

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 31, 2013

Subject: DAC Revision Approval; Department of Chemistry

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. The DAC includes excerpts from the Unit A and Unit B collective bargaining agreements. I routinely advise that this practice be avoided and that faculty be referred as appropriate to the source documents. Based on negotiations, contract language can change, and DAC revisions can span more than one contract period.
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. From a contractual perspective, peer evaluations of Unit B faculty are permissive and not required. The contractually required evaluators of Unit B faculty are the chair and the dean.
4. With regard to online student evaluations (III.A.3.d.), the Office of Testing and Evaluation provides the University's secure system.
5. As a matter of principle, Unit A and Unit B faculty may not be held to different standards of achievement in the area of teaching/performance of primary duties for given materials and methods as they apply to an evaluation. For example, what constitutes evidence of achievement of "superior" teaching based on student

evaluations may not differ for Unit A faculty and Unit B faculty even though the number of required student evaluations may vary. This is consistent with negotiations that led to annually contracted faculty having access to a rating of "superior" in teaching/performance of primary duties.

6. 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.
7. The Department of Chemistry Peer Evaluation Form essentially mirrors the Approved University Peer Evaluation Form, albeit with one fewer item. The department should consider simply adopting the Approved University Peer Evaluation Form.

Thank you for your conscientious work during the DAC revision process. It is very much appreciated as is the engagement of the Department of Chemistry 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 Chemistry
University Approved Core Items for Student Evaluations
University Approved Peer Evaluation Form

cc: Chair, Department of Chemistry (with attachments)

2012 - 2016 Departmental Application of Criteria

Department Chemistry

Approved _____

UNIT A section begins on page 5

UNIT B

Unit B faculty members shall be evaluated according to the EIU/UPI Unit B Faculty Agreement only in the area of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties. Levels of achievement required are given in Table 1.

The faculty member will submit evidence of materials and activities that will enable evaluation to take place. Descriptive narratives may be included as appropriate. All such evidence should include names, dates, and any other pertinent information. Evaluators may also refer to the faculty member's personnel file to assist in formulating the evaluation, or request the faculty member to provide additional information (as specified in the current EIU/UPI Unit B contract).

I. Assigned Duties

Assigned duties shall be considered as primary duties for the purposes of evaluation.

II. Categories of Materials and Activities Considered Appropriate and Relative Importance of Materials/Activities

Items listed below shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive.

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

1. Categories of Materials and Activities

- a. Peer evaluation/Classroom visitation
- b. Teaching grants awarded, external
- c. Student evaluations
- d. Course or curriculum development
- e. Teaching materials
- f. Items related to assigned coordinator duties
- g. Teaching grant proposals submitted, external
- h. Teaching grants awarded, internal
- i. Teaching awards
- j. Continuing education to enhance teaching skills and methods
- k. Teaching grant proposals submitted, internal
- l. Other

2. Relative Importance

The items in (1) above are listed in order of approximate relative importance.

3. Notes

The department recognizes that student evaluations can be affected by course difficulty, class size and make-up, and other factors such as innovative teaching and course designs that might require more of students than their previous expectations. Hence, sole use of the quantitative data from student evaluation forms is discouraged in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. More importantly, the department requests evaluators consider all the evaluation data in context.

III. Methods of Evaluation to be Used Listed by Performance Area

Items listed below shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive. "Chairperson" refers to the chair or acting chair of the Department of Chemistry. "Peer" refers to a tenured/tenure-track (Unit A) or annually contracted (Unit B) chemistry faculty member, or the Chairperson.

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

Using information in the evaluation portfolio, the Chairperson will provide evaluative statements and assign, in the area of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, each faculty member one of four ratings: superior, highly effective, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory using II.A. and III.A.

