MEMORANDUM

Blair M. Lord
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

To: Bonnie Irwin, Dean, College of Arts and Humanities

Date: April 26, 2013

Subject: DAC Revision Approval; Department of Communication Studies

Consistent with Article 8.7 of the 2012-2016 EIU-UIP 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 acknowledge with appreciation the academic contextual statements on the first page of the DAC. The DAC is approved with the following understandings and conditions:

1. In I.A.3.b, please clarify the words “can must” at the end of the first line.

2. In I.B.2, the department would be well served to specify that peer-reviewed scholarship is valued more highly the non-peer-reviewed scholarship, and external grants are valued more highly than institutional grants.

3. The University Approved Core Items for Student Evaluations should be incorporated verbatim first in all student evaluations in the order listed with the Likert scale, 5=Strongly Agree and so on.

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

cc: Chair, Department of Communication Studies (with attachments)
MEMORANDUM

Jeffrey Cross  
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

To: Stephen A. King, Chair, Department of Communication Studies

Date: August 21, 2013

Subject: Further DAC Revisions: Communication Studies

Thank you for your memo regarding further DAC revisions that the Department of Communication Studies has endorsed in response to comments included in Provost Lord's conditional approval dated April 26, 2013. I note with much appreciation that the department faculty have addressed each of the review comments. This is entirely consistent with the intention that the DAC review and revision process involve collaboration among department faculty members, the chairperson, the dean, and the Provost.

To effect these additional revisions, will your office be sending a further revised DAC for publication online or would you like for us to revise the material that we already have consistent with your memo of August 21. Please extend sincere thanks to the department faculty for their engagement in the DAC review and revision process.

cc: Bonnie Irwin, Dean
As a faculty with a passion for teaching, scholarship, and engaged citizenship, we hold ourselves accountable to three principles that stem from our belief that we are a diverse community of faculty and students interested in exploring the complex and dynamic nature of communication in multiple contexts.

- Faculty are expected to provide students with an educational experience that encourages and motivates intellectual curiosity, critical thinking abilities, effective communication skills, ethical responsibility, and sensitivity to diverse cultures. We recognize that such efforts include integrative engagement in meaningful experiences that foster learning beyond the classroom such as study abroad, university honors, integrative learning, internships, practicum, and student research. Such efforts should be continually reviewed and updated to be as relevant as possible to students.

- Faculty are expected to be professionally active, maintaining an ongoing research or creative agenda. We recognize the value of the research process and scholarly engagement, including progress on projects from conception to execution, but also acknowledge the importance of demonstrable outcomes on a regular basis. Such efforts should enhance the quality and reputation of the faculty member and the department.

- Faculty are expected to engage in ongoing, collegial, and meaningful ways of contributing to the department, university, profession and potentially the community. Such efforts should ensure that the work of the department is spread equitably across all faculty and faculty members will be evaluated on the quality of service. In total, service activities should enhance the quality and reputation of the faculty member and the department.

Evaluation items herein shall be considered illustrative, but not exhaustive. As the Department’s large and diverse faculty covers multiple areas, this document gives guidelines for the kinds of material each candidate might submit for consideration.

Except where noted as required in the contract or this document, these materials and activities will differ among the faculty according to their areas of expertise. Throughout the evaluation process, the CANDIDATE is responsible for documenting, in as much detail as necessary, claims made in regard to retention, tenure, promotion, and
professional advancement activities. The candidate is expected to discuss and document as appropriate the contribution and quality of his or her achievement of the above principles and their impact on teaching, research/creative activity and service.

The DPC, along with other contractually prescribed evaluators, will review both the documentation of and quality assessment of activities submitted by the candidate. The DPC may request written statements as to the quality of teaching research/creative activity, and/or service from other professionals in the activity with the knowledge and consent of the candidate. Where activities might apply to multiple categories, the candidate must clearly delineate the category for evaluation. A single activity may not be counted in more than one performance area. The candidate must justify and explain the relevance of any materials submitted which are not identified in this document.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to be familiar with the evaluation criteria and the evaluation process. The department encourages new faculty members, and/or candidates with concerns, to seek advice and counsel from more experienced faculty members. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to meet with candidates who request a meeting and to provide them with clarification and counsel relevant to improving evaluations.

