



March 4, 2019

To: A. Moshtagh, Chairperson

From: J. Gatrell, Provost

CC: M. Kattenbraker, AVP  
A. Shelton, Dean

**RE: 2019 DAC Revisions**

I am writing to acknowledge the submitted 2019 revisions to the Departmental Application of Criteria. Additionally, I would like to thank the faculty for considering the feedback provided and forwarding a revised final version. Likewise, I applaud the department's obvious commitment to student success—particularly relative to the articulated expectations for instructional effectiveness.

As required by the EIU-UPI agreement, I am pleased to accept the revisions.

# 2019-2022 Departmental Application of Criteria

## Department of Economics

Approved by Department: January 2019

Approved by VPAA: 3/4/19

Faculty members under consideration for retention, tenure, promotion, or professional advancement increase shall be evaluated in the three areas of (1) Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties, (2) Research/Creative Activity, and (3) Service. Of these three areas, Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties will be considered the most important.

Research/Creative Activity shall be given greater relative weight than Service in the evaluation of faculty. Annually contracted faculty will be evaluated only in the area of teaching/performance of primary duties. The applicable criteria of performance stated in Article 8.6 of the EIU-UPI Agreement will apply in each area of evaluation. A single activity may not be included in more than one performance area, unless it is clearly indicated how this activity can be divided between the categories. This document will govern evaluation periods commencing in Spring 2019 or later until supplanted. Nothing in this document shall be interpreted in a manner inconsistent with the 2018-2022 EIU-UPI Unit A or Unit B Agreements or their successor agreements. Nothing in this document shall be construed to limit and nothing in this document shall be construed to grant administration rights to uninvited classroom visitation.

Further, the Economics department is committed to cultivating an environment that enables all members of the EIU community to achieve excellence in teaching, research, and service. To create a supportive environment for all our colleagues, the department highly values collegiality and expects all faculty to maintain the highest standards of professional integrity as they teach, research, and serve. These expectations are aligned with the 2018 EIU-UPI agreement's preamble that states: *"The University is an academic community with professional expectations of engagement in the life of the community as a University citizen."*

In practice, faculty are expected to be engaged University citizens who actively advance the mission of the institution. In the positive sense, it means respect for, as well as support and recognition of, the efforts of colleagues toward making the Department of Economics, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and Eastern Illinois University reach the highest levels of performance possible. Further, the department expects colleagues to maintain the highest standards for professional integrity. As integrity is essential for any academic community, the Department of Economics endorses the discipline's Code of Professional Conduct. To maintain the highest standards, the department recognizes that university sanctions for policy violations, as defined by Section 16 of the EIU-UPI agreement, or findings by the American Economic Association of a violation of the Code of Professional Conduct may be considered, by chairs and senior administrators, as part of the evaluation process.

## I. Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

### A. Categories of Materials and Activities

1. The employee must document teaching effectiveness for the undergraduate and/or graduate classroom, as well as small-group and/or individual instruction as appropriate. Indicators of teaching effectiveness include:

#### a) Student Course Evaluations

- (1) Student course evaluations shall be conducted each academic term in each of the faculty member's sections with more than three students (exception: course evaluations shall not be required for sections assigned intra-semester due to faculty reassignment). Student evaluations should be conducted during the last 2 weeks of the semester, or as required to meet the calendar of personnel actions as published by the VPAA.
- (2) Student course evaluations must include the approved University core evaluation items and the approved Department of Economics core<sup>1</sup> evaluation items. Items which refer to both the technological and pedagogical aspects of online classes shall be included in student course evaluations for online classes courses.
- (3) The student course evaluation forms will be distributed, collected, and returned to the Department Office by a student, and tabulated by the Academic Assessment and Testing Center. The faculty member shall not be in the room while students are completing evaluation forms. The collection of student course evaluations for distance education courses will conform to university policy once established.
- (4) The faculty member is responsible for maintaining copies of all student evaluation summaries to be used in evaluation portfolios and shall provide copies to evaluators upon request. Student evaluation summaries should be kept for the duration of any applicable evaluation period. If student comments are included in the evaluation portfolio, all student comments from that course must be provided. Faculty reflections on student evaluations and comments are welcome.

