


**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 30, 2013

Subject: DAC Revision Approval; Department of Biological Sciences

---

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 and provide evidence of thoughtful reflection on peer, chair, and student evaluations during the evaluation period.
2. As a matter of principle, Unit A and Unit B faculty may not be held to different standards of achievement in the area of teaching/performance of primary duties for given materials and methods as they apply to an evaluation. For example, what constitutes evidence of achievement of "superior" teaching based on student evaluations may not differ for Unit A faculty and Unit B faculty even though the number of required student evaluations may vary.
3. In III.A.2.c.1) I note the specification that single peer and chair evaluations are minimally required during multiyear evaluation periods. Consideration should be given to whether a single chair and a single peer evaluation visitation provide a sufficiently representative sample for a five-year/10-semester evaluation period 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 semester during the evaluation period. Consider that having considerably more student evaluations appears to give them more importance even though they are ranked of lesser

importance to peer and chair evaluations in the area of teaching/performance of primary duties. Perhaps specifying “a minimum of two course visitations per year” would be more appropriate.

4. The 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. As listed under III.2.d.4), the items specified for the department’s student course evaluation form are inconsistent with the University Approved Core Items (as developed jointly by the University and the faculty union).

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

cc: Chair, Department of Biological Sciences (with attachments)

# 2012- 2016 DEPARTMENTAL APPLICATION OF CRITERIA

## Department of Biological Sciences

Approved by Biological Sciences Faculty – October 31, 2012  
Revisions Approved by Biological Sciences Faculty – October 31, 2012

### I. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Evaluations of Department of Biological Sciences Unit A faculty members for the purpose of retention of non-tenured personnel, tenure, promotion, or professional advancement increases (PAI) shall be based upon University criteria in the three performance areas, which are, in order of priority: (1) Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, (2) Research/Creative Activity, and (3) Service.

Evaluations of Department of Biological Sciences annually contracted faculty members shall be based upon University criteria only in the area of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties.

For the purposes of this document, “chair” is defined as the chair of the Department of Biological Sciences, “associate chair” is defined as the associate chair of the Department of Biological Sciences, and “peers” are defined as tenured/tenure-track faculty in the Department of Biological Sciences.

### II. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION CRITERIA

A faculty member who has an assignment, including overload, outside the evaluating department shall submit materials relevant to these duties for evaluation. Assigned duties or activities are reflected on the assignment of duties form and credit unit values are given for these assignments. Assignment of duty forms should be submitted by all candidates as part of the evaluation materials.

Materials and activities shall be placed in the most appropriate performance area of the portfolio, and each activity should be clearly but concisely documented. A single activity may not be counted in more than one performance area, unless there is clear explanation of division of the activity between the categories.

For evaluation periods extending beyond the immediately preceding year (*e.g.*, for tenure, promotion, or professional advancement increase), activity records for all relevant years should be included. Materials should be presented chronologically within each of the three evaluation categories.

### III. CATEGORIES OF MATERIALS AND ACTIVITIES CONSIDERED APPROPRIATE BY PERFORMANCE AREA AND THEIR RELATIVE IMPORTANCE

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

Items listed as criteria for the evaluation of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive, and not necessarily specifically required unless mandated by the EIU-UPI faculty agreement, so long as a candidate provides a body of accomplishments appropriate to a given level of achievement.

#### *1. Categories of materials and activities*

## **Unit A faculty**

- a. Classroom teaching, as documented by chair or associate chair, peer, and student evaluations and materials submitted, (*e.g.*, syllabi, sample handouts, and exams showing classroom activities)
- b. Non-teaching assigned duties for which CU's are given (course coordinators, program directors, etc.)
- c. Course/curriculum development, *e.g.*, new study abroad or on-campus courses developed & implemented, development of new technology for use in instruction
- d. Receipt of monies for curriculum development or enhancement
- e. Supervision of independent study and/or thesis
- f. Participation in workshops, seminars, or institutes to develop teaching skills
- g. Course/curriculum improvement, (*e.g.*, new laboratory exercises developed, incorporation of new technology into instruction)
- h. Graduate committee member
- i. Student advisement
- j. Awards or special commendations for teaching excellence
- k. Other assigned duties and other instructional activities

