

# 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: Mahyar Izadi, Dean, Lumpkin College of Business and Applied Sciences

Date: March 25, 2013

Subject: DAC Revision Approval; School of Technology

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. In that spirit, I wish to offer some observations which I would ask that you discuss with the School. The DAC is approved with the following understandings and conditions:

1. The date in the heading on the first page of the DAC could be confusing. As noted above, the approved 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."
2. In I.B. Level I. 2. and I.B. Level II. 1., these items require clarification in the same way that I.B. Level III. 4. is clarified with the phrase, "...not directly related to teaching/primary duties." Also in I.B., a distinction should be made between peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed publications and presentations with the former being valued more highly.
3. In I.C. Level II.4., simply attending is not to be considered "participates."
4. Regarding Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire (Appendix A and Appendix C), the University Approved Core Items for Student Evaluations are to be incorporated verbatim as the first items in all student evaluations in the order listed. Further, on the student evaluation Likert scale, 5=Strongly Agree and so on.

5. In IV.C., because peer and chair evaluations are required in order to determine performance in the area of teaching/performance of primary duties for retention, promotion, and tenure, it is inappropriate for the DAC to remove this requirement for professional advancement increase evaluations. Removing chair and peer evaluations would have the effect of elevating student evaluations to being of highest value, and this is inconsistent with the general statement in I.A. regarding the importance of peer, chair, and student evaluations. Consequently, the last sentence of IV.C. is to be disregarded.

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

cc: Chair, School of Technology (with attachments)

**2013-17 DEPARTMENTAL APPLICATION OF CRITERIA  
SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY**

**The employment obligation of a tenure/tenure track employee is composed of both assigned and unassigned duties and activities. An assigned duty or activity of an employee will be reflected on an assignment of duties form and will receive a credit unit value.**

**I. Categories of Materials and Activities Considered Appropriate by Performance Area and Relative Importance of Materials/Activities.**

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

Categories of materials and activities appropriate for the evaluation of teaching/performance of primary duties are grouped below in levels of effective performance. Classroom evaluation by peers, the Department Chair, and teaching performance evaluations by students will be considered the most important with considerations given to such factors as the difficulty of the course, class size, rate of return, 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. The items listed below for each level shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive because of the diverse nature of the courses within the School of Technology.*

Level I: Satisfactory performance in the area of teaching/primary duties may be evidenced by, but not limited to, the following:

1. Prepares and adopts course syllabi according to Council on Academic Affairs Syllabus Policy 95-69 that includes "course objectives, course outline, or a description of course content, course assignments, projects/papers, grading policy and/or grading scale, attendance policy, evaluation procedures, disability policy, and office hours."
2. Satisfactory classroom observations by peers (School Personnel Committee) and Department Chair.
3. Satisfactory teaching performance evaluations by students as indicated by student responses on the student evaluation instrument.
4. Demonstrates proficient oral communication skills.
5. Incorporates technology-enhanced learning into the classroom.
6. Demonstrates appropriate knowledge of subject area and/or academic field.
7. Uses teaching methods and materials which encourage and interest students in the learning process.
8. Demonstrates appropriate organization and presentation of course material including the use of course outlines/syllabi.
9. Demonstrates appropriate methods of evaluating student knowledge and/or skill.
10. Demonstrates proficiency in and safe operation of laboratory and/or instructional equipment/materials and ensures appropriate safety practices in the classroom/laboratories.

11. Demonstrates effective coordination and management of laboratory facilities.
12. Maintains membership in professional organizations related to faculty member's subject area and/or academic field.

Level II. Highly effective performance in the area of teaching/primary duties may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Highly effective classroom observations by peers (School Personnel Committee) and Department Chair.
2. Highly effective teaching performance evaluations by students as indicated by student responses on the student evaluation instrument.
3. Demonstrates effectiveness in organizing, analyzing, and presenting knowledge and/or materials.
4. Delivers a technology-delivered course.
5. Demonstrates effectiveness in the coordination of academic programs.
6. Participates in revising and/or development of curricula/instructional materials.
7. Demonstrates accessibility and effective involvement in addressing student needs, including academic and professional issues.
8. Participates in relevant professional development activities related to teaching/primary duties.
9. Demonstrates continued performance in preceeding level(s).

