

# 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 Foreign Languages

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 third paragraph of the DAC as proposed provides that Unit B faculty evaluations are limited to teaching/performance of primary duties. While it is true that the 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. I note that the elements listed within the levels of achievement for teaching/performance of primary duties and for research/creative activity are without rank and that no indication of ranking is apparent for the service area of evaluation. I would ask the department to consider if, for example, it truly finds no evaluative difference between value of chair and peer evaluations and creation of language lab materials. I would also ask the department to consider providing some relative guidance to the evaluators from the perspective of departmental perspectives and institutional planning goals related to being first-choice and best of class.
3. I would also advise the department to reconsider the use of "and/or" in the first bullets in each level under teaching/performance of primary duties. If the "or construction" were advanced, it would be possible for an average mean score on

student evaluations to completely supplant negative written evaluations by peers and by the department chair. Most departments address this by specifying peer, chair, and student evaluations in separate items.

4. As written, it appears that the inclusion of written comments on student evaluations appears to be 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. 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. In I.A. Level III, the reference to “4, 5, 6, 7, 8, or 9 (see above Level II)” appears to be ambiguous. No numbered items are to be found in Level II.
6. I note inclusion of membership on a professional association in Level II of research/creative activity. This kind of activity is considered in the service area of evaluation in most departments. In the same area, preparing to teach a course is generally considered in the teaching/performance of primary duties area of evaluation. I note further no distinction is made in the DAC between internal and external grants. In most departments, such a distinction is made with external grant applications and awards being valued more highly than internal grants.
7. Reference to the DPC in the first paragraph in II., for example, is not to be considered as exclusive of other contractually prescribed evaluators.
8. I note in II.A.2. (second paragraph) that a single chairperson evaluation is minimally required for tenured faculty applying for promotion or a PAI. Consideration should be given to whether a single visitation/evaluation can provide a sufficiently representative sample for a five-year/10-semester evaluation period for faculty applying for promotion to the rank of full professor or for a PAI.
9. Lastly, I also note a reference to Appendix A in II.A.4., but no appendix was included with the DAC as routed for review.

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 22, 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 Foreign Languages 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 Foreign Languages

cc: Chair, Department of Foreign Languages (with attachments)

## 2006-2009 Departmental Application of Criteria

Department: FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Date approved by Department: December 7, 2007

Evaluation of the faculty of the Department of Foreign Languages for purposes of retention, promotion, or tenure will be based on the EIU-UPI contract and on University criteria in the three performance areas of: (1) Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, (2) Research/Creative Activity, (3) Service.

The Department Personnel Committee will review both documentation of and quality assessment of such activity submitted by a candidate. The DPC may request written statements as to the quality of the material from other professionals involved in the activity with the knowledge and consent of the candidate. Further elaboration of methods and procedures of evaluation may be found in section II, "Methods of Evaluation to be Used by Performance Area."

In the evaluation of annually contracted employees, the Chair and the Dean will use only appropriate items in I.A. Level I, Level II and Level III.

I. Categories of Materials and Activities Considered Appropriate by Performance Area and Relative Importance of Materials/Activities

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

Categories of materials and activities appropriate for the evaluation of teaching/performance of primary duties are grouped below in Levels demonstrating the order of their relative importance as evidence of effective performance. Items shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive. All activities for which CU's are assigned, with the exception of CU's assigned for research under the current UPI contract, shall fall under this rubric.

In establishing priorities for activities in each performance area, those activities normally expected of university faculty members or of a minimal level of expectation shall be assigned lowest priority, if cited at all. Examples are attendance at and participation in departmental meetings.

After completion of one full academic term of service at the University, annually contracted faculty will be evaluated in the performance area of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties.

