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 21, 2013

Subject: DAC Revision Approval; Department of Physics

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. In I.B., 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-semsester 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 student evaluations for every course taught. Consider that having considerably more student evaluations appears to give them more importance even though they are ranked equally in 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.

3. 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.

4. I note that the department has elected to use online student course evaluations exclusively. This is a bold move that recognizes the demonstrated results of online student evaluations comparable to those of paper "bubble forms" albeit with somewhat diminished rates of return. Experience teaches that how faculty inform their students about student evaluations can influence response rates. The department is encouraged to develop a scripted announcement that faculty can use when student evaluations are available that sincerely demonstrates to students how important their evaluations are to not only individual faculty members but to the continuous improvement of teaching and learning in the department.

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

cc: Chair, Department of Physics (with attachments)

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT APPLICATION OF CRITERIA FOR RETENTION/TENURE/PROMOTION/ PROFESSIONAL ADVANCEMENT INCREASE 2012-2016

Faculty members under consideration for retention, tenure, promotion, or professional advancement increase shall be evaluated in the three areas of (1) Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, (2) Research/ Creative Activity and (3) Service. Of these three areas teaching will be considered the most important. Generally, research/creative activity will be second in importance and service third.

Unit A faculty members will submit a succinct portfolio of materials that document their performance in teaching/performance of primary duties, research, and service. Materials and activities shall be placed in the performance area most appropriate for their consideration. A single activity may not be counted in more than one performance area. Unit B faculty members will submit a succinct portfolio of materials and activities that document their performance in teaching/performance of primary duties. All such evidence should include names, dates, and any other pertinent information. In each area, items contained under I. Instruments of Documentation and II. Evaluation Methods shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive. In the evaluation process the department recognizes the total nature of a faculty member's contribution to the university.

Dissertation or other demonstrable research credits, completed as a part of a terminal degree program, shall be considered in the area of research/creative activity. Faculty being considered for retention, who have not completed educational requirements for tenure, shall document progress toward meeting that requirement. Faculty members are expected to know the relevant articles in the Agreement.

Each area of evaluation requires activities that are completed in a manner and quality acceptable to the DPC. Two of the characteristics considered in that judgment are collegiality and integrity.

Collegiality means cooperative interaction between colleagues. In the positive sense, it means respect, support, and recognition of the efforts of colleagues toward making the Physics Department, the College of Sciences, and Eastern Illinois University reach the highest levels of performance possible. Acts that are humiliating, threatening, insulting, bullying, condescending, or degrading to colleagues, staff, and students are demonstrations of a lack of collegiality. Reports of such actions may be entered into the evaluation for the purpose of encouragement to the faculty member to improve their collegiality. If a pattern of such acts has occurred during the evaluation period and these acts are documented, the evaluation of the individual in the areas of evaluation related to such acts may be lowered at least one step from what they would be if collegiality were not considered.

The Physics Department demands academic and scientific integrity in all activities in all areas of evaluation. An instance of plagiarism, dishonesty, lying, or other act demonstrating a lack of integrity associated with any activity may result in a lower evaluation in that category of evaluation. A pattern of behavior consisting of multiple instances of actions that demonstrate a

lack of integrity during the evaluation period will be cause for an unsatisfactory evaluation in all corresponding areas of the evaluation. For an action to be judged to be an instance that demonstrates a lack of integrity, there must be evidence that demonstrates the lack of integrity and cannot only be a suspected instance of a lack of integrity.

For assigned duties other than research and sabbaticals, constituent groups shall be provided with the opportunity to evaluate the employee as appropriate.

I. Methods of Collecting Documentation in the Areas of Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service

Evaluations shall be conducted using the following materials:

A. Student Course Evaluations

Faculty shall be evaluated by students, using the Physics Department's form and/or the University Student Course Evaluation forms, including the University Core questions. All student evaluations shall be done online using the University online evaluation process through the Office of Assessment and Testing. ~~Student evaluations are to be collected and given to the department chair or secretary by a person other than the one being evaluated. All faculty, including Unit B faculty, are required to administer evaluations in each course section they teach. The DPC may, at its discretion, elect to administer all of the student evaluations in a given semester.~~ All the student evaluations from each course section shall be included in the evaluation portfolio. If students in a class of small enrollment have confidentiality concerns, they may decline to do the evaluation.

