


# 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: Bonnie Irwin, Dean, College of Arts and Humanities

Date: May 7, 2013

Subject: DAC Revision Approval; Department of Music

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. I note with appreciation that the DAC revision was provided in mark-up form showing clearly the proposed changes.
2. I share the dean's concerns provided to the department in writing on April 15 of this year (and appended hereto).
3. I again note in the paragraph immediately preceding the heading "Evaluation Criteria and Procedures" that the DAC restricts the evaluation of annually contracted faculty to teaching/performance of primary duties. While it is true that annual evaluations of annually contracted faculty are limited to the area of teaching/performance of primary duties, annually contracted faculty members who have not qualified for a performance-based increase based on successive annual evaluations may submit evaluation materials for evaluation for a performance-based increase that document evidence of superior performance in teaching/primary duties, in the aggregate. Those materials may be supplemented by evidence of contributions to the University that are in addition to those contractually required. This should be made clear in the DAC.
4. Specific references to the DPC and the chair with regard to evaluation do not exclude other contractually prescribed evaluators, evaluations, and reviews.

5. 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 Music 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 Music  
University Approved Core Items for Student Evaluations  
Dean Irwin's DAC Review Concerns of April 15, 2013

cc: Chair, Department of Music (with attachments)

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF ARTS & HUMANITIES

Bonnie D. Irwin  
Dean

581-2922  
[bdirwin@eiu.edu](mailto:bdirwin@eiu.edu)

---

To: Jerry Daniels, Chair  
Music

Re: Music DAC

Date: 15 April 2013

Associate Dean Poulter and I have reviewed all the DACs in the College, and I want to take this opportunity to thank you and the faculty for your work on the Music DAC.

The process for the review and revision of the DAC is intended to be a collaborative one among the faculty, the chair, the dean, and the provost. In that spirit, I offer the comments below for your consideration. My apologies for the delay in communicating the points below, but if the faculty still has time to consider them this term, I would appreciate it.

In most respects, the Music DAC works well, as it takes into account the various types of teaching and learning that take place in the department. Within that context, however, there are some things that the faculty might want to review.

1. I.B.1.a: the forms currently in use for music seems geared more toward lessons and studios and less toward traditional classrooms, such as might be used for history and general education offerings. Permissive language here that might allow teachers to use a revised instrument for classroom teaching would be helpful. Language indicating the university core items must be included would also provide helpful guidance here.
2. I.B.1.d and e: Adding the language, "all other evaluators" here will include the dean and UPC level of evaluation. All evaluators must be looking at the same materials.
3. I.B.1.f: More specific language concerning online evaluations would be a good idea. I recommend looking at the HIS or ART DACs, both of which have good language here.
4. I.B.2: I have several concerns in this section regarding the way classroom visits are handled. Because so many faculty are allowed to observed, some language about working with the candidate to find an appropriate time might prevent too many people sitting in on the same lesson, etc. Allowing the faculty member to issue invitations rather than just permitting anyone to come in at any time is probably a good idea. Is the candidate allowed time to revise his or her narrative to accommodate the observations? The DAC implies that the observations may go into the portfolio at any time. I have concerns about "stacking the deck" here either for or against a candidate.
5. I.B.2.i: Similar concerns as those expressed above apply to Unit B candidates.
6. II.B.1 and III.B.1: language that includes all evaluators and not just those in the department is preferable.

Thank you so much for all your efforts during the DAC revision process. As Eastern Illinois University seeks continuous improvement, I especially appreciate the work on these DACs which uphold the standards of excellence on which we pride ourselves in the College of Arts and Humanities.

c: Provost and VPAA, Associate VPAA

## Music Department

### Departmental Application of Criteria, ~~2006-2011~~ 2012-2016

#### General Statement

Evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the terms of the *EIU/UPI Agreement* (~~2006-2010~~ 2012-2016) and according to the standards and procedures outlined in this document.

Unit A: Details of the evaluation procedures may be found in article ~~8-9~~ 8 of the ~~2006-2010~~ 2012-2016 *EIU/UPI Unit A Agreement*.

