

WINSTON-SALEM STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY EVALUATION MANUAL

Revised October 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Purposes and Objectives	3
History	4
Institutional Expectations for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service	6
Faculty Evaluation Process	9
Overview	9
Evaluation Cycle from the Perspective of Rank	9
Tenure –Track Faculty	9
Tenured Faculty	9
Fixed Term and Other Non-Tenure-Track Appointments	10
Clinical Faculty	10
Evaluation Cycle from the Perspective of Timeframe	10
The Annual Review	10
Reappointment Review	11
Mid-Cycle Review of Tenure-Track Faculty	11
Tenure Review	11
Promotion Review	11
Post-Tenure Review	11
Presenting Evidence	12
Teaching	12
Required Assessments	13
Scholarship	14
Service	14
Evaluating Evidence	15
Expectations of Evaluators	15
Peers	15
Chairs and Senior Faculty	16
Dean	16
Promotion and Tenure Committee	16
Provost	16
Addressing Criteria through the Use of Rubrics	18
Use of Evaluation Data	19
APPENDICES	
A: Responsibility List	20
B: Evaluation Calendar and Timeline	21
C: University Criteria for Evaluating Tenure and Promotion	22
D: Evaluation Instruments	
Student Rating of Classroom Instruction	24
Advising	25
Mentoring	25

Peer Observation of Teaching	27
Teaching Rubric	28
Service Rubric	31
E: A Numeric Evaluation Model	35
F: Annual Faculty Record Sheet	38

INTRODUCTION

Presented in this document is the comprehensive faculty evaluation system for Winston-Salem State University. This evaluation system is based on the expectation that the **improvement of teaching, the engagement in scholarship, and the attention to service** is an ongoing process for each faculty member, whether tenured or on tenure-track. Those in fixed-term or clinical faculty positions should also be engaged in continual improvement related to their professional responsibilities. The annual evaluation is also tied closely to the expectations and processes required in the Tenure and Promotion processes so that the evaluation and development efforts of those on tenure-track accomplish multiple goals. Faculty members should read carefully the procedures for evaluation and note they will be required to document the process of their development from the time they are hired until the time they leave the university. The annual evaluation, the pre-tenure review by senior faculty in the third or fourth year, the review for tenure and promotion, and the post-tenure review all require that faculty reflect on their journey. It also requires peers and the department chair to provide timely and constructive feedback that reflects the departmental and institutional values and a desire for excellence. The excellence of the faculty and the students they graduate ultimately creates the academic reputation of the institution.

PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES OF FACULTY EVALUATION

In an effort to promote understanding among the faculty of the relationship between faculty evaluation, faculty growth, and the ongoing improvement of the entire educational process at Winston-Salem State University, the following objectives were developed.

1. To develop a framework within which the faculty role can be effectively assessed in order to promote student learning and success.
2. To establish an evaluative process which assesses the strengths and weaknesses of faculty for the purposes of improving teaching, enhancing scholarship, encouraging appropriate service, and encouraging professional growth through a meaningful faculty development program.
3. To create a means of assessing performances of non-tenured faculty for the purposes of retention and/or appointment to tenure.
4. To establish public criteria based means of assessing performance of faculty for purposes of awarding merit raises.
5. To create a means of assessing performances of tenured faculty for the purposes of post-tenure review.
5. To create a means of assessing performance of part-time faculty for the purpose of retention.

Included in this document is a definitive description of the faculty roles in each of three areas to be evaluated. A model for determining how much weight the various faculty roles will be given, who will supply data related to these roles, and how data will be gathered to define the level at which a faculty member is filling these roles is provided. The actual model for an individual faculty member is determined by the general model developed within each department and by the evaluation conferences with the chairperson and/or senior faculty each year.

Assessments in which all faculty will engage are described. **Departments are responsible for developing other areas of the evaluation process.** Finally, a **calendar** pinpointing important deadlines for the components of the evaluation process is presented.

While it is not possible or desirable to identify and review all the roles of a faculty member for evaluation purposes, those selected by the university and incorporated within this system include the roles identified as being most important. An institutional minimum and maximum value for each role relative to the total system has been established. These values reflect the philosophy of the institution as to the importance of each role within the faculty member's total responsibilities. The faculty evaluation system examines three major faculty roles:

1. Teaching
2. Scholarly or Creative Activity
3. Service (Departmental, University, Community, Professional)

RECENT HISTORY OF FACULTY EVALUATION AT WSSU

The faculty evaluation system at Winston-Salem State University was developed by a faculty committee using the Handbook for Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System by Raoul A. Arreola, Ph.D. published by the Center of Educational Development and Assessment, 1988 and other literature. A draft faculty evaluation manual was presented to faculty in the spring of 1993. For the following year and a half, a committee of departmental representatives worked to refine the procedures and instruments and presented a revised manual to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in December of 1995. The manual was updated in 1999 by a faculty committee. After that time a new Faculty Constitution was created and adopted, changes were made to the Faculty Handbook (some mandated by the Board of Governors), several changes in administration occurred, and the university evolved to offering graduate programs. The literature on teaching and learning continued to expand as did the understanding of assessment and its impact on improvement in all aspects of the university. The impact of the technology and explosion of readily available information increasingly challenged faculty's conception of teaching, and to some degree, scholarship and service. Faculty were also desirous to have the annual evaluation more closely tied to senior faculty reviews and the tenure and promotion process so as to minimize the time investment and maximize the effect. Thus in 2011 and 2012 another faculty committee reviewed and made recommendations about changes to the Faculty Evaluation Manual.

The development of this document, and in some cases, the contents of this document rely heavily on books, articles and evaluation systems developed at other universities which have been adapted to the needs of WSSU and faculty. Informing the first and subsequent iterations of the document was General Administration Administrative Memorandum # 338 sent to the chancellors from the President of the University of North Carolina regarding Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina. Each institution was instructed to comply with the following instructions:

- a. Review institutional mission statements, tenure policies, and the criteria for making faculty personnel decisions and, where necessary, to revise them so as to give explicit recognition to the primary importance of teaching in the University;
- b. Revise institutional policies and procedures, as necessary, to require (1) that clear and specific statements of criteria for evaluation of faculty performance at every level (institution, college/school, department) are provided in writing and discussed with each probationary faculty member before initial employment and at the beginning of the first term of employment and with each candidate being reviewed for reappointment or tenure at the beginning of the year in which the review is scheduled to be made, and (2) that a record of these discussions be kept in the individual's personnel file;

c. Review procedures for the evaluation of faculty performance to ensure (1) that student evaluations and formal methods of peer review are included in teaching evaluation procedures, (2) that student evaluations are conducted at regular intervals (at least one semester each year) and on an ongoing basis, (3) that peer review of faculty includes direct observation of the classroom teaching of new and non-tenured and of graduate teaching assistants, and (4) that appropriate and timely feedback from evaluations of performance is provided to those persons being reviewed.

In 2007 in response to the University of North Carolina's strategic plan, UNC Tomorrow, each institution was directed by the President to ensure that community engagement and service were recognized and rewarded in the evaluation, tenure, and promotion processes.

INSTITUTIONAL EXPECTATIONS FOR TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP AND SERVICE

For many years the historical teaching mission of Winston-Salem State University served as the foundational basis for annual evaluation, tenure and promotion expectations. Heavy emphasis had always been placed on teaching relative to service and research and in some cases departmental standards and criteria reflected very little research expectation. As the university began to evolve to a graduate-degree granting institution, the role of scholarship in the evaluation of the faculty increased in many areas. Academic administration recognized that every department and program and by extension the university needed to ready the environment for the rigors of research expected of any institution offering graduate programs. However, it was also acknowledged that a marked increase in the emphasis on research across the board could not happen overnight given the reality of teaching loads and other service expectations. Therefore, the need to gradually build the expectation for research productivity among the tenure-track and tenured faculty was built into the faculty evaluation system.

With the goal of moving the university to a new level, minimum expectations for tenure and promotion were established in the **Fall of 2011** for faculty hired after this date. A range of effort for both teaching and research were offered for tenure-track and tenured faculty so that programs and departments could implement these expectations consistent with the unique loads and readiness of their faculty. Departments were asked to align their tenure and promotion criteria to reflect the following efforts.

The percentages reflect accumulated effort over the course of the tenure and promotion cycles.

- 40% to 50% effort on teaching
- 35% to 45% effort on scholarship/research
- 15% effort on service

While in any given year the percentages could vary somewhat due to individual and department needs, **over the course of the tenure or promotion cycle the ranges should be addressed and the narrative and evidence in the portfolio should clearly align with the required efforts.** The particulars for each year should be established in a conference with the chair/senior faculty during the evaluation conference each spring.

