

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 Jackman, Dean, College of Education and Professional Studies

Date: April 5, 2013

Subject: DAC Revision Approval; Department of Health Studies

Consistent with Article 8.7.c. 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. Additionally, any reading of the DAC shall be consistent with the *Agreement* or its successor agreement(s).

I note with appreciation that the department faculty amended the DAC in consideration of all but one of the review comments. Also appreciated is the department's expressed intention to continue to review the scoring rubric for the evaluation form in Appendix B.

Thank you for your conscientious work during the DAC revision process. It is very much appreciated as is the engagement of the Department of Health Studies 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; Department of Health Studies

cc: Chair, Department of Health Studies (with attachment)

The following color codes designate which recommendations were made by the different groups that have input into the DAC revisions.

Black – original DAC

Red- HST/DPC revisions based on department and Dean comments

Blue- VPAA comments

Orange- revisions based on VPAA comments

As provided in Article 8.7 of the *2012-2016 EIU-UPI Unit A Agreement* (Agreement), I have reviewed the revised statement of Departmental Application of Criteria (DAC) for the Department of Health Studies. The process for the 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 a few observations which I would ask that you discuss with the department. Specifically, based on my review, I believe that the current revision would benefit from further consideration of the following:

2012-2016 EIU-UPI Unit A Agreement

1. The correct dates for the current EIU-UPI collective bargaining agreement are 2012-2016. When approved the revised DAC will be effective for evaluations done during the 2014 spring semester and thereafter until the DAC is again reviewed, revised, and approved. The DAC review and revision “window” is specified in the current Agreement that expires August 31, 2016. A successor Agreement may, or may not, open a subsequent DAC review and revision “window.”

Revised 11-13-12

Health Studies: Departmental Application of Criteria

Categories of Materials and Activities Considered Appropriate by Performance for Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty

Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

2. The statement under “Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties” on p. 1, should be revised to clarify that it pertains to Unit B faculty and not to other Unit B employees (i.e. academic support professionals). There also is a word missing in this sentence (“as”).

Methods of Evaluation for evaluating performance of Unit B faculty will follow the same guidelines as Unit A.

A. Categories of materials and activities

1. Peer/Chair Evaluations
2. Student Evaluations
3. GROUP A SATISFACTORY
 - a) Syllabi following university criteria, departmental criteria, and demonstrating SATISFACTORY course organization
 - b) Creative activities/materials developed for classroom use
 - c) Evaluative comments from students demonstrating SATISFACTORY performance
 - d) Evaluation of teaching ability by professional peers at the SATISFACTORY level

- e) Teaching load (courses per semester, students per course, diversity of courses)
 - f) Examples of course assignments, activities, and examinations
 - g) Professional development activities to enhance performance of primary duties
4. GROUP B HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
- a) Syllabi following university criteria, departmental criteria, and demonstrating HIGHLY EFFECTIVE course organization
 - b) Evaluative comments from students demonstrating HIGHLY EFFECTIVE performance
 - c) Academic Advising Evaluation using approved departmental evaluation forms
 - d) Internship Supervision Evaluation using approved departmental evaluation forms
 - e) Evaluation of teaching ability by professional peers at the HIGHLY EFFECTIVE level
 - f) Supervision of independent studies
 - g) Activities related to curriculum revision and development
 - h) Application of technology in the teaching and learning process
 - i) Participation on an interdisciplinary, interdepartmental and/or intercollegiate basis (i.e. Giving presentations to classes other than those of primary responsibility)
 - j) Participation in workshops, seminars, webinars, or institutes to develop teaching skills
5. GROUP C SUPERIOR
- a) Syllabi following University criteria, Departmental criteria, and demonstrating SUPERIOR course organization
 - b) Awards or special commendations for teaching excellence
 - c) Nominations for awards for teaching excellence
 - d) Awards for mentoring students
 - e) Development of assessment activities and materials
 - f) Serving on thesis committees and/or Honors Thesis
 - g) Receipt of monies for curriculum development or enhancement
 - h) Student engagement activities including accompanying students to conferences and student involvement with professional organizations
 - i) Evaluative comments from students demonstrating SUPERIOR performance
 - j) Study abroad and national student exchange activities
 - k) New course development, modifying existing courses or developing technology delivered courses
 - l) Achieving/maintaining appropriate professional certification such as CHES, ARC, etc.
 - m) Innovative use of assessment techniques using technology, such as the development of an online test/quiz, survey instruments, class projects/presentations, and surveys
 - n) Evaluation of teaching ability by professional peers at the SUPERIOR level.
 - o) Awards or special commendations for research excellence
 - p) Nominations (other than self-nominations) for prestigious/significant awards for teaching excellence
 - q) Evidence of integrative learning.
 - r) Faculty engages in appropriate recruitment and retention activities.