Unit B: Details of the evaluation procedures may be found in article 8 of the ~~2006-2010~~ 2012-2016 *EIU/UPI Unit B Agreement*.

Only items listed in this document under I. A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties will be utilized by the chairperson and dean in the evaluation of Unit B faculty.

#### Evaluation Criteria and Procedures

##### I. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

###### A. Appropriate Activities and Supporting Materials and Their Relative Importance in the Evaluation Process

Categories of materials and activities appropriate for the evaluation of teaching/performance of primary duties are grouped below in levels demonstrating the order of their relative importance as evidence of effective performance. With the exception of research and sabbatical assignments, most activities for which three (3) or more credit units per academic year are assigned shall be considered as primary duties for the purposes of evaluation. Research and sabbatical assignments shall be considered as research/creative activity. Each successive level includes the materials and activities cited in the preceding level(s). Items cited are considered to be illustrative and not exhaustive. Exceptional achievement (with regard to quality and quantity) in individual items listed as evidence of satisfactory or significant accomplishment may be considered as evidence of significant or superior accomplishment.

1. Evidence of **satisfactory** accomplishment in the area of teaching/primary duties may include but is not limited to the following:
  - a. Student evaluations indicating satisfactory accomplishment.
  - b. Satisfactory evaluation by peers.
  - c. Satisfactory evaluation by the department chair.
  - d. Advising student(s) with satisfactory advisee evaluations, and/or other supporting documentation.
  - e. Satisfactory course outlines, syllabi, and handouts.
  - f. Appropriate methods of evaluating student knowledge and skills.
  - g. ~~Coaching a student who is entering a local competition such as Honors Recital or the Concerto competition~~ Coaching or mentoring a student who is entering a

- local competition (e.g. the Honors Recital, the Concerto Competition, or the Booth Library Awards for Excellence in Student Research and Creativity).
- h. ~~The teacher's students/ensembles perform on departmental division and general recitals~~ The teacher's students/ensembles perform or present at departmental and university venues (e.g. departmental and general recitals or the annual EIU Showcase).
  - i. Attending teaching-related conferences, workshops, seminars, or lectures (e.g., Writing Across the Curriculum).
  - j. ~~Utilization of analog or digital media as teaching supplements, or e~~Coordinating guest lecturers.
  - k. Application of technology in the teaching and learning process.
2. Evidence of **highly effective** accomplishment in the area of teaching/primary duties may include but is not limited to the following:
- a. Student evaluations indicating highly effective accomplishment.
  - b. Highly-effective evaluation by peers.
  - c. Highly-effective evaluation by the department chair.
  - d. Advising students with highly effective advisee evaluations, and/or other supporting documentation.
  - e. Coaching a student who is entering a state- or regional-level competition such as MTNA or NATS.
  - f. The teacher's students/ensembles demonstrate a high level of achievement.
    - 1) ~~The teacher's students are Concerto Competition finalists or Honors Recital participants.~~
    - 2) ~~The teacher's students/ensembles perform professionally on a regular basis in area venues (i.e. churches, orchestras, or clubs).~~
    - 3) ~~The teacher's students/ensembles are accepted into national summer study/performance programs.~~

For example, the teacher's students/ensembles:

    - 1) are Concerto Competition finalists or Honors Recital participants.
    - 2) perform professionally on a regular basis in area venues (e.g. churches, orchestras, or clubs).
    - 3) are accepted into national summer study/performance programs.
    - 4) are recipients of a college- or university-wide award, such as the Thesis Award for Excellence.
  - g. Academic presentation of specialty area to groups outside of the department.
  - h. Teaching and/or coordinating supplemental learning experiences such as field trips and performance seminars.
  - i. Taking courses related to teaching.
  - j. Directing independent studies at the undergraduate level.
  - k. Serving on a graduate student's examining committee.
  - l. Receiving funding, such as a Redden Grant, to enhance student learning.
  - m. Participation in teaching or other primary duties on an interdisciplinary, interdepartmental, or intercollegiate basis.
3. Evidence of **superior** accomplishment in the area of teaching/primary duties may include but is not limited to the following:

