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: James K. Johnson, Dean, College of Arts & Humanities

Date: September 29, 2008

Subject: DAC Revision Approval; Department of English

Consistent with Article 8.7.c. of the *2006-2010 EIU-UPI Unit A Agreement* (Agreement), the attached revised statement of Departmental Application of Criteria (DAC) is approved. This approval is consistent with your recommendation and is effective for evaluations commencing in January, 2009. As always, any reading of the DAC shall be consistent with the *Agreement* or its successor agreement(s).

The process for the review and revision of the DAC is intended to be collaborative among the department faculty members, the chairperson, the dean and the Provost. In that spirit, I wish to offer some observations which I would ask that you discuss with the Department:

1. The second paragraph under the heading, "Categories of Materials and Activities…" paraphrases and is inconsistent with the Unit B Agreement. A better strategy would be to make a reference to the contract. Specifically, the Unit B Agreement also provides for a "superior" rating of annually contracted faculty and while it is true that annual evaluation of annually contracted faculty is limited to the area of teaching/performance of primary duties, annually contracted faculty members who have not qualified for a performance-based increase based on successive annual evaluations may submit evaluation materials for evaluation for a performance-based increase that document evidence of superior performance in teaching/primary duties, in the aggregate. Those materials may be supplemented by evidence of contributions to the University that are in addition to those contractually required. The afore-mentioned sentence needs to be modified to recognize this.

2. In I.A.1., I note that the DAC appear to place a higher value on student evaluations than it does on chairperson and peer evaluations, and I would ask the department to carefully reconsider this. Student evaluations can be influenced in a number of ways, and some are inconsistent with meaningful faculty evaluations. Student evaluations have a place, but their relative value needs to be put in perspective with the goal of establishing and sustaining rigorous first-choice academic programs.

3. In I.A.1., the option for annually contacted faculty to exclude a set of evaluations from review is also inconsistent with the Unit B Agreement (Article 8.1.b.(1)).

4. I also note in I.A.1. that the inclusion of written comments on student evaluations is permissive. Making the inclusion of student responses to open-ended items permissive, appears contrary to the spirit of the principle of wholeness as applied to student evaluations, a basic principle of such evaluations. If a student evaluation is done for a given course section, a compilation of all the completed evaluations should be included in the evaluation portfolio. I would also note that student comments can be compiled for evaluation an need not be submitted on the actual evaluation forms. I would further note that even if not required to be included, evaluators may request additional information during the evaluation process, including responses to open-ended items on student evaluations.

5. With regard to the evaluation of technology-delivered course sections, the Office of Assessment and Testing has a secure confidential online student course evaluation option that is equivalent to the traditional paper bubble forms.

6. In I.A.2. I note the specification for the minimum number of peer and Department Chair evaluations required for tenure, promotion, or PAI applications. Consideration should be given to whether two visitations in a single semester provide a sufficiently representative sample for a five-year/10-semsester evaluation period for faculty applying for promotion to the rank of full professor or for a PAI.

7. In the research/creative activity area of evaluation, it appears that internal and external grant applications and internal and external grant awards are valued equally. In most areas, external grant applications and awards are valued more highly than internal grants.

If the department elects to reconsider and further revise its approved DAC in light of the review comments herein, I would ask that they do so no later than October 15, 2008. Thank you for your conscientious work during the DAC revision process. It is very much appreciated as is the engagement of the Department of English in the discussion and consideration of the DAC revision. The department is encouraged to continue to include in its various discussions the academic goals that have been articulated for the University.

attachments: Revised DAC; Department of English

cc: Chair, Department of English (with attachments)

------ Forwarded Message
From: Dana Ringuette <dringuette@eiu.edu
<https://cudweed.serv15.eiu.edu/zimbra/public/dringuette@eiu.edu> >
Date: Mon, 13 Oct 2008 09:45:20 -0600
To: Blair Lord <blord@eiu.edu <https://cudweed.serv15.eiu.edu/zimbra/public/blord@eiu.edu> >, James Johnson <jkjohnson@eiu.edu <https://cudweed.serv15.eiu.edu/zimbra/public/jkjohnson@eiu.edu> >
Conversation: English DAC as approved
Subject: English DAC as approved

Dear Blair,

Thank you for your memorandum of September 29, 2008, regarding approval of our Departmental Application of Criteria.