I. Categories of materials and activities considered appropriate by performance areas and relative importance of materials/activities

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties: For the purposes of this evaluation process, candidates for retention, promotion, tenure or Professional Advancement Increase will supply materials to support duties or activities considered primary duties. Primary duties are those which generate three or more CU’s (except for sabbatical and research assignments). These CU’s may be generated either in and out of the department, e.g., coordinators of internship and practicum, forensics, undergraduate and graduate program, thesis or independent study.

1. Categories of materials and activities
   a. The following materials are required to support claims regarding Teaching/Performance of Primary duties.
      (1) Student evaluations, peer evaluations, and chair evaluation of teaching
      (2) Course syllabi and sample assignment (one per class).
   b. The following materials are optional and may be submitted to support claims regarding Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties:
(1) Advising evaluations
(2) Materials related to non-teaching primary duties such as administrative duties
(3) Receiving awards and special recognition for teaching or primary duties.
(4) Receiving teaching grants (on or off campus)
(5) Other documentation deemed pertinent
   (a) Course materials other than syllabi and assignments
   (b) Evaluations from current or former students or other outside evaluators
(6) Developing curriculum and/or course proposals, including study abroad experiences
(7) Developing and engaging in student learning experiences outside of the traditional classroom including, but not limited to, practicums, internships, and integrative learning experiences
(8) Feedback and materials generated from the
   (a) conduct of courses and workshops directly related to curriculum and instruction
   (b) on-campus presentations related to curriculum and instruction
(9) Taking courses and workshops directly related to curriculum and instruction
(10) Invitations to speak at other universities on curriculum or instruction

2. Distance Education
For classes taught solely on-line, the above categories will also apply.

3. Documentation of teaching/primary duties
a. Student, peer, and chair evaluations of teaching/primary duties will be of equal value and considered more important than other supporting materials. The faculty member can request additional chair and/or peer evaluations as needed.

b. Course syllabi and sample assignments/materials must also be included as further documentation of teaching effectiveness.

c. Optional documentation/evidence can also be included such as awards/recognition, grants, etc. related to teaching and primary duties.

d. The candidate may provide documentation of other relevant
supporting material and can elaborate about its inclusion in the narrative.

B. Research/Creative Activity
1. Categories of materials and activities
   a. Published Research
      (1) Books, print or electronic, excluding self-published; Editing a book or journal; Peer-reviewed journals; and Book chapters, including invited chapters.
      (2) Published proceedings (print or electronic)
      (3) Encyclopedia entries
      (4) Non-peer reviewed journals (print or electronic)
      (5) Authored newspaper or magazine articles
   b. Creative/Artistic Endeavors
      (1) Presentation, awards, or publication of materials in peer reviewed venues
      (2) Presentation, awards, or publication of materials in non-peer reviewed venues
      (3) Materials created and distributed for other purposes related to faculty member's academic expertise including community exhibitions, research or creative projects for non-profits, etc.
   c. Grants
      (1) External grant received
      (2) Internal grant received requiring extensive applications
      (3) Internal grant received requiring short, structured applications
      (4) Application for external grant
      (5) Application for internal grant requiring extensive application
   d. Presentations of competitively selected research
      (1) National/international conferences including specialized conferences
      (2) Regional conferences
      (3) State conferences
      (4) Invitations to speak about research on other campuses
   e. Receiving awards for research or creative activity
f. Efforts to improve research or creative skills including courses, workshops, webinars, etc. provided by professional associations or other outlets.

g. Other documentation of efforts to develop one's research or creative activities including the submission of manuscripts, creative works, or grants for review or discussion of one's research agenda.

2. The relative importance of the categories for research/creative activity is as follows:
   a. Published Research and Creative/Artistic Endeavors are of equal value and most important.
   b. Peer-reviewed research and artistic/creative activity are valued more highly than non-peer-reviewed research and artistic/creative activity and external grants are valued more highly than institutional grants.
   c. Grants, presentations of competitively selected research, the receiving of awards for research or creative activity, efforts to improve research or creative skills, and finally other documentation will be considered less important than Published research and Creative/Artistic Endeavors.
   d. The evaluation is an aggregate over the evaluation period. The candidate is not expected to have items in every category.