- a. Student evaluations indicating superior accomplishment.
- b. Superior evaluation by peers.
- c. Superior evaluation by the department chair.
- d. Advising students with superior advisee evaluations, and/or other supporting documentation.
- e. ~~Coaching a student who is entering a national competition such as MTNA or a Young Artist Competition~~ Coaching or mentoring student who is entering a national competition or submitting a paper for a national conference (e.g. MTNA, a Young Artist Competition, or the National Conference on Undergraduate Research).
- f. The teacher's students/ensembles demonstrate a superior level of achievement.
  - 1) ~~The teacher's students/ensembles are finalists or prize winners in regional, state or national auditions/competitions.~~
  - 2) ~~The teacher's students/ensembles are invited to perform for a state or national event.~~
  - 3) ~~The teacher's students/ensembles perform professionally on a regular basis in a leadership role in area venues (i.e. churches—directors, orchestras—titled positions).~~
  - 4) ~~The teacher's students/ensembles receive scholarships to national summer study/performance programs.~~

For example, the teacher's students/ensembles:

- 1) are finalists or prize winners in regional, state or national auditions/competitions.
- 2) are invited to perform for a state or national event.
- 3) perform professionally on a regular basis in a leadership role in area venues (i.e. churches—directors, orchestras—titled positions).
- 4) receive scholarships to national summer study/performance programs.
- 5) have papers accepted for presentation at state or national conferences.

- g. Directing independent studies at the graduate level.
- h. Directing ~~masters'~~ master's degree theses or recital analyses.
- i. Pursuing an advanced degree in the field with clear evidence of progress toward the degree.
- j. Awards for teaching excellence.
- k. Participating in curriculum revision and development including activities such as proposing a course that is approved by the Music Department and College of Arts and Humanities curriculum committees.
- l. Teaching Honors courses, with superior evaluations.

## B. Methods of Evaluation (Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties)

Chair and peer evaluations will be given a higher priority in the evaluation process than student evaluations.

### 1. Student Evaluations

- a. Forms approved by the University and Music Department will be used for this purpose.

- b. Each faculty member will permit students to evaluate his/her teaching in each class, ensemble, and private studio lesson, each academic term.
- c. Each faculty member will permit his/her advisees to evaluate advising effectiveness each academic term.
- d. Forms will be distributed, monitored, and collected by the Chair of the Music Department or one designated by him/her, and tabulated by the testing service. The tabulated results and the student evaluations that include comments, or, at the request of the faculty member, copies of all student evaluations, will be provided to the faculty member after completion of the academic term in which the evaluations are written. The faculty member shall be responsible for maintaining copies of student evaluations for the duration of any applicable evaluation period. In the cases of retention, promotion, tenure, and professional advancement increase, all copies of the evaluations from all sections and courses must be submitted by the faculty member and reviewed by the DPC and the Chair.
- e. Factors such as differences in applied or class instruction, the size of the class, the difficulty of the course, the required or elective status of the course, and other considerations will be taken into account by the DPC and the Chair in assessing the evaluations.
- f. Items which refer to both the technological and pedagogical aspects of distance learning shall be included on student evaluations for distance learning courses.

## 2. Peer Evaluations

- a. All members of the DPC will visit the candidate's classes and/or studio lessons as part of their evaluative responsibility preceding each personnel action. At least one complete class and/or one complete lesson must be observed.
- b. Each tenured faculty member of the department will have the opportunity to evaluate tenured and tenure-track candidates for personnel actions ~~during an evaluation period determined and announced by the DPC~~. Evaluations of teaching will be based on visits to a class, a studio lesson and/or to an ensemble rehearsal of the candidate.
- c. Each tenure-track member of the department will have the opportunity to evaluate other tenure-track faculty ~~during an evaluation period determined and announced by the DPC~~.
- d. The university peer evaluation form shall be used for the required peer evaluations. Additional peer review and comments may also be submitted.
- e. All visitations shall result in written reports. The reports shall be given to the DPC chair, who will submit copies to the Chair and applicant. The reports shall become part of the materials used in the process of evaluating an employee for the purposes of retention, promotion, tenure, or professional advancement increase.
- f. Before the DPC submits its final recommendation to the Chair, the candidate and the DPC may meet to discuss the peer evaluations. The meeting may be requested by the faculty member or the DPC.
- g. All peer evaluations must be signed in keeping with the Agreement and with university policy opposing anonymous letters.
- h. Peer evaluations for distance learning courses will address technological and pedagogical aspects of the course through samples of on-line student interactions, video recordings of live presentations, or other class activities.

