Appalachian State University

NTT Faculty Evaluation Policy and Procedures

The Composition Program seeks to offer faculty support through its peer mentoring program. Faculty will either be placed in a group or select members of a group and share assignments and activities, ask questions, give advice, and observe each others' teaching. Once a year, all faculty will write up a peer evaluation for at least one other faculty member and submit it. The peer evaluation will then be a permanent part of the faculty member's departmental file. Each faculty member who is evaluated is also encouraged to write a response to the evaluation of their teaching if they feel it is necessary.

Non-Tenure Track Evaluation Policy

Approved by English Department Faculty 4/20/04

New Non-tenure Track Faculty

As has been the practice in the past few years, the coordinator of the composition program will mentor and visit new NTT faculty in their first semester and write an evaluation.

- These faculty will also be members of a mentoring group who will visit classes and talk about their experiences with other group members.
- During the first semester, NTT faculty will ask students for an evaluation of teaching practice.
- NTT faculty will attend pre-semester orientation and other comp program workshops and discussions.

Non-tenure Track Faculty Evaluation

Faculty who have taught in the composition program for more than a year must be evaluated annually. In an effort to widen the discussions we have about teaching composition and the scope of the evaluations, we suggest one of the following two models for these evaluative activities:

- NTT faculty might choose to be evaluated through a conversation and class visit by at least one colleague who teaches composition.
- NTT faculty can elect to be members of a small mentoring group (of 3-4 colleagues) who visit each other's classes and write evaluations.

For all NTT faculty we propose

- that the evaluation include the whole semester plan as well as the class visit and that the teachers and evaluators discuss good teaching practice in an end-of-the-semester staff meeting.

- that NTT faculty attend the pre-semester orientation and at least one composition workshop or discussion each year.

Suggested Criteria for Evaluation

1. Comments on syllabus design and course plan: do they reflect best current practice in teaching composition?

   - Strengths

   - Suggestions

2. How does the class plan fit into the syllabus and reflect the best current practice in the field? Describe class activities and their effectiveness.

   - Strengths

   - Suggestions

3. Comment on the interactions between teacher and students (clarity, questions and responses, involvement of students)

   - Strengths

   - Suggestions

Once you have completed your observation, please do the following:

1. Submit the peer evaluation to the faculty observed.

2. Wait for feedback regarding any suggestions for revision or questions that the faculty observed may have.

3. Submit a copy of your peer evaluation to **both** Kim Gunter and the English Department administrative assistant. These can be either electronic or paper copies.

4. The faculty member being evaluated is encouraged to submit a response to the evaluation if she feels it is important or necessary to do so.

No faculty handbook readily available.

Ball State University

Student evaluations are completed online, which was a relatively recent switch.

Faculty Resource Page
(http://cms.bsu.edu/about/administrativeoffices/provost/facresources/crseresponsefaqs)

Faculty Handbook discusses PT, but states that those decisions are made at the Department and College levels – pg. 76-97). (http://cms.bsu.edu/-/media/WWW/DepartmentalContent/FacProfHandbook/201516/201516C2.pdf

3. Policy Statements for Materials Presented for Promotion and Tenure Purposes
3.1 Promotion and Tenure Materials Presented by Faculty Members. Faculty members shall present promotion and tenure materials in a format specified by college and departmental policies for tenure or promotion deliberations. Those materials shall contain a curriculum vitae and supporting documentation in accordance with guidelines established by departments and colleges for those materials.

3.2 Internal Records and Materials: Section II of this Handbook, Faculty and Professional Personnel Policies - - Files, defines a personnel file and identifies materials for a personnel file. A portion of this personnel file shall be designated the Promotion and Tenure file, shall be separately maintained, and 82 shall be kept in the department chairperson's office for every individual faculty member or professional personnel member who is eligible to be considered for promotion and/or tenure. As is the case with the entire personnel file, this Promotion and Tenure file shall be open to the faculty or professional personnel member concerned. Materials shall be placed in the file in a timely manner by the department chairperson.

3.3 A candidate's Promotion and Tenure file shall contain all materials and only those materials relevant to promotion and/or tenure. Such materials include, but are not limited to, vita; forms concerning changes in appointment; formal evaluations by supervisors; teaching evaluations; information concerning scholarly productivity or creative endeavors; information concerning service in a professional capacity; information concerning any disciplinary actions taken; information concerning the status of any formal charges against an employee; or signed letters from students, alumni, peers, supervisors, etc., concerning teaching, scholarly productivity or creative endeavors, or service in a professional capacity. Information about the individual's gender, race, disability, national origin, religion, age, veteran status, citizenship, sexual orientation, or marital status may not be included. As with all contents of the personnel file, when information detrimental to an individual is placed in the candidate's Promotion and Tenure file, it shall be brought to his or her attention in writing at once by his or her administrative head. The faculty or professional personnel member shall have the opportunity to place in the file materials which might rebut or explain the detrimental information. Detrimental material that has not been brought to the attention of the faculty or professional personnel member cannot be used in subsequent promotion and tenure deliberations. Anonymous letters shall not be made a part of this file.

Bowling Green State University

It seems that departments have specific criteria for merit, etc., but there isn't a publically posted Faculty Handbook.

For example:

IV. ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION AND DETERMINATION OF MERIT

Bowling Green State University / College of Arts and Sciences / Philosophy / Graduate Program / Graduate Student Handbook / Philosophy Department / Department Policies and Procedures / IV Annual Faculty Evaluation and Determination of Merit
ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION AND DETERMINATION OF MERIT

(Revised January 2011)

Department of Philosophy

College of Arts and Sciences

Bowling Green State University

This policy governs the annual evaluation of faculty and the annual determination of merit, as well as the activities of the Faculty Evaluation Committee of the Department of Philosophy (hereinafter "the Committee"). It does not in any way limit the charter- mandated responsibilities of the department Chair.

The performance indicators described in Policy I the *Departmental Policies for Annual Review, Merit, Contract Renewal, Promotion, and Tenure of Tenured and Probationary Faculty* should be used for annual merit review. The annual merit review will be based upon the accomplishments over the most recent three-year period on a rolling basis, ie., each year new information is added to the file for the most recent year, and information from the oldest year is eliminated from the file. This will help to reduce inequities that can result both from differences in the merit funds available each year and from fluctuations in performance that may occur from year to year.

The Committee will perform the following tasks annually using the following time table and process.

A: Calculation of Merit Points

1. *Time Table.* The Committee will solicit new information from the faculty regarding their professional activity in the past calendar year for teaching, research and service activities. Results of student evaluations of teaching as indicated on the Department's standard form are required for all courses taught during the regular academic year.

The Committee will evaluate the teaching, research and service of each faculty member and publish the results of these evaluations in each of the three categories, as well as an overall evaluation for each faculty member, by March 1.

2. *Evaluation Criteria.* All evaluations will be done using the departmental scale: (3) greatly exceeds expectations, (2) exceeds expectations, (1) meets expectations, and (0) does not meet expectations.

The departmental scale will be interpreted as giving assessments equivalent to those measured on the following three point scale used by the university: (2) exceeds expectations, (1) meets expectations, and (0) does not meet expectations. The departmental ratings of (3) and (2) will be converted to a rating of (2) on the university scale.

University policy limits eligibility for merit increases to those who have an overall rating of (2) exceeds expectations. Any faculty member who receives at least a rating of (1) meets expectations in all three areas and a rating of (2) exceeds expectations in at least one area is eligible for merit and shall be given an overall rating of (2). [The rationale for this is that anyone who does what is expected in every area, but does more than expected in at least one area is, overall, exceeding expectations.

Overall Evaluation or Merit Score

The department expects its faculty to maintain a standard allocation of effort that approximates 40% teaching, 40% research and 20% service. These weights will apply to most faculty who are carrying full teaching loads as defined by department policy. Modification of the allocation of effort for a faculty member who receives released time from teaching duties for administrative responsibilities or for research will be determined as follows: each course of reduced teaching load will reduce the allocation of effort to teaching by 10% and increase the allocation of effort to service or to research, respectively, by 10%. For example, a faculty member with a one course reduction in teaching load to compensate for increased administrative duties will be expected to allocate 30% to teaching, 40% to research, and 30% to service.

A faculty member's overall evaluation shall be based on the evaluations in the three areas using the following rule: the individual's points in teaching, research, and service, will be multiplied by the percent allocations of effort that are expected in those areas, and the overall rating will be the sum of the numbers thus calculated. In the standard case, the individual's points in both teaching and research will be multiplied by .4, the points in service will be multiplied by .2.

Teaching. Student evaluations of teaching shall be required from all classes using the departmental form for determining annual salary recommendations. Raw student evaluation scores for the teacher and the class will be adjusted in the light of the class size and of the course level (lower division, upper division, or graduate level). In addition, raw student evaluation scores will be further adjusted in the light of the written comments submitted by students. Each member of the Committee will review student's comments from each class.

The evaluation of teaching should include, but not be limited to, student evaluations, course objectives, methods, organization, and the communication skills of the instructor. The members of the Committee should evaluate all faculty using the same standards.

Conclusions concerning teaching evaluations will take into account other teaching related activities, such as: directed readings, thesis and dissertation committees, curriculum development, unpaid overloads, extra course assignments, and participation in teaching large-lecture courses.

Whereas members of the Graduate Faculty regularly teach a four course annual load not only to facilitate their research efforts but significantly also to provide them time to work with graduate students, for example, on directed readings, internship supervision and theses and dissertation committees, the Committee shall give due consideration to the performance of such duties in its evaluation of their teaching. To receive a grade of "3" or "greatly exceeds expectations", in teaching, graduate faculty with a standard four course teaching load must be members of at least two doctoral or masters committees of Philosophy graduate students. Beyond this minimum, membership on committees of graduate students in departments other than Philosophy shall receive the same credit as membership on committees of Philosophy graduate students (excluding service merely as the Graduate Faculty Representative).

Research. Each faculty member's research will be evaluated using the following criteria: monographs will be given greater weight than textbooks; papers in national journals will be given greater weight than regional journals (e.g. _Proceedings of the Ohio Philosophical Association_); normally, refereed articles will be given more weight than non-refereed articles; and paper presentations at a conference will outweigh commenting on a paper, panel participation or the chairing of a session. ***With regard to the scholarship of engagement, faculty will be evaluated in terms of the indicators in "A Guide for Documenting the Scholarship of Engagement at BGSU" (Appendix D of the Report of the Standards Committee on the Scholarship of Engagement—see attached). Faculty submitting scholarship of engagement activities for evaluation should provide a summary account of the activity and a brief explanation of the value they perceive the activity to have based on these indicators.***

In regard to those who have funded part-time appointments outside of the Department the Committee shall evaluate their contributions to the Department, and those who supervise the activities outside of the Department should evaluate those activities. Further, the merit monies that such persons receive will be calculated by taking the points they would have received if full-time and by multiplying them by the percentage of time that they spend in the Department. Moreover, research merit ranking for those

with part-time contracts should be multiplied by the percentage of time in the Department. In order to help those with part-time appointments outside of the Department, the Committee will communicate to their supervisors concerning the meritorious work that they have done in the Department, particularly in the area of research.

 Service. The Committee shall evaluate service of faculty members in light of the criteria listed in Policy I, the _Departmental Policies for Annual Review, Merit, Contract Renewal, Promotion, and Tenure of Tenured and Probationary Faculty_. Included in the area of service is work on external affiliations and partnerships appropriate to the Department's mission in Applied Philosophy. Attendance at departmental colloquia is included.

Central Michigan University

Didn't find any evidence of student evaluations for faculty. There is an online system, but you have to have a login/password to get into it.

Western Kentucky University
Academic Quality Committee

Teaching Evaluation Guidelines from Benchmark Institutions

Prepared by Helen Liang
Feb 5, 2016

The following memo documents the guidelines of using teaching evaluation from four benchmark institutions of WKU:

1. Eastern Tennessee State University
2. East Carolina University
3. Florida Atlantic University
4. Illinois State University

All these universities require using more than one factor in the evaluation of teaching performance, including peer review, self-reported teaching/developing activities, and others. In all these universities departments have their own criteria in evaluation, based on university-wide criteria.

1. Eastern Tennessee State University

There is not a university-wide guideline/criteria on how to use teaching evaluation in tenure/promotion. There are detailed guideline in each college and departmental level. **Each department seems to have a different set of criteria.** Most departmental guidelines include **both quantitative and qualitative** measures on teaching effectiveness. (See two attached examples.)

Quantitative measures include student evaluation, the number of new course preparations (subjects and delivery methods), teaching workshops attended, articles published related to pedagogical research, etc.

Qualitative measures include comments from student evaluation, informal evaluations/peer evaluations, departmental chair's evaluation of syllabus, course material, academic rigor, students' letters, curriculum development (new course, new material, incorporating research into teaching, etc.).

ETSU attachments
A1.1 College of Business, Management & Marketing Department (7 pages):
http://www.etsu.edu/senate/facultyhandbook/colldept/documents/cbat/Management%20and%20Markeitng%20Promotion%20and%20Tenure%20Criteria%207-15.pdf

A1.2 College of Clinical & Rehabilitative Health Sciences, Dept. of Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology (13 pages):
http://www.etsu.edu/senate/facultyhandbook/colldept/aslp%20promotion%20and%20tenure%20rubric%202014.pdf

2. East Carolina University
At university level, **peer evaluation** is required for all tenure track faculty in addition to **student evaluation**. Details are provided at the link below (2.2). **Each faculty member is to be reviewed by two**

peer faculty members at least twice in the first four years of appointment (in the first year and in the fourth year). These reviewers must undergo training to qualify, according to Faculty Senate Policy (http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/ofe/upload/FacSenDoc-2.doc). Of the two reviewers, one is appointed by departmental chair, the other by the faculty being reviewed.

At departmental level, each department seems to have their own criteria. An example is in section 2.3, Department of Physical Therapy. This department requires **a combination of material** to evaluate teaching effectiveness, including course material (syllabus, teaching portfolio, etc.), sample student work, peer evaluation, and student evaluations.

2.1 Student evaluation procedure and forms
http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/ipar/assessment/spots.cfm#
2.1.1 Student evaluation form for face-to-face class:
http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/ipar/assessment/upload/SPOTS_ST_EXAMPLE-V2.pdf
2.1.2 Student evaluation form for online class
http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/ipar/assessment/upload/SPOTS_DL_EXAMPLE-V2.pdf

2.2 Peer evaluation procedure and forms
http://www.ecu.edu/ofe/evaluation_peer-review.cfm
http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/ofe/upload/FacSenDoc-2.doc
2.2.1 Peer evaluation form for face-to-face class
http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/committee/as/peerreviewinstrument.pdf
2.2.2 Peer evaluation form for online class
http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/committee/as/peerreviewinstrumentforonlinecourses.pdf

2.3 Sample departmental guideline for teaching evaluation, Department of Physical Therapy:
http://www.ecu.edu/cs-dhs/pt/upload/PTHE-Evaluation-of-Teaching-Final.pdf

3. Florida Atlantic University
There is no university-wide guideline or formal procedure on how to use student evaluation and peer evaluation. **At departmental level, a combination** of student evaluation, peer evaluation, and other measures are used, as in the sample departmental guidelines (3.1 and 3.2). The list of material used for teaching evaluation is similar to ECU. FAU puts **more emphasis on advising graduate students** and serving as committee member for students, i.e. **research-related instruction activities**.

3.1 Department of Political Science Annual Evaluation Policy:
http://www.fau.edu/artsandletters/pdf/POSCAnnualEvalPolicy.pdf

3.2 Department of Physics Annual Evaluation Policy:
http://www.physics.fau.edu/documents/P_T_guidelines_v7.pdf

4. Illinois State University
4.1 The **university specifies in tenure and promotion criteria** that "departments should use **at least two types of factors to evaluate teaching performance**"
(http://provost.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/aspt/ASPTmasterAugust2011.pdf , page 62-63), one of which should be student evaluation, others including peer review of teaching material, classroom performance, mentoring students, curriculum development, etc.

At departmental level, each department has its own evaluation criteria, ranging from very sketchy to very specific.

4.2 Department of Psychology lists three categories of factors
(http://provost.illinoisstate.edu/faculty/tenure/PSY%20DFSC%20standards.pdf):
group instruction (student evaluation, teach different student body, different delivery methods, etc.), supervising and mentoring students, and developing learning activity (such as curriculum development, using new teaching material).

4.3 Department of Management
(http://provost.illinoisstate.edu/faculty/tenure/MQM%20DFSC%20Standards%202014.pdf , page 4)
requires "favorable student evaluation" and "**use of techniques beyond information providing**" such as cases, simulations, or "critical thinking" pedagogy.

Indiana State University

From handbook:

310 FACULTY DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

310.1.3.1 Course Evaluations. The quality of teaching will be given high priority in performance evaluations. Multiple methods of evaluation are appropriate, but all courses must be evaluated by students using a common pool of items selected by the university, and if appropriate, the college and department; faculty are encouraged to supplement with items that assess the unique characteristics of their courses. Course evaluations will be collected via software purchased by the University. Results of course evaluations will be made available to the faculty member; summary results of the evaluations for each section will be made available to the appropriate Department Chair and academic Dean(s). (Note: Effective Fall 2015).

From "Report to Executive Committee of the University Senate from AAUP ~ ISU Chapter"

Presented by: Richard H. Lotspeich, Officer at Large Date: 10 November 2015 AAUP~ISU Chapter believes the following issues warrant the attention of the top faculty leadership at Indiana State University.

Full document:

http://www2.indstate.edu/aaup/docs/AAUP-Rept-SEC-10Nov2015.pdf

Relevant section:

3. Student Course Evaluations: Linkage to Violations of Academic Integrity, Other Concerns We are concerned about the uncritical use of student course evaluations in appraising faculty performance when faculty members have submitted reports of student violations of academic integrity. Recent research from the University of Texas has demonstrated a substantial and statistically significant downward bias in student course evaluations when faculty members pursued disciplinary action against a student in a class. This has created an atmosphere in which faculty are reluctant to pursue disciplinary measures for cheating and plagiarism. We believe that such an atmosphere also exists at Indiana State University, and that this is ultimately harmful to the process of education here. We recommend that a charge be given to the Faculty Affairs Committee to review the University of Texas research and develop a plan to address the downward bias in evaluation scores associated with disciplinary measures against violations of academic integrity. A policy designed to address this is needed in order to provide faculty members, especially assistant professors and contingent faculty, with confidence that pursuing disciplinary measures will not harm their own professional careers. This particular concern is but one of several reasons to be wary of student course evaluations. Another reason is the broader incentive they establish for instructors to teach at a lower level of rigor and to be less demanding of students. A third reason is that student course evaluations are highly imperfect as an indicator of the quality of instruction, yet the provision of specific numbers in this role induces belief in their validity. Because the University is implementing a new student course evaluation system,

AAUP~ISU Chapter recommends a comprehensive review of the process and results. The University needs to know a number of things about student course evaluations, including the following: 1) What percentage of students complete the surveys? 2) How are the data generated used by faculty, chairs, and deans? 3) What impacts do evaluations have on teaching? Are they providing valuable feedback? Do they incent less rigor and fewer disciplinary measures? 4) What other problems do administrators, students and faculty see in them?

From Testing office website:

http://www.indstate.edu/services/testing/faculty

Relevant information:

Student Instructional Reports (SIRs and eSIRs)
Electronic versions of SIRs are available from Fall 2003 to Spring 2014. eSIR reports are also available from Fall 2010 to Spring 2014. All requests are processed within two business days.

Conclusion:

Indiana State University is currently in the process of standardizing/changing their student course. It is unlikely they have established University-wide guidelines.

James Madison University

From handbook:

III.E.2.b.(1) Teaching Consideration of teaching performance must include, but need not be limited to, the following: self-evaluation, evaluations by peers and/or AUHs, and student evaluations. Consideration should be given to a faculty member's commitment to student advising and innovations in teaching as evidenced by development of new course work and teaching methodology. In those academic units that do not use student evaluations in all classes taught by a faculty member, the policy determining which classes will be evaluated shall be stated in the academic unit's evaluation procedures. Any such policy shall apply equally to all similarly situated faculty members in the academic unit.

Conclusion:

It appears that academic units get to define their own criteria and procedures, including questions on student survey tools. There seems to be a major (somewhat) recent push to change to standardize their system:
https://www.jmu.edu/academic-affairs/_documents/2012-07-19-student-evals-report.pdf

It is unlikely they have established University-wide guidelines.

MTSU

From handbook:

Evaluation Procedures
[…clipped…] Results of the faculty evaluations are used as a part of the decision making for re-hiring, renewal, promotion and tenure processes. Additionally, student evaluations of faculty are conducted, minimally, fall and spring semesters for tenured, tenure-track and temporary full-time faculty, and every semester for adjuncts, part-time faculty, and GTAs. The evaluation by students are to be administered by someone other than the faculty member being evaluated. The faculty member being evaluated should not be in the room at the time the evaluations are being done. Student evaluation results are shared with the faculty member evaluated, with the department chairperson, and with the respective dean.

http://www.mtsu.edu/provost/newinstrument.pdf

Conclusion:

Could not find much else on their website related to guidelines or standards.

Northern Illinois University

From handbook:

http://www.niu.edu/provost/policies/appm/II14.shtml

Only one common question (related to "teaching effectiveness") and some protocol guidelines. The rest is left up to the Department level. Policy is reviewed every 5 years by Senate.

Guidelines for administration and submission (not interpretation) are available here:

http://niu.edu/testing/course_evaluation_processing/index.shtml

Other:

It appears that a couple of colleges have switched to online forms but AND that they have used different vendors within the last several years. The following document outlines some general advisories developed by Senate committee:

http://www.niu.edu/u_council/reports/FS-Academic-Affairs/2011-2012/FS-AA-Online_Course_Eval_report-FS-04-25-12.pdf

Other:

No University-wide guidelines or even common questions.

OU Faculty handbook-

The criteria used to make decisions on promotion and tenure must originate in the department, school, or division in consultation with the dean.

Towson – Fischer College of Science and Mathematics

https://www.towson.edu/fcsm/facultystaff/promotiontenure.html

Teaching — The general expectation of the FCSM is that teaching is our central function and that all faculty should strive to be outstanding teachers. Assessing teaching performance, however, is extremely difficult. Our general philosophy is that no single criterion can be used to adequately judge teaching performance. At a minimum, the following must be used to measure teaching effectiveness. The listed items are not prioritized according to order of importance.

- Quantitative student evaluation scores as designated by the department. The method for determination of quantitative scores should be provided by each department to the FCSM PTRM Committee
- All qualitative comments from student evaluation forms.
- Course syllabi.
- Copies of all signed reports from peer observations of teaching teaching (Approved departmental peer observation forms can be found in Appendix C).
- Evidence of advising (include a narrative summary and self-reflection that describes the number of advisees, methods of advisement, range of issues discussed, etc.)

However, in addition to the above items, other measures are also appropriate. Other items that may be included, where appropriate, are (but not limited to) the following. The list is not prioritized according to order of importance:

- examples of novel assessments
- evidence of the development of new courses
- evidence of modification of course content or delivery
- evidence of improvement of personal knowledge of subject content or teaching methodologies
- evidence of contributions and/or delivery of a new curriculum professional awards for teaching excellence
- evidence of supervision of student research
- evidence of advising
- for mathematics and science educators: evidence of supervision and mentoring of pre-service teachers

UNC Charlotte-

http://provost.uncc.edu/academic-budget-personnel/handbook/c-review-reappointment-promotion-and-conferral-permanent-tenure

1. Teaching, Advising, Curriculum and Instructional Development

Effective teaching is the primary mission of the University and, therefore, is an essential criterion for appointment or advancement. Clear documentation of effectiveness in this area is required for approval of any recommendation for reappointment, promotion, or conferral of permanent tenure.

Effective teaching encompasses a broad range of activities in addition to performance in the classroom, and the weighting of each may differ from case to case. The total performance of the candidate in this area must be evaluated according to established department and college criteria and standards, taking into consideration the types and levels of instructional activities assigned to and expected of the candidate.

Evaluation of the candidate's teaching should consider at least the following:

a. Subject Competence. What subject areas and level of courses normally are taught by the candidate and what is their relevance to the department's curriculum? Does the candidate have full command of the subject and an understanding of its relationship to other areas of knowledge? Is course content current and appropriate for the level of the course and curriculum?

b. Course Design. Are the courses taught by the candidate organized appropriately for their subject matter and placed within the curriculum? Are instructional strategies and course materials appropriate for the level of the course, size of the class, nature and preparation of the students, contact hours, and schedule of class meetings?

c. Course Presentation. Are course materials presented clearly and coherently? Does the candidate present the course with enthusiasm that supports the learning process? Is the course presented in a manner that stimulates the interest and involvement of students and challenges their abilities? What is the candidate's impact on the quality of student performance?

d. Advising. What is the type and the extent of advising responsibilities of the candidate? What measures does the department use to evaluate advising effectiveness, and what are the results of these evaluations? To what extent has the candidate attempted to improve the effectiveness of advising? Have these efforts been successful?

e. Directing Student Research. What types and levels of student research have been directed by the candidate? How does the department evaluate effectiveness in guiding student research, and what are the results of these evaluations for the candidate?

f. Supervision of Graduate Teaching Assistants. What responsibilities has the candidate had, if any, for training, supervising, and evaluating graduate teaching assistants? How does the department evaluate effectiveness in fulfilling such responsibilities, and what are the results of these evaluations for the candidate?

g. Curriculum and Instructional Development. What has the candidate contributed to development of the curriculum, and how has this contribution been evaluated? How effective, innovative, and significant have the instructional strategies and materials developed and disseminated by the candidate been? What are the significance and results of curriculum and instructional development projects for which the candidate has been awarded grant funding? What are the quality and significance of other contributions to pedagogy by the candidate?

Each College seems to have it's own, more specific, guidelines for the evaluation of teaching

Appendix A - Faculty Evaluation Criteria
(Revised and Approved by Faculty, November 2008; minor edits approved November 2009

TEACHING

Teaching evaluations are a necessary, but not sufficient, component of assessing teaching performance. When assessing teaching scores, other factors can be considered, including the courses taught and trends in scores. In addition, faculty development efforts to improve teaching should be recognized as part of the evaluation process.

It is recommended that the maximum a faculty member's teaching performance rating can be raised based on teaching development activities is one Level. For example, if the department chair reviews the annual teaching activities and teaching narrative provided by a faculty member and determines that the faculty member merits a Level 3 (Satisfactory) teaching score for the year, the chair may then consider raising the faculty member's evaluation based on faculty development activities during the year (e.g.Master Teacher, Lilly, Faculty Commons Programs etc). However, the chair should limit the increased rating due to development activities to a maximum of one level. In the example provided above, a rating of 3 could only be raised to a 3.5 or 4 based on development activities.

Teaching Designations

Level 1: A faculty member whose teaching is not acceptable. The faculty member is judged as having significant problems as judged by his/her peers and chair/director and is failing to meet the minimum teaching expectations identified in Level 2. Some indications of unacceptable teaching from peer and student evaluations may include: the faculty member makes no effort to improve teaching, the faculty member does not seem prepared for classroom activities, does not seem current on the subject matter, shows little enthusiasm for the subject matter or classroom interaction, does not return examinations and assignments in a timely manner, does not manage the classroom well, is not available to students, etc. This level of performance often leads to student complaints judged as significant by peers and department chairs/directors and by teaching evaluations consistently below the department and college averages. This professor should not be in the classroom at Ohio University.

Level 2: The activities listed in Level 2 define the minimum expectations for teaching. A faculty member who earns a Level 2 rating may meet the minimum expectations for teaching, but their teaching still needs improvement and observation. This level of performance occasionally leads to student complaints judged as significant by peers and department chairs/directors and by teaching evaluations below the department and

1

college averages. The faculty member does meet all of the following minimum expectations:

X Having an appropriate (as defined by the department, college and University) syllabus which is distributed at the first meeting of the class.

X Collecting and submitting required assessment data to support Assurance of Learning efforts for courses that are part of that effort.

X Meeting with the class at the scheduled times unless there are extenuating circumstances.

X Incorporating current AACSB business context and functional area requirements into appropriate courses as defined by the College and departmental curricular missions

X Incorporating library and computer resources into appropriate courses as defined by the College and departmental curricular missions

X Adhering to college policies regarding student evaluations and obtaining adequate student evaluations in all courses taught without consistent serious problems as judged by departmental peers.

X Being available in his/her office during posted office hours (as specified by departmental policy) unless there is an unavoidable conflict

X Returning examinations and assignments with comments in a timely manner

X Submitting course grades in a timely manner

Level 3: A faculty member in this Level performs satisfactorily based on student evaluations and a peer review of the relevant teaching materials. Teaching evaluation scores are typically near the department and college averages. In addition to meeting the minimum expectations for teaching, the faculty member is judged as providing a positive learning environment which is conducive to student learning. This faculty member would benefit from developing behaviors such as those described in Level 4 and 5.

Satisfactory performance is typically demonstrated through activities such as:

X Showing evidence of continuous improvement of existing course content and delivery for all courses taught as judged by departmental peers.

X Being prepared for the classroom (speaking to the topic area, demonstrating preparation through logical and informative lectures, class exercises or other related pedagogical tools) Note - this could be measured by peer review or through student evaluations.

X Maintaining an updated teaching portfolio judged as average by peers.

X Participation in a faculty development initiative focused on teaching improvement requiring low levels of time, effort, or formality. (e.g. 1 hour workshop; having a colleague watch a class and provide informal feedback, etc.).

X Sharing of Teaching Best Practices from Conferences or Workshops with COB Faculty at a Presentation or Brown Bag Lunch.

Level 4: A faculty member who is recognized by peers and students in valid documented evaluations as an above average teacher typically has teaching evaluations above the department and college averages.

In addition to meeting the minimum expectations for teaching, a significant level or number of activities such as those listed below can be used as evidence of above average teaching.

X Maintaining an updated teaching portfolio demonstrating teaching judged as above average by departmental peers

X Participating effectively as the subject in a teaching improvement effort involving classroom visitations with feedback or participation in multiple faculty development initiatives focused on teaching improvement. These efforts are characterized as requiring more formality, effort, and rigor than Level 3 activities.

X Preparing a course that they are teaching for the first time

X Effectively teaching extremely large sections. (The Faculty Evaluation Committee will judge whether the sections taught would constitute a large section. Evidence from the Faculty Annual Evaluation Form will be used in making this determination.   It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to make the case that a course should be considered a large section.)

X Participating effectively in an effort targeting the integration of disciplines (cluster, Integrated MBA, etc)

X   Demonstrating significant incorporation of active and applied learning in courses taught

X   Effectively supervising Thesis/Dissertation committees, participating in the departmental Honors' Programs or tutoring Honors Tutorial Students.

X   Effectively supervising Independent Study/Internship judged as significant by departmental peers.

X   Having teaching evaluations judged by departmental peers as above average.

X   Having a larger than normal number of assigned preparations per year on the Athens campus (for faculty with teaching reductions for intellectual activities, the normal number of preparations will be less than that for faculty without such reductions).

X   Receiving departmental teaching honors

X   Being readily available to students at times other than posted office hours for discussion and counseling.

X   Participating in faculty development activities focused on teaching judged as above average by peers.

X   Participating in peer review of teaching by colleagues or outside experts.

Level 5:   A faculty member who is clearly excellent in the classroom compared with his or her colleagues. This person exhibits many of the following traits: attends seminars or colloquia for improvement; tries new pedagogical methods and technologies in the classroom; shares successful techniques with colleagues; and receives teaching evaluations significantly higher than department and college averages. A faculty member that receives a Level 5 typically includes regular peer review of teaching in their annual development activities.

In addition to meeting the minimum expectations for teaching, aA significant number or level of activities such as those listed below can be used as evidence of excellent teaching:

X   Receiving a University Professor Award or other COB teaching award judged as significant by departmental peers (Awards that last more than 1 year, such as a University Professor Award, can be included as part of the faculty narrative for the entire term of the award.).

X   Developing and successfully delivering a new, standalone course at the request of the department or college in support of the department or college mission judged as being significant by departmental peers and chairs/directors.

X   New contributions to interdisciplinary/interdepartmental curriculum integration judged as significant by departmental peers and chairs/directors.

X   Teaching evaluations judged by departmental peers as excellent

X   Maintaining an updated teaching portfolio demonstrating materials and methods judged by departmental peers as excellent. Such a portfolio should contain documented evaluations of classroom performance; attendance at seminars or colloquia for improvement of teaching; and other materials expected in an excellent teaching portfolio. Participation in a faculty development initiative focused on teaching improvement.

X   Participation in faculty development initiatives focused on teaching improvement judged as significant by department and college peers (e.g. Master Teacher Conference).

X   Participating in peer review of teaching by colleagues or outside experts judged as significant by peers.

INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For purposes of categorizing Intellectual Contributions, each department will maintain a journal list organized into four levels as follows:

1. Elite Journals – the top 3-5 journals in the field, typically rated as "A" journals
2. Top Journals – the next 10-15 journals that are considered to be high quality journals or journals that are the top journals of discipline sub-specialties ("best-in-class"). These are typically B+ to A- journals.
3. High Quality Journals – the next 20+ journals that are solid journals in the field. These are typically B level journals
4. Acceptable Journals – the remaining journals in the field.

In all cases these are to be peer or editor- reviewed outlets. While each department has the discretion to develop a journal list consistent with the mission of the department or college, the department journal lists should be reasonably consistent with peer institutions or colleges with similar missions.

Consistent with our college's goal of encouraging and supporting cross-disciplinary research, faculty members can receive credit for cross-disciplinary research that appears in journal outlets on other department journal lists within the college. Faculty members

5

may also get credit for research related to their discipline published in peer-reviewed outlets not on current college or department lists or in an outlet from a discipline outside the college. However, to receive credit, faculty members must submit a request to the department chair summarizing the research and the proposed outlet under consideration. If the chair determines that the research is relevant to the discipline and that the proposed outlet is peer-reviewed and appropriate, a memorandum approving the outlet will be provided to the faculty member. This approval must be included with the research in the year it is being counted in the performance evaluation process.

The college will develop a College Journal List to capture those publication outlets that are interdisciplinary or broad in focus and apply to all departments (eg HBR, Journal of Business Ethics).

Intellectual Contribution Activities will be placed in the following levels of the IC Rubric for the annual performance review process:

- An Elite Journal Publication = 5 Rating for Two Years
- Top Journal = 5 Rating for One Year
- Two High Quality Journals = 4.5 Rating for One Year
- High Quality Journal = 4 Rating for One Year
- Two Acceptable Journals = 4 Rating for One Year
- One Acceptable Journal = 3.5 Rating for One Year
- One Peer-reviewed Conference = 3 Rating for One Year

Level 1

No evidence of research activity

Level 2
The minimum expectation for research activity may be met with at least one of the following activities:

X   Submission of manuscript to peer-reviewed or editorial board reviewed journal

X   Submission of manuscript or instructional software to publisher

X   Submission of paper to peer-reviewed academic, professional, or pedagogical meeting

X   Documented progress on or completion of a manuscript/working paper

X   Submission of an external grant proposal

X   Funding of an internal grant request

X   Attendance at a Research Development workshop, seminar, or conference. The faculty member should describe the impact of the development activity in the

narrative.

X   Invited published papers

A Group I faculty member who has no course reductions for research cannot be evaluated as being a "Level 2" in three successive years. If this happens, the faculty member will be rated as a "Level 1" until a rating of at least Level 3 has been achieved.

Level 3

Achievement of at least one of the following results:

X   Submission of external research grant proposal judged as being significant by peers and departmental chairs/directors

X   Presentation of peer-reviewed paper**,** workshop, symposia, poster-session, etc., at an acceptable academic, professional, or pedagogical conference or meeting

X   Invited published papers judged by peers as requiring significant effort or having a significant impact based on quality or publication outlet.

X   Publication of a case or paper in peer-reviewed meeting proceedings or book

X   Publication of chapter in scholarly book, professional book or textbook

X   Publication of book review in peer-reviewed journal

X   Publication of editorials or research comments in professional or academic publication.

Level 3.5

X   Publication of one Acceptable Journal article

Level 4

Evaluation in Level 4 is earned by achievement of one of the following results:

X   Publication of a High Quality Journal article

X   Publication of two Acceptable Journal articles

X   Publication of peer-reviewed research monograph

X   Publication of a new edition of a scholarly book, professional book or textbook judged as significant by department peers and chair/director

X   Publication of instructional software judged as significant by the faculty's peers
        and departmental chair/director

X   Funding of external research grant (including OURC and Baker) judged as
        significant by departmental peers and chairs/directors.

Level 4.5

Evaluation at Level 4.5 is earned by publication of 2 High Quality Journal Articles

Level 5

Evaluation in Level 5 is earned by

X   Publication of an Elite Journal article earns a Level 5 rating for two consecutive
        years.

X   Publication of one Top Journal article

X   Publication of a new scholarly book, professional book or textbook judged as
significant by department peers and chair/director.

Activity Reporting Times
Unless noted otherwise, intellectual contributions should be counted as follows:

X   Books, book chapters, instructional software and monographs in the year of
        copyright, acceptance date or publication date. The faculty member must clearly
        state which date is to be considered.

X   Journal publications in the year of formal acceptance or publication date. The
        faculty member must clearly state which date is to be considered.

X   Papers presented in the year the meeting is held

Banking of Intellectual Contributions

For purposes of evaluation, faculty may "bank" intellectual contributions. In other words,
faculty may decide to have certain intellectual contributions count in another year. All
peer-reviewed publications (articles and equivalents under the Tenure and Promotion
policy) can be "banked" up to two years. This can be done as long as the faculty member
clearly indicates which publication is going to count in which year. This would mean that
an article with a publication date in 2012 can be counted in 2012, 2013 or 2014. Faculty
also still have the option of counting an article in the year of acceptance or publication

which essentially gives a faculty member a four-year window into which they can count the publication for evaluation purposes if an acceptance occurs the year before publication. Departmental chairs/directors will be required to maintain a record of which publications are counted in which year in the Faculty Annual Evaluation Form.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY/SERVICE

Level 1

There is no evidence of professional activity at this level. The faculty member does not meet many of the Level 2 requirements for Service.

Level 2

The minimum expectations for service include the following activities. A faculty member that fails to meet minimum expectations for service within the department and college can have their service evaluation reduced even if some higher level service activities are present:

Service

X   Serving on a college CIT with a positive evaluation from the Team Leader or other approved alternative demonstrating regular attendance to CIT meetings and contributing to the work and activities of the CIT.

X   Effective service on departmental committees as rated by the chair of that committee

X   Regular attendance at department and college meetings (approximately half of scheduled meetings).

X   Being a member in a professional organization

X   Providing assigned advisees with academic advising that is judged as effective by departmental peers (e.g. meeting with interested students and providing knowledgable curricular advice)

Level 3

In addition to meeting the minimum expectations for service, a significant level or number of professional or service activities can be used as evidence of satisfactory performance such as the following:

Professional Activity

X Attendance at one professional meeting

X Participation in a professional development activity related to the Faculty Development Plan from the previous year. Professional activities are those activities which contribute to the teaching and/or research capabilities of the faculty member. It must be a documented activity which is approved by the departmental chair.

Service

X Community service judged as significant by departmental peers and departmental chair/directors

X Effectively serving on one or more active (i.e., the group met at least once during the year or that the position required some work**)** University committees and/or College CITeams judged as being significant by departmental peers and chairs/departments.

X Effectively serving on multiple CITeams as judged by the chair of the CITeams.

X Providing student advising judged as effective (meeting with a significant number of advisees and providing knowledgeable curricular advise) by departmental peers

X Student placement or recruitment activity judged as significant by departmental peers.

X Serving as a session chair or serving in a voluntary capacity at a significant national or regional conference

X Effectively teaching an assigned overload course or regional campus

X Undercompensated service activities (regional campus, HTC tutorials, Residential Learning Communities, etc)

Level 4

In addition to meeting the minimum expectations of service, a significant level or number of activities such as those listed below can be used as evidence of above average performance. A faculty member earning a Level 4 in service will meet the minimum expectations for service and typically be engaged in some Level 3 service activities.

Professional Activity

X   Participating in a faculty internship, externship, or involvement in a project judged as significant by departmental peers

X   Organizing a conference workshop, session, or panel judged as significant by departmental peers and chairs/directors.

X   Book and manuscript reviewing judged as significant by departmental peers

X   Attendance at multiple professional conferences

X   Holding an office or serving as a member on an active committee or board of a professional organization (i.e., the group met at least once during the year or that the position required some work)

X   Obtaining and maintaining significant professional certifications as judged by departmental peers

X   Serving as a discussant in a significant national or regional conference judged as significant by departmental peers and chairs/directors

X   Effectively serving on the editorial board of a journal

<u>Service Activity</u>

X   Effectively chairing an active departmental committee or task force that is judged as significant by departmental peers

X   Effectively leading a special departmental project judged as significant by the departmental chair

X   Effectively serving as advisor to an active club or student organization as determined by the members of that club or student organization

X   Alumni relations/fund-raising activity judged as significant by departmental peers

X   Career advising efforts judged as significant by departmental peers

X   Serving in a leadership role for student advising

X   Participation on a department or university committee that required a significant amount of time and effort.

X   Serving as an Officer for the College of Business Faculty

X   Significant number or magnitude of undercompensated service (regional campus, HTC tutorials, Residential Learning Communities, etc)

X   Engaging in an above average number of unreported service activities (e.g. Copeland Scholars, Corporate Leaders, receptions, speaking engagements, extra classes without compensation, etc)

Level 5

A significant level & number of professional or service activities listed below can be used as evidence of excellent performance. A faculty member earning a Level 5 in service will meet the minimum expectations for service and typically be engaged in some Level 3 and 4 service activities. A faculty member earning a Level 5 in service must also be engaged in some internal service activities for the department or college.

Professional Activity

X   Effectively serve as the editor or assistant editor of a peer-reviewed journal

X   Organizing and successfully presenting a management development program judged as significant by departmental peers

X   Effectively serving as an officer in or chairing a significant state or national committee as judged by departmental peers

X   Effectively serving as a track chair at a national or regional conference

X   Organizing and successfully presenting a conference workshop, session, or panel judged as outstanding by departmental peers

Service

X   Effectively chairing a college CI Team and submitting an annual report summarizing the activities and accomplishments of the CIT and an assessment of each member's contribution to the CIT

X   Effectively serving as advisor to a significant active club or student organization where a significant time commitment is required: i.e., working with a student group on a major project as determined by the members of the student group or club

X   Serving effectively as a program director without release time

X   Effectively chairing an active university committee or task force

X Serving as a COB Faculty Senator that regularly attends meetings.

X Engaging in a significant number of unreported service activities (e.g. Copeland Scholars, Corporate Leaders, receptions, speaking engagements, extra classes without compensation, etc)

X Serving as a trained teaching mentor for a college faculty member. This level of mentoring would typically be characterized by a close working relationship between the mentor and mentee and require significant time and effort while engaged in a formal and rigorous teaching development process.

TOWSON
UNIVERSITY™

Teaching Evaluation Handbook

Prepared by the
Provost's Teaching Evaluation Task Force

Academic Year 2011/2012

Towson University Teaching Evaluation Handbook
Table of Contents

Introduction

Whether you are a full time tenure track faculty member or a lecturer, clinical or adjunct faculty member, you are all involved in what we focus on and do best at Towson University, teaching. Towson University's new strategic plan, *Towson 2016: Building Within-Reaching Out,* will culminate with our 150th anniversary as an institution of higher learning in Maryland. Since 1866 with the founding of the Maryland State Normal School in Baltimore, our teaching roots have run deep.

Teaching in the 21st century has become, in many ways, a very different experience than what it was in 1866. As this institution has evolved into a large public comprehensive university, so too have our methods of teaching adapted. We now live in a time when technology greatly impacts how we teach. While not losing sight of the basic values of education, we need, now more than ever, to be able to assess our effectiveness as teachers and to continually strive to inform ourselves about how to improve our teaching.

After having read many promotion and tenure files, comprehensive reviews, and faculty annual reports since coming to TU, a very clear pattern about teaching is evident. The very best teachers among us constantly look for ways to improve their teaching and become more effective educators. Quality teaching is hard work; it is a calling; and it is what we should all strive for.

In December of 2010 I asked the deans of six colleges to nominate some of their star teachers to be part of a group to look at how we evaluate teaching. The Teaching Evaluation Task Force, under the leadership of Art Professor Bridget Sullivan, wasted no time meeting the challenges before it. Their initial task was to develop guiding principles for the hiring and evaluation of adjunct faculty. Many of those principles are now embedded into the various college and department guidelines for employing adjunct faculty members. Next, the task force turned to the creation of this *Teaching Evaluation Handbook.* I am extremely proud of the manner in which this group came together, worked diligently, and bonded as a group as they crafted this handbook. All of this was done in the spirit of service to their colleagues and as a way to raise the standards and quality of teaching at TU even higher.

It is my hope that the *Teaching Evaluation Handbook* will serve us all well. My sincere thanks to all who served on the task force; your work will make a difference for TU.

Marcia G. Welsh, PhD
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Overview

Susanna Sayre, Bridget Z. Sullivan

The purpose of the Teaching Evaluation Handbook

This *Teaching Evaluation Handbook* is intended to serve as a resource of examples and guidelines for colleges, departments and faculty to utilize in the preparation of faculty review materials related to teaching. This document is a collection of evaluation models that can be reviewed, considered and potentially adopted by departments and colleges. The major goal of the *Handbook* is to suggest ways to bring about greater consistency and meaningful reflection in the evaluation of teaching across colleges and disciplines at Towson University. The authors of the *Handbook* recognize there are no universally correct or appropriate models of teaching that can be applied across the institution, but instead suggest the quality and value of teaching methods can be revealed in effective evaluation.

NOTE: The *Teaching Evaluation Handbook* does not represent policy and is not intended to supersede or circumvent any guidelines or policies as defined in university, college and department PTRM documents. All faculty should refer to their respective department, college PTRM documents as well as the *Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure of Faculty* for specific information regarding PTRM policies and standards.

The intended audience of this *Teaching Evaluation Handbook*

The *Teaching Evaluation Handbook* is intended to be a useful resource for **<u>all</u>** teaching faculty at Towson University (at every rank and every stage of their teaching careers) as well as academic administrators.

Members of the *Teaching Evaluation Task Force*

The Provost's *Teaching Evaluation Task Force,* TETF, created the *Teaching Evaluation Handbook*. The TETF, formed in late fall of 2010, was charged with the task of guiding the review, revision and improvement of teaching evaluation methods and processes utilized at Towson University. The TETF is comprised of two faculty representatives from each of the university's colleges with faculty as well as three ex-officio members. The task force met for the first time in January of 2011.

TETF Membership

Linda Cooper, Associate Professor, Mathematics, Fisher College of Science & Mathematics

Diana Emanuel, Professor, Audiology, Speech-Language Pathology, and Deaf Studies, College of Health Professions (TETF secretary)

Norma Holter, Professor, Accounting, College of Business & Economics

James Manley, Assistant Professor, Economics, College of Business & Economics

George McCool, Associate Professor of Foreign Languages, College of Liberal Arts

Lynne Murphy, Clinical Associate Professor, Occupational Therapy & Occupational Science, College of Health Professions

Elizabeth Neville, Clinical Professor and Chair, Special Education, College of Education

Sharon Pitcher, Professor, Education, Technology & Literacy, College of Education

Douglas Pryor, TU Chapter President AAUP, Professor, Sociology, ex-officio member

Alex Storrs, Associate Professor, Physics, Astronomy & Geoscience, Fisher College of Science & Mathematics

Susanna Sayre, Lecturer, English, College of Liberal Arts

Bridget Z. Sullivan, Professor, Art+Design, College of Fine Arts and Communications (TETF Chairperson)

Timothy Sullivan, President University Senate, Associate Professor Economics, ex-officio member

Vincent Thomas, Associate Professor, Dance, College of Fine Arts & Communications

James DiLisio, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, ex-officio member

I.

The Teaching Portfolio: Documenting Teaching and Its Improvement
Norma Holter and James Manley

What is a teaching portfolio?

A teaching portfolio is an evidence-based written document using concise, selective details of current teaching to demonstrate performance and spark reflective analysis and peer collaboration leading to improvement of teaching and student learning (Zubizaretta, 1999). It should include a balance of selectively chosen but illustrative evidence with *interpretation* of that evidence, showing how one's teaching has developed over time. The portfolio describes the professor's values and beliefs about teaching; it describes how and why a person teaches and summarizes the manner in which he/she develops the links from philosophy to design to execution. Preparing a teaching portfolio is an opportunity to present one's best work as a teacher.

Why is it recommended?

The university's mission statement declares that "Towson emphasizes excellence in teaching." Teaching portfolios are designed to promote continual improvement as faculty strive toward excellence by encouraging reflection on and improvement of teaching. While student and peer evaluations are important pieces of the portfolio, they are like flashlights because they illuminate only the teaching skills and abilities that fall within their beams, shedding light on only a small part of a professor's performance (Seldin 1991, p.3). The teaching portfolio can provide balance by providing a structure for self-reflection, presentation of data, and responses to data that include student and peer evaluations. It is also an opportunity to clarify the entire process of defining teaching goals, designing materials to accomplish those goals, and carrying out teaching in praxis.

In addition, portfolios are useful in providing evidence when applying for grants and teaching awards, sharing teaching expertise and experience with younger faculty members, and fostering an environment in which a discussion of teaching is normal and encouraged (Seldin 1991, p.4). Finally, a portfolio can guide mentoring and faculty development; as faculty members present themselves and

their teaching more comprehensively, it becomes easier to take part in a cyclical and reflective interaction with others providing dialogue and guidance.

To the extent possible, portfolios should be comprised of materials already incorporated into reviews. The purpose of the portfolio is to be developmental and not evaluative; as such it is to help preparers reflect on and improve their teaching and should not be used to justify disciplinary action.

What should a teaching portfolio contain?

A teaching portfolio should be no more than 8-12 pages long. The main body should concisely, but effectively, present the author's philosophy of teaching and how his or her teaching embodies that approach. The document should produce and organize evidence demonstrating teaching effectiveness and continued attempts for improvement. Appendices can be added to corroborate main points made in the main body of the portfolio. Descriptions of some of the types of data that are useful for this document are described in Section 3.

 Specifically, the main body should include:

- A short teaching philosophy including the faculty member's goals, his or her understanding of how students learn, and why s/he has chosen the specified approach to education;
- How the activities chosen for classes relate to the goals, including a presentation of relevant work samples, perhaps including as appendices syllabi and assignments, examples of student work and grading, and/ or evidence of teaching impact and student achievement;
- An assessment of whether teaching goals are being met, including a self-evaluation and narrative summaries of (and perhaps responses to) recurring themes in student and peer evaluations;
- How teaching materials have been modified in response to changes in students, course materials, the changes in regulation of the teaching subject, the instructor's situation, curriculum changes, and other mitigating factors.

Items here and in the appendices should show the range of activities to showcase an individual's teaching. That is, they should demonstrate that person's development as a teacher, rather than being just a list of accomplishments. Appended material should highlight what is unique or characteristic of him or her as a teacher.

Departments are encouraged to establish written criteria regarding organization and content of both the main body and appendix of the teaching portfolios prepared by their faculty members. Specific instructions should be provided that make assembly of this document a straightforward and easy-to-follow process. Lists may be made available, as appropriate, citing items to be included in various sections of the portfolio along with parameters of adequate sampling. See the examples of teaching portfolios included in the case study section of the handbook, or the detailed examples in the most recent version of the Seldin et al. (2010) text. Finally, relevant information is also contained in the *A.R.T. Policy*, college PTRM documents, and department PTRM documents.

II.
Supporting Data: Collection and Presentation
Linda Cooper, Elizabeth Neville, Vincent Thomas

Acknowledging that the desired outcome of teaching is learning and the development of critical thinking, one of the main goals of assessment is to give the instructor/teacher/professor critical feedback or information that will then inform his/her teaching effectiveness. The assessment of teaching should paint a broad picture of various aspects of teaching that focuses on the specificity of the class and instructor, thus leading to critical information that may be used to validate and enhance teaching and learning. As such, multiple sources of assessment from a range of perspectives encourage a balanced approach to evaluation. Though each of the categories below is limited in its scope of evaluation, together, sources from these categories can be used to evaluate the breadth and depth of teaching.

Student-Generated Data

Students are able to tell us a lot about their perception of our teaching; however, they may be biased or not always qualified to judge effective teaching. Below are the two primary types of student-generated data:

- Student evaluations (quantitative ratings and qualitative comments)
- Student testimonials

Instructor-Generated Artifacts

Teaching is a dynamic process. Through instructor-generated artifacts, teachers provide context of their teaching methodology and have the opportunity to solicit feedback that may address their strengths and weaknesses, and desired direction for growth. They are able to convey their values with regard to class atmosphere (methods of questioning, facilitation of inquiry …) and how they strive to achieve their goals.

- Teaching background and responsibilities, including advising responsibilities, supervision of student groups, and courses taught (titles, codes, credits, contact hours, PG/UG, required/ elective course), supervision undertaken, student demographics (class sizes, number of

sections, homogeneity, majors/ non-majors), teaching status (coordinator, team-teaching, lab/ school/ teacher supervision etc.), grade distributions

- Syllabi
- Instructional materials, activities, assignments, and PowerPoint lectures, examinations
- Formative and summative student assessments with instructor feedback
- Teaching reflections
- Committee participation in course improvement
- Sample of student work
- Video of a class
- Description of advising activities

Peer Review

While our peers do not consistently "experience" our teaching, they should have the expertise to evaluate our subject-matter expertise, appropriateness of course goals, instructional and grading practices and professional ethics.

- Peer observations
- Teaching awards, honors, or acknowledgement of excellence in teaching
- Invited presentations (departmental, university-wide, outside source)

The following University of North Dakota Office of Instructional Development site's "Documenting Teaching" was used to guide the creation of this section:

 http://und.edu/academics/instructional-development/documenting-teaching.cfm

III.

Criteria for Evaluating Data on Teaching

George McCool, Sharon Pitcher

This discussion of approaches to evaluating teaching is an attempt to gather all of the criteria about teaching at Towson University in one place to assist faculty seeking to improve their teaching. Excellence in teaching is highly valued at our institution. As stated in the university's mission statement, "Towson's academic programs develop students' capacities for effective communication, critical analysis, and flexible thought, and they cultivate an awareness of both difference and commonality necessary for multifaceted work environments and for local and global citizenship and leadership." The faculty at Towson emulates this mission every day in the classrooms across campus.

Teaching at Towson connects students with the real world, considers the needs of the individual student, and spans a bridge between research and practice. Faculty are knowledgeable of their subject matter, but are equally concerned about making that knowledge understandable for their students. Participation in the scholarship of application allows the faculty member to share experiences that enrich their students learning. Different class sizes call for different teaching techniques and therefore require variability in evaluation. Effective instruction evolves from the fusion of students' needs and subject matter knowledge.

What is excellent teaching? How do we recognize it when we are evaluating each other and what can we all do to constantly improve the "art of teaching"? Bain (2004) after studying effective college teaching concluded that determining how to "count evidence that a professor profoundly helped and encouraged students to learn deeply and remarkably" was a complex process. This chapter does not suggest a simple process but attempts to share some approaches to weigh many factors to both evaluate and encourage excellent teaching at the university. It begins with a general discussion of how we define effective teaching utilizing our many university documents. Then we suggest ways to value all of the data available, recommending multiple approaches on how we can use the data resources to continually improve our teaching.

Effective Teachers – A Description

Given the history of the institution, it is natural that Towson University should value excellence in teaching. Since Towson University's founding in 1866 as a Normal School focused on developing teachers, excellent teaching has been the most important job of its faculty. As the successor to the Maryland State Teachers College, the University's commitment to teaching excellence is both traditional and ongoing. According to the TU *Faculty Handbook*, the university sees the faculty members' primary role as "the facilitation of learning through a variety of modes." Towson

University values and rewards "the scholarships of discovery, teaching, integration and application," and believes that "a faculty member is primarily concerned with effectiveness in teaching." What constitutes effective teaching? L. Shulman, in a 1989 article entitled "Toward a Pedagogy of Substance," described it succinctly:

> ". . . [O]ne of the things we see when we look at teaching analytically is this combination of an emphasis on understanding the subject matter, understanding how it is represented in the heads of students and then being able to generate representations of your own as a teacher that will be a bridge between the subject matter and the students."

That is, effective teaching must be considered with two areas of expertise: understanding a body of knowledge and being able to explain it to others. In addition, Porter and Brophy (1988) in their article "Synthesis of Research on Good Teaching: Insights from the Work of the Institute for Research on Teaching" point out that

> "Effective teachers are clear about what they intend to accomplish through their instruction, and they keep these goals in mind both in designing the instruction and in communicating its purpose to the students. They make certain that their students understand and are satisfied by the reasons given for why they should learn what they are asked to learn."

Teaching is not just about what instructors do in front of the class but how they prepare to inspire and what expectations they have for their students. Bain (2004) suggests that high quality college teachers:

- Use a rich line of inquiry to design a class, lecture, discussion section, internship, or any other encounters with students.

- Begin preparation for teaching with questions about student learning objectives rather than about what they will do.

- Expect more of their students with objectives that require critical thinking and inspire life actions.

- Create learning environments where students confront important problems in a challenging yet supportive environment.

- Tend to inspire trust from the students by treating them with simple decency.

To further understand how faculty at Towson University define teaching, we turned to college documents for guidance. The following characteristics compiled from our college Promotion, Tenure, Merit and Reappointment documents suggest that excellent teachers:

- Reflect on how to incorporate teaching strategies and efficacy into their teaching.

- Design syllabi that convey to students a clear overview of course objectives, expectations for student learning, and course requirements.

- Incorporate appropriate instructional technology in one's teaching

- Maintain currency in their field

- Reflect and grow in teaching methodology

- Mentor student scholarship

Additionally, Towson University prides itself in focusing on meeting the needs of all students. By following the principles of Universal Design for Learning, the needs of all students will be met:

1. Begin class with a review of the previous lecture and an overview of the topics to be covered that day. At the end of class, summarize key points.

2. Highlight major concepts and terminology both orally and visually.

3. Speak directly to students, and minimize auditory and visual distractions.

4. Use visual aids such as diagrams, charts and graphs. Use color to enhance the message.

5. Vary instructional methods using a combination of lecture with a visual outline, group activities, use of stories, guest speakers, web-based discussions. Integrate technology (e.g., YouTube, iTunesU) to support class content.

6. Relate content to real world situations.

7. Reach out individually to students who appear to be struggling and provide resources and support as necessary.

More information available on Universal Design is available at
http://www.towson.edu/dss/teachingguide/universaldesign.asp .

Valuing All Data

Theall (2010) concludes a study of faculty evaluation over time with the recommendation that multiple forms of data should be used as a "starting point for opening and sustaining dialogue about the profession" and defining "what it means to be a faculty member at this institution." He further suggests that valuing all data "maximize opportunities for faculty success," which will "lead to effective teaching and learning" (pp. 90–92). Prichard, Saccucci, and Potter (2010) found it was "wise to include more than one measure of teacher effectiveness" in order to demonstrate continuous improvement in teaching (p. 283). Therefore, in evaluating teaching it is crucial that multiple forms of data are considered to have a meaningful conversation about how successful a faculty member's teaching is at a given point and ways a faculty member can grow. At Towson University, the multiple

data sources include student evaluations, teaching portfolio, peer evaluations, and faculty member's narrative in the Annual Review.

Role of Student Surveys

The Student Evaluation Survey has a role in the evaluation of teaching, but only if the data are being looked at meaningfully. Just a reporting of means is not a meaningful way of looking at data. A mean in the case of student survey data can greatly be influenced by one disgruntled student just giving a faculty member "1" as a way to contest a low grade. A high mean of means can also disguise an area that a faculty member needs to work on. Additionally, students' comments often further identify areas that need improvement or the differing of opinions of the students. The level of the course, the difficulty in the material being taught, the grade distribution (required in all faculty members' Annual Report), and whether the course is required should all be taken into consideration, too.

Use of Survey Data to Improve Teaching

Looking at survey data across semesters for a course can give valuable information on how a professor is improving instruction. Analyzing responses to specific questions, couching those questions in specifics from the students' comments, and making changes in elements of courses can improve teaching. At times department analysis across sections of a course can reveal the impact of the difficulty of course content.

As part of the Annual Review, faculty members should demonstrate the thoughtful use of the student survey data in a narrative analyzing student data and documenting ways courses are changed or strengthened. Towson University has a rich tradition of valuing students' input and considering teaching to be the most important work of faculty. The expectation is not that student data will dictate change but that faculty will address ways to consider the input.

Using Survey Data to Evaluate Teaching

It is the prerogative of each department to determine how survey data are used to evaluate teaching. Important, though, is the consideration of what the numbers mean. Research on evaluating university teaching suggests that means alone do not tell the whole story (Prichard, Saccucci, & Potter, 2010; Theall, 2010). Prichard, et al., in a longitudinal study of student evaluations over time comparing them to determine if they could be used to measure continuous improvement, found that they did not demonstrate long-term improvement (p. 282). A mean can be made up of fifteen very satisfied students and maybe only three very dissatisfied students. A mean needs to be qualified with either distribution or median to better understand what is being portrayed.

The following are some suggestions on ways criteria can be developed to use survey data as one of the components in interpreting students' perceptions of teaching:

1. The following is a way that medians could be used:

   - Students' perception of teaching would be interpreted as satisfactory if medians to questions generally fell in a range determined by the department, keeping the context of the course (typical ratings, professor's first time teaching the course, etc.) in perspective. The means of the responses and the distribution of the answers could serve as secondary measures in understanding students' perception of teaching. Overall low distribution of answers may indicate possible areas of change that the professor could address in the reflective narrative. Comments from the students are used in the narrative to better understand survey scores.

   - Students' perception of teaching would be interpreted as excellent if all of the medians for questions on the survey across courses fell above the upper limit of the satisfactory range. Mean responses could serve as secondary measures in understanding students' perception of teaching. Items with low mean response could be addressed in the reflective narrative. Comments from the students are used in the narrative to better understand survey scores.

2. The following is a way that means could be used:

   - Students' perception of teaching would be interpreted as satisfactory if mean responses generally fell within a range determined by the department, keeping the context of the course (typical ratings, professor's first time teaching the course, etc.) in perspective. Median responses and the distribution of the answers could be compared to the mean to reveal possible atypical responses.

   - Students' perception of teaching would be interpreted as excellent if the means fell above the upper limit of the satisfactory range.

3. The following is a way that a grand mean could be used:

- The grand mean of the questions in the "Instructor" component of the survey could be used as an overall   rating. If the grand mean fell in a range determined by the department, keeping the context of the course in perspective, the students' perceptions of the professor's teaching would be rated satisfactory.   If the grand mean fell above the satisfactory range, students' perceptions of the professor's teaching would be rated excellent. In both of these cases, the overall median could be used as a secondary measure and the standard deviation could be used to indicate the variability of responses.

In all cases, the narrative on teaching would explain the numbers, but the information contained in the numbers could also be helpfully interpreted. Looking at survey data across semesters for a course helps to better understand the influence of grade distribution or extenuating circumstances. Comments from the students can be used in the narrative to better understand survey scores.

Narrative in the Annual Review

As part of the Annual Review at Towson University beginning during the 2010-11 academic year, faculty members are asked to reflect on their teaching in a narrative to be included in their Annual Review. The narrative can include:

- Analysis of student evaluations

- Discussion of changes made in teaching over the year

- Description of courses changed and/or designed

- Incorporation of technology in courses

Use of Narrative to Improve Teaching

The narrative gives faculty members the opportunity to reflectively examine their teaching. Course evaluations and students' comments can provide faculty members some information on students' response to their teaching and examination of this data could lead to some ideas for future changes and/or how successful course changes were received. In the narrative faculty members can capture work they did during the school year to improve courses, add current research, or describe how they plan to incorporate technology. Finally, it can be used to consider next steps in teaching.

Use of Narratives in Evaluation Process

The Annual Review narratives should be used to judge how reflective faculty members are towards their teaching. Some of the characteristics of excellent teachers that can be evaluated in the portfolio are:

- Does the faculty member use student data to inform his/her practice of teaching?

- Is the faculty member keeping current in his/her discipline?

- How is the faculty member incorporating technology into instruction?

- What is the faculty member contributing to the development of courses in his/her department?

- How deeply does the faculty member reflect on instructional practice and make changes as a result?

Role of the Teaching Portfolio

Developing a teaching portfolio provides a faculty member with the opportunities to explain his/her teaching philosophy, reflect on growth as a teacher, and examine impact on students. The development of the teaching portfolio should occur over time and be examined by peers at crucial times in a faculty member's teaching career at Towson.

Potential Use of Portfolios in the Evaluation Process

At the time of evaluation including self-evaluation the portfolio could be updated to include the reflective components of the portfolio listed earlier in this handbook. The portfolio then gives the evaluative committees evidence of the following to consider in looking at all teaching in a more holistic way:

- Development of teaching over time

- Reflection on the processes of teaching

- Application of what was learned from data

- Incorporation of technology in instruction

- Assessment of the effectiveness of instruction

- Understanding of teaching methodology

- Rigor in courses

The Role of Peer Evaluation

Perkins (1993), in his article *Teaching for Understanding,* emphasized that teaching for understanding is not about what the teacher does, but what he/she gets students to do. He suggests that good teaching involves more "intricate classroom choreography" in which the teacher leads the students to "think with and about the ideas they are learning" (p. 29). Observing how the students are learning, evaluating how the teacher creates a thoughtful environment for learning, and leading the teachers to understand what they do well and how they could grow are all part of the objectives of peer review.

Ongoing Development from Peer Review

Peer review provides the faculty member with an opportunity to invite conversation about their teaching. Peer observations according to our faculty documents should include a conference before observation to discuss the class and methods used, the observation, and then a post-observation conversation. This is an opportunity for the faculty members to reflect on their practices, learning from each other, and focus on student learning.

Use of Peer Observation in the Evaluation Process

For evaluation purposes, multiple peer reviews should be considered. These observations provide a glimpse into student learning and how the faculty member has developed the learning climate of the classroom. Multiple faculty members should evaluate the instructor in different courses to get a multifaceted view of the faculty member's teaching. Each department should have a well-defined process for peer review developed by the faculty members to capture student engagement, student/teacher interaction, classroom climate, and innovations in teaching practice.

Meeting the multiple needs of students, especially minority students and those with disabilities, should also be considered. The following suggestions from Universal Design for Learning may be helpful in evaluating whether the faculty member is meeting those needs:

- Auditory and visual presentations of information are provided.

- Demonstrations are provided to entire class and small working groups that may need more clarification.

- Opportunities are provided in the class for different types of learners such as presentations, practice in small groups, and discussion/sharing.

- Choices are offered to the students to provide "adjustable levels of challenge" and "multiple ways to be successful."

- Ongoing, relevant feedback is provided to the students.

- Instruction includes multiple examples with critical features highlighted, and multiple media and formats utilized.

- Instruction provides support for the differing backgrounds of the learners. (Coyne, Ganley, Hall, Meo, Murray & Gordon, 2006).

Evaluating Teaching for Merit

The evaluation of teaching for merit, unlike the evaluation for promotion and tenure (see below), is, in a sense, a snapshot, focusing on the candidate's performance in a given academic year. The evaluation will, of course, consider all of the sources discussed earlier, such as student evaluations, peer evaluations, the self-reflective narrative included in the Annual Report, and other pertinent material.

Evaluating Teaching for Promotion and Tenure

Unlike the evaluation of teaching for the purpose of awarding merit, the evaluation of teaching for purposes of promotion and tenure decisions must take a longer-term view. These decisions must take into account a number of different factors, including but not limited to the types of courses the candidate has taught during the period being evaluated, the number of new courses the candidate has (re-)designed and taught, whether the candidate has explored alternative teaching methods where appropriate, whether the candidate has served as a mentor for newer faculty members, whether there have been changes in the structure of the candidate's courses over time and whether there has been an evolution of the candidate's perceived teaching performance. This last factor is extremely important in the case of new faculty members who have come to Towson University with little or no teaching experience and who may have encountered difficulty in developing their teaching strategies.

IV.

Improving Practice: Case Examples

Diana Emanuel, Lynne Murphy

NOTE: These case examples represent fictional faculty members. Any resemblance to real persons, living or dead, is purely coincidental

This section is intended to provide two prototypical case examples of fictional faculty members--the "inexperienced teacher" and the "burnt out teacher"-- to illustrate how a teaching portfolio can be used to guide and assist a struggling professor through a critical self-study of teaching, to prepare documents for review by other professors for the purpose of mentoring, and to develop a plan to enhance teaching. This section is not intended as a guide for individuals or departments in the assessment of teaching for the promotion and tenure process (For this, please consult with promotion and tenure documents.).

In general, the professor preparing a portfolio as part of a self-study of teaching should ask the following questions:

- What evidence-based documentation do I have that reflects the effectiveness of my teaching?

- How can I best analyze this evidence to reflect on my skill as a teacher?

- How will the teaching narrative reflect the ways I plan to use this evidence to enhance my future teaching?

- How am I using help from colleagues to get feedback and ideas for change?

- Which portions of my self-analysis should be included in the main portion of the portfolio (8-10 pages) and what items should be included as appendices to support the assertions in the narrative?

Case Study #1: "The Inexperienced Teacher"

Background: Susan Jones, MS, RN, is an experienced nurse with 15 years of clinical practice and several outstanding practice awards from her employer and state association. In her search for continued professional challenges, she accepted a teaching position as a lecturer at Towson University. Ms. Jones was assigned to teach two sections of two courses during her first semester. She was given the syllabi used by a prior instructor two weeks before the beginning of the semester. She was also given the required textbooks and a brief introduction to Blackboard. One of the courses (Philosophy of Nursing) was an undergraduate lecture course. The other course (Clinical Nursing Skills) was a graduate lecture and clinical skills lab course taken by students who are working as nurses or in other areas of healthcare. Ms. Jones taught the Philosophy of Nursing course in a lecture hall with seating for 40-50 students and a well-equipped teaching station. The Clinical Nursing Skills class was taught in a small skills lab with a variety of simulation models and technology that simulates patient care. There was also a computer and projector for didactic portions of the class in the skill lab. Ms. Jones provided outlines of all lectures by posting PowerPoint notes and grades in Blackboard, but she had not used the technology previously and did not use other Blackboard features. Ms. Jones read the assigned textbook chapter before each lecture, but did not have time to incorporate additional scholarly resources. However, she did provide informative narrative case examples based on her experience. She provided learning objectives for lab activities, but noticed that students completed them quickly and often asked to leave early. Ms. Jones did not fully understand what the student assignments should contain, and provided plenty of hand-written feedback when they were graded, but grades were high because she felt her instructions may not have been clear. Exam grades tended to be low because Ms. Jones used the exams from the prior instructor. During the course of the semester, she noticed that student attendance was declining. She held office hours, but students never sought her out.

On course evaluations, students frequently stated that Ms. Jones was disorganized and did not meet learning objectives for the course. They reported that she did not use technology effectively, primarily in posting grades on Blackboard in a timely manner. However, many commented that they liked her lectures because she included relevant examples, and she cared about student learning.

Ms. Jones is using the creation of a teaching portfolio at the end of the first semester to help her conduct an analysis of her teaching. She asks herself critical questions to guide her in the analysis and portfolio creation.

What evidence-based documentation do I have that reflects the effectiveness of my teaching?

<u>Student numeric course evaluation means</u> were good for the Clinical Nursing Skills course but poor for the Philosophy of Nursing course. <u>Grade distributions</u> for the Clinical Nursing Skills course were all A and B grades, but Ms. Jones is concerned that some students missed critical skills during the final practical examination that are not reflected in the grade but that will affect their ability to

competently treat patients. Grade distributions for the Philosophy of Nursing course were almost all A grades; however, the midterm and final exam grades were fairly poor. The <u>syllabus</u> from the Philosophy of Nursing course indicated that the grades may be inflated because a large percentage of the grade is based on written assignments, attendance, and classroom participation. On <u>student written course evaluations</u> for the Philosophy of Nursing courses, students frequently stated that Ms. Jones was disorganized, unapproachable, and did not meet learning objectives for the course. Students in the Nursing Skills course indicated that Ms. Jones was knowledgeable and that she was able to demonstrate all of the techniques they needed. They also liked her case examples concerning patients with various pathologies and that Ms. Jones was approachable and appeared concerned about their learning. One <u>peer evaluation</u> was conducted during the semester (in the Philosophy of Nursing course) and it indicated that Ms. Jones appeared to be very knowledgeable but also that the slides contained only an outline of the notes and that students appeared to be writing furiously and were frustrated when she switched slides before they could take down all the information. The peer review also indicated that Ms. Jones did not ask questions of the class or call on any students. The students did not ask very many questions except if the professor could "slow down" or "go back to the last slide for a minute."

How can I best analyze this evidence to reflect on my skill as a teacher?

Ms. Jones will use the evidence that she has compiled to do a careful teaching analysis. Evidence includes (a) quantitative evaluations such as student and peer ratings and grade distributions; (b) qualitative data from outside sources such as student written comments and peer written comments; and (c) personal observations such as the limited amount of time she had to prepare for the class, the size of the class, the fact that some students received good grades but were not able to demonstrate all skills. The analysis will include critical questions related to the data:

- Why did the students respond better in the graduate clinical skills class compared to the undergraduate didactic class?

- Were the differences based on the type of class, the level of student, or the way the class was taught?

- Why did graduate students receive good grades when they were not able to demonstrate all the clinical skills?

- Were there items that were similar across courses?

Her narrative on this topic might go like this:

> *I believe that my clinical skills are an asset to my teaching effectiveness in the Clinical Nursing Skills class, because I was able to demonstrate what I know how to do. However, I did not give my students ample time or experience to develop these skills themselves. Developing additional structured activities for student performance may be needed to bridge this gap. The grades in the*

Philosophy of Nursing course were high across the board, but I don't think students were actively engaged, and certainly viewed by ability as a lecturer to be lacking. Their comments stated I was unapproachable, but I viewed the role of the teacher as the authority figure. Maybe my philosophy of an effective teacher as one who imparts knowledge doesn't reflect what the students need from me. I can't teach in the same way as I was taught; I need to develop more interactive teaching strategies. I'm not disorganized, but I am new to teaching technologies and supports, so this is clearly an area of professional development that I can address.

How will the teaching narrative reflect the ways I plan to use this evidence to enhance my future teaching?

An important aspect of the teaching narrative is that it not only addresses the data that are available, but it allows the professor to respond to those data in a scholarly manner. This response should not be limited to acknowledging the problem areas and making a general statement such as "My evaluations were poor because I am an inexperienced teacher" and/or "I will do a better job in the future". The narrative is an opportunity for the professor to organize the data and their observations, create hypotheses regarding these data, and plan a targeted response for future classes to address these areas. For example, Ms. Jones prepared her lectures only a few days prior to each class. This was because she was working full time and agreed to teach the class with only two weeks to prepare. The timing was out of her control; however, the narrative can address her plan to revise the notes well in advance of each lecture and how she intends to change the notes to address the student comment that she was disorganized. With more time to prepare, she could also indicate that she intends to take a workshop on using technology in the classroom to enhance the teaching format in the undergraduate course. She could also indicate her plan to include other resources besides the textbook in her notes. Another example of an item to address in the narrative: the syllabus was already written and Ms. Jones did not have the experience to change it; however, she can include her plan to change the syllabus so that it addresses grade inflation, attention to all learning outcomes, and other items highlighted by students, peers and her own observations. She could also take a critical look at the skills that students are completing and determine how to address the issue of students finishing quickly and leaving early but not being able to demonstrate the skills at the end of the semester. A portion of Ms. Jones's narrative might go like this:

To improve my abilities as a lecturer, I will review the syllabus to examine how I can make changes that address student comments and my observation about the lack of skill development. The syllabus has so many assignments for the students; I can review how they meet the learning objectives for the course, and decide if they are weighted according to their ability to meet the objectives.

How am I using help from colleagues to get feedback and ideas for change?

Faculty members should ask for and receive mentoring from colleagues and take advantage of teaching and technology training opportunities available to them. The narrative provides a mechanism for faculty to plan strategies in this area. The narrative for Ms. Jones might look like this:

> *To improve my abilities as a lecturer, I plan to use the teaching technologies available to me more effectively. I can take a course on Blackboard through the Center for Instructional Advancement and Technology (CIAT) and I will ask my mentor to be a guest on her Blackboard site. I can see how she has organized the materials and update the resources available to students. I can meet with the librarian assigned to my department to get more skilled at using the databases, so I can use current articles to inform my teaching, and consider adding some for students to review and possibly present or discuss in class.*

Which portions of my self-analysis should be included in the main portion of the portfolio (8-10 pages) and what items should be included as appendices to support the assertions in the narrative?

The main body of the portfolio should include a narrative that includes teaching philosophy, a summary of the self-analysis described in the previous section, and short-term (and long-term) teaching goals. The narrative can include tables and figures if needed to illustrate the discussion (for example, providing the grade distribution in a table and the assigning of points for various graded activities in a table when discussing grade inflation). For the most part, however, the data will be provided in appendices and referred to as such in the narrative as needed. Each identified area of weakness should be addressed with a possible reason why and a plan for enhancing teaching in that area.

Case Study #2: "The Burnt Out Teacher"

Background: John Stone, Ph.D., CPA, is a tenured full professor with 20 years of experience teaching courses in the undergraduate accounting major and graduate courses in the MBA program. He worked full time as an accountant for a few years prior to pursuing a Ph.D. and worked part-time as an accountant for a few years when he was an assistant professor. For the past 15 years, he has taught accounting but has not focused on his required research output regarding accounting practices nor has he kept abreast of the changes in accounting standards. He has taught the same courses for the past eight years with few changes in the syllabi. Dr. Stone uses PowerPoint and one type of accounting software that came on the market 10 years ago, but prefers to teach "old school" and encourage student interaction and the use of the whiteboard. Lately, he has felt that the level of student dedication to study is so poor that he has become discouraged. The scores on the accounting department's exit examination have significantly declined over the past five to six years. Student numeric ratings have been steadily falling and written course evaluations over the past few years have indicated that Dr. Stone is often late to class, boring, and that he doesn't know how to teach the tough new accounting standards and how to use new teaching technology effectively. Peer evaluations have been conducted once per year. The most recent two peer evaluations indicated significant issues in the classroom. The first peer evaluation stated that the students do not appear to be engaged in the learning, that Dr. Stone did not know any student's name, did not return assignments promptly, and that Dr. Stone refused to spend class time answering student questions.. Dr. Stone wrote a rebuttal indicating that the "young and inexperienced" peer evaluator did not understood his "traditional and seasoned" teaching approach and that there was too much emphasis on teaching technology in the current classroom, which led to students not being engaged and just staring at PowerPoint notes instead of paying attention. The second peer evaluation indicated that the content of the course was not sufficient to prepare them for the next course in the sequence. Dr. Stone wrote a rebuttal indicating that the peer evaluator should re-evaluate the next course in the series because the current students are not capable of learning like students from 10 years ago. After the second negative peer evaluation, Dr. Stone met with the department chairperson to complain about the peer-evaluation process and to dictate the person he thought should observe his classes. The chair of the department indicated students were not learning what they needed and that the peer evaluators should not be hand selected.

Dr. Stone was asked to create a teaching portfolio by his department chairperson in order to improve his teaching in preparation for a 5-year review, which is scheduled for the following year. Dr. Stone asks himself the critical questions to guide him in the analysis and portfolio creation.

What evidence-based documentation do I have that reflects the effectiveness of my teaching?

Dr. Stone knew he had to prepare a graph of his mean student numeric ratings over time for his upcoming five-year review. He had a sense that his ratings over the past five years were not indicative of his best teaching abilities, so he graphed the ratings over a 10-year period. He noticed a slow and

steady decline over the 10-year period from what the department considers "excellent" teaching to borderline "acceptable" and "unacceptable" across all of his courses. His first thought regarding the decline in teaching was that students changed over time and did not approve of his methods and that he was viewed as the "really difficult teacher in the department"; however, it was difficult to reconcile this hypothesis with the fact that the decline was also seen for courses in which the students were primarily second career, non-traditional, "more seasoned" students.

He then examined the grade distributions over time, and found that he was giving more A and B grades and the overall course GPA was actually increasing over time. He asked the chairperson for data regarding the grade distributions of the same courses taught by other faculty and found that the grades for the other professors were lower than his. His hypothesis about being the "difficult teacher" was untenable because he was actually one of the professors awarding the best grades.

Dr. Stone examined his syllabi over time and realized that he had made very few changes in the past five years and had not changed the syllabus references for the past four years and that the most recent article listed on any syllabus was eight years prior to the date of the course. He realized that the field of accounting was changing very quickly and that these references were not acceptable.

Dr. Stone took a critical look at his student written course evaluations over time and peer evaluations over time and he re-read his two peer-evaluation rebuttals and realized that his reactions were emotional and not critical. He realized that he needed to take a critical look at these data and to use the data to create an improvement plan and not react to the data as a personal attack.

Dr. Stone examined the long-term outcomes of the program by examining student scores on the department's exit examination. He was tempted to consider the declining scores to be "someone else's problem," but then realized as one of the most experienced members of the faculty and a full professor that he should demonstrate leadership in the area of teaching by suggesting to the chair that he assist in a -study of why the exam scores were falling.

How can I best analyze this evidence to reflect on my skill as a teacher?

Dr. Stone used the evidence he compiled to do a careful teaching analysis. Evidence included an analysis over time of: (a) student and peer numeric ratings, (b) student and peer qualitative evaluations, (c) grade distributions over time (d) his role in the program which, overall, had seen a decline in long-term outcome success based on the exit exam, (e) personal observations such as the fact that his syllabi did not contain current references, the fact that he reacted emotionally to criticism rather than a productive reaction, the fact that students and peers indicated he needed to use more updated material, but he felt he was teaching in a way that was just "different" and not outdated. The analysis included critical questions related to the data:

- How can I update my use of teaching technology and more current information?

- Does the fact that I have not done actual accounting work in 15 years affect my efficacy as a teacher?

- How can I work better with my peers in the department to improve my teaching and the outcomes of the department?

An example of the analysis portion of the narrative might go like this:

Over the past 10 years, my teaching has declined in quality. I find it difficult to accept that this decline has occurred even though I have taught the same way I always did, and my teaching earned high praise at the beginning of my career. However, I must admit that an examination of the evidence indicates that as the students, the field, accounting standards, and teaching practices change, so must my teaching. For example, in the previous year, across 6 didactic courses, 77% of the students and the sole peer evaluation indicated that my teaching methods appeared to be "old fashioned" or "out dated". This comment first appeared about 6 years ago, but only by 1 or 2 students; it has become more prevalent over the years until it is now the most common student comment and, in response, I realize that I must update my teaching methods.

How will the teaching narrative reflect the ways I plan to use this evidence to enhance my future teaching?

Dr. Stone took the opportunity offered by the teaching narrative to organize his data, his critical reflection on the data, and a planned response to improve teaching. His narrative on this topic might go like this:

The most prevalent comment is that my teaching is outdated. I will address this by conducting a literature review for each course and will update my syllabi and my notes to include at least 3-4 recent journal articles on pertinent topics.

His narrative may also include items that indicate his willingness to become more interdependent with colleagues, to ask for help, and to offer to lead changes in teaching. For example:

I plan to meet with the colleagues who did the peer evaluations and ask them for suggestions for improving my teaching. It is my goal to just listen to their commentary, and not to react in a way that indicates refusal to accept suggestions. I am also planning to meet with the department chairperson to discuss the development of an Ad Hoc teaching committee to address ways in which the department, as a whole, can more effectively address long-term outcomes.

How am I using help from colleagues to get feedback and ideas for change?

Dr. Stone may include in his narrative his plans to use university technology resources to improve his teaching. For example:

> *The most prevalent comment is that my teaching is outdated. I plan to address this in several ways. For example, I have enrolled in a course with the Center for Instructional Advancement and Technology (CIAT) on using Blackboard. I plan to choose two features from Blackboard and use them in my courses next semester. Over time, I may include more teaching technology, but this is what I feel would be a reasonable first step. I also plan to update my course content by studying the new accounting standards, reviewing different texts, and conducting a literature review.*

Which portions of my self-analysis should be included in the main portion of the portfolio (8-10 pages) and what items should be included as appendices to support the assertions in the narrative?

The main body of the portfolio should include the reflective narrative and the appendices should include the compiled support data. Certain aspects of the data that enhance the reflective discussion should be included. For example, a figure showing long-term student numerics could be included if it is pertinent to the discussion. If it is simply commented upon but not highlighted, then the figure should go in the appendix. If qualitative data are highlighted, then the qualitative analysis of these data can be included and, for common comments, representative quotes can be included. It is also important to highlight the good aspects of teaching, and not just the negative and formative portions. Dr. Stone feels that his traditional teaching style is something that he values. He should consider including the ways in which he can include the parts of teaching that he likes along with the changes that are needed in order to develop a teaching style that is uniquely his own but also effective and well received by students and colleagues.

Appendix A

Evidence-Based Documentation Checklist to Reflect Teaching Effectiveness

_____ Student course evaluation data (quantitative, i.e., consideration of means, median, and distribution of responses for selected items.)

_____ Student course evaluation comments (qualitative)

_____ Grade distribution data

_____ Peer evaluations (quantitative ratings)

_____ Peer evaluations (qualitative comments)

_____ Syllabus (assignments and grading, review of learning objectives)

_____ Syllabus (course policies that affect student experience and learning)

Appendix B

Examples of Peer Teaching Evaluations

NOTE: This appendix includes a sampling of teaching evaluations collected from departments representing all colleges.

College of Business and Economics

PEER VISITATION REPORT FORM

Department of Economics

Faculty Member Visited:

Visited By:

Date:

Course Title and Numbers:

      Please Provide Written comments in the space below. Be complete and concise.

I.   **Course Content: Evaluate the syllabus, examinations, instructor knowledge, ability to illuminate difficult points, and instructor ability to handle questions from the class.**

II. **Pedagogy: Evaluate the teaching methods in the area of aids, techniques, and teaching method relative to other courses, and other sections of the same course.**

III. **Class Conduct: Evaluate the level of participation, interest, preparedness, and general class reaction to the teaching process.**

Evaluator: _____ **Date** _____

Instructor (Read and Understood):_____ **Date** _____

PEER VISITATION REPORT

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

Faculty member visited

Visited by _____   Date _____

Course title and number _____

     Please provide written comments in the space below. Be complete and concise.

I. Course Content: Evaluate the syllabus, examinations, instructor knowledge, ability to illuminate difficult points, and instructor ability to handle questions from the class.

II. Pedagogy: Evaluate the teaching methods in the area of aids, techniques, and teaching method relative to other courses, and other sections of the same course.

III. Class Conduct: Evaluate the level of participation, interest, preparedness, and general class reaction to the teaching process.

Signed _____

                                       Evaluator

Signed _____

           (Read and understood) Instructor

TOWSON
U N I V E R S I T Y

Department of Educational Technology and Literacy
Online Peer Observation Form

Colleague Observed:
Date of Observation:
ONLINE Course Observed:
Observer:

Context of the course (e.g., audience, special circumstances related to this course):

Context of the lesson within the course syllabus:

Course and Module Design:

Organization or Structure of the Lesson:

- **Clarity of instruction**

- **Interactivity (faculty-student)**

- **Interactivity (student-student)**

Professional Competence:

General Comments or Recommendations:

Signature of the Observer   Date

Signature of Colleague Observed   Date

Department of Art + Design, Art History, Art Education
Peer Evaluation Form

Name: _____ Rank: _____ Date: __/__/____

Area of Specialization: _____ Name of Evaluator: _____

	excellent	very good	good	fair	poor

1. To what degree was the faculty member prepared?   5   4   3   2   1
   Comments: _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

2. How effective was the teaching strategy (i.e. lecture,   5   4   3   2   1
   demonstration, one-on-one assistance, etc.)? Comments:
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

3. To what degree was the content appropriate for the class   5   4   3   2   1
   (the teaching techniques, skills, aesthetic concepts,
   safety/health, etc.)?   Comments:_____
   _____
   _____
   _____

4. To what level did you observe evidence of learning   5   4   3   2   1
   (as demonstrated through student production/discussion/
   other indicators -observe student work, listen to comments, etc.)?
   Comments: _____
   _____
   _____

5. To what degree did the faculty motivate enthusiasm   5   4   3   2   1
   (though dialogue, energy level, eye contact, body
   language, etc.)? Comments: _____
   _____
   _____

6. Taking into consideration the nature of the course, (i.e.:   5   4   3   2   1
   studio, art Ed, art history), please comment on specific
   qualities or observations not included above. Comments:
   _____
   _____
   _____

Art Chair Signature: _____ Date: ___/___/_____

FACULTY PRE-EVALUATION FORM-Department of Dance

INSTRUCTOR:_____

COURSE NO. AND SECTION_____

<u>CLASS OBJECTIVES AND GOALS</u>

<u>ACCOMPLISHMENTS THUS FAR IN THE SEMESTER</u>

<u>AREAS OF PARTICULAR ATTENTION</u>

<u>PERSONAL QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS</u>

<u>OVERVIEW OF STUDENTS</u>

FACULTY EVALUATION FORM--Department of Dance

INSTRUCTOR:_____

COURSE NO. AND SECTION_____

EVALUATOR:_____

DATE OF EVALUATION:_____

CLASS FORMAT

CLASS OBJECTIVES

ORGANIZATION

COMMUNICATION SKILLS

RELEVANCE OF MATERIAL

GENERAL IMPRESSIONS/SUGGESTIONS

EVALUATION OF SYLLABUS

_____

Signature of Evaluator   Date:

_____

Signature of Faculty Member Evaluated   Date:

Original: Faculty Evaluated   Copy: Evaluator

Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching

Department of Nursing -- College of Health Professions

I. PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOR

Desired Outcome: The faculty member is a role model of professional behavior in interactions with students and University/agency personnel.

Critical behaviors which demonstrate achievement of the desired outcome may include but are not limited to the following:

1. integrity and interest in the welfare of the University and/or the clinical agency.
2. consideration of the institutional policies of the University and/or the clinical agency.
3. courtesy and respect toward students and University/agency personnel.
4. availability to staff/colleagues and students.
5. personal behavior appropriate to professional setting and situation.

II. CRITICAL THINKING

Desired Outcome: The faculty member engages in teaching-learning activities which promote critical thinking.

Critical behaviors which demonstrate achievement of the desired outcome may include but are not limited to the following:

1. clearly stated goals and objectives for selected experiences.
2. appropriate teaching-learning methodologies to meet objectives.
3. setting of objectives for learning experience which are consistent with course objectives, client needs, and student learning needs.
4. promoting student reflection on and analysis of learning needs and evaluation of achievement.
5. supportive feedback to encourage and to affirm appropriate student actions.
6. posing of questions requiring student to analyze own learning experience.
7. making suggestions or recommendations for improvement or continued professional growth.
8. engagement of students in joint problem solving.
9. facilitation of exchange of ideas between persons.

10. integration of theoretical knowledge into the practice of professional nursing.
11. facilitation of student application of nursing concepts.
12. assistance to students in anticipating potential problems/new experiences and preparing for them.
13. encouragement of students to examine experiences from diverse viewpoints and perspectives.
14. use of methodologies appropriate to learning needs of students, subject matter, and/or other contextual variables.

III. COMMUNICATION AND GROUP PROCESS

Desired Outcome: The faculty member facilitates student learning and faculty interaction through the use of appropriate communication techniques and group process skills.

Critical behaviors which demonstrate achievement of the desired outcome may include but are not limited to the following:

1. encouragement of mutual exchange between members during group interactions.
2. demonstration of respect for group members.
3. maintenance of eye contact when communicating with others.
4. avoidance of domination of conversation.
5. asking of open-ended questions.
6. avoidance of interruption of members.
7. sensitivity and concern to others during communication process.
8. supportive non-verbal communication.
9. goal-directed exchanges between persons to facilitate student learning.
10. encouragement of students to examine a variety of perspectives.
11. discernment of confusion and clarification of subject matter when necessary.
12. provision of opportunities for questioning and student input.

IV. NURSING KNOWLEDGE

Desired Outcome: The faculty member communicates relevant nursing knowledge to prepare students to function as baccalaureate level, generalist nursing practitioners.

Critical behaviors which demonstrate achievement of the desired outcome may include but are not limited to the following:

1. creation of an atmosphere conducive to learning.
2. knowledge of the profession of nursing and of the specific clinical discipline.
3. clearly stated expectations/goals for the learning experience.
4. appropriate teaching-learning methodologies to meet established goals.
5. preparation for the teaching-learning experience.
6. emphasis of significant nursing concepts.
7. enthusiasm in communicating nursing knowledge.

Faculty Evaluation of Teaching
(classroom or clinical)

Department of Nursing -- College of Health Professions

check one
  PEER EVALUATION
  FACULTY SELF ASSESSMENT

NAME   RANK

DATE   SETTING

STUDENTS
                          indicate number and class level (sophomore, junior, senior)

COURSE

TOPIC (or area of focus)

OBJECTIVES

TEACHING METHODOLOGIES USED

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION OF METHODOLOGIES

CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES IMPACTING ON LEARNING EXPERIENCE

Using the attached guidelines, comment in writing about the faculty member's performance. (Note: each guideline may not apply in every situation. The guidelines, however, serve as a guide for developing evaluative statements concerning the faculty member's performance.)

EVALUATIVE SUMMARY

_____ _____ _____
Evaluator's name and rank   signature of evaluator   date

COMMENTS OF EVALUATEE

_____

Signature of evaluatee   date

date of preconference _____   date of postconference

additional follow-up indicated
 yes
 no   if yes, date of follow-up conference

TOWSON UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY & OCCUPATIONAL SCIENCE
Peer Evaluation of Classroom Teaching

Instructor:_____Course:_____ Date:_____Time:_____

| Class | ____UG 1st year | ____UG 2nd year | ____UG 3rd year |
| Level: | ____G 1st year | ____G 2nd year | ____G 3rd year |

Student   ___   Combined BS/MS
Cohort(s):   ___   Professional MS
               ___   Post-Professional MS
               ___   Doctoral

Instructor's experience with class: ___ first time taught   ____ occasional teacher
___ frequent teacher ____ team leader for course

Number of students present in class: _____

Topic:

Objectives:

Evaluation of Teaching Materials and Strategies:

Comments on Effectiveness:

Suggestions for Improvement, if any:

Overall Rating and Summary (see departmental criteria)
____Not Meritorious

____Satisfactory

____Excellent

Comments of Evaluatee:

        _____
        Signature and Rank of Evaluator

        _____
        Signature and Rank of Evaluatee

        _____
        Date

Peer Eval. Form 10/06

Department of English
Classroom Observation Template

Instructor's Name:
Number and Course Title:
Date of Classroom Observation:
Number of students enrolled _____in attendance_____:

Type of class:

☐ Class Discussion
☐ Student Presentations
☐ Group work
☐ Lecture
☐ Writing Workshops
☐ Seminar
☐ Other (please describe below)

Pedagogy

1. Knowledge of the subject:

                Excellent   Good   Needs Improvement

Comments:

2. Organization of the class: Identifying a central purpose, holding to it, integrating questions and answers into it, clarifying major points in it, managing time, etc.

                Excellent   Good   Needs Improvement

Comments:

3. Teaching strategy: E.g., classroom manner, classroom presence, innovation, ability to guide a discussion or workshop, responsiveness to student input, clarity, etc.

                          Excellent   Good   Needs Improvement

Comments:

4. Academic Rigor: To what degree did the classroom activities and reading and writing assignments meet the intellectual expectations of a course at this level? To what degree did the faculty member encourage critical thinking and careful reasoning?

                          Excellent   Good   Needs Improvement

Comments:

5. Student Engagement: To what degree did the faculty member encourage student engagement and enthusiasm (through dialogue, energy level, eye contact, calling upon students by name, etc.)?

                          Excellent   Good   Needs Improvement

Comments:

Syllabus-Required Information

According to the Faculty Handbook, the following information is required on all syllabi. Check all that apply.
- ☐ Course name and number
- ☐ Instructor information(name, email address, telephone and office numbers)
- ☐ Text[s] required including bibliographic information
- ☐ Brief description of course content
- ☐ Learning Outcomes Statement
- ☐ Assignments and requirements
- ☐ Grading procedures
- ☐ Attendance policy (including lateness)
- ☐ Plagiarism policy
- ☐ Policy for students with special needs
- ☐ Statement that the course can be repeated only once without permission of the Academic Standards Committee.
- ☐ A week-by-week or session-by-session calendar

Syllabus-Supplemental Information

Other information (Check all that apply):
- ☐ Classroom conduct policy
- ☐ Cellphone and laptop policies
- ☐ Test make-up policy
- ☐ Other—Include and/or comment on any information that you found particularly effective in communicating expectations and requirements.

Marking and Grading

Collect three samples of a graded assignment that the students have completed as part of this course. The instructor should choose three that demonstrate a range of quality.

Type of commentary on assignments:
- ☐ Written comments
- ☐ One-on-one conferences
- ☐ Detailed instructions for peer critiques and responses

Additional comments and observations.

6. Clarity and thoroughness of the comments

      Excellent   Good   Needs improvement

7. Grading Standards

   Too high   Satisfactory   Too low

Attach the syllabus and any additional materials supplied by the instructor (written assignments, handouts, etc.)

Conference with Instructor

The observation process and form are meant to serve both an evaluative and a mentoring purpose. The post-observation conference should be a dialogue between observer and the observed faculty member. Comment on your post-observation conference with the instructor. When did you meet? Briefly list any relevant information that came up in your discussions with the instructor.

Observer's Signature   _____

Instructor's Signature   _____

Date Completed and Submitted to the Department   _____

Department of English
Online/Hybrid Evaluation Template

Instructor's Name:
Number and Course Title:
Date of Evaluation:
Number of students enrolled _____ Combined course site? _____Number of sections_____.

Type of class:

☐   Online
☐   Hybrid (Percent online_____)

Consider using the regular evaluation form if a classroom session is being observed and this form as a supplement to evaluate online material.

1. Evaluation of Blackboard course site (or other online learning method) for clear organization, ease of navigation, consistent design, availability of course documents.

Excellent   Good   Needs Improvement

Comments:

2. Evaluation of assignment or learning module:

a. Clarity of guidelines, expectations, due date, and method of submission.

Excellent   Good   Needs Improvement

Comments:

b. Academic Rigor: To what degree did the assignment meet the intellectual expectations of a course at this level? To what degree did the assignment encourage critical thinking and careful reasoning?

                          Excellent   Good   Needs Improvement

Comments:

c. Communication: To what degree did the faculty member offer assistance on the assignment, beyond the assignment sheet (video, PowerPoint, supplemental materials, additional meetings, chat sessions, phone calls, Skype, Instant Messenger)

                          Excellent   Good   Needs Improvement

Comments:

Syllabus-Required Information

According to the Faculty Handbook, the following information is required on all syllabi. Check all that apply.
- ☐ Course name and number
- ☐ Instructor information (name, email address, telephone and office numbers)
- ☐ Text[s] required including bibliographic information
- ☐ Brief description of course content
- ☐ Learning Outcomes Statement
- ☐ Assignments and requirements
- ☐ Grading procedures
- ☐ Attendance policy (noting relationship to online activity)
- ☐ Plagiarism policy
- ☐ Policy for students with special needs
- ☐ Statement that the course can be repeated only once without permission of the Academic Standards Committee.
- ☐ A week-by-week or session-by-session calendar

Syllabus-Supplemental Information

Other information (Check all that apply):
- ☐ Internet connectivity issues
- ☐ Hardware and software requirements
- ☐ Alternative communication methods
- ☐ Online and campus resources
- ☐ Test make-up policy
- ☐ Other—Include and/or comment on any information that you found particularly effective in communicating expectations and requirements

Marking and Grading

Collect three samples of a graded assignment that the students have completed as part of this course. The instructor should choose three that demonstrate a range of quality.

Type of commentary on assignments:
- ☐ Written comments
- ☐ One-on-one conferences in person/by phone, Blackboard chat, Instant Messenger, Skype, or other method
- ☐ Detailed instructions for peer critiques and responses

Additional comments and observations.

6. Clarity and thoroughness of the comments.

         Excellent   Good   Needs improvement

7. Grading Standards

    Too high   Satisfactory   Too low

Attach the syllabus and any additional materials supplied by the instructor (written assignments, handouts, etc.)

Conference with Instructor

The observation process and form are meant to serve both an evaluative and a mentoring purpose. The post-observation conference should be a dialogue between observer and the observed faculty member. Comment on your post-observation conference with the instructor. When did you meet? Briefly list any relevant information that came up in your discussions with the instructor.

Observer's Signature   _____

Instructor's Signature   _____

Date Completed and Submitted to the Department   _____

Department of Family Studies and Community Development
PEER VISITATION REPORT

Faculty Member Visited: _____

Visited By: _____   **Date:** _____

Course Title and Number: _____

Please provide written comments in the space below. Be complete and concise.

I.   **Course Content:** Evaluate the syllabus, examinations, instructor knowledge, ability to illuminate difficult points, and instructor ability to handle questions from the class.

II.   **Pedagogy:** Evaluate the teaching methods in the area of aids, techniques, and teaching method relative to other courses, and other sections of the same course.

III.   **Class Conduct:** Evaluate the level of participation, interest, preparedness, and general class reaction to the teaching process.

Signed: _____Evaluator

Signed: (Read and Understood) _____Instructor

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS, ASTRONOMY & GEOSCIENCES
CLASSROOM VISITATION REPORT

Evaluation of teaching by faculty colleagues is intended to promote improvement of teaching as well as to gather evidence of teaching effectiveness.   The following guidelines should be considered when planning and participating in this process.

1.   The date of the visit shall be arranged at least one week in advance of the class period.
2.   All visits will be conducted by members of the PDTC. Two faculty members if possible will visit a class period together.
3.   The visited and visiting faculty members will meet at least one day prior to the class period so that the visited member may discuss philosophy and objectives for the course and provide a syllabus, etc., to any visitor.
4.   Within one week after the visit, an open and professional post-visit conference will be held to discuss the observations made by the visiting faculty members. At this time each visitors proposed Report (see below) will be discussed.
5.   Within two weeks after the visit, each visiting faculty member will have completed and placed the Classroom Visitation Report, signed by both visitor and visited, into the visited P&T folder. The visited faculty member (and mentor, if any) will also receive a copy of this report.

VISITED FACULTY MEMBER _____

VISITING FACULTY MEMBER _____

DATE VISITED FACULTY MEMBER WAS INFORMED OF VISIT _____

DATE OF CLASSROOM VISITATION _____

COURSE_____

TOPIC BEING TAUGHT _____

DATE AND BRIEF SUMMARY OF PRE-VISIT MEETING:

SPECIAL TECHNIQUES EMPLOYED *(demonstrations, videos, etc):*

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS: *(Note especially efforts to engage students through questions, small group discussions, brief presentations, etc.)*

STUDENT RESPONSE:

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

DATE OF POST–VISITATION CONFERENCE: _____

SUMMARY (BY VISITOR) OF POST–VISITATION CONFERENCE:

COMMENTS BY VISITED FACULTY MEMBER:

SIGNATURE OF VISITING FACULTY: _____

SIGNATURE OF VISITED FACULTY: _____

References

University of North Dakota, Office of Instructional Development (2011). Documenting Teaching. Available at http://und.edu/academics/instructional-development/documenting-teaching.cfm .

Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Coyne, P., Ganley, P. Hall, T., Meo, G., Murray, E., & Gordon, D. (2006). Applying Universal Design for Learning in the classroom. In D. H. Rose & A Meyer, Eds., *A practical reader in Universal Design for Learning.* Cambridge: Harvard Education Press.

Perkins, D. (1993). Teaching for understanding. *American Educator,* pp. 28-35.

Porter, A. and J. Brophy. (1988). Synthesis of Research on Good Teaching: Insights from the Work of the Institute for Research on Teaching. **Educational Leadership,** 78-83.

Pritchard, R., Saccucci, M. S., & Potter, G. C. (2010). Evaluating a program designed to demonstrate continuous improvement in teaching at an AACSB-accredited college of business at a regional university: A case study. *Journal of Education for Business, 85,* pp. 280-283.

Seldin, Peter. 1991. The teaching portfolio: A practical guide to improved performance and promotion/tenure decisions. Bolton, MA: Anker,.

Seldin, Peter, 2010. J. Elizabeth Miller, Clement A. Seldin, and Wilbert McKeachie. The Teaching Portfolio: A Practical Guide to Improved Performance and Promotion/ Tenure Decisions. Fourth Edition. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Shulman, L. (1989). Toward a Pedagogy of Substance. **AAHE Bulletin**, June, 11.

Theall, M. (2010). Evaluating teaching: From reliability to accountability. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 123*, pp. 85-95.

Towson University Department of Disability Services (2011). Working with Students with Disabilities: A Faculty/Staff Guide. Available at http://www.towson.edu/dss/teachingguide/universaldesign.asp.

Zubizarreta, John. "Evaluating Teaching Through Portfolios," in *Changing Practices in Teaching Evaluation*, ed. Peter Seldin. Bolton, MA: Anker, 1999 (162-182).

Theatre Department Criteria and Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure
(Approved 2/21/2011)

The Department of Theatre has adopted the following *Criteria and Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure* in accordance with the following documents: *The Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina* (hereinafter referred to as *The Code*), the *Tenure Policies, Regulations, and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte* as currently in effect (hereinafter referred to as *TPRP-UNCC*), and the *College of Arts and Architecture Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure* (hereinafter referred to as *CoAA-RPT*). If any part of the *Criteria and Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure* is found to be in conflict with either *The Code*, the *TPRP-UNCC*, or the *CoAA-RPT – The Code*, the *TPRP-UNCC*, or the *CoAA-RPT* shall prevail.

