

# 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: W. Harold Ornes, Dean, College of Sciences

Date: July 3, 2013

Subject: DAC Revision Approval; Department of Psychology

---

Consistent with Article 8.7 of the *2012-2016 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, 2014. 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. I note that the department elected not to make any revisions to its DAC. The DAC is approved with the following understandings, conditions, and continuing concerns (some of which were included in the 2008 DAC approval):

1. The dates below the heading on the first page of the DAC are potentially confusing. As noted above, the approved revised DAC will be effective for evaluations done during the 2014 spring semester and thereafter until the DAC is again reviewed, revised, and approved. The DAC review and revision "window" is specified in the current Agreement that expires August 31, 2016. A successor Agreement may, or may not, open a subsequent DAC review and revision "window."
2. As a general matter and consistent with Article 8.3.b., I encourage the department to consider the teaching/performance of primary duties materials and methods of evaluation in such a way that they identify both desired and achieved student learning outcomes and provide evidence of thoughtful reflection on peer, chair, and student evaluations during the evaluation period.
3. With regard to Unit A faculty, the department is encouraged to consider whether a single chair and a single peer evaluation visitation 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. Compare this to the requirement to provide student evaluations for all courses during the evaluation period. Consider that having considerably more student evaluations appears to give them more importance even though they are ranked of equal importance to peer and

chair evaluations in the area of teaching/performance of primary duties. Perhaps specifying “a minimum of two course visitations per year” would be more appropriate.

4. The University Approved Core Items for Student Evaluations are to be incorporated verbatim first in all student evaluations in the order listed with the Likert scale, 5=Strongly Agree and so on.
5. I continue to note in item I.A.k. that inclusion of responses to open-ended items on student evaluations is deemed permissive and not required. A basic principle of evaluation is that of wholeness. If a student evaluation is done for a given course section, a compilation of all the completed evaluations is to be included in the evaluation portfolio. 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. 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.

Thank you for your conscientious work during the DAC review and revision process. It is very much appreciated as is the engagement of the Department of Psychology in the discussion and consideration of the DAC review. The department is also encouraged to continue to include in its various discussions the academic goals that have been articulated for the University.

attachments: Revised DAC; Department of Psychology  
University Approved Core Items for Student Evaluations  
University Approved Peer Evaluation Form

cc: Chair, Department of Psychology (with attachments)

**Department of Psychology**  
**Application of Evaluation Criteria**  
**2012-2016**  
**Approved: October 8, 2012**

**Preamble**

The purpose of this Departmental Application of Criteria (DAC) is to evaluate the performance of departmental faculty eligible for retention, promotion, tenure, or Professional Advancement Increase (PAI) in accordance with the contracts between the University Professionals of Illinois, Eastern Illinois University Chapter and the Board of Trustees of Eastern Illinois University. These contracts take precedence over this document in all instances.

The goal of this document is to allow Psychology faculty and responsible others to evaluate faculty performance in a way that is open, collegial, and accountable.

**General Considerations**

- 1) Faculty members are individually responsible for providing the documentation for evaluation, and for making clear the relationship between supporting materials and areas, categories and sub-categories in the DAC to which the material applies.
- 2) Evaluation of annually contracted faculty by the department chair shall apply the same criteria as evaluation of tenure-track faculty in the area of teaching/performance of primary duties.
- 3) As specified in the contract for annually contracted faculty (Unit B), Unit B faculty are eligible to apply for a performance based increase in pay after four years of employment in the bargaining unit as an annually contracted faculty member and after every four years of employment in the bargaining unit as an annually contracted faculty member thereafter.
- 4) All assignments for which faculty receive credit units (CUs) must be documented in the appropriate area.
- 5) Tenured faculty not applying for a promotion or PAI must substantiate performance in all three areas for an annual evaluation by the department chair.
- 6) All portfolios submitted for review must include a current curriculum vita, a copy of this DAC, a detailed table of contents, and all assignment of duties forms for the relevant evaluation period.
- 7) In each of the areas of review (teaching/primary duties; research; service) the activities specifically listed shall be regarded as of primary importance, but are not intended to be an exhaustive list of activities that faculty members might include in their portfolio to document performance.
- 8) Teaching/primary duties will be considered the most important of the three areas of evaluation. Research/Creative Activity will be given greater relative weight than Service.

