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: Diane Jackman, Dean, College of Education and Professional Studies

Date: April 17, 2013

Subject: DAC Revision Approval; Department of Secondary Education and Foundations

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. The department faculty have now addressed all review comments and conditions enumerated in my previous conditional approval, and I greatly appreciate their doing so.

Thank you for your conscientious work during the DAC revision process. It is very much appreciated as is the engagement of the Department of Secondary Education and Foundations 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 Secondary Education and Foundations

cc: Chair, Department of Secondary Education and Foundations (with attachments)

DEPARTMENTAL APPLICATION OF CRITERIA
for Faculty Evaluation and Development

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY EDUCATION & FOUNDATIONS
Effective Spring 2014

The Department of Secondary Education and Foundations (SED-EDF) will use the following guidelines and procedures to achieve the purpose stated in Article 8 of the EIU-UPI Agreement for 2012-2016. In order to provide recommendations for that purpose, the Department Personnel Committee (DPC) shall assess faculty as stated below.

Following the Unit A Faculty Agreement, the department's DPC will assess Unit A candidates for retention, tenure, promotion, and PAIs, in three areas: Teaching/ Performance of Primary duties, Research/Creative Activity, and Service. The DAC identifies Teaching as the most important, with Research/Creative Activity and Service secondary but equal to each other in importance. Following the Unit B Faculty Agreement, the DPC will normally assess Unit B faculty on the basis of Teaching/Performance of Primary duties alone. However, annually-contracted faculty (ACFs) who have not qualified for a performance-based increase (PBI) based on successive annual evaluations may apply for a PBI based on evidence of superior performance in the aggregate, including contributions to the university in addition to those contractually required.

For each area, evaluation procedures 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, Research/Creative Activity and Service shall be based on qualitative and quantitative assessments.

For purposes of evaluation, the faculty member will submit evidence of materials and activities, placing them in a single appropriate performance area. The faculty member will identify all such evidence with names, dates, and other pertinent information. Within each area, the DAC's list of Categories of Material and Activities and its list of Methods of Evaluation is meant to be illustrative, not exhaustive.

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

Activities for which 3 or more credit units per academic year 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. Chair 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.

E. Study 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 chair and other faculty colleagues to improve quality of teaching.

II. Methods of Evaluation

Consistent with Article 8.4, the DPC shall assign a rating of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, highly effective, or superior based on its overall evaluation of materials submitted. The DPC 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; and at least two times by at least two different peers during a period of evaluation that is more than one year. No more than one peer evaluation shall take place during a given semester. All peer evaluators must be Unit A colleagues from the department. The candidate will choose 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. 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 8.4 for the overall evaluation of the candidate.) During the evaluation period, peers shall visit at least two different courses, with one exception: if the candidate is teaching only one course, peers shall visit at least two different sections. Peers will evaluate distance learning courses based on both technological and pedagogical criteria. All members of the DPC shall have access to peer evaluation reports during the evaluation process and may discuss them with the peer reviewers and the candidate.

Chair visit: Each candidate shall include in his/her portfolio at least one chair evaluation report for an evaluation period of one year; and at least two chair evaluation reports for an evaluation period of more than one year. The faculty member will be responsible for scheduling the visit of the chair. The chair shall complete a narrative chair evaluation form (copy attached) and provide a copy to the faculty member in a timely manner.

For technology-delivered course sections, the candidate and the 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 or chair evaluation form in as complete a manner as possible (for example, access to course syllabus, learning materials, modules, lectures, discussion boards, etc.).

Student evaluations: For each semester that a candidate is teaching, he or she shall submit student evaluations from all courses and sections. Exceptions must be approved by the chair prior to the end of the academic term. Faculty will use uniform evaluation forms that include university core items and any additional items approved at the inception of each new DAC by majority vote of department faculty who are teaching full time. For distance learning courses, additional items must refer to both pedagogical and technological aspects of distance learning. The DPC 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. Faculty members will furnish a student or colleague with an envelope containing the evaluation forms. The student or colleague will distribute, collect, seal, and deliver evaluation forms to the department chair or a faculty colleague who will then deliver the completed forms to the Office of Academic Assessment and Testing for tabulation of results. The department chair will return results to the faculty member after the candidate has submitted final grades to the Records Office. Faculty may choose either on-line or in-person student evaluations, as the faculty member deems appropriate. The DPC may disregard on-line course evaluations if the return rate is less than 50%.

