

**EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY**

Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

MEMORANDUM

Blair M. Lord  
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

217-581-2121  
blord@eiu.edu

---

To: Mary Anne Hanner, Dean, College of Sciences  
Date: October 31, 2008  
Subject: DAC Revision Approval; Department of Chemistry

---

Thank you for taking another look at your department's statement of Departmental Application of Criteria (DAC) in light of my review comments and suggestions. The further revised DAC sent via e-mail attachment on October 23, 2008, is approved consistent with Article 8.7.c. of the *2006-2010 EIU-UPI Unit A Agreement (Agreement)*. As always, any reading of the DAC will be consistent with the Agreement or its successor agreement(s).

As a matter of principle, Unit A and Unit B faculty may not be held to different standards of achievement in the area of teaching/performance of primary duties for given materials and methods as they apply to an evaluation. For example, what constitutes evidence of achievement of "superior" teaching based on student evaluations may not differ for Unit A faculty and Unit B faculty even though the number of required student evaluations may vary. This is consistent with negotiations that led to annually contracted faculty having access to a rating of "superior" in teaching/performance of primary duties.

The contributions of the department are appreciated, and I continue to encourage consideration of the University's articulated academic goals in the department's deliberations.

attachments: Further Revised DAC; Department of Chemistry

cc: Doug Klarup, Chair, Department of Chemistry

## 2007 - 2010 Departmental Application of Criteria

Department Chemistry

Approved \_\_\_\_\_

*UNIT A section begins on page 5*

### **UNIT B**

Unit B faculty members shall be evaluated according to the EIU/UPI Unit B Faculty Agreement only in the area of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties. Levels of achievement required are given in Table 1.

The faculty member will submit evidence of materials and activities that will enable evaluation to take place. All such evidence should include names, dates, and any other pertinent information. Evaluators may also refer to the faculty member's personnel file to assist in formulating the evaluation, or request the faculty member to provide additional information (as specified in the current EIU/UPI Unit B contract).

#### I. Assigned Duties

Assigned duties shall be considered as primary duties for the purposes of evaluation.

#### II. Categories of Materials and Activities Considered Appropriate and Relative Importance of Materials/Activities

Items listed below shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive.

##### A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

###### 1. Categories of Materials and Activities

- a. Peer evaluation/Classroom visitation
- b. Teaching grants awarded, external
- c. Student evaluations
- d. Course or curriculum development
- e. Items related to assigned coordinator duties
- f. Teaching grant proposals submitted, external
- g. Teaching grants awarded, internal
- h. Teaching awards
- i. Continuing education to enhance teaching skills and methods
- j. Student advisement
- k. Teaching grant proposals submitted, internal
- l. Teaching materials
- m. Other

###### 2. Relative Importance

The items in (1) above are listed in order of approximate relative importance.

###### 3. Notes

The department recognizes that student evaluations can be affected by course difficulty, class size and make-up, and other factors such as innovative teaching and course designs that might require more of students than their previous expectations. Hence, sole use of the quantitative data from student evaluation forms is discouraged in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. More importantly, the department requests reviewers consider all the

evaluation data in context.

### III. Methods of Evaluation to be Used Listed by Performance Area

Items listed below shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive. “Chairperson” refers to the chair or acting chair of the Department of Chemistry. “Peer” refers to a tenured/tenure-track (Unit A) or annually contracted (Unit B) faculty member, or the Chairperson.

#### A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

Using information in the evaluation portfolio, the Chairperson will provide evaluative statements and assign, in the area of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, each faculty member one of four ratings: superior, highly effective, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory using II.A. and III.A.

##### 1. Peer Evaluation:

- a. Peer evaluations for Unit B faculty will be conducted by faculty (see 2a, below) and the Chairperson. For classroom-based courses, these evaluations will involve classroom visitations. The faculty member and evaluator will mutually agree on the time and place for the visitation. For distance-education (Internet-based) courses, the evaluations will involve a “visit” by the evaluator to the instructor’s course website using a supplied student logon. The faculty member and the evaluator will mutually agree upon the time window in which this “visitation” takes place.
- b. Peer evaluations of laboratory courses and summer school courses are considered optional and will be conducted at the discretion of the faculty member who is evaluated.
- c. The peer evaluation shall be written in narrative form, using the Approved Chemistry Department Peer Evaluation Form, and must be based on classroom visitation, or course observation in the case of technology-delivered courses.
- d. Each peer evaluator will provide a copy of the peer evaluation to the applicant.
- e. The applicant must submit at least the minimum number of peer evaluations required for any particular evaluation period (as described below in 2. Peer evaluation minima).