Level I: Satisfactory performance in the area of teaching/primary duties may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, the following items which are not ranked:

- Positive written evaluation by peers and Chair based on classroom visitation, and/or a mean score of 3.2 or higher for the general rating of the instructor and/or the overall average of all other appropriate items from student course evaluations. One evaluation from a peer who is a tenured or tenure-track faculty member in the Department of Foreign Languages must be included. Additional evaluations from peers outside the department or university may be considered. In assessing student evaluations, such considerations as the difficulty of the course, the size of the class, the teaching load, whether the class was required or elective whether the course was taught for the first time by the instructor, as well as other considerations suggested by review of representative course materials may be taken into account. Unit B faculty are required to be observed and evaluated by the Department Chairperson but are not required to submit peer evaluation or observations.
- Creation of appropriate course materials, such as syllabi or other descriptions.
- Creation of appropriate language lab materials.
- Evidence of student advisement, to be assessed qualitatively and quantitatively.
- Relevant travel or residence in the area where the target language is spoken. Applicants shall submit a report of tangible accomplishments as a result of the travel that are relative to a performance area.
- Evidence of satisfactory performance of duties other than teaching for which CU's have been assigned.

Level II: In addition to meeting applicable criteria for satisfactory performance (see above), highly effective performance in the area of teaching/primary duties may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, the following items which are not ranked:

- Positive evaluations by peers and Chair, and/or a consistent mean score of 3.8 or higher for the general rating of the instructor and/or the overall average of all other appropriate items from student course evaluations. In assessing student evaluations, such considerations as the difficulty of the course, the size of the class, the teaching load, whether the class was required or elective, whether the course was taught for the first time by the instructor, as well as other considerations suggested by review of representative course materials may be taken into account.
- Favorable written comments by students on student evaluations.
- Appropriate course work taken or degrees obtained pertaining to secondary area

of expertise.

- Course work or workshops taken that provide training in the application of technology to the teaching and learning process with the goal of enhancing traditional course delivery and/or providing the knowledge and skill base needed to deliver course material in part or whole by electronic means.
- Curriculum development. Development or significant improvement of existing courses, to be delivered either in a traditional classroom setting or online, and/or as a result of a joint effort between or among disciplines, departments or colleges.
- Use of online technology for teaching, communicating with students and facilitating interaction among students. This may include, but is not limited to, posting course materials online, setting up a listserv or electronic message board, and using WebCT to deliver course content.
- Relevant travel or residence in the area where the target language is spoken. Applicants shall submit a report of tangible accomplishments as a result of the travel that are related to a performance area.
- Evidence of highly effective performance of duties other than teaching for which CU's have been assigned.

Level III: In addition to meeting applicable conditions for highly effective performance (see above), superior performance in the area of teaching/primary duties may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, the following items which are not ranked:

- Consistent positive evaluations by peers and Chair, and/or a consistent mean score of 4.2 or higher for the general rating of the instructor and/or the overall average of all other appropriate items from student course evaluations. In assessing student evaluations, such considerations as the difficulty of the course, the size of the class, the teaching load, whether the class was required or elective, whether the course was taught for the first time by the instructor, as well as other considerations suggested by review of representative course materials may be taken into account.
- Carrying and effectively executing a significant advising load as evidenced by the number of advisees assigned and performance on Advisor Evaluation Form submitted by advisees.
- Evidence of repeated involvement in activities described in 4,5,6,7, 8 or 9 (see above Level II).
- Developing language materials judged appropriate and of professional quality by

peers (computer software, audio and/or video materials, etc.) for language teaching and courses and/or distribution to colleagues at other institutions including high schools.

- Delivery of a course in a non-traditional setting.
- Relevant travel or residence in the area where the target language is spoken. Applicants shall submit a report of tangible accomplishments as a result of the travel that are related to this performance area.
- Supervision of Independent Study, Cadet Teachers, Internships, and Study Abroad Programs.
- Evidence of superior performance of duties for which CU's have been assigned.

#### B. Research/Creative Activity

Categories of materials and activities appropriate for the evaluation of research/creative activity are grouped below in levels demonstrating the order of their relative importance as evidence of effective performance. Items shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive:

Level I: Appropriate performance. This category is limited to first-year tenure track faculty. Appropriate performance in the area of research/creative activity may be evidenced by, but not limited to, the following items which are not ranked:

- Giving evidence of suitable planning for research/creative activity.
- Submission of evidence of applying for funding a research project.
- Membership in professional associations.

