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. The dates below the heading on the first page of the DAC are 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. The DAC continues to include statements that duplicate or paraphrase contract language. An example is the last sentence in the opening paragraph in which the purposes of evaluation are incompletely described. The purposes of evaluation are fully specified in Article 8.1.a. of the Agreement. A better strategy would be to make a reference to the contract. This is consistent with a general recommendation that DACs avoid, where possible, repeating or restating contractual language and requirements. If contract language were to change, the new language would supersede the DAC and could lead to confusion. Therefore, I routinely advise that this practice be avoided and that faculty be referred as appropriate to the source documents. Based on negotiations, contract language can change, and DAC revisions can span more than one contract period.

3. 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.

4. With regard to chair evaluations of Unit B faculty with a multiple-year contract (I.A.1.b.), I note the specification that a single chair evaluation is specified. As structured, the Unit B Agreement essentially requires annual evaluations even for those with a multiyear contract. To do otherwise would deny a Unit B faculty member with a multiple-year contract the opportunity to qualify for an annual merit increase for which there is a contractual entitlement (and to qualify for a PBI based on consecutive annual evaluations). With regard to Unit A faculty, the department is encouraged to consider whether three chair and peer evaluation visitations provide a sufficiently representative sample for a five-year/10-semester evaluation period for faculty applying for promotion to the rank of full professor or for a PAI. Compare this to the requirement to provide considerably more student evaluations during the evaluation period. Consider that having considerably more student evaluations appears to give them more importance even though they are ranked of equal 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.

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

6. In IV. the references should be to the 2012-2016 EIU-UPI Unit A Agreement and to the 2012-2016 EIU-UPI Unit B Agreement respectively or their successor agreements.

Thank you for your conscientious work during the DAC revision process. It is very much appreciated as is the engagement of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology 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 Sociology and Anthropology
University Approved Core Items for Student Evaluations
University Approved Peer Evaluation Form

cc: Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology (with attachments)
Evaluations of faculty members in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, for the purpose of retention, tenure, promotion, or professional advancement increases, shall be based on, in order of priority, three performance areas: (1) Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, (2) Research/Creative Activity, and (3) Service. Clear and concise documentation of activities in the evaluation period is to be placed in the most appropriate performance area of the portfolio. A single activity shall not appear in more than one performance area, unless division of the activity is clearly explained and justified. This Department of Sociology and Anthropology Departmental Application of Criteria (DAC) is the basis of the performance evaluation, reflects the dynamics of the department’s culture and accommodates an evaluation of faculty members’ expectations by, and contributions to the department, the university and the profession. In that regard, “purposes of evaluation are to judge the degree of effectiveness of an employee’s performance, to identify areas of strength and weakness, and to improve employee performance” (8.1.a - Unit A; 8 - Unit B), encouraging pursuit of the higher-order activities valued by the culture and the tradition of the department.

Categories of materials and activities listed in the DAC represent extended but not exhaustive examples for evaluation of departmental members, and all categorical activities are listed in order of their relative importance.

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

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

1. Categories of Materials and Activities
   a. Faculty course evaluation results using the university-approved instrument. Any alternative instrument must contain both the university and departmental core items. All faculty members (tenured, tenure-track, annually contracted; full-time, part-time) will ensure that student course evaluations are conducted in all courses taught in each academic term using the university-approved instrument. This or any instrument used must include at least one item assessing the adequacy of the faculty member’s English language skills.

   Inclusion of written comments by students is at the discretion of the faculty member. If comments are included, all comments from all courses taught during the evaluation period must be included.

   Completed evaluations will be returned immediately to the departmental office to be sealed and delivered in a timely manner to Testing Services by either the chair or the departmental secretary. All evaluations must be conducted within the last two weeks of each semester, unless administratively mandated otherwise.

   Student course evaluations must be administered by a faculty member or secretary in the Department of Sociology & Anthropology unless the chair approves of an alternative.
The evaluator will read the following directions to the class:

- These evaluations are conducted to assess the performance of the instructor as a teacher in the Department of Sociology & Anthropology.
- The results are weighed seriously in determining retention, promotion and tenure.
- Please feel free to honestly respond to the questions and to offer written comments on the back of the evaluation form.
- Your evaluation is completely anonymous.
- The teacher will not have access to your evaluation until after your grades are submitted.

b. Each Unit A faculty member seeking retention or tenure, and each Unit B faculty member seeking reappointment, will invite the chair and a tenured faculty member of the department to visit at least one class during the current evaluation period. These visitors shall provide written evaluation, using the Approved University Peer Evaluation Form.

