

2022 DAC Revisions – IDS Department

**DPC: J. H. Bickford, Ph.D.
E. Tacke, Ph.D.
J. M. Morgan, M.Ed.**

Date Approved by DPC: 10/10/2022

Date Submitted to Director: 10/ 10/2022

Date Revisions Submitted to Director: 10/10/2022

Date of Final Edit Submitted to Director:

Date Submitted to VPAA: 10/10/2022

Date Approved by VPAA: 10/10/2022

**DEPARTMENTAL APPLICATION OF CRITERIA
for Faculty Evaluation and Development**

DEPARTMENT OF INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

The Department of Interdisciplinary Studies (IDS) will use the following guidelines and procedures to achieve the purpose stated in Article 8 of the EIU-UPI Agreement. In order to provide recommendations for that purpose the committee (selected Unit A faculty from the College of Education) shall assess faculty as stated below. The Interdisciplinary Studies department is a unit within the School of Extended Learning (SEL). In keeping with the faculty guidelines for SEL, the program employs a single annually contracted faculty (ACF). Therefore, research, service and creative activity are not requirements for faculty evaluation. If a Unit A faculty is hired within the IDS program, these criteria will be revised and amended as needed.

Following the Unit B Faculty Agreement, the reviewers/evaluators will normally assess Unit B faculty on the basis of Teaching/Performance of Primary duties alone.

The evaluation procedure will involve (a) categories of materials and activities that faculty may submit, (b) methods of evaluation that reviewers/evaluators may use, and (c) relative importance of areas of activity, including assignments and responsibilities. Judgments regarding performance of faculty in Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties shall be based on qualitative and quantitative assessments.

For purposes of evaluation, the faculty member will submit evidence of materials and activities pertaining to Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, which includes professional development. The faculty member will identify all such evidence with names, dates, and other pertinent information. The DAC's list of Categories of Material and Activities and its list of Methods of Evaluation is not exhaustive.

Unit B faculty, who meet the Eastern Illinois University criteria to be evaluated, will be observed and evaluated by the Director and will be required to submit all student evaluations. Evaluations by the Department Director and students will be used by the Director of the Department and Dean of the College to determine teaching effectiveness.

Annual Evaluation Procedures of Annually- Contracted Employees - ACFs will submit to the Director a summary of performance (portfolio or statement) in the area of teaching/primary duties. The summary shall include, but not be limited to, the following information:

Teaching/primary duties: A tabulated summary of student evaluations; evidence of the successful completion of professional development activities; and a statement/self-reflection of areas of strength and weakness in teaching for the purpose of improvement.

In developing and maintaining their portfolios, faculty members are expected to know the relevant details of the DAC and the EIU-UPI Agreement.

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

Any activities for which CUs are assigned shall be considered as primary duties for the purposes of evaluation.

- I. Categories of Materials and Activities for Evaluation (not listed in priority order):
 - A. Evaluation by Colleagues
Examples: Peer evaluation
 - B. Director evaluation report
 - C. Student evaluations including all narrative comments
Candidates may also include communications from students that relate to quality of teaching.
 - D. Materials and Services Provided to Support Teaching
 - 1) A syllabus shall be submitted for each course taught during the evaluation period. Syllabi must conform to CAA Policy 95-69 and include "course objectives, course outline or a description of course content, course assignments/projects/papers, grading policy and/or grading scale, attendance policy, evaluation procedures, information for students with disabilities, and office hours."
 - 2) In the classroom
Examples: Assessment/evaluation instruments developed and used, supplemental instructional materials, documentation of innovative teaching activities, integration of technology in the classroom (including distance learning), writing assignments and engaged learning projects.
 - 3) Outside the classroom
Examples: New courses designed, curricular revisions, program development, seminars and workshops conducted, teaching classes outside one's specific assignment, serving on examination committees, directing independent study, formal and informal advising activities, study abroad activities, and honors activities.
 - 4) Professional Development Undertaken to Improve the Quality of Teaching
Examples: workshops or seminars attended, professional conferences

attended, courses taken, books or articles studied, report of sabbatical or leave activities related to teaching, consultation with the director and other faculty colleagues to improve quality of teaching.

II. Methods of Evaluation

Consistent with Article 8.1.c(1) of the agreement, the reviewers/evaluators shall assign a rating of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, highly effective, or superior based on its overall evaluation of materials submitted. The reviewers/evaluators will take into consideration the faculty member's workload and duties.

Classroom visits for peer evaluation: Each candidate will be evaluated by at least one peer during a one-year evaluation period. All peer evaluators must be Unit A colleagues from the College of Education. The primary modality for courses taught within the Department is technology-delivered. Select courses are also taught at an off-site location. Peers will complete the evaluation of these courses based on the following: The candidate will select peer evaluators according to the above criteria, arrange classroom visits, and provide the evaluator, prior to the visit, with representative course materials taught during the evaluation period. For technology-delivered courses, the candidate and the reviewer/evaluator will mutually determine the level and duration of access to the designated course section through the university learning management system. The level and duration of the access should enable the evaluator to readily access course materials needed to complete the items in the approved peer in as complete a manner as possible (for example, access to course syllabus, learning materials, modules, lectures, discussion boards, etc.). Peer evaluators shall use the Approved University Peer Evaluation form to provide written evaluations. (Note: The above form does not require use of contractual terms, such as Highly Effective and Superior that are prescribed in Article 8.1.c(1) of the agreement for the overall evaluation of the candidate.) All members of the reviewers/evaluators shall have access to peer evaluation reports during the evaluation process and may discuss them with the peer reviewers and the candidate.