Evaluation in technology-delivered courses shall be conducted using the secure, confidential online student course evaluation option provided by the Office of Assessment and Testing, or a secure system (or choice of systems), approved by the department faculty, that ensures that each student is able to submit one and only one evaluation for each course taken. Questions which refer to the technological and pedagogical aspects of the technology-delivered course shall be included on student evaluations for technology-delivered courses. Student evaluations in technology-delivered courses shall be considered relative to the level of technological support, reliability and performance quality of the hardware and software used, and in the context of general student response to distance education versus face-to-face classroom instruction.

B. Physics Department Faculty and Chair Teaching Evaluation Report

For the purpose of retention, promotion, tenure, or professional advancement increase, a written report of the classroom visitation by a tenured member of the Physics Department and by the department chair shall become part of the evaluation materials for the individual being evaluated. Peer evaluators shall use the University Peer Evaluation form (copy attached). The evaluated faculty member is responsible for arranging the classroom evaluations.

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.

For unit B faculty, classroom visitations will be conducted by the Chair.

In the case of all technology-delivered courses, that is, a courses in which face-to-face interaction is not the predominant mode of instruction, the instructor will permit access to the department chair and the DPC chair for observation of course activities using the course web site (or whatever mode of delivery is used), such as discussion groups, chat rooms, and posted materials. Minimally, this permission will allow a one week window of opportunity for the evaluators to make the observations. Evaluators shall refer to both the technological and pedagogical aspects of distance learning in their evaluations of these courses ~~for distance learning assignments~~.

A copy of the evaluation will be provided to the person being evaluated. For Unit A faculty only two evaluations are required per evaluation period (one by a tenured member of the Physics Department and one by the department chair) but all visitation reports must be included in the evaluation materials.

C. Other Peer Evaluation Reports

Additional evaluation reports of any format may be submitted by any tenured or tenure track member of the Physics Department Faculty. A copy will be provided to the person being evaluated.

D. Informal Reports

A written evaluation or critique of aspects of the faculty member's teaching, research/creative activity, or service based upon the personal knowledge and judgment of any other qualified individual, such as a collaborator from outside the University or an employer during a sabbatical, may also be used in the evaluation of a faculty member. Such critique or evaluation will not be superficially obtained but will be supported by thorough analysis. Informal reports shall be obtained with the knowledge and consent of the faculty member being evaluated, subject to the provisions of the Agreement. A copy will be provided to the person being evaluated.

E. Written Documentation

Documentation of all activities listed in the evaluation portfolio content summary shall be included in the appropriate sections of the evaluation portfolio.

II. Evaluation Methods by Area

All materials shall be evaluated both quantitatively and qualitatively. Categories of activities listed below under Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service shall be considered representative and not exhaustive.

A. Teaching

A faculty member will be assigned one of four ratings:

1. Superior
2. Highly effective
3. Satisfactory
4. Unsatisfactory

Categories of Teaching

a. Lecture classes
b. Lecture / laboratory classes
c. Laboratory classes
d. Mentoring students in research
e. Independent study classes
f. Seminars
g. Special topic classes
h. Advising Students

Unit B faculty are evaluated according to their course evaluations, classroom visitation, sample exams, syllabi, other course materials, and other documentation of teaching activities. Unit B faculty can receive ratings of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, highly effective, or superior based on the items submitted. In assessing student course evaluations such consideration as the difficulty of the course and the size and nature of the class shall be considered. Peer evaluations by the chair or other Physics Faculty shall have a greater weight than student evaluations in the determination of a rating.

In addition to student, peer, and chair evaluations Unit A faculty members will be evaluated on documentation of teaching. In general, categories are listed in order of importance however, exceptional achievement in any category will be evaluated appropriately. The documentation is a part of the overall evaluation and that part of the evaluation will be considered as follows:

i. To be evaluated "satisfactory" by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least three activities of types 1 or 2 listed below in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC.

ii. To be evaluated "highly effective" by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least three activities of types 1 or 2 listed below, at least one of which should be of type 1, in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC.

iii. To be evaluated "superior" by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least four activities of types 1 or 2 listed below, at least two of which should be of type 1, in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC.