Roles and responsibilities vary for those faculty not in tenure-track or tenured positions and should be established at time of hire or in contract renewal. The institutional criteria should be used to judge performance of the roles that are established for contracted faculty.

ROLE DEFINITIONS

Although Academic Affairs expects departments and programs to interpret and delineate the percentages locally, some minimum expectations for what should be considered in each role are offered.

- First, teaching efforts must include all student contact expectations – the learning experience that is influenced by faculty. These include expectations about **teaching including instructional design and delivery** that lead to **student learning** as well as **advising** and **mentoring**.
- Second, scholarship efforts must include real participation in the **production of knowledge or new works**. This should include some or all of the following: **peer reviewed publications** (books, articles, chapters, reviews etc.), grant writing/funding, and conference presentations. Those in the fine arts can also be

practicing artists, **producing new works** and actively participating in curated and peer reviewed exhibitions, performances and public presentations.

- Finally, service expectations must minimally include **full participation in departmental work and shared governance**; institutional faculty governance (faculty meetings, committees and senate); curriculum and program integrity and evaluation; and appropriate institutional effectiveness activities. Departments should also define some expectation about **service to the wider community** related to individual or departmental expertise. Faculty may be involved in the advancement of their **discipline/profession** through their service.

A. TEACHING EFFORTS: TEACHING, ADVISING and MENTORING

The teaching role encompasses many facets of a faculty member's responsibilities. Six core propositions paraphrased from the university's teacher education conceptual framework help explain what is expected of faculty at WSSU.

Faculty

- Are committed to our students and their learning, in and out of the classroom;
- Strive to know the subjects they teach and how to effectively teach them to our students;
- Are responsible for managing and monitoring our students' learning;
- Reflect systematically about their teaching and learn from their experiences;
- Promote curriculum design consistent with state and national trends in the discipline; and
- Are members of learning communities in order to stay current in their discipline, scholarship, and practice.

Teaching is defined as those activities associated with the design and delivery of a body of knowledge to students coupled with students' improvement in the ability to use knowledge. Advising and mentoring involve helping students make decisions about courses, curriculum pathways, out-of-class learning experiences and forging relationships that help develop the whole student. For purposes of evaluation, the teaching role includes the following components. These components are often interwoven in any teaching/learning experience and may often be explained and evaluated as a whole process.

1. Teaching/Instruction
 - a. Instructional Design
 - b. Instructional Delivery
 - c. Relevancy and Currency (Up to date) of Content Expertise
 - d. Knowledge/Acknowledgement of the Learner
 - e. Impact on Student Learning
 - f. Other (determined by the faculty in the academic department)
2. Advising
 - a. Advising in the General Education Curriculum to ensure that students have a broad perspective
 - b. Advising Majors to ensure that students have appropriate breadth and depth in the discipline
 - c. Contribution to the advancement and retention of students
3. Mentoring
 - a. Assisting students in taking advantage of opportunities for professional and personal growth (e.g., attending conferences, doing internships, international travel, summer research, volunteering)
 - b. Providing guidance to students in setting and reaching goals.

Examples of activities included in the teaching/instruction role are: developing course materials; giving lectures; producing effective on-line learning interactions; developing and facilitating active learning strategies; producing

assessments; evaluating students; using creative teaching techniques; developing and using supplementary class materials; managing student data related to courses; updating course materials; tutoring; mentoring student's class work; mentoring student's research; and directing student's research.

Advising expectations include academic advising of both students in general education and those in the major so that students progress towards their goals both efficiently and effectively.

Mentoring includes all student development activities from guiding student participation in course work, research, and practical experiences such as internships through helping students apply for graduate programs and jobs including writing letters of recommendation.

B. SCHOLARLY/RESEARCH ACTIVITY

Scholarly activity is defined as increasing the body of knowledge or creative work in the faculty member's area of expertise; contributing to the knowledge about the teaching/learning process in the discipline or institutional learning outcomes; and/or application of expertise and knowledge for improvements in industry or government. There should be **some balance between quantity and quality of scholarship** which the faculty member should explain each year in the annual review and for the tenure and promotion processes. The scholarship should be evaluated and recognized by peers as having value, relevance and significance. This is usually managed through some type of professional review that results in publications in professional journals; books in or about the discipline; chapters in discipline books; grants; and/or curated and peer reviewed exhibitions, performances, public presentations, productions, and/or practice or published manuscripts. For purposes of evaluation scholarly activity will include Research or Creative Process; Research and Creative Products; and Dissemination of Knowledge outside of teaching students (such as peer reviewed presentations and invited keynote speakers for discipline organizations, etc.). Minimal institutional criteria are presented in Appendix C which each department augments with expectations from their discipline.

C. SERVICE

As noted in the introduction, service at a minimum requires participation in departmental work and shared governance at both the departmental and university levels. Service can extend to other areas including to the community and to the profession and should be delineated in the departmental evaluation criteria.

Departmental service is defined as service rendered by a faculty member in support of his/her program, department or majors. For purposes of evaluation, departmental service could include Curriculum Development, Student Development including Advising Student Organizations, Program Management, Program Assessment, Program Development, Departmental Governance, Conducting Workshops and/or Resource Development.

University service is defined as service rendered by a faculty member in support of the university as a whole. For purposes of evaluation, university service could include Non-Academic Program Administration, University Governance, and/or Resource Development.

Community service is defined as the application of a faculty member's recognized area of expertise in the community without pay and service in community organizations where the person is representing the university.

Professional Service usually is the advancement of professional organizations and their processes through the service of the faculty who belong to them and could include Professional Involvement in Learned Societies and Discipline Organizations and Serving on Committees, Holding Office in Professional Organizations, Conducting Workshops, Manuscript Review, and Editing for a Professional Journal. Professional Service can also include Consulting where a faculty member's expertise is requested to aid an external organization.

FACULTY EVALUATION PROCESS

OVERVIEW

The process of faculty development is on-going and should be guided by meaningful and constructive evaluation. Feedback that is informal and formal, formative and summative, and from a variety of sources including students, peers, and those more senior, provides a gauge as to the progression of development in teaching, scholarship and service. Tenure track faculty should receive the most focused evaluation as it is through evaluation that their teaching, scholarship and service are shaped to meet departmental and institutional values and needs. Some departments will align junior faculty with senior faculty mentors as guides in this process. Those tenured benefit from evaluation, albeit less frequently, as they continue to move through the ranks; stay relevant with the needs of students, the department, and the university; and contribute to their disciplines.

The cycle of evaluation is outlined in the following sections first from the perspective of rank and then from the perspective of timeframe. **Feedback from all formal evaluations should be in writing, include detail about areas needing improvement, and signed by those conducting the evaluation.**

EVALUATION CYCLE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF RANK

TENURE-TRACK

In general there are several formal evaluations that should occur for tenure-track faculty. The backbone of the evaluation is the annual review that should be conducted by senior faculty and the chair with a goal of shaping the tenure portfolio.

- Upon joining the university the department chair should discuss with new faculty members the expectations of the department and university in relationship to teaching, scholarship and service (**TSS**).
- At the end of each academic year, usually before the end of the spring semester, the chair and senior faculty should meet with each junior faculty member and discuss progress during the year related to annual goals and TSS. The faculty member should complete a Faculty Record sheet and provide a narrative that addresses relevant criteria from the tenure and promotion information. The outcome (areas of strength and areas needing attention) of the discussion should be documented in writing and given to the faculty member.
- At the time of each reappointment (and in conjunction with an annual review), the chair and senior faculty should review junior faculty and provide written feedback (in one letter representing all views) related to progress in TSS towards tenure. A written summary is presented to the dean along with the recommendation regarding reappointment (normally either a 2 or 4 year reappointment).
- The fourth year annual review should look not only at the year but also the accumulated work in order to give faculty information about their progress and support for a tenure application in the 5th or 6th year.
- A thorough evaluation looking at the accumulated body of work in teaching, scholarship and service should occur when faculty submit the application for tenure and promotion usually in the 5th or 6th year. This evaluation should result in a single letter that summarizes the evaluation that was made by the senior faculty and chair and details their recommendation relative to tenure and promotion. This letter should be presented to the faculty member and the dean.

TENURED

Tenured faculty should annually present a Faculty Record sheet (see appendix) and a 1-3 page narrative that summarizes each year's contributions in teaching, scholarship and service. Tenured faculty should continue to receive feedback about their teaching, advising and mentoring from students each semester. These reviews should be looked at by the chair and those senior to them jointly at least once per year. If there are areas of concern, then the chair should discuss and document improvement plans. The Faculty Record and narrative in conjunction with the department's merit rubric is used to assign a merit score.

