Consistent with Article 8.7.c. of the 2012-2016 EIU-UPU Unit A Agreement (Agreement), the attached revised statement of Departmental Application of Criteria (DAC) is approved. This approval is consistent with your recommendation and is effective for evaluations commencing in January, 2014. Additionally, any reading of the DAC shall be consistent with the Agreement or its successor agreement(s).

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

Thank you for your conscientious work during the DAC revision process. It is very much appreciated as is the engagement of the Department of Health Studies in the discussion and consideration of the DAC revision. The department is encouraged to continue to include in its various discussions the academic goals that have been articulated for the University.

attachment: Revised DAC; Department of Health Studies

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

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

Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

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

A. Categories of materials and activities

1. Peer/Chair Evaluations
2. Student Evaluations
3. GROUP A SATISFACTORY
   a) Syllabi following university criteria, departmental criteria, and demonstrating SATISFACTORY course organization
   b) Creative activities/materials developed for classroom use
   c) Evaluative comments from students demonstrating SATISFACTORY performance
   d) Evaluation of teaching ability by professional peers at the SATISFACTORY level
   e) Teaching load (courses per semester, students per course, diversity of courses)
   f) Examples of course assignments, activities, and examinations
   g) Professional development activities to enhance performance of primary duties

4. GROUP B HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
   a) Syllabi following university criteria, departmental criteria, and demonstrating HIGHLY EFFECTIVE course organization
   b) Evaluative comments from students demonstrating HIGHLY EFFECTIVE performance
   c) Academic Advising Evaluation using approved departmental evaluation forms
   d) Internship Supervision Evaluation using approved departmental evaluation forms
   e) Evaluation of teaching ability by professional peers at the HIGHLY EFFECTIVE level
   f) Supervision of independent studies
   g) Activities related to curriculum revision and development
   h) Application of technology in the teaching and learning process
   i) Participation on an interdisciplinary, interdepartmental and/or intercollegiate basis (i.e. Giving presentations to classes other than those of primary responsibility)
   j) Participation in workshops, seminars, webinars, or institutes to develop teaching skills

5. GROUP C SUPERIOR
   a) Syllabi following University criteria, Departmental criteria, and demonstrating SUPERIOR course organization
   b) Awards or special commendations for teaching excellence
c) Nominations for awards for teaching excellence
d) Awards for mentoring students
e) Development of assessment activities and materials
f) Serving on thesis committees and/or Honors Thesis
g) Receipt of monies for curriculum development or enhancement
h) Student engagement activities including accompanying students to conferences and student involvement with professional organizations
i) Evaluative comments from students demonstrating SUPERIOR performance
j) Study abroad and national student exchange activities
k) New course development, modifying existing courses or developing technology delivered courses
l) Achieving/maintaining appropriate professional certification such as CHES, ARC, etc.
m) Innovative use of assessment techniques using technology, such as the development of an online test/quiz, survey instruments, class projects/presentations, and surveys
n) Evaluation of teaching ability by professional peers at the SUPERIOR level.
o) Awards or special commendations for research excellence
p) Nominations (other than self-nominations) for prestigious/significant awards for teaching excellence
q) Evidence of integrative learning.
r) Faculty engages in appropriate recruitment and retention activities.

B. Methods of Evaluation
1. Peer/Chair Evaluations – based on a minimum of 2 course visitations per year, one of which may be a technology delivered course. If a faculty member is assigned more than one technology delivered course then at least one of the technology delivered courses must be evaluated. Faculty must have a minimum of one evaluation conducted by the HST chair and one unit A peer evaluation. Evaluations must be completed during the appropriate evaluation time period and submitted on the departmental Peer/Chair Review Form.

2. Student Evaluations - from a minimum of 3 courses per academic year with at least 1 representative from each semester assigned, must include the approved University core and the approved Department of Health Studies core. Student evaluations must be proctored by another Health Studies faculty member or a selected student and the faculty being evaluated must not be in the room at the time of evaluation.