These rankings and considerations are to be considered in addition to the student, peer, and chair evaluations not in place of them. One would have to perform at the levels listed above AND have evaluations that are commensurate with a final rating.

Categories of Teaching Documentation

Type 1 Teaching Activities

a. Awards for teaching by national, state, regional, or university organizations
b. Curriculum development that will lead to major enhancement in departmental offerings such as developing a new course
c. Being a mentor for a student in research
d. Design, development and implementation of new laboratory exercises or substantial changes to a current lab exercise.
e. Teaching aids developed that indicate significant effort such as implementing special course projects.
f. Major course revisions implemented
g. Seminars, posters, or papers related to Physics teaching given at national or regional meetings
h. Overwhelming evidence of high quality teaching activity

Type 2 Teaching Activities

a. Curriculum development materials that will lead to minor enhancement in departmental offerings such as changes to an existing course within the framework of the existing syllabus
b. Education oriented meetings attended, such as the ISAAPT.
c. Tutorials, special topics, or independent study classes taught
d. Laboratory development materials that will lead to minor enhancement in departmental offerings such as development or redesign of an existing laboratory.
e. Class materials such as solution sets developed
f. Technology based materials indicative of teaching effort
g. Seminars, posters, or papers related to Physics teaching given at local meetings
h. Course revision materials

Additionally, any activity listed in Type 1 will be counted as Type 2 activity if the effort required and the result obtained are judged by evaluators to be significant, but not sufficient for a Type 1 activity.

In assessing student course evaluations such consideration as the difficulty of the course and the size and nature of the class shall be considered. Peer evaluations by the chair, or other Physics Faculty shall have a greater weight than student evaluations in the determination of a rating. Items from the Teaching Documentation will also be taken into consideration in determining the rating of the faculty member.

B. Research/Creative Activities

A faculty member will be assigned one of four ratings (one of five for probationary year one):

1. Superior
2. Significant
3. Satisfactory
4. Appropriate (for probationary year one)
5. Unsatisfactory

i. To receive a rating of "appropriate", during probationary year one, by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least two activities of type 1 or 2 listed below in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC

ii. To receive a rating of "satisfactory" by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least three activities of types 1 or 2 listed below in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC.

iii. To receive a rating of "significant" by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least three activities of types 1 or 2 listed below, at least one of which should be of type 1, in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC.

iv. To receive a rating of "superior" by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least four activities of types 1 or 2 listed below, at least two of which should be of type 1, in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC.

Categories of Research/Creative Activities

In general, categories are listed in order of relative importance; however, exceptional achievement in any category will be evaluated appropriately.

Type 1

a. Articles published in peer-reviewed journals
b. Book published by reputable publisher
b. Seminars, posters, or papers presented at national or regional meetings
c. Grants received
d. Review of papers or proposals as part of an external peer review process
e. Other major research/creative activities

Type 2

a. Articles submitted for publication in peer-reviewed journals
b. Grant proposals submitted
c. Faculty mentored research with students
d. Articles published in non peer-reviewed media
e. Courses taken or advanced books or articles studied to improve research skills

f. Seminars and talks before local groups related to Physics
g. Professional meetings attended

Additionally, any activity listed in Type 1 will be counted as Type 2 activity if the effort required and the result obtained are judged by the DPC to be significant, but not sufficient for a Type 1 activity.

C. Service

A faculty member will be assigned one of four ratings (one of five for probationary year one):

1. Superior
2. Significant
3. Satisfactory
4. Appropriate (for probationary year one)
5. Unsatisfactory

i. To receive a rating of "appropriate", during probationary year one, by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least one activity of type 1 or 2 listed below in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC

ii. To receive a rating of "satisfactory" by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least two activities of types 1 or 2 listed below in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC.

iii. To receive a rating of "significant" by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least three activities of types 1 or 2 listed below in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC.

iv. To receive a rating of "superior" by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least four activities of types 1 or 2 listed below, at least one of which should be of type 1, in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC.