1. Peer Evaluation:

- a. Peer evaluations for Unit B faculty will be conducted by faculty (see 2a, below) and the Chairperson. For classroom-based courses, these evaluations will involve classroom visitations. The faculty member and evaluator will mutually agree on the time and place for the visitation. For distance-education (Internet-based) courses, the evaluations will involve a "visit" by the evaluator to the instructor's course website using a supplied student logon. The faculty member and the evaluator will mutually agree upon the time window in which this "visitation" takes place.
- b. Peer evaluations of laboratory courses and summer school courses are considered optional and will be conducted at the discretion of the faculty member who is evaluated.
- c. The peer evaluation shall be written in narrative form, using the Approved Chemistry Department Peer Evaluation Form, and must be based on classroom visitation or course observation in the case of technology-delivered courses.
- d. Each peer evaluator will provide a copy of the peer evaluation to the applicant.
- e. The applicant must submit at least the minimum number of peer evaluations required for any particular evaluation period (as described below in 2. Peer evaluation minima).

2. Peer evaluation minima:

- a. For each evaluation period, a minimum of one evaluation by the chair and one evaluation by a Unit A member from two different courses is required, unless only multiple sections of the same course are taught during the evaluation period in which case the evaluations may be from the same course. (Note the summary of peer evaluation minima in Table 2)
- b. The minima must be supplied by Chemistry Department peer evaluators. Additional evaluations may be supplied by evaluators either internal to or external to the department.

3. Student Evaluation of Classroom-Based Courses:

- a. Student evaluations of teaching, using the Chemistry Core Items for Student Evaluations form, will be conducted in each course taught each semester. Faculty members may add additional items to the form. Faculty members may choose whether to conduct student evaluation in the classroom or online.

- b. A statistical summary of student evaluations from each section of each course taught must be included in the portfolio. All comments from student evaluations must be included.
 - c. The procedure for conducting student evaluations in the classroom is as follows:
 - 1) Each course instructor will be responsible for making sure student evaluations are distributed in a timely manner. "Timely manner" is defined as after at least 80% of the term has passed but no later than the last day of regular classes.
 - 2) The instructor will distribute the forms, provide necessary instructions, and explain the rating system.
 - 3) The instructor will ask a student to return the completed forms, in the envelope provided, to the Chemistry Department Office and will leave the room until the evaluations are completed.
 - 4) The instructor will not see the completed forms until after the grades have been submitted.
 - 5) Original evaluation forms, a copy of a blank evaluation form, and a statistical summary will be provided to the faculty member.
 - d. The procedure for conducting student evaluations online is as follows:
 - 1) Evaluations will be conducted over the Internet using a secure system.
 - 2) Each course instructor will be responsible for making sure student evaluations are made available to students in a timely manner. "Timely manner" is defined as after at least 80% of the term has passed but no later than the last day of regular classes.
 - 3) The instructor will not see the completed forms until after the grades have been submitted.
 - e. It shall be the faculty member's responsibility to maintain copies of all original student evaluations for the duration of any applicable evaluation period and to provide copies to evaluators upon request.
4. Student Evaluation of Distance Education (Internet) Courses:
- a. Student evaluations of teaching, using the Chemistry Core Items for Student Evaluations form, will be conducted in each distance education course taught each semester. Faculty members may add additional items to the form.
 - b. A statistical summary of student evaluations from each section of each course taught must be included in the portfolio. All comments from student evaluations must be included.
 - c. Evaluations will be conducted over the Internet using a secure system.
 - d. Each course instructor will be responsible for making sure student evaluations are distributed in a timely manner. "Timely manner" is defined as after at least 80% of the term has passed but no later than the last day of regular classes.
 - e. The instructor will not see the completed forms until after the grades have been submitted.
 - f. If the instructor concludes that challenges or difficulties beyond his/her control and unique to distance learning (Internet-based) courses (including but not limited to inadequate hardware/software support, Internet connection problems, substandard software from publishers) has directly impacted student evaluations, an explanatory note may be included with the evaluation portfolio.

- g. It shall be the faculty member's responsibility to maintain copies of all original student evaluations for the duration of any applicable evaluation period and to provide copies to evaluators upon request.

B. Assigned Credit Units

Each faculty member will include in his/her portfolio documentation for all activities for which credit units were received.