Level II: Satisfactory performance in the area of research/creative activity may be evidenced by, but not limited to, the following items which are not ranked:

- Consultative activity appropriate to this level involving cultural, linguistic or scholarly knowledge.
- Giving evidence of a work in progress (essays, stories, poems, translations, reviews, etc.) Documentation should be in as much detail as possible in order to provide a basis for qualitative assessment.
- Travel abroad that is functionally related to this performance area. Applicants shall submit a report of tangible accomplishments as a result of the travel that are relative to

research/creative activity.

- Continuing education in one's field (teaching, literature, language studies), or in another language with the intent of being able to fill in for colleagues.
- Keeping abreast of current bibliography and reading journals and selected longer works in one's field. Evidence of bibliographies of self-guided study or designed reading which are submitted for consideration for purposes of retention, promotion and/or tenure shall be developed in as much detail as possible.
- Active membership in professional associations.
- Research involved in preparing a course the faculty member is teaching for the first time.
- Attending meetings of professional associations.

Level III: Significant performance in the area of research/creative activity may be evidenced by, but not limited to, the following items which are not ranked:

- Reading an original work at a conference sponsored by a professional association or institution.
- Presenting or offering workshops on pedagogy or teaching methodology at conferences sponsored by professional associations or institutions.
- Having translations of less than book length published.
- Chairing sessions at meetings of professional associations.
- Having a review of a book, article etc. published.
- Residence abroad that is functionally related to this performance area. Applicants shall submit a report of tangible accomplishments as a result of the travel that are relative to a performance area.
- Consultative activity appropriate to this level involving cultural, linguistic or scholarly knowledge.
- Development of language materials (computer programs, Web-based instructional materials, audio and video materials, etc.).

Level IV: Superior performance in the area of research/creative activity may be evidenced by, but not limited to, the following items which are not ranked:

- Having longer original work, journal articles or translations published in journals of the language profession or related area.
- Having book-length translations published.
- Having books of original work published.
- Doing editorial work for journals, anthologies, Festschrift, etc.
- Development of language materials (computer programs, Web-based instructional materials, audio and video materials, etc.) recognized by peers knowledgeable in the field as being of very high quality and worthy of marketing.
- Being recognized by regional, national, or international groups because of one's scholarship.
- Receiving grants for study in specialized areas of research, including the application of technology to the teaching and learning process.
- Residence abroad that is functionally related to this performance area. Applicants shall submit a report of tangible accomplishments as a result of the travel that are relative to a performance area.
- Publishing multiple reviews of books, journal articles etc.
- Reading multiple original works at conferences sponsored by professional organizations or institutions.
- Serving as a peer evaluator for a referenced journal.
- Development of original course texts which are to be used as primary or secondary course texts.
- Presenting extensive and/or multiple workshops on pedagogy or teaching methodology at conferences sponsored by professional associations or institutions.
- Exceptional contribution of activities listed in Level 3 to be evaluated qualitatively.

### C. Service

Categories of materials and activities appropriate for the evaluation of service are



grouped below. Performance levels for service follow these categories on pp. 9-10. Items shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive:

1. Service to the Department
  - a. Member of the Department Personnel Committee.
  - b. Acting as section supervisor or multi-section coordinator.
  - c. Supervision of extracurricular activities.
  - d. Acting as advisor to a language club and/or language honor society.
  - e. Member of other departmental committees.
  - f. Acting as secretary for departmental meetings.
  - g. Acting as editor for the departmental newsletter.
  - h. Promoting new curricula in any way.
  - i. Developing language materials for the Department (e.g. proficiency exams).
  - j. Visiting area schools and/or serving as liaison between the Department and area schools.
  - k. Participation in outreach activities intended to represent the Department, College and University to populations both within and outside the Eastern community, especially those aimed at increasing departmental exposure and recruitment of students. Particular value will be given to extensive or repeated instances of activity, e.g., extensive and/or repeated participation in University open houses or such venues as the elementary school enrichment program or GlobalFest.
2. Service to professional organizations (Academic and/or pertaining to primary duty)
  - a. Holding an office in a professional organization.
  - b. Serving as chairperson or member of a committee in a professional organization.
  - c. Serving as editor of a newsletter published by a professional organization.
  - d. Effective participation in or contribution to professional academic

organizations.

