

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

MEMORANDUM

Blair M. Lord
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

217-581-2121
blord@eiu.edu

To: Mary Anne Hanner, Dean, College of Sciences
Date: October 22, 2008
Subject: DAC Revision Approval; Department of Physics

Thank you for taking another look at your department's statement of Departmental Application of Criteria (DAC) in light of my review comments and suggestions. The further revised DAC sent via e-mail attachment on October 3, 2008, is approved consistent with Article 8.7.c. of the *2006-2010 EIU-UPI Unit A Agreement* (Agreement). As always, any reading of the DAC will be consistent with the Agreement or its successor agreement(s).

As a matter of principle, Unit A and Unit B faculty may not be held to different standards of achievement in the area of teaching/performance of primary duties for given materials and methods as they apply to an evaluation. For example, what constitutes evidence of achievement of "superior" teaching based on student evaluations may not differ for Unit A faculty and Unit B faculty even though the number of required student evaluations may vary. This is consistent with negotiations that led to annually contracted faculty having access to a rating of "superior" in teaching/performance of primary duties.

The contributions of the department are appreciated, and I continue to encourage consideration of the University's articulated academic goals in the department's deliberations.

attachments: Further Revised DAC; Department of Physics

cc: Len Storm, Chair, Department of Physics

**PHYSICS DEPARTMENT APPLICATION OF CRITERIA
FOR RETENTION/TENURE/PROMOTION/
PROFESSIONAL ADVANCEMENT INCREASE
2008-2011**

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 will be considered the most important. Generally, research/creative activity will be second in importance and service third.

Unit A faculty members will submit a succinct portfolio of materials that document their performance in teaching/performance of primary duties, research, and service. Materials and activities shall be placed in the performance area most appropriate for their consideration. A single activity may not be counted in more than one performance area. Unit B faculty members will submit a succinct portfolio of materials and activities that document their performance in teaching/performance of primary duties. All such evidence should include names, dates, and any other pertinent information. In each area, items contained under I. Instruments of Documentation and II. Evaluation Methods shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive. In the evaluation process the department recognizes the total nature of a faculty member's contribution to the university.

Dissertation or other demonstrable research credits, completed as a part of a terminal degree program, shall be considered in the area of research/creative activity. Faculty being considered for retention, who have not completed educational requirements for tenure, shall document progress toward meeting that requirement. Faculty members are expected to know the relevant articles in the Agreement.

For assigned duties other than research and sabbaticals, constituent groups shall be provided with the opportunity to evaluate the employee as appropriate.

I. Methods of Collecting Documentation in the Areas of Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service

Evaluations shall be conducted using the following materials:

A. Student Course Evaluations

Faculty shall be evaluated by students, using the Physics Department's form and/or the University Student Course Evaluation forms, including the University Core questions. Student evaluations are to be collected and given to the department chair or secretary by a person other than the one being evaluated. All faculty, including Unit B faculty, are required to administer evaluations in each course section they teach. The DPC may, at its discretion, elect to administer all of the student evaluations in a given semester. All the student evaluations from each course section shall be included. If students in a class of small enrollment have confidentiality concerns, they may decline to do the evaluation.

Evaluation in technology-delivered courses shall be conducted using the secure, confidential online student course evaluation option provided by the Office of Assessment and Testing, or a secure system (or choice of systems), approved by the department faculty, that ensures that each student is able to submit one and only one evaluation for each course taken. Questions which refer to the technological and pedagogical aspects of the technology-delivered course shall be included on student evaluations for technology-delivered courses. Student evaluations in technology-delivered courses shall be considered relative to the level of technological support, reliability and performance quality of the hardware and software used, and in the context of general student response to distance education versus face-to-face classroom instruction.

B. Physics Department Faculty and Chair Teaching Evaluation Report

For the purpose of retention, promotion, tenure, or professional advancement increase, a written report of the classroom visitation by a tenured member of the Physics Department and by the department chair shall become part of the evaluation materials for the individual being evaluated. Peer evaluators shall use the University Peer Evaluation form (copy attached). The evaluated faculty member is responsible for arranging the classroom evaluations.

Classroom visitations shall be conducted, at a minimum, in the year of personnel action for all faculty considering application for retention, promotion, tenure, or professional advancement increase.

For unit B faculty, classroom visitations will be conducted by the Chair.

In the case of technology-delivered courses, that is, a course in which face-to-face interaction is not the predominant mode of instruction, the classroom visit may be replaced by observation of course activities using the course web site (or whatever mode of delivery is used), such as discussion groups, chat rooms, and posted materials. Evaluators shall refer to both the technological and pedagogical aspects of distance learning for distance learning assignments.

A copy of the evaluation will be provided to the person being evaluated. For Unit A faculty only two evaluations are required per evaluation period (one by a tenured member of the Physics Department and one by the department chair) but all visitation reports must be included in the evaluation materials.