## **Annually Contracted Faculty**

- a. Teaching, as documented by chair or associate chair (and peer if included by the faculty member) and student evaluations and materials submitted, (*e.g.*, syllabi, sample handouts, and exams showing classroom activities)
- b. Other teaching or instructional related materials may be included at the faculty member's discretion

## **2. *Methods of evaluation***

- a. All materials submitted shall be evaluated both quantitatively and qualitatively. In general, categories are listed in order of relative importance; however, exceptional achievement in any category will be evaluated appropriately.
- b. Evaluation of classroom teaching and distance education
  - 1) Materials to be used for evaluation of teaching are, in order of importance: i) reports from course visitations; ii) course structure and materials; and, iii) student evaluations.
  - 2) In assessing teaching effectiveness in the classroom, as evaluated by the chair or associate chair, peers, and students, such considerations as the relative difficulty of the course, the number and diversity of students in the class, whether or not the class was required, the diversity of courses taught by the faculty member, as well as other considerations suggested by review of representative course materials will be taken into account.
- c. Procedures for classroom visitation
  - 1) Classroom visitations shall be conducted, at a minimum, in the year of personnel action for all faculty considering application for retention, promotion, tenure, or professional advancement increase.

- 2) The chair or associate chair and two tenured/tenure track faculty from the Department of Biological Sciences selected by the Unit A faculty member being evaluated, will visit a class to evaluate the classroom activity of each candidate.
    - a) The chair or associate chair and peer visitations and evaluations shall be conducted independently of one another, although classroom observations may be made at the same time.
    - b) Choice of classes, date, and time for visitation(s) shall be decided upon by mutual agreement between the candidate and evaluator; all peer evaluations will be recorded on the University Peer Evaluation (UPE) form (copy attached).
  - 3) For annually contracted faculty, classroom visitations will be conducted by the chair or associate chair (and by peers if desired by the faculty member, but peer-evaluations are not required)
    - a) Choice of class, date, and time for visitation shall be by mutual consent of the chair or associate chair and annually contracted faculty member being evaluated.
    - b) The chair or associate chair shall provide the annually contracted faculty member with a written report of classroom visitation.
  - 4) The faculty member being evaluated is responsible for informing the Chair or Associate Chair of the need for classroom visitation and for arranging a mutually agreed upon date.
  - 5) Evaluators will be responsible for ensuring that reports of classroom visitations are delivered to the candidate in a timely fashion. It is the faculty member's responsibility to include the necessary materials in the portfolio.
- d. Procedures for student evaluation of teaching effectiveness
- 1) Unit A faculty are required to conduct student evaluations, using the standard departmental form, in a minimum of one class or section per academic term (*i.e.*, every semester). Student evaluations submitted by applicants for retention, promotion, tenure, and professional advancement increase shall be representative of the teaching assignments of the faculty member, so that each class taught over the evaluation period must be represented at least once in the portfolio. Student evaluations for summer courses, seminars, continuing education courses, student research, independent study, and Lab Teach (BIO 4400) courses are optional.
  - 2) Annually contracted faculty shall provide student evaluations of all courses and sections taught each term using the standard departmental form.
  - 3) Every class that is evaluated by students on the standard form must be included in the portfolio.
  - 4) Student evaluations shall be based on the Biological Sciences Evaluation System. Candidates will use the University Testing Service to provide the questionnaire forms, answer forms and grading services. The following questions will be used:
    1. The instructor has a good understanding of the subject.
    2. The instructor was organized and prepared for class.

3. The instructor presented the material clearly.
4. The instructor made clear what was expected of me in the class.
5. The instructor evaluated and returned papers in a timely manner, so that I was able to judge my progress.
6. The instructor is readily available outside of class for face-to-face course sections or electronically for technology-delivered course sections.
7. The instructor was fair and impartial with students.
8. The instructor encourages and interests students in the learning process.
9. I would recommend this instructor to other students.
10. Overall, I would rate this instructor: a) excellent (SA) b) good (A) c) average (U) d) below average (D) e) inadequate (SD)

Technology-delivered course sections require further evaluation of the technological aspects necessary to successfully conduct such classes. Faculty who teach technology-delivered course sections will also include the following question (in addition to III.A.2.d.4) in the questionnaire for all technology-delivered course sections:

11. Please evaluate the technology (server access, interacting with other students, etc.) used to deliver your technology-delivered course section.