##### 2. Peer evaluation minima:

- a. For each evaluation period, a minimum of one evaluation by the chair and one evaluation by a Unit A member from two different courses is required, unless only multiple sections of the same course are taught during the evaluation period in which case the evaluations may be from the same course.
- b. The minima must be supplied by Chemistry Department peer evaluators. Additional evaluations may be supplied by evaluators either internal to or external to the department.

##### 3. Student Evaluation of Classroom-Based Courses:

- a. Student evaluations of teaching, using the Chemistry Core Items for Student Evaluations form, will be conducted in each course taught each semester. Faculty members may add additional items to the form.
- b. A statistical summary of student evaluations from each section of each course

taught must be included in the portfolio. All comments from student evaluations must be included.

- c. The procedure for conducting student evaluations is as follows:
  - 1) Each course instructor will be responsible for making sure student evaluations are distributed in a timely manner. "Timely manner" is defined as after at least 80% of the term has passed but no later than the last day of regular classes.
  - 2) The instructor will distribute the forms, provide necessary instructions, and explain the rating system.
  - 3) The instructor will ask a student to return the completed forms, in the envelope provided, to the Chemistry Department Office and will leave the room until the evaluations are completed.
  - 4) The instructor will not see the completed forms until after the grades have been submitted.
  - 5) Original evaluation forms, a copy of a blank evaluation form, and a statistical summary will be provided to the faculty member.
- d. It shall be the faculty member's responsibility to maintain copies of all original student evaluations for the duration of any applicable evaluation period and to provide copies to evaluators upon request.

4. Student Evaluation of Distance Education (Internet) Courses:

- a. Student evaluations of teaching, using the Chemistry Core Items for Student Evaluations form, will be conducted in each distance education course taught each semester. Faculty members may add additional items to the form.
- b. A statistical summary of student evaluations from each section of each course taught must be included in the portfolio. All comments from student evaluations must be included.
- c. Evaluations will be conducted over the Internet using a secure system approved by the faculty in the Chemistry Department.
- d. Each course instructor will be responsible for making sure student evaluations are distributed in a timely manner. "Timely manner" is defined as after at least 80% of the term has passed but no later than the last day of regular classes.
- e. The instructor will not see the completed forms until after the grades have been submitted.
- f. If the instructor concludes that challenges or difficulties beyond his/her control and unique to distance learning (Internet-based) courses (including but not limited to inadequate hardware/software support, Internet connection problems, substandard software from publishers) has directly impacted student evaluations, an explanatory note may be included with the evaluation package.
- g. It shall be the faculty member's responsibility to maintain copies of all original student evaluations for the duration of any applicable evaluation period and to provide copies to evaluators upon request.

B. Assigned Credit Units

Each faculty member will include in his/her portfolio documentation for all activities for which credit units were received.

Table 1. Required levels of evaluation for Unit B members†  
(specific to the 2006-2010 EIU-UPI Unit B Agreement)

Merit based increase	Highly Effective or Superior
Performance based increase	Superior*

† - Evaluation rank to be chosen from the following: Superior > Highly Effective > Satisfactory > Unsatisfactory

\* - Portfolio submission with a superior rating in a 4-year aggregate, or an automatic performance based increase with 4 consecutive superior ratings

## **UNIT A**

Unit A faculty members under consideration for retention, tenure, promotion, or professional advancement increase shall be evaluated according to the EIU/UPI Unit A Faculty Agreement in the three areas of (1) Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, (2) Research/ Creative Activity and (3) Service. Of these three areas teaching will be considered the most important. Research/Creative activity will receive greater emphasis relative to Service. Levels of achievement required in each area for retention, promotion, and professional advancement increases (PAI) are given in Table 2.

The faculty member will submit evidence of materials and activities that will enable evaluation to take place. Materials and activities shall be placed in the performance area most appropriate for their consideration. A single activity may not be counted in more than one performance area, unless there is a clear explanation of division of the activity between categories. All such evidence should include names, dates, and any other pertinent information. Evaluators may also refer to the faculty member's personnel file to assist in formulating the evaluation, or request the faculty member to provide additional information (as specified in the current EIU/UPI Unit A contract). In the evaluation process the department recognizes the total nature of a faculty member's contribution to the university.

### **IV. Assigned Duties**

With the exception of research and sabbatical assignments, most activities for which three or more credit units per academic year are assigned shall be considered as primary duties for the purposes of evaluation. Research and sabbatical assignments and any other activity for which less than three credit units per academic year are assigned shall be evaluated in the appropriate category.