Level III. Superior performance in the area of teaching/primary duties may be evidenced by, but not limited to, the following:

1. Superior classroom observations by peers (School Personnel Committee) and Department Chair.
2. Superior teaching performance evaluations by students as indicated by student responses on the student evaluation instrument.
3. Demonstrates leadership in revising and/or developing curricula and/or instructional materials, including developing new course(s), workshop(s), curriculum for special topic course(s), and/or providing leadership for program or curriculum revisions.
4. Develops a technology-delivered course.
5. Directs graduate thesis or other student research activities.
6. Participates in intensive and/or extensive professional development activities directly related to teaching/primary duties.
7. Demonstrates superior coordination and management of laboratory facilities.

8. Demonstrates continued performance in preceding levels.

## B. Research/Creative Activity

Categories of materials and activities appropriate for the evaluation of research/creative activities tend to contribute to the profession and/or enhance professional development. Creative activities include, but are not limited to, inquiry and/or innovative efforts within the field of expertise or profession. The levels below describe degrees of effectiveness. 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. Research/creative activities, which are juried, shall be considered more important than those that are not. In general, completed or published works will be more important than work in progress, except that considerations such as the quality or quantity of the work in progress may deem it more important. **No order of priority is given to statements for each level. Documentation listed below shall be considered *illustrative and not exhaustive*.**

Level I. Appropriate performance of first-year probationary faculty in the area of research/creative activity may be evidenced by, but not limited to, the following:

1. Departmental research as assigned by Chair.
2. Attends appropriate professional development activities.

Level II. Satisfactory performance in the area of research/creative activity may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Attends appropriate professional development activities, including workshop(s), conference(s), and conventions(s).
2. Research activities associated with the pursuit of advanced degree.
3. Research/creative activities not directly associated with teaching duties.
4. Demonstrates continued performance in preceding levels.

Level III. Significant performance in the area of research/creative activity may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Research required by Departmental and/or University committees.
2. Preparation of exhibit(s), demonstration(s) and/or materials for seminar(s), workshop(s) and competition(s).
3. Preparation of materials for publication in book(s), monograph(s), or article(s) in professional journals.
4. Participates in intensive and/or extensive professional development activities not directly related to teaching/primary duties.
5. Research, writing and submission of grant(s) or contract proposal(s).

6. Demonstrates continued performance in preceding levels.

Level IV. Superior accomplishment in the area of research/creative activity may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Actively engages in funded research grant(s) or contract(s).
2. Presentations at professional meeting(s).
3. Research toward the creation of an innovative project or the development of experimental teaching material(s).
4. Publication in book(s), monograph(s), or article(s) in professional journals.
5. Research involved in editing professional materials.
6. Demonstrates continued performance in preceding levels.

### C. Service

Categories of materials and activities appropriate for the evaluation of service are grouped below in levels demonstrating effective performance. Service activities tend to include those efforts that contribute to the profession, the School of Technology, and/or to the University mission including its public service mission. Faculty members should document their professional service activities, and when appropriate, include their time and/or personal resources invested. Both quantity of service and the quality of service as it benefits the University and the general public shall be considered. **No order of priority is given to the statements listed within each level. These items shall be considered *illustrative and not exhaustive*.**

Level I. Appropriate performance of first-year probationary faculty in the area of service may be evidenced by, but not limited to, the following:

1. Participation/membership in School Committees.
2. Assists with planning and coordination of School-sponsored professional activities (e.g. open houses, recruitment, alumni activities, conferences).

Level II. Satisfactory performance in the area of service may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Informs schools, businesses, industries and the general public of the services available through the School of Technology and the University through presentations as a guest speaker, written letters to schools or businesses or industries, distribution of marketing materials, or doing presentations.

2. Participates in the preparation of school publications, seminars, promotional materials, exhibits, etc.
3. Participates in student recruitment activities.
4. Participates in registered student organization.
5. Participates in at least one professional organization as a member.
6. Demonstrates continued service in preceding levels.