An area at the bottom of the form will ask for a short narrative evaluation of the course and instructor.

- 5) A numerical summary of student evaluation results, together with the questions and the data forms must be included in the portfolio. Written comments may be included in the portfolio at the discretion of the faculty member.
  - 6) The faculty member shall not administer his/her own evaluations or collect the evaluations after students have completed them. Another faculty member, graduate assistant, or student will collect evaluation forms and return them to a Biological Sciences secretary.
  - 7) The faculty member shall be responsible for maintaining copies of all student evaluations to be used in evaluation portfolios and shall provide copies to evaluators. Student evaluations should be kept for the duration of any applicable evaluation period.
  - 8) Student evaluation of distance learning courses shall include both technological and pedagogical aspects.
- e. Procedure for evaluation of classroom materials: Evaluations of course syllabi, examinations, handouts, or other materials used in each course will be evaluated qualitatively. A representative sample from each course is sufficient.
- f. Other criteria to be considered for evaluating teaching/performance may include, but are not limited to the following:
- 1) Revision of existing courses, development of new courses, development of laboratory exercises, obtaining equipment for teaching labs.
  - 2) For the evaluation of course coordination, independent study and thesis supervision, the faculty member shall provide a brief narrative description of these activities.

- 3) Student advisement - Faculty shall maintain a file on each advisee and report the number of advisees.
  - 4) Evaluation of assigned duties other than research and sabbaticals, which are considered Research/Creative Activities (*e.g.*, program coordinators). It is the responsibility of program coordinators to provide opportunity for evaluation. This evaluation shall be included in the portfolio. In addition, the faculty member may provide a narrative summary of activities performed.
- g. Using the information described above, the DPC and Chair, independently shall assign each Unit A faculty member one of four ratings: Superior, Highly Effective, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory.
  - h. Using the information described above (for those items that apply to Annually Contracted Faculty, see III.A.1), the Chair shall assign each Annually Contracted Faculty member one of four ratings: Superior, Highly Effective, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory.
  - i. For tenure, promotion and PAI, faculty must evidence mentorship of at least four semesters as the primary mentor/co-primary mentor of a student. These semesters would be counted as "per student semesters" (*e.g.*, one graduate student for 4 semesters would be the equivalent of 4 graduate students for a single semester, or two undergraduates for two semesters each, etc.).

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

Items listed as criteria for the evaluation of Research/Creative Activity are listed in Table 1, and the minimum activity requirements needed to achieve retention, tenure and promotion are listed in Table 2.

### ***1. Categories of materials and activities:***

Table 1. Activities included in three categories.

Activities in Category 1	Activities in Category 2	Activities in Category 3
<p>1. Publication, as author or coauthor in a peer-reviewed professional journal, or book, or monograph.</p> <p>2. Receipt of extramural funds from a grant, contract, or award.</p>	<p>1. Receipt of intramural grant, contract, or award</p> <p>2. Research outcome from a semester of M.S. student thesis/Independent study (<i>e.g.</i>, presentation, paper, grant, report)</p> <p>3. Presentation at professional meeting (international, national)</p> <p>4. Editor of a peer-reviewed book</p> <p>5. Contributor to a textbook or manual, as author or coauthor</p> <p>6. Research outcome from a semester of undergraduate thesis/independent study (<i>e.g.</i>, presentation, paper, grant, report)</p>	<p>1. Presentation at professional meeting (regional, state)</p> <p>2. Presentation of invited workshop, institute or similar professional program.</p> <p>3. Submission of an extramural proposal</p> <p>4. Publication in a non-peer reviewed book, as author or coauthor.</p> <p>5. Submission of a manuscript for publication</p> <p>6. Presentation of a seminar</p> <p>7. Submission of an intramural proposal</p> <p>8. Recognition of expertise in one's area, including, but not limited to, awards or special commendations for research excellence or election to professional honorary societies.</p> <p>9. Non-peer-reviewed articles, website materials, review papers, and development of audio/visual materials in conjunction with research/creative activities, etc.</p> <p>10. Participation in a workshop, institute or similar professional program, related to faculty member's area of expertise</p> <p>11. Projects currently in progress (the work shall be documented in as much detail as possible).</p> <p>12. Continuing education (formal or self-study) to enhance skills; documentation should be developed in as much detail as possible.</p> <p>13. Attendance (without making a presentation) at a professional meeting.</p>



Table 2. Levels of achievement necessary for retention, tenure and promotion.