- i. Each faculty member of the department will have the opportunity to evaluate non-tenure-track faculty. Evaluations of teaching will be based on visits to a class, a studio lesson and/or an ensemble rehearsal.

### 3. Course Materials

- a. Candidates will provide appropriate course material (course outlines and/or syllabi, tests, examinations, course handouts, sample ~~overhead transparencies~~ PowerPoint presentations, or any other documentation as evidence of accomplishment under I.A.1-3 of this document) for the DPC's and the Chair's examination. This applies to all areas of teaching/performance of primary duties.
- b. Before the DPC submits its final recommendation to the Chair, the candidate and the DPC may meet to discuss the course materials. The meeting may be requested by the faculty member or the DPC.

## II. Research/Creative Activity

### A. Appropriate Activities and Supporting Materials and Their Relative Importance in the Evaluation Process

Categories of materials and activities appropriate for the evaluation of research/creative activity are grouped below in levels demonstrating the order of their relative importance as evidence of effective performance. Each successive level includes the materials and activities cited in the preceding level(s). Items cited are considered illustrative and not exhaustive. The faculty is encouraged to be active participants in publication, performance, or other creative activities accepted by the profession. Exceptional achievement (with regard to quality and quantity) in individual items listed as evidence of satisfactory or significant accomplishment may be considered as evidence of significant or superior accomplishment.

1. Evidence of **satisfactory** accomplishment in the area of research/creative activity may include but is not limited to the following:
  - a. Membership in professional organizations and subscribing to professional journals.
  - b. Attending research/creative activity-related workshops, clinics, conferences, or conventions at the area, state, regional, and/or national levels (e.g. attending a conference on research methods in your field).
  - c. Participating as a panel member for a seminar, workshop, clinic, or lecture at EIU.
  - d. Performing on a recital/concert or presenting a paper for a local audience.
  - e. ~~Performance of an original composition or arrangement~~ Composing or arranging a work that is performed for a local audience.
  - f. Authoring content for local publications.



2. Evidence of **significant** accomplishment in the area of research/creative activity may include but is not limited to the following:
  - a. Presenting a seminar, workshop, clinic, lecture, or paper to a professional organization or at another university, college, or community college.
  - b. Research activity associated with office or committees of professional music organizations.
  - c. Performing a faculty recital ~~demonstrating a variety in programming~~.
  - d. Performing a recital/concert for a regional audience.
  - e. ~~Performance of an original composition or arrangement~~ Composing or arranging a work that is performed for a regional audience.
  - f. Publishing an article or review in a state or regional professional journal.
  - g. Teaching at and/or coordinating research/creative activity-related workshops, clinics, conferences, conventions, or music camps at the area, state, regional, and/or national levels.
  - h. Performing as a primary accompanist for a faculty recital.
  
3. Evidence of **superior** accomplishment in the area of research/creative activity may include but is not limited to the following:
  - a. Writing reviews for and/or serving on the editorial board/staff of a professional journal.
  - b. Reviewing publications for publishing firms in one's field of expertise.
  - c. Authoring or co-authoring a book, textbook, manual, new media, or chapters of a book in the field of one's expertise.
  - d. Publishing a composition or arrangement.
  - e. Receiving a fellowship, grant, commission, or other funding to pursue research/creative activity.
  - f. Dissertation or other demonstrable research credits completed as a part of a terminal or related degree program.
  - g. ~~Performance of an original composition or arrangement~~ Composing or arranging a work that is performed for a national/international audience.
  - h. ~~Performance of an original composition or arrangement~~ Composing or arranging a work that is performed by a group not associated with EIU.
  - i. Performing a recital/concert for a national/international audience.
  - j. Performing on a commercially available recording.
  - k. Publishing an article or review in a national/international, professional, refereed journal.
  - l. Presenting a seminar, workshop, clinic, lecture, or paper at the national/international level.
  - m. Publishing articles in dictionaries and encyclopedias.
  - n. Awards for excellence in research.