Level III. Significant performance in the area of service may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Serves in a leadership role to registered student organizations and/or school/college committees.
2. Presentations to community groups in your area of professional expertise of your major teaching area.
3. Committee membership in a professional organization.
4. Professionally-related and/or University-related work in an advisory capacity with community organizations, schools, businesses, and industry.
5. Serves on a college committee.
6. Demonstrates effective student academic advisement.
7. Chairs a school committee.
8. Demonstrates continued service in preceding levels.

Level IV. Superior performance in the area of service may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Serves on a university committee.
2. Serves in a leadership role in a professional organization.
3. Serves as a consultant at national, state, or local level.
4. Solicits tangible items or services to School and/or University such as equipment, supplies, software, commodities, etc.
5. Organizes a conference, symposia, or seminar at national, state, or local level.



6. Participates on non-academic boards or government agencies when related to the applicant's discipline or to University-sanctioned activities that advance the mission of the institution.
7. Demonstrates continued service in preceding levels

## II. Methods of Evaluation to be Used

### A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

1. **Teaching Performance Evaluations by Students.** The School Personnel Committee (SPC) will administer **teaching performance evaluations** by students during each semester. A faculty member applying for retention, tenure, or promotion must have at least two of his/her classes evaluated each term he/she teaches and at least one of the two classes must come from his/her teaching responsibility within a major in the School of Technology. At least one class has to be evaluated during the summer. The teaching performance evaluation by students will be administered in the last half of the course period.

The approved School of Technology evaluation form (Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire-See Appendix A) will be used. The form includes both the approved University core of evaluation items and additional items selected by the School. Labeled packets with a header sheet and forms included will be prepared and distributed by a representative of the School Personnel Committee for bargaining Unit A and Unit B personnel only. The instructor will leave the classroom during the evaluation. A designated student in the class will collect the evaluations. Special arrangements will be made to have the evaluation packets distributed to off-campus classes. EIU Office of Academic Assessment and Testing will make tabulations. The SPC member-elect is responsible for coordinating classroom evaluations. It is the responsibility of the Chair of the School of Technology to coordinate summer classroom evaluations if the member-elect is not available. Web-based classes in the School of Technology shall be evaluated using the approved form (See Appendix C) until new guidelines and procedures are established by the University.

The packets with the processed instructor evaluation questionnaires (teaching performance evaluations) and printout of evaluation results (the statistical summary) will be returned to the faculty member via the Chair. One copy of the evaluation results will be filed in the office of the School of Technology or Lumpkin College of Business and Applied Sciences. Faculty members must include a copy of the statistical summary and a compilation of student responses to open-ended items for all teaching performance evaluations.



In assessing teaching performance evaluations, evaluators should consider factors such as the difficulty of the course, class size, rate of return; whether the course is a program requirement, elective, or part of general education; and mode of delivery as well as other considerations suggested by a review of representative course materials.

2. Classroom Observations by Peers and Chair. During the evaluation period, each candidate applying for retention, promotion, and/or tenure will be observed twice by a different member of the School Personnel Committee and in different classes with one being unannounced. Also each candidate applying for retention, promotion, and/or tenure will be observed at least once by the Chair, or his/her designee, unannounced. The observations are for the purpose of evaluating teaching. The approved School of Technology Peer Evaluation Classroom Visit Observation Instrument will be used (See Appendix B).

Each candidate is responsible for scheduling observations by a representative of the School Personnel Committee and by the Chair of the School of Technology during each evaluation period for retention, tenure, and promotion. A copy of the peer and chair observations will be given to the School Personnel Committee Chair, SoT Chair, and the faculty member being evaluated within ten working days of the observation. Faculty applying for retention, promotion, and/or tenure must include a copy of each classroom observation conducted during the evaluation period as part of his/her evaluation materials.

3. Course Materials: Candidates are expected to provide course materials for all assigned courses for the evaluation period.
4. Candidates shall include any materials they wish the School Personnel Committee to use for evaluation purposes. The School Personnel Committee shall conduct the evaluation based on the quality of materials presented.
5. The School Personnel Committee shall evaluate the effectiveness of the candidate's teaching/performance of primary duties as specified in the contract.
6. Program Coordination and Leadership: Evaluation will be based on effectiveness of performing the responsibilities published for the assigned position. A copy of those responsibilities must be submitted.
7. Student Advisement: Academic advisors shall submit items such as a list of academic advisees, the academic advisement procedures used, and the results of student evaluations of academic advisement assistance. The School of Technology Academic Advisement Questionnaire form will be used (See Appendix D).