B. Methods of Evaluation

1. Peer/Chair Evaluations – based on a minimum of 2 ~~classroom~~ course visitations per year, one of which may be a technology delivered course. If a faculty member is assigned more than one technology delivered course then at least one of the technology delivered courses must be evaluated. Faculty must have a minimum of one evaluation conducted by the HST chair and one unit A peer evaluation. Evaluations must be completed during the appropriate evaluation time period and submitted on the departmental Peer/Chair Review Form.
 3. On p. 2 (B.1.), I note the specification for the number of peer and Department Chair evaluations required during even multiyear evaluation periods. Consideration should be given to whether a single chair and a single peer evaluation visitation provide a sufficiently representative sample for a five-year/10-semester evaluation period (~35-40 course sections) for faculty applying for promotion to the rank of full professor or for a PAI. Compare this to the requirement to provide at least three student evaluations per academic year. Consider that having considerably more student evaluations appears to give them more importance even though they are ranked lower in importance compared to peer and Department 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.
2. Student Evaluations - from a minimum of 3 courses per academic year with at least 1 representative from each semester assigned, must include the approved University core and the approved Department of Health Studies core. Student evaluations must be proctored by another Health Studies faculty member or a selected student and the faculty being evaluated must not be in the room at the time of evaluation.
3. Student evaluations for Technology-Delivered Courses must be submitted using the ~~University approved~~ On-line Technology-Delivered Course Evaluation form.
 4. Also on p. 2 (B.3.), the words “University approved” must be stricken from “University approved on-line Technology-Delivered Course Evaluation form.” There is no such form. If the department wishes to prescribe a form, it should be appended to the DAC when resubmitted. (See Appendix B)
4. Evaluative comments from student – if student comments are submitted, all the student comments from any one section must be included, either in summary or as an inclusive package.
5. All materials submitted shall be evaluated both quantitatively and qualitatively. Evaluators have the opportunity to recognize the extent to which outstanding achievement in one component or subset of components may potentially compensate for apparent shortcomings in other categories.
6. Other materials deemed pertinent for the evaluation process may be submitted for consideration.
7. SATISFACTORY performance requires all of the following:
 - a) Peer/Chair Evaluations at a SATISFACTORY or above level,
 - b) Student Evaluations – No minimum scores are specifically required to document SATISFACTORY teaching performance. Typically, median/mean scores on the University and Department core items of the Purdue evaluations that are 3.2 and above indicate SATISFACTORY teaching. These scores serve only as basic guidelines.

- c) At least 2 items from Group A, B, or C
 - d) At least 1 syllabus from a course taught in the review year per academic year in the review period.
5. As written the DAC could be interpreted to mean that for a multiple-year evaluation (i.e. promotion and PAI) only a single course syllabus is required to be included in the evaluation materials. Please clarify this in light of the generally accepted practice of including at least one course syllabus (following CAA-prescribed guidelines) for each semester of the evaluation period.
- 8. HIGHLY EFFECTIVE performance requires all of the following:
 - a) Peer/Chair Evaluations –at a HIGHLY EFFECTIVE or above level.
 - b) Student Evaluations – No minimum scores are specifically required to document SATISFACTORY teaching performance. Typically, median/mean scores on the University and Department core items of the Purdue evaluations that are 3.6 and above indicate HIGHLY EFFECTIVE teaching. These scores serve only as basic guidelines.
 - c) At least 2 items from Group B or C
 - d) At least 1 syllabus from a course taught per academic year in the review period.
 - e) ~~in the review year.~~
 - 9. SUPERIOR performance requires all of the following:
 - a) Peer/Chair Evaluations –at the SUPERIOR or above level.
 - b) Student Evaluations – No minimum scores are specifically required to document SATISFACTORY teaching performance. Typically, median/mean scores on the University and Department core items of the Purdue evaluations that are 4.0 and above indicate SUPERIOR teaching. These scores serve only as basic guidelines.
 - c) At least 2 items from Group C
 - d) At least 1 syllabus from a course taught per academic year in the review period.
 - e) ~~in the review year.~~

C. Relative importance

Categories of materials and activities appropriate for the evaluation of teaching/performance of primary duties are grouped above in levels of effective performance. Classroom evaluation by peers and the Department Chair will be considered above; student evaluations, but all three will be considered the most important with considerations given to such factors as the difficulty of the course, class size, 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.