Each Unit A faculty member seeking promotion or professional advancement increase (PAI) will invite the chair and a tenured faculty member of the department to visit at least 3 classes from different semesters during the multiple-year evaluation period. These visitors shall provide written evaluation, using the Approved University Peer Evaluation Form.

Each Unit B faculty member holding a multi-year contract shall be evaluated by the chair once in that contract period.

c. Course-related documents, including all syllabi, and other representative teaching materials (e.g., handouts and power-point slides).

d. Student advisement or similar activities (e.g., 4+4 teaching).

e. Participation in interdisciplinary, interdepartmental and intercollegiate instruction.

f. Development of technology-delivered instruction (web courses).

g. Contribution to the department via curriculum revision/course development.

h. Participation in instructional and other outreach activities, including student mentoring, recruitment or off-campus instruction.

i. Continuing education to enhance teaching skills or substantive areas.

2. Relative Importance

Items above are listed in approximate order of relative importance. However, the tenured faculty member (of the department), chair, and student evaluations carry equal weight (i.e. 1/3, 1/3, 1/3) for both Unit A and Unit B faculty.

B. Research/Creative Activity

1. Categories of Materials and Activities

a. Publications
   (1) Books and/or refereed journal articles
   (2) Chapters in books and/or non-refereed journal articles
   (3) Book reviews
   (4) Proceedings of professional meetings

b. Papers presented at national/regional meetings

c. Grants/contracts from national/regional-level entities such as the NSF

d. Grants/contracts from state-level entities
e. Papers presented at state meetings
f. Grants/contracts from local entities
g. Papers/presentations for local organizations
h. Grants/contracts from campus entities
i. Continuing education to enhance research skills

2. Relative Importance
   Items listed above are in approximate order of relative importance.

C. Service

1. Categories of Materials and Activities
   a. Serving in a leadership position for an international, national, regional or state organization
   b. Serving in a leadership position for a university council/committee
   c. Serving on a committee of a national or regional organization
   d. Serving on a university council/committee
   e. Serving on departmental committees requiring considerable time/effort
   f. Paper sessions organized, chaired or discussed at national/regional meetings
   g. Reviewing/refereeing manuscripts for publication
   h. Serving as advisors/sponsors of student organizations
   i. Seminars/workshops/consulting provided
   j. Reviewing/editing manuscripts of colleagues
   k. Serving as a member with professional expertise on community/public committees
   l. Serving on departmental committees not demanding considerable time/effort
   m. Continuing education to enhance/learn service skills

II. Methods of Evaluation to be Used, by Performance Area

A. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

Using the criteria and methods described below, a faculty member’s teaching/performance of primary duties will be evaluated as either superior, highly effective, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory performance.

All members of the DPC and the chair of the department will independently review the documentation of teaching/performance of primary duties submitted by the candidate. These reviewers may request written statements addressing the quality of teaching/primary duties from peers and professionals within and outside the department who are familiar with the candidate’s performance.

1. Student Evaluation

For all student course evaluations or other identically-scaled evaluation instrument, a statistical summary (mean of medians) shall be submitted with each evaluation conducted. Generally, a rating (mean of medians) of 3.00-3.49, overall, is necessary for satisfactory performance; 3.50-3.99 for highly effective; and 4.00-5.00 for superior performance. However, such ratings, by themselves, are not absolute and are not sufficient for evaluation, but are further evaluated within the context of classroom visitation reports, teaching materials and other demonstration of primary duties.
In assessing teaching effectiveness, evaluators shall consider such factors as: size of class, the level of the class (lower division, upper division); required or elective status of class; number of writing intensive classes; whether students are primarily majors in sociology; and, innovative pedagogical techniques and new course development. Reference to both the technical and pedagogical aspects of distance learning shall be made for distance learning assignments reviewed by the chair and a tenured faculty member of the department.

The DPC and the chair, independently, will review the student summary tabulations of Unit A faculty and may discuss them with the faculty member. At the departmental level, only the chair receives and reviews Unit B evaluations, and may discuss them with the faculty member.

