

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 Economics

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 (not fall 2012 as written in the DAC). 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. 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.
3. In I.A.1.b) (2), I note the specification that single peer and chair evaluations are minimally 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 (~35-40 course sections) 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.

4. The illustrative items listed in II.A.1. and II.A.2. are assumed be peer-reviewed scholarship.

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

cc: Chair, Department of Economics (with attachments)

2012-2016 Departmental Application of Criteria

Department of Economics

Approved by Department: December 2012

Approved by VPAA:

Relative Importance of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, Research/Creative Activity, and Service: Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties will be considered the most important of the three areas of evaluation. Research/Creative Activity shall be given greater relative weight than Service in the evaluation of faculty. Annually contracted faculty will be evaluated only in the area of teaching/performance of primary duties. The applicable criteria of performance stated in Article 8.6 of the EIU-UPI Agreement will apply in each area of evaluation. A single activity may not be included in more than one performance area, unless it is clearly indicated how this activity can be divided between the categories. This document will govern evaluation periods commencing in Fall 2012 or later until supplanted. Nothing in this document shall be interpreted in a manner inconsistent with the 2012-2016 EIU-UPI Unit A or Unit B Agreements or their successor agreements. Nothing in this document shall be construed to limit and nothing in this document shall be construed to grant administration rights to uninvited classroom visitation.

I. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

A. Categories of Materials and Activities

1. The employee must document teaching effectiveness for the undergraduate and/or graduate classroom, as well as small-group and/or individual instruction as appropriate. Indicators of teaching effectiveness include:
 - a) Student Course Evaluations
 - (1) Student course evaluations shall be conducted each academic term in each of the faculty member's sections (exception: course evaluations shall not be required for sections assigned intra-semester due to faculty reassignment). Student evaluations should be conducted during the last 2 weeks of the semester, or as required to meet the calendar of personnel actions as published by the VPAA.
 - (2) Student course evaluations must include the approved University core evaluation items and the approved Department of Economics core¹ evaluation items. Items which refer to both the technological and pedagogical aspects of distance learning shall be included in student course evaluations for distance learning courses.
 - (3) The student course evaluation forms will be distributed, collected, and returned to the Department Office by a student, and tabulated by the Academic Assessment and Testing Center. The faculty member shall not be in the room while students are completing evaluation forms. The collection of student course evaluations for distance education courses will conform to university policy once established.
 - (4) The faculty member is responsible for maintaining copies of all student

¹ For distance education courses the Department of Economics core will be modified so as to exclude the question My instructor speaks audibly and clearly.

evaluation summaries to be used in evaluation portfolios and shall provide copies to evaluators upon request. Student evaluation summaries should be kept for the duration of any applicable evaluation period.

b) Peer and Chair Evaluations

- (1) Each candidate for retention, promotion, tenure and Professional Advancement Increase shall invite a peer from among the tenured faculty members of the Department of Economics and the chair to visit a class at a time(s) agreed upon by the candidate and the visitor(s).
- (2) For tenure-track faculty, at least one classroom visitation by a peer and at least one visitation by the chair should be conducted each year. Tenured faculty applying for promotion or a Professional Advancement Increase should arrange for at least one classroom visitations from the chair and one classroom visitations from a peer during the evaluation period.
- (3) For annually-contracted faculty members, classroom visitations will be conducted by the chair each year.
- (4) For sections that are technology-delivered, granting access to the password restricted areas of the course can be substituted for classroom visitation. Technology-delivered course peer evaluations must be conducted by a faculty member who has successfully completed the university's approved Online Learning training and information modules.
- (5) It is the faculty member's responsibility to arrange for these classroom visits. If a mutually agreeable time for the chair's visit cannot be determined, the faculty member will select a date and time for the classroom visit and give the chair at least two weeks notice of the scheduled classroom visit.
- (6) Classroom peer evaluations must use the approved university peer evaluation form. Peer evaluators will provide a copy of the completed evaluation form to the Chair with a copy to the candidate. Additional peer review and comment may also be submitted.

c) Other Documentation

- (1) The faculty member may submit other materials in support of teaching effectiveness such as samples of course syllabi, examinations and class materials, teaching awards or recognition and contributions to the development or revision of curriculum. Such material is particularly encouraged in so far as it pertains to i) Application of technology in the teaching and learning process; ii) Participation on an interdisciplinary, interdepartmental and/or intercollegiate basis; iii) Participation in instructional and/or outreach activities including student engagement and mentoring, recruitment, or off-campus instruction.
- (2) Faculty responsible for academic advisement will be evaluated by the Chair through an advisee survey pertaining to the advisor's effectiveness.
- (3) Faculty who have received reassigned time for non-instructional activity over the evaluation period will show evidence of their accomplishments during that time. Such evidence must include the faculty's proposal for such reassigned time and a statement of accomplishment during the semester for which reassigned time was received.