Director visit: Each candidate shall include in their portfolio at least one director evaluation report for an evaluation period of one year. The faculty member will be responsible for scheduling the visit of the director. The director shall complete a narrative evaluation form (copy attached) and provide a copy to the faculty member in a timely manner. Evaluation of technology-delivered courses will follow the same procedure as peer evaluations.

Student evaluations: For each semester that a candidate is teaching, they shall submit student evaluations from all courses and sections. Exceptions must be approved by the director prior to the end of the academic term. Faculty will use uniform evaluation forms that include university core items and any additional item approved at the inception of each new DAC by majority vote of department faculty

who are teaching full time. Student evaluations of IDS technology-delivered courses must contain additional items that refer to both pedagogical and technological aspects of distance learning. The reviewers/evaluators shall assess evidence from student evaluations both qualitatively and quantitatively, taking into account the size and makeup of the class as well as other considerations suggested by a review of representative course materials. Patterns that emerge from student comments will also be considered. While student evaluations are useful, the Department recognizes that the students' course evaluations are inherently subjective. Furthermore, evidence indicates these subjectivities unfairly impact marginalized demographic groups such as faculty of color, faculty belonging to the LGBTQ+ community, women, and non-English native speakers. As such, student evaluations are one of many means of assessing classroom effectiveness; the Department will utilize a comprehensive approach based on multiple relevant modes.

To prepare for student evaluations, faculty will follow the Purdue-based Evaluation Submission Process by accessing the portal online at <https://www.eiu.edu/apps/purdue-request> and selecting the courses for which an evaluation request will be submitted. Faculty will complete a form to generate the request which must include the following information: (1) Evaluation administration date; (2) Online administration type; (3) Purdue catalog questions; (4) Any custom questions faculty wishes to include. The University's core questions will automatically appear verbatim and first on the evaluation forms, and in this order: (1) The instructor demonstrates command of the subject matter or discipline; (2) The instructor effectively organizes knowledge or material for teaching/learning; (3) The instructor is readily accessible outside of class* (*The instructor is available during office hours and appointments for face-to-face sections or electronically for technology- delivered sections); (4) The instructor presents knowledge or material effectively; (5) The instructor encourages and interests students in the learning process. On the student evaluation Likert scale, 5 - Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Agree.

Once the evaluation form is complete, the survey request will be routed to the Office of Testing and Evaluation for approval. Once approved, a link to the survey will be forwarded via email to enrolled students. After students complete the evaluation form, the Director will return results to the faculty member after the candidate has submitted final grades to the Records Office. The reviewers/evaluators may disregard on-line course evaluations if the return rate is less than 50%.

All reviewers/evaluators will review the student evaluation summary tabulations and the student evaluation forms with narrative comments and may discuss them with the candidate. Faculty members must include in their faculty evaluation portfolios all student evaluations collected and shall be responsible for maintaining copies of all student evaluations to be used in these portfolios. Student evaluations are to be kept by the faculty member for the duration of any evaluation period, including the period of any grievance or arbitration procedure.

III. Relative Importance

Evidence from the above categories will be considered as a whole in assessing the faculty member's portfolio.

IV. Levels of Evaluation

Superior teaching is holistically defined and is based on a high degree concurrence between the peer, director, and student evaluations. Superior instruction requires positive student feedback based on the Likert Scale with average scores consistently above 4.0. Highly Effective instruction requires the general concurrence of peer, director, and student evaluations. Student evaluations must be positive and with average scores consistently above 3.5. Satisfactory instruction is defined as the concurrence of two of the three evaluation methods. Student evaluations must be generally positive to neutral with no average scores below 3.1 for the standard items.

**DEPARTMENT OF INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES
EVALUATION FORM**

I have observed the teaching/performance of primary duties of _____ on date(s)

NOTE: This report is based only on the events observed during the above-mentioned visit(s). It includes mention of all such events that are significant enough to be referenced later in the evaluation process. (Additional pages may be attached as needed). A copy of this report will be given to the faculty member within two weeks of the last visitation and at least two weeks before the end of the evaluation period.

- I. Command of the subject matter or discipline.

2. Oral English proficiency (as mandated by the Illinois statute).

3. Ability to organize knowledge or material for teaching and learning.

4. Ability to analyze knowledge or material for teaching and learning.

5. Ability to present knowledge or material for teaching and learning.

6. Ability to encourage and interest students in the learning process.

Date

Signature

PEER EVALUATION FORM

In accordance with Article 8.3.a.(3)(a) of the *Agreement*, I have reviewed the teaching/ performance of primary duties of _____ on [date/s] _____ and considered the following items upon which I have commented and offered examples:

[Additional pages may be attached as needed]

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

Date

Signature

Eastern Illinois University

Approved University Core Items for Student Evaluations

	SD	D	N	A	SA
1. The instructor demonstrates command of the subject matter or discipline.					
2. The instructor effectively organizes knowledge or material for teaching/learning.					
3. The instructor is readily accessible outside of class.*					
4. The instructor presents knowledge or material effectively.					
5. The instructor encourages and interests students in the learning process.					

*The instructor is available during office hours and appointments for face-to-face sections or electronically for technology-delivered sections.

Rev. 2 {September 2, 2004}

Additional required Purdue Items

	SD	D	N	A	SA
My instructor explains experiments and/or assignments clearly.					
My instructor makes good use of examples and illustrations.					
In this course many methods are used to involve me in learning.					
This course has effectively challenged me to think.					
My instructor evaluates often and provides help where needed.					