Those tenured at the Associate Professor level should work towards the rank of Professor following guidelines in the Faculty Handbook and using institutional and departmental criteria.

For tenured faculty, a process of post-tenure review was implemented within the University of North Carolina. Faculty Members who hold Permanent Tenure must undergo a comprehensive evaluation no less frequently than every five years by the chair; peers and/or an external reviewer and the dean. This review looks at the faculty's continued contribution towards the department goals of teaching, scholarship and service and should be consistent with the expectations set forth in the tenure and promotion criteria of the university and department. The chair and senior faculty should help the faculty member create directional goals at the beginning of the post-tenure review period which will be used in evaluating performance at the time of the formal 5-year post-tenure review. The performance evaluation should indicate how well the goals are being met using a scale of Meets Expectations, Exceeds Expectations, or Does Not Meet Expectations.

FIXED-TERM AND OTHER NON TENURE-TRACK APPOINTMENTS

Non-tenure track faculty generally should be evaluated annually by the chair and/or senior faculty. Adjunct faculty should be evaluated either by semester or annually depending on the length of the contract. However, faculty who are in multiple year fix-term contracts may be evaluated less frequently as long as there are indications that they are fulfilling their responsibilities, that their teaching evaluations remain positive, and that there is evidence that student learning is occurring. Non-tenure track and adjunct faculty should be evaluated on the contribution they make towards the goals and responsibilities delineated at the time of hire.

CLINICAL FACULTY

Clinical faculty, as fixed term faculty, should be evaluated annually by the chair and/ or senior faculty as other fixed-term faculty.

EVAUATION CYCLE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF TIMEFRAME

THE ANNUAL REVIEW

New tenure-track, fixed-term (non-tenure track) and adjunct faculty should have a conference with the chair person or senior faculty at the beginning of the first year or contract term to delineate responsibilities and what balance of effort is expected that year. After the initial year the annual evaluation is used to set the goals for the following year. **Evaluations of progress by senior faculty and the chair are conducted at the end of the academic year.** Results of the annual evaluation are used to focus the faculty member's work for the following year.

If the burden of evaluation is split among the senior faculty and chair, then there should be a conference among the senior faculty and chair before meeting with the faculty who is being evaluated. All data and/or summary sheets from all evaluation sources will be given to the chair/senior faculty previous to the evaluation conference so that he/she/they has/have a chance to read the documentation. At the conference, the chair/senior faculty and faculty member discuss the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses and develop a plan for addressing weaknesses. The chair and senior faculty provide a written summary of the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses and sends it to the faculty members shortly after the annual evaluation and before the end of the academic year. Some

departments also use a numeric scoring system and those numbers should also be provided to the faculty each year.

The Faculty Handbook (2011) states that “[a] summary of the evaluation from the chair and the Senior Faculty shall be provided to the Faculty Member by June 30th of each year in a letter that specifically addresses strengths and weaknesses and that provides a plan and timetable for improvement of deficiencies in performance. The letter shall indicate progress towards reappointment/promotion/Permanent Tenure.”

REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW

Tenure-track, fixed-term (non-tenure track) and adjunct faculty who are at a point whereby they have served an initial probationary cycle or who need a contract renewed, should be reviewed by the chair and/or senior faculty. For non-tenure-track and adjunct faculty the review should be against the criteria outlined at hiring. The chair/senior faculty should use the annual evaluation to determine if the requirements of the contract are being fulfilled satisfactorily. If not the chair/senior faculty can determine if an improvement plan needs to be part of a new contract or if the contract should not be renewed.

For those on tenure-track this review should look at the accumulated evidence of competence and/or growth in teaching, scholarship and service. If feasible this review should be conducted in conjunction with or in place of the annual evaluation. As with all reviews of faculty, the results of the evaluation should be communicated in writing back to the faculty member. The chair/senior faculty have the option to recommend that faculty under review is not reappointed.

MID-CYCLE REVIEW OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

By the end of the fourth year, usually in conjunction with the annual review, tenure-track faculty should undergo a thorough review by the senior faculty and the chair. In advance of this review, the faculty member should prepare a dossier similar to the one that will be prepared for the tenure and promotion application. Senior faculty and the chair will thoroughly review the dossier and give written feedback about strengths and weaknesses in the narrative, evidence, writing, and presentation of the portfolio. Any major concerns about the progress towards tenure should be noted in writing and discussed with the faculty member.

TENURE REVIEW

A review for tenure and promotion usually occurs in the fifth or sixth year for assistant professor's on tenure-track. The annual faculty evaluation process helps build the case for the recommendation for promotion and tenure. However, the narrative of the tenure portfolio should provide the context and case for the accumulated work and evidence of growth as a faculty member. The review and recommendations should be made by senior faculty who are at equal or higher ranks.

PROMOTION REVIEW

A review for promotion from associate to full-professor occurs when the faculty member is ready to request promotion. The faculty member needs to present a dossier that demonstrates a discernible pattern of consistently high quality work in teaching, scholarship and service since the review for tenure and promotion. The review and recommendations should be made by senior faculty who are at equal or higher ranks.

POST-TENURE REVIEW

Every five years tenured faculty should undergo a thorough review (post-tenure review). Post-Tenure Review is designed to promote continuous renewal and improvement among Faculty Members who have Permanent Tenure. A review undertaken to grant Permanent Tenure or decide on promotion qualifies as a cumulative review.

Directional goals established at the beginning of the 5-year cycle should be used in setting milestones to be

reviewed annually by the senior faculty and chair. The 5-year formal post-tenure review and recommendations should be made by senior faculty who are at equal or higher ranks and presented to the faculty member and dean in writing. In addition the dean must provide an evaluative review.

PRESENTING EVIDENCE OF TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE

For each annual review faculty will present a Faculty Record sheet and a narrative that provides context and summary of the previous year's work. For cumulative evaluations faculty members will present a "portfolio" that **summarizes, explains (provides context), and provides supporting evidence** for their work, accomplishments and contributions in teaching, scholarship, and service for the period covered by the evaluation. The annual report will focus on the activities of the previous academic year while the portfolio for reappointment and tenure will focus on the accumulated activities over the course of the faculty member's time at the university. A post-tenure portfolio or one prepared for promotion after tenure will focus on the accumulated activities since the last major review.

TEACHING

The teaching portfolio "...is a factual description of a professor's major strengths and teaching achievements. It describes documents and materials which collectively suggest the scope and quality of a professor's teaching performance."¹ The teaching portfolio should be structured to include both work samples and reflective commentary. The faculty member must be selective in choosing content so that data is reduced, there is a synthesis of the material, and the content is representative of the key dimensions of the scholarship of teaching.² "Teaching is also a dynamic endeavor involving all the analogies, metaphors, and images that build bridges between the teacher's understanding and the student's learning. Pedagogical procedures must be carefully planned, continuously examined, and relate directly to the subject taught.... teaching, at its best, means not only transmitting knowledge, but transforming and extending it as well."³

The following information, taken from the *Cornell University Teaching Evaluation Handbook*, provides some rationale for what to include in a teaching portfolio.

"At the same time the portfolio has representative breadth, it is also selective. Criteria for inclusiveness must be established that limits the bulk and form of data to a manageable amount. The selection process should preserve the criteria of representativeness of primary teaching responsibilities, yet reduce and transform the available data into a manageable form that ensures efficiency during the subsequent evaluation process. Selectivity is governed by structuring the portfolio into two major components:... work samples, which consist of the details of what was taught and what its impact was on students, and a reflective commentary, which extends the meaning of the work samples selected by providing a context in which to comprehend their design and choice from the teacher's own point of view.

Work samples ... constitute direct evidence of teaching such as facts, objects, and reproductions of events from daily practice. Work samples should be selected that 'highlight what is unique about an individual's approach to teaching.'⁴ Just what samples are selected must be negotiated between the faculty member and department. From the candidate's point of view, selection most probably will be governed by an intimate knowledge of what was done, its effect, and how it changed over time.

According to Edgerton, Hutchings and Quilan (1991),⁵ the work samples are artifacts of teaching performance, while the reflective commentary that accompanies each artifact provides the teacher's

¹ P. Selding (1991). *The Teaching Portfolio-A Practical Guide to Improved Performance and Promotion/Tenure Decisions*. (Bolton, MA.: Anker Publishing Co.),3.

² Cornell University (1992). *Teaching Evaluation Handbook*.

³ E. Boyer (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered*. (Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching), 23-24.

⁴ R. Edgerton (1991). "The teaching portfolio as a display of best work." Paper presented at the National Conference of the American Association for Higher Education. Washington, D.C.