### **V. Categories of Materials and Activities Considered Appropriate by Performance Area and Relative Importance of Materials/Activities**

Items listed below shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive.

#### **A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties**

##### **1. Categories of Materials and Activities**

- a. Peer evaluation/Classroom visitation
- b. Teaching Grants awarded, external
- c. Student evaluations
- d. Course or curriculum development
- e. Items related to assigned coordinator duties
- f. Teaching Grant proposals submitted, external
- g. Teaching Grants awarded, internal
- h. Teaching awards
- i. Continuing education to enhance teaching skills and methods
- j. Student advisement
- k. Teaching Grant proposals submitted, internal
- l. Teaching materials
- m. Other

##### **2. Relative Importance**

The items in (1) above are listed in order of approximate relative importance.

##### **3. Notes**

The department recognizes that student evaluations can be affected by course difficulty, class size and make-up, and other factors such as innovative

teaching and course designs that might require more of students than their previous expectations. Hence, the sole use of quantitative data from student evaluation forms is discouraged in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. More importantly, the department requests reviewers consider all the evaluation data in context.

B. Research/Creative Activity

1. Categories of Materials and Activities

- a. Publications (peer-reviewed)
- b. Research Grants awarded, external
- c. Research Grant proposals submitted, external
- d. Presentations at international or national meetings
- e. Presentations at regional meetings and seminar presentations
- f. Research Grants awarded, internal
- g. Research Grant proposals submitted, internal
- h. Work in progress
- i. Research students supervised
- j. Consulting (related to research/creative activity)
- k. Research awards received
- l. Continuing education to enhance research skills
- m. Professional meetings attended without a presentation
- n. Other

2. Relative Importance

The items in (1) above are listed in order of approximate relative importance.

C. Service

1. Categories of Materials and Activities

- a. Professional activities at the international, national, regional and state levels
- b. Service Grants awarded, external
- c. Books, research proposals, and journal manuscripts reviewed
- d. University-wide councils and committees served on as chairperson
- e. College committees served on as chairperson
- f. University-wide councils and committees served on as a member
- g. Service Grant proposals submitted, external
- h. Advisor of student organization
- i. Service Grants awarded, internal
- j. Service Grant proposals submitted, internal
- k. Departmental committees served on as chairperson
- l. Equipment maintained
- m. College committees served on as a member
- n. Departmental services
- o. Departmental committees served on as a member
- p. Service awards received
- q. Community activities and services related to area of expertise
- r. Consulting
- s. Other

2. Relative Importance

The items in (1) above are listed in order of approximate relative importance.

## VI. Methods of Evaluation to be Used Listed by Performance Area

Items listed below shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive. “Chairperson” refers to the chair or acting chair of the Department of Chemistry. “Peer” refers to a tenured/tenure-track faculty member, or the Chairperson.

### A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

Using information in the evaluation portfolio, the DPC and Chairperson will independently provide evaluative statements and assign, in the area of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, each faculty member one of four ratings: superior, highly effective, satisfactory, unsatisfactory.

#### 1. Peer Evaluation:

- a. Peer evaluations for Unit A faculty will be conducted by Unit A faculty and the Chairperson. For classroom-based courses, these evaluations will involve classroom visitations. The faculty member and evaluator will mutually agree on the time and place for the visitation. For distance-education (Internet-based) courses, the evaluations will involve a “visit” by the evaluator to the instructor’s course website using a supplied student logon. The faculty member and the evaluator will mutually agree upon the time window in which this “visitation” takes place.
- b. Peer evaluations of laboratory courses and summer school courses are considered optional and will be conducted at the discretion of the faculty member who is evaluated.
- c. The peer evaluation shall be written in narrative form, using the Chemistry Department Peer Evaluation Form, and must be based on classroom visitation, or course observation in the case of technology-delivered courses.
- d. Each peer evaluator will provide a copy of the peer evaluation to the applicant.
- e. The applicant must submit at least the minimum number of peer evaluations required for any particular evaluation period (as described below in 2. Peer evaluation minima).

#### 2. Peer evaluation minima:

- a. For probationary years 1, 2, and 5 a minimum of one evaluation per semester for each course taught.
- b. For probationary years 3 and 4, a minimum of one evaluation per semester.
- c. For tenure application (probationary year 6), a minimum of six evaluations from at least two different courses from at least six different peer evaluators, during the entire evaluation period. The minimum must include at least one evaluation per semester for each course taught since application for year 5 retention.
- d. For tenured faculty applying for promotion or PAI, a minimum of three evaluations from at least two different courses during the relevant period.
- e. Peer evaluations included in the portfolio for the relevant evaluation period should be from at least two different individuals, except for the tenure application period as described in c above.