#### b) Peer and Chair Evaluations

- (1) Each candidate for retention, promotion, tenure and Professional Advancement Increase shall invite a peer from among the tenured faculty members of the Department of Economics and the chair to visit a class at a time(s) agreed upon by the candidate and the visitor(s).
- (2) For tenure-track faculty, at least one classroom visitation by a peer and at least one visitation by the chair should be conducted each year. Tenured faculty applying for promotion or a Professional Advancement Increase should arrange for at least one classroom visitations from the chair and one classroom visitations from a peer during the evaluation period.
- (3) For annually-contracted faculty members, classroom visitations will be conducted by the chair each year.
- (4) For sections that are technology-delivered, granting access to the password restricted areas of the course can be substituted for classroom visitation. Online course peer evaluations must be conducted by a faculty member

---

<sup>1</sup> For **online** courses the Department of Economics core will be modified so as to exclude the question "My instructor speaks audibly and clearly."

who has successfully completed the university's approved Online Learning training and information modules.

(5) It is the faculty member's responsibility to arrange for these classroom visits. If a mutually agreeable time for the chair's visit cannot be determined, the faculty member will select a date and time for the classroom visit and give the chair at least two weeks notice of the scheduled classroom visit.

(6) Classroom peer evaluations must use the approved department peer evaluation form (attached). Peer evaluators will provide a copy of the completed evaluation form to the Chair with a copy to the candidate. Additional peer review and comment may also be submitted.

c) Other Documentation

(1) The faculty member may submit other materials in support of teaching effectiveness such as samples of course syllabi, examinations and class materials, teaching awards or recognition and contributions to the development or revision of curriculum. Such material is particularly encouraged in so far as it pertains to i) Application of technology in the teaching and learning process; ii) Participation on an interdisciplinary, interdepartmental and/or intercollegiate basis; iii) Participation in instructional and/or outreach activities including student engagement and mentoring, recruitment, or off-campus instruction.

(2) Faculty responsible for academic advisement will be evaluated by the Chair through an advisee survey pertaining to the advisor's effectiveness.

(3) Faculty who have received reassigned time for non-instructional activity over the evaluation period will show evidence of their accomplishments during that time. Such evidence must include the faculty's proposal for such reassigned time and a statement of accomplishment during the semester for which reassigned time was received.

2. Relative Importance

a) The peer (Unit A) and chair (Units A and B) evaluations, appended material, and the student evaluations (both statistical summaries of the student course evaluations and any written comments provided by students) will be used to evaluate the faculty member's abilities in the following areas:

(1) execution of assigned responsibilities,

(2) command of the subject matter,

(3) ability to organize, analyze, and present material.

(4) ability to encourage and interest students,

(5) oral English proficiency.

b) Specific questions on the University and Department cores for the student course evaluations will be used to evaluate these particular abilities.

c) Other materials submitted by the faculty member will be considered in the evaluation process, but these may be given less importance than the peer and Chair reports of classroom visitations and the student evaluations.

B. Method of Evaluation

1. Evaluators will review the student evaluation summary tabulations, the completed chair and peer evaluation forms and other materials submitted. Members of the DPC (Unit A) may discuss any of these items with the faculty member. Based on these sources of information, each faculty member will be evaluated as having attained the following level of overall teaching performance:(1) unsatisfactory. (2) satisfactory,

