


**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: Mary Anne Hanner, Dean, College of Sciences

Date: September 30, 2008

Subject: DAC Revision Approval; Department of Sociology and Anthropology

---

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. 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. In that spirit, I wish to offer some observations which I would ask that you discuss with the Department:

1. First, I note with appreciation that the proposed revisions to the DAC were submitted in mark-up form so that they could be easily identified. One would think that this would be standard procedure, but, that has not been my experience.
2. The DAC, as proposed, includes statements that duplicate or paraphrase contract language. An example is the last sentence in the opening paragraph in which the purpose of evaluation is described. The purposes of evaluation are specified in Article 8.1.a. of the Agreement. A better strategy would be to make a reference to the contract. This is consistent with a general recommendation that DACs avoid, where possible, repeating or restating contractual language and requirements. If contract language were to change, the new language would supercede the DAC and could lead to confusion.
3. Reference to the DPC and the Chair in various places in the DAC (e.g. II.A., second paragraph) should not be consider exclusive of other contractually prescribed evaluators.
4. With regard to the evaluation of technology-delivered course sections (II.A.1.), the Office of Assessment and Testing has a secure confidential online student course evaluation option that is equivalent to the traditional paper bubble forms.

5. In IV. the references should be to the *2006-2010 EIU-UPI Unit A Agreement* and the *2006-2010 EIU-UPI Unit B Agreement* respectively or their successor agreements.

Thank you for your conscientious work during the DAC revision process. It is very much appreciated as is the engagement of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology 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.

attachments: Revised DAC; Department of Sociology and Anthropology

cc: Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology (with attachments)

**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY**  
**Departmental Application of Criteria**  
**2007-2010**

Evaluations of faculty members in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, for the purpose of retention, tenure, promotion, or professional advancement increases, shall be based on the three performance areas of (1) Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, (2) Research/Creative Activity, and (3) Service, which are in order of priority. Documentation of activities which occurred in the evaluation period is to be placed in the most appropriate performance area of the portfolio, and each activity shall be clearly and concisely documented. A single activity shall not appear in more than one performance area, unless division of the activity is clearly explained and justified. This Department of Sociology and Anthropology Departmental Application of Criteria (DAC) is the basis of the performance evaluation reflects the dynamics of the department's culture and accommodates an evaluation of faculty members' expectations by, and contributions to the department, the university and the profession. In that regard, "purposes of evaluations are to judge the degree of effectiveness of an employee's performance, to identify areas of strength and weakness, and to improve employee performance" (8.1.a - Unit A; 8 - Unit B), encouraging pursuit of the higher-order activities valued by the culture and the tradition of the department.

Categories of materials and activities listed in the DAC represent extended but not exhaustive examples of the criteria used for evaluation of departmental members, and all categorical activities are listed in order of their relative importance.

**I. Categories of materials and activities considered appropriate, by performance area and relative importance of materials/activities.**

**A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties**

**1. Categories of Materials and Activities**

- a. Student course evaluation using the university-approved instrument. Any alternative instrument must contain both the university and departmental core items.
- b. For all faculty (Units A and B), classroom visitations are made by the chair and a tenured faculty member of the department; each independently provides written evaluation.
- c. Course-related documents, including syllabi, power-point presentations, and other technological integration, handouts and other innovative, teaching materials.
- d. Student advisement or similar activities (e.g., 4 + 4 teaching).
- e. Participation in interdisciplinary, interdepartmental and intercollegiate instruction.
- f. Development of technology-delivered instruction (web courses).
- g. Contributing to the department via curriculum revision/course development.
- h. Participation in instructional and other outreach activities, including student mentoring, recruitment or off-campus instruction.
- i. Continuing education to enhance teaching skills or substantive areas.

## 2. Relative Importance

Items above are listed in approximate order of relative importance. However, the tenured faculty member (of the department), chair, and student evaluations carry equal weight (i.e. 1/3, 1/3, 1/3) for both Unit A and Unit B faculty.