~~D. Tenure~~

~~Individuals applying for tenure/associate professor performance standards will be used to judge whether an employee's performance has achieved and sustained the required standard by the end of the evaluation period.~~

6. On p. 3, please remove the section headed D. Tenure. As written it is inconsistent with contract language in UA 8.6.f. "For tenure: superior teaching/performance of primary duties, significant research/creative activity, and significant service achieved by probationary year five and sustained through the end of the evaluation period."

~~E. Promotion to Professor/PAI~~

Individuals applying for promotion to full professor or PAI must document SUPERIOR performance in the aggregate during the entire evaluation period.

7. On p. 3, E. Promotion to Professor/PAI repeats a contractually specified standard of achievement. My Departmental Application of Criteria Review and Revision memo advised departments to “[a]void restating contract language (e.g. standards for retention, promotion, and tenure). Use the DAC to specify evidence necessary to achieve standards of performance.”

Research/Creative Activity

A. Categories of materials and activities

1. GROUP A SATISFACTORY

- a) Professional development activities to enhance research skills
- b) Attendance at a seminar, workshop, webinar, conference, or convention at the regional, state, or national level deemed pertinent to the faculty member’s academic area
- c) Graduate Degree research
- d) Evidence of active engagement in research activities
- e) Completion of dissertation research.

2. GROUP B SIGNIFICANT

- a) Presenting a public lecture based upon research expertise
- b) Contributions to professional practice through papers, reports, or participation in committees/organizations, panels, etc
- c) Non-peer-reviewed publications, including website materials, review papers, and development of audio/visual materials in conjunction with research/creative activities, etc.
- d) Writing a published review of a book or textbook
- e) Grants awarded from sources within the university obtained for the conduct of research.
- f) Submission of a grant application
- g) Mentoring student research
- h) Grants awarded from sources within the University obtained for the conduct of research, excluding CFR grants.
- i) Completion of dissertation research.

3. GROUP C SUPERIOR

- a) Awards or special commendations for research excellence
- b) Nominations (other than self-nominations) for prestigious/significant awards for research excellence
- c) Published research in peer-reviewed books, monographs, or professional journals, as author or coauthor
- d) Research-oriented or applied professional consultation

- e) Supervising undergraduate research, independent studies, or undergraduate research awards
- f) Poster presentation pertinent to professional expertise related to health and safety studies at a regional, state, national or international conference or webinar
- g) Serving on the editorial board of a refereed professional publications
- h) Serving as referee or juror for professional presentations
- i) Grants awarded outside the university, or grants awarded by the Council on Faculty Research obtained for the conduct of research
- j) Citation in published works
- k) Presentation of research activities at professional meetings or webinars at the state, national, and/or international level
- ~~l) Completion of dissertation research~~

8. On p. 4, A.3,l), Completion of dissertation as evidence of superior performance in the area of research/creative activity is inappropriate and misplaced because a doctoral degree is a condition of employment for a tenure-track faculty member. Publications and presentations from dissertation research may continue to be considered in the significant or superior groups, as appropriate, but mere completion of dissertation research, although a worthy achievement in its own right, would better be considered in Group A Satisfactory especially in the context of evaluation for tenure and promotion.

B. Methods

1. SATISFACTORY performance will be represented by minimum of 2 items from Group A, B, or C per year during the evaluation period, or equivalent.
 2. SIGNIFICANT performance in the area of research by minimum of 2 items from Group B or C per year during the evaluation period, or equivalent.
 3. SUPERIOR performance will be represented by minimum of 2 items from Group C per year during the evaluation period, or equivalent.
9. On p. 5 (B-1-3), if “minimum of 2 items” also applies to a five-year evaluation period, please clarify that it is a minimum of two items per year during the evaluation period, or equivalent.
4. 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.
 5. Works in progress as well as those completed/published exhibited/ performance shall be documented in as much as possible to provide a base for qualitative assessment.
 6. All materials submitted shall be evaluated both quantitatively and qualitatively. Evaluators have the opportunity to recognize the extent to which outstanding achievement in one component or subset of components may potentially compensate for apparent shortcomings in other categories.
 7. Other materials deemed pertinent for the evaluation process may be submitted for consideration.

