

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: Diane Hoadley, Dean, Lumpkin College of Business and Applied Sciences

Date: September 4, 2008

Subject: DAC Revision Approval; School of Technology

Consistent with Article 8.7.c. of the *2006-2010 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, 2009.

Any reading of the DAC shall be consistent with the *Agreement* or its successor agreement(s). As proposed, the revised DAC includes a statement in the concluding paragraph that is inconsistent with the Unit B Agreement. For instance, IV.D. includes a statement that “[a]t least one classroom observation by the Chair is required.” This could be misleading because 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 (PBI) that document evidence of superior performance in teaching/primary duties, in the aggregate. They will have had classroom observations by the Chair as part of each of their annual evaluations and need not have another as part of the PBI portfolio. Additionally, materials in a PBI evaluation portfolio may be supplemented by evidence of contributions to the University that are in addition to those contractually required. Additionally in II. (Methods of Evaluation to be Used), reference to the role of the School Personnel Committee should not be considered exclusive of other contractually prescribed evaluators.

I also noted the following for your further consideration:

- In I.A.Level I 11., maintaining membership in a professional organization is more commonly and more appropriately considered in the service area of evaluation.
- “Attends appropriate professional development activities” in I.B.Level I 2. and I.B.Level II 1. appear to be duplicate statements.
- “Departmental research” in I.B.Level I 1. and “[r]esearch required by Departmental and/or University committees” I.B.Level II 1. would appear to be more commonly and more appropriately considered in the service area of evaluation.

- The DAC, as proposed does not distinguish by level between internal and external grants. In most academic units, externally funded grants are viewed as more prestigious and desirable. Also, the DAC does not appear to distinguish between peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed publications. Most academic units value peer-reviewed publications more highly.
- With regard to the evaluation of technology-delivered course sections (II.A.), the Office of Assessment and Testing has a secure confidential online student course evaluation option that is equivalent to the traditional paper bubble forms.

Thank you for your conscientious work during the DAC revision process. It is very much appreciated as is the engagement of the School of Technology in the discussion and consideration of the DAC revision. The department is encouraged to continue to include in its various discussions the academic goals that have been articulated for the University.

attachment: Revised DAC; School of Technology

cc: Chair, School of Technology (with attachment)

2006-2010 DEPARTMENTAL APPLICATION OF CRITERIA SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY

The employment obligation of a tenure/tenure-track employee is composed of both assigned and unassigned duties and activities. An assigned duty or activity of an employee will be reflected on an assignment of duties form and will receive a credit unit value.

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

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

Categories of materials and activities appropriate for the evaluation of teaching/performance of primary duties are grouped below in levels of effective performance. Classroom evaluation by peers, the Department Chair, and teaching performance evaluations by students will be considered the most important with considerations given to such factors as the difficulty of the course, class size, rate of return, whether the course is required or elective and mode of delivery. No order of priority is given to the remaining statements listed within each level. **The items listed below for each level shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive because of the diverse nature of the courses within the School of Technology.**

Level I: Satisfactory performance in the area of teaching/primary duties may be evidenced by, but not limited to, the following:

1. Satisfactory classroom observations by peers (School Personnel Committee) and Department Chair.
2. Satisfactory teaching performance evaluations by students as indicated by student responses on the student evaluation instrument.
3. Demonstrates proficient oral communication skills.
4. Incorporates technology-enhanced learning into the classroom.
5. Demonstrates appropriate knowledge of subject area and/or academic field.
6. Uses teaching methods and materials which encourage and interest students in the learning process.
7. Demonstrates appropriate organization and presentation of course material including the use of course outlines/syllabi.
8. Demonstrates appropriate methods of evaluating student knowledge and/or skill.
9. Demonstrates proficiency in and safe operation of laboratory and/or instructional equipment/materials and ensures appropriate safety practices in the classroom/laboratories.
10. Demonstrates effective coordination and management of laboratory facilities.

11. Maintains membership in professional organizations related to faculty member's subject area and/or academic field.

Level II. Highly effective performance in the area of teaching/primary duties may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Highly effective classroom observations by peers (School Personnel Committee) and Department Chair.
2. Highly effective teaching performance evaluations by students as indicated by student responses on the student evaluation instrument.
3. Demonstrates effectiveness in organizing, analyzing, and presenting knowledge and/or materials.
4. Delivers a technology-delivered course.
5. Demonstrates effectiveness in the coordination of academic programs.
6. Participates in revising and/or development of curricula/instructional materials.
7. Demonstrates effective student academic advisement.
8. Demonstrates accessibility and effective involvement in addressing student needs, including academic, professional, or personal issues.
9. Participates in relevant professional development activities related to teaching/primary duties.
10. Demonstrates continued performance in appropriate areas under Level I.