Categories of Service

Type 1

a. Service on national, regional, or state councils and committees
b. Service on university, college or departmental councils and committees
c. Service on union councils and committees, offices held, or contributions to special projects
d. Organizing, directing, or hosting meetings, speakers, or other events
e. Significant amount of equipment maintenance
f. Advisor of appropriate student organizations
g. Community activities and services related to physics, such as the Physics Road Show
h. Seminars and talks before local groups related to the mission of the University
i. Editor or coordinator of departmental newsletter
j. Consistent and repeated recruitment of students for admission to EIU in Physics or Pre-Engineering

k. Judging at national science fairs
l. Other significant service activities

Type 2

a. Attending and contributing to departmental faculty meetings
b. Participation in professional organizations
c. Judging local or regional science fairs
d. Contributing to the department newsletter
e. Recruitment of students

Additionally, any activity listed in Type 1 will be counted as a Type 2 activity if the effort required and the result obtained are judged by the DPC to be significant, but not sufficient for a Type 1 activity.

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT
CHAIR VISITATION FORM

I have observed the teaching/performance of primary duties of
_____ on date(s) _____

Course: _____

☐ Lecture ☐ Lab ☐ Technology Delivered

NOTE: This report is based only on the events observed during the above-mentioned visit(s). It includes mention of all such events that are significant enough to be referenced later in the evaluation process. This report shall be used to evaluate the instructor's command of the subject matter or discipline and ability to organize, analyze, and present knowledge of material. It should also evaluate the instructor's ability to encourage and interest students in the learning process. The chair must determine if the instructor's communication skills are adequate to perform his/her assigned teaching duties. If not, then an unsatisfactory evaluation must be rendered, with specific mention of the deficiency. This report shall indicate whether the faculty member's teaching has been unsatisfactory, satisfactory, highly effective, or superior. (Additional pages may be attached as needed). A copy of this report will be given to the faculty member within two weeks of the last visitation and at least two weeks before the end of the evaluation period.

Rating: _____

Chair: _____ Received by Faculty Member: _____

Date: _____ Date: _____

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT
PEER EVALUATION FORM

In accordance with the Agreement, I have observed the teaching/performance of primary duties of:

_____ on date(s)_____

Course: _____

☐ Lecture ☐ Lab ☐ Technology Delivered

NOTE: This report is based only on the events observed during the classroom visits by the individual reporting. Peer evaluation shall be used to evaluate the instructor's command of the subject matter or discipline and ability to organize, analyze and present knowledge of material. It should also evaluate the instructor's ability to encourage and interest students in the learning process. The peer evaluator must determine if the instructor's communication skills are adequate to perform his/her assigned teaching duties. If not, then an unsatisfactory evaluation must be rendered, with specific mention of the deficiency. Peer evaluation shall indicate whether the faculty member's teaching has been unsatisfactory, satisfactory, highly effective, or superior. (Additional pages may be attached as needed.) A copy of this report will be given to the faculty member within two weeks of the last visitation and at least two weeks before the end of the evaluation period.

_____

Faculty Evaluator Rating:

Signature: Received by Faculty Member

_____

_____ _____

Date: _____ Date: _____

Dean's request for consideration.

I encourage the Department faculty to consider revisions to the DAC that would result in evaluation materials that include:

- Evidence that courses were well-prepared, well-organized, and well-delivered.
- Syllabi with clearly stated Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) related to the course content and, when pertinent, SLOs for Writing, Critical Thinking, Speaking, and Global Citizenship
- Evidence that the faculty member has read and given thoughtful consideration to the feedback from supervisor, peers, and students.
- Evidence that the faculty member included all student evaluations including written comments and evidence that the faculty member is modeling good critical thinking skills related to analysis of the student evaluations of the class. For example a statistical analysis and interpretation of data from all questions on the instrument with comparisons among courses within a semester and comparisons of courses over time, including identification and discussion of patterns, trends, and plans for future modifications based on the student input.
- Evidence of student learning and comments about patterns of students' academic achievement.

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)