- f. The minima must be supplied by Chemistry Department peer evaluators. Additional evaluations may be supplied by evaluators either internal to or external to the department.
3. Student Evaluation of Classroom-Based Courses:
- a. Student evaluations of teaching, using the Chemistry Core Items for Student Evaluations form, will be conducted in each course taught each semester. Faculty members may add additional items to the form.
  - b. A statistical summary of student evaluations from each section of each course taught must be included in the portfolio. All comments from student evaluations must be included.
  - c. The procedure for conducting student evaluations is as follows:
    - 1) Each course instructor will be responsible for making sure student evaluations are distributed in a timely manner. "Timely manner" is defined as after at least 80% of the term has passed but no later than the last day of regular classes.
    - 2) The instructor will distribute the forms, provide necessary instructions, and explain the rating system.
    - 3) The instructor will ask a student to return the completed forms, in the envelope provided, to the Chemistry Department Office and will leave the room until the evaluations are completed.
    - 4) The instructor will not see the completed forms until after the grades have been submitted.
    - 5) Original evaluation forms, a copy of a blank evaluation form, and a statistical summary will be provided to the faculty member.
  - d. It shall be the faculty member's responsibility to maintain copies of all original student evaluations for the duration of any applicable evaluation period and to provide copies to evaluators upon request.
4. Student Evaluation of Distance Education (Internet) Courses:
- a. Student evaluations of teaching, using the Chemistry Core Items for Student Evaluations form, will be conducted in each distance education course taught each semester. Faculty members may add additional items to the form.
  - b. A statistical summary of student evaluations from each section of each course taught must be included in the portfolio. Copies of all individual student evaluations containing written comments must be included.
  - c. Evaluations will be conducted over the Internet using a secure system approved by the faculty in the Chemistry Department.
  - d. Each course instructor will be responsible for making sure student evaluations are distributed in a timely manner. "Timely manner" is defined as after at least 80% of the term has passed but no later than the last day of regular classes.
  - e. The instructor will not see the completed forms until after the grades have been submitted.
  - f. If the instructor concludes that challenges or difficulties beyond his/her control and unique to distance learning (Internet-based) courses (including but not limited to inadequate hardware/software support, Internet connection problems, substandard software from publishers) has directly impacted student evaluations, an explanatory note may be included with the evaluation package.

- g. It shall be the faculty member's responsibility to maintain copies of all original student evaluations for the duration of any applicable evaluation period and to provide copies to evaluators upon request.

B. Research/Creative Activity

Using information in the evaluation portfolio, the DPC and Chairperson will independently provide evaluative statements and assign, in the area of Research/Creative Activity, each faculty member one of four ratings: superior, significant, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory (or appropriate for probationary year 1).

This category will include research in chemical education and pedagogy, experimental chemistry, and theoretical chemistry. The documentation will include activity records for all years relevant to the particular evaluation period. Work in progress (V.B.h.) should be documented in detail and included in the activity records.

A successful application for tenure and/or promotion should include publication(s) in peer reviewed journals, and evidence of significant effort to acquire external funding.

C. Service

Using information in the evaluation portfolio, the DPC and Chairperson will independently provide evaluative statements and assign, in the area of Service, each faculty member one of four ratings: superior, significant, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory (or appropriate for probationary year 1).

A work-related activity not counted as teaching/primary duties or research/creative activity will be considered service.

D. Assigned Credit Units

Each faculty member will include in his/her portfolio documentation for all activities for which credit units were received.

E. Relative Importance of Research/Creative Activity and Service

Research/Creative Activity will receive greater emphasis relative to Service.