Level III. Superior performance in the area of teaching/primary duties may be evidenced by, but not limited to, the following:

1. Superior classroom observations by peers (School Personnel Committee) and Department Chair.
2. Superior teaching performance evaluations by students as indicated by student responses on the student evaluation instrument.
3. Demonstrates leadership in revising and/or developing curricula and/or instructional materials, including developing new course(s), workshop(s), curriculum for special topic course(s), and/or providing leadership for program or curriculum revisions.
4. Develops a technology-delivered course.
5. Directs graduate thesis or other student research activities.
6. Participates in intensive and/or extensive professional development activities directly related to teaching/primary duties.

7. Demonstrates superior coordination and management of laboratory facilities.
8. Demonstrates continued performance in appropriate areas under Levels I and II.

B. Research/Creative Activity

Categories of materials and activities appropriate for the evaluation of research/creative activities tend to contribute to the profession and/or enhance professional development. Creative activities include, but are not limited to inquiry and/or innovative efforts within the field of expertise or profession. The levels below describe degrees of effectiveness. Documentation shall be reviewed in regard to relative quality, quantity, and relevance of the efforts to the faculty member's area of expertise and primary duties. Research/creative activities, which are juried, shall be considered more important than those that are not. In general, completed or published works will be more important than work in progress, except that considerations such as the quality or quantity of the work in progress may deem it more important. **No order of priority is given to statements for each level. Documentation listed below shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive.**

Level I. Appropriate performance of first-year probationary faculty in the area of research/creative activity may be evidenced by, but not limited to, the following:

1. Departmental research as assigned by Chair.
2. Attends appropriate professional development activities.

Level II. Satisfactory performance in the area of research/creative activity may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Attends appropriate professional development activities, including workshop(s), conference(s), and conventions(s).
2. Research activities associated with the pursuit of advanced degree.
3. Research/creative activities not directly associated with teaching duties.
4. Demonstrates continued performance in appropriate areas under Level I.

Level III. Significant performance in the area of research/creative activity may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Research required by Departmental and/or University committees.
2. Preparation of exhibit(s), demonstration(s) and/or materials for seminar(s), workshop(s) and competition(s).

3. Preparation of materials for publication in book(s), monograph(s), or article(s) in professional journals.
4. Participates in intensive and/or extensive professional development activities not directly related to teaching/primary duties.
5. Research, writing and submission of grant(s) or contract proposal(s).
6. Demonstrates continued performance in appropriate areas under Level I and II.

Level IV. Superior accomplishment in the area of research/creative activity may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Actively engages in funded research grant(s) or contract(s).
2. Presentations at professional meeting(s).
3. Research toward the creation of an innovative project or the development of experimental teaching material(s).
4. Publication in book(s), monograph(s), or article(s) in professional journals.
5. Research involved in editing professional materials.
6. Demonstrates continued performance in appropriate areas under Level I, II, and III.

C. Service

Categories of materials and activities appropriate for the evaluation of service are grouped below in levels demonstrating effective performance. Service activities tend to include those efforts that contribute to the profession, the School of Technology, and/or to the University mission including its public service mission. Faculty members should document their professional service activities, and when appropriate, include their time and/or personal resources invested. Both quantity of service and the quality of service as it benefits the University and the general public shall be considered. **No order of priority is given to the statements listed within each level. These items shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive.**

Level I. Appropriate performance of first-year probationary faculty in the area of service may be evidenced by, but not limited to, the following:

1. Participation/membership in School Committees.
2. Assists with planning and coordination of School-sponsored professional activities (e.g. open houses, recruitment, alumni activities, conferences).

Level II. Satisfactory performance in the area of service may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Informs schools, businesses, industries and the general public of the services available

through the School of Technology and the University.

2. Participates in the preparation of school publications, seminars, promotional materials, exhibits, etc.
3. Participates in student recruitment activities.
4. Provides leadership to student organizations and/or committees.
5. Demonstrates continued service in appropriate areas under Level I.