- (3) highly effective. (4) superior.
2. In assessing teaching effectiveness, evaluators shall consider such factors as 1) the size of the class; 2) the level of the class (lower division, upper division, graduate); 3) required or elective status; 4) whether the students are primarily majors in economics, business, or some other discipline; 5) innovative technique and course development; and 6) application of technology in the teaching and learning process. Reference to both the technological and pedagogical aspects of online classes shall be made for online classes assignments reviewed by peers and the chair.
  3. Because of the variety of circumstances that affect statistical summaries of the student course evaluations, no minimum scores are specifically required to document superior, highly effective, or satisfactory teaching performance. Typically, median scores on the University and Department core items of the student course evaluations that are (i) 4.0 and above indicate superior teaching, (ii) 3.7 and above indicate highly effective teaching, and (iii) 3.4 and above indicate satisfactory teaching. These scores serve only as basic guidelines for the faculty member and the evaluators to improve consistency across different departmental personnel committees. In applying these guidelines, evaluators shall recognize that factors outside the faculty member's control, such as those listed in I.B.2 above, may adversely affect student evaluations. In applying these guidelines, evaluators shall also recognize that some desirable teaching methods and traits, such as experimental and innovative techniques and writing-intensive instruction, may also adversely affect student evaluations. The focus of evaluators should be to evaluate rigor and excellence and not rely solely on numerical data.

## II. Research/Creative Activity

### A. Categories of Materials and Activities

1. The following item(s) are typically viewed as indicators of Superior research activity, but may not be sufficient in or of itself.
  - a) Book accepted for publication or published, authored or co-authored;
  - b) Article accepted for publication or published in refereed journals and/or books, authored or co-authored;
  - c) Grants originating outside the University obtained for the conduct of research;
  - d) A University-level award for research;
  - e) Presentation of research/creative activities to international, national or regional conference/meetings;
2. The following item(s) are typically viewed as indicators of Significant research activity but may not be sufficient in or of itself.
  - a) Grants originating from sources within the University obtained for the conduct of research,
  - b) Presentation of research/creative activities to state or university conference/meetings;
  - c) Writing a published review of a book or textbook;
  - d) Acting as a discussant or chair at an international, national, or regional professional meeting
3. The following item(s) are typically viewed as indicators of Satisfactory or Appropriate research activity.
  - a) Acting as a discussant or chair at a state or university conference or professional meeting;
  - b) Dissertation research;

- c) Continued attendance at national, regional, or statewide conferences and professional meetings;
  - d) Presentation to the department's Faculty Seminar.
4. The items enumerated above should not be considered to be an exhaustive list. It is rather an illustrative list of some of the possible forms of materials and activities that a faculty member may submit. Other activities and documents may be submitted and will be considered on an individual basis according to their perceived merits relative to the enumerated items. Items that may be evaluated, depending upon their individual characteristics, as evidence of either superior, significant, appropriate or satisfactory research activity include but are not limited to the following
- a) Article publication in journals other than refereed;
  - b) Book publication, authored or co-authored, self-published;
  - c) Unpublished manuscripts and/or research/creative activity work in progress;
  - d) Acting as a consultant to a private or government body;
  - e) Participation in legal proceedings as an expert witness;
  - f) Publication in government documents;
  - g) Written reports for private or government agencies, institutions or other bodies;
  - h) Acting as a reviewer or referee for journals;
  - i) Creating technologies to improve the teaching and learning process;
  - j) Reports prepared for the University Professionals of Illinois may be taken as evidence of research/creative activity or, more often, as evidence of service depending on the intellectual depth and creativity involved
  - k) Acting as a reviewer for books and textbooks may be taken as evidence of research/creative activity or, more often, as evidence of service depending on the intellectual depth and creativity involved;
  - l) Public lectures of personal research;
  - m) Invitations to participate in restricted conferences;
  - n) Other.

B. Method of Evaluation

1. All members of the DPC will review and discuss documentation of research/creative activity submitted by a candidate. The DPC may request that the candidate submit representative written statements as to the quality of the materials from peers within or external to the department but related to the discipline.
2. Based on the sources of information listed above and other material that the faculty member may provide, each faculty member will be evaluated as having attained the following level of performance with respect to Research/Creative Activity: (1) unsatisfactory, (2) appropriate — applicable only during the first probationary year —, (3) satisfactory, (4) significant. (5) superior.
3. For the purposes of promotion or Professional Advancement Increase, either the quantity of the research evidenced by the submitted materials or the quality of the research evidenced by the submitted materials may be judged sufficient to warrant the indicated category.

