


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: May 30, 2013

Subject: DAC Revision Approval; Department of Communication Disorders and Sciences

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 appreciate the department considering the previous review comments. The DAC is approved with the following understandings, conditions, and continuing concerns:

1. 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.
2. In II.C.2., I note the specification that single peer and chair evaluations are required during multiyear evaluation periods. Consideration should be given to 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 every course taught. Consider that having considerably more student evaluations appears to give them more importance even though they are ranked equally in 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.
3. The DAC continues to include a statement about the award of special CUs that is outside the scope of a description of the materials and methods of evaluation.

Current Faculty Assignment of Duties Guidelines - Effective Fall 2011 supersedes this statement.

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.

Thank you for your conscientious work during the DAC revision process. It is very much appreciated as is the engagement of the Department of Communication Disorders and Sciences in the discussion and consideration of the DAC revision. 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 Communication Disorders and Sciences
University Approved Core Items for Student Evaluations
University Approved Peer Evaluation Form

cc: Chair, Department of Communication Disorders and Sciences (with attachments)

- ix. development and implementation of remediation plans for student retention and skill acquisition
- b. Evidence of highly effective clinical teaching
 - i. tenured CDS faculty member and chairperson evaluations (which may include evaluation of a live or recorded clinical conference; review of syllabus, feedback on lesson plans, reports, supervisor observation notes)
 - ii. student evaluations indicate effective clinical instruction
 - iii. assessment of student learning (e.g., self-evaluation, weekly descriptive written feedback, midterm oral case summary to supervisor)
 - iv. collaboration with professionals or families
 - v. supervision style adapted to needs of student clinician
 - vi. provision of clinical resources (e.g., case examples, literature, materials)
 - vii. investment of time beyond weekly clinical conference and observation
 - viii. evidence of student learning (e.g., finding EBP, student reflection of learning)
 - ix. documentation exceeding ASHA's minimum observation requirements
 - x. development and implementation of remediation plan for student retention and skill acquisition
- d. Highly effective academic advisement (e.g., student evaluations, advisement materials, advising students in planning study abroad experiences)
- e. Curriculum revision, curriculum development, development of teaching assignments, or a proposal for study abroad
- f. Participation as a faculty committee member mentoring student projects associated with undergraduate honors program or graduate thesis.
- g. Mentor an independent study
- h. Completion of course(s)/training related to primary duties
- i. Completion of 20 or more hours of continuing education in areas related to teaching and supervision in a 12-month period

Level 3: Superior performance may be evidenced by, but not limited to, a preponderance of activities from the following:

- a. Evidence of superior course instruction
 - i. tenured CDS faculty member and chairperson evaluations (which may include evaluation of live or recorded classroom instruction and review of syllabus, assessment methods, course management system, projects/papers/assignments)
 - ii. student evaluations indicate high-quality instruction
 - iii. assignments/projects reflecting problem-solving activities, analysis, synthesis, integration, and/or evaluation
 - iv. instruction for the development of professional communication skills (writing and/or speaking)
 - v. assessment of student learning and adjustment of instruction based on student performance
 - vi. evidence of student learning and/or mastery (e.g., comprehensive examination results, Praxis results, employer feedback)
 - vii. course rigor and student expectations (e.g., amount/type of reading comprehension, problem solving, role-playing, debates, demonstrations, number and type of assignments, type of exams)
 - viii. learning activities to enhance course content
 - ix. weekly synchronous meetings in on-line courses
- b. Evidence of superior clinical teaching
 - i. tenured CDS faculty member and chairperson evaluations (which may include evaluation of a live or recorded clinical conference; review of syllabus, feedback on lesson plans, reports, supervisor observation notes)
 - ii. student evaluations indicate high-quality clinical instruction
 - iii. assessment of student learning (e.g., oral case summary to other students or faculty)

