

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 16, 2013

Subject: DAC Revision Approval; Department of Geology and Geography

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. I applaud the department for encouraging thoughtful reflection on student evaluations during the evaluation period and would urge that this encouragement be extended to peer and chair classroom evaluations as well.
2. In III.A.1., 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 (~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.

3. 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.
4. With regard to item III.C.1.b. and III.C.1.e., coordination of labs, honors, or internships and academic advising or mentoring may be considered in the area of service provided that CUs are not assigned for these activities in which case they are more properly considered in the area of teaching/performance of primary duties.
5. I urge the department to discontinue excerpting from the Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation Portfolios and simply refer to the current version of the guidelines because the guidelines can change during the effective term of the DAC.

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

cc: Chair, Department of Geology and Geography (with attachments)

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY
Department Application of Criteria 2012-2016

- I. Relative importance of Teaching, Research/Creative Activity and Service: University and department policy state that performance of Teaching/Primary Duties is the most important function of a faculty member. In the Department of Geology/Geography, Research/Creative Activity is considered to be more important than Service. Research/Creative Activity should indicate the value of its contribution to the discipline, its significance, originality, and evidence of professional growth. The department recognizes the total nature of a faculty member's contribution to the university.

- II. The evaluation of the Teaching/Primary Duties, Research/Creative Activity, and Service documentation will be considered in accordance with the UPI Agreements (See Appendix A for University Portfolio Guidelines). A narrative summary is expected within each of the three content sections.

- III. Documentation of Activities (to be included in an Evaluation Portfolio with each section in reverse chronological order)

A. Teaching/Primary Duties (applies to annually contracted as well as tenured/tenure-track instructors)

1. Peer Evaluations: An annual written evaluation of classroom performance by the department chair and a Geology/Geography DPC member will be required for retention and tenure. One department chair and one Geology/Geography DPC classroom evaluation are required for faculty applying for promotion to Full Professor or Professional Advancement Increase; tenured faculty may request an annual Department Chair and Geology/Geography DPC classroom visitation. This can be done on the approved University Peer Evaluation Form (See Appendix B) or in a letter that addresses all the points in this form. Faculty members must make arrangements with the DPC Chair and the department chair for classroom visitations. In the case of "on-line" technology delivered courses, faculty must provide the DPC and department chair access to web-sites and course materials. Copies of the evaluations will be sent to the Faculty member, DPC Chairperson, and department chairperson.

2. Student Evaluations (Statistical summaries of the Purdue Cafeteria System including University Core, Department, and optional Instructor Supplied Items; or departmentally approved evaluation instruments): Student evaluations should be administered for every course, every semester, including summer courses using either paper forms at a regular class meeting or university-administered online versions. For traditional classroom courses, the instructor may deliver the evaluation forms, but must not be present in the

room while students are completing the evaluation. The completed evaluation forms must be delivered from the classroom to the department chair or secretary by a student or staff member. Completed evaluation forms and their statistical summary forms (provided by Academic Testing Services) will be returned directly to the faculty member. Faculty must include statistical summary forms in his/her evaluation portfolio. All written student comments will be included. Reflections upon student evaluation results and comments are welcome. Faculty are responsible for keeping student evaluations for the duration of any applicable evaluation period. Courses with 2 to 6 students or field courses may be evaluated using evaluation instruments other than the Purdue System. Courses with single students may not be included. Administration and delivery of alternate evaluations should follow the same procedures as described above.

3. Supporting Materials: The following items of documentation of Teaching/Primary Duties are listed in order of decreasing importance. Documentation other than that listed below should be submitted as a supplement (see III.A.4.).

- a. student, DPC and department chair classroom evaluations are required and deemed equally important
- b. awards for teaching
- c. development and implementation of academic programs (e.g., new concentrations, majors, or degree programs)
- d. new university course or study abroad development
- e. supervising research courses, independent study courses and/or service learning
- f. developing, organizing and leading field programs, field trips, and field projects
- g. workshops, seminars, or meetings attended (in person or online) for teaching enhancement
- h. course revision materials
- i. representative sample of course syllabi are required (See Appendix C)
- j. evaluative statements from students and alumni
- k. evaluations of teaching by other professional peers
- l. travel to acquire course material or travel related to the discipline

4. Other Supporting Materials: Documentation of Teaching/Primary Duties other than listed above.

B. Research & Creative Activity

1. Research Expectations: Faculty are expected to publish a minimum of one refereed manuscript of original research per promotion cycle. The number of publications will not be the sole criterion for achieving ratings levels (as identified in the union contract). In addition, continued progress on research should be demonstrated throughout the review period, regardless of previous publications.

2. Supporting Materials: The following items of documentation of Research/Creative Activity are listed in order of decreasing importance. Documentation other than that listed below should be submitted as a supplement (see III.B.2.).

- a. refereed manuscripts of original research published or in press (with documentation of anticipated publication date). Examples include journal articles, monographs, texts, chapters in texts, technical reports, or other electronic media
- b. external research grants awarded
- c. non-refereed manuscripts of original research published or in press (with documentation of anticipated publication date). Examples include journal articles, monographs, texts, chapters in texts, technical reports, or other electronic media
- d. internal research grants awarded
- e. fellowships or similar awards
- f. presentation of research activity at professional meetings
- g. mentoring student research
- h. student research awards
- i. manuscripts of original research in the review process in refereed publication
- j. published reviews of books, journal articles, videos or software
- k. grant or contract proposals submitted
- l. presentations of scholarly activity at other institutions
- m. research-oriented or applied professional consultation
- n. recognition for scholarly activity (e.g., by the University, external professional peers, etc.)
- o. professional travel to organize, conduct, or report research
- p. participation in courses related to one's specialized area of research, or maintenance of professional licensure
- q. citation in published works
- r. patents, copyrights

3. Other Supporting Materials: Documentation of Research/Creative

Activity other than listed above.