Employment Year/Level	Research/Creative activity	Minimum Required number of activities
1st year	Appropriate	1
2nd year	Satisfactory	2 or 3
3rd year	Significant or Satisfactory (if Service is Significant)	2 or 3
4th year	Significant or Satisfactory (if Service is Significant)	2 or 3
5th year	Significant	3
6th year	Significant	3
	<b>Total activities for Tenure/Associate Professor</b>	13 to 16
Full Professor	Superior	15
PAI	Superior or Significant (if Service is Superior)	15

The requirements for achieving a particular performance ranking for a **particular year** are:

To be evaluated “**appropriate**”, a faculty member should have accomplished a minimum of one activity from category 3.

To be evaluated “**satisfactory**”, a faculty member should have accomplished a minimum of at least three **different** activities from category 3 or at least two activities, one of which must be from category 2.

To be evaluated “**significant**”, a faculty member should have accomplished a minimum of one activity from category 1 unless the faculty member already has at least two category 1 activities from previous years. In the latter instance, an evaluation of “**significant**” requires at least three **different** activities of category 2 and 3, at least one of which must be from category 2.

To be evaluated as “**superior**”, a faculty member should have accomplished at least two activities, one of which must be from category 1.

## ***2. Provisos for attaining tenure and promotion***

- a. Credit cannot be obtained for multiple submissions of a particular publication; and, publications can be counted once, either at acceptance or at publication, not both. All publications must list EIU as the faculty member’s byline.
- b. Post-tenure evaluation for promotion, or a PAI, requires an accumulation of 15 activities four of which must be different. At least two of the 15 activities must be peer reviewed publications for a ranking of Superior; a ranking of Significant requires a minimum of two activities from category 1 at least one of which must be a publication in a peer reviewed publication.

- c. The submission of a particular grant proposal or manuscript can only count once (*i.e.*, multiple submissions of a grant proposal or manuscript cannot be counted as multiple activities).
- d. The term “research” is meant to include only efforts in the field of biology and can include investigatory activities within the field of science education (specifically in biology). With regard to science education, the term “investigatory” refers to activities that test or examine aspects of science education theory (*e.g.*, practice, delivery and outcome). The term “investigatory” does not include course/curriculum improvement (*e.g.*, including the development and application of classroom materials, methods, activities, web sites, new course proposals).

### **3. *Methods of evaluation***

- a. The DPC and the Chair, independently, will assign each faculty member one of four ratings: Superior, Significant, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory (except Appropriate is an acceptable rating for retention in Year 1).

## **C. Service**

Items listed as criteria for the evaluation of Service shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive, and not necessarily specifically required unless mandated by the EIU-UPI faculty agreement, so long as a candidate provides a body of accomplishments appropriate to a given level of achievement.

### **1. *Categories of materials and activities:***

- a. Active participation on committees or councils at the University or professional level, and performance of other organizational duties in professional organizations. Serving as an Officer or as Chair of a professional organization or committee indicates a higher level of activity.
- b. Reviewing professional publications and/or research/grant proposals.
- c. Active participation on committees or councils of the College or Department, including advisement of student organizations. Serving as Chair of a committee indicates a higher level of activity.
- d. Course coordination and preparation without CU’s assigned
- e. Professional consultation.
- f. Specimen collection, preparation, and curation, as well as culture collection, development, and maintenance.
- g. Other non-classroom departmental assignments; including equipment repair, inventory maintenance, and library development.
- h. Service on accreditation committees.
- i. The sharing of professional background and skills outside the classroom setting in such areas as speeches or programs, judging science fairs, and participation in University or community programs and activities.
- j. Guest lectures.
- k. Awards for excellence in Service.
- l. Other documented Service.

### **2. *Methods of evaluation***

- a. All materials submitted shall be evaluated both quantitatively and qualitatively. In general, categories are listed in order of relative importance.

- b. It is recognized that extraordinary service in one area may be of more importance than a broader scope of activities.
- c. Using the information in the portfolio, the DPC and the Chair, independently, shall assign each faculty member one of four ratings: Superior, Significant, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory (except Appropriate is an acceptable rating for retention in Year 1).

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)