## Criteria for Evaluation in the Department of Psychology

### I. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

The categories below (A, B, C, D) are listed in order of their relative importance for personnel recommendations. Within category A, the numerical elements (1, 2, 3, 4) are equal in importance. Within the other categories, the elements are listed in descending order of importance.

Evaluators have the opportunity to recognize that outstanding contributions in any category may compensate for apparent shortcomings or deficiencies in a second category, even in cases in which the first category is ranked lower in relative importance.

#### A. Classroom Teaching

##### 1. Student Evaluations

- (a) Faculty shall make arrangements to administer the approved departmental student evaluation instrument in all classes during the final two weeks of both the Fall and Spring semesters.
- (b) All university and departmental core evaluation items must be included. Faculty may include any additional items.
- (c) For distance learning courses, faculty shall include items that refer to both the technological and pedagogical aspects of distance learning.
- (d) Student evaluations may be given in courses during the Summer session at the option of the faculty. If given during the Summer session, evaluations shall be given during the final week of the regularly scheduled Summer session.
- (e) Evaluations shall not be conducted during the final examination period of any term.
- (f) The results of all approved departmental student evaluations shall be included in the applicant's portfolio for retention, promotion, tenure, or professional advancement increase.
- (g) Faculty shall not be present during the students' completion of the evaluation instrument.
- (h) Administration of student evaluations shall take place at the beginning of class.
- (i) A table shall be presented in the narrative portion of the teaching section of the portfolio, reporting the overall mean of the median ratings for each item on the evaluation instrument. This information shall be reported for each class taught and evaluated.
- (j) This table shall also include the overall mean of the means presented (i.e., with the mean of each class counting as a single score, regardless of the number of students per class).

- (k) Faculty members may also include non-numerical evaluations of teaching, such as solicited or unsolicited student written comments. If such non-numerical evaluations are included, photocopies of all such comments produced in any particular class must be included.

2. Reports of Classroom Visitation.

- (a) At least two peer evaluations must be submitted by any faculty member seeking retention, promotion, tenure, or PAI. One peer evaluation shall be conducted by the department chair. The second peer evaluation shall be conducted by a tenured department faculty member chosen by the faculty member under evaluation.
- (b) Additional peer evaluations by the same or other faculty members are encouraged, but not required.
- (c) Peer evaluations shall be based on a visit to at least one class taught by the faculty member being evaluated.
- (d) The department chair may, at his or her discretion, arrange additional class visits. The faculty member may also request additional class visits by the department chair.
- (e) Reference to both the technological and pedagogical aspects of distance learning shall be made for distance learning assignments reviewed by peers.

3. Awards for teaching by national, state, regional, or university organization.

- (a) A copy of the award shall serve as documentation of this outcome.

4. Course materials such as syllabi, supplementary materials, and exams.

- (a) Faculty may submit copies of representative course materials, documentation of new courses for programs, documentation of innovative teaching methods and materials, and other materials that the faculty member believes provide evidence of quality of performance in this area.

B. Other Primary Duties (e.g. activities of coordinator or director).

- (a) Faculty shall submit a brief narrative description of the assigned duties and activities performed toward the fulfillment of those duties.

C. Direction of Individual Activities

1. Supervision of internships, practica, theses, and independent studies.

- (a) Faculty shall submit brief narrative descriptions of supervisory activities, including, for example, approximate number and nature of contacts.

2. Service on Masters Thesis Committees and Honors Thesis Committees.

3. Involvement of students in research and publication.

- (a) Faculty shall submit brief narrative descriptions of student involvement in research and publication, indicating number of students, the degree of their participation, and the degree of supervision by the faculty member.

4. Student Advisement

- (a) Faculty who are involved in academic advisement of students shall maintain a file on each advisee and shall submit an estimate of the average number of advisees supervised each semester.

D. Continued Development as a Teacher

1. Funded extramural grants supporting teaching activities.
2. Funded intramural grants supporting teaching activities.
3. Attendance at workshops and conferences pertaining to professional development in teaching.
  - (a) Faculty shall submit evidence of receipt of grants or attendance at workshops and conferences.
4. Application of technology in the teaching and learning process.
  - (a) Faculty shall submit a brief narrative description of the use of technology.

II. Research/Creative Activity

In all cases, the quality of the work shall be the primary consideration and peer review – as evidence of national, regional, state, or local recognition of work – will be the primary guide.

Published work is considered more significant than unpublished work. However, no single activity is necessary for the attainment of any particular performance level.

Faculty members applying for tenure, promotion, and PAI are expected to include evidence of published research as indicated in section II.A below.