C. Service

1. Supporting Materials: The following items of documentation of Service are listed in order of decreasing importance. Documentation other than that listed below should be submitted as a supplement (see III.C.2.).

- a. departmental, college, or university committees
- b. coordinating department's laboratories, Honors and internship programs
- c. advising and organization of student organizations
- d. attracting resources to the department and/or the university
- e. academic advising or mentoring of students
- f. holding elected office in professional organizations
- g. editing professional journals or other professional publications
- h. editorial or peer review of books, journal articles, grant proposals, or software
- i. professional mentoring of colleagues (inside or outside the university)
- j. public lectures and participation in organized professional activity (i.e., session chair, session organizer, panelist)
- k. professional activity outside the university (e.g., presentations, publications, or group leadership)
- l. professional service to the non-academic community
- m. student recruitment activities
- n. awards for service activities
- o. department web-page designer and web-master
- p. service-oriented professional consultation
- q. recognition for service activities

2. Other Supporting Materials: Documentation of Service other than that listed above.

Appendix A

Excerpted from: *Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation Portfolios* (September 14, 2012)

Evaluation Portfolio Format:

1. The evaluation materials should be placed in a loose leaf, ring binder. Materials for retention evaluations shall be submitted in one notebook or binder. Materials for tenure, promotion, or PAI evaluation shall be submitted in one three-inch notebook or binder. In a continuing effort to encourage submission of evaluation portfolios of reasonable size, even as the makers of ring binders continue to manufacture larger and larger models, faculty are encouraged to avoid using a binder greater than two inches for retention evaluation and three inches for tenure, promotion or PAI. In the evaluation process succinct, judicious portfolios are valued. In those circumstances when additional or supplemental supporting material exceeds the capacity of the ring binder, the additional or supplemental supporting material may be referenced in the portfolio and placed on file in the department in a supplemental binder for review at the discretion of those authorized to make evaluation recommendations and decisions.
2. Binders should have a label on the spine indicating the person's name, department and the personnel action or actions being considered:
 - retention; or
 - promotion and/or tenure; or
 - professional advancement increase.
3. Tabbed dividers should mark the three major areas of the evaluation:
 - teaching/primary duties; and
 - research/creative activity; and
 - service.

Evaluation Portfolio Content and Organization:

These guidelines discuss the supporting materials to be included as well as the general organization of such materials in the evaluation portfolio. Suggestions for reducing the amount of supporting materials are also included. Generally, evaluation portfolios should only include supporting materials covering the evaluation period as set forth in the *Agreement*, see Articles 9.1.a, 10.5, 11.5, and 12.3, as appropriate.

1. Front Matter
 - a. Standard evaluation forms from the Department Personnel Committee, department chair, and dean.
 - b. Assignment of duties (workload) forms for the evaluation period.

- c. Curriculum vita or résumé that includes information concerning the faculty member's education, teaching and/or administrative experience, research/creative activity, and service.
 - d. Content Summary and Table of Contents providing an overview of the documentary evidence included in the portfolio in support of the application for retention, promotion, tenure, or PAI. The Content Summary consists of a page or less abstracting the basis on which the application is being submitted for review. It should include and highlight the salient evidence in the areas of teaching/performance of primary duties, research/creative activity, and service. The Table of Contents provides a more detailed directory of all the contents of the portfolio and serves to both document the contents and to facilitate location of materials by reviewers. Notice is hereby given that a copy of the Content Summary and Table of Contents will be placed in the employee's personnel file for each portfolio submitted.
2. Evaluation portfolio contains an assessment and documentation of performance in the three areas of evaluation: teaching/performance of primary duties; research/creative activity; and service. A copy of the departmental application of criteria (DAC), should be attached to this section. The supporting materials in the portfolio should be labeled as stated in the DAC. They should follow the same format as stated in the DAC.
3. Faculty members who are applying for promotion and/or tenure should consistently organize materials chronologically within the major areas of evaluation (teaching/primary duties, research/creative activity, service) (See Article 8.3.a. of the *Agreement*). For promotion, performance standards will be used to judge an employee's performance during the entire evaluation period. In tenure evaluations, the performance standards will be used to judge whether an employee's performance has reached and sustained the required degree of effectiveness by the 5th probationary year and sustained it through the 6th probationary year.
4. Consult the applicable DAC for the materials and methods of evaluation used in the three areas of evaluation.
 - a. Teaching/performance of primary duties.
 - i. Optional brief (maximum two-page) introductory narrative that provides context information for activities and materials documented in this section of the portfolio.
 - ii. Other teaching/performance of primary duties evaluation materials as specified in the DAC.
 - b. Research/creative activity.
 - i. Optional brief (maximum two-page) introductory narrative that provides context information for activities and materials documented in this section of the portfolio.
 - ii. Research/creative activity evaluation materials as specified in the DAC.

c. Service.

- i. Optional brief (maximum two-page) introductory narrative that provides context information for activities and materials documented in this section of the portfolio.
- ii. Service-related evaluation materials as specified in the DAC.

Faculty Evaluation Portfolio Workshops Representatives of the University and the UPI routinely schedule portfolio development workshops during the fall semester. Faculty preparing evaluation portfolios are encouraged to attend.

Appendix B

Obtained from Geology/Geography Department Records (November 25, 2012)

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

Appendix C

Syllabus policy: from CAA Minutes (December 7, 1995)

This action approves the following to become effective Spring 1996:

During the first week of class, instructors shall provide the department chairperson and students in each class with a course syllabus. The course syllabus should include, but not be limited to, the following information: 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. The course outline may include additional requirements based on department, college, and university policies.

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)