8. With the exception of research and sabbatical assignments, most activities for which three or more credit units per academic year are assigned shall be considered as primary duties for the purposes of evaluation.
9. For assigned duties other than research or sabbaticals, constituent groups shall be provided with the opportunity to evaluate the employee as appropriate.
10. Union duties, responsibilities, and projects may be considered in any of the three areas as appropriate.

**B. Research/Creative Activity**

1. Members of the School Personnel Committee will review and discuss research/creative activity documentation as submitted by a candidate.
2. The School Personnel Committee, with the knowledge and consent of the candidate, may request statements from qualified individuals as to the quality of the materials presented.
3. Research and sabbatical assignments shall be considered as research/creative activity.

**C. Service**

1. Members of the School Personnel Committee will review and discuss materials submitted by the candidate under service.
2. The School Personnel Committee may request written statements as to the quality of service given by the candidate from the appropriate sources involved.

**III. Relative Importance of Research/Creative Activity, and Services**

Teaching/primary duties are to be considered of primary importance followed by research and then service.

**IV. Other Considerations**

- A. Annually contracted faculty will be evaluated in the area of Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties under Levels I, II, and III by the Chair of the School of Technology and the Dean of the Lumpkin College of Business and Applied Sciences.
- B. Faculty members are required to submit documentation of all activities for which departmental CUs are assigned.
- C. Criteria for Professional Advancement Increase (PAI): Departmental criteria will be used with the required performance level of superior in teaching, superior in research, and significant in service; or superior in teaching, significant in research, and superior

in service. Classroom observations by peers and the Chair of the School of Technology are not required.

- D. Performance Based Increase (PBI) for Unit B faculty: Departmental criteria will be used with the required performance level of superior in teaching. At least one classroom observation by the Chair is required. A peer classroom observation may be requested by the faculty member applying but is not required.

Approved by the School of Technology:	January 24, 1989
Amended by the School of Technology:	October 12, 1989
Amended by the School of Technology:	December 3, 1992
Amended by the School of Technology:	November 11, 1996
Amended by the School of Technology:	November 16, 2000
Amended by the School of Technology:	November 13, 2003
Amended by the School of Technology:	February 24, 2004
Amended by the School of Technology:	October 11, 2007
Amended by the School of Technology:	December 6, 2012

Inst# | Course# | Sect# |

## INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

## School of Technology

The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide your instructor feedback regarding the teaching of this course. Using the scale below, respond to each item. The results of this questionnaire will not be made available to the instructor until next semester. Please make additional comments regarding the course on the back.

5	4	3	2	1
Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Fair	Poor

1. The instructor demonstrates command of the subject matter or discipline.
2. The instructor effectively organizes knowledge or material for teaching and learning.
3. The instructor presents knowledge or material effectively.
4. The instructor explains lab procedures clearly. (Do not respond to this item if this is not a lab course.)
5. The instructor is on time.
6. The instructor uses class time to focus on course content.
7. The instructor engages students in the learning process.
8. The instructor encourages careful, critical, and independent thinking about the course materials.
9. The instructor demonstrates proficient oral communication skills.
10. The instructor is courteous and approachable.
11. The instructor is readily accessible outside of class for face-to-face course sections or electronically for technology delivered course sections.
12. The instructor respects differences of opinion.
13. The instructor respects cultural diversity in the classroom.
14. The instructor provides feedback on classroom assignments that is helpful to the learning process.
15. The instructor's course content is aligned with the course description and learning objectives.
16. The instructor establishes clear standards for grading.
17. Exams and evaluation procedures are aligned with what is taught and assigned in the course.
18. In general, this class is conducted in a manner conducive to learning.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

1. What activities/topics were most useful and should be retained?

a.

b.

c.

2. What activities/topics seemed to have the least relevance?

a.

b.

c.