Among the categories listed below, Published Research, Funded Extramural Grants, Editorial Activity, and Presented Research (A, B, C, & D) are of the greatest importance in personnel decisions. Continued Development as a Researcher/Scholar and Applications of Scholarship (Categories E & F) are considered of lesser importance than the previous group, and are considered of equal importance to one another. Within each of these categories (A to F), relative importance of activities is given below.

In all cases, the importance of activities is: national or international level; state level; local level.

Each research/creative activity must be documented in some way.

A. Published Research Related to the Field of Psychology

Sub-categories 1 (articles) and 2 (books) are of equal importance. Within each subcategory, activities are listed in descending order of importance.

1. Articles

- (a) Authored or co-authored article of original, scholarly work or literature review in APA journals or the scholarly equivalent.
- (b) Authored or co-authored article of original, scholarly work or literature review in other refereed journals
- (c) Book review in scholarly journal
- (d) Authored or co-authored article published in formats other than refereed journals.

2. Books

- (a) Authored or co-authored book of original, scholarly work.
- (b) Authored or co-authored monograph or book chapter.
- (c) Edited book or journal of scholarly works which have not been previously published.

B. Funded Extramural Grants

C. Editorial Activity

Activities are listed in descending order of relative importance.

- 1. Editor of Journal
- 2. Consulting Editor of Journal
- 3. Reviewing for a National, Regional, or State Publication or Grant Competition
- 4. Reviewing for a National, Regional, or State Conference

D. Presented Research Related to the Field of Psychology

Subcategory 1 is of greater relative importance than subcategory 2. Within each subcategory, activities are listed in descending order of importance.

- 1. Original, scholarly findings presented at a professional meeting at the following levels:
  - (a) National or International
  - (b) Regional
  - (c) State
  - (d) Local

2. Application or reviews of research presented at a professional meeting at the following levels:
  - (a) National or International
  - (b) Regional
  - (c) State
  - (d) Local

E. Continued Development as a Researcher/Scholar

Activities are listed in descending order of relative importance.

1. Works in progress, as documented by manuscripts, correspondence, grant proposals, etc.
2. Funded Intramural Grants
3. Awards for Research by National, State, Regional, or University Organizations.

F. Application of Scholarship

Activities are listed in descending order of importance.

1. Authoring or co-authoring an instructor's manual, study guide, or test bank for a textbook.
2. Public lectures, workshops, and panel discussion for an audience of professional peers in psychology.

III. Service

Participation in category A (Departmental Service) is required for retention, tenure and promotion. Following this category, categories B, C, & D are listed in decreasing order of importance. Within each category, including category A, the items are listed in decreasing order of importance.

Candidates for retention, promotion, or tenure may submit descriptions of activities, statements by others concerning service, service awards, meeting minutes, reports, and other documentation of their service contributions. The primary considerations in this area are diversity and depth of service.

A. Departmental Service

1. Chairing a standing or ad hoc departmental committee or group.
2. Service on a standing or ad hoc departmental committee or group, or service relating to departmental functions (e.g., library liaison).



3. Advising an officially recognized student organization.
4. Service in a non-CU-earning administrative capacity within the department.
5. Ad hoc service to the department such as scheduled activities involving recruiting, advising, representing the department, and serving as a peer evaluator.

B. College and University Service

1. Chairing a standing or ad hoc college or university committee or group.
2. Service as a member of a standing or ad hoc college or university committee or group.
3. Consultative services with members of the college or university community, involving the faculty member's expertise.
4. Awards for service by national, state, regional, or university organization.

C. Service to the discipline and profession.

1. Recognition of service to the discipline or profession in the form of a national service award.
2. Service in an administrative capacity within a state, regional, or national organization of psychologists.
3. Consultative services, involving the faculty member's area of expertise, for psychologists and psychological or human service organizations outside the immediate university community.

D. Community service

1. Public lectures, workshops, panel discussions, and participation in broadcasts involving the faculty member's expertise, but intended for an audience other than professional peers in psychology.
2. Consultative services, involving the faculty member's expertise with non-psychologist members of the community outside the university.

IV. Methods of Review

- A. All DPC members shall review and discuss available documentation of teaching/performance of primary duties, research, and service for all faculty who are candidates for retention, promotion, tenure, and PAI.
- B. Discussion with the faculty member of submitted documentation may be held at the request of either the faculty member or the DPC.

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)

APPROVED UNIVERSITY 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