⁵ *Ibid*

rationale for using that artifact and an account of its development. The reflective component of the portfolio is a kind of annotation to each sample of work."⁶

All statements in the portfolio should be referenced with real data which is provided in a well-marked place in the Appendix. Appendix material should be kept to a minimum. Faculty should edit material in the Appendix so that only the material which illustrates a particular point in the narrative is used, i.e. use only the first page of a student's paper with the professor's comments, not provide the whole paper, etc.

REQUIRED ASSESSMENTS

Several assessments of teaching are required in the annual evaluation of faculty.

1. The **Student Rating of Classroom Instruction** should be administered to **all classes each semester**. Appropriate questions from the Student Rating of Classroom Instruction should be included and used to support statements about course delivery and teaching effectiveness in the annual review. Student responses to individual questions should be used to illustrate strengths and areas where, from the student's perspective, improvement might be needed.
2. Other student rating forms or evaluative instruments which elicit more information about **Advising** and **Mentoring** should also be administered and data collected and shared with the faculty member and evaluators.
3. Non-tenured faculty members will compile a **course design document** for one class each year as part of the annual review of teaching. A very good resource for this document is the book *Idea-Based Learning, A course Design Process to Promote Conceptual Understanding*, by Edmund J. Hansen⁷. This can be either a fall or spring class. In order to spread the evaluation load faculty should consider doing the design document in the fall or even over the summer after a spring class. This ensures adequate time for both the preparation and the review by the peer. The coversheet for the design document should explain why this course was chosen for evaluation. If this course has been evaluated before, then the faculty member being evaluated should also guide the evaluator as to what changes have been made in the course. The course design document should contain contextual information about the course; the course syllabus; a course matrix (which gives a detailed analysis of the instructional methodology used to address each course objective and how each course objective is assessed); and supporting materials. The faculty member being evaluated should provide a narrative to guide the evaluator through the materials provided. The backbone of the course design document is the syllabus. The faculty member should use this to show the evaluator in detail how each objective on the syllabus is presented to students, how objectives are assessed and what the criteria are for assessment of each objective. Supporting materials should be included as referenced examples of how lectures, classroom activities, supplemental readings, handouts, quizzes, tests, assignments and assessments are used to enhance student learning.
4. A **classroom observation** of the course under review for non-tenured faculty (**course design document in 3 above**) must be completed by at least one peer each year and included in the annual review.

For cumulative reviews (tenure, promotion), a summary across time and a narrative about how the information from the student reviews and peer reviews were used to improve teaching should be included.

⁶ Cornell University (1992). Teaching Evaluation Handbook.

⁷ Hansen, Edmund J (2011). *Idea-Based Learning, A course Design Process to Promote Conceptual Understanding*. (Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing, LLC).

SCHOLARSHIP

The scholarship portion of the annual report or tenure and/or promotion portfolio should include a narrative on how the faculty member has been and continues to be involved in the research process. It is important that the narrative help the reader understand the direction, coherence, and relevance of the faculty member's work. This includes not only research in their discipline, but also both research into the teaching and learning process. It should also include examples of research or creative products produced within the year(s) being evaluated. Details or examples of how the dossier should be developed are left to departments to determine.

DEPARTMENTAL, UNIVERSITY, COMMUNITY AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

At the heart of the academic enterprise is faculty participation in governance, especially in matters of curriculum and the vitality of the faculty. Faculty should determine the content of the curriculum, degree and certificate requirements, standards of instruction, student achievement standards, grading, and all matters relating to student progress in academic programs. They should also have major responsibility for the hiring, evaluating, reappointing, recommending tenure, and promoting of their faculty colleagues. This requires participation in curriculum and faculty committees at the departmental and university levels.

The service portion of the annual report or tenure and/or promotion portfolio should explain and provide examples of how the faculty member has been involved in any of the service areas. The faculty member should make a case for how their service to the department, university, community and/or profession has made an impact on those served. Details or examples of how the report/portfolio should be developed are left to departments to determine. Letters from committee chairs and/or the products of service work should be provided as evidence of work accomplished or the service rendered.

EVALUATING EVIDENCE OF TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP AND SERVICE

It is incumbent upon the faculty member to provide a reflective narrative and supporting evidence of the competence and growth in teaching, scholarship and service at both annual and cumulative reviews.

EXPECTATIONS OF EVALUATORS

Evaluation is subjective no matter how much effort has gone into trying to make it objective. In order to try to make it fair and evenly applied across faculty there needs to be a set of well established, vetted, and published criteria for teaching, scholarship and service that is understood by both faculty and evaluators. The role of evaluator needs to be undertaken with the goal of improving teaching, scholarship and service so that students and the university are well served by its faculty. All involved need to understand their critical roles as evaluators.

At the departmental level a collective of senior faculty and the chairperson is more likely to hold the group accountable for keeping an eye on fairness and evenness of application of the criteria across faculty and across years. The evaluator, no matter whether a peer, a senior faculty, a chairperson or a dean, should look at the narrative and evidence provided by a faculty member and determine how well s/he has provided a case for meeting the criteria. Once having made this determination, the evaluator should provide both written and verbal feedback about the strengths and weakness relative to the criteria. The evaluator may also make the case that the faculty member did not provide a guiding narrative or appropriate evidence in support of one or more criteria.

PEER EVALUATION (COURSE DESIGN AND DELIVERY)

The goal of peer evaluation of course design and delivery is to use the insight of colleagues to improve the quality of teaching and course activities through an analysis of a course including

1. a review of the course design document that includes the syllabus, teaching activities, reference material, readings, and assessments and
2. at least one observation of the faculty member teaching (face to face or on-line).

Faculty bring a wealth of experience to this process as they are trained in the evaluation of evidence and practice this skill almost daily in evaluating their students and pursuing their research. The validity of the evaluation is, of course, improved depending on what questions are addressed by the review; what documentation is provided to reviewers; what principles are followed when selecting peers; and what procedures govern the conduct of the review process.⁸ If a faculty member feels that there is truly no peer on campus able to evaluate their content, then they should ask someone from another university. They may also want someone from their department to evaluate the same course with a focus on course design and not on content. Because senior faculty will be asked to make a recommendation for promotion and tenure, it's important that they have had the opportunity to evaluate all non-tenured faculty members' course design and delivery.

The course review should take place for each non-tenured faculty member at least once a year. Course materials convey important information about course content, policies and procedures of course conduct, level or sophistication of course, expectations of students, mode of teaching and integration of assessment into the learning process. Because peers have a thorough knowledge of the discipline, they are in the best position to evaluate what is taught; its accuracy, its currency, its sophistication, its depth; and the level of learning of the students.⁹ The evaluation of these characteristics must be based on the examination of documentary evidence.

⁸ Ibid

⁹ G. French-Lazovk. "Documentary Evidence in the Evaluation of Teaching." J. Millman, ed. Handbook of Teacher Evaluation. (Sage Publications).

The objective of peer observation of teaching is to provide the faculty member with concrete information about practices that appear to be promoting learning in the classroom/on-line environment and to suggest how that good practice might be extended or supplemented. Peer observation of teaching is most valuable as part of a formative evaluation process and can be substantive in the efforts to improve teaching, especially during the early years of the teaching experience. Therefore, the faculty member being observed should view the peer observation of their teaching in a positive light and be willing to use the information provided by the process to improve teaching and student learning. The observation should be preceded by a meeting between the observee and observer to discuss the objectives of the class which will be observed and the mode of learning facilitation. The observation should be for the entire class period and may be through on-site observation or through use of a video. A form with a list of teaching behaviors (see Appendix) will be provided to help structure the pre-observation meeting and actual observation. Additional items on which the observee would like feedback may be included. A follow-up meeting will be conducted to discuss the observation.

After examining all materials against the teaching criteria, the evaluator will provide a narrative that discusses the strengths and weaknesses of the design and the delivery of the course against the criteria. Departments that are using a numeric model will also want the evaluator to determine ratings for the components of the teaching role. The peer evaluation form should be sent to the department chairperson/senior faculty and a copy to the faculty member. The evaluator should discuss the results with the faculty member. The course design document may, in some departments, be forwarded to the department chair for review by the senior faculty when they meet to discuss recommendations about faculty teaching.

CHAIR AND SENIOR FACULTY

The involvement of the senior faculty and chair in guiding and evaluating junior faculty growth is a critical responsibility for the well-being and excellence of the department. In some departments the burden of the evaluation of non-tenure-track faculty might be distributed among the chair and senior faculty. The evaluation of tenure-track faculty should be shared by the chair and senior faculty.

