



February 21, 2018

To: R. Roberts, Chairperson

From: J. Gatrell, Provost

CC: M. Kattenbraker, AVP
D. Bower, Dean

RE: 2019 DAC Revisions

I am writing to thank the department for submitting 2019 revisions to the Departmental Application of Criteria. As required by the EIU-UPI agreement, I have reviewed the materials and am pleased to accept the revisions.

Finally, I appreciate the department's clarifications relative to prior feedback.

**Department of Counseling and Higher Education
2018-2022 Departmental Application of Criteria**

Date Approved by Dept.: 1/16/19
Date Submitted to Chair: 1/16/19
Date Submitted to Dean: 1/16/19
Date Revisions Submitted to Dean: 2/15/19
Date of Final Edit Submitted to Dean: 2/18/19
Date Approved by VPAA: 2/21/19

Department Statement of Purpose: The Counseling and Higher Education Department has established as its mission the pursuit of excellence in the application of professional standards including Student Affairs and Counseling knowledge, techniques and disposition. As such, we aspire as a faculty to carry out that mission through modeling best practice and challenging our students to perform at a high level of expertise.

Evaluation Overview: Evaluation of Counseling and Higher Education faculty for purposes of retention, promotion, tenure, and professional advancement increase shall be based upon BOT/UPI criteria in the three performance areas. In order of importance, the performance areas are

- (1) Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties,
- (2) Research/Creative Activity, &
- (3) Service.

For each area, evaluators will review the documenting material and activities submitted. Reviewers will use the DAC as the evaluation tool to determine the level of faculty member performance. To the extent that it is possible to make such distinctions, the DAC indicates the relative importance of activities and responsibilities. Judgments as to the performance of a faculty member in Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, Research/Creative Activity, and Service must be based on qualitative as well as quantitative assessments. Evaluators may recognize the extent to which outstanding achievement in one component of an area may potentially compensate for apparent shortcomings in other components even if other components are higher on the list.

Evaluation of Unit B faculty (Annually Contracted Faculty) will be guided by the

teaching/performance of primary duties section of the DAC. Evaluations of Annually Contracted Faculty for performance-based increases may be supplemented by contributions to the University that are in addition to those contractually required (UB 10.4.d).

Organization of Portfolios: "The Office of the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs will supply instruction early in the fall semester concerning the applicant's arrangement of such front matter as the Department Application of Criteria, Assignment of Duties, forms, curriculum vitae, and content summary." Other instructions are as follows: Faculty members are

- ◆ encouraged to consult with the DPC concerning performance expectations for each of the evaluation categories &
- ◆ encouraged to consult with the Department Chair concerning performance expectations for each of the evaluation categories.

I. Teaching/Performance of Primary duties:

A. Student Evaluations: The approved Department evaluations tool (including university core items) will be used for all classes in the fall and spring semesters. Instructors will deliver the student evaluation forms to their classes, appoint a graduate assistant or other student in each class to administer the forms, then excuse themselves from the classroom until the procedure has been completed. Student appointees will distribute and collect the forms and deliver them in a sealed envelope to the CHE office secretary. If an instructor is teaching a class in-load and off-campus, the instructor should ask the student appointee to seal and sign across the back of the evaluation envelope to ensure confidentiality of ratings or utilize the secure confidential online student course evaluation provided by the Office of Academic Assessment and Testing. Instructors will see evaluation results only after final course grades have been submitted. Lastly, a compilation of all the completed student evaluations should be included in the evaluation portfolio including statistical summaries and responses to open-ended items.

B. Chair and Peer Evaluations: For retention, promotion, and/or tenure, a faculty member's classroom teaching will be evaluated by at least two peers (one time each year) and the Department Chair. The peers will include one faculty member from within the department and at least one faculty member with expertise in the content area. The faculty member

being evaluated will initiate the process of arranging for classroom visits. Peer evaluators and Department Chair will use the Approved University Peer Evaluation (AUPE) Form.

C. Documentation: Supportive evidence of teaching effectiveness shall be as follows:

- demonstrated by sustained effectiveness throughout the evaluation period as determined by the DPC committee, Department Chair and/or other contractually prescribed evaluator, and
- organized according to the criteria listed below. NOTE: performance may be evaluated on, but not limited to, the criteria listed below. Level of involvement or quantity of activities may be considered in addition to ranking. The criteria below are grouped in order of importance.

In order to receive a rating of **superior**, the faculty member must document evidence of meeting the following criteria (ratings that do not meet the following standard will be evaluated by the DPC committee, Department Chair and/or other contractually prescribed evaluator at one of the lower levels - Highly Effective, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory).