#### B. Methods of Evaluation (Research/Creative Activity)

1. To meet minimum departmental standards in this area, a faculty member will document accomplishment to which the DPC will apply the criteria of **satisfactory**,

**significant**, or **superior** performance. Accomplishment will be assessed both qualitatively and quantitatively.

2. In addition to reviewing documented materials submitted by candidates, the DPC may request (with the knowledge and consent of the candidate) written statements attesting to the quality of submitted materials.
3. Before the DPC submits its final recommendation to the Chair, the candidate and the DPC may meet to discuss the submitted statements and materials. The meeting may be requested by the faculty member or the DPC.

### III. Service

#### A. Appropriate Activities and Supporting Materials and Their Relative Importance in the Evaluation Process

Activities normally expected of music department faculty include attending and participating in department and area meetings and attending department sponsored performances. Categories of materials and activities appropriate for the evaluation of service are grouped below in levels demonstrating the order of their relative importance as evidence of effective performance. Each successive level includes the materials and activities cited in the preceding level(s). Items cited are illustrative and not exhaustive. Exceptional achievement (with regard to quality and quantity) in individual items listed as evidence of satisfactory or significant accomplishment may be considered as evidence of significant or superior accomplishment.

1. Evidence of **satisfactory** performance in the area of service may include but is not limited to the following:
  - a. Recruiting at the secondary and/or college level.
  - b. Service other than committee assignments and area responsibilities.
  - c. Directing, membership in, or performance with a church choir or community musical group or organization.
  - d. Adjudicating music contests or festivals.
  - e. Building collections for Booth Library.
2. Evidence of **significant** performance in the area of service may include but is not limited to the following:
  - a. Providing service to the department through committee assignments.
  - b. Serving as a division director of any of the seven divisions of the department.
  - c. Serving as an administrator of an area of study (e.g., Director of Jazz Studies).
  - d. Acting as a consultant, clinician, guest soloist, or guest conductor in one's field of expertise in a way that will advance the mission of the University.
  - e. Participating in evaluations by accreditation associations.
  - f. Evidence of significant recruitment activity.
  - g. Advising any student organization.
  - h. Building major collections for Booth Library.
  - i. Receiving funding, such as a Jaenike Access to the Arts grant.

3. Evidence of **superior** performance in the area of service may include but is not limited to the following:
  - a. Acting as chair of a departmental committee with a demonstrative record of accomplishment.
  - b. Membership on any elected or appointed college or university committee, board, or council.
  - c. Acting as chair, vice-chair, or secretary of a College of Arts and Humanities committee.
  - d. Acting as chair, vice-chair, or secretary of any major university committee.
  - e. Service to the Union as an elected or appointed representative.
  - f. Serving on state, regional, or national committees.
  - g. Serving as an officer or board member for a professional music organization.
  - h. Evidence of successful recruitment.
  - i. Advising a professional or recognized student organization.
  - j. Awards for excellence in service.

#### B. Methods of Evaluation (Service)

1. To meet the minimum departmental standards in this area, a faculty member will document accomplishment, to which the DPC will apply the criteria of **satisfactory**, **significant**, or **superior** performance. Accomplishment will be assessed both qualitatively and quantitatively.
2. In addition to reviewing documented materials submitted by candidates, the DPC may request (with the knowledge and consent of the candidate) written statements attesting to the quality of the submitted materials.
3. Before the DPC submits its final recommendation to the Chair, the candidate and the DPC may meet to discuss the submitted statements and materials. The meeting may be requested by the faculty member or the DPC.

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)