At each annual review of tenure-track and fixed-term faculty, the chair/senior faculty doing the evaluation should review student evaluations, peer evaluations, the current Faculty Record sheet, and the previous year's recommendations before the evaluation conference. During the conference, this information should be used to determine strengths, weaknesses, and progress towards the Tenure/Promotion criteria or the contract criteria. Those on tenure track should be reviewed by all senior faculty. A memo detailing the conversation and setting directions for the next year should be sent to the faculty member after the annual conference.

At each cumulative review, the tenure-track faculty member's portfolio should be reviewed against the tenure and promotion criteria. After discussion among the chair and senior faculty, a written response detailing the strengths and weaknesses should be prepared by the group, signed by each member of the group, and shared both verbally and in writing with the candidate.

DEAN

The dean should conduct an independent review of each tenure-track faculty member's portfolio against the criteria for teaching, scholarship and service at each cumulative review. In addition, the dean looks at the letter submitted by the department to see if a strong case was made in support of the candidate's application. Feedback to the faculty member should be in writing and detail the strengths and weaknesses relative to the criteria. The dean must also provide a rationale relative to whether or not the recommendation of the chair and senior faculty will be upheld for tenure and promotion recommendations.

TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE

The Tenure and Promotion Committee should conduct an independent review of each tenure-track faculty member's tenure and/or promotion portfolio against the criteria for teaching, scholarship and service at the institutional and departmental level. The committee looks at the letters from the department and dean to see if a strong case was made in support of the candidate. Feedback to the faculty member should be in writing and detail the strengths and weaknesses relative to the criteria. The committee must also provide a rationale relative to whether or not the recommendations of the chair/senior faculty and dean will be upheld for tenure and promotion recommendations.

PROVOST

The provost should conduct an independent review of each tenure-track faculty member's tenure and/or promotion portfolio against the criteria for teaching, scholarship and service at the institutional and departmental level. Feedback to the faculty member should be in writing and detail the strengths and weaknesses relative to the criteria.

ADDRESSING CRITERIA THROUGH THE USE OF RUBRICS

Qualitative evaluations or evaluations of practical skills are often managed through the use of rubrics.

(Adapted from Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia)

In education jargon, the word *rubric* means "an assessment tool for communicating expectations of quality" or "a standard of performance for a defined population"¹⁰. Rubrics are supposed to support self-reflection and self-assessment as well as communication between an assessor and those being assessed. A rubric is a set of [criteria](#) and [standards](#) typically linked to learning objectives. It is used to assess or communicate about product, performance, or process tasks. A rubric can also provide a basis for self-evaluation, reflection, and peer review. It is aimed at accurate and fair assessment, fostering understanding, and indicating a way to proceed with subsequent learning/teaching. This integration of performance and feedback is part of ongoing assessment.

Several common features of rubrics can be distinguished, according to [Bernie Dodge](#) and Nancy Pickett:^{[[citation needed](#)]}

- focus on measuring a stated objective (performance, behavior, or quality)
- use a range to rate performance
- contain specific performance characteristics arranged in levels indicating the degree to which a standard has been met.

Scoring rubrics include one or more dimensions on which performance is rated, definitions and examples that illustrate the attribute(s) being measured, and a rating scale for each dimension. Dimensions are generally referred to as **criteria**, the rating scale as **levels**, and definitions as **descriptors**.

The university has set forth rubrics that can be used to evaluate teaching, scholarship and service. The criteria for good teaching, scholarship, and service are delineated in the Meets Expectations column of the rubrics in Appendix D.

Ratings and Level Definitions

Ratings for each component of the evaluation system are based on a five-point scale which really has three levels:

Outstanding or Consistently Exceeds Expectations-- (5)

Exceptional performance is demonstrated by performance levels that are recognized as exceptional as compared to other faculty within the university.

Good or Meets Expectations- (3)

Satisfactory performance is demonstrated by performance levels that are recognized as meeting all reasonable and acceptable standards compared to other faculty within the university.

Unacceptable or Consistently Does Not Meet Expectations-- (1)

Performance is unsatisfactory. Intervention is needed.

All evaluation instruments and data should conform to this scale for consistency across departments.

¹⁰ The National Science Education Standards (1996), http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=4962&page=75) page 93

USING EVALUATION DATA

Formative and summative faculty evaluations should occur on an ongoing basis. Summative has traditionally been used for personnel decisions and formative evaluation is usually conducted for use in the improvement of teaching, scholarship and service. Information developed by the faculty member by creating a course design document or portfolio or obtained from a peer, senior faculty or chair in the evaluation process should be used by the faculty member for reflection and improvement of teaching, scholarship and service. However, it also has to be used for the basis of establishing meritorious performance that in some years results in merit increase in salary and in the case for tenure and promotion.

USE OF THE FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR IMPROVING PERFORMANCE

Since the evaluation system at Winston-Salem State is based on the expectation that all faculty are constantly striving to improve their performance, the two uses of evaluation need not be considered separately. "...[T]he way to approach improvement of teaching is through an effort to build on the strengths of the individual teacher. Building on strengths recognizes and accepts the methods and objectives of the individual teacher as a professional, it justifies the use of praise and reward, which have great potential for actually changing the person's behavior, and it maximizes the possibility of providing a wide variety of kinds of good teaching."¹¹

USE OF THE FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR MERIT

Each department should establish its own criteria for merit recommendations which are aligned with the tenure criteria. These expectations should be captured in some type of rubric. The merit recommendation requires that faculty be at least at a "Good or Meets Expectations" in teaching, scholarship and service and "Outstanding or Consistently Exceeds Expectations" in at least one of the three areas. Given that merit is usually dependent upon state resources and not available every year, an averaging of the merit scores for years between the years with actual merit funds should be used to mitigate faculty productivity variability from year to year.

Whatever the criteria established by each department, they should be public and clear (thus the need to be as specific as possible). The merit system should also be reviewed periodically to make sure that the merit criteria reflect university emphases.

Based on the criteria established in the department, the department chairperson will recommend a merit rating to the dean who in turn will make a recommendation to the provost. Recommendations will be reported as High, Moderate, Low or None. The merit recommendation of the chairperson will be reported to the faculty member by May 31 each year in which merit is available. Depending on the available funds, the dean and provost determine the percent raise which corresponds to each of these levels.

EVALUATION/MERIT APPEALS COMMITTEE

At the completion of the evaluation cycle, the department chairperson should provide a copy of the merit recommendation to each faculty member. If a faculty member feels that there were irregularities in administering the system or that they were treated unfairly or unethically, then they should appeal the evaluation.

A two or three member Evaluation/Merit Appeals Committee should be elected by the faculty in each department to mediate if necessary between the concerned faculty and the chairperson. If the concerns are not resolved the case(s) can be presented to the Dean.

¹¹ B.B. Helling. "Looking for Good Teaching: a Guide to Peer Observation". Danforth Faculty Fellowship Project Report, 2.

APPENDIX A:

RESPONSIBILITY LIST FOR IMPLEMENTING FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM

FACULTY MEMBER

- Engage in Teaching, Scholarship and Service as outlined in hiring and/or evaluation conferences
- Develop Portfolio; update each year and include a new course design/dossier document
- Encourage students in each class to do Student Rating of Classroom Instruction
- Serve as Peer Course Evaluator and Observer; put evaluation in writing and discuss with observee
- Meet with Chair/Senior Faculty for Final Evaluation Conference each year
- Implement steps to improve Teaching, Scholarship and/or Service
- Prepare annual, mid-cycle, tenure and promotion applications in a timely manner

SENIOR FACULTY

- Provide leadership in hiring qualified faculty who support the mission, value and direction of the department
- Provide mentorship for faculty junior in rank in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service
- Participate in the evaluation of junior faculty annually and in the tenure and promotion processes
- Serve as leaders in maintaining academic integrity and quality of the department

CHAIRPERSON

- Make arrangements for appropriate faculty to have course review and observation of teaching during the course of the year
- Implement procedures for Student Rating of Classroom Instruction for all courses each semester
- Ensure process in department whereby all Non-Tenured Faculty are evaluated either by the chair or Senior Faculty each year; ensure that written documentation is provided to each non-tenured faculty member
- Meet or ensure process where Senior Faculty meets with Non-Tenured Faculty for Final Evaluation Conference
- Monitor student evaluations of Tenured Faculty
- Ensure that mid-cycle and tenure reviews are carried out according to the guidelines
- Ensure that Post-Tenure review is carried out according to the guidelines
- Provide merit recommendation to Faculty and Dean by the end of May

DEPARTMENT

- Refine Faculty Evaluation System to meet departmental needs
- Develop and/or refine evaluation instruments
- Publish evaluation and merit procedures and criteria so all Faculty have access

DEAN

- Make sure evaluation processes are conducted in each department
- Review faculty who are up for tenure and/or promotion against department and university criteria and provide written feedback to faculty