Table 1 A summary of required levels of evaluation for Unit B members as articulated in the contract†
(specific to the 2012-2016 EIU-UPI Unit B Agreement)

Merit based increase	Highly Effective or Superior
Performance based increase	Superior*

† - Evaluation rank to be chosen from the following: Superior > Highly Effective > Satisfactory > Unsatisfactory

* - Portfolio submission with a superior rating in a 4-year aggregate, or an automatic performance based increase with 4 consecutive superior ratings

Table 2 Summary of Peer and Chair Evaluation Minima for Unit B

Unit B	Minima for each evaluation period	Restriction
Each one	1 chair + 1 unit A faculty	two different courses unless only one course assigned

UNIT A

Unit A faculty members under consideration for retention, tenure, promotion, or professional advancement increase shall be evaluated according to the EIU/UPI Unit A Faculty Agreement in the three areas of (1) Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, (2) Research/ Creative Activity and (3) Service. Of these three areas teaching will be considered the most important. Research/Creative activity will receive greater emphasis relative to Service. Levels of achievement required in each area for retention, promotion, and professional advancement increases (PAI) are given in Table 3.

The faculty member will submit evidence of materials and activities that will enable evaluation to take place. Descriptive narratives may be included as appropriate. Materials and activities shall be placed in the performance area most appropriate for their consideration. A single activity may not be counted in more than one performance area, unless there is a clear explanation of division of the activity between categories. All such evidence should include names, dates, and any other pertinent information. Evaluators may also refer to the faculty member's personnel file to assist in formulating the evaluation, or request the faculty member to provide additional information (as specified in the current EIU/UPI Unit A contract). In the evaluation process the department recognizes the total nature of a faculty member's contribution to the university.

IV. Assigned Duties

Most activities for which three or more credit units per academic year are assigned shall be considered as primary duties for the purposes of evaluation. Exceptions include: research, sabbatical, and any assignments for which less than three credit units per academic year are assigned. These shall be evaluated in the appropriate category.

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

Items listed below shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive.

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

1. Categories of Materials and Activities

- a. Peer evaluation/Classroom visitation
- b. Teaching Grants awarded, external
- c. Student evaluations
- d. Course or curriculum development
- e. Teaching materials
- f. Items related to assigned coordinator duties
- g. Teaching Grant proposals submitted, external
- h. Teaching Grants awarded, internal
- i. Teaching awards
- j. Continuing education to enhance teaching skills and methods
- k. Teaching Grant proposals submitted, internal
- l. Other

2. Relative Importance

The items in (1) above are listed in order of approximate relative importance.

3. Notes

The department recognizes that student evaluations can be affected by course difficulty, class size and make-up, and other factors such as innovative teaching and course designs that might require more of students than their

previous expectations. Hence, the sole use of quantitative data from student evaluation forms is discouraged in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. More importantly, the department requests evaluators consider all the evaluation data in context.

B. Research/Creative Activity

1. Categories of Materials and Activities

- a. Publications (peer-reviewed)
- b. Research Grants awarded, external
- c. Research Grant proposals submitted, external
- d. Presentations at international or national meetings
- e. Presentations at regional meetings and seminar presentations
- f. Research Grants awarded, internal
- g. Research Grant proposals submitted, internal
- h. Research students supervised
- i. Work in progress
- j. Consulting (related to research/creative activity)
- k. Research awards received
- l. Continuing education to enhance research skills
- m. Professional meetings attended without a presentation
- n. Other

2. Relative Importance

The items in (1) above are listed in order of approximate relative importance.

C. Service

1. Categories of Materials and Activities

- a. Professional activities at the international, national, regional and state levels
- b. Service Grants awarded, external
- c. Books, research proposals, and journal manuscripts reviewed
- d. University-wide councils and committees served on as chairperson
- e. College committees served on as chairperson
- f. University-wide councils and committees served on as a member
- g. Service Grant proposals submitted, external
- h. Advisor of student organization
- i. Service Grants awarded, internal
- j. Service Grant proposals submitted, internal
- k. Departmental committees served on as chairperson
- l. College committees served on as a member
- m. Departmental services (e.g., equipment maintained, seminar coach or thesis committee member)
- n. Departmental committees served on as a member
- o. Service awards received
- p. Community activities and services related to area of expertise
- q. Consulting
- r. Other

2. Relative Importance

The items in (1) above are listed in order of approximate relative importance.