3. Student evaluations for Technology-Delivered Courses must be submitted using the Online Technology-Delivered Course Evaluation form.

4. Evaluative comments from student – if student comments are submitted, all the student comments from any one section must be included, either in summary or as an inclusive package.

5. All materials submitted shall be evaluated both quantitatively and qualitatively. Evaluators have the opportunity to recognize the extent to which outstanding achievement in one component or subset of components may potentially compensate for apparent shortcomings in other categories.
6. Other materials deemed pertinent for the evaluation process may be submitted for consideration.

7. SATISFACTORY performance requires all of the following:
   a) Peer/Chair Evaluations at a SATISFACTORY or above level,
   b) Student Evaluations – No minimum scores are specifically required to document SATISFACTORY teaching performance. Typically, median/mean scores on the University and Department core items of the Purdue evaluations that are 3.2 and above indicate SATISFACTORY teaching. These scores serve only as basic guidelines.
   c) At least 2 items from Group A, B, or C
   d) At least 1 syllabus from a course taught in the review year per academic year in the review period.

8. HIGHLY EFFECTIVE performance requires all of the following:
   a) Peer/Chair Evaluations – at a HIGHLY EFFECTIVE or above level.
   b) Student Evaluations – No minimum scores are specifically required to document SATISFACTORY teaching performance. Typically, median/mean scores on the University and Department core items of the Purdue evaluations that are 3.6 and above indicate HIGHLY EFFECTIVE teaching. These scores serve only as basic guidelines.
   c) At least 2 items from Group B or C
   d) At least 1 syllabus from a course taught per academic year in the review period.

9. SUPERIOR performance requires all of the following:
   a) Peer/Chair Evaluations – at the SUPERIOR or above level.
   b) Student Evaluations – No minimum scores are specifically required to document SATISFACTORY teaching performance. Typically, median/mean scores on the University and Department core items of the Purdue evaluations that are 4.0 and above indicate SUPERIOR teaching. These scores serve only as basic guidelines.
   c) At least 2 items from Group C
   d) At least 1 syllabus from a course taught per academic year in the review period.

C. Relative importance
   Categories of materials and activities appropriate for the evaluation of teaching/performance of primary duties are grouped above in levels of effective performance. Classroom evaluation by peers and the Department Chair will be considered above student evaluations, but all three will be considered the most important with considerations given to such factors as the difficulty of the course, class size, whether the course is required or elective and mode of delivery. No order of priority is given to the remaining statements listed within each level.

Research/Creative Activity

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

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

3. **GROUP C SUPERIOR**
   a) Awards or special commendations for research excellence
   b) Nominations (other than self-nominations) for prestigious/significant awards for research excellence
   c) Published research in peer-reviewed books, monographs, or professional journals, as author or coauthor
   d) Research-oriented or applied professional consultation
   e) Supervising undergraduate research, independent studies, or undergraduate research awards
   f) Poster presentation pertinent to professional expertise related to health and safety studies at a regional, state, national or international conference or webinar
   g) Serving on the editorial board of a refereed professional publications
   h) Serving as referee or juror for professional presentations
   i) Grants awarded outside the university, or grants awarded by the Council on Faculty Research obtained for the conduct of research
   j) Citation in published works
   k) Presentation of research activities at professional meetings or webinars at the state, national, and/or international level

**B. Methods**

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

2. **SIGNIFICANT** performance in the area of research by minimum of 2 items from Group
B or C per year during the evaluation period, or equivalent.

3. SUPERIOR performance will be represented by minimum of 2 items from Group C per year during the evaluation period, or equivalent.

4. Documentation shall be reviewed in regard to relative quality, quantity and relevance of the efforts to the faculty member’s area of expertise and primary duties.

5. Works in progress as well as those completed/published exhibited/ performance shall be documented in as much as possible to provide a base for qualitative assessment.