The approved university core items for student evaluations shall be included 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.

All members of the DPC 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.

B. Research/Creative Activity

I. Categories of Activities

A. Published Works
Examples: Books, chapters, articles, book reviews, online publications, and media materials, such as web pages, TV programs, and computer software related to professional field. Relevance of research/creative activity to one's area of academic specialization must be documented. The faculty member should identify peer reviewed and invited works as such when appropriate.

B. Other Externally Recognized Research/Creative Activity
Examples: Professional papers presented at conferences and workshops, public lectures, participation on professional panels, external or university awards or research grants. Relevance of research/creative activity to one's area of academic specialization must be documented. The faculty member should identify peer reviewed and invited works as such when appropriate.

C. Editorial or advisory contributions
Examples: Editor of professional publication, referee of material for publication or presentation, consultant, faculty member's contribution to research done by a student. Relevance of research/creative activity to one's area of academic specialization must be documented.

D. Work in Progress, Scholarly Study

Examples: Manuscript prepared; progress on unfinished research - to be documented in as much detail as possible; talk(s) presented on campus; grant proposal(s) submitted; conference(s), seminar(s), or workshop(s) attended; course(s) taken (other than toward completion of a terminal degree). Relevance of research/creative activity to one's area of academic specialization must be documented. The faculty member should identify peer reviewed and invited works as such when appropriate.

E. Other Contributions to Research/Creative Activity

II. Methods of Evaluation

Consistent with Article 8.4, the DPC shall rank a faculty member's performance as unsatisfactory, satisfactory, significant, or superior. Exception: Articles 8.4.b and 8.4.c of the Agreement provide for a ranking of appropriate for employees in their first probationary year only.

Consideration of materials and activities will be in accordance with Article 8.6 of the Agreement. The faculty member's workload and duties, as well as other considerations suggested by review of materials submitted, will be taken into account.

III. Relative Importance

Evidence from the above categories will be considered as a whole in assessing the faculty member's portfolio. Relative importance of national, international, regional, state, and local professional activities will be considered. In general, peer-reviewed activities will be given greater weight than non-peer-reviewed activities; external grants will be given greater weight than internal grants; and formal scholarship on teaching, learning, and the historical, philosophical, and social foundations of education will be given greater weight than scholarship in other areas.

C. Service

I. Categories of Activities

A. Organizational Leadership
Examples: Officer of college or university council/committee (standing or ad hoc), director or advisor to a student organization, officer of a local, state, regional, national or international professional organization, or chair of a state, regional, national or international professional conference, chair of a departmental search committee.

B. Organizational Participation
Examples: Participating member of local, state, regional, national, or international organizations or committees that provide service to the varied publics of EIU; participant in a professional conference; consultant for individuals, organizations, or institutions, member of a departmental search committee.

C. Other Professional Service

Examples: Member of an elected or appointed school, college or university, board, or council, member of departmental committee, membership in a professional organization, service to the faculty and students in the department, college or university, participation in service or technology projects.

II. Methods of Evaluation

Consistent with Article 8.4, the DPC shall assess whether an unsatisfactory, satisfactory, significant or superior performance level has been achieved. Exception: Articles 8.4.b and 8.4.c of the Agreement provide for a ranking of appropriate for employees in their first probationary year only. Consideration of materials and activities will be in accordance with Article 8.6 of the EIU/UPI Unit A Faculty Agreement. The faculty member's workload and duties, as well as other considerations suggested by review of materials submitted, will be taken into account.

III. Relative Importance

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

IV. Composition of Department Personnel Committee

The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) shall be composed of and elected by the Unit A faculty of the department in accordance with Article 8.8.a of the Agreement and will perform functions specified therein. Ideally, the DPC shall consist of three department members, at least one of which must be tenured (representing both of its divisions -SED and EDF), plus an alternate member, who will replace any DPC member who is the subject of DPC deliberations during those deliberations. If only two faculty members are eligible for a specific DPC deliberation, the DPC may function as long as at least one of the members is tenured. After one year, the alternate member will rotate onto the committee for a term of three years and therefore must be elected so as to maintain a balance between SED and EDF members. The third-year member will serve as chair.

All DPC members must have been full-time tenure track members of the department during the entire academic year immediately preceding their nomination. No DPC member may serve for two or more consecutive three-year terms.

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY EDUCATION AND FOUNDATIONS
CHAIR 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.

1. 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:

_____
Chair 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)