C. Relative Importance

Evaluation of research/creative activity will include consideration of: the quality and quantity of research/creative activity in health and safety studies; extent and nature of national, state,

or local recognition of research/creative activity. Items within groups A, B, and C, are not listed by relative importance.

~~D. Individuals applying for tenure/associate professor performance standards will be used to judge whether an employee's performance has achieved and sustained the required standard by the end of the evaluation period.~~

~~E. Individuals applying for promotion to full professor or PAI must document SUPERIOR performance in the aggregate during the entire evaluation period.~~

10. On p. 5 (D. and E.), please see review comment #7 above.

Service

A. Categories of materials and activities

1. GROUP A SATISFACTORY

- a) Attendance at departmental/college meetings
- b) The sharing of professional expertise and skills outside the classroom setting.
- c) Service to university or community programs and activities
- d) Serving on departmental committees
- e) Professional development activities to enhance service opportunities and skills

2. GROUP B SIGNIFICANT

- a) Assist with student organizations
- b) Involvement with local, state, regional or national organizations
- c) Departmental student recruitment activities
- d) Inventory and/or maintain equipment/supplies for department
- e) Service on departmental committees with documentation of significant activity.

3. GROUP C SUPERIOR

- a) Awards or special commendations for service contributions.
- b) Nominations (other than self-nominations) for significant/prestigious awards for service contributions
- c) Serving on a college/university committees
- d) Serving in a leadership capacity on departmental/college/university committees
- e) Serving in a leadership capacity on a local, state, regional or national professional organizations
- f) Faculty advisor to the departmental health honorary (Eta Sigma Gamma)
- g) Professional participation and contribution to health or safety-related community-wide organizations or provide consultation to community organizations
- h) University representative to local, state, regional or national organization

B. Methods

- 1 SATISFACTORY performance will be represented by minimum of 2 items from Group A, B, or C per year during the evaluation period, or equivalent.
- 2 SIGNIFICANT performance will be represented by minimum of 2 items from Group B or C per year during the evaluation period, or equivalent.

- 3 SUPERIOR performance will be represented by minimum of 2 items from Group C per year during the evaluation period, or equivalent.
11. On p. 6 (B.1-3), if “minimum of 2 items” also applies to a five-year evaluation period, please clarify that it is a minimum of two items per year during the evaluation period, or equivalent.
4. 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.
5. All materials submitted shall be evaluated both quantitatively and qualitatively. Evaluators have the opportunity to recognize the extent to which outstanding achievement in one component or subset of components may potentially compensate for apparent shortcomings in other categories.
6. Other materials deemed pertinent for the evaluation process may be submitted for consideration.

C. Relative Importance

Evaluation of service activity will include consideration of: the quality and quantity of service activity in health and safety studies; extent and nature of national, state, or local recognition of service activity; extent and nature of participation in professional organizations. Items within groups A, B, and C, are not listed by relative importance.

~~D. Individuals applying for tenure/associate professor performance standards will be used to judge whether an employee’s performance has achieved and sustained the required standard by the end of the evaluation period.~~

~~E. Individuals applying for promotion to full professor or PAI must document SUPERIOR performance in the aggregate during the entire evaluation period.~~

12. On p. 6 (D. and E.), please see review comment #7 above.

APPENDIX A
 EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
 COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL STUDIES
 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH STUDIES

APPROVED UNIVERSITY PEER/CHAIRPERSON EVALUATION FORM

In accordance with Article 8.3.a.(3) (a) of the *Agreement*, I have reviewed the teaching/performance of primary duties of _____ within the following course _____, on _____ and considered the following items upon which I have commented and offered examples:

[additional pages may be attached as needed]

In addition to a narrative description, please use the following scale to respond to the statements below:

5 4 3 2 1
 Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
The instructor demonstrates:					
1. Command of subject matter or discipline	5	4	3	2	1
2. Oral English proficiency (as mandated by Illinois statute)	5	4	3	2	1
3. Ability to organize knowledge or material for teaching and learning	5	4	3	2	1
4. Ability to analyze knowledge or material for teaching and learning	5	4	3	2	1
5. Ability to present knowledge or material for teaching and learning	5	4	3	2	1
6. Ability to encourage and interest students in the learning process	5	4	3	2	1

Overall I would rate this instructor's teaching as _____.