- iv. participation in outside consultation for client (e.g., IEP meetings, interactions in other aspects of client's life)
- v. demonstration of treatment techniques (e.g., related to assigned supervision or outside of assigned duties)
- vi. evidence of student learning (e.g., application of EBP, student mastery)
- c. For Unit B faculty, evidence of leadership related to performance of primary duties
- d. Evidence of leadership as a faculty mentor in student projects associated with undergraduate honors program or graduate thesis
- e. Receipt of credential, award, or other recognition for teaching
- f. Completion of 30 or more hours of continuing education or receipt of an award for continuing education (e.g., ASHA Award for Continuing Education (ACE), or completion of at least 70 hours of continuing education within a three year period
- g. Build an area of expertise for teaching or supervision through focused CE
- h. Lead a study-abroad experience

B. Research/Creative Activity

Level 1: Satisfactory performance may be evidenced by, but not limited to, a cohort of activities such as:

- a. Research/creative activity or presentation (non-competitive selection) in conjunction with a student project or seminar
- b. Local level professional presentation
- c. Research/creative activity associated with professional organizations which serve the needs of the communicatively impaired
- d. Demonstration of works in progress (e.g., manuscripts, assessment/intervention materials clinical materials, student thesis collaboration for presentation)
- e. Receipt of an internal grant or other funding to attend research/creative activity
- f. Documentation regarding individual line of research/creative activity

Level 2: Significant performance may be evidenced by, but not limited to, a cohort of activities such as:

- a. Research/creative activity or presentation (competitive selection) in conjunction with a student project or seminar.
- b. State/regional level presentation (e.g., ISHA area groups, ISHA convention, other state communication disorders conference, StarNet).
- c. Receipt of an internal grant or other funding to pursue research/creative activities
- d. Submission of a federal grant (e.g., NIH, Dept of Ed)
- e. Publication of article in non-peer reviewed journal
- f. Publication of abstract/commentary in peer-reviewed journal

Level 3: Superior accomplishment may be evidenced by, but not limited to, a cohort of activities such as:

- a. Presentation at out-of-state/national/international professional conference.
- b. Research activity or presentation in conjunction with a student project or seminar at a national/international level
- c. Earning a fellowship, external grant, or other funding to pursue research/creative activity
- d. Receipt of an award or other recognition for research/creative activity
- e. Publication in peer reviewed journal (e.g. research/clinical article, editorial)
- f. Publication of books, chapters, or assessment/intervention materials based on clinical theory or research

C. Service

Level 1: Satisfactory performance may be evidenced by, but not limited to, a preponderance of activities such as the following:

- a. Service on a departmental committee
- b. Service to enhance the department that requires occasional, limited commitment (e.g. choosing artwork, recruitment activities)
- c. Service as a resource for professional colleagues or agencies

- d. Providing invited guest lecture(s) in the department
- e. Service in student recruitment at organized university/department events (e.g., open houses, transfer advisement, visit days)

Level 2: Significant performance may be evidenced by, but not limited to, a preponderance of activities such as the following:

- a. Leadership on a departmental committee
- b. Service to enhance the department that requires frequent commitment (e.g. computer expertise, department events)
- c. Service on a college/university committee
- d. Providing an invited guest lecture outside the department
- e. Service for local, regional, or state committee/organization (e.g., ECISHA, ISHA)
- f. Service as a speech-language-hearing specialist for professional colleagues or professional agencies for a limited time
- g. Advisement of a student organization
- h. Service as departmental resource for student recruitment (e.g., meeting individually with prospective students and families, answering inquiry calls, off-campus events)
- i. Completion of requested peer review for professional publications

Level 3: Superior performance may be evidenced by, but not limited to, a preponderance of activities such as the following:

- a. Leadership activities on a college or university committee
- b. Leadership activities in local, regional, state organization/committee
- c. Consultation as a speech-language-hearing specialist with professional colleagues or professional agencies that requires substantial or ongoing commitment
- d. Supervision of Clinical Fellowship Year (CFY) for a professional colleague
- e. Receipt of an award or other recognition for service-related activities
- f. Committee membership/leadership in national/international organization/committee (e.g., ASHA)
- g. Appointment to editorial board of a peer reviewed professional journal

II. Methods of Evaluation

University and Department policy state that performance of Teaching/Primary Duties is the most important function of a faculty member at Eastern Illinois University.