Office of Faculty Affairs

- Provide oversight for faculty evaluation processes at all levels

APPENDIX B:

CALENDAR FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

August 1 st Day of Classes	Application for promotion and tenure due
Early-September	New faculty orientation to evaluation system
Late September	Departments forward recommendations for tenure and/or promotion to Dean
Mid October to Mid March	Course Design Document submitted to Peer Evaluator and Chair
Mid October to Mid March	Peer visitation of classes; Dept. Chair/ Senior Faculty visitation of classes
Mid October	Post-Tenure Review completed
First Two Weeks November	Administer student teaching rating instrument to all students
January 15	Material submitted to Teaching Awards Committee
Late March thru Mid April	Annual faculty portfolio materials prepared and submitted for review by senior faculty
First Two Weeks April	Administer student teaching rating instruments to all students
Late April	Peer evaluation and assessment complete; Chair/Senior Faculty evaluation of faculty members completed; Final conferences set
Early May	Post-Tenure Reviews completed
Second Week May	Evaluation conferences complete; Evaluation agreement with non-tenured faculty members completed for next year; Recommendations for Reappointment/Non-Reappointment sent to Dean
Late May	Evaluation reports and merit recommendations sent to faculty member and Dean Evaluation appeals completed by department
Early June	Merit recommendations submitted by dean to provost

APPENDIX C:

UNIVERSITY MINIMUM CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

Minimum criteria have been established for evaluating or judging performance of each of the faculty roles. Teaching should be judged against “best practices” from the scholarship of teaching and learning and should be consistent across the university. Teaching should also include student academic advising and mentoring as these are places where faculty teach outside of the classroom. Departments have some leeway to develop their own criteria for judging scholarship based on the nature of the discipline as long as they meet the minimum standards set forth by the university. Service must include participation in department and university governance. Departments should have more specific examples of what is expected in the disciplines that should be shared with tenure-track faculty.

The following criteria related to the evaluation of performance were established for tenure and promotion after review of all departments’ criteria in the spring of 2012 (effective for faculty hired with a start date after August 1, 2012).

I. Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

(The following criteria also apply for the application for tenure if the applicant was hired at the rank of associate professor without tenure; however, promotion requires that the applicant meet the requirements for moving to full professor as noted in Section II.)

A. Teaching, Advising, and Mentoring

Should include but not be limited to the following:

- **Evidence of ongoing improvement and growth in teaching.**
- Evidence of effective teaching noted in annual faculty evaluation at WSSU for **at least** two years prior to application. This evidence should include peer and student evaluation data for multiple years. Senior faculty should also have evidence of student input gathered independently through focus groups or random samples of students for the most recent year.
- Demonstration of proficiency in instructional design and delivery that lead to student learning.
- Demonstration of currency in content and curriculum knowledge in the discipline.
- Demonstration of an understanding of the needs of the learner in his/her classes.
- Evidence of effective advising (noted in annual evaluations).
- Where appropriate, evidence of effective mentoring (noted in annual evaluations and in narrative of tenure documents with appropriate supporting evidence).

B. Scholarship

- **Evidence of ongoing significant scholarship and production of knowledge that can be sustained.** Some ways to demonstrate this include:
 - **A**
consistent record of scholarly activities. These activities should result in peer-reviewed publications (at least one with first authorship) or products of scholarly/creative work in the candidate’s field of expertise or a related field acceptable to the senior faculty. Some peer reviewed scholarship/creative work must be produced while a faculty member is at WSSU. The

determination of whether the peer-review process was a true academically rigorous process will be made by the senior faculty or external experts.

- Presentations at professional meetings or presentations of scholarship/creative work while at WSSU. These presentations include poster presentations and oral communications or a medium that is generally accepted for those in the arts. Professional meetings can be international, national, or regional meetings. The faculty member must be first author for at least one presentation. At least one presentation must be at a national or an international level meeting (equivalent status for an arts presentation).

C. Service

- **Evidence of ongoing commitment to service minimally to the department and university.**
- Service commitment (department, university and professional/community service) should be noted in annual faculty evaluations at WSSU for three years prior to application, which is supported by evidence of the following:
 - Active and productive engagement in shared governance at the departmental and university levels.
 - Engagement in service to the profession and/or service to the community related to the discipline or as a representative of the university.
 - Service to the profession including leadership roles in state, regional and national organizations; serving on committees; conducting workshops; manuscript review and editing for professional journals; serving as evaluator for artistic productions.
 - Service in the community including involvement in local agencies or the department's or university's service initiatives and activities. Community service should involve an application of the faculty member's expertise.
 - Consulting whether as a volunteer or for pay is usually considered service but departments may list it as scholarship if the consulting contributes to the production of knowledge and recognition of the faculty member's unique expertise.

II. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor

To be promoted to full professor the faculty member should have demonstrated a discernible pattern of **consistently** high quality work in teaching, scholarship and service.

- The faculty member should have demonstrated competence "above and beyond" the norm for Associate Professor, but not necessarily be a "superstar" in all areas. (Cannot be "mediocre" or have done the minimum in any area.)
- The faculty member should have established a record as an excellent teacher, advisor and mentor.
- The faculty member should have already carried out and **should still be engaged in peer reviewed scholarly and/or creative work** that exemplifies high quality professional competence.
- The faculty member should have **demonstrated** leadership within the department and/or university that has led to **positive institutional impact**.

APPENDIX D: EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Student Rating of Classroom Instruction (Rev. 11/07)

Please use the scales below to answer the following questions. Your feedback will be used to help improve the course and instruction.

Scale:

5 – Strongly Agree 4 – Agree 3 – Neutral 2 – Disagree 1 – Strongly Disagree

Section A: Instructor

The instructor in this course ...

1. Presented course material in an organized manner.
2. Showed an interest in the subject being taught.
3. Appeared to be knowledgeable about the subject.
4. Was well prepared for each class.
5. Used examples and illustrations to help clarify difficult points.
6. Clearly stated the policies of the course on the syllabus.
7. Showed application of course material to real life situations.
8. Gave quizzes, tests, projects, and assignments that reflected the objectives of the course.
9. Provided students with useful feedback on tests, reports, projects, and assignments.
10. Throughout the semester, provided students with feedback regarding their academic performance in the course.
11. Set clear criteria for the quality of student work.
12. Challenged students to go beyond simple memorization of facts.
13. Encouraged students to apply course related knowledge and skills to solve problems.
14. Provided the opportunity for assistance outside of class (office visits, phone calls, e-mail).
15. Seemed to take an interest in the progress of his/her students.
16. Encouraged students to be responsible for their own learning.
17. Managed the classroom effectively.
18. Maintained close agreement between the objectives stated in the syllabus and what was actually taught in the course.
19. Encouraged the use of educational technology or tools to enhance student learning.
20. Should be rated as outstanding in terms of his/her teaching ability.

Section B: Resources For This Course

21. The required reading materials were helpful in explaining and/or reviewing topics covered in class.
22. The library resources at the O’Kelly Library were adequate for this course.
23. The classroom had working educational technology or tools to enhance student learning.

Section C: Student

24. To which age group do you belong? (a) under 18 (b) 18-20 (c) 21-23 (d) 24-29 (e) 30 or older
25. Gender : (a) male (b) female
26. How many credit hours were you enrolled in this semester? (a) 1 – 6 (b) 7 - 11 (c) 12 -15 (d) 16 -18 (e) above 18
27. On average, how many hours are you employed in one week? (a) 0 - 10 (b) 11 – 20 (c) 21 – 30 (d) 31 – 40 (e) above 40
28. On average, how many hours per week outside of regular class time, did you spend studying, reading, or working on assignments for this course? (a) 0 (b) 1 - 3 (c) 4 - 8 (d) 9 or more
29. How many times have you been absent from this class? (a) 0 (b) 1 - 3 (c) 4 or more
30. What grade do you expect to earn in this course? (a) A (b) B (c) C (d) D (e) F

Section D: General

31. The difficulty of this course was about the same compared to courses at the same level I have taken at this university.

32. I put forth more effort in this course than in most courses I have taken.
33. Overall, I would rate this course as outstanding.

STUDENT EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADVISOR

ADVISOR'S NAME _____

Instructions: On a scale of 1-5 (5=highest; 1-lowest), please rank your advisor. Place the appropriate number in the blank space.

My Advisor:

1. _____ Is approachable and easy to talk to.
2. _____ Has told me about how and where to get in touch with him/her.
3. _____ Has helped me understand the general education curriculum, choice and requirements.
4. _____ Has been helpful to me in planning my schedule of classes.
5. _____ Has given me useful advice about university policies and procedures.
6. _____ Allows sufficient time for me during the advising sessions.
7. _____ Has enabled me to make my own decisions, when there are choices available.
8. _____ Has provided me, when appropriate, information about various support services – Counseling, Career Planning, tutoring, etc.
9. _____ Discusses my academic progress and, if necessary, recommends strategies for changes (adds, drops, withdrawals) or improvements.
10. _____ Is a person with whom I would be willing to share certain problems or concerns.
11. _____ Has helped me to consider choice of major in relationship to my interests, talents, abilities and career orientation.

Use this space to include any other information about your advisor: _____

I have met with my advisor _____ times.

MENTORING EVALUATION FORM

Name of the Person You are Rating _____

A mentor by definition a “wise and trusted teacher”, someone who helps guide you through life’s decisions. You are being asked to evaluate how faculty and staff have served as mentors for you. Please circle the number which best describes the faculty/staff member.

- 1= nonexistent or negative, has caused problems for you
- 2= very low or weak
- 3= about average
- 4= high
- 5= extremely high

1. Can be trusted	1	2	3	4	5
2. Has assisted me in making life decisions	1	2	3	4	5
3. Relates own personal experiences to clarify situations	1	2	3	4	5
4. Encourages positive and appropriate behavior	1	2	3	4	5
5. Is concerned about me as a person	1	2	3	4	5
6. Is a positive role model for me	1	2	3	4	5
7. Creates an environment of belonging	1	2	3	4	5
8. Encourages me to seek obtainable career goals	1	2	3	4	5
9. Instills self-esteem in me	1	2	3	4	5
10. Is willing to listen	1	2	3	4	5

Comments about how this person has been a mentor to you.

Completion Date: _____ Please return to the department secretary.

Classroom Observation Worksheet
(To be used by peer or chair when observing teaching)

Name of Instructor _____ Observer _____

Class Observed _____ Date _____

Mode(s) of Instruction Employed _____

Directions: Below are instructor behaviors that may occur within a given class. Please use the following as a guide in making observations, not as a list of required characteristics. Respond to each statement using the following scale and/or make comments.

Not Observed	More Emphasis Recommended	Acceptable	Accomplished Very Well	Not Applicable to Situation
NO	ME	A	AW	NA

1. The instructor demonstrates careful planning and organization of the class.
2. The various elements of the class (lecture, material written on the board, slides, overheads, videos, handouts, group work, lab work, presentations, etc.) are effective for promoting learning.
3. The instructor answers student questions in a clear and understandable manner.
4. The instructor focuses student attention on relevant aspects of the subject.
5. The instructor is aware of participatory patterns in the class and actively encourages ages, genders and ethnic groups to participate.
6. The instructor interacts with students and promotes interaction among students by encouraging student questions and discussion.
7. The instructor appears to be open to students' ideas, suggestions and opinions.
8. The instructor responds appropriately to nonverbal cues from student (e.g. confusion, boredom, curiosity).
9. When lecturing, giving instructions or answering questions the instructor is easily heard, uses intonation to vary emphasis, projects nonverbal gestures consistent with intentions and speaks in a clear and understandable manner.
10. The instructor integrates class activities in an effective manner.
11. The instructor reviews and summarizes the importance of major points of the class activities.
12. The instructor asks questions requiring thought and integration of previous knowledge.
13. The instructor follows incomplete student responses with probing questions.
14. The instructor monitors student understanding and learning.
15. The instructor varies explanations for complex and difficult material by presenting meaningful examples to clarify points.

Other:

Date of Post-Observation Discussion:

Strengths:

Areas that Could be Improved:

WSSU Teaching Evaluation Rubric for Faculty

Faculty

- Are committed to **our** students and their learning, in and out of the classroom;
- Strive to know the subjects they teach and how to effectively teach them to **our** students;
- Strive to use effective strategies in teaching tailored to the learner to help **our** students accomplish institutional learning outcomes;
- Are responsible for managing and monitoring **our** students' learning;
- **Reflect** systematically about their teaching and learn from experience.
-

Some ways these values are demonstrated are through the following (this is a guide; not all have to be evident):

Component	Standard (Meets Expectations)
Instruction:	<i>Design and Delivery are interwoven.</i>
Instructional Design	<p>The faculty's (instructional designer's role) responsibility is to discover what motivates people to increase their knowledge and skills and improve their performance.</p> <p>The term "effective" means that student performance improves when the instructional strategies are used.</p> <p>Identifies key concepts/theories/skills and goals on which to base the course.</p> <p>Identifies the subject content and task components related to the stated goals.</p> <p>States measurable learning outcomes for the students.</p> <p>Sequences content within each instructional unit for logical learning.</p> <p>Instructional message and delivery appears planned.</p> <p>Evaluation instruments are designed to assess the learning outcomes.</p> <p>Includes resources that support instruction and learning activities.</p> <p>Course design focuses and translates expertise of professor into learning by students.</p> <p>Course design includes activities that challenge and include the possibility of failure.</p> <p>Course design creates effective bridges between professor's and learner's knowledge (course units are divided into realistic segments that help students bridge what they know with new information and help them figure out <u>how</u> to "learn" the new information).</p> <p>Technology is used effectively to improve learning not just to have technology in the class.</p> <p>Assessments/measurements provide good information about what the learner <i>needs</i> to learn and are used to influence the remaining instruction.</p> <p>Assessments/measurements provide good information about what the learner <i>has</i> learned in authentic settings (simulations, portfolios, writing (even as short as Tweets), real-time observation, case studies).</p> <p>Clear awareness of desired student outcomes is apparent in course design.</p> <p>Provides students with metacognition (thinking about the process of thinking) strategies to use in systematizing and enhancing their learning.</p> <p>Provides students with learning frameworks which enable them to independently synthesize and learn in a progressive and sequential manner.</p> <p>Course activities reflect the realization that what is learned is more likely to be remembered and used in the future if it serves students' purposes beyond meeting school requirements.</p> <p>Course content is integrated with information from other academic areas, experiences, current events, and/or research.</p> <p>Demonstrates flexibility in teaching methodology and course design to meet individual needs and interest of students so that course is student centered.</p> <p>Demonstrates a willingness to be innovative, to experiment, to try new things and to take risks.</p> <p>Uses assessment as an integral part of student learning process.</p> <p>Course activities stimulate higher order think skills.</p> <p>Uses valid assessments for determining student progress and grades.</p> <p>Uses a variety of assessments for the various learning styles.</p> <p>Provides timeline which provides adequate time for preparation of assignments and or assessments.</p>
Instructional Delivery	<p>The term "effective" means that student performance improves when the instructional strategies are used.</p> <p>Sets the learning stage: why important; stimulate interest (cues, questioning); tap prior knowledge (advanced</p>

	organizers)
	In explicit teaching/direct teaching situations presents key facts, concepts, and skills; explains, models, and demonstrate; uses graphic organizers, cues, questions
	Sets activities that gradually release responsibility to the learner such as guided practice with instructor, practice with a partner, independent practice. Instructor circulates to assess, respond, encourage, prompt, observe, listen, question, give feedback, and focus conversations.
	Utilizes formative assessments that are integrate and ongoing, provide relevant feedback; and are used for corrective instruction and adjusting instruction.
	Activities require frequent student responses.
	Appropriate instructional pacing is evident.
	Adequate processing time is evident.
	Faculty member monitors responses and adjust instruction.
	Faculty member provides feedback for correct and incorrect responses.
	Course delivery allows learners to engage in participatory, memorable experiences instead of solely listening to or reading other's materials.
	Course delivery enables self-directed learning before and after formal "class time" by providing learners with contextually meaningful tools and resources that depending on the course might be delivered on a "just in time" basis (i.e., Wikis, SharePoint sites to work together to build knowledge bases, synthesize research, write papers, and present project-based work; blogs that provide an audience for student writing, encouraging thoughtfulness and clarity, and enable learning through online debate, peer modeling and peer review; journals; mobile learning podcasts and e-learning on connected devices which facilitate learning on the go by disseminating courses, recorded lectures, and supplemental course material.).
	Promotes learning by students through a variety of communication modes.
	Promotes learning through the use of active learning strategies.
	Promotes learning by communicating to students what is expected and why.
	Remains subject oriented and focused on objectives of course throughout classroom activities.
	Focuses learning activities on class objectives so that students understand the relevance and importance.
	Is sensitive to atmosphere in classroom and responds appropriately.
	Discharges the instructional plan and day to day activities in a progressive sequence.
	Creates environment where students are willing to risk, talk, and give opinions.
	Elicits desired learning outcomes through use of appropriate teaching methodology.
	Incorporates appropriate technology to promote learning.
	Routinely provides timely and detailed feedback, but not necessarily in the same ways for all students
	Continuously monitors students' understanding of presentations and responses to assignments.
Relevancy and Currency of Content	Stays current in content area and discipline changes.
	Demonstrates not only knowledge of content area but also how the subject matter is constructed in the minds of students.
	Is engaged with the content, 'feels' that the information is of value to students and demonstrates investiture in wanting students to understand it.
Knowledge of the Learner	Course design creates effective bridges between professor's and learner's knowledge (course units are divided into realistic segments that help students bridge what they know with new information and help them figure out <u>how</u> to "learn" the new information).
	Identifies learner characteristics that should be addressed for effective learning.
	Designs instructional strategies so that every learner has an opportunity to master the learning outcomes.
	Identifies systemic learning barriers such as phase in the evolution of thought about the learning process, acquisition of learning-conducive habits of mind, discipline-specific misconceptions on how things work, and logical fallacies in complex reasoning. (E.J Hansen)
Student Learning	Most effective learning environments are those that are problem based and involve the student in four distinct phases of learning: (1) activation of prior experience, (2) demonstration of skills/knowledge, (3) application of skills/knowledge, and (4) integration of these skills/knowledge into real world activities. (Merrill)
	Students are engaged in solving real-world problems or the material is made relevant to their lives.
	An effort is made to activate existing knowledge as a foundation for new knowledge.