3. What other comments do you want to make about the teaching of this course.

SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY PEER EVALUATION  
CLASSROOM VISIT OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Course: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: Respond to the items below by circling the response that represents your observations according to the following scale:

- 4 = Superior 1= Needs Improvement
- 3 = Highly Effective NA = Not Applicable/Not Observed
- 2 = Satisfactory

1. Instructor effectiveness in:

- |  |            |
|--|------------|
| a. Planning and organizing the activities observed<br>COMMENTS:  | 4 3 2 1 NA |
| b. Instructional methods/techniques used (including display and presentation of class/course subject matter)<br>COMMENTS:              | 4 3 2 1 NA |
| c. Providing effective avenues for written and oral communication of English proficiency between instructor and students.<br>COMMENTS: | 4 3 2 1 NA |
| d. Effectiveness in facilitating critical thinking, independent thinking, or both.<br>COMMENTS:  | 4 3 2 1 NA |
| e. Audiovisual aids/instructional materials used<br>COMMENTS:  | 4 3 2 1 NA |
| f. Establishing and maintaining rapport with students<br>COMMENTS:   | 4 3 2 1 NA |
| g. Supervising assigned activities (Group work; chat rooms, presentations)<br>COMMENTS:  | 4 3 2 1 NA |

2. Instructor appears to:

a. Possess a good mastery/command of the subject 4 3 2 1 NA  
COMMENTS:

b. Effectively analyze and synthesize course/class material 4 3 2 1 NA  
COMMENTS:

c. Require learner participation in safety if a lab course. 4 3 2 1 N A  
COMMENTS:

d. Project professionalism 4 3 2 1 N A  
COMMENTS:

3. In general, the instructor:

a. Creating and managing a learning environment 4 3 2 1 N A  
that enhances student learning in the applicable field  
COMMENTS:

Additional Comments:



## INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

## School of Technology

The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide your instructor feedback regarding the teaching of this course. Using the scale below, respond to each item. The results of this questionnaire will not be made available to the instructor until next semester. Please make additional comments regarding the course on the back.

5	4	3	2	1
Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Fair	Poor

1. The instructor demonstrates command of the subject matter or discipline.
2. The instructor effectively organizes knowledge or materials for teaching and learning.
3. The instructor presents knowledge or material effectively.
4. The instructor clearly explained lab procedures and/or projects. (Do not respond to this item if laboratory activities or assigned projects were not part of the course requirements.)
5. The on-line materials and assignments were posted by the instructor in a timely fashion.
6. The instructor uses online discussions and other media to focus on course content.
7. The instructor engages students in the learning process.
8. The instructor encourages careful, critical, and independent thinking about the course materials.
9. The instructor demonstrates proficient written communication skills.
10. The instructor is courteous and approachable.
11. The instructor is readily accessible outside of class electronically for technology delivered course sections.
12. The instructor respects differences of opinion.
13. The instructor respects cultural diversity in the classroom.
14. The instructor provides feedback on classroom assignments that is helpful to the learning process.
15. The instructor's course content is aligned with the course description and learning objectives.
16. The instructor establishes clear standards for grading.
17. Exams and evaluation procedures are aligned with what is taught and assigned in the course.
18. In general, the class is conducted in a manner conducive to learning.

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

1. What activities/topics were most useful and should be retained?

2. What activities/topics seemed to have the least relevance?
3. What other comments do you want to make about the teaching of this course?

ACADEMIC ADVISOR EVALUATION

Please circle one answer that fits. Feel free to write in additional comments in the space provided.

1. Please circle your major = AET/INT, CTE-FCS, CTE-BED, CTE-Tec, OPD/COS
  
2. Has your advisor been helpful in answering your questions?      yes – no
  
3. Do you feel confident that your advisor can help you with where or how to find answers to your concerns?      yes – no
  
4. Did your advisor show an interest in your needs, or concerns?      yes – no
  
5. Did your advisor encourage you to understand your academic path/degree audit within your major?      yes – no
  
6. Was your advisor accessible for appointments, phone calls, or email questions?      yes – no
  
7. Did your advisor offer guidance, and directions for completing graduation requirements?  
yes – no

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)