

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: James K. Johnson, Dean, College of Arts & Humanities

Date: September 29, 2008

Subject: DAC Revision Approval; Department of Journalism

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. Reference to the DPC (e.g. in the first paragraph of the DAC) is not to be considered exhaustive of other contractually prescribed evaluators.
2. I note in the second paragraph under I. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, that the minimum number of peer and chair visitations/evaluations required for promotion, or PAI applications appears to be two. Consideration should be given to whether a single peer visitation and a single chair visitation provide a sufficiently representative sample for a five-year/10-semester evaluation period for tenured faculty applying for promotion to the rank of full professor or for a PAI. I note further that in I.C.1. only a peer evaluation is during each evaluation period. The department should clarify this apparent discrepancy. And then, in the third paragraph under I. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, the last sentence provides that "peer and student evaluations will have priority over other items in assessing teaching effectiveness..." Unless the term "peer evaluation explicitly includes evaluations by the chair, the DAC could be interpreted in such a way that student evaluations carry more weight than chair evaluations. The department is urged to clarify its intentions in this regard.
3. The department is urged to include course and curriculum development among the materials and activities considered in I.A. for the evaluation of teaching/performance of primary duties.

4. I note II.A. the inclusion of belonging to professional organizations and attending workshops related to the discipline. In most departments, these kinds of activities are considered in the service area of evaluation.
5. In II.B. the word “significant” is a strikeout. The department should make clear its intentions with regard to this construction.
6. In the research/creative activity area of evaluation (II.C.), it appears that internal and external grant applications and internal and external grant awards are valued equally. In most areas, external grant applications and awards are valued more highly than internal grants.
7. I note in IV.A. that the DAC appears to restrict the evaluation of annually contracted faculty to teaching/performance of primary duties. While it is true that annual evaluation of annually contracted faculty is limited to the area of teaching/performance of primary duties, annually contracted faculty members who have not qualified for a performance-based increase based on successive annual evaluations may submit evaluation materials for evaluation for a performance-based increase that document evidence of superior performance in teaching/primary duties, in the aggregate. Those materials may be supplemented by evidence of contributions to the University that are in addition to those contractually required. This should be made clear in the DAC.
8. Contractually, teaching/performance of primary duties is of greatest importance among the three areas of evaluation. The department should provide a statement in the DAC indicating the relative importance of teaching/performance of primary duties and service. This indication should be considered from the perspective of the department’s aspirations relative to the University’s first choice and top of class goals and objectives.
9. Finally, the department specifies criteria for the various evaluative ratings in the areas of research/creative activity and service but not for teaching/performance of primary duties. Is this intentional?

If the department elects to reconsider and further revise its approved DAC in light of the review comments herein, I would ask that they do so no later than October 22, 2008. Thank you for your conscientious work during the DAC revision process. It is very much appreciated as is the engagement of the Department of Journalism 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 Journalism

cc: Chair, Department of Journalism (with attachments)

JOURNALISM DEPARTMENTAL APPLICATION OF CRITERIA

Approved by faculty Dec. 3, 2007

Revisions approved by faculty March 3, 2008

Preamble: All faculty are expected to meet their employment obligations as set out in Article 6 of the 2006-2010 EIU-UPI Unit A Agreement. Evaluations shall be conducted according to criteria set out in Article 8.3 of the Agreement. For purposes of evaluation, a portfolio containing a narrative summary and listing of activities and documentary evidence of achievement and organized in the order presented in this DAC shall suffice. In addition to those materials required in this DAC and in the agreement, other illustrative supporting materials presented should be demonstrative but not exhaustive. The narrative summary, list of activities, and addenda shall be organized in descending chronological order beginning with the most current evaluation period. The quality of materials and activities will be considered as more important than the quantity. Ultimately, the responsibility for evaluating the quality and depth of a portfolio is assigned to the Journalism DPC.

I. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties:

With the exception of research and sabbatical assignments, activities for which credit units are assigned shall be considered as primary duties for the purpose of evaluation. Evaluation will be categorized as Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Highly Effective, and Superior. Activities listed herein shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive.

At least one chair and one peer classroom visitation must be documented for each retention or other evaluation period. A peer is a member of Unit A. All classroom visitations conducted for purposes of complying with the DAC during an applicable evaluation period must be documented in the portfolio for the action being applied for. No more than one classroom visitation evaluation from the same peer during an evaluation period may be considered.