3. Service to the University

- a. Membership in any university council or committee.
- b. Membership in any subcommittee of a university council or committee.
- c. Development or supervision of special programs or events.
- d. Sponsorship of university organizations, such as the Eastern Film Society, or any other approved organization.
- e. Sponsorship of a recognized honor society, such as Phi Beta Kappa.
- f. Serving as resource person to another department.
- g. Serving as guest lecturer in other departments.
- h. Student recruitment activity.
- i. Procuring external funding for the University.
- j. Union service as it relates to one's professional expertise.

4. Service to the Public

- a. Effective participation in and contribution to other educational institutions and to professional service groups.
- b. Serving on regional, state, or national committees or commissions concerning education, whether or not such service pertains directly to language teaching.
- c. Participating in the evaluation of schools for NCATE or other accrediting organizations.
- d. Participating in community, state, national or international service organizations, where a relationship to one's primary duties can be shown, or which fulfills the University's goal of promoting good relations between the University and the public (e.g., Habitat for Humanity, The Tree Society, the Literacy Council, etc. )
- e. Pro bono translation and/or interpreter services.

- Level I: Appropriate Service. This category is limited to first-year tenure track faculty. Appropriate Service may be evidenced by contribution to any item in Category 1.
- Level II: Satisfactory performance in the area of Service may be evidenced by, but not be limited to, the following: Contribution to any item in Category 1 and contribution to any item in any other category. (see above)
- Level III: Significant performance in the area of Service may be evidenced by, but not limited to, the following:
- Contribution to any item in Category 1 and contribution in two other categories.  
Contribution to any item in Category 1 and one other category with exceptional contribution in one item in one or two categories may also be judged significant.
- Level IV: Superior performance in the area of service may be evidenced by, but not limited to, the following:
- Intensive and/or repeated contribution in at least three categories.
- Intensive and/or exceptional contribution in one or two categories.

## II. Methods of Evaluation to be Used by Performance Area

The entire DPC shall evaluate all materials submitted by each faculty member. The DPC alternate shall serve as the third member of the DPC when evaluating DPC members. The DPC may, wherever applicable, require supporting evidence in every performance area as outlined below. An interview may be requested by either the DPC or the candidate being evaluated for purposes of clarification. Methods shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive.

As a general policy, the Department of Foreign Languages encourages faculty to apply language skills in areas of international business, social service, law enforcement, medicine, and other non-traditional academic areas.

Faculty are also encouraged to serve the Department, the University and the public-at-large in cross-cultural, interdepartmental, or internationally-oriented ways so as to broaden bases of support for foreign language study both within and outside the University.

Faculty members are urged to serve their professions by attending, presiding, or presenting at language-related conferences. In assessing all activities, especially travel-related criteria, such considerations such as a faculty member's teaching load or the availability of departmental or university funding will be taken into account. Faculty who

continue to excel in these areas in spite of continued funding shortages may well be considered exceptional by the DPC depending on the quality and quantity of their activity in the aggregate.

Items explicitly listed for one performance standard may be considered "exceptional" and thus used to qualify for a higher performance standard if the quality or quantity of the work justifies such an exception.

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

1. Probationary tenure-track faculty must submit student course evaluations from at least two classes per semester. Unit A faculty with tenure must submit student evaluations from a least one class per semester, and Unit B faculty must submit student evaluations from all classes taught. All numerical and narrative evaluations from a class must be submitted and there must be at least a 50% response rate. Evaluation by larger four and/or three semester hour classes is encouraged, when such classes are included in the instructor's teaching load.