VI. Methods of Evaluation to be Used Listed by Performance Area

Items listed below shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive. "Chairperson" refers to the chair or acting chair of the Department of Chemistry. "Peer" refers to a Unit A faculty member, or the Chairperson.

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

Using information in the evaluation portfolio, the DPC and Chairperson will independently provide evaluative statements and assign, in the area of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, each faculty member one of four ratings: superior, highly effective, satisfactory, unsatisfactory.

1. Peer Evaluation:

- a. Peer evaluations for Unit A faculty will be conducted by Unit A faculty and the Chairperson. For classroom-based courses, these evaluations will involve classroom visitations. The faculty member and evaluator will mutually agree on the time and place for the visitation. For distance-education (Internet-based) courses, the evaluations will involve a "visit" by the evaluator to the instructor's course website using a supplied student logon. The faculty member and the evaluator will mutually agree upon the time window in which this "visitation" takes place.
- b. Peer evaluations of laboratory courses and summer school courses are considered optional and will be conducted at the discretion of the faculty member who is evaluated.
- c. The peer evaluation shall be written in narrative form, using the Chemistry Department Peer Evaluation Form, and must be based on classroom visitation, or course observation in the case of technology-delivered courses.
- d. Each peer evaluator will provide a copy of the peer evaluation to the applicant.
- e. The applicant must submit at least the minimum number of peer evaluations required for any particular evaluation period (as described below in 2. Peer evaluation minima).

2. Peer evaluation minima (Note the summary of peer evaluation minima in Table 4:

- a. For probationary years 1, 2, and 5 a minimum of one evaluation per semester for each course taught.
- b. For probationary years 3 and 4, a minimum of one evaluation per semester.
- c. For tenure application (probationary year 6), a minimum of six evaluations from at least two different courses from at least six different peer evaluators, during the entire evaluation period. The minimum must include at least one evaluation per semester for each course taught since application for year 5 retention.
- d. For tenured faculty applying for promotion or PAI, a minimum of three evaluations from at least two different courses during the relevant period.
- e. Peer evaluations included in the portfolio for the relevant evaluation period should be from at least two different individuals, except for the tenure application period as described in c above.

- f. The minima must be supplied by Chemistry Department peer evaluators. Additional evaluations may be supplied by evaluators either internal to or external to the department.
3. Student Evaluation of Classroom-Based Courses:
- a. Student evaluations of teaching, using the Chemistry Core Items for Student Evaluations form, will be conducted in each course taught each semester. Faculty members may add additional items to the form. Faculty members may choose whether to conduct student evaluation in the classroom or online.
 - b. A statistical summary of student evaluations from each section of each course taught must be included in the portfolio. All comments from student evaluations must be included.
 - c. The procedure for conducting student evaluations in the classroom is as follows:
 - 1) Each course instructor will be responsible for making sure student evaluations are distributed in a timely manner. "Timely manner" is defined as after at least 80% of the term has passed but no later than the last day of regular classes.
 - 2) The instructor will distribute the forms, provide necessary instructions, and explain the rating system.
 - 3) The instructor will ask a student to return the completed forms, in the envelope provided, to the Chemistry Department Office and will leave the room until the evaluations are completed.
 - 4) The instructor will not see the completed forms until after the grades have been submitted.
 - 5) Original evaluation forms, a copy of a blank evaluation form, and a statistical summary will be provided to the faculty member.
 - d. The procedure for conducting student evaluations online is as follows:
 - 1) Evaluations will be conducted over the Internet using a secure system.
 - 2) Each course instructor will be responsible for making sure student evaluations are made available to students in a timely manner. "Timely manner" is defined as after at least 80% of the term has passed but no later than the last day of regular classes.
 - 3) The instructor will not see the completed forms until after the grades have been submitted.
 - e. It shall be the faculty member's responsibility to maintain copies of all original student evaluations for the duration of any applicable evaluation period and to provide copies to evaluators upon request.
4. Student Evaluation of Distance Education (Internet) Courses:
- a. Student evaluations of teaching, using the Chemistry Core Items for Student Evaluations form, will be conducted in each distance education course taught each semester. Faculty members may add additional items to the form.
 - b. A statistical summary of student evaluations from each section of each course taught must be included in the portfolio. All comments from student evaluations must be included.
 - c. Evaluations will be conducted over the Internet using a secure system.
 - d. Each course instructor will be responsible for making sure student evaluations are distributed in a timely manner. "Timely manner" is defined as after at least 80% of the term has passed but no later than the last day of regular classes.

