement Article 33.1.d Promotion.



# APPENDIX A

Course:



Professor:



Correct: ☐ Incorrect: ☒ ☐ ☐

## English Student Evaluation Report

	Disagree/ Low Rating				Agree/ High Rating
<b><u>Section I: Course Syllabus, Organization, and Expectations</u></b>					
1. The instructor provided the students with an informative syllabus.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
2. The instructor presented and discussed the course expectations and objectives.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
3. The instructor organized the course in a coherent manner.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
<b><u>Section II: Course Preparation</u></b>					
4. The instructor's presentations appeared well organized.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
5. The instructor gave students the opportunity to ask questions or provide feedback.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
6. The instructor encouraged students to explore the area of study.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
7. The instructor provided sufficient and appropriate instructions so that most students could understand the presented topic.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
8. The instructor attempted to engage students in the learning process.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
<b><u>Section III: Evaluation Procedures</u></b>					
9. The syllabus clearly explained the course assignments and grading procedure.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
10. Evaluation instruments such as tests, essays, and other assignments matched the course content.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
11. Major assignments were graded and returned before the next major assignment was due.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
<b><u>Section IV: Instructor Characteristics</u></b>					
12. The instructor was knowledgeable in the subject area.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
13. The instructor indicated a genuine interest in the subject matter.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
14. The instructor showed a genuine concern for the students.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
15. The instructor acknowledged student questions and comments as they arose.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
16. I would rate this instructor as an effective teacher.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Please continue on the reverse side of this page

**Student Comment Section**

Please write any additional comments about the teaching of this course.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Appendix B**  
**Department of English Peer Teaching Evaluation Form**

<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Class:</b>	<b>Date/Time:</b>
<b>Observer:</b>	<b>Delivery Mode:</b>	<b>Number of Students:</b>

Prior to observing an instructor's class, the observer is expected to:

- Review the course syllabi and any relevant materials the instructor shares
- Communicate with the instructor as appropriate about modality, teaching style, material to be covered, etc.

**Note:** Below are the characteristics of teaching upon which evaluations of teaching primary duties for tenure, retention, and promotion are based. While an observer need not comment on all of these characteristics, they are encouraged to speak to as many as they are able to observe.

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.

Strengths:

Concerns/Room for Improvement:

2. Ability to organize, analyze, and present knowledge.
  - a. Presentation of an informative syllabus and clear goals and objectives.
  - b. Clear and coherent course organization.
  - c. Clear and coherent class organization and presentation.

Strengths:

Concerns/Room for Improvement:

**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.

**Strengths:**

**Concerns/Room for Improvement:**

**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 student work.

**Strengths:**

**Concerns/Room for Improvement:**

**General Comments (e.g., content covered, pedagogical strategies, student participation):**