2. Classroom Visitation Reports

Teaching will be evaluated using the Approved University Peer Evaluation Form. Each visitation report shall evaluate the faculty member’s effectiveness in teaching/primary duties as unsatisfactory, satisfactory, highly effective, or superior with reference to the performance standards specified in this document.

3. Course Related Documents & Teaching Materials

All Unit A and B faculty are expected to provide representative course materials for courses which students have evaluated or in which a classroom visitation has taken place. Faculty are also encouraged to contextualize their teaching through a personal narrative describing their teaching efforts over the evaluation period. Relative to Unit A faculty, members of the DPC will review the materials in conjunction with their review of student course evaluations of teaching. At the departmental level, only the chair will review the course-related documents of Unit B faculty.

4. Interdisciplinary, Interdepartmental and Intercollegiate Instruction

All faculty involved in such cross-disciplinary, team activities related to teaching are expected to submit their student course evaluations and their course-related documents, as detailed in II.A.1 and 3 above.

5. Web-enhanced/Web-based Courses

Any faculty member who develops and teaches a web-based course is expected to provide summary documentation of work to develop those courses. Electronic delivery of student evaluation instrument is accommodated by Testing and Assessment, and all faculty teaching on-line courses will avail themselves of this opportunity.

Web Course instructors will provide a tenured faculty member of the department and chair with their course syllabus and examples of their tests as well as electronic access to the course so that at least one class/lesson may be visited electronically to evaluate the class.

6. Curriculum Revision/Development

Any faculty member directly involved in substantial course revision, coordination with other courses for purposes of sequencing, or course development shall submit appropriate documentation enabling assessment of such activity. More broadly-
based revision of the sociology/anthropology curriculum occurring by way of the department curriculum committee should be reported and documented under service.

7. Instructional and Outreach Activities

All faculty involved in off-campus instruction are expected to document teaching effectiveness in those courses as they would for on-campus instruction in terms of documentation to be submitted for evaluation. All faculty involved in student mentoring or recruitment are expected to submit such documentation to assess the quality of student participation.

8. Continuing Education to Enhance Teaching Skills

All Unit A and Unit B faculty are expected to provide summary contents and performance indicators as documentation for continuing education taken to enhance teaching skills.

TEACHING PERFORMANCE
UNIT A AND UNIT B FACULTY

*Level I:* Evidence of *satisfactory* performance in the area of teaching/primary duties will be based upon, but is not limited to the following:

1. Faculty course evaluation reports from university-approved instrument of all assigned classes (see: II.1).
2. Classroom visitation reports indicating attainment of the "satisfactory" level of overall teaching performance.
3. Submission of course-related documents.
4. Evidence of office hours maintained as posted.

*Level II:* Evidence of *highly effective* performance in the area of teaching/primary duties will be based upon, but is not limited to the following:

1. Faculty course evaluation reports from university-approved instrument of all assigned classes (see: II.1).
2. Classroom visitation reports indicating attainment of the "highly effective" level of overall teaching performance.
3. See #3 above.
4. See #4 above.
5. Evidence of thorough student advisement, academic counseling/referral, internship coordinating or supervision of independent studies.
6. Evidence of successfully pursuing continuing education to enhance teaching skills.

*Level III:* Evidence of *superior* performance in the area of teaching/primary duties will be
based upon, but is not limited to the following.

1. Faculty course evaluation reports from university-approved instrument of all assigned classes (see: II.1).

2. Classroom visitation reports indicating “superior performance” in overall teaching performance

3. See #3 above.

4. See #4 above.

5. See #5 above

6. Evidence of developing web-based courses or superior evaluation of web-based courses.

B. Research/Creative Activity

Using the criteria and the following materials, a faculty member will be evaluated as having achieved superior, significant, satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance in research/creative activity.

All members of the DPC and the chair of the department will independently review the creative work and the documentation of research activity submitted by the candidate. These reviewers may request written statements as to the quality of the material from peers and professionals within and outside the department, with the knowledge and consent of the candidate, and may discuss the creative work/research with the candidate. Reviewers may give further consideration to the potential impact of teaching load on research/creative activity.

RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY

*L*evel I. Evidence of *satisfactory* performance in the area of research/creative activity may include, but is not limited to the following:

1. Evidence of papers presented at national or regional conferences.

2. Evidence of grants and contracts applied for and/or received.

3. Evidence of continuing education to enhance research skills.

*L*evel II. Evidence of *significant* performance in the area of research/creative activity may include, but is not limited to the following:

1. Evidence of publication(s) which may include:
   a. Books and/or refereed journal articles
   b. Chapters in books and/or non-refereed journal articles
   c. Book reviews
   d. Proceedings of professional meetings

2. Evidence of papers presented at national and regional meetings.
3. Evidence of grants and contracts received.

4. Evidence of continuing education to enhance research skills.

*Level III.* Evidence of superior performance in the area of research/creative activity may include, but is not limited to the following:

1. Evidence of publication(s) from the following array, which may include, but is not limited to Level II.1.a., with additional consideration given to senior/sole authorship.
   a. Books and/or refereed journals.
   b. Chapters in books and/or non-refereed journal articles.
   c. Book reviews.
   d. Proceedings of professional meetings.

2. Evidence of a substantial number of papers presented at national and regional meetings, as deemed by the DPC in the context of the profession and peer institutions. A substantial number of papers (in the aggregate) will be expected for probationary faculty and those seeking promotion, however, for an annual evaluation, one paper presented at a national or regional meeting will suffice, in conjunction with other evidence from Level III 1.

3. Consideration will be given to faculty who show progress toward a multi-year project.

4. Evidence of a pattern of success as primary investigator or co-primary investigator in securing and administering grants or contracts.

5. Evidence of continuing education to enhance research skills.

C. Service

Using the criteria and the following materials, a faculty member will be evaluated as having achieved superior, significant, satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance in service.

All members of the DPC and the chair of the department will independently review the documentation of service activities submitted by the candidate. These reviewers may request written statements addressing the quality of service from peers and professionals within and outside the department who are familiar with the candidate's service. Reviewers may give further consideration to the potential impact of teaching load on service.

**SERVICE PERFORMANCE**

*Level I.* Evidence of satisfactory performance in the area of service should include evidence of engagement in both departmental service requiring considerable time/effort and service within the larger EIU community, discipline, and or broader social community that reflects appropriate professional training, interest or need.

a. Serving in a leadership position for an international, national, regional or state organization
b. Serving in a leadership position for a university council/committee
c. Serving on a committee of a national or regional organization
d. Serving on a university council/committee
e. Serving on departmental committees requiring considerable time/effort
f. Paper sessions organized, chaired or discussed at national/regional meetings

g. Reviewing/refereeing manuscripts for publication

h. Serving as advisors/sponsors of student organizations

i. Seminars/workshops/consulting provided

j. Reviewing/editing manuscripts of colleagues

k. Serving as a member with professional expertise on community/public committees

l. Serving on departmental committees not demanding considerable time/effort

m. Continuing education to enhance/learn service skills

*Level II. Evidence of a **significant** performance in the area of service should include evidence of **engagement** as demonstrated by Level I with additionally **either** a **depth** of commitment in time/effort in a particular area or **breadth** of commitment across a wide variety of areas.

*Level III. Evidence of **superior** performance in the area of service should include evidence of **engagement** as demonstrated by Level I with additionally **both** a **depth** of commitment in time/effort in a particular area and **breadth** of commitment across a wide variety of areas.

III. **Relative Importance of Research/Creative Activity and Service**

Research/creative activity is regarded substantially more important than service, and while service is expected and required for retention and promotion, in no instance will even laudable and significant service make up or substitute for deficient research.

IV. For Unit A faculty, applying for retention in a given year, tenure, promotion or PAI, evaluation criteria must be met at the level of performance as specified in Section 8.6 of the 2012-2015 EIU-UPI Unit A agreement. For Unit B faculty, evaluation criteria must be met at the level of performance as specified in Section 8.1 of the 2012-2015 EIU-UPI Unit B agreement.

Departmental Approval: 1-14-2013
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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.

Rev. 2 (September 2, 2004)
In accordance with Article 8.3.a.(3)(a) of the Agreement, I have reviewed the teaching/performance of primary duties of ____________________________ on [date/s] ____________ and considered the following items upon which I have commented and offered examples:

[additional pages may be attached as needed]

1. Command of the 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

_________________________  ________________________
Date                                              Signature