### III. Service

All faculty members should be engaged in service activities appropriate to the faculty member's discipline and to the missions of the Department of Economics, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and/or Eastern Illinois University.

A. Categories of Materials and Activities

The following materials and activities (which are not listed in order of importance) are appropriate for evaluation of Service activities:

1. Service to the Department of Economics including, for example:
  - a. Chairing a department committee;
  - b. Contributing to department-sponsored events;
  - c. Serving as an advisor or co-advisor to a department student organization;
  - d. Serving as a member of a department committee;
  - e. Attending presentations (of students, candidates, research, etc.), Open Houses, or Graduation Ceremonies
2. Service to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences including, for example:
  - a. Chairing a College committee;
  - b. Organizing a conference, symposium, or workshop;
  - c. Serving as an advisor or co-advisor to a College student organization;
  - d. Serving as a member of a College committee.
3. Service to the University including, for example:
  - a. Chairing a University committee or faculty governance organization;
  - b. Organizing a University conference, symposium, or workshop;
  - c. Serving as an advisor or co-advisor to a University student organization;
  - d. Serving as a member of a University committee or faculty governance organization;
  - e. Serving as an officer, representative or committee member in chapter or local levels of the union;
4. Service to Professional Organizations including, for example:
  - a. Serving on a committee;
  - b. Serving in a leadership role such as officer, standing committee chair, or other position;
  - c. Serving as a member of a professional organization;
  - d. Serving as a session chair, discussant, or program chair at a professional meeting;
  - e. Otherwise planning, coordinating, or directing professional presentations or organization meeting;
  - f. Serving as referee or reviewer for proceedings of scholarly, professional, or pedagogical meetings;
  - g. Serving as referee or reviewer for scholarly, professional, or pedagogical journals.
5. Other Service Activities including, for example:
  - a. Guest lecturing in a class;
  - b. Presentation of paper or lecture to a group or organization other than professional organizations;
  - c. Presenting public lecture on topics related to faculty member's discipline;
  - d. Relevant community service; and/or
  - e. Other relevant service.

#### B. Relative Importance

Although the five general categories of service listed in Section I11. A. are of equal importance, some service to the Department of Economics is expected. Because faculty members will document widely differing activities and emphases in their service contributions, the nature and importance of those activities will be considered on the basis of the factors listed in Section I11.D.2, after accounting for the quantitative assessment in Section I11.D.1.

#### C. Documentation

Each faculty member is responsible for providing sufficient documentation for assessments of service. When "special circumstances" are claimed in the quantitative measures (III.D.1), more documentation is expected as compared to the modest documentation required for familiar categories. Examples may include:

1. Listing of committee meetings, preparation, and other time spent;
2. Letters from committee chairs (or others) describing the nature and scope of work;
3. Listing of RSO events and activities sponsored;
4. Listing of professional organization activities;
5. Letters from professional organization officers/organizers; and/or
6. End of year committee reports (annotated with individual contributions).