2. Relative Importance

- a) The peer (Unit A) and chair (Units A and B) evaluations, appended material, and the student evaluations (both statistical summaries of the student course evaluations and any written comments provided by students) will be used to evaluate the faculty member's abilities in the following areas:
 - (1) execution of assigned responsibilities,
 - (2) command of the subject matter,
 - (3) ability to organize, analyze, and present material.
 - (4) ability to encourage and interest students,
 - (5) oral English proficiency.
- b) Specific questions on the University and Department cores for the student course evaluations will be used to evaluate these particular abilities.
- c) Other materials submitted by the faculty member will be considered in the evaluation process, but these may be given less importance than the peer and Chair reports of classroom visitations and the student evaluations.

B. Method of Evaluation

1. Evaluators will review the student evaluation summary tabulations, the completed chair and peer evaluation forms and other materials submitted. Members of the DPC (Unit A) may discuss any of these items with the faculty member. Based on these sources of information, each faculty member will be evaluated as having attained the following level of overall teaching performance: (1) unsatisfactory. (2) satisfactory, (3) highly effective. (4) superior.
2. In assessing teaching effectiveness, evaluators shall consider such factors as 1) the size of the class; 2) the level of the class (lower division, upper division, graduate); 3) required or elective status; 4) whether the students are primarily majors in economics, business, or some other discipline; 5) innovative technique and course development; and 6) application of technology in the teaching and learning process. Reference to both the technological and pedagogical aspects of distance learning shall be made for distance learning assignments reviewed by peers and the chair.
3. Because of the variety of circumstances that affect statistical summaries of the student course evaluations, no minimum scores are specifically required to document superior, highly effective, or satisfactory teaching performance. Typically, median scores on the University and Department core items of the student course evaluations that are (i) 4.0 and above indicate superior teaching, (ii) 3.6 and above indicate highly effective teaching, and (iii) 3.2 and above indicate satisfactory teaching. These scores serve only as basic guidelines for the faculty member and the evaluators to improve consistency across different departmental personnel committees. In applying these guidelines, evaluators shall recognize that factors outside the faculty member's control, such as those listed in I.B.2 above, may adversely affect student evaluations. In applying these guidelines, evaluators shall also recognize that some desirable teaching methods and traits, such as experimental and innovative techniques and writing-intensive instruction, may also adversely affect student evaluations. The focus of evaluators should be to evaluate rigor and excellence and not rely solely on numerical data.

II. Research/Creative Activity

A. Categories of Materials and Activities

1. The following item(s) are typically viewed as indicators of Superior research activity, but may not be sufficient in or of itself.

- a) Book accepted for publication or published, authored or co-authored;
 - b) Article accepted for publication or published in refereed journals and/or books, authored or co-authored;
 - c) Grants originating outside the University obtained for the conduct of research;
 - d) A University-level award for research;
 - e) Presentation of research/creative activities to international, national or regional conference/meetings;
2. The following item(s) are typically viewed as indicators of Significant research activity but may not be sufficient in or of itself.
- a) Grants originating from sources within the University obtained for the conduct of research,
 - b) Presentation of research/creative activities to state or university conference/meetings;
 - c) Writing a published review of a book or textbook;
 - d) Acting as a discussant or chair at an international, national, or regional professional meeting
3. The following item(s) are typically viewed as indicators of Satisfactory or Appropriate research activity.
- a) Acting as a discussant or chair at a state or university conference or professional meeting;
 - b) Dissertation research;
 - c) Continued attendance at national, regional, or statewide conferences and professional meetings;
 - d) Presentation to the department's Faculty Seminar.
4. The items enumerated above should not be considered to be an exhaustive list. It is rather an illustrative list of some of the possible forms of materials and activities that a faculty member may submit. Other activities and documents may be submitted and will be considered on an individual basis according to their perceived merits relative to the enumerated items. Items that may be evaluated, depending upon their individual characteristics, as evidence of either superior, significant, appropriate or satisfactory research activity include but are not limited to the following
- a) Article publication in journals other than refereed;
 - b) Book publication, authored or co-authored, self-published;
 - c) Unpublished manuscripts and/or research/creative activity work in progress;
 - d) Acting as a consultant to a private or government body;
 - e) Participation in legal proceedings as an expert witness;
 - f) Publication in government documents;
 - g) Written reports for private or government agencies, institutions or other bodies;
 - h) Acting as a reviewer or referee for journals;
 - i) Creating technologies to improve the teaching and learning process;
 - j) Reports prepared for the University Professionals of Illinois may be taken as evidence of research/creative activity or, more often, as evidence of service depending on the intellectual depth and creativity involved
 - k) Acting as a reviewer for books and textbooks may be taken as evidence of research/creative activity or, more often, as evidence of service depending on the intellectual depth and creativity involved;
 - l) Public lectures of personal research;
 - m) Invitations to participate in restricted conferences;