C. Other Peer Evaluation Reports

Additional evaluation reports of any format may be submitted by any tenured or tenure track member of the Physics Department Faculty. A copy will be provided to the person being evaluated.

D. Informal Reports

A written evaluation or critique of aspects of the faculty member's teaching, research/creative activity, or service based upon the personal knowledge and judgment of any other qualified individual, such as a collaborator from outside the University or an employer during a sabbatical, may also be used in the evaluation of a faculty member. Such critique or evaluation will not be superficially obtained but will be supported by thorough analysis. Informal reports shall be obtained with the knowledge and consent of the faculty member being evaluated, subject to the provisions of the Agreement. A copy will be provided to the person being evaluated.

E. Written Documentation

Documentation of all activities listed in the evaluation portfolio content summary shall be included in the appropriate sections of the evaluation portfolio.

II. Evaluation Methods by Area

All materials shall be evaluated both quantitatively and qualitatively. Categories of activities listed below under Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service shall be considered representative and not exhaustive.

A. Teaching

A faculty member will be assigned one of four ratings:

1. Superior
2. Highly effective
3. Satisfactory
4. Unsatisfactory

Categories of Teaching

- a. Lecture classes
- b. Lecture / laboratory classes
- c. Laboratory classes
- d. Mentoring students in research
- e. Independent study classes
- f. Seminars
- g. Special topic classes
- h. Advising Students

Unit B faculty are evaluated according to their course evaluations, classroom visitation, sample exams, syllabi, other course materials, and other documentation of teaching activities. Unit B faculty can receive ratings of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, highly effective, or superior based on the items submitted. In assessing student course evaluations such consideration as the difficulty of the course and the size and nature of the class shall be considered. Peer evaluations by the chair or other Physics Faculty shall have a greater weight than student evaluations in the determination of a rating.

In addition to student, peer, and chair evaluations Unit A faculty members will be evaluated on documentation of teaching as described below. In general, categories are listed in order of importance; however exceptional achievement in any category will be evaluated appropriately. The documentation is a part of the overall evaluation and that part of the evaluation will be considered as follows:

- i. To be evaluated "satisfactory" by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least three activities of types 1 or 2 listed below in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC.
- ii. To be evaluated "highly effective" by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least three activities of types 1 or 2 listed below, at least one of which should be of type 1, in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC.
- iii. To be evaluated "superior" by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least four activities of types 1 or 2 listed below, at least two of which should be of type 1, in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC.

These rankings and considerations are to be considered in addition to the student, peer, and chair evaluations not in place of them. One would have to perform at the levels listed above AND have evaluations that are commensurate with a final rating.

Categories of Teaching Documentation

Type 1 Teaching Activities

- a. Awards for teaching by national, state, regional, or university organizations
- b. Curriculum development that will lead to major enhancement in departmental offerings such as developing a new course
- c. Being a mentor for a student in research
- d. Design, development and implementation of new laboratory exercises or substantial changes to a current lab exercise.
- e. Teaching aids developed that indicate significant effort such as implementing special course projects.
- f. Major course revisions implemented
- g. Seminars, posters, or papers related to Physics teaching given at national or regional meetings
- h. Overwhelming evidence of high quality teaching activity

Type 2 Teaching Activities

- a. Curriculum development materials that will lead to minor enhancement in departmental offerings such as changes to an existing course within the framework of the existing syllabus
- b. Education oriented meetings attended, such as the ISAAPT.
- c. Tutorials, special topics, or independent study classes taught

- d. Laboratory development materials that will lead to minor enhancement in departmental offerings such as development or redesign of an existing laboratory.
- e. Class materials such as solution sets developed
- f. Technology based materials indicative of teaching effort
- g. Seminars, posters, or papers related to Physics teaching given at local meetings
- h. Course revision materials

Additionally, any activity listed in Type 1 will be counted as Type 2 activity if the effort required and the result obtained are judged by evaluators to be significant, but not sufficient for a Type 1 activity.

In assessing student course evaluations such consideration as the difficulty of the course and the size and nature of the class shall be considered. Peer evaluations by the chair, or other Physics Faculty shall have a greater weight than student evaluations in the determination of a rating. Items from the Teaching Documentation will also be taken into consideration in determining the rating of the faculty member.

B. Research/Creative Activities

A faculty member will be assigned one of four ratings (one of five for probationary year one):

1. Superior
2. Significant
3. Satisfactory
4. Appropriate (for probationary year one)
5. Unsatisfactory

- i. To receive a rating of "appropriate", during probationary year one, by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least two activities of type 1 or 2 listed below in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC
- ii. To receive a rating of "satisfactory" by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least three activities of types 1 or 2 listed below in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC.
- iii. To receive a rating of "significant" by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least three activities of types 1 or 2 listed below, at least one of which should be of type 1, in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC.
- iv. To receive a rating of "superior" by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least four activities of types 1 or 2 listed below, at least two of which should be of type 1, in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC.