I have attached a slightly revised (or rather, corrected) final draft of the DAC, and those changes can be summarized quickly.

Regarding your observation #1, we have added "superior" to the ratings for Unit B faculty. Actually, that omission was simply a proofreading error. We had "superior" in the draft that was approved by the department (just as we had it in our previous DAC), and somehow just missed including it in the draft sent to you and Dean Johnson. So this is easily fixed.

Regarding observation #3, we have revised I.A.1. "Student Evaluations," in order to be consistent with the Unit B Agreement [Article 8.1.b.(1)]. Of course that change seems to us a necessity.

We have made no other changes. We appreciate your other thoughtful observations, and I want to assure you that we discussed these issues at length in our departmental meetings before approving the DAC last October. It is the feeling of the department that we will wait to take them up again the next time we revisit the DAC for revision purposes. In fact, I am in the process of appointing (at the faculty's request) a subcommittee to address these and other issues so that we will have a broad and coherent set of suggestions to present to faculty for their consideration the next time the DAC is to be revised.

Thanks once again, and my best,

--Dana

DEPARTMENT APPLICATION OF CRITERIA
Department of English

(Document approved by the Department on October 24, 2007.
Approved by the Provost on September 29, 2008)

Evaluation of English Department faculty for purposes of retention, promotion, tenure, and Professional Advancement Increase shall be based upon BOT/UPI criteria in the three performance areas. In order of importance, the performance areas are (1) Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, (2) Research/Creative Activity, and (3) Service.

CATEGORIES OF MATERIALS AND ACTIVITIES CONSIDERED APPROPRIATE BY PERFORMANCE AREAS, RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF MATERIALS/ACTIVITIES, AND METHODS OF EVALUATION TO BE USED:

The items listed below are to be considered illustrative and not exhaustive. To the extent that it is possible to make such distinctions, the items under each of the evaluation categories are listed in order of importance. At the same time, the English Department recognizes the diversity of its faculty members' areas of specialization, methodologies, and assigned responsibilities, and values the resulting diversity of faculty members' activities in all three evaluation categories.

Only the annual Personnel Data Sheet and items 1-3 in section I.A below will be utilized by the chairperson and dean in the evaluation of Unit B faculty, in accordance with performance levels unsatisfactory, satisfactory, highly effective, and superior.

ORGANIZATION OF PORTFOLIOS:

Front Matter: The Office of the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs will supply instructions early in the Fall semester concerning the applicant's arrangement of such front matter as the Department Application of Criteria, "Assignment of Duties" forms, curriculum vitae, and content summary. Front matter stipulated by the VPAA's office is to be followed by the "Supplementary Personnel Data Sheets" the applicant has submitted annually to the English Department chair during the period under review.

The Evaluation Portfolio: Documentation supplied for each of the three evaluation categories should be labeled in accordance with the listing of the applicable DAC items below. The applicant may choose to include a narrative that summarizes or provides further context for the documentation included in any section.

CONSULTATION WITH DPC CHAIR:

Faculty members are encouraged to consult with the DPC chair concerning performance expectations for each of the three evaluation categories. Questions concerning portfolio arrangement, contents, and appropriate DAC-labeling of documentation should also be referred to the DPC chair.

After the DPC and Department chair have completed and forwarded their evaluations of portfolios submitted by applicants for retention, promotion, tenure, or Professional Advancement Increase, applicants are encouraged to meet with the DPC chair to discuss the DPC's evaluation and recommendation.

I. **TEACHING/PERFORMANCE OF PRIMARY DUTIES**: To the extent that it is possible to make such distinctions, the items below are listed in order of importance.

A. Teaching

1. **Student Evaluations:** The Department form is to be used by both Unit A and Unit B faculty in all classes, every Fall and Spring semester. In addition to department forms, Purdue Cafeteria or instructor-designed forms may be used. Student evaluations must establish that all teaching personnel speak the English language clearly.

   Instructors will deliver the student evaluation forms to their classes, appoint a student in each class to administer the forms, then absent themselves from the classroom until the procedure has been completed. Student appointees will distribute and collect the forms and deliver them in a sealed envelope to the central English office. Instructors will see evaluation results only after final course grades have been submitted. In their evaluation portfolios, instructors must include statistical summaries of the submitted evaluation results. If instructors choose to include comments, all comments for that class must be included; these should be submitted on the actual evaluation forms, even if they have been collected on a separate typed sheet.