Level III. Significant performance in the area of service may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Sponsors *student organizations*.
2. Presentations to community groups.
3. Committee membership in a professional organization.
4. Professionally-related and/or University-related work in an advisory capacity with community organizations, schools, businesses, and industry.
5. Serves on a college committee.
6. Demonstrates continued service in appropriate areas under Levels I and II.

Level IV. Superior performance in the area of service may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Serves on a university committee.
2. Serves in a leadership role in a professional organization.
3. Serves as a consultant at national, state, or local level.
4. Solicits of tangible items or services to School and/or University such as equipment, supplies, software, commodities, etc.
5. Organizes a conference, symposia, or seminar at national, state, or local level.
6. Participates on non-academic boards or government agencies when related to the applicant's discipline or to University-sanctioned activities that advance the mission of the institution.
7. Demonstrates continued service in appropriate areas under Levels I, II, and III.

II. Methods of Evaluation to be Used

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

1. **Teaching Performance Evaluations by Students.** The School Personnel Committee (SPC) will administer teaching performance evaluations by students during each semester. A faculty member applying for retention, tenure, or promotion must have at least two of his/her classes evaluated each term he/she teaches and at least one of the two classes must come from his/her primary teaching responsibility within a major in the School of Technology. At least one class has to be evaluated during the summer. The teaching performance evaluation by students will be administered in the last half of the course period.

The approved School of Technology evaluation form (See Appendix A) will be used. The form includes both the approved University core of evaluation items and additional items selected by the School. Labeled packets with a header sheet and forms included will be prepared and distributed by a representative of the School Personnel Committee for bargaining Unit A and Unit B personnel only. The instructor will leave the classroom during the evaluation. A designated student in the class will collect the evaluations. Special arrangements will be made to have the evaluation packets distributed to off-campus classes. EIU Office of Academic Assessment and Testing will make tabulations. The SPC member-elect is responsible for coordinating classroom evaluations. It is the responsibility of the Chair of the School of Technology to coordinate summer classroom evaluations if the member elect is not available. Web-based classes in the School of Technology shall be evaluated using the approved form (See Appendix C) until new guidelines and procedures are established by the University.

The packets with the processed teaching performance evaluation questionnaire and printout of evaluation results (the statistical summary) will be returned to the faculty member via the Chair. One copy of the evaluation results will be filed in the office of the School of Technology or Lumpkin College of Business and Applied Sciences. Faculty members must include a copy of the statistical summary and a compilation of student responses to open-ended items for all teaching performance evaluations.

In assessing teaching performance evaluations, evaluators should consider factors such as the difficulty of the course, class size, rate of return; whether the course is a program requirement, elective, or part of general education; and mode of delivery as well as other considerations suggested by a review of representative course materials would be taken into account.

2. **Classroom Observations By Peers and Chair.** During the evaluation period, each candidate applying for retention, promotion, and/or tenure will be observed twice by a different member of the School Personnel Committee and in different classes with one being unannounced. Also each candidate applying for retention, promotion, and/or tenure will be observed at least once by the Chair, or his/her designee, unannounced. The observations are for the purpose of evaluating teaching. The approved School of Technology Peer Evaluation Classroom Visit Observation Instrument will be used (See Appendix B).

Each candidate is responsible for scheduling observations by a representative of the School Personnel Committee and by the Chair of the School of Technology during each evaluation period for retention, tenure, and promotion. A copy of the peer and chair observations will be given to the School Personnel Committee Chair, SoT Chair, and the faculty member being evaluated within ten working days of the observation. Faculty applying for retention, promotion, and/or tenure

must include a copy of each classroom observation conducted during the evaluation period as part of his/her evaluation materials.

3. **Course Materials:** Candidates are expected to provide course materials for all assigned courses for the evaluation period.
4. Candidates shall include any materials they wish the School Personnel Committee to use for evaluation purposes. The School Personnel Committee shall conduct the evaluation based on the quality of materials presented.
5. The School Personnel Committee shall evaluate the effectiveness of the candidate's teaching/performance of primary duties as specified in the contract.
6. **Program Coordination and Leadership:** Evaluation will be based on effectiveness of performing the responsibilities published for the assigned position. A copy of those responsibilities must be submitted.
7. **Student Advisement:** Academic advisors shall submit items such as a list of academic advisees, the academic advisement procedures used, and the results of student evaluations of academic advisement assistance. The School of Technology Academic Advisement Questionnaire form will be used (See Appendix D).
8. With the exception of research and sabbatical assignments, 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.
9. For assigned duties other than research or sabbaticals, constituent groups shall be provided with the opportunity to evaluate the employee as appropriate.
10. Union duties, responsibilities, and projects may be considered in any of the three areas as appropriate.