n) Other.

B. Method of Evaluation

1. All members of the DPC will review and discuss documentation of research/creative activity submitted by a candidate. The DPC may request that the candidate submit representative written statements as to the quality of the materials from peers within or external to the department but related to the discipline.
2. Based on the sources of information listed above and other material that the faculty member may provide, each faculty member will be evaluated as having attained the following level of performance with respect to Research/Creative Activity: (1) unsatisfactory, (2) appropriate — applicable only during the first probationary year —, (3) satisfactory, (4) significant. (5) superior.
3. For the purposes of promotion or Professional Advancement Increase, either the quantity of the research evidenced by the submitted materials or the quality of the research evidenced by the submitted materials may be judged sufficient to warrant the indicated category.

III. Service

A. Categories of Materials and Activities

1. The following item(s) are typically viewed as indicators of Superior service activity
 - a) Faculty participation in the governance of the university;
 - b) Holding office or committee assignments in professional organizations;
 - c) Editing of journals;
 - d) Membership on the editorial board of a journal
 - e) Evidence of superior service on councils, standing committees. or special assignment groups at the university, college, or department level:
 - f) A University-level award for service.
2. The following item(s) are typically viewed as indicators of Significant service
 - a) Membership on councils, standing committees. and special assignment groups at the university or college level:
 - b) Evidence of significant service on standing committees or special assignment groups at the department level:
 - c) Advisement of student organizations;
 - d) Public lectures on basic economic concepts.
3. The following item(s) are typically viewed as indicators of Satisfactory or Appropriate service
 - a) Membership on standing committees or special assignment groups at the department level
4. Other activities and documents may be submitted and will be considered on an individual basis according to their perceived merits relative to the enumerated items. Items that may be evaluated, depending upon their individual characteristics, as evidence of either superior, significant, appropriate or satisfactory service activity include but are not limited to the following
 - a) Service on non-academic organizations and governmental agencies;
 - b) Supervision of internship program;
 - c) Acquisition of funds for student-support programs or other university-related activities;
 - d) Services rendered to the University Professionals of Illinois;
 - e) Community Service
 - f) Providing substantial technological support or training to colleagues;

- g) Reports prepared for the University Professionals of Illinois may be taken as evidence of service if it has not already been deemed creative/research activity under II.A.4.j);
 - h) Acting as a reviewer or referee for journals, books and textbooks may be taken as evidence of service if it has not already been deemed creative/research activity under II.A.4.k);
 - i) Other.
5. For the purposes of promotion or Professional Advancement Increase, either the quantity of the service evidenced by the submitted materials or the quality of the service evidenced by the submitted materials may be judged sufficient to warrant the indicated category.
 6. The above enumerated items should not be considered an exhaustive list. They are rather illustrative of some of the possible forms of materials and activities that a faculty member may submit.

B. Methods of Evaluation

1. All members of the DPC will review and discuss documentation of service submitted by a candidate. With the knowledge and consent of the faculty member, the DPC may request representative written statements as to the quality of the service from other professional persons involved in the service activity(ies) documented by the faculty member, and may discuss the materials with the faculty member.
2. Based on the sources of information listed above, each faculty member will be evaluated as having attained the following level of performance with respect to service: (1) unsatisfactory, (2) appropriate — applicable only during the first probationary year — , (3) satisfactory, (4) significant, (5) superior.

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)