Table 2. Required levels of evaluation for Unit A members†  
(specific to the 2006-2010 EIU-UPI Unit A Agreement)

	Teaching	Research	Service
<b>Retention</b>			
Year 1	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Year 2	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Year 3	Highly Effective	Significant(Satisfactory) <sup>#</sup>	Satisfactory(Significant) <sup>#</sup>
Year 4	Highly Effective	Significant(Satisfactory) <sup>#</sup>	Satisfactory(Significant) <sup>#</sup>
Year 5	Superior	Significant	Significant
<b>Tenure</b>	Superior	Significant	Significant
<b>Promotions</b>			
Instructor → Assistant	Highly Effective <sup>+</sup>	Satisfactory <sup>+</sup>	Satisfactory <sup>+</sup>
Assistant → Associate (Untenured)	Superior	Significant	Significant
Assistant → Associate (Tenured)	Superior <sup>+</sup>	Significant <sup>+</sup>	Significant <sup>+</sup>
Associate → Full	Superior <sup>+</sup>	Superior <sup>+</sup>	Superior <sup>+</sup>
Professional Advancement Increase	Superior <sup>+</sup>	Superior (Significant) <sup>*+</sup>	Significant (Superior) <sup>*+</sup>

Notes:

† - Evaluation rank to be chosen from the following:

Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties: Superior > Highly Effective > Satisfactory > Unsatisfactory

Research/Creative Activity: Superior > Significant > Satisfactory > Unsatisfactory

Service: Superior > Significant > Satisfactory > Unsatisfactory

The ranking of Appropriate is also available for evaluation in probationary year 1 for the categories of Research/Creative Activity and for Service.

\* - Superior required in one of these categories, significant required in the other.

# - Satisfactory required in one of these categories, significant required in the other.

+ - Evaluation period considered as a single aggregate, viewed as a whole.

## CHEMISTRY DEPARTMENT YEARLY FACULTY ACTIVITY RECORD

For the period: \_\_\_\_\_ Today's date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Rank: \_\_\_\_\_

### A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

1. Teaching grants awarded, external
2. Course or curriculum development
3. Items related to assigned coordinator duties
4. Teaching grant proposals submitted, external
5. Teaching grants awarded, internal
6. Teaching awards
7. Continuing education to enhance teaching skills and methods
8. Student advisement
9. Teaching grant proposals submitted, internal
10. Teaching materials
11. Other

### B. Research/Creativity Activity

1. Peer-reviewed publications within the last year (title, authors, references; \*indicates senior author; attach copy)
2. Research grants awarded, external
3. Research grant proposals submitted, external
4. Presentations at international or national meetings
5. Presentations at regional meetings and seminar presentations
6. Research grants awarded, internal
7. Research grant proposals submitted, internal
8. Work in Progress
9. Research students supervised
10. Consulting (related to research/creative activity)

11. Research awards received
12. Continuing education to enhance research skills
13. Professional meetings attended without a presentation
14. Other

C. Service

1. Professional activities at the international, national, regional and state levels
2. Service grants awarded, external
3. Books, research proposals and journal manuscripts reviewed
4. University-wide councils and committees served on as chairperson
5. College committees served on as chairperson
6. University-wide councils and committees served on as a member
7. Grant proposals submitted, external
8. Advisor of student organization
9. Service grants awarded, internal
10. Service grant proposals submitted, internal
11. Departmental committees served on as chairperson
12. Equipment maintained
13. College committees served on as a member
14. Departmental services
15. Departmental committees served on as a member
16. Service awards received
17. Community activities and services related to area of expertise
18. Consulting
19. Other

APPROVED DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY CORE ITEMS FOR STUDENT EVALUATIONS

1. What is your current class? 1=freshman, 2=sophomore, 3=junior, 4=senior, 5=graduate student
2. What is your expected grade in this class? 1=A, 2=B, 3=C, 4=D, 5=F

Answer questions 3-10 using the following scheme:

1 = strongly agree    2 = agree    3 = undecided    4 = disagree    5 = strongly disagree

3. It was difficult for me to master the material in this course.
  4. I made a sufficient effort to master the materials presented in this course.
- 

5. The instructor effectively organizes and presents knowledge or material for teaching and learning.
6. The instructor appears comfortable with the material.
7. The instructor is readily accessible outside of class.
8. The instructor is concerned about and willing to help students.
9. The instructor encourages and interests students in the learning process.

Please include written comments to questions 10-11 on front and back

10. When your instructor teaches this course again, what would you suggest your instructor do the same? What would you suggest your instructor do differently?
11. Other comments welcome.

APPROVED CHEMISTRY DEPARTMENT PEER EVALUATION FORM

In accordance with Article 8.3 b of the Agreement, I have reviewed the teaching/performance of primary duties of \_\_\_\_\_ on [date/s] \_\_\_\_\_.

The narrative should address the following issues with examples where appropriate:

- Command of the subject matter or discipline.
- Oral English proficiency (as mandated by Illinois statute).
- Ability to organize, analyze and present knowledge or material for teaching and learning.
- Ability to encourage and interest students in the learning process.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature