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: W. Harold Ornes, Dean, College of Sciences

Date: May 31, 2013

Subject: DAC Revision Approval; Department of Mathematics and Computer Science

---

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. 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.

2. I again note that the department continues to make the inclusion of responses to open-ended items on student evaluations permissive. Making the inclusion of student responses to open-ended items permissive, appears contrary to the spirit of wholeness as applied to student evaluations, and I encourage the department to give additional consideration to this practice. Evaluators may ask for more information during their respective reviews including, but not limited to, student responses to open-ended items.

3. The inclusion of course lecture notes in the research/creative activity area of evaluation is confusing and, and it is unclear how lecture notes would not already be considered in the primary area of teaching/performance of activities unless they were reworked and expanded into an article, book chapter, or book for publication.

4. I note with appreciation the department having revised its student course evaluation form so that the University Approved Core Items for Student Evaluations are

incorporated verbatim first in all student evaluations in the order listed with the Likert scale, 5=Strongly Agree and so on.

5. With regard to peer and chair evaluations, the department is encouraged to adopt and make use of the Approved University Peer Evaluation Form. In III. I note the specification that two peer and chair evaluations are minimally required during multiyear evaluation periods for promotion to the rank of professor or for a professional advancement increase (PAI). Consideration should be given to whether two chair and peer evaluation visitations provide a sufficiently representative sample for a five-year/10-semster 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 lesser 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.

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

cc: Chair, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science (with attachments)

MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE DEPARTMENT APPLICATION OF CRITERIA FOR RETENTION/TENURE/PROMOTION/PROFESSIONAL ADVANCEMENT INCREASE/PERFORMANCE BASED INCREMENT

2013-2017

Faculty members under consideration for retention, tenure, promotion, or professional advancement increase shall be evaluated by the Mathematics and Computer Science Department Personnel Committee (MDPC) 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.

The faculty member will submit evidence of materials and activities that will enable evaluation to take place. 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. All such evidence should include names, dates, and any other pertinent information. In each area, items contained under I. Categories of Materials and Activities and III. Methods of Evaluation shall be considered illustrative and not exhaustive.

Coursework toward completion of a terminal degree shall be considered in the area of teaching. 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.

1 Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

I. Categories of Materials and Activities

A. Evaluation by Colleagues
   Examples: Peer evaluation.

B. Materials and Services Provided to Support Teaching

   (1). In the classroom
       Examples; Syllabi; quizzes; tests; problem sets; explanatory handouts; documentation of innovative activities, such as the use of technology writing, or student projects.

   (2). Outside the classroom
       Examples: Seminars given; new courses designed; curriculum revision; student research projects which the faculty member guided; students supervised for independent study; advising activities, including advisement of students seeking postgraduate training; names of students for whom letters of recommendation have been provided.

C. Chair ~~and Student~~ Evaluations
   Chair visitation report(s).
   ~~Student evaluations (Notes from students in which quality of teaching is described may be included.)~~

D. Student Evaluations

Student evaluations (Notes from students in which quality of teaching is described may be included.)

E. Study Undertaken to Improve the Quality of Teaching

Examples: Workshops or seminars attended, professional conferences attended, courses taken, books or articles studied, report of sabbatical or leave activities related to teaching. Relevance to teaching / performance of primary duties must be documented.

II. Relative Importance

Categories are listed in the order of their importance.

III. Methods of Evaluation

The MDPC shall assign a rating of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, highly effective or superior based on its overall evaluation of materials submitted. The faculty member's workload and duties will be taken into consideration.

Peer evaluation shall be used to evaluate command of the subject matter or discipline and ability to organize, analyze and present knowledge of material. The peer evaluation committee must determine if the instructor's communication skills are adequate to perform his/her assigned teaching duties. The peer evaluation report must so state if the communication skills are below the minimal expectations.

Faculty shall have their teaching performance evaluated by three faculty members of the Mathematics and Computer Science Department each of whom shall visit at least one of the faculty member's classes during the semester under evaluation. Among them, the peer evaluators will visit at least two of the faculty member's courses. In exceptional circumstances, one peer evaluator may come from outside the Mathematics and Computer Science Department. 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.

In the case of tenured faculty, peer evaluation shall be conducted at least once every five years. In the case of promotion or professional advancement increase, there shall be at least two peer evaluations during the evaluation period. In the case of retention, the peer evaluation shall be completed every year. The members selected to complete the evaluation shall be chosen by mutual consent of the department chair and faculty member to be evaluated. The chair shall ensure that the membership of a faculty member's peer evaluation committees over the entire evaluation period is varied. In general, no more than one evaluator should serve on consecutive evaluations.

Request for peer evaluation shall be initiated by memo to the department chair by mid-semester. The peer evaluation shall be in written narrative form, using the Mathematics and Computer Science Department Peer Evaluation Form, and must be based on classroom visitation, or course observation in the case of technology-delivered courses. The committee shall indicate whether the faculty member's teaching performance has been unsatisfactory, satisfactory, highly effective, or superior. Copies of the peer evaluation shall be given to the MDPC, chair, and faculty member prior to their submission for evaluation and shall become part of the materials to be used in the process of evaluation.

Every faculty member must include in his/her portfolio at least one chair visitation report per evaluation period. Within the first three weeks of each semester, the chair should send

2

a memo to all faculty asking them if they want a chair evaluation that semester. A faculty member desiring a chair visitation has the responsibility for making the request, in writing, to the chair not less than 40 working days prior to the end of the semester or evaluation period. The chair will arrange to visit at least two of the faculty member's classes, and two of the faculty member's courses. In the case of a technology-delivered course, 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. The chair will meet with the faculty member within two working days of each such visit to discuss the chair's observations. The chair visitation report will be written in narrative form using the Mathematics and Computer Science Department Chair Visitation Report Form. A copy of the chair visitation report shall be given to the faculty member in a timely manner. A rating in Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties that is inadequate for a favorable recommendation for retention, promotion, tenure, or PAI cannot be based solely on the Chair Visitation Report.

Materials and activities for categories B and D shall be judged both qualitatively and quantitatively. Materials submitted for evaluation should include materials in category B.(I). for at least one course every other year.

Student evaluations of faculty will be conducted in accordance with the Mathematics and Computer Science Department Student Evaluations Policy (attached). Student evaluations submitted by applicants for retention, promotion, tenure, or professional advancement increase shall be systematic and representative of the applicant's teaching assignments. Evidence from student evaluation will be judged both qualitatively and quantitatively. The difficulty of the course, the size and make-up of the class, whether the class was required or elective, the faculty member's workload and duties, as well as other considerations suggested by review of representative course materials will be taken into account.

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 the context of general student response to distance education versus face-to-face classroom instruction. The preparation and experience of the faculty member with regard to distance education shall also be considered.

2 Research/Creative Activity

I. Categories of Materials and Activities

II. Relative Importance

A. Refereed Publications

Examples: Book or chapter in a book published or accepted for publication; article published or accepted for publication by a refereed journal non-print work (e.g. computer software) published or accepted for publication by an organization recognized in the field. (Coauthored works of all types may certainly be included.)

B. Other Externally Recognized Research/Creative Activity

Examples: Invited address given at a state, regional, national, or international conference; invited paper or workshop presented at a state, regional, national, or international conference; workshop presented to teachers at the local (but beyond EIU alone), state, regional, national, or international level; membership on a panel at the local (but beyond EIU alone), state, regional, national, or international level; talk or workshop given

at another college or university; external or university award or research grant; article, monograph, course lecture notes, or non-print work (whether singly or jointly authored) published or accepted for publication but not refereed or subjected to a similar standard of selection. Relevance to research/creative activity must be documented.

C. Editorial or advisory contributions

Examples: Editor of any professional journal; referee of material for publication; consultant; faculty member's contribution to research done by a student. Relevance to research/creative activity must be documented.

D. Work in Progress, Scholarly Study, Other Contributions to Research/Creative Activity

Examples: Manuscript prepared; talk presented on campus; grant proposal submitted; advanced books or articles studied; conference, seminar, or workshop attended; course taken (other than toward completion of a terminal degree). Relevance to research/creative activity must be documented.

III. Methods of Evaluation

The MDPC shall rank a faculty member's performance as unsatisfactory, appropriate, satisfactory, significant, or superior. This will be done category by category and then an overall rating in research/creative activity will be given.

The following guidelines will, in general, be applied for evaluation purposes.

For purposes of retention, an evaluation of satisfactory or better performance in at least one of the above categories is expected. Evidence of other materials and activities may lead to a qualitative evaluation of significant or superior performance provided the overall assessment of performance in the area warrants that evaluation level.

For purposes of tenure, promotion and professional advancement increase, in general a qualitative rating of at least satisfactory in two of the above categories will indicate overall satisfactory performance. Evidence of materials and several activities in at least three categories may lead to a qualitative evaluation of significant or superior performance provided the overall assessment of performance in the area warrants either of those two evaluation levels.

In general, 1, 2, 1, and 2 items in Categories A, B, C, and D, respectively will suffice for a rating of satisfactory in that category. Ratings of significant or superior may also be given. The faculty member's workload and duties, as well as other considerations suggested by review of materials submitted, will be taken into account.

These are general guidelines and are not intended to preclude a satisfactory, significant, or superior evaluation by doing outstanding work in fewer than the indicated number of categories.

3 Service

I. Categories of Materials and Activities

A. Organizational Leadership

Examples: Chair of a departmental committee (standing or ad hoc); officer of a school, college or university committee (standing or ad hoc); director or advisor to a student organization; officer of a local, state, regional, national or international organization; or chair of a sectional, state, regional, national or international conference.

B. Organizational Participation

Examples: Consultant for individuals, organizations, or institutions; member of a local, state, regional, national, or international organization which provides a service to the varied publics of EIU; judge or official for a math contest or science fair; speaker for a mathematics class or club in a local or regional elementary, secondary or post-secondary school; or participant in a professional conference; member of an elected or appointed school, college or university committee, board, or council; member of a departmental committee; visitation of high schools for the purpose of recruitment; visitation of other universities or colleges for the purpose of recruitment or placement of students.

C. Other Professional Service

Examples: ~~Member of an elected or appointed school, college or university committee, board, or council; member of a departmental committee; visitation of high schools for the purpose of recruitment; visitation of other universities or colleges for the purpose of recruitment or placement of students; s~~Service to the faculty and students in the Department, College or University; membership in a mathematical honorary or honor society; attendance at a professional meeting (state, regional, national or international); or membership in a professional organization.

II. Relative Importance

~~In general, an item from Category A is most significant, followed by items from Categories B or C.~~ Categories are listed in the order of their importance.

III. Methods of Evaluation

The MDPC shall determine if an unsatisfactory, appropriate, satisfactory, significant, or superior performance level has been achieved. This will be done category by category and then an overall rating in service will be given.

The following guidelines will, in general, be applied for evaluation purposes.

For purposes of retention, an evaluation of satisfactory or better performance in at least one of the above categories is expected. Evidence of other materials and activities may lead to a qualitative evaluation of significant or superior performance provided the overall assessment of performance in the area warrants that evaluation level.

For purpose of tenure, promotion, or professional advancement increase, in general, a qualitative rating of at least satisfactory in one of the above categories will indicate overall satisfactory performance. Evidence of materials and several activities in at least two categories may lead to a qualitative evaluation of significant or superior performance provided the overall assessment of performance in the area warrants either of those two evaluation levels.

In general, 1, 1, and 2 items in Categories A, B, and C, respectively, will suffice for a rating of satisfactory in that category. Ratings of significant or superior may also be given. The faculty member's workload and duties, as well as other considerations suggested by review of materials submitted, will be taken into account.

These are general guidelines and are not intended to preclude a satisfactory, significant, or superior evaluation by doing outstanding work in fewer than the indicated number of categories.

MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE DEPARTMENT STUDENT EVALUATIONS POLICY

Student evaluations shall be considered by the Personnel Committee and the Department Chair in making their recommendations for personnel actions, and by the Department Chair in annual evaluations.

a. Each semester all department faculty members shall, at times of their own choosing, administer the Mathematics and Computer Science Department Student Evaluation Form to at least one class they are teaching. At the faculty member's discretion, the Department Form may also be administered in summer and submitted for consideration at the next evaluation.

   For the purpose of retention, all faculty in the first and second year of their employment are encouraged to administer the Department Student Evaluation Form to all classes they teach. Student evaluations are required to be given in at least two classes per semester during this period.

b. Student evaluations may be administered electronically through the Office of Testing and Evaluations. For evaluations administered in-class, vVerbal directions and comments should be limited to those on the cover sheet. The forms shall be collected in each class by a student, placed in an envelope, sealed, and delivered to the Mathematics and Computer Science Department Secretary, who shall give them to the Department Chair. After the forms are distributed the faculty member may not be present until the forms are in the sealed envelope.

   Evaluation in technology-delivered courses shall be conducted using 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.

c. The forms shall be machine tabulated; results will not be available to the instructors until after grades have been submitted. The official numerical summary from all student evaluations collected must be submitted. If any student comments are included, all comments from that section must be included. The faculty member may submit additional summaries and/or documentation.

d. The faculty member shall be responsible for maintaining copies of all student evaluations to be used in evaluation portfolios. Student evaluations should be kept for the duration of any applicable evaluation period.

MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE DEPARTMENT
STUDENT EVALUATION COVER SHEET FOR IN-CLASS ADMINISTRATION

- Student evaluations should be completed in class <u>before</u> the last day of classes. Please allow at least 15-20 minutes for students to work on the forms.

- ~~On the outside of the package of evaluations you should find any information students will need to complete the portion of the evaluation sheet identifying the course, section, and instructor. Place this information on the blackboard prior to the distribution of the evaluation sheets to students.~~

- Students should use ~~only~~ #2 pencils, blue ink or black ink for filling out these forms.

- Remind students all written comments should be placed on the back of the evaluation sheet.

- Designate a student present in the class to bring the envelope containing all completed evaluations to the department office when all students have handed them in.

- Once evaluations are passed out to the class you should leave the room.

- Inform students that a summary of the the student evaluations and the forms themselves, with student comments, are not seen by the instructor until after grades have been submitted.

- Encourage students to participate thoughtfully by letting them know you value their responses and their comments.

The final four questions have been removed and the other questions re-ordered. The proposed student evaluation form is on the next page.

MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE DEPARTMENT
STUDENT EVALUATION FORM

Strongly Agree	SA
Agree	A
Undecided	U
Disagree	D
Strongly Disagree	SD
No Opinion/Don't Know/Not Applicable	N

1. I understand what is expected of me in class.   SA A U D SD N
2. This class increased my ability to think logically.   SA A U D SD N
3. I have been encouraged to ask questions in class.   SA A U D SD N
4. My instructor seems to enjoy teaching.   SA A U D SD N
5. If I were to take another class in this department, and could   SA A U D SD N
   do so with this instructor, I would.

University Core

6. The instructor demonstrates command of subject matter.   SA A U D SD N
7. The instructor effectively organizes knowledge or material for   SA A U D SD N
   teaching/learning.
8. The instructor is readily accessible outside of class.*   SA A U D SD N
9. The instructor presents material effectively.   SA A U D SD N
10. The instructor encourages and interests students in the learn-   SA A U D SD N
    ing process.

11. Overall my instructor is an effective teacher.   SA A U D SD N
12. The exams in this class are fair.   SA A U D SD N
13. What is your current class?   5 4 3 2 1
    5 = Graduate, 4 = Senior, 3 = Junior, 2 = Sophomore, 1 = Freshman
14. What is your expected grade in this class?   A B C D F
15. Is this course required for your major?   Y N
16. Please write any comments on the back.

* The instructor is available during office hours and appointments for face-to-face sections or electronically for technology-delivered sections.

The following is the current student evaluation form — although slightly reformatted by The Office of Testing an Evaluation for the forms they distribute.

MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE DEPARTMENT
STUDENT EVALUATION FORM

Strongly Agree	SA
Agree	A
Undecided	U
Disagree	D
Strongly Disagree	SD
No Opinion/Don't Know/Not Applicable	N

University Core

1.1	The instructor demonstrates command of subject matter.	SA	A	U	D	SD	N
1.2	The instructor effectively organizes knowledge or material for teaching/learning.	SA	A	U	D	SD	N
1.3	The instructor is readily accessible outside of class.(The instructor is available during office hours and appointments for face-to-face sections or electronically for technology-delivered sections.)	SA	A	U	D	SD	N
1.4	The instructor presents material effectively.	SA	A	U	D	SD	N
1.5	The instructor encourages and interests students in the learning process.	SA	A	U	D	SD	N

Department Questions

2.1	I understand what is expected of me in class.	SA	A	U	D	SD	N
2.2	This class increased my ability to think logically.	SA	A	U	D	SD	N
2.3	I have been encouraged to ask questions in class.	SA	A	U	D	SD	N
2.4	My instructor seems to enjoy teaching.	SA	A	U	D	SD	N
2.5	If I were to take another class in this department, and could do so with this instructor, I would.	SA	A	U	D	SD	N
2.6	Overall my instructor is an effective teacher.	SA	A	U	D	SD	N
2.7	The exams in this class are fair.	SA	A	U	D	SD	N

Comments

Please write any comments in the space provided below

MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE 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: _____

MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE DEPARTMENT
PEER EVALUATION 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 classroom visits by the committee members. 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 evaluation committee 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.

Committee Rating: _____

Committee:

_____, Chair

_____   Received by Faculty Member: _____

_____

Date: _____   Date: _____

Eastern Illinois University

Approved University Core Items for Student Evaluations

	SD	D	N	A	SA
1. The instructor demonstrates command of the subject matter or discipline.					
2. The instructor effectively organizes knowledge or material for teaching/learning.					
3. The instructor is readily accessible outside of class.*					
4. The instructor presents knowledge or material effectively.					
5. The instructor encourages and interests students in the learning process.					

* 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)

APPROVED UNIVERSITY PEER EVALUATION FORM

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