I. Criteria

Theatre faculty at all professorial ranks are expected to demonstrate competence in the three areas of accomplishment defined by the University: (1) scholarship and/or creative activity; (2) teaching; and (3) service. The Department recognizes that, because of the diversity of its faculty, and the range of their professional expertise, individual programs of teaching, research, writing, performance, and service will take a variety of directions. But in general, competence in scholarship and/or creative activity means a program of creative or scholarly work that contributes to the art of theatre or to the production of new knowledge in the field of theatre studies, at levels of quality and quantity established in the discipline. Competence in teaching means proficiency in the classroom (from the preparation of instructional materials to the mentoring of students in alternative educational settings) as demonstrated in a candidate's teaching portfolio and as measured by indices of student satisfaction and peer review. Competence in service means effective contributions to the administrative and governance efforts of the College, Department and University, together with external professional and community work, as appropriate to an individual's rank, expertise, and experience.

1. For reappointment as assistant professor, a candidate is expected to have initiated a program of creative work and/or scholarship with promise of discernible professional impact, and also to have met departmental standards in teaching and service. Criteria for professional impact in creative work or scholarship, including disciplinary standards in Design/Production/Performance and Theatre Studies, are given below. Departmental standards in teaching and service are defined below under "C. Teaching" (competencies and benchmarks) and "D. Service."

2. For permanent tenure and promotion to associate professor, a candidate is expected to have met disciplinary standards in research or creative work, including rate,

quality, and quantity of creative and/or scholarly accomplishment, to have had documented impact on the field, and to have met departmental standards in teaching and service. See sections A through D below.

3. For promotion to full professor, a candidate is expected to have demonstrated significant, continuing accomplishment in all three areas of accomplishment, and to have achieved distinction in scholarship and/or creative work as measured by the sustained professional impact of the candidate's artistry and/or publications.

At each level of review, the quality of a candidate's aggregate achievement must be substantiated by means of objective documentation and peer assessment. The general indicators of professional success are (1) *positive trajectory*, which means that the candidate's work demonstrates steady and continuing development, as measured by frequency, rate, and quality of publication or performance, as well as teaching effectiveness and responsible service; (2) *breadth of scope*, which means that a candidate's accomplishments and reputation spread over time from local to national and/or international venues, as measured by publication in distinguished journals or presses, opportunities to perform, design, or direct with recognized companies, and invitations to speak, read, coach, teach, consult, or engage in professional service beyond the campus; and (3) *positive comparative evaluation*, which means that the candidate enjoys the recognition of her or his peers as measured by reviews, letters of recommendation, honors or awards, written critiques, citations, grants, juried or refereed performances, and invited professional work.

In addition to College and University review criteria, the Department's standards of personnel review follow guidelines articulated by the professional organizations of the discipline of Theatre. Supporting documents include: "The Work of Arts Faculties in Higher Education," (1993) from the National Office for Arts Accrediting Associations; Guidelines for Evaluating Teacher/Artists for Promotion and Tenure" (2000), from the Association for Theatre in Higher Education; and "Tenure and Promotion Guidelines" (2000) from USITT: the Association of Design, Production, and Technology Professionals in the Performing Arts and Entertainment Industries.

A. Design, Production, and Performance Work

According to USITT guidelines, "Participation in theatrical productions is a normal mode of professional endeavor" for theatre artists in the academy and is considered a form of research and creative activity. "Significant research is required in the processes of design and production, and the communication of the results of this research is performance. The creative process is documented by the visual record of the production and by the graphics and organizational materials prepared in the planning of the production." USITT recommends "the acceptance of off-campus professional design and production work as an equivalent of refereed publication." The character of the selection process and venue may be evidenced by the location and size of the theatre, the

pool of applicants, the length of the production run, the theatre's visibility in local and national media reviews, or other criteria supplied by the candidate.

Theatre is both a collaborative and an ephemeral art. Performance is the conclusion of an integrated process entailing direction, dramaturgy, acting, scene design, costume design, lighting design, sound design, technical direction, choreography, scenic artistry, production management, and stage management. Playwriting and historical, technical, or other research are commonly included among these activities as well. The resulting achievement, a live performance, exists only in the moment; its documentation (apart from immediate witness) is necessarily retrospective and only suggestive of the quality of the performance itself. Hence, when evaluating the creative work of a candidate for promotion and/or tenure, the Department appreciates that the candidate's contributions are legitimately assessed both in themselves and in the context of the success of the production as a whole. The candidate's work need not invariably be singled out in reviews and other documentation in order to be credited for the success of the ensemble. Moreover, the Department accepts the inherent complexity of judging a performance retrospectively, and therefore allows appropriate latitude, consistent with USITT and other guidelines, in the range of artifacts, including but not limited to sketches, models, design notes, photographs, peer reviews, and public recognition, that may legitimately testify to the quality of a candidate's work.

(1) Creative activities authorized for RPT credit:

- Work successfully produced in an exceptional venue (such as a nationally or internationally recognized theatre or professional company) as determined by peers or sanctioned by professional theatrical unions or organizations.
- Work successfully produced in other substantial, off-campus venues as determined by peers.
- Work successfully produced on campus, provided it is peer-reviewed and/or leads to documented external activities (which may include conference presentations, articles, or external productions).
- Work successfully produced for exhibits and competitions.
- Work successfully produced in electronic media venues.
- Scripts or adaptations that have been read in significant venues, produced as live performance, or published.
- Dramaturgical work in significant venues.
- *Candidates whose primary work is in design, production, or performance also receive full promotion and/or tenure credit for traditional scholarship, including books, articles published in recognized journals, published reviews of theatrical performances, and presentations at academic conferences, provided it meets the standards articulated below under "Theatre Studies Work."*

(2) Benchmarks for Evaluating Creative Work

The Department Review Committee's (DRC) judgment regarding "distinction" and "professional impact" in design, production, and performance work depends on a variety of conventional benchmarks in the discipline of Theatre and in the past practice of the University.

- A candidate's work should describe a history of sustained productivity over time. All records of artistic accomplishment, including those compiled prior to employment at the University, are counted in the review, but there is an expectation that the candidate will have concluded work at this institution consistent with the defined benchmarks of sustained productivity.

- While the quantity of professional work does not by itself indicate quality or impact, lower than average quantity suggests a poor trajectory for later achievement. It is reasonable to assume that candidates in design fields will average two significant off-campus production activities per year, and that candidates in production and performance fields will average one such activity, during the period leading to tenure and promotion review.

- Peer reviews of specific performances are an essential indicator of significant accomplishment, especially written evaluations by colleagues in the area of a candidate's particular expertise, or by other theatre professionals, or by members of a production team.

- The process by which an artist is chosen to perform (for example, an actor's audition or a designer's portfolio presentation) is rigorously competitive in significant venues and therefore constitutes, in itself, a peer review which a candidate should document as such.

- Adjudication reports from regional or national festivals and reviews by professional theatre critics are also useful indicators.

- A candidate should demonstrate the ability to attract invitations to work in substantial venues, as described above.

- Repeated engagements in a substantial venue are a particularly noteworthy indicator of successful work.

- Invitations or commissions to work for professional theatre companies or election to competitive union memberships indicate growing reputation.

- Inclusion in competitions or exhibits, especially those that are juried, also indicates growing reputation.

- Candidates may enhance professional standing by presenting on panels and programs of professional organizations as well as by securing opportunities to teach master classes or lead intensive workshops.

- Awards, honors, and prizes offer helpful testimony of artistic accomplishment and should be listed in the curriculum vitae and explained in the personal commentary.

- Awards of externally sponsored funding, together with a record of successful grant proposal writing, are valuable credentials and should be accurately

documented in the curriculum vitae and described in the personal commentary.

- The judgments of peers, including the referees who submit evaluations of the candidate in support of promotion and/or tenure review, should indicate that a candidate has achieved professional standing outside the Department to the degree that is appropriate for the rank the candidate is seeking.

Note: A mix of professional accomplishments and measures of distinction or impact is desirable, and it is the burden of a candidate, in consultation with the Chair, to explain in her or his personal statement how the complete body of work, including teaching and service, illustrates the candidate's strengths, furthers his or her career goals, and reveals a coherent plan for creative and/or scholarly growth.

B. Theatre Studies Work

(1) Scholarly and research activities authorized for RPT credit:

- books or textbooks, authored, co-authored, edited, or translated, with academic, literary, or professional presses, in electronic or visual media;
- refereed journal (including e-journal) articles, interviews, book or performance reviews, and review essays;
- refereed chapters, essays, or articles in reference texts, proceedings, collections, and anthologies.

(A "refereed" publication is one whose acceptance is the result of editorial or other peer review in a competitive venue. The candidate is responsible for distinguishing between refereed and non-refereed publications on the curriculum vitae, and for explaining the nature of non-traditional published or professional work in the personal commentary.)

- *candidates whose primary work is in traditional scholarship also receive full promotion and/or tenure credit for creative activities, provided they meet the standards articulated above under "Design, Production, and Performance Work."*

Other demonstrations of scholarly activity may include:

- non-refereed publications, including production notes and other research, play programs, interviews, book reviews, review essays, occasional essays, and grant-related, governmental, or other professional reports;
- juried papers given at international, national, regional, or local professional conferences;
- invited addresses, keynotes, or papers given at international, national, regional, or local professional conferences;
- production of computer software;
- on-line publication;
- film or video production;
- reports and materials derived from consulting activities in universities, schools, government agencies, business, or industry;
- funded grant proposals for basic or applied research, curriculum development, or professional service;
- editorial service, either as editor or on an editorial board;
- manuscripts accepted for publication.

(2) Benchmarks for Evaluating Scholarly Work

The DRC's judgment regarding "distinction" and "professional impact" in scholarship depends on a variety of conventional benchmarks in the discipline of Theatre Studies and in the past practice of the University:

- A candidate's publications should describe a history of sustained productivity over time. All publications, including those completed at other institutions, are counted in the review, but there is an expectation that the candidate will have published work at this institution, consistent with the defined benchmarks of sustained productivity.

- While the quantity of professional work does not by itself indicate quality or impact, lower than average quantity suggests a poor trajectory for later achievement. It is reasonable to assume that candidates in scholarly fields will either complete a book and 3 to 5 articles, or else, in the absence of a book, 8 to 10 significant articles, during the period leading to tenure and promotion review. The traditional academic book, while a conventional measure of academic accomplishment, is not a prerequisite for achieving tenure or promotion.

- A candidate should demonstrate the ability to place refereed articles in respected journals, and/or to place book manuscripts with recognized academic, literary, or professional presses. When the candidate is aware of a submission/acceptance rate at a particular journal or press, the information should be included on the curriculum vitae or in the personal commentary under the section devoted to scholarship or creative work.

- Reviews of a candidate's published work and citations in the research of other scholars may provide helpful testimony regarding the impact of that work.

- Substantial awards of externally sponsored funding, together with a record of successful grant-proposal writing, constitute important scholarly credentials and should be accurately documented on the curriculum vitae and described in the personal commentary.

- Publication awards and prizes from presses, journals, or professional associations, along with other forms of recognition, provide helpful testimony of scholarly or artistic accomplishment and should be listed on the curriculum vitae and explained in the personal commentary.

- Invitations to present papers or keynote addresses at prestigious national or international gatherings argue for growing prominence in a field and should be noted in the personal commentary.

- The judgments of peers, including the referees who submit evaluations of the candidate in support of promotion and/or tenure review, should indicate that a candidate has achieved professional standing outside the Department to the degree that is appropriate for the rank the candidate is seeking.

Note: A mix of professional accomplishments and measures of distinction or impact is desirable, and it is the burden of a candidate, in consultation with the Chair, to explain in

her or his personal statement how the complete body of work, including teaching and service, illustrates the candidate's strengths, furthers his or her career goals, and reveals a coherent plan for creative and/or scholarly growth.

C. Teaching

The Theatre Department places high value on the quality of its teaching, and does not consider excellence in scholarly and/or performance activity as a substitute for that quality. Candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure will present as evidence of their competence the following materials: (1) a statement of teaching philosophy and general classroom practice, incorporated in the personal commentary; (2) syllabi, exams, and other course materials; (3) in the case of tenure track faculty, all student course evaluations, both written and numerical; in the case of tenured faculty, all evaluations since the last mandatory review; and (4) peer observations and evaluations as required by the State of North Carolina.

The DRC will also assess other documented evidence of teaching excellence or engagement, including:

- development of new programs, courses, or teaching methods;
- peer assistance, teacher mentoring;
- pedagogically-oriented consulting work;
- team-taught and interdisciplinary courses;
- curriculum development grants;
- supervision of independent studies, directed readings;
- supervision of internships;
- sponsorship of and participation in extracurricular events or activities that support student learning;
- academic advising;
- teaching honors/ awards.

Competence in teaching may be demonstrated by but is not limited to the following benchmarks:

- command of the appropriate disciplinary subject areas;
- effective organization and presentation of course materials;
- articulate philosophy of teaching, manifest in course design and classroom method;
- evidence of clear assignments and careful assessments of student work;
- performance at or near the Theatre Department's norms, according to written student evaluations and peer evaluations.
- performance at or near the Theatre Department's means, according to OPSCAN student evaluations.

In exceptional cases, a faculty member who has achieved public distinction in teaching may be promoted on the basis of that accomplishment. "Distinction" in this instance entails national recognition for educational achievements (teaching awards, etc.), peer reviewed publications (articles and/or books) and other normative professional activities (conference papers, etc.), that have resulted in a demonstrable improvement of the quality of teaching, learning, curriculum, educational technology, or the administration of schools.

D. Service

Service activities contribute to the governance of the University, the support of the profession, and the flourishing of the community. They also testify to the collegiality of individual faculty. At a minimum, Theatre faculty are expected to attend Department meetings and to play responsible roles on committees to which they are assigned. Accomplishments in the area of service are less important for tenure track faculty than contributions in scholarship, writing, and teaching, but they constitute a significant measure of the professional engagement and stature of senior faculty, including those seeking promotion to full professor.

Tenure track faculty are expected to assume meaningful but not burdensome service duties in elected or appointed committee assignments in the Department or, less typically, the College or University. Tenure track faculty should exercise reasonable discretion in accepting professional or community service responsibilities that might negatively affect productivity in research and writing or effectiveness in teaching. Tenured faculty are expected to share the routine responsibilities of departmental administration and governance, to take leadership roles in the Department, College, and University, and to perform in those professional or community service capacities for which their interests, expertise, and experience may qualify them.

For both tenure track and senior faculty members, academic and community service activities must be documented in the individual's employment file. Documentation may include references in the CV and Personal Statement, references in annual faculty performance reviews, letters from committee or task force chairs, testimonials from community members or groups, and news reports. Examples of academic and community service activities include:

Academic Service Activities

- serving on Departmental, College, or University committees and taskforces;
- chairing committees, or accepting special committee or subcommittee assignments;
- creating, chairing, or serving on ad hoc committees;
- administering academic or support programs;
- helping to create new academic or support programs;
- serving and/or holding office in local, regional, national, or international professional associations;
- reading manuscripts for journals or book publishers (including textbooks);
- performing external tenure/promotion reviews.

Community Service Activities

- consulting, related to professional expertise, with universities, schools, theatre companies, government agencies, business, or industry;
- service or volunteer work, related to professional expertise, in civic, cultural, educational, and/or religious organizations;
- performances, readings, stagings, and presentations to civic, cultural, educational, and/or religious organizations;
- judging community competitions.

II. Procedures

Preparation for Review

A faculty member is expected to represent career achievement in the three areas of professional accomplishment by maintaining an accurate and complete curriculum vitae. A candidate for personnel review is also required to create a personal statement of no more than six pages addressing his or her creative or scholarly work, teaching, and service. The purpose of the statement is to explain the coherence and significance of the candidate's professional effort to colleagues within and beyond the Theatre Department. The statement should reflect on accomplishments during the period of review, discuss present activities and work in progress, and detail future plans. This commentary is an important guide to the candidate's review file, and the DRC will study it closely in the process of evaluation. It is also critically important to colleagues outside of Theatre who will participate in College or University levels of review.

Tenure track faculty normally stand for reappointment during the third year of an initial, four-year contract. Presuming successful reappointment, the review for permanent tenure and promotion to associate professor normally occurs during the sixth year of service. The tenure "clock" may occasionally be accelerated or temporarily halted under special circumstances, the former if a faculty member comes to the University with time in grade elsewhere, the latter if a faculty member receives family medical leave, or encounters other circumstances that may interrupt full-time employment. Tenured faculty may elect to stand for promotion at any time, and the decision whether or not to undergo review is usually negotiated with the Chair. The "tenure clock" **may not** be extended in the case of research or professional leave. Such activities are considered a normative aspect of an academic career and contribute to the production of scholarly and/or creative work, which benefit candidates on their path to tenure or promotion.

In the spring of the year prior to review, no later than May 1, candidates for reappointment or promotion with permanent tenure are notified in writing by the Chair to prepare their credentials. Candidates for promotion to full professor should ordinarily plan to meet the same deadline in order to allow the Chair time to identify external referees. All faculty seeking reappointment and/or promotion are encouraged to consult with the Chair and/or other colleagues regarding the preparation of their files, including the format of the curriculum vitae, the content of the personal statement, and the selection as well as ordering of their materials.

All faculty applying for tenure and/or promotion will assemble a representative portfolio of publications and creative materials to send out for evaluation by recognized specialists in the candidate's field. The Chair will contact between four and six external reviewers; University guidelines require no fewer than three. The candidate should submit the names of at least three individuals who work in the specific field(s)

represented by the candidate's work. Excluded from this list should be those who would have an obvious conflict of interest, such as dissertation committee members and co-authors, past or present. The Chair will select at least one of the reviewers proposed by the candidate, and will select additional reviewers from nominations provided by Department faculty or outside consultants in related areas of expertise.

Departmental Review

By University policy, the DRC is exclusively designated to provide recommendations to the Chair regarding candidates' suitability for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. Committee members are elected from the Department's cadre of tenured faculty in accordance with Departmental by-laws. The DRC holds its deliberations each fall approximately two weeks prior to the due dates for submission of personnel cases in the College. Cases for reappointment are due in the Dean's Office on or about October 1, cases for tenure and promotion on or about October 15, and cases for promotion to full professor on or about October 31. Candidates should plan, therefore, to make their materials available to the Committee, at the latest, by September 1, September 15, and September 30 respectively.

The tenured faculty of the department, other than those who will participate in the review process at another level, who are at or above the rank for which a candidate is under consideration, have an opportunity to evaluate the candidate's dossier and provide advice to the DRC. Eligible individuals should regard it as a professional responsibility to assist the Committee in its deliberations by offering written opinions for inclusion in the case file.

Evaluations of the candidate's dossier by the DRC and by the Chair are separate and independent, although the Committee may invite the Chair into its discussions if it unanimously determines that doing so will assist its work. After deliberating in confidential session, the Committee will submit its recommendation(s) and rationale(s) concerning reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion to the Chair in writing. After consulting with the DRC, the Chair will submit a recommendation and rationale, together with those of the Committee, to the Dean of the College.

Whether the recommendation for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion is positive or negative, the Chair will meet with the candidate and provide a copy of the forwarding memorandum. In cases where the Chair's recommendation is not to reappoint, promote, or confer permanent tenure, he or she will explain the faculty member's right of rebuttal. Within ten days after this meeting, the faculty member may submit to the Dean and the Chair his or her written rebuttal to the Chair's recommendation. Upon receipt of the faculty member's rebuttal, or at the end of a ten day period if the faculty member does not submit a rebuttal, the Chair will submit his or her recommendations and rationales, together with those of the Committee, to the Dean of the College.

III. University Review

Procedures governing personnel actions beyond the Departmental review are detailed in *Tenure Policies, Regulations, and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte*. In brief, all cases for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, whether judged positively or negatively in the Department, proceed to the College Review Committee, and subsequently to the Dean, for their independent evaluations, before proceeding finally to the Provost, who is the first University official to make a binding decision, as opposed to a recommendation, for or against a candidate. At every level of review, each positive or negative determination and its rationale is provided in writing to the candidate prior to its transmittal to the next administrative level. In addition, the candidate has the right to access (upon written request) all documents that are part of the decision-making process. However, the decisions of the Provost can only be appealed on procedural grounds, not on the merits. A faculty member who contends that the decision was based on "impermissible grounds" or "material procedural irregularities" may seek a hearing on that contention in accordance with protocols described in *Tenure Policies, Regulations, and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte*.

Guidelines for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Tenured Faculty Performance Review

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of North Carolina Charlotte
Revised and Approved Unanimously on 2/1/2016

Part I. Guidelines for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

The candidates are evaluated for promotion to the various ranks, for tenure, and for reappointment in the areas of teaching, research and service on the basis of the same RTP criteria used by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences as listed in the following criteria (not in a ranked order).

For reappointment of an assistant professor:

- Effective teaching.

- High quality research/creative activity.

- Appropriate service contributions at the department level.

- Projected growth as a teacher, scholar, and university citizen that shows promise of satisfying criteria for promotion to associate professor with conferral of permanent tenure.

Promotion of an Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:

- A demonstrated record of effectiveness as a teacher.

- A continuous and distinctive record of peer reviewed publication and/or peer-reviewed creative activity, and an appropriate external funding activity in the candidate's field of specialization.

- Demonstrated commitment to service, with a level of engagement appropriate to the discipline, the department and, where possible, the College and the University.

- Projected growth as a teacher, scholar, and university citizen that will lead to promotion to the rank of Professor.

- The rationale for early promotion must provide compelling justification using the above criteria.

Promotion of an Associate Professor to Professor:

- A record of academic achievement that has led to national or international recognition as a scholar, creative performer or teacher.

- A cumulative record of teaching effectiveness since promotion to associate professor.

- Substantial peer-reviewed publications and/or peer-reviewed creative activity; grantsmanship where appropriate; a demonstrated growth in scholarship since promotion to associate professor.