Student evaluations of courses taught during summer semester are required only for classes taught as part of the employee's assigned primary duties during his/her regular appointment period. Evaluators may take into consideration conditions beyond the control of faculty members such as class size, classroom environmental factors, poor quality of technological support, and teaching beyond an eight-hour schedule in any one-day period. In general, peer and student evaluations will have priority over other items in assessing teaching effectiveness of faculty members.

A. For the purpose of evaluating teaching/performance of primary duties, evaluators will use the following materials, activities:

1. Student evaluations
2. Peer evaluations of classroom performance
3. Chair evaluations of classroom performance
4. Syllabi and related course materials
5. Academic advising evaluations
6. Incorporation and use of new and evolving technologies
7. Evaluations of non-classroom assignments for which credit units are assigned*
8. Participation in professional development activities designed to improve teaching and learning

*Activities related to non-teaching assignments, but not directly part of primary duties, may be counted in the teaching, research/creative or service categories. See Article 8.9d(2) of the EIU UPI 2006-2010 Agreement.

B. Relative Importance:

1. Peer and student evaluations will have priority over other items in assessing teaching effectiveness of faculty members.

C. Methods of Evaluation to be Used in Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties:

1. A peer evaluation will be required once during each evaluation period, and a copy shall be presented to the instructor being observed as soon as possible after the classroom visit. The evaluation should reflect the evaluator's perception of the instructor's teaching techniques and general effectiveness. The instrument of evaluation shall be the Eastern Illinois University Approved Peer Evaluation Form.
2. Official departmental student evaluations will be required for at least half of a faculty member's course load every fall and spring term and will be structured to reveal student's perception of the instructor's effectiveness. Student evaluations submitted by applicants for retention, promotion, tenure or a professional advancement increase shall be representative of the teaching assignments of the faculty member. The department's official student evaluation instrument shall be the Purdue evaluation form. The faculty member shall be responsible for

maintaining copies of all student evaluation portfolios and shall provide copies to evaluators upon request. Students evaluations should be kept for the duration of any applicable evaluation period.

3. Official departmental student evaluations will be administered as follows: The faculty member will present and explain the evaluation materials; he or she will ask a peer or a student to be in charge of collecting the materials and delivering them to the departmental secretary, who will deliver them to the Testing Center in a sealed envelope; and the faculty member will excuse himself or herself from the classroom while the evaluation takes place.
- D. Examples of syllabi will be included for evaluation. Syllabi must comply with course descriptions as approved by the Council on Academic Affairs and Council on Graduate Studies, contain learning outcomes that can be assessed, meet standards of the Accrediting Council for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication and be in accord with the department's diversity and assessment plan.
- E. In consultation with the faculty member, the chair shall provide appropriate opportunities for feedback to persons served by non-classroom activities for which credit units are assigned.
- F. Student evaluations of academic advisers will be required once every calendar year.
- G. A faculty member is obligated to submit supporting materials for other items.
- H. All peer and chair evaluations during evaluation period must be included for evaluation.
- I. DPC members shall meet at appropriate times to review materials associated with individual evaluations.
- J. The quality of materials and activities will be generally considered as more important than the quantity.

II. Research/Creative Activity:

For the purpose of assessing Research/Creative Activity, evaluation shall be categorized as Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Significant and Superior. Items shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive. Research and sabbatical assignments shall be considered as research/creative activity. First-year retention criteria for appropriate research/creative activity will include demonstrated potential for achievement of the satisfactory level of performance as described in II.A.1 below. Publication will be given priority over work in progress. Faculty member is obligated to submit supporting materials for items.

The department values and encourages a variety of approaches to scholarship that includes theoretical research, applied research, and creative activities, all of which contribute to the body of knowledge and to disseminating information in and beyond the classroom. These areas are equally important to the department's mission. Theoretical research leads to greater understanding of journalism. Applied research is designed to solve practical problems, improving the field of journalism.

Creative activity contributes to society at large through practical, journalistic research methods that result in exemplary work. All three approaches demonstrate the value of continued learning to our students. The weight that is accorded these materials will be judged by their adherence to professional standards, by their contribution to the profession, by the quality of their execution, and by the distinction they may bring to the university.