Student evaluations submitted by applicants for retention, promotion, and/or tenure shall be representative of the teaching assignments of the faculty member. Student evaluations shall be documented by the use of the Departmental or Purdue Evaluation Form. Questions will concern various aspects of classroom performance. Evidence will be judged both quantitatively and qualitatively, but in general a faculty member is expected to attain a mean score of 3.2 for the general rating of the instructor and/or the overall average of all other appropriate items to meet minimum Department standards.

The instructor selects a student to monitor the student evaluations process but is absent from the classroom during that time. When the class has finished, the designated student collects the evaluations, seals them in the marked envelope and delivers it to the Department secretary.

If in a given course a question does not apply, like question #10 on the Departmental Student Evaluation form in a first year language class, the instructor may ask students to omit that question.

Copies of the reports shall be given to the DPC, Chair, and faculty member and shall become a part of the materials used in the process of evaluating an employee for the purposes of retention, promotion or tenure. In assessing student evaluations, such considerations as the difficulty of the course, the size of class, the teaching load, whether the class was required or elective, whether the course was taught for the first time by the instructor, as well as other considerations suggested by review of representative course materials may be taken into

account.

In compliance with State requirements, for those courses in which English is the language of instruction a question will be added which rates the instructor's command of the English language. (At the time new faculty members are hired attention is already directed to that point.)

2. Evaluations based on at least one classroom observation by the Department Chair and at least one observation by a peer shall be obtained and will be considered as evidence of performance in this area. One evaluation from a peer who is a tenured or tenure-track faculty member in the Department of Foreign Languages must be included. Additional evaluations from peers outside the Department or University may be considered. Unit B faculty are not required to submit a peer evaluation. A written report for observations, as stated in I. A. Level 1, #1, is required for Unit A faculty applying for retention, promotion and/or tenure, and for Unit B faculty seeking retention. All peer and Chair evaluations based on classroom observation shall become part of the evaluation portfolio. Peer and Chair evaluations based on classroom observation shall be conducted a minimum of once per year for probationary faculty. Chair evaluation based on classroom observation shall be conducted a minimum of once per semester for annually contracted faculty.

Tenured faculty applying for promotion or professional advancement increase must submit a minimum of one Chairperson evaluation from within the two years preceding the application. The candidate and the Chairperson shall arrange the Chairperson's visitation for a mutually acceptable hour. They will also arrange for visitation by one or more of the candidate's peers with such person or persons being acceptable to both the Chairperson and the candidate.

3. The DPC will require supporting course materials and any other additional appropriate evidence of performance.
4. In order to evaluate the quality of advising, an advisor may require advisees to complete a questionnaire pertaining to the advisor's effectiveness. Questions will focus on relevant areas such as availability for consultation, allowing sufficient time for discussion of academic concerns, grasp of the advisement system, and over-all satisfaction with assistance. Provision will be made for additional comments and the advisor's name will be identified on the questionnaire. The questionnaires will be forwarded to the Chairperson and made available to the Department Personnel Committee for use in the evaluation process (see Appendix A for questionnaire).

B. Research/Creative Activity

1. Evidence of research activity and/or publication must be submitted. This may include titles, reprints or the actual publication. Work in progress must be detailed in writing with information regarding anticipated completion as well as development of language materials for departmental use in teaching, etc.
2. Participation in conferences, conventions and other similar endeavors must be documented.
3. Travel abroad related to individual expertise must be documented and some explanation given as to the relationship to that area.
4. Additional comments and evaluation from University peers and/or other qualified scholars may be requested by the DPC or the chair.
5. All evidence submitted will be considered and evaluated quantitatively and qualitatively.

C. Service

1. A list of contributions to the Department, University or general public must be submitted for consideration.
2. For qualitative analysis, the candidate may furnish statements concerning the nature of the contribution and the relevance to the goals of the Department and/or University.
3. Equal emphasis will be given to Departmental and University service.

III. Relative Importance of Research/Creative Activity and Service

The Department of Foreign Languages considers research and service to be of equal importance.