A. Department Personnel Committee

1. **Composition:** The Department of Communication Disorders and Sciences Personnel Committee is composed of three elected voting members and one elected non-voting alternate. Each shall be selected annually from tenured faculty according to DPC bylaws. The alternate will serve as a voting member in the absence of a voting member or in personnel decisions relating to a voting member.
2. **Review Procedures:** In each of the performance areas, submitted materials will be individually reviewed by members of the DPC. Independent evaluations concerning the level of accomplishments will be compared at a meeting of the DPC. Qualitative evaluation of the submitted material will be used to judge the degree of effectiveness of an employee's performance, identify areas of strength and weakness, improve the employee's performance, and provide a basis to make recommendations and decisions concerning retention, promotion, and tenure. The DPC's evaluation should be independent of and presented to the Department Chair, the Dean of the College of Sciences, the University Personnel Committee, and the Provost.

B. Student Evaluation Procedures

1. All faculty, including non-tenured tenure-track, tenured faculty completing annual evaluations, and annually contracted faculty, will submit student evaluations for all course/clinical assignments. Student course evaluations must include the approved university core of evaluation items; additional items selected by the employee may be included. All student evaluations must be included for any section of a course in which student evaluations were conducted. Inclusion of

- narrative comments is optional, but if narratives are included, all should be provided.
2. Distance learning courses shall be evaluated using departmental generated course evaluation items.
 3. Administration of Student Evaluations: Faculty will order student course evaluations from the Office of Academic Assessment and Testing (OAAT). Administration can be online through (OAAT) or paper evaluations can be used and arrangements made for a faculty member to administer the evaluations. The faculty member administering the evaluations assumes responsibility for delivering the objective evaluations and the written evaluations to the Office of Academic Assessment and Testing. The Department Chair distributes one copy of the statistical analysis of the evaluations to faculty members after grades have been posted, with the exception of early evaluation.

Administration of Student Evaluations for Clinical Practicum: The Clinic Director will distribute the department approved faculty evaluation forms and instructions for completion of the forms to students. The Clinic Director arranges a confidential procedure for students to return the forms and then forwards them to the Office of Academic Assessment and Testing for analysis. After finals week, the Clinic Director returns the written comments and one copy of the statistical analysis to the faculty member. One copy of the statistical analysis is forwarded to the Department Chair.

C. Chair/Tenured Faculty Evaluation Procedures

Tenured CDS faculty member and chairperson evaluations may include evaluation of live or recorded classroom or clinical instruction and review of syllabus, assessment methods, course management system, projects/papers/assignments.

1. Non-tenured/tenure-track faculty
 - a.
 - b. All non-tenured, tenure-track faculty applying for retention, promotion, and/or tenure will submit at least one chairperson and one tenured CDS faculty member evaluation for each area of teaching/performance of primary duties. For each area (e.g., teaching, supervision) in which 3 or more credit units (CUs) per evaluation period are assigned (e.g., classroom teaching, clinical supervision, special CUs), one Department Chair and one tenured faculty evaluation per evaluation period will be submitted. Consultation between faculty member and evaluator shall occur prior to the observation. Tenured faculty and peer evaluators will use the university peer evaluation form. Copies of evaluations by tenured faculty and peer evaluators shall be given to the faculty member who requested the evaluation. Chairperson observations may be recorded via the approved university peer evaluation form. If not, Chair evaluations will result in a written summary submitted to the faculty member. The summary will specify the duty observed, date, time, and length of observation.
 - c. With the exception of research, service, and sabbatical assignments, activities for which 3 or more CUs per academic year are assigned shall be considered as primary duties for the purposes of evaluation. For assigned duties other than research, service, or sabbaticals, the employee will be evaluated as appropriate by the Chair.
 - d. In evaluating distance learning courses, items from a departmental adaption of the Quality Matters Rubric should be considered.
2. Tenured Faculty
 - a. Faculty applying for professional advancement increase (PAI) or promotion (multi-year evaluation) will be evaluated by having a minimum of one Chair and one tenured CDS faculty member evaluation for each area of teaching/performance of primary duties. For each area (e.g., teaching, supervision) in which 3 or more credit units (CUs) per evaluation period are assigned (e.g., classroom teaching, clinical supervision, special CUs), one Department Chair and one tenured faculty evaluation per evaluation period will be submitted. The evaluation period is since the submission of the portfolio for the last promotion or PAI, or five years, whichever is shorter.
 - b. Tenured faculty not being considered for promotion need to include required student course evaluations and documented activities in the areas of teaching/primary duties, research/creative activity and service.
 - c. In evaluating distance learning courses, items from a departmental adaption of the Quality