1. Narrative Peer and Chair evaluations that state evidence of exceptional performance

and
2. Student evaluations that indicate evidence of exceptional performance. A superior rating would be indicated by an average evaluation of between 4 and 5, where 5 signifies the highest performance.

as well as strong evidence from the following:
3. Award presented by Eastern Illinois University or a professional organization for teaching and primary duties performed during the evaluation period.
4. Course materials: evidence of syllabi, assignments, handouts,

- electronic resources, bibliographies, and exams. Quality, organization, and design should be considered by the evaluators.
5. Exceptional use of technology integrated into teaching/primary duties (e.g., web enhanced course design, resources for learning, etc.).
 6. Advising: evidence of superior advising such as letters from advisees, and/or documentation of letters of reference.
 7. Documented evidence of exceptional engagement in work activity related to teaching/primary duties:
 - Internship site visits
 - Peer assisted curriculum development
 - School/university partnerships
 - Direction of thesis
 - Serving on multiple thesis committees
 - Mentoring of students
 - Other activities as deemed appropriate by the DPC
 8. New course development and implementation.
 9. Advising student organizations.
 10. Multiple attendances at workshops or professional development activities.
 11. Evidence of performance not existing within these lists will be ranked by consensus of the DPC.

Highly Effective Rank: Consensus Peer rankings indicating Highly Effective performance and mean student rankings of between 3.5 and 4. Effective evidence from items 3-11.

Satisfactory Rank: Consensus Peer rankings indicating satisfactory performance and mean student rankings of between 3.0 and 3.5. Satisfactory evidence from items 3-11.

II. Research and Creative Activity

Documentation: Supportive evidence of research effectiveness shall be as follows:

- a. demonstrated by sustained effectiveness throughout the evaluation period as determined by the DPC committee, Department Chair and/or other contractually prescribed evaluator , and

- b. organized according to the criteria listed below. NOTE:
performance may be evaluated on, but not limited to, the criteria listed below. Level of involvement or quantity of activities may be considered in addition to ranking. The criteria below are grouped in order of importance.

In order to receive a rating of superior, the faculty member must document evidence of meeting at least

Two from the following list

1. Publication in a national or international refereed journal, book or book chapter.
2. Publication in a state or regional refereed journal.
3. Presentation at the national, international, regional, or state level.
4. Editor (or editorial board member) of a national, international, state or regional journal.
5. Co-publication and or co-presentation at the national, international, regional, or state level with a graduate student(s).

Faculty members may also document evidence from the following lists to demonstrate sustained effectiveness:

6. Book review or invited journal reviewer.
7. Mentoring several student projects leading to presentation/publication at an institutional research event or conference.
8. A publication other than mentioned in 1-5.
9. Evidence of performance not existing within these lists will be ranked by consensus of the DPC.

Significant Rank: Consensus Peer rankings indicating documented evidence of only 1 from items 1-5 and significance evidence from items 6-9.

Satisfactory Rank: Consensus Peer rankings indicating documented evidence of items 6-9.

III. Service

Documentation: Supportive evidence of service effectiveness shall be as follows:

- a. demonstrated by sustained effectiveness throughout the evaluation period as determined by the DPC committee, Department Chair and/or other contractually prescribed evaluator, and
- b. organized according to the criteria listed below. NOTE: performance may be evaluated on, but not limited to, the criteria listed below. Level of involvement or quantity of activities may be considered in addition to ranking. The criteria below are grouped in order of importance.

In order to receive a rating of **superior**, the employee must document evidence of meeting at least

four from criteria 1 – 8.

1. Served as chair or secretary of a committee or subcommittee at the college, university, community, and/or professional level.
2. Elected or appointed to college or university committee, subcommittee, executive committee, or task force.
3. Served on committee(s) or subcommittee(s) at the department, college, university, community and/or professional level.
4. Served on multiple thesis committees.
5. Received award for service at the college, university, community, and/or professional level.
6. Served as coordinator for an officially sanctioned event at the department, college, university, community, and/or professional level (e.g., CHE Spring conference, Union duties, Hooding Ceremony).
7. Served as advisor or mentor to a student, alum or university sanctioned organization.
8. Served the department in recruitment efforts.

Faculty members may also document evidence from the following lists to demonstrate sustained effectiveness:

9. Served as officer in a professional organization related to discipline.
10. Participated in counseling practice or consultation on a regular basis.
11. Served as consultant to an organization related to discipline.
12. Served as consultant to university or community sponsored group.

13. Involved in a community organization as a board member, advisory council, etc.
14. Maintained or secured a professional license or credential within the field of counseling or student affairs.
15. Evidence of performance not existing within these lists will be ranked by consensus of the DPC committee and/or other contractually prescribed evaluator.

Significant Rank: Consensus Peer rankings indicating documented evidence of only 2 from items 1-8 and significance evidence from items 9-15.

Satisfactory Rank: Consensus Peer rankings indicating documented evidence of items 9- 15.