6. All materials submitted shall be evaluated both quantitatively and qualitatively. Evaluators have the opportunity to recognize the extent to which outstanding achievement in one component or subset of components may potentially compensate for apparent shortcomings in other categories.

7. Other materials deemed pertinent for the evaluation process may be submitted for consideration.

C. Relative Importance

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

Service

A. Categories of materials and activities

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

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

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

B. Methods
1. SATISFACTORY performance will be represented by minimum of 2 items from Group A, B, or C per year during the evaluation period, or equivalent.
2. SIGNIFICANT performance will be represented by minimum of 2 items from Group B or C per year during the evaluation period, or equivalent.
3. SUPERIOR performance will be represented by minimum of 2 items from Group C per year during the evaluation period, or equivalent.
4. Documentation shall be reviewed in regard to relative quality, quantity and relevance of the efforts to the faculty member’s area of expertise and primary duties.
5. All materials submitted shall be evaluated both quantitatively and qualitatively. Evaluators have the opportunity to recognize the extent to which outstanding achievement in one component or subset of components may potentially compensate for apparent shortcomings in other categories.
6. Other materials deemed pertinent for the evaluation process may be submitted for consideration.

C. Relative Importance
Evaluation of service activity will include consideration of: the quality and quantity of service activity in health and safety studies; extent and nature of national, state, or local recognition of service activity; extent and nature of participation in professional organizations. Items within groups A, B, and C, are not listed by relative importance.
In accordance with Article 8.3.a.(3) (a) of the Agreement, I have reviewed the teaching/performance of primary duties of ______________________ within the following course ____________________________, on __________________ and considered the following items upon which I have commented and offered examples:

[additional pages may be attached as needed]

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor demonstrates:

1. Command of subject matter or discipline
2. Oral English proficiency (as mandated by Illinois statute)
3. Ability to organize knowledge or material for teaching and learning
4. Ability to analyze knowledge or material for teaching and learning
5. Ability to present knowledge or material for teaching and learning
6. Ability to encourage and interest students in the learning process

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

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

7-8 = Superior, 5-6 = Highly Effective, 3-4 = Satisfactory, 0-2 = Unsatisfactory
APPENDIX C
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH STUDIES
STUDENT ACADEMIC ADVISING EVALUATION

Please respond to the questions below.

1. Current Status: A) freshman  B) sophomore  C) junior  D) senior

2. My major is: A) Community Health Option  
                  B) School Health, with Teacher Certification

3. My Advisor was available for consultation when assistance was needed.  
   5 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Undecided  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

4. My Advisor was knowledgeable about curriculum and general education requirements.  
   5 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Undecided  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

5. Information regarding academic requirements was readily available. (e.g. general education requirements, specific major requirements, drop/add, pre-registration etc.)  
   5 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Undecided  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

6. My Advisor served as a source for referrals to other campus services when appropriate.  
   5 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Undecided  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

7. My Advisor was willing, in a timely manner, to find answers to questions he/she did not know.  
   5 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Undecided  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

8. My Advisor has been actively helpful and genuinely concerned about me as an individual.  
   5 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Undecided  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

9. My Advisor provided guidance in selecting courses for the following semester.  
   5 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Undecided  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

10. My advisor was helpful to me in understanding graduation requirements.  
    5 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Undecided  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

11. Please make any comment(s) you wish concerning services provided by your Advisor.
APPENDIX D
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH STUDIES
DEPARTMENT INTERN COORDINATOR EVALUATION
(If the statement does not apply to you, leave it blank.)

Name of Department Intern Coordinator:

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

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

1. Internship website application process (forms and procedures).
   
   E   VG   G   F   P

2. Coordinator’s assistance in finding an internship.

   E   VG   G   F   P

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

   E   VG   G   F   P

4. Communication between the coordinator and student.

   E   VG   G   F   P

5. Coordinator's overall organization.

   E   VG   G   F   P

6. Overall assessment of the internship coordinator.

   E   VG   G   F   P