C. Service
1. Categories of materials
   a. Professionally related service to international, national, regional, or state professional organizations
      (1) Holding office in professional organizations
      (2) Fulfilling committee assignments in professional organizations
      (3) Other (candidate elaboration)
   b. Reviewing research or creative projects. If a candidate chooses to use the subsequent items as research, these items cannot be double-counted in Research part I and Service Part I.
      (1) Reviewer for a journal
      (2) Reviewer for a conference
   c. University-related service in the form of contributions to the academic department, college, and university such as:
(1) Participation in governance, formulation and direction of the department, college, or university programs through membership on Committees and Councils and/or Special Assignments.
(2) Advising student organizations
(3) Engaging in any activity with a goal of recruiting or placing students
(4) On-campus presentations such as workshops, guest lectures, and media interviews
(5) Acting as a fiscal agent or treasurer

Community-related service which is related to the faculty member's academic interest or expertise in the form of activities which aid the varied publics of Eastern Illinois University such as:

(1) Service to non-academic organizations, councils, committees, and/or government agencies
(2) Engaging in activities which advance the university's ability to relate teaching and research activities to community concerns
(3) Serving as a consultant where assistance is a result of the faculty member's expertise
(4) Membership in any international, national, regional, state or local organization

e. Receiving awards for service activities.
f. Other community-related service.

2. Relative importance
   a. In general, professional, university, and professionally related community service (categories a-e) will be considered equal, and of greater value than other service (category f).
   b. It is expected that individuals will document service activities at multiple levels.

II. Methods of evaluation to be used, by performance area: quality as well as quantity of performance will be taken into account.
A. Teaching/Performance of primary duties
   1. Evaluations
      a. Student evaluations for campus, off campus or on-line instruction will be conducted in each of the instructor's sections at least once a semester using departmentally approved forms. Forms will be preprinted or available online for computer analysis of data. Evaluations should be
administered during the last two weeks of the class meetings.

(1) Faculty members should administer student evaluations in a confidential manner. (The office of Assessment and Testing has a secure, confidential online student course evaluation option that is equivalent to the traditional paper bubble forms.)

(a) If preprinted forms are used, the faculty member should designate a student or colleague to collect the evaluation forms and return them to the Department Chair or designee.

(b) The faculty member should not be present while students are filling out the evaluation forms.

(c) The faculty member shall have no contact with the completed evaluation forms until after the term has ended.

(d) Every effort should be made to conduct student evaluations in a neutral environment.

(e) For distance education the above categories will apply.

(2) Student evaluations for campus, off campus or on-line instruction for each academic term during the evaluation period will be submitted by applicants for retention, promotion, tenure, and/or the professional advancement increase.

(3) In assessing student evaluations such considerations as class size, difficulty of the course, whether the course was elective or required, comprised of majors or non-majors, as well as other factors such as experimental teaching approaches and a variety of classroom dynamics will all be taken into consideration. Traditional lecture formats, class discussions, and other teaching methods are all acceptable for evaluations. Courses taught outside the department will be considered for evaluation purposes.

b. Candidates for retention, promotion, tenure, and/or the professional advancement increase will be evaluated by peers (who will be faculty members at EIU and have relevant expertise in the field), including at least two tenured or tenure track faculty members of the department who have been teaching at the university for at least four years. The
candidate will invite peers to a specified class or classes. Evaluators will provide a copy to the candidate and provide a copy to the DPC chair upon request. All members of the DPC will review the reports. Candidates are encouraged to invite peers to more than one class. The candidate or DPC may request additional visits. Forms for the peer review will be generated by the DPC and made available in the departmental office.

c. Candidates for retention, promotion, tenure, and/or professional advancement increase will be evaluated by the chair of the department. The chair will visit at least one class during the period since the candidate's last evaluation. The chair will give the candidate a copy of the written evaluation of the class visited and provide the DPC with a copy upon request. The candidate or the DPC may request additional evaluations. Forms for the chair's review will be available in the departmental office.

d. The candidate may provide evaluations from current or former students, or outside evaluators. These evaluations must include the student or evaluator's name and contact information.

e. It is the responsibility of the candidate to document other activities that generate CU's.