   In the case of technology-delivered classes, an evaluation form will be provided to students during the final weeks of the semester, to be returned to the department secretary, who will transmit the results to testing services.

2. **Chair and Peer Evaluations:** Observations of tenured/tenure-track faculty will be conducted, with advance notice, by the Department chairperson and a tenured/tenure-track member of the department chosen by the faculty member (1) during the fall semester of his/her first year of teaching in the Department, (2) in the semester preceding fifth-year retention review, (3) in the semester preceding his/her application for tenure, promotion, or Professional Advancement Increase, and (4) at any other time the instructor requests such an observation. Class observations will be placed in the context of the instructor's objectives for the course as delineated in the syllabus and in other course materials the instructor elects to supply to the observer. In addition, an instructor may invite a colleague to observe his/her class and write an evaluation for inclusion in the portfolio. Unit B faculty will be observed each year by the Department chairperson or composition director.

   In the case of technology-delivered classes, tenured/tenure-track faculty will invite the chair and a tenured/tenure-track member of the department chosen by

the instructor to examine the course materials, resources, and student work available on-line at a time of the instructor's choice.

3. **Course Materials:** The applicant should submit samples of such materials as syllabi, assignments, handouts, bibliographies, electronic resources, and exams.

B. Directorship of Composition, Undergraduate Studies, Graduate Studies, or Writing Center; Assistant Directorship of Writing Center; Directorship of English Education; Coordination of Student Internship, and other primary duties. (Directors, Assistant Director, and Coordinator will offer pertinent constituent groups an opportunity to evaluate their performance; documentation will include a summary of the results of such evaluations.)

C. Advising (documentation will include a list of advisees' names and a summary of advisees' responses to the Department's Academic Advisement Student Evaluation Form)

D. Direction of Theses and M.A. Exams

E. Direction of Independent Study

F. Curriculum Development (includes enhancing or developing programs, planning and proposing new courses)

G. Serving on exam and thesis committees.

H. Awards related to Teaching/Primary Duties

I. Other Activities related to Teaching/Primary Duties

II. **RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY:** To the extent that it is possible to make such distinctions, the items below are listed in order of importance. In evaluating the quality of the applicant's documentation for any of the items below, however, the DPC will take into account such factors as the scope, complexity, and appropriateness of the material and the nature of the audience, forum, or vehicle of dissemination.

A. Publication (includes work as principal editor) in Print or Electronic Media of Books, Monographs, Articles, Journals, Reviews, or Creative Works

B. Presentation of Lectures or Papers; Performance or Reading of Creative Works; Participation in Panels; Facilitation/Direction of Workshops or Seminars; Organization or Direction of Conference Sessions

C. Receipt of Advanced Scholarships, Fellowships, Grants, or Honors

D. Professional non-academic publications.

E. Research/Creative Activity under Consideration for Publication or Presentation

F. Research/Creative Works in Progress

G. Work as Consulting Editor, Referee, or Academic Consultant

H. Writing for Local Media (drama reviews, book reviews, film reviews, etc.); Presentations before Local Groups

I. Other Research/Creative Activity

III. **SERVICE:** Faculty members are expected to participate in a variety of service activities. To the extent that it is possible to make such distinctions, the items below are listed in order of importance. In evaluating the quality of the applicant's documentation for any of the items, however, the DPC will take into account such factors as the scope, complexity, and duration of the activity.

A. Chairperson/Member of University or College Committee, UPI Executive Board Officer, Officer or Program Planner in Professional Society

B. Chairperson/Member of Department Committee

C. Participant in University or College Task Force or ad hoc Committee, Leadership in UPI

D Recipient of Awards related to Service

E. Sponsor of Extra-Departmental University Activity

F. Judge for English-Related Competitions/Exercises for Area Schools and Organizations

G. Participant in Student Recruitment

H. Participant in Department Activities (English Studies Student Conference and events sponsored by English Club, Sigma Tau Delta, etc.)

I. Participant in UPI Activities

J. Other Service Related to Faculty Member's Expertise or Services Advancing the Mission of the University

K. Participant in Community Service