- A significant service record within the individual's academic profession and also within the university community at large.

- It is recognized that tenured faculty sometimes replace their normal duties with professional or university service such as acting as a funding agency program officer or assuming administrative roles in the University. In such cases, faculty must still meet department requirements for promotion to Full Professor, but assessment of scholarly and teaching achievement should take into account this departure from named duties.

Evaluation of Teaching: In evaluating teaching, the department considers the following for all candidates.

1. Summaries of the student evaluation data on selected questions from the student questionnaire.

2. Summaries of other course statistics which are compiled annually by the department. These include grade distributions and performance of classes on departmental common final exams (when appropriate).

3. Any written comments from students collected during the evaluations.

4. The yearly evaluations of the candidate's teaching record contained in the annual merit evaluation.

5. Peer classroom visitations by colleagues and their reports on them.

6. The teaching portfolio prepared by the candidate. The candidate is encouraged and is free to submit any relevant information.

   The evaluation may also consider items such as:

7. Evidence of significant extra efforts in teaching such as special lecture notes or materials, special course developments, computer assisted materials, audio-visual materials, special projects which result in significant written student output, directed studies, theses, *etc.*

8. Curriculum (course and program) development or experimentation.

9. Teaching-related service such as serving as course coordinators, authors/readers of department common final exams, supervisors, mentors or committee members of graduate students and/or teaching assistants, ad hoc committee members for text book selection and syllabus preparation, *etc.*

   In the case that the candidate has had some problems with teaching, it is important that he or she demonstrate improvement and document efforts at improvement. Whatever is involved in these efforts can be considered as part of the teaching evaluation. The following are a few such examples:

10. Video recording and/or critical analyses of the classes by colleagues in the department or experts from other departments within UNCC.

11. Close consultation with experienced faculty members concerning teaching lessons, planning, testing, etc. Again, the faculty involved may be asked for an evaluation of what they have observed.

12. Letters solicited directly from the students after a course is completed.

Evaluation of Research and Professional Activity: In evaluating research and professional activity, the department considers the following for all candidates.

1. The collected professional works, including an evaluation of the quality of the outlets, and an assessment by outside reviewers of quality and impact of research. The outside reviewers must include recognized, top experts in the field of specialization. Internal evaluations of the research may also be included if the department has faculty members with expertise in the research area of the candidate.

2. In the case that a large proportion of the candidate's work is joint, the candidate needs to describe his or her contributions and his/her co-authors may be asked to comment on the contributions of the candidate.

3. Evidence of professional activity such as regular talks at conferences, refereeing of papers, refereeing of grant proposals, journal/proceedings editorial work, *etc.*

4. Receipt of internal and external grants in support of research or professional activity, with an emphasis on the external grants.

5. Documented significant efforts in applying for internal and external research grants, with an emphasis on the external grants.

   Other possible considerations include:

6. Organization of professional conferences.

7. Serving as an outside referee for tenure and promotion cases or for theses.

8. Citations of the faculty member's work in papers or books.

9. Consulting work involving the faculty member's expertise in significant ways. Here someone familiar with the project may be asked for an evaluation and reports may be inspected.

Evaluation of Service: In evaluating service, the department considers the service on various departmental, college, and university committees, as well as service to the community. Examples of these include the following.

1. Serving on search committees within the department or outside the department.

2. Serving on the Department Review Committee.

3. Serving as a program director or coordinator.

4. Representing the department in faculty government.

5. Serving on certain state or national boards or committees that are concerned with educational matters of importance to the university.

6. Serving as a faculty associate or as a university student advisor.

7. Taking on special assignments, which are important to the department, the college or the university.

8. Serving in an administrative capacity, *e.g.*, as chairperson, associate chairperson or coordinator(s).

9. Serving as a faculty advisor for an honorary society or a student club.

10. Serving on national committees or as an officer in a professional society.

11. Serving the community in ways which use the individual's professional expertise.

Part II. Guidelines for Tenured Faculty Performance Review (TFPR)

The TFPR review consists of examining the faculty member's current vita, his/her past five years annual merit reviews and a current five-year plan with set of goals. The faculty member may also submit an optional statement describing his or her professional accomplishments in teaching, research, and service (including part-time administrative responsibilities) related to his or her five-year plan. The DRC writes a report to the Department Chair and the Department Chair writes a formal report to the Dean of the College (both reports will be submitted to the Dean). In accordance with University and College guidelines, this report shall conclude with one of the three findings "Exceeds Expectations", "Meets Expectations", or "Does Not Meet Expectations", as determined by the standards described in the next paragraph. In the last case the DRC shall state the faculty members primary responsibilities and in its report describe the performance deficiencies as they relate to the faculty members assigned duties and the goals established.

A faculty member is given the performance rating "Exceeds Expectations" if his annual merit evaluation ratings over the past five years are all *Very Good* or above, with at least three *Excellent* ratings. A faculty member is given the performance rating "Does Not Meet Expectations" if his annual merit evaluation rating in at least three of the past five years is *Does Not Meet Expectations*. A faculty member is given the performance rating "Meets Expectations" in all other cases. In the case that a faculty members performance rating is "Does Not Meet Expectations" a Developmental Plan may be prepared by the Department Chair in consultation with the DRC. (Annual merit review ratings are *Excellent, Very Good, Good, Meets Expectations*, and *Does Not Meet Expectations*.)

Supplement: Instruction on Preparing the Five-Year Plan

1. Guideline from CLAS:

Every faculty member must have a written plan in the three clearly identified areas of teaching, research and service over the five year period between their TFPR or since their most recent promotion, whichever is most recent. The five-year plan will be prepared by the faculty member. It may vary according to department expectations, but will include at a minimum a description of the faculty member's plans for the five year period in the three areas noted above. It may also include specific performance goals during this period, timetables for meeting these goals and anticipated resources (grants, reassignment of duties, library, laboratory or other research resources, etc.) that will assist the faculty member in fulfilling their plans in each of the three areas noted above. The five-year plan may be revised or reevaluated by the faculty member and Chair annually at the time of the faculty member's annual review.

The five-year plan will be reviewed by the departmental committee charged with annual review and the Chair in their annual evaluation of the faculty member. Adjustments to the plan may be made, as necessary, by the faculty member in consultation with the chair of his/her department to complement the professional activities of the faculty member in the areas of teaching, research and public service.

2. It is recommended that the five-year plan to brief and be kept within one to two pages.

3. Keep in mind that the five-year plan can be updated/revised on an annual basis. The faculty member can do that at the time of annual activity report.

UNIVERSITY-WIDE EVALUATION GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTIONS AND TENURE
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO

http://provost.uncg.edu/documents/personnel/evaluationPT.pdf

(Approved by the General Faculty, January 21, 1998)
(Amended by the General Faculty, April 5, 2006)
(Amended by the Faculty Senate, November 4, 2009)
(Approved by the General Faculty, November 18, 2009)
(Amended by the Faculty Senate, April 7, 2010; Approved by the General Faculty, April 28, 2010

I.   Introduction

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro strives to excel in the selection and development of faculty members. One aspect of faculty development is the evaluation of faculty members for promotions and tenure. This evaluation process should address both individual and institutional goals, reflect the complexity of faculty work, recognize faculty members' uniqueness, foster their career development, and take place in a spirit of collegiality.

I.A.   **Role of Scholarship in Faculty Roles and Responsibilities**

The promotions and tenure guidelines of the University rest on a definition of scholarship that can be applied to all aspects of University work:

Scholarship is characterized by creative intellectual work based on a high level of professional expertise, the significance of which can be validated by peers and which enhances the fulfillment of the mission of the University. Scholarship is not considered to be synonymous with research, but can be demonstrated by activities in teaching, research and creative activity, service, and directed professional activity.

I.B.   Relationship of the *Evaluation Guidelines* to University and Unit Documents

The *University-wide Evaluation Guidelines for Promotions and Tenure* are in accordance with and subordinate to *The Code of the University of North Carolina* and the *Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations* of The University of North Carolina at Greensboro. The *Evaluation Guidelines* provide a context in which each unit can develop specific evaluation plans appropriate to its mission. Each unit shall utilize the university-wide activities and documentation itemized under the common categories as examples within a range of possibilities to be adapted to the unique mission of each unit.

I.C.   The primary responsibility for recommendations concerning the promotions and tenure of faculty members rests with the units. Therefore, each unit is expected to:

I.C.1.   Establish comprehensive unit-specific evaluation guidelines for each of the three common categories of teaching, research and creative activity, and service, and for a fourth category, directed professional activity, if the unit incorporates this category into its criteria. This fourth category applies to individual faculty

members and should be based on mutual agreement and understanding of the expectations and responsibilities among the individual faculty member, his or her department head, and dean.

I.C.2.   Have a standing committee on promotions and tenure, which will serve to evaluate individual candidates and ensure at least two levels of faculty review with one being the unit's Committee on Promotions and Tenure.

I.C.3.   Ensure that its evaluation guidelines conform to the provisions of the *Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations* and the other documents listed in the Appendix to the *Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations*.

I.C.4.   Develop profiles establishing unit expectations for faculty performance at each rank in the categories of teaching, research and creative activity, service, and directed professional activity, with expectations of continuous growth and productivity reflected in the profiles.

I.C.5.   Use the University-wide activities and documentations itemized under the common categories, below, as examples within a range of possibilities to be adapted to the unique mission of each unit.

I.C.6.   Provide membership on the Faculty Senate Promotions and Tenure Guidelines Committee by assigning the chair of the unit promotion and tenure committee to serve as a member of this committee. .

I.C.7.   Develop promotions and tenure criteria of that will:

I.C.7.(a) assert the primary importance of teaching and learning as required in The Code of the Univeristy of North Carolina, Section 400.3.1.1[A]

I.C.7.(b) comprehensively address the levels of achievement desired for promotion and tenure to each rank (tenure only in the case of the University Libraries). The promotion and tenure of each faculty member should be viewed in the context of continuous growth and productivity.

I.D.   **Relationship of Department Documents to Unit Documents**

Department guidelines for promotions and tenure are in accordance with and subordinate to unit documents. Each department is expected to establish clear and specific (see section 2.D.i. of the *Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations*) comprehensive department-specific evaluation guidelines for each of the three common categories and for the fourth, directed professional activity, if the unit incorporates the fourth category into its criteria.

II.   **Four Evaluation Categories**

Evaluation for promotions and tenure is based upon three traditional categories of faculty contributions: teaching, research and creative activity, and service. An additional category, directed professional activity, may also be used by the unit as a category of evaluation. The emphasis given to a specific category can vary among faculty members. Each activity must

manifest the basic features of scholarly and professional work. The work should show a high level of discipline-related proficiency, be creative or original, be amenable to documentation, be peer or constituent-reviewed, and have a significant impact.

II.A.   **Teaching**

The most fundamental function of the University is teaching. Research and creative activity, service, and directed professional activity, while important to the life of the University, do not have the central importance of teaching. Therefore, it is essential that excellence in teaching be encouraged and rewarded. Faculty members eligible for promotions and tenure should demonstrate their accomplishments as teachers and their continual efforts to improve their teaching.

The University embraces all teaching strategies that enhance student learning both inside and outside the classroom, particularly critical thinking, higher-order reasoning, and problem-solving skills, and encourages a wide array of student learning opportunities including community engaged teaching, international experiences, and other diverse modalities and settings. Faculty members eligible for promotion and tenure should demonstrate their accomplishments as teachers and their continual efforts to improve their teaching (UNC System Code, 400.3.1.1[A]).

II.A.1.   **Scope of Teaching**

Teaching embraces activities related to instruction and learning that occur both inside and outside the classroom, including community-engaged teaching, international experiences, and other diverse modalities and settings. Teaching activities may include, but are not limited to, the following:

II.A.1.(a)   **Instructing**

- Instructing students in courses, laboratories, clinics, studio classes, libraries, study-abroad programs, and distance education

- Instructing participants in workshops, retreats, and seminars

- Mentoring other faculty

- Facilitating faculty, student, and/or staff learning

II.A.1.(b)   **Advising, Supervising, Guiding, and Mentoring Students**

- Advising students in laboratories and fieldwork, research projects, theses, and dissertations

- Supervising teaching assistants and students enrolled in internships and clinical experiences

- Directing collaborative research with students

- Directing students in creative presentations

- Overseeing student-directed creative presentations

- Supervising students in independent study

- Mentoring students

- Providing program/career advising

II.A.1.(c) **Developing Learning Activities**

- Developing, reviewing, and redesigning courses, including interdisciplinary and interdepartmental offerings

- Developing and revising curricula

- Developing teaching materials, manuals, and software

- Developing off-campus teaching activities such as study-abroad courses and distance education courses

- Developing web-based or computer-enabled courses or programs

- Designing and implementing new processes or procedures that enhance the use of scholarly materials

- Enhancing the organization of material so that it can be more easily accessed and understood

- Developing and using bibliographic and information systems to facilitate access to scholarly materials

II.A.1.(d) **Sustaining Teaching Effectiveness**

- Conducting assessments to evaluate teaching and learning

- Participating in professional development activities

- Maintaining state or national certification or licensure

II.A.1.(e) **Community Engaged Teaching**

- Developing and delivering community-based instruction, such as service-learning experiences, on-site courses, clinical experiences, professional internships, and collaborative programs

- Developing and delivering off-campus teaching activities such as study-abroad courses and experiences, international instruction, and distance education courses

- Developing and delivering instruction to communities and other constituencies

II.A.2. **Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness**

Documentation of teaching effectiveness may include, but is not limited to, the following:

II.A.2.(a) **Descriptions of Teaching Activities**

- Summary of responsibilities and activities

- Portfolio containing such materials as course syllabi, assignments, examinations, and handouts

- Samples of electronic media such as audio, video, and Internet resources

II.A.2.(b) **Documented Outcomes**

- Evidence of student learning and achievement through external standardized tests, awards, and scholarships

- Student creative works and project or field work reports

- Student publications based on course-related work

- Student development as evidenced by participation in professional societies and performances in the fine arts

- Supervision of honors or master's theses and doctoral dissertations

- Establishment or management of a successful clinical or internship program

- Nominations by students, alumni, or peers for teaching excellence

- Descriptions and examples of instructional innovations

- Textbooks and other educational materials

- Grant and contract proposals developed and submitted to funding agencies for instructional/curriculum development or assessment of the effectiveness of teaching strategies

- Evidence of enhanced access to materials and resources

- Evidence of enhanced organization of materials

- Evidence of effective facilitation of learning

II.A.2.(c) **Judgments about Teaching**

- Statements from students such as information from exit interviews, written comments on examinations, teacher evaluations, and letters from students and alumni

- Statements from colleagues on observations of teaching effectiveness and contributions to course development and improvement

- Statements from administrators

- Feedback on the preparedness of former students for graduate study and/or employment

- Comments on teaching effectiveness from parents of students, alumni, and employers of students

II.A.2.(d) **Eminence Measures**

- Honors or recognition for meritorious teaching from campus and professional associations

- Invitations to teach at other institutions or other outside agencies

- Accomplishments of former students (e. g., placement of students, post-doctoral fellowships, dissertation awards)

- Receipt of grants, contracts, or external funding related to teaching

II.A.2.(e) **Self-reflection and Appraisal**

- Evidence of steps taken to evaluate and improve one's teaching

- Self-appraisals of one's professional goals, development, and achievements in teaching

II.A.3. **Unit-Specific Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness**

As sepcified in section I.B. each unit shall "utilize the University-wide activities and documentation itemized under the common categories as examples within a range of possibilities to be adapted to the unique mission of each unit." The unit documents for the evaluation of teaching must meet the following University-wide standards:

II.A.3.(a) Assert the primacy of teaching as required by the UNC Policy Manual, section 400.3.1.1[A].

II.A.3.(b) Establish evaluation procedures which guarantee the assessment of teaching activities, outcomes, and measures of success

II.A.3.(c) Reward meritorious teaching as defined by the unit

II.A.3.(d) Recommend against promotion or tenure on the basis of unacceptable teaching as defined by the unit

II.B. **Research and Creative Activity**

As part of its mission, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro rewards research and creative activities that advance knowledge, support teaching, apply innovation and

entrepreneurship, and promote the application of knowledge for the benefit of society. Research and creative activities include all forms of discovery and integration of knowledge such as the solution of practical problems; critical analyses; the organization, creation, analysis and dissemination of knowledge resources; the creation and performance or exhibition of works of art; and their public dissemination. All faculty members are expected to engage in significant research or creative scholarly activities as appropriate to their fields or disciplines, their continuing professional growth, and the mission of the University.

Research and Creative Activities may be conducted by a variety of methods, across a variety of contexts, and in pursuit of a variety of purposes. Such acitivies can enhance or revise disciplinary knowledge; have an impact on various populations or organizations; or offer new theoretical insights. Because of the breadth of research and creative activities, candidate's paths will vary according to the candidate's line of inquiry. The evaluation of research and creative activities shall consider contributions to the field or discipline, including interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and collaborative work, the quality of the work, and its significance or impact. The evaluation also should include the continuity, range, focus, and aggregation of productive work as appropriate to the field or discipline, with particular emphasis on accomplishments since appointment or the last promotion. Documentation of the significance and quality of research and creative expression must include formal external peer review.

II.B.1. **Scope of Research and Creative Activity**

Research and creative activities include all forms of discovery and integration of knowledge; innovations that address social, economic, or environmental challenges; critical analyses; the organization, creation, analysis and dissemination of knowledge resources; the creation and performance or exhibition of works of art; the development of innovative processes or technologies; the application of entrepreneurship, and their public dissemination.

Research and creative activities may include, but are not limited to, the following:

II.B.1.(a) **Scholarly Research and Its Dissemination**

- Writing books, monographs, textbooks, and book chapters

- Writing papers for refereed journals and conference proceedings

- Presenting papers at professional meetings

- Writing other papers and reports (e.g., exhibition catalogues, trade or in-house publications, encyclopedias)

- Writing translations, abstracts, and reviews

- Preparing patent applications

II.B.1.(b) **Creative Activities**

- Writing poems, fictional works, plays, essays, and musical scores

- Presenting exhibitions of graphic and/or visual art

- Choreographing dance productions

- Writing or producing radio or television productions, films, and videos

- Performing as actor, dancer, or musician

- Producing or directing theatrical works

- Conducting musical performances

II.B.1.(c)   Community Engaged Research and Creative Activities

- Writing papers for refereed journals and conference proceedings

- Creating exhibits in educational and cultural institutions

- Disseminating community engaged research through public programs and events

- Conducting and disseminating directed or contracted research

- Conducting and reporting program evaluation research or public policy analyses for other institutions and agencies

- Developing innovative solutions that address social, economic, or environmental challenges (e.g., inventions, patents, products, services, clinical procedures and practices)

II.B.1.(d) **Editing**

- Editing books

- Editing journals or other learned publications

II.B.1.(e) **Grants, Contracts, and Related Activities**

- Developing and submitting research grant proposals (e. g. individual, interdisciplinary, community)

- Obtaining funding and managing grants

- Directing research teams

- Engaging in entrepreneurship and related activities

II.B.2. **Documentation of Research and Creative Activity**

Documentation of the effectiveness of research and creative activities may include, but is not limited to, the following:

II.B.2.(a) **Descriptions of Research and Creative Activity**

- Summary of responsibilities and activities

- Analyses of research and creative problems addressed

II.B.2.(b) **Documented Outcomes**

- Journal articles, books, book chapters, edited books, monographs, translations, abstracts, and reviews

- Grant proposals submitted and external funding received

- Unpublished papers and reports

- Papers presented at professional meetings

- Works of art

- Public performances and exhibitions

- Electronic publishing

- Granted patents

- Patent applications

- Disclosures of innovation

- Entrepreneurship and related activities

- Document social changes (e.g., policies, programs, and procedures)

- Adoption of scholarly products

- Development of bills or laws based on evidence/research

II.B.2.(c) **Judgments about Research and Creative Activities**

- Evaluations from faculty colleagues at UNCG and other institutions

- Evaluations from department chairs, deans, and other appropriate administrators

- Evaluations from curators, critics, reviewers, experts from the community and elsewhere

II.B.2.(d) **Eminence Measures**

- Position as editor of journal or member of editorial board

- Invited chapters in prestigious publications

- Invited papers and guest lectures

- Invited exhibitions and performances

- Recognition in artistic competitions

- Honors and awards from professional or community entities

- Appointment or election as officer in professional organizations

- Citation, replication, or continuation of scholarly and creative work

- Published translations of works into other languages

- Published or broadcast interviews or public testimonials

- Media exposure of research and creative activity

- Receipt of research grants, contracts, or external funding

- Recognition of impact on public policy and the solution of social problems

- Receipt of investment funding related to innovations

- Starting and growing a business or organization or assisting in making an existing business or organization more creative and innovative

II.B.2.(e) Self-Reflection and Appraisal

- Self-appraisal of one's professional goals, development, and achievements in research and creative activity

II.C. Service

Service embraces activities that sustain the University and enable it to carry out its mission, contributes to the function and effectiveness of the faculty member's profession and discipline, and reaches out to external communities and constituencies, such as government agencies, business, private for-profit and not-for-profit organizations, and arts communities, where academic knowledge intersects with practical affairs and problem solving. Academic and professional service is essential to creating an environment that supports scholarly excellence, meets the internal operational needs of the University, and enhances the University's relationships to the UNC system, the local community, the region, state, and world. All faculty members are expected to engage in University service, with increasing involvement at unit and University levels at higher ranks.