Signature

Date

APPENDIX B
 EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
 COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL STUDIES
 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH STUDIES

~~APPROVED UNIVERSITY~~ PEER/CHAIRPERSON EVALUATION FORM FOR
 TECHNOLOGY DELIVERED CLASSES

13. In Appendix B, remove the words "APPROVED UNIVERSITY" from the title of the form. There is no approved University peer/chairperson evaluation form for technology-delivered classes. Also, you may want to correct the spelling of "delivered" in the title.

		Does
--	--	------

	Meets Standard 1	Not Meet Standard 0
1. The overall design of the course, including online and face-to-face (in the case of hybrid courses) components such as navigational information and course, instructor, and student information, is made clear to the student at the beginning of the course.		
2. Learning objectives are clearly defined and explained. They assist the student to focus learning activities.		
3. Assessment strategies use established ways to measure effective learning, assess student progress by reference to stated learning objectives, and are designed as essential to the learning process.		
4. Instructional materials are sufficiently comprehensive to achieve announced objectives and learning outcomes and are prepared by qualified persons competent in their fields.		
5. The effective design of instructor-student interaction, meaningful student cooperation, and student-content interaction is essential to student motivation, intellectual commitment, and personal development.		
6. To enhance student learning, course technology enriches instruction, fosters student interactivity, and increases access to instructional materials and resources.		
7. Courses are effectively supported for students through fully accessible modes of delivery, resources, and student support.		
8. The face-to-face, electronic, and online course components are accessible to all students.		
TOTAL		
7-8 = Superior, 5-6 = Highly Effective, 3-4 = Satisfactory, 0-2 = Unsatisfactory		

14. Also pertaining to Appendix B, the faculty are asked to consider whether a course that meets only three of the eight criteria can be truly be considered “satisfactory.”

The faculty have decided to retain the current scoring rubric and will conduct a review of scores once the form has been applied in the next DAC review cycle.

During the review of the DAC, it was clear that the faculty considered and incorporated integrative learning and online teaching in the materials and methods of evaluation. These were requests in my Departmental Application of Criteria Review and Revision memo of September 21, 2012, and the department faculty’s work in this regard is sincerely appreciated.

I look forward to receiving a further revision of the DAC after you have discussed the observations described above with the department. So that we might keep as close to the DAC

revision/approval schedule as possible, please forward this revision by April 2, 2013. Along with the resubmission of the DAC, it would help me to receive (preferable in electronic form) your analysis and recommendation as well as that of the department chair including a description of what further changes are incorporated in the revised resubmission.

If you would like to discuss any of these observations before proceeding, I would be pleased to do so.

APPENDIX C
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH STUDIES
STUDENT ACADEMIC ADVISING EVALUATION

Please respond to the questions below.

1. Current Status: A) freshman B) sophomore C) junior D) senior
2. My major is: A) Community Health Option

B) School Health, with Teacher Certification

	5 Strongly Agree	4 Agree	3 Undecided	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree			
				<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
3.				5	4	3	2	1
4.				5	4	3	2	1
5.				5	4	3	2	1
6.				5	4	3	2	1
7.				5	4	3	2	1
8.				5	4	3	2	1
9.				5	4	3	2	1
10.				5	4	3	2	1
11.								

APPENDIX D
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH STUDIES
DEPARTMENT INTERN COORDINATOR EVALUATION

(If the statement does not apply to you, leave it blank.)

Name of Department Intern Coordinator:

Please rate your experiences with the HST Department Intern Coordinator and internship process using the following scale:

E=Excellent VG=Very Good G=Good F=Fair P=Poor

1. Internship website application process (forms and procedures).

E VG G F P

2. Coordinator's assistance in finding an internship.

E VG G F P

3. Coordinator's explanations of expectations, responsibilities, and deadlines.

E VG G F P

4. Communication between the coordinator and student.

E VG G F P

5. Coordinator's overall organization.

E VG G F P

6. Overall assessment of the internship coordinator.

E VG G F P

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)