## B. Research/Creative Activity

### 1. Categories of Materials and Activities

- a. Publications
  - (1) Books and/or refereed journal articles
  - (2) Chapters in books and/or non-refereed journal articles
  - (3) Book reviews
  - (4) Proceedings of professional meetings
- b. Papers presented at national/regional meetings
- c. Grants/contracts from national/regional-level entities such as the NSF
- d. Grants/contracts from state-level entities
- e. Papers presented at state meetings
- f. Grants/contracts from local entities
- g. Papers/presentations for local organizations
- h. Grants/contracts from campus entities
- i. Continuing education to enhance research skills

### 2. Relative Importance

Items listed above are in approximate order of relative importance.

## C. Service

### 1. Categories of Materials and Activities

- a. Serving in a leadership position for a national, regional or state organization
- b. Serving in a leadership position for a university council/committee
- c. Serving on a committee of a national or regional organization
- d. Serving on a university council/committee
- e. Serving on departmental committees requiring considerable time/effort
- f. Paper sessions organized, chaired or discussed at national/regional meetings
- g. Reviewing/refereeing manuscripts for publication
- h. Serving as advisors/sponsors of student organizations
- i. Seminars/workshops/consulting provided
- j. Reviewing/editing manuscripts of colleagues
- k. Serving as a member with professional expertise on community/ public committees
- l. Serving on departmental committees not demanding considerable time/effort
- m. Continuing education to enhance/learn service skills

## 2. Relative Importance

Items listed above are in approximate order of relative importance.

## II. Methods of Evaluation to be Used, by Performance Area

### A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

Using the criteria and materials described below, a faculty member's teaching/performance of primary duties will be evaluated as either superior, highly effective, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory performance.

All members of the DPC and the chair of the department will independently review the documentation of teaching/performance of primary duties submitted by the candidate. These reviewers may request written statements addressing the quality of teaching/primary duties from peers and professionals within and outside the department who are familiar with the candidate's performance.

#### 1. Student Evaluation

All faculty members (tenured, tenure-track, annually contracted; full-time, part-time) will ensure that student course evaluations are conducted in all courses taught in each academic term using the university-approved instrument. ~~This or any instrument used~~ must include at least one item assessing the adequacy of the faculty member's English language skills. Completed evaluations will be returned immediately to the departmental office to be sealed and delivered in a timely manner to Testing Services by either the chair or the departmental secretary.

All evaluations must be conducted within the last two weeks of each semester prior to finals week, unless administratively mandated otherwise.

Student course evaluations must be administered by a faculty member or secretary in the Department of Sociology & Anthropology unless the chair approves of an alternative. The evaluator will read the following directions to the class:

- These evaluations are conducted to assess the performance of the instructor as a teacher in the Department of Sociology & Anthropology.
- The results are weighed seriously in determining retention, promotion and tenure.
- Please feel free to honestly respond to the questions and to offer written comments on the back of the evaluation form.
- Your evaluation is completely anonymous.
- The teacher will not have access to your evaluation until after your grades are submitted.

For all student course evaluations or other identically-scaled evaluation instrument, a statistical summary (mean of medians) shall be submitted with each evaluation conducted. Generally, a rating (mean of medians) of 3.00-3.49, overall, is necessary for satisfactory performance; 3.50-3.99 for highly effective; and 4.00-5.00 for superior performance. However, such ratings, by themselves, are not absolute and are

not sufficient for evaluation, but are further evaluated within the contexts of comparison to departmental averages, both in the whole and in comparable courses.

In assessing teaching effectiveness, evaluators shall consider such factors as: size of class, the level of the class (lower division, upper division); required or elective status of class; number of writing intensive classes; whether students are primarily majors in sociology; and, innovative pedagogical techniques and new course development. Reference to both the technical and pedagogical aspects of distance learning shall be made for distance learning assignments reviewed by the chair and a tenured faculty member of the department.

The DPC and the chair, independently, will review the student summary tabulations of Unit A faculty and may discuss them with the faculty member. At the departmental level, only the chair receives and reviews Unit B evaluations, and may discuss them with the faculty member.

## **2. Classroom Visitation**

Each Unit A faculty member seeking retention or tenure and each Unit B faculty member seeking reappointment will invite the chair and a tenured faculty member of the department to visit at least one class during the current evaluation period. Each Unit A faculty member seeking promotion or professional advancement increase (PAI) will invite the chair and a tenured faculty member of the department to visit at least 3 classes from different academic years during the multiple-year evaluation period. These visitors shall provide the departmental personnel committee (DPC) and the faculty member with copies of their evaluations, using the Approved University Peer Evaluation Form.