Matters Rubric should be considered.

3. Annually Contracted Faculty

- a. All annually contracted faculty will provide at least one evaluation for each area of teaching/performance of primary duty by the Department Chair. Evaluations must be obtained for each area (e.g., classroom teaching, clinical supervision, special CUs) for which 3 or more CUs are assigned per evaluation period.
- b. Annually contracted teaching faculty will be evaluated for teaching performance of primary duties by the same criteria as tenured/tenure track faculty members.
- c. In evaluating distance learning courses, items from a departmental adaption of the Quality Matters Rubric should be considered.

D. Other Evaluation Procedures

1. The items listed under each performance level in each area of evaluation (teaching/performance of primary duties, research/creative activities, service) are to be considered illustrative and not exhaustive.
2. Materials and activities listed in each performance level are not rank ordered by importance.
3. Items other than those listed that are illustrative of performance may be included.
4. Items shall be included in only one section of the portfolio (teaching/performance of primary duties; research/creative activities; service).
5. In the area of teaching/performance of primary duties, course instruction evaluations and clinical teaching evaluations shall be considered of greater weight than other items in each level. Department Chair, tenured CDS faculty member, and peer evaluations shall be given more weight than student evaluations.
6. For purpose of evaluation, a peer is defined as a tenured/tenure-track faculty member (e.g., CDS peer, peer with knowledge of the discipline at EIU or another university). Chair shall approve choice of peer outside the Department or university.
7. The evaluation period is defined by the collective bargaining agreement and set forth in the Schedule for Personnel Actions and Credit Unit Guidelines issued by the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The evaluation period is not the same as an academic term. It varies depending upon appointment and rank.
8. It should be recognized that teaching evaluations might be affected by the rigor of a course or technological issues in distance learning courses. In applying these guidelines, evaluators should, therefore, recognize that new course preparation, teaching methods/traits and technological difficulties may affect evaluations.
9. Course materials (e.g., syllabi, exams) may be requested by the evaluator completing the observation.
10. Union duties, responsibilities, and projects may be considered in any of the three areas of evaluation, as appropriate.
11. Special CUs may be awarded for the following duties: Honors coordinator, educational internship coordinator, medical internship coordinator, graduate program coordinator, clinic director.
12. Qualitative evaluation of submitted materials will be rendered by the evaluators of the DPC.
13. A faculty member can request unofficial assessment of teaching/supervision to solicit informal feedback from colleagues; this material would not be included in the formal portfolio materials.

Dean's request for consideration.

I encourage the Department faculty to consider revisions to the DAC that would result in evaluation materials that include:

- Evidence that courses were well-prepared, well-organized, and well-delivered.
- Syllabi with clearly stated Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) related to the course content and, when pertinent, SLOs for Writing, Critical Thinking, Speaking, and Global Citizenship
- Evidence that the faculty member has read and given thoughtful consideration to the feedback from supervisor, peers, and students.
- Evidence that the faculty member included all student evaluations including written comments and evidence that the faculty member is modeling good critical thinking skills related to analysis of the student evaluations of the class. For example a statistical analysis and interpretation of data from all questions on the instrument with comparisons among courses within a semester and comparisons of courses over time, including identification and discussion of patterns, trends, and plans for future modifications based on the student input.
- Evidence of student learning and comments about patterns of students' academic achievement.

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