#### D. Assessing Service

1. For quantitative assessment, use the approved "Service Reporting Form." In the designated area, provide a brief description of each service activity. Indicate the appropriate category for the activity.
  - a. Category I consists of committees such as CGS, COTE, CAA, Faculty Senate, UPC, CFR and the like. Service of this type merits 3 service points.
  - b. Category II consists of committees such as Student Standards, the COASCC, ATAC, Library Advisory Board, and the like. Service of this type merits 2 service points.
  - c. Category III consists of committees such as the DPC, DCC, College Grade Appeals Committee and the like. Service of this type merits 1 service point.
  - d. Category IV consists of committees such as the University Naming Committee, the Honorary Degree Committee, the Parking Committee and the like. Service of this type merits one-half service point.
  - e. Category V consists of service contributions involving social engagement with students such as attending the department picnic, attending eiu@edu, going on the Chicago trip and the like. Service of this type merits one-quarter service point per instance. No more than 2 service points credit per semester can be credited in this category.
  - f. Taking a leadership role (such as chairing the committee) will have the effect of doubling the service points normally associated with that category.
  - g. Committees listed above are intended to be representative. The small listings in each category are not exhaustive. Committees and activities not listed should be assigned to a category such that the quantitative extent of the service is similar to that expected from those serving on the listed committees.
  - h. Participation in subcommittees shall be credited in addition to credit for the sponsoring committee
  - i. We recognize that the measures contemplated above might sometimes result in an inappropriate amount of service points awarded relative to the amount of actual service provided. In such cases, the special circumstances category should be selected and the service points desired should be indicated in the final column of the Service Reporting Form. An explanation and evidence supporting the request should be attached so that the DPC and subsequent evaluators can verify the appropriateness of the service points requested. Insufficient justification may result in a modified quantity of service points. This category may also be used to credit advising when CUs awarded for advising do not fully reflect the workload therein.
2. For qualitative assessment, evaluators will review all materials submitted by the faculty member to document service and will consider factors such as:
  - a. The nature and extent of leadership provided;
  - b. The degree of participation and/or contribution;
  - c. The depth, scope, quality, and length of service;
  - d. The extent and nature of local, state, national, or international recognition of service;
  - e. The relationship of the service to the missions of the Department of Economics, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and University; and/or

f. Other appropriate factors.

3. Evaluation of the faculty member's service activities shall be based on the quantitative criteria listed below. However, if a faculty member has not met the quantitative guideline for a specific performance standard, evaluators nevertheless may assess the faculty member as having achieved that performance standard based on other relevant qualitative or quantitative factors. In addition, service is not expected when a faculty member is on sabbatical or leave. Therefore, if a faculty member is on sabbatical or leave during the evaluation period, then the quantitative criteria listed below shall be adjusted downward to account for this time.

a. For purposes of retention evaluations and annual evaluations after tenure:

- (1) A rating of Satisfactory requires documentation of at least two service points during the evaluation period;
- (2) A rating of Significant requires documentation of at least four service points during the evaluation period; and
- (3) A rating of Superior requires documentation of at least six service points during the evaluation period.

b. For purposes of promotion when tenured, and professional advancement increase evaluations:

- (1) A rating of Satisfactory requires documentation of at least an average of two service points during each year of the evaluation period;
- (2) A rating of Significant requires documentation of at least an average of four service points during each year of the evaluation period; and
- (3) A rating of Superior requires documentation of at least an average of six service points during each year of the evaluation period.

c. For purposes of promotion from assistant professor to associate professor for an untenured employee and for tenure evaluations, faculty members must at a minimum achieve the rating of Significant during the fifth year and sustain this level through the sixth year:

- (1) A rating of Satisfactory requires documentation of at least two service points during each of the fifth and sixth probationary years;
- (2) A rating of Significant requires documentation of at least four service points during each of the fifth and sixth probationary years; and
- (3) A rating of Superior requires documentation of at least six service points during each of the fifth and sixth probationary years.

**Department of Economics - Classroom Visitation Evaluation Form**

**U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory HE = Highly Effective SP = Superior**

Activity (All activities may not be observed.)	U	S	HE	SP	N/O	Comments (Additional comments may be included on the back or on an attachment.)
Command of the subject matter						
Ability to organize material /knowledge for teaching and learning						
Ability to present material/knowledge for teaching and learning						
Ability to analyze material/knowledge for teaching and learning						
Ability to encourage and interest students in the learning process						
Oral English proficiency						
(online class) use of technology						
<b>Overall rating of presentation (not an average of the above)</b>						

Professor: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Class: \_\_\_\_\_ Section: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Day: \_\_\_\_\_ Time of class: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_