B. Research/Creative Activity

1. Members of the School Personnel Committee will review and discuss research/creative activity documentation as submitted by a candidate.
2. The School Personnel Committee, with the knowledge and consent of the candidate, may request statements from qualified individuals as to the quality of the materials presented.
3. Research and sabbatical assignments shall be considered as research/creative activity.

C. Service

1. Members of the School Personnel Committee will review and discuss materials submitted by the candidate under service.
2. The School Personnel Committee may request written statements as to the quality of service given by the candidate from the appropriate sources involved.

III. Relative Importance of Research/Creative Activity, and Services

Teaching/primary duties are to be considered of primary importance followed by research and then service.

IV. Other Considerations

- A. Annually contracted faculty will be evaluated in the area of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties under Levels I, II, and III by the Chair of the School of Technology and the Dean of the Lumpkin College of Business and Applied Sciences.
- B. Faculty members are required to submit documentation of all activities for which departmental CUs are assigned.
- C. *Criteria for Professional Advancement Increment (PAI)*: Departmental criteria will be used with the required performance level of superior in teaching, superior in research, and significant in service; or superior in teaching, significant in research, and superior in service. Classroom observations by peers and the Chair of the School of Technology are not required.
- D. *Performance Based Increase (PBI) for Unit B faculty*: Departmental criteria will be used with the required performance level of superior in teaching. At least one classroom observation by the Chair is required. A peer classroom observation may be requested by the faculty member applying but is not required.

Approved by the School of Technology:	January 24, 1989
Amended by the School of Technology:	October 12, 1989
Amended by the School of Technology:	December 3, 1992
Amended by the School of Technology:	November 11, 1996
Amended by the School of Technology:	November 16, 2000
Amended by the School of Technology:	November 13, 2003
Amended by the School of Technology:	February 24, 2004
Amended by the School of Technology:	October 11, 2007

TEACHING PERFORMANCE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

School of Technology

The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide your instructor feedback regarding the teaching of this course. Using the scale below, respond to each item. The results of this questionnaire will not be made available to the instructor until next semester. Please make additional comments regarding the course on the back.

	5	4	3	2	1
2006-2010	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Fair	Poor

5 4 3 2 1

1. The instructor demonstrates command of the subject matter or discipline.
2. The instructor effectively organizes knowledge or material for teaching and learning.
3. The instructor presents knowledge or material effectively.
4. The instructor explains lab procedures clearly. (Do not respond to this item if this is not a lab course.)
5. The instructor is in control of the direction of the class.
6. The instructor appears to keep up to date on developments in the field.
7. The instructor encourages and interests students in the learning process.
8. The instructor encourages careful, critical, and independent thinking about the course materials.
9. The instructor demonstrates proficient oral communication skills.
10. The instructor's personal mannerisms are not annoying or distracting.
11. The instructor is courteous and approachable.
12. The instructor is readily accessible outside of class for face-to-face course sections or electronically for technology delivered course sections.
13. The instructor respects differences of opinion.
14. The instructor respects cultural diversity in the classroom.
15. The instructor is actively helpful when students have problems.
16. The course content is related to the course objective.
17. The instructor establishes clear standards for grading.
18. Exams and evaluation procedures are coordinated with what is taught and assigned in the course.
19. In general, this class is conducted in a manner conducive to learning.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

1. What activities/topics were most useful and should be retained?

a.

b.

c.

2. What activities/topics seemed to have the least relevance?

a.

b.

c.

3. What other comments do you want to make about the teaching of this course.

SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY
CLASSROOM OBSERVATION BY PEERS AND CHAIR INSTRUMENT

Instructor: _____ Date: _____

Course: _____ Evaluator: _____

DIRECTIONS: Respond to the items below by circling the response that represents your observations according to the following scale:

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 4 = Superior | 1= Needs Improvement |
| 3 = Highly Effective | NA = Not Applicable/Not Observed |
| 2 = Satisfactory | |

1. Instructor effectiveness in:

a. Planning and organizing the activities observed 4 3 2 1 NA

COMMENTS:

b. Instructional methods/techniques used (including display and presentation of class/course subject matter) 4 3 2 1 NA

COMMENTS:

c. Providing effective avenues for written and oral communication of English proficiency between instructor and students. 4 3 2 1 NA