## **3. Course-related Documents**

All Unit A and B faculty are expected to provide representative course materials for courses which students have evaluated or in which a classroom visitation has taken place. Relative to Unit A faculty, all members of the DPC will review the materials in conjunction with their review of student course evaluations of teaching. At the departmental level, only the Chair will review the course-related documents of Unit B faculty.

## **4. Interdisciplinary, Interdepartmental and Intercollegiate Instruction**

All faculty involved in such cross-disciplinary, team activities related to teaching are expected to submit their student course evaluations and their course-related documents, as detailed in II.A.1 and 3 above.

## **5. Web-enhanced/Web-based Courses**

Any faculty member who develops and teaches a web-based course is expected to provide summary documentation of work to develop those courses. Electronic delivery of student evaluation instrument is accommodated by Testing and Assessment, and all faculty teaching on-line courses will avail themselves of this opportunity.

Web Course instructors will provide a tenured faculty member of the department and chair with their course syllabus and examples of their tests as well as electronic access to the course so that at least one class/lesson may be visited electronically to evaluate the class.

## **6. Curriculum Revision/Development**

Any faculty member directly involved in substantial course revision, coordination with other courses for purposes of sequencing, or course development shall submit appropriate documentation enabling assessment of such activity. More broadly-based revision of the sociology/anthropology curriculum occurring by way of the department curriculum committee should be reported and documented under service.

## **7. Instructional and Outreach Activities**

All faculty involved in off-campus instruction are expected to document teaching effectiveness in those courses as they would for on-campus instruction in terms of documentation to be submitted for evaluation. All faculty involved in student mentoring or recruitment are expected to submit such documentation to assess the quality of student participation.

## **8. Continuing Education to Enhance Teaching Skills**

All Unit A and Unit B faculty are expected to provide summary contents and performance indicators as documentation for continuing education taken to enhance teaching skills.

### **TEACHING PERFORMANCE UNIT A AND UNIT B FACULTY**

\***Level I:** Evidence of satisfactory performance in the area of teaching/primary duties will be based upon, but is not limited to the following:

1. Student course evaluations from university-approved instrument of all assigned classes (see: II.1). All written comments by students for all classes for the evaluation period must be included.
2. All classroom visitation reports indicating competent performance and organization in teaching, and oral proficiency in English concomitant with primary duties.

3. Submission of course-related documents, as specified in I.A.1.c.
4. Evidence of office hours maintained as posted.

**\*Level II:** Evidence of **highly effective** performance in the area of teaching/primary duties will be based upon, but is not limited to the following:

1. Student course evaluations from university-approved instrument of all assigned classes (see: II.1). All written comments from students for all classes for the evaluation period must be included.
2. All classroom visitation reports indicating more than competent performance and organization in teaching, and oral proficiency in English concomitant with primary duties.
3. See #3 above.
4. See #4 above.
5. Evidence of thorough student advisement, academic counseling/referral, internship coordinating or supervision of independent studies.
6. Evidence of successfully pursuing continuing education to enhance teaching skills.

**\*Level III.** Evidence of **superior** performance in the area of teaching/primary duties will be based upon, but is not limited to the following.

1. Student course evaluations from university-approved instrument of all assigned classes (see: II.1). All written comments from students for all classes for the evaluation period must be included.
2. All classroom visitation reports indicating superior performance and organization in teaching, including rapport and interaction with students, and oral proficiency in English concomitant with primary duties.
3. See #3 above.
4. See #4 above.
5. See #5 above
6. Evidence of developing web-based courses or superior evaluation of web-based courses.

## **B. Research/Creative Activity**



Using the criteria and the following materials, a faculty member will be evaluated as having achieved superior, significant, satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance in research/creative activity.

All members of the DPC and the chair of the department will independently review the creative work and the documentation of research activity submitted by the candidate. These reviewers may request written statements as to the quality of the material from peers and professionals within and outside the department, with the knowledge and consent of the candidate, and may discuss the creative work/research with the candidate. Reviewers may give further consideration to the potential impact of teaching load on research/creative activity.