- A. Satisfactory Research/Creative Activity will include some of, but not be limited to:
 1. engaging in scholarly/creative work
 2. engaging in work toward a graduate degree program related to the discipline
 3. attending workshops, seminars, conventions, related to the discipline
 4. belonging to professional organizations
 5. contributing to publications for the department
- B. Significant Research/Creative Activity will include some of but not be limited to:
 1. acceptance for publication, exhibition or presentation of scholarly/creative work
 2. engaging in significant journalistic activities
 3. making presentations on campus related to the discipline
 4. engaging in activity related to grants
 5. making substantial progress toward completion of a terminal degree related to the discipline
 6. reviewing and editing journals, papers and books before publication

- C. Superior Research/Creative Activity will include some of, but not be limited to:
 1. publication or exhibition of scholarly/creative work
 2. presentation of scholarly/creative work at regional, national or international conventions, seminars, or workshops related to the discipline.
 3. contributing to published books, parts of books or other scholarly or educational media products.
 4. authoring and receiving a grant
 5. being recognized for expertise and/or creative activity through such means as citations in others' work
 6. completion of an appropriate terminal degree that may include, but not be limited to, Ph.D., J.D., M.F.A., Ed.D.
 7. contributions to the educational mission of the department, such as curriculum revision/development or innovations in the pedagogy of teaching and learning
 8. editing a publication or creating media products for the department, university, community, professional organizations, or other publics
 9. engaging in professional development activities to gain knowledge and skills that further creative activity and research

III. Service:

For the purpose of assessing service, evaluation shall be categorized as Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Significant and Superior. Items shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive. Activities for which CUs are awarded can not be counted under service. First-year retention criteria for appropriate service will include showing potential for achieving the satisfactory level of performance described in 1. below. Service will tend to reflect the expertise, interests and concerns of the faculty member. The extent of such service must be measured in terms of impact upon the department, the students serviced by the department, the university as a whole, the profession of journalism and the community outside the university. In general, service to the larger publics—the community, the profession, the students, and the university—will be given priority in assessing service contributions over the smaller publics cited. Faculty member is obligated to submit supporting materials for items.

- A. Satisfactory service will include some of, but not be limited to:
 1. participating in departmental committees and activities.
 2. judging journalism contests and publication evaluations.
 3. belonging to organizations related to discipline, or university mission or community.

- B. Significant service will include some of, but not be limited to:
 1. heading departmental committees and directing significant departmental activities.
 2. advising student organizations for which CUs are not assigned.
 3. engaging in substantial evaluation of journalism competitions or other activities.
 4. participating in college-level and university committees.
 5. contributing to publications for the department, the university or community.
 6. actively participating in assessment efforts that measure and improve learning outcomes and/or contribute toward meeting accreditation standards.
 7. actively participating in professional or community organizations.
 8. making presentations in classes other than those of the faculty member.

- C. Superior service will include some of, but not be limited to:
 1. heading a college or university level committee/activity.
 2. extensively participating in a college or university-level committee/activity.
 3. providing sustained superior advisement of student organizations for which CUs are not assigned.
 4. organizing and/or directing journalism competitions or other activities on a superior level.
 5. providing sustained outstanding service to the department.
 6. engaging in substantial activity related to assessment efforts that measure and improve learning outcomes and/or contribute toward meeting accreditation standards.
 7. organizing professional seminars, workshops, conventions or similiar activities.
 8. providing leadership in professional or community organizations related to discipline or university mission.
 9. engaging in substantial activity related to recruiting that is in the best interest of the university or the discipline.

IV. Evaluation of Unit B Annually Contracted Faculty Members

- A. An ACF must submit an evaluation portfolio to the department chair containing the materials described below in B. Evaluations will be based solely on Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties. Evaluations will be

categorized as Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Highly Effective, or Superior.

B. Materials Required for Inclusion in Portfolio

1. **Student Evaluations.** A Unit B faculty member must submit student evaluations for all classes taught during the evaluation period. The required process for conducting and handling student evaluations is described in I.C.2. and I.C.3. of this document.
2. **Chair Classroom Visit.** During the evaluation period, the department chair will visit at least one class in order to evaluate a Unit B faculty member. The chair will provide a copy of such evaluation to the faculty member evaluated and a copy of the evaluation must be included in the portfolio.
3. **Syllabi.** A syllabus from each course taught during the evaluation period must be included in the portfolio of a Unit B faculty member. Syllabi must conform to the standards explained in I.D.
4. **Other course materials.** Other materials that document the content and quality of a course should also be included in the portfolio. Such items include, but are not limited to assignments, exams, quizzes, and handouts.

If a Unit B faculty member is assigned CUs for non-class duties, the evaluation of such assignments must conform with the same standards applied to Unit A faculty who have non-class assignments.