Categories of Research/Creative Activities

In general, categories are listed in order of relative importance; however, exceptional achievement in any category will be evaluated appropriately.

Type 1

- a. Articles published in peer-reviewed journals
- b. Book published by reputable publisher
- b. Seminars, posters, or papers presented at national or regional meetings
- c. Grants received
- d. Review of papers or proposals as part of an external peer review process
- e. Other major research/creative activities

Type 2

- a. Articles submitted for publication in peer-reviewed journals
- b. Grant proposals submitted
- c. Faculty mentored research with students
- d. Articles published in non peer-reviewed media
- e. Courses taken or advanced books or articles studied to improve research skills
- f. Seminars and talks before local groups related to Physics
- g. Professional meetings attended

Additionally, any activity listed in Type 1 will be counted as Type 2 activity if the effort required and the result obtained are judged by the DPC to be significant, but not sufficient for a Type 1 activity.

C. Service

A faculty member will be assigned one of four ratings (one of five for probationary year one):

1. Superior
2. Significant
3. Satisfactory
4. Appropriate (for probationary year one)
5. Unsatisfactory

i. To receive a rating of "appropriate", during probationary year one, by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least one activity of type 1 or 2 listed below in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC

ii. To receive a rating of "satisfactory" by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least two activities of types 1 or 2 listed below in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC.

iii. To receive a rating of "significant" by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least three activities of types 1 or 2 listed below in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC.

iv. To receive a rating of "superior" by the DPC, a faculty member should have accomplished at least four activities of types 1 or 2 listed below, at least one of which should be of type 1, in a manner and of a quality acceptable to the DPC.

Categories of Service

Type 1

- a. Service on national, regional, or state councils and committees
- b. Service on university, college or departmental councils and committees
- c. Service on union councils and committees, offices held, or contributions to special projects
- d. Organizing, directing, or hosting meetings, speakers, or other events
- e. Significant amount of equipment maintenance
- f. Advisor of appropriate student organizations
- g. Community activities and services related to physics, such as the Physics Road Show
- h. Seminars and talks before local groups related to the mission of the University
- i. Editor or coordinator of departmental newsletter
- j. Consistent and repeated recruitment of students for admission to EIU in Physics or Pre-Engineering
- k. Judging at national science fairs
- l. Other significant service activities

Type 2

- a. Attending and contributing to departmental faculty meetings
- b. Participation in professional organizations
- c. Judging local or regional science fairs
- d. Contributing to the department newsletter
- e. Recruitment of students

Additionally, any activity listed in Type 1 will be counted as a Type 2 activity if the effort required and the result obtained are judged by the DPC to be significant, but not sufficient for a Type 1 activity.

**PHYSICS DEPARTMENT
CHAIR VISITATION FORM**

I have observed the teaching/performance of primary duties of _____
_____ on date(s) _____

NOTE: This report is based only on the events observed during the above-mentioned visit(s). It includes mention of all such events that are significant enough to be referenced later in the evaluation process. This report shall be used to evaluate the instructor's command of the subject matter or discipline and ability to organize, analyze, and present knowledge of material. It should also evaluate the instructor's ability to encourage and interest students in the learning process. The chair must determine if the instructor's communication skills are adequate to perform his/her assigned teaching duties. If not, then an unsatisfactory evaluation must be rendered, with specific mention of the deficiency. This report shall indicate whether the faculty member's teaching has been unsatisfactory, satisfactory, highly effective, or superior. (Additional pages may be attached as needed). A copy of this report will be given to the faculty member within two weeks of the last visitation and at least two weeks before the end of the evaluation period.

Rating: _____

Chair: _____ Received by Faculty Member: _____

Date: _____ Date: _____

**PHYSICS DEPARTMENT
PEER EVALUATION FORM**

In accordance with the Agreement, I have observed the teaching/performance of primary duties of:

_____ on date(s) _____

NOTE: This report is based only on the events observed during the classroom visits by the individual reporting. Peer evaluation shall be used to evaluate the instructor's command of the subject matter or discipline and ability to organize, analyze and present knowledge of material. It should also evaluate the instructor's ability to encourage and interest students in the learning process. The peer evaluator must determine if the instructor's communication skills are adequate to perform his/her assigned teaching duties. If not, then an unsatisfactory evaluation must be rendered, with specific mention of the deficiency. Peer evaluation shall indicate whether the faculty member's teaching has been unsatisfactory, satisfactory, highly effective, or superior. (Additional pages may be attached as needed.) A copy of this report will be given to the faculty member within two weeks of the last visitation and at least two weeks before the end of the evaluation period.

Faculty Evaluator Rating:

Signature:

Received by Faculty Member

Date: _____

Date: _____