### **RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY**

**\*Level I.** Evidence of **satisfactory** performance in the area of research/creative activity may include, but is not limited to the following:

1. Evidence of papers presented at national or regional conferences.
2. Evidence of grants and contracts applied for and/or received.
3. Evidence of continuing education to enhance research skills.

**\*Level II.** Evidence of **significant** performance in the area of research/creative activity may include, but is not limited to the following:

1. Evidence of publication(s) which may include:
  - a. Books and/or refereed journal articles
  - b. Chapters in books and/or non-refereed journal articles
  - c. Book reviews
  - d. Proceedings of professional meetings
2. Evidence of papers presented at national and regional meetings.
3. Evidence of grants and contracts received.
4. Evidence of continuing education to enhance research skills.

**\*Level III.** Evidence of **superior** performance in the area of research/creative activity may include, but is not limited to the following:

1. Evidence of publication(s) from the following array, which may include, but is not limited to Level III.1.a., with additional consideration given to senior/sole authorship.
  - a. Books and/or refereed journals.
  - b. Chapters in books and/or non-refereed journal articles.

- c. Book reviews.
  - d. Proceedings of professional meetings.
2. Evidence of substantial number of papers presented at national and regional meetings, as deemed by the DPC in the contexts of the profession and peer institutions.
  3. Evidence of a pattern of success as primary investigator or co-primary investigator in securing and administering grants or contracts.
  4. Evidence of continuing education to enhance research skills.

### **C. Service**

Using the criteria and the following materials, a faculty member will be evaluated as having achieved superior, significant, satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance in service.

All members of the DPC and the chair of the department will independently review the documentation of service activities submitted by the candidate. These reviewers may request written statements addressing the quality of service from peers and professionals within and outside the department who are familiar with the candidate's service. Reviewers may give further consideration to the potential impact of teaching load on service.

### **SERVICE PERFORMANCE**

**\*Level I.** Evidence of **satisfactory** performance in the area of service should include, but is not limited to the following:

1. Evidence of serving on any departmental committee requiring considerable time/effort.
2. Evidence of serving any community organization or activity requiring professional expertise.
3. Evidence of serving as advisors/sponsors of student organizations.
4. Evidence of reviewing forthcoming textbooks or textbook chapters
5. Evidence of reviewing/editing manuscripts of colleagues.

**\*Level II.** Evidence of a **significant** performance in the area of service should include, but is not limited to the following:

1. Evidence of serving on university or college committees/councils
2. Evidence of serving select departmental committees requiring considerable time/effort.
3. Evidence of serving as a member with professional expertise on community/public committees.

4. Evidence of paper sessions at national or regional meetings organized, chaired or discussed.
5. Evidence of reviewing/refereeing manuscripts for publication.
6. Evidence of reviewing/editing manuscripts for colleagues.

**\*Level III.** Evidence of **superior** performance in the area of service should include, but is not limited to the following:

1. Evidence of serving in a leadership position for a national, regional or state organization.
2. Evidence of serving in a leadership position for a university or college council/committee.
3. Evidence of serving a committee of a national, regional or state organization.
4. Evidence of serving a university or college council/committee.
5. Evidence of substantial service on select departmental committees requiring considerable time/effort.
6. Evidence of a substantial number of paper sessions at national or regional meetings organized, chaired or discussed, as deemed by the DPC in the contexts of the profession and peer institutions.
7. Evidence of serving as a member with professional expertise on community/public committees.
8. Evidence of reviewing/refereeing manuscripts for publication.
9. Evidence of reviewing/editing manuscripts of colleagues.

### **III. Relative Importance of Research/Creative Activity and Service**

Research/creative activity is regarded substantially more important than service, and while service is expected and required for retention and promotion, in no instance will even laudable and significant service make up or substitute for deficient research.

- IV. For Unit A faculty, applying for retention in a given year, tenure, promotion or PAI, evaluation criteria must be met at the level of performance as specified in Section 8.6 of the 2007-2010 EIU-UPI Unit A agreement. For Unit B faculty, evaluation criteria must be met at the level of performance as specified in Section 8.1 of the 2007-2010 EIU-UPI Unit B agreement.

Departmental Approval: September 24, 2007