- e. The instructor will not see the completed forms until after the grades have been submitted.
- f. If the instructor concludes that challenges or difficulties beyond his/her control and unique to distance learning (Internet-based) courses (including but not limited to inadequate hardware/software support, Internet connection problems, substandard software from publishers) has directly impacted student evaluations, an explanatory note may be included with the evaluation package.
- g. It shall be the faculty member's responsibility to maintain copies of all original student evaluations for the duration of any applicable evaluation period and to provide copies to evaluators upon request.

B. Research/Creative Activity

Using information in the evaluation portfolio, the DPC and Chairperson will independently provide evaluative statements and assign, in the area of Research/Creative Activity, each faculty member one of four ratings: superior, significant, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory (or appropriate for probationary year 1).

This category will include research in chemical education and pedagogy, experimental chemistry, and theoretical chemistry. The documentation will include activity records for all years relevant to the particular evaluation period. Work in progress (V.B.i.) should be documented in detail and included in the activity records.

A successful application for tenure and/or promotion should include publication(s) in peer-reviewed journals based on work substantially performed as a faculty member, and evidence of significant effort to acquire external funding.

C. Service

Using information in the evaluation portfolio, the DPC and Chairperson will independently provide evaluative statements and assign, in the area of Service, each faculty member one of four ratings: superior, significant, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory (or appropriate for probationary year 1).

A work-related activity not counted as teaching/primary duties or research/creative activity will be considered service.

D. Assigned Credit Units

Each faculty member will include in his/her portfolio documentation for all activities for which credit units were received.

E. Relative Importance of Research/Creative Activity and Service

Research/Creative Activity will receive greater emphasis relative to Service.

Table 3. A summary of required levels for Unit A members as articulated in the contract (specific to the 2012-2016 EIU-UPI Unit A Agreement)†

	Teaching	Research	Service
<u>Retention</u>			
Year 1	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Year 2	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Year 3	Highly Effective	Significant(Satisfactory) [#]	Satisfactory(Significant) [#]
Year 4	Highly Effective	Significant(Satisfactory) [#]	Satisfactory(Significant) [#]
Year 5	Superior	Significant	Significant
<u>Tenure</u>	Superior	Significant	Significant
<u>Promotions</u>			
Instructor → Assistant	Highly Effective ⁺	Satisfactory ⁺	Satisfactory ⁺
Assistant → Associate (Untenured)	Superior	Significant	Significant
Assistant → Associate (Tenured)	Superior ⁺	Significant ⁺	Significant ⁺
Associate → Full	Superior ⁺	Superior ⁺	Superior ⁺
Professional Advancement Increase	Superior ⁺	Superior (Significant) ^{*+}	Significant (Superior) ^{*+}

Notes:

† - Evaluation rank to be chosen from the following:

Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties: Superior > Highly Effective > Satisfactory > Unsatisfactory

Research/Creative Activity: Superior > Significant > Satisfactory > Unsatisfactory

Service: Superior > Significant > Satisfactory > Unsatisfactory

The ranking of Appropriate is also available for evaluation in probationary year 1 for the categories of Research/Creative Activity and for Service. (The above is summarized from what is written in the contract.)

* - Superior required in one of these categories, significant required in the other.