COMMENTS:

d. Promoting careful, critical and independent thinking (including encouraging student interest in the learning process) 4 3 2 1 NA

COMMENTS:

e. Audiovisual aids/instructional materials used 4 3 2 1 NA

COMMENTS:

f. Establishing and maintaining rapport with students 4 3 2 1 NA

COMMENTS:

g. Supervising assigned activities
(Group work; chat rooms, presentations) 4 3 2 1 NA
COMMENTS:

2. Instructor appears to:

a. Possess a good mastery/command of the subject 4 3 2 1 NA
COMMENTS:

b. Effectively analyze and synthesize course/class material 4 3 2 1 NA
COMMENTS:

c. Require learner participation in safety if a lab course. 4 3 2 1 NA
COMMENTS:

d. Project professionalism 4 3 2 1 NA
COMMENTS:

3. In general, the instructor:

a. Taught the class effectively and in a manner conducive to
learning 4 3 2 1 NA
COMMENTS:

Additional Comments:

**Teaching Performance Evaluation of On-line (WEB based)
Courses**

The faculty in the School of Technology is continually striving to improve the delivery of courses offered through the department. The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide your instructor feedback regarding the teaching of the on-line course (listed below) in which you are enrolled this semester. Using the scale below, please respond to each item. The results of this questionnaire will not be made available to the instructor until next semester.

2006-2010	5	4	3	2	1	
	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Fair	Poor	

Please note, this instrument is intended to evaluate the faculty member teaching your class. Factors beyond his/her control should not be reflected in responses to this questionnaire/evaluation. Factors that the faculty member does not have power over include, but are not limited to network interruptions, textbook delivery, your unfamiliarity with e-mail and WEB access at Eastern, and hardware and software problems and the internet connection associated with the computer you used for this course.

5 4 3

2 1

1. As a learner, I accepted responsibility for studying, and participating in online discussions.
2. The on-line materials and assignments were posted by the instructor in a timely fashion.
3. Course objectives, grading, and assignments were made clear.
4. Course content was related to course objectives.
5. The instructor effectively organizes knowledge or materials for teaching and learning.
6. The instructor answered questions with sufficient feedback as to grades, course status, etc.
7. The instructor is readily accessible outside of class for face-to-face course sections or electronically for technology-delivered course sections.
8. The instructor demonstrates command of the subject matter or discipline.
9. The instructor presents knowledge or material effectively.
10. The instructor clearly explained lab procedures and/or projects. (Do not respond to this item if laboratory activities or assigned projects were not part of the course requirements.)
11. The instructor encourages and interests students in the learning process.
12. The instructor appears to keep up to date on developments in the field.
13. The instructor encourages careful, critical, and independent thinking.
14. The instructor demonstrates proficient written communication skills.
15. The instructor respects differences of opinion.
16. The instructor respects cultural diversity.
17. In general, the class is conducted in a manner conducive to learning.

SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY
ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide feedback regarding your academic advisement. Using the scale below, respond to each item as it pertains to your academic advisor in the School of Technology. Items you do not consider appropriate should be left blank.

2006-2010	<u>SCALE</u>					
	5	4	3	2	1	
	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Fair	Poor	
						5 4 3 2 1
1. My advisor showed concern for my academic progress.						
2. My advisor was well informed about departmental, college, and university policies.						
3. My advisor was organized and kept advising records up to date.						
4. My advisor treated me with respect.						
5. My advisor made time available for advisement.						
6. My advisor was reliable and punctual.						
7. My advisor served as a good source for referrals to other campus services when needed.						
8. My advisor showed concern for me as an individual.						
9. My advisor was helpful in providing answers to my career related questions.						
10. My advisor helped with course selection and scheduling problems.						
11. My advisor was informed about program and university graduation requirements.						
12. My advisor advised me of necessary course prerequisites and sequencing.						
13. What is your declared major?						a b c d
a. Career & Organizational Studies						
b. Career & Technical Education						
c. Industrial Technology						
d. M.S. in Technology						
14. What is your classification?						a b c d e
a. Freshman (0-29 hours)						
b. Sophomore (30-59 hours)						
c. Junior (60-89 hours)						
d. Senior (90+ hours)						
e. Graduate Student						
15. As a student, I am aware that the ultimate responsibility for meeting requirements for graduation rests with me.						a b
a. Yes						
b. No						

SPACE IS PROVIDED ON THE BACK FOR WRITTEN COMMENTS.