2. In assessing student advisement evaluations, the DPC will consider both quality and quantity of advising. Evidence of informal advising can also be considered in this area.

3. The candidate may submit other documentation deemed pertinent. This may include course materials, special recognition for teaching, chairing an honor's thesis, chairing and membership on thesis committees, etc.

4. The student, chair, and peer evaluations shall contain an item designed to evaluate the faculty member's use of oral and written English.

B. Research/creative activity

1. All members of the DPC will review and discuss the candidate's documentation of research/creative activity. They may request written statements as to the quality of the materials from peers within the department or experts in the field outside the department if the work is not peer-reviewed. Such statements may be requested only with the knowledge of the candidate.
2. The candidate may submit other documentation deemed pertinent.

C. Service
1. All members of the DPC will review and discuss the candidate's documentation of service. They may request written statements as to the quality of service from professional persons involved in the service activity documented by the candidate. Such statements may be requested only with the knowledge of the candidate.
2. The candidate may submit other documentation deemed pertinent.

III. Relative importance
The relative importance of the performance areas shall be as follows: teaching and performance of primary duties as most important, research/creative activity and service as equally important.

IV. Evaluation of annually-contracted teaching and resource professionals.
A. Categories of materials and activities.
1. Required Evaluations
   a. Student evaluations for campus, off campus or on-line instruction will be conducted in each section at least once a semester using departmentally approved forms. Forms will be preprinted or available online for computer analysis of data. Evaluations should be administered during the last two weeks of the term.
      (1) Annually-contracted faculty members should administer student evaluations in a confidential manner.
         (a) If preprinted forms are used, the annually-contracted faculty member should designate a student or colleague to collect the evaluation forms and return them to the Department Chair or designee.
         (b) The annually-contracted faculty member shall not be present while students are filling out the evaluation forms.
         (c) The annually-contracted faculty member shall have no contact with the completed evaluation forms until after the term has ended.
         (d) Every effort should be made to conduct student evaluations in a neutral environment.
      (2) Student evaluations submitted by annually-contracted faculty members shall be from all teaching
assignments both inside and outside of the department.

(3) In assessing student evaluations, such considerations as class size, difficulty of the course, whether the course was elective or required, comprised of majors or non-majors, as well as other factors such as experimental teaching approaches and a variety of classroom dynamics will all be taken into account. Traditional lecture formats, class discussions, and other teaching methods are all acceptable for evaluations.

(4) The department chair will review the student evaluation summary tabulations and may discuss them with the annually-contracted faculty member.

b. The department chair will visit at least one class in order to evaluate each annually-contracted faculty member at least once a year. The chair will give the annually-contracted faculty member a written evaluation for the class visited. The annually-contracted faculty member may request additional evaluations. Forms for the chair's review will be available in the departmental office.

c. Student and chair evaluations of teaching/primary duties will be of equal value and consideration.

d. The annually-contracted faculty member must include a syllabus from each course that he/she teaches each semester, plus any other course materials that document the content and quality of the course (assignments, exams, quizzes, handouts, etc.). These materials shall be taken into account in the department chair's evaluation of the annually contracted faculty member. The candidate is expected to discuss the contribution, quality and/or impact the documented activities have on teaching.

2. The annually-contracted faculty member may submit other documentation deemed pertinent; special recognition for teaching, university and professional awards, department and university service, study abroad, etc. The department chair will review the materials in conjunction with the evaluations and may discuss them with the annually-contracted faculty member.

3. The student and the chair evaluation forms shall contain an item designed to evaluate the annually-contracted faculty member's use of oral and written English.
4. Annually-contracted faculty members with non-teaching duties may submit documentation indicating effective execution of duties.

B. No annually-contracted faculty member shall be evaluated by the chair until the completion of at least one full academic semester at the university. If there is no chair evaluation at this juncture, the first year portfolio will include all other required elements.
### Approved University Core Items for Student Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The instructor demonstrates command of the subject matter or discipline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The instructor effectively organizes knowledge or material for teaching/learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The instructor is readily accessible outside of class.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The instructor presents knowledge or material effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The instructor encourages and interests students in the learning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The instructor is available during office hours and appointments for face-to-face sections or electronically for technology-delivered sections.
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