- Satisfactory required in one of these categories, significant required in the other.

+ - Evaluation period considered as a single aggregate, viewed as a whole.

Table 4 Summary of Peer* Evaluation Minima for Unit A

Evaluation period	Minima for each evaluation period	restriction
Year 1	1 per semester for each course taught	2 different peer evaluators
Year 2	1 per semester for each course taught	2 different peer evaluators
Year 3	1 per semester	2 different peer evaluators
Year 4	1 per semester	2 different peer evaluators
Year 5	1 per semester for each course taught	2 different peer evaluators
Year 6	1 per semester for each course taught	2 different peer evaluators
Promotion to tenure	6 for entire period including 1 per semester for each course taught since application for year 5 retention	2 different courses; 6 different peer evaluators
Promotion after tenure	3	2 difference courses; 2 different peer evaluators
PAI	3	2 difference courses; 2 different peer evaluators
* Chair or Unit A chemistry faculty member		

CHEMISTRY DEPARTMENT YEARLY FACULTY ACTIVITY RECORD

For the period: _____ Today's date: _____

Name: _____ Rank: _____

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

1. Teaching grants awarded, external
2. Course or curriculum development
3. Teaching materials
4. Items related to assigned coordinator duties
5. Teaching grant proposals submitted, external
6. Teaching grants awarded, internal
7. Teaching awards
8. Continuing education to enhance teaching skills and methods
9. Teaching grant proposals submitted, internal
10. Other

B. Research/Creativity Activity

1. Peer-reviewed publications within the last year (title, authors, references; *indicates senior author; attach copy)
2. Research grants awarded, external
3. Research grant proposals submitted, external
4. Presentations at international or national meetings
5. Presentations at regional meetings and seminar presentations
6. Research grants awarded, internal
7. Research grant proposals submitted, internal
8. Research students supervised
9. Work in Progress
10. Consulting (related to research/creative activity)
11. Research awards received
12. Continuing education to enhance research skills

13. Professional meetings attended without a presentation
14. Other

C. Service

1. Professional activities at the international, national, regional and state levels
2. Service grants awarded, external
3. Books, research proposals and journal manuscripts reviewed
4. University-wide councils and committees served on as chairperson
5. College committees served on as chairperson
6. University-wide councils and committees served on as a member
7. Grant proposals submitted, external
8. Advisor of student organization
9. Service grants awarded, internal
10. Service grant proposals submitted, internal
11. Departmental committees served on as chairperson
12. College committees served on as a member
13. Departmental services (e.g., equipment maintained, seminar coach or thesis committee member)
14. Departmental committees served on as a member
15. Service awards received
16. Community activities and services related to area of expertise
17. Consulting
18. Other

APPROVED DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY CORE ITEMS FOR STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Answer questions 1-8 using the following scheme:

5 = strongly agree 4 = agree 3 = undecided 2 = disagree 1 = strongly disagree

1. It was difficult for me to master the material in this course.
 2. I made a sufficient effort to master the materials presented in this course.
-

3. The instructor effectively organizes knowledge or material for teaching and learning.
4. The instructor appears comfortable with the material.
5. The instructor presents knowledge or material effectively.
6. The instructor is readily accessible outside of class.
7. The instructor encourages and interests students in the learning process.
8. The instructor is concerned about and willing to help students.

Because the next two questions might be sources of personal identification, answering them is optional.

9. What is your current class? 1=freshman, 2=sophomore, 3=junior, 4=senior, 5=graduate student
10. What is your expected grade in this class? 5=A, 4=B, 3=C, 2=D, 1=F

Please include written comments to questions 11-12 on the back

11. When your instructor teaches this course again, what would you suggest your instructor do the same? What would you suggest your instructor do differently?
12. Other comments welcome.

APPROVED CHEMISTRY DEPARTMENT PEER EVALUATION FORM

In accordance with Article 8.3 b of the Agreement, I have reviewed the teaching/performance of primary duties of _____ on [date/s] _____.

The narrative should address the following issues with examples where appropriate:

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

Date

Signature

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)