In addition to service on campus, faculty members often contribute to their professions and disciplines through involvement and leadership in professional organizations, interdisciplinary activities, community service, and community-engaged outreach. Professional, interdisciplinary, and community-related service will be given consideration as part of promotion and tenure review based on their importance to the discipline or profession and the mission of the University.

II.C.1. Scope of Service

Service embraces activities that enable the University to carry out its mission, contribute to the function and effectiveness of the faculty member's profession and discipline, and reach out to external communities and constituencies, such as government agencies, business, and the arts, where academic knowledge intersects with practical affairs and problem solving. Service activities may include, but are not limited to, the following:

II.C.1.(a) **Institutional Service**

- Providing leadership in or making significant contributions to department, unit, or University committees or other appointed or elected groups

- Developing and revising major policies

- Participating in campus governance

- Mentoring other faculty or staff

- Representing the University for its advancement

- Recruiting students

- Assisting in the development of international programs and exchanges

- Advising student groups

II.C.1.(b) **Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Service**

- Holding a leadership position in organizations

- Election or appointment to a professional board, task force, or committee organizing and managing conferences

- Serving on accreditation bodies

- Reviewing grant applications

- Serving as editor or on the editorial board of a professional journal

- Reviewing articles, books, and other creative works for journals and presses

- Writing external reviews of the work of colleagues for promotions and tenure or other professional awards and acknowledgments

- Adjudicating for competitions in the arts, sciences, and humanities

- Reviewing and testing discipline-specific software and other electronic applications

II.C.1.(c) **Community Service**

- Informing general audiences through seminars, conferences, and lectures

- Interpreting technical information for a variety of audiences

- Serving as an expert witness

- Testifying before the legislature and Congressional committees

- Editing newsletters in one's field or discipline

- Serving as an expert for the press and other media

- Diagnosing and treating clients and patients

- Assisting organizations in being more creative and innovative through entrepreneurship

II.C.1.(d) **Community Engaged Service**

- Consulting and providing technical assistance and/or services to public and private organizations

- Writing position papers for the general public

- Collaborating with schools, businesses, advocacy groups, community groups, and civic agencies to develop policies

- Providing leadership in or making significant contributions to economic and community development activities

II.C.2. Documentation of Service Activity

Documentation of service activity effectiveness may include, but is not limited to, the following:

II.C.2.(a) **Descriptions of Service Activities**

- Summary of responsibilities and activities

- Analyses of work accomplished

II.C.2.(b) **Documented Outcomes**

- Number of people served and benefited

- Official documents and reports resulting from an activity

- Illustrations of ways in which the activity enhanced the University or the community

- Changes in professional practice, institutional processes, or public policy

- Grant proposals, contracts, and awards

- License and technical assistance agreements

- Business creation, growth, or assistance activities

- Recognition of the activity

- Acknowledgement from audience or client

II.C.2.(c) **Judgments about Service**

- Evaluations and letters recognizing service

- Evaluations from sponsoring organizations

- Evaluations from faculty colleagues and other peers

II.C.2.(d) **Eminence Measures**

- Honors or awards recognizing service

- Election or appointment as officer in professional organization

- Replication of activity or outcomes in other settings

- Documentation of changes in practice

- Receipt of grants, contracts, or external funding related to service

II.C.2.(e) **Self-Reflection and Appraisals**

- Self-appraisal of one's career goals, development, and achievements in service

II.D. **Directed Professional Activity**

While all faculty members are expected to perform and be evaluated in the categories of teaching, research and creative activity, and service, their responsibilities also may include professional activities that merit separate classification as directed professional activity. Directed professional activity embraces university activities whose contribution is sufficiently distinctive that their significance is diminished when embedded in any of the three categories of teaching, research and creative activity, and service. In some cases, these activities may be a significant part of the faculty member's contributions to the University and other communities. Since not all units will include this category for promotions and tenure, directed professional activity must be well defined and its purpose and significance clearly stated in the documents of the units which choose to include the category. The faculty member, department chair, and dean must discuss and agree upon the faculty member's involvement in directed professional activity.

II.D.1. **Scope of Directed Professional Activity**

Directed professional activity is defined as a University activity whose contribution is sufficiently distinctive that its significance is diminished when embedded in either of the three categories of teaching, research and creative activity, and service. The principal objective in the evaluation of directed professional activity is to assess the nature and quality of the contribution and its significance to, or impact on, the University. Directed professional activity may include, but is not limited to, the following:

II.D.1.(a) **Preparation of Significant University Documents/Resources**

- Developing grant proposals and obtaining extramural funding

- Writing technical manuals or training manuals

- Developing library and other learning resources

II.D.1.(b) **Development and/or Direction of Special Programs**

- Developing international affiliations

- Developing special programs for students such as honors and residential college and other interdisciplinary programs

- Developing and/or directing formal community outreach or extension activities that promote continuous learning in the University or external communities

- Directing or providing other significant leadership in research centers or institutes on campus

- Directing clinics affiliated with academic programs

- Administering activities or assignments that enhance the visibility of the University

- Planning and administering specialized summer programs, including youth programs and programs for faculty

II.D.1.(c) **Direction or Conduction of Activities that Enhance the University's Effectiveness**

- Designing and directing faculty development activities

- Providing statistical or methodological assistance to colleagues conducting research

- Participating in recruitment and retention activities

II.D.1.(d) **Academic Administrative Leadership**

- Chairing a department within a unit

- Directing clinics affiliated with academic programs

- Directing special programs

- Heading or participating in special task forces, commissions, and self-studies

II.D.2. **Documentation of Directed Professional Activity**

Documentation for directed professional activity effectiveness may include, but is not limited to, the following:

II.D.2.(a) **Descriptions of Directed Professional Activity**

- Written description of the scope of the project and participation

- Analyses of the work accomplished

II.D.2.(b) **Documented Outcomes**

- Number of people served and/or number who benefited

- Official documents and reports resulting from the activity

- Illustrations of ways in which the activity enhanced the University

- Published articles, technical reports, or monographs

- Grants applied for and/or obtained

- License and technical assistance agreements finalized

- Documented business assistance or licenses

- Log of activities (recruiting, programs presented, etc.)

- Visibility of the activity

II.D.2.(c) **Judgments of Directed Professional Activity**

- Evaluations by peers, participants, administrators, and other constituents

- New programs and initiatives resulting from the activity

II.D.2.(d) **Eminence Measures**

- Honors and awards

- Accreditation

- Grants received and contracts negotiated

- Degree of economic impact to the community

- Degree to which the activity brings positive visibility to the University

II.D.2.(e) **Self-Reflection and Appraisal**

- Self-appraisal of one's career goals, development, and achievements in directed professional activity

III. **Procedure for the Documentation and Review of Faculty Work**

The promotions and tenure review has basically three parts: the documentation provided by the candidate, the materials collected by the department, and the review and evaluation of these materials at various levels by promotions and tenure committees and administrators. Evaluation of faculty work should stress two components: (1) the quality of the work and (2) the significance of the work. The portfolio of evidence should be manageable, focused, and reasonable in size. Candidates should submit only those materials that, in their opinion, are most representative of their work and most significant. The Promotion and Tenure Form, maintained by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, is used to prepare this documentation.

AcQ Committee: Faculty Evaluation Research

1.   University of South Alabama:

a.   Faculty Handbook (Oct. 2014)

Page 87:

3.10 Promotion Policies and Procedures

3.10.1 Introduction and General Criteria The overall quality of the University and its programs depends on the quality of the faculty. The faculty's achievements in scholarship, research, honors, professional reputation, and teaching excellence are all measures of faculty strength, although different types of institutions may value these measures differently. For universities, however, the level of scholarship attained by the faculty is the most meaningful criterion, judged in the light of national standards. Because promotion in rank is recognition of the achievements by which the University is measured, promotion decisions have serious long-term implications for the quality of the faculty, and, therefore, of the University.

All promotion decisions will be based solely on demonstrated professional merit, the quality of contributions to the University, and the competent and regular performance of duties, including one's ability to participate harmoniously in a healthy learning environment. In making promotion decisions, the general policy of the University shall be to use faculty consultation with appropriate approval and recommendation by the department chair, academic deans/directors, vice presidents, with a final decision to be made by the President and the Board of Trustees.

Promotion in academic rank constitutes recognition of an individual's professionalism and professional achievement. The pertinent attributes of professionalism are identified in the "AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics" (see section 4.5). The degree of professional achievement is evaluated in three broad areas: teaching effectiveness, professional development, and professional service to the department, the college, the University, and where appropriate, the community. While not exhaustive, the following descriptions provide broad definitions of the three areas.

The area of teaching effectiveness includes classroom and laboratory performance, academic advising and counseling, availability to students, supervision of students' independent research or study, course and curriculum development, and guest lectures to classes.

3.10.3 Promotion Procedures

Promotion recommendations will be submitted to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs/Vice President for Health Sciences each year, normally by March 1. (A list of eligible faculty is forwarded to the college dean by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.) The recommendations originate at the departmental level and proceed upward through normal

administrative channels. Final promotion decisions are made by the President, subject to approval by the Board of Trustees.

1. Departmental Procedures The chair is responsible for the organization and conduct of the department's activities with regard to promotion. Candidates for promotion are nominated by the chair or may be self-nominated. The chair will insure that all candidates have an opportunity to submit relevant information and materials for appropriate review.

For purposes of dealing with the recommendations for promotion, the appropriate faculty consultative body consists of a committee composed of all those members of the department, except assistant professors, senior in rank to the candidate. Some academic units may find it difficult or impossible to constitute a committee, given the above exclusions. In that event, the chair appoints an appropriate committee, following the spirit of the review process. All involved faculty must have an opportunity to examine whatever supporting information and materials the candidate may have submitted in support of his/her candidacy. Faculty members who serve on both the departmental promotion committee and on the collegiate Promotion Evaluation and Review Committee, shall vote concerning the candidate at the departmental committee only, and must abstain from voting at the collegiate Promotion Evaluation and Review Committee.

Once these procedures have been completed, the chair shall submit a recommendation in writing, including justification for the recommended action, to the dean (or director) of the academic unit. Along with the recommendation, the chair will report to the dean the results of the faculty consultation

Information for Students: http://www.southalabama.edu/ecampus/docs/classclimatefaq.pdf

Affirmative Action Plan for Eval of Faculty:

https://www.southalabama.edu/departments/eforms/academicaffairs/affirmativeaction.pdf

2.   University of Southern Mississippi

a.   Policy: Evaluation of Teaching

https://www.usm.edu/sites/default/files/groups/office-provost/pdf/statement_of_policy_-_evaluation_of_teaching.pdf

"All University employees who are instructors of record must undergo a performance review of their teaching on at least an annual basis. This review process applies to all instructional staff: faculty and non-faculty, full-time and part-time, holders of "adjunct," "visiting," or "interim" appointments, clinical or research professors with teaching responsibilities, Professors of Practice, and graduate student teaching assistants. Faculty in the Corp of Instruction (as defined in the Faculty Handbook) will receive this review as part of the normal Annual Evaluation process within their units of appointment. Performance reviews of non-faculty instructional staff

may be conducted as part of the Annual Evaluation process, or separately by the administrative head of the unit of appointment, but must be based on criteria available to the employee at the time of appointment. Performance reviews of non-faculty should be designed to meet the general purposes of faculty performance reviews: they should provide feedback appropriate to faculty development and provide the basis for reappointment decisions. Graduate students with grading or teaching responsibilities, but who are not instructors of record in the course, will be evaluated by the faculty member responsible for the course. Graduate students who teach as instructors of record should be evaluated using the same procedure as other non-faculty instructors."

b. Policy: Course Exclusion from Student Evaluations:

A course may be excluded from the evaluation process for every future semester by completing the attached Permanent Course Exclusion Form and sending it to Institutional Research at Box 5167. These forms are due back to IR by the 3rd week of classes so that short classes can be excluded on time. The Course Id, Subject Area, and Catalog Nbr are needed for each course that will be excluded.

A course may be excluded from the evaluation process for a particular semester by completing the attached Semester Class Exclusion Form and sending it to Institutional Research at Box 5167. These forms are due back to IR by the 3rd week of classes so that short classes can be excluded on time. The Class Nbr, Subject Area, Catalog Nbr and   Section are needed for each course that will be excluded. Each section to be excluded must be listed on the form.

3.   Eastern Kentucky University:

a. IDEA http://ir.eku.edu/idea

What is IDEA? Individual Development and Educational Assessment

IDEA is a student assessment of faculty instruction focusing on student learning.

IDEA assesses 20 different teaching methods and 12 learning objectives and is adjusted for 5 student and course circumstances found to influence the results.

EKU's Faculty Senate Policy on Student Opinion of Instruction:
All full-time non-tenured faculty members shall have Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) or alternative-system questionnaires administered in at least two classes each semester (Fall/Spring)
All full-time tenured faculty members shall have IDEA or alternative administered in at least one class each semester (Fall/Spring)

Helpful Links regarding IDEA:

The IDEA Center: http://www.theideacenter.org

Information on Student Ratings of Instruction: http://www.theideacenter.org/services/student-ratings

Sample IDEA Diagnostic Form Report: http://theideacenter.org/sites/default/files/axreport.pdf

Interpreting IDEA Reports: http://www.theideacenter.org/support/student-ratings/interpreting-reports (link was broken)

Deadlines:

Fall 2015, 12/4/15

b.   Faculty Self Evaluation Requirements

Faculty are required to include student opinion of instruction AND systematic method of evaluation OTHER THAN student opinion (peer visits/consultations, peer reviewed portfolios, etc.).

4.   Kentucky State University:

a.   Faculty Handbook, Section 2:

For promotion or tenure applications, applicants are required to include peer evaluation forms and official student evaluations

No additional information was readily available.

5.   Morehead State University:

a.   Policy Pac-35: Faculty Evaluation Plans

http://www.moreheadstate.edu/content_template.aspx?id=2147487665&terms=Student%20evaluation%20of%20faculty

This policy establishes the framework that a department and college will use to evaluate its faculty for the purposes of reappointment, tenure, promotion, and annual performance-based evaluations, including merit compensation when available. Evaluation results shall be considered in distribution of any merit compensation pool.

Each department shall create a Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP) that describes the expectations of the department in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service and the criteria for evaluating its

faculty for the purposes of reappointment, tenure, promotion, and annual performance-based evaluations. The department FEP must be consistent with university and college policies. Before implementation, the FEP must be approved by 51% or more of the tenured faculty of the department and by the Department Chair/Associate Dean, the Dean of the College, and the Provost. Although the FEP must be approved by the tenured faculty in a department, both tenured and tenure-track faculty shall contribute to the creation of the FEP.

The FEP shall include:

(1) a description of the criteria to be used to determine whether a faculty member's teaching is above, at, or below departmental expectations. Such criteria shall include the use of a university approved student evaluation instrument as well as other methods. Teaching evaluation shall include (a) student review and (b) peer and/or chair/associate dean review. Student evaluations of teaching shall account for no more than 50% of the evaluation of a faculty member's teaching.

(2) a description of the criteria to be used to determine whether a tenure-track or tenured faculty member's scholarship is above, at, or below departmental expectations. Such criteria shall not merely count activities but must also address the quality of the faculty member's contributions as defined within each academic discipline. Activities considered to be scholarly in nature must be consistent with the definition of scholarship in PAc-11.

(3) a description of the criteria to be used to determine whether a tenure-track or tenured faculty member's service is above, at, or below departmental expectations. Such criteria shall not merely count activities but must also address the quality of the faculty member's contributions to the discipline as well as the affairs and mission of the University.

(4) a description of other requirements (if any) of the department not already stated in University, college, or school policy for faculty seeking reappointment, tenure, or promotion and for performance-based compensation increases.

(5) an indication of the relative weights that each of the areas and requirements carry in the overall assessment of the faculty member.

(6) additional restrictions (if any), not stated in PAc-29, on the creation of Flexible Workload Agreements (FWAs).

(7) a rubric or formula with specific criteria for determining whether faculty performances are above, at, or below expectations.

A university-wide appeal process that articulates the faculty member's right to appeal annual faculty evaluations at the department/school level shall be provided.

If a faculty member is involved in regional engagement, evidence should be provided of how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond. This is not a separate category of the FEP, but should be reflected in the faculty member's teaching, scholarship and service as appropriate.

The FEP shall require an annual report of activity from each faculty member to assist the chair/associate dean in developing the member's progress report. The annual report of activity must come from the approved faculty activity reporting system. The annual report may also include a report of activities that cannot be accommodated by the approved faculty activity reporting system.

Department FEPs shall be used by the appropriate department, college, and university committees to evaluate faculty for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and for performance based compensation increases.

At the beginning of each calendar year, if a faculty member had a FWA for the prior year, that faculty member's immediate supervisor will review the faculty member's performance in accordance with the criteria specified in the FWA and the guidelines outlined in PAc-29. This review will be forwarded to the appropriate department committee to be considered as part of the standard review process. If a faculty member disagrees with his or her progress report, he or she may appeal, following the appeal procedure identified in PAc-29.

The procedures for using the FEP in decisions of reappointment, tenure, and promotion are described in PAcs 2 and 27, and shall not be quoted or reworded by a departmental FEP.

Murray State University

2.5 Annual Evaluation Policy
The Murray State University Board of Regentshas expressed the expectation that evaluations be conducted on a valid and systematic basis so that the effectiveness of faculty and administrators may be continually assessed. While the Board directly evaluates the performance of the President, it is necessary for appropriate evaluationsto be conducted for the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice Presidents, Deans, Chairs, faculty, and administrative staff.It is recognized that each college/schoolof the university has its own unique qualities, expectations, and priorities and that the most effective evaluation system for faculty must be one centered at the college/school level. In addition to the university's systems for evaluation, (see the Academic Promotion Policy, Section 2.6.2, Number 1, and the Tenure Policy, Section 2.7.4.1, Number 1, Teaching Excellence) each college/school may include peer evaluation, portfolios, follow-up studies, graduate success, and other methods consistent with fundamental fairness. Faculty evaluations are shared each year with the individual faculty member being evaluated. These evaluations will become part of the documentation that will support recommendations for promotion or tenure.

2.7.4.1 Faculty Performance
The following guidelines will assist in the determination and evaluation of significant professional experience, accomplishments and qualifications. Individual colleges/schools and the library shall formulate and keep current further criteria specific to the professional activities and standards of the academic unit. These more specific guidelines shall be formulated by the faculty of the colleges/schools and the library. Such criteria shall be no less stringent than the university-wide requirements. Copies of all guidelines shall be on file with the University Tenure Committee and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
.
1. Teaching Excellence, as evidenced by an unmistakable demonstration of teaching and advising effectiveness as recognized by students, colleagues, Chairs, and Deans. Teaching effectiveness will be judged by examining instructional delivery skills, instructional design skills, content expertise, and course management through the use of student evaluations and teaching portfolios as well as other evaluative tools. (See the Report of the Task Force on Teaching Evaluation, September 26, 1991.) Evidence of concern for students, including academic advising, and contributions to student development, should be considered. Advising skills will be evaluated by ability to provide accurate and timely information to students on course selection, academic and degree requirements, policies and options, career opportunities, and graduate and professional school.

Northern Kentucky University
c.
Evaluation
The assessment of teaching should take into account contact hours, preparations, and number of students. It is important that the quality of teaching be evaluated as objectively as possible, based on a range of criteria. Criteria to be evaluated may include, but are not limited to,
i.Documented student learning.
ii.Establishment of outcomes appropriate to the course and curriculum.
iii.Selection and coverage of topics appropriate to outcomes.
iv.Use of methods and materials appropriate to the course content.
v.Creative and effective use of new and/or innovative teaching techniques.
vi.Assessment of student achievement consistent with course content and level.
vii.Other criteria established by departments and/or colleges

Documentation

Faculty members should provide evidence of their activities and performance as teachers. Documentation may include, but is not limited to,

i.Copies of course syllabi, including course objectives, plan of study, and means of student performance evaluation.

ii.Copies of lecture notes, lesson plans, laboratory exercises, discussion questions, etc.

iii.Copies of exams and quizzes.

iv.Copies of graded student materials.

v.Copies of students' independent study projects, student research projects, or honors projects.

vi.Copies of Master's theses or Master's projects.

vii.Examples of students' creative activities.

viii.Teaching portfolios.

ix.Grade distributions.

x.Evidence of student learning such as pre-course/post-course test scores.

xi.Students' performance on nationally standardized tests.

xii.Student evaluations.

xiii.Informal peer evaluations based on performance of students in subsequent courses, discussions with students, and discussions with faculty in areas served by the department.

xiv.Formal peer evaluations based on classroom observations and review of developed materials.

xv.External reviews of teaching.

xvi.Evidence of course impact on students, such as student testimonials.

xvii.Alumni opinions.

xviii.Evidence of demand for course.

xix.Evidence of new course development and revised course development in program of study.

xx.Record of student advising and/or mentoring.

xxi.Teaching awards.

xxii.Participation in educational projects and programs, such as those sponsored by the University or professional organizations.

xxiii.Evidence of involvement in retention efforts indicating the impact of such activities on student success either in the faculty member's classroom or in a broader campus setting.

xxiv.Evidence of impact of teaching and/or course development beyond NKU.

xxv.Other (as appropriate to the discipline, department, or college

University of Kentucky

http://www.uky.edu/iraa/understanding-uk%E2%80%99s-teachercourse-evaluation-reports

University of Louisville

I couldn't find any report even on how faculty are evaluated. I did find a sample of the evaluations that students complete on faculty.