	New knowledge is demonstrated to the student.
	New knowledge is applied by the student.
	New knowledge is integrated into the student's world.
Other	
	Reflection and self-evaluation are evident in course design and delivery and in the statements of philosophy and attention to student learning.
	Monitors own instruction to make sure that worthwhile content is being taught to all students.
	Accepts responsibility for guiding student learning and behavior. Models professional behaviors.
	Presents clear and consistent philosophy of teaching.
	Has assumed the responsibilities related to the department's and the university's teaching values.
	Recognizes the problems that hinder good teaching and student learning and takes a responsible part in trying to solve them.
	Collects data on teaching quality exploring alternative teaching methods.
	Makes changes in course overtime seeking aid in trying new teaching materials.
	Develops special teaching materials participating in teaching improvement opportunities.
Advising:	
Advising in the General Education Curriculum	Students have a transcript that reflects courses across a broad perspective.
	Students exit general education with approximately 60 hours outside the major.
	Students indicate that the faculty advisor was available.
	Students indicate that the faculty advisor was knowledgeable about the general education curriculum.
	Students indicate that the faculty advisor was knowledgeable about prerequisites for major programs or knew where to find good information.
Advising Majors	Students have a transcript that reflects both breadth and depth in the major.
	Students indicate that the faculty advisor was available.
	Students indicate that the faculty advisor was knowledgeable.
Mentoring:	
	Assists students in taking advantage of opportunities for professional and personal growth (e.g., attending conferences, doing internships, international travel, summer research, volunteering)
	Provides encouragement and guidance to students in setting and reaching goals
Counselor	Is an advocate who students can turn to for advice, counsel, guidance, or direction; who listens actively and empathically; and who responds to students in a non-judgmental manner—treating them as clients to be mentored—rather than as subordinates to be evaluated (or graded).
Personable/ Approachable	Is a humanizing or personalizing agent with whom students feel comfortable seeking out, who knows students by name, and who takes a personal interest in individual students' experiences, progress, and development.
Knowledgeable / Helpful	Is an effective consultant—a role that may be said to embrace the following functions: (a) <i>Resource Agent</i> —one who provides accurate and timely information about the curriculum, co-curriculum, college policies, and administrative procedures. (b) <i>Interpreter</i> —one who helps students make sense of, and develop appreciation for the college mission, curricular requirements (e.g., the meaning, value, and purpose of general education), and co-curricular experiences (e.g., the importance of out-of-class experiences for student learning and development). (c) <i>Liaison/Referral Agent</i> —one who connects students with key academic support and student development services. (d) <i>Teacher/Educator</i> —one who helps students gain self-insight into their interests, aptitudes, and values; who enables students to see the “connection” between their academic experience and their future life plans; and who promotes students' cognitive skills in problem-solving, decision-making, and critical thinking with respect to present and future educational choices.
Available/ Accessible	Is someone who effectively communicates and interacts with students outside the classroom, and does so more informally, more frequently, and on a more long-term basis than most course instructors.
	Makes certain that their students understand and are satisfied by the reasons given for why they should learn what they are asked to learn.
	Displays positive attitudes towards students and views the student as a whole person.
	Supports student efforts in other academic areas and in non-academic campus activities.
	Holds students accountable and helps students understand their accountability for their role in learning.

WSSU Service Evaluation Rubric

Some ways service may be demonstrated are through the following (this is a guide for department to use for setting up evaluation rubrics for service; not all have to be evident):

SERVICE	SATISFACTORY	EXCELLENT
Departmental Service		
Participation in department and curriculum meetings	<p>Faculty member participated regularly and contributed to the outcome</p> <p>The participation contributed to the normal and efficient functioning of the department</p> <p>The Faculty member and other participants contributed equally to the outcome</p>	<p>Participation and contributions stand out for effectiveness</p> <p>The Faculty member helped shape new policy, and/or negotiated satisfactory outcome of a contentious process</p>
Curriculum development	Faculty member participated regularly and contributed to the outcome	The Faculty member assumed a leadership role that positively affected the outcome
Program development	Faculty member participated regularly and contributed to the outcome	<p>The Faculty member assumed a leadership role that positively affected the outcome</p> <p>The Faculty member's leadership shaped the planning, drafting, and completion of a report or product published or otherwise disseminated to appropriate audiences</p>
Serving as student organization advisor, activities with goal of recruiting and retaining students or improving the quality of out-of-class academic experience for students	<p>Faculty member participated regularly and contributed to the outcome</p> <p>The activity contributed to the normal and efficient functioning of the student organization or activity</p>	Participation and contributions stand out for consistently high quality and effectiveness
University Service		
Participation in university faculty meetings	Faculty member participated regularly and contributed to the outcome	Participation and contributions stand out for consistently high quality and effectiveness
Member of a university committee or task force; responsible role in university governance (e.g., chair of university committee); projects for which a faculty member has reassigned time; contributions to programs that help the university meet strategic goals; and related activities at the college/school or	<p>Faculty member participated regularly and contributed to the goals of the committee or other body, program, or campus.</p> <p>The Faculty member contributed to the efficient conduct of necessary business.</p> <p>Faculty member and other colleagues</p>	<p>Faculty member assumed a leadership role that positively affected the outcome, <u>and</u> one or more of the following apply:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The Faculty member's leadership helped to solve a problem, or develop a plan for a new initiative, or implement a plan, or</p>

<p>university level</p>	<p>involved contributed equally.</p> <p>Evaluations document the quality and impact of the work (value to constituencies served).</p>	<p>complete other essential work consistent with the campus mission and strategic goals.</p> <p>The Faculty member's leadership shaped the planning, drafting, and completion of the report/product.</p> <p>Faculty member helped shape new policy, and/or negotiated satisfactory outcome of a contentious process.</p> <p>The evaluations document the significance of the Faculty member's contributions, based on her/his disciplinary or other expertise, to the work of the group</p>
<p></p>	<p></p>	<p></p>
<p>Professional Service</p>	<p></p>	<p></p>
<p>Refereeing of manuscripts, abstracts, or proposals; reviewing textbooks for publishers; adjudication of performances or exhibits; development of catalog or guidebook for exhibits; book reviews; journal editing; serving as external evaluator for P&T cases at other universities; serving as program evaluator at other universities, or for accrediting agencies; and similar assignments</p>	<p>Occasional invitations to perform such service reflect competent performance.</p> <p>Reviews appear in recognized media appropriate to the discipline.</p> <p>Faculty member contributed to efficient and timely publication of the volume.</p> <p>Faculty member participated in the process and contributed to the final product.</p> <p>Evaluators assess the Faculty member's contributions as satisfactory per accepted standards.</p> <p>Faculty member participated regularly and contributed to the outcome.</p>	<p>Frequent invitations to perform such service reflect recognition of Faculty member's special expertise and high quality contributions.</p> <p>Reviews appear in media recognized for high quality and significance to the discipline.</p> <p>Faculty member's leadership and creativity or special expertise contributed significantly to a high quality volume.</p> <p>Faculty member's leadership or special expertise contributed significantly to the final product.</p> <p>Evaluators assess the Faculty member's contributions as excellent per accepted standards.</p>
<p>Member of a committee or task force of a professional association; organizer of conference, conference sessions, or workshops</p>	<p>The committee/task force contributed to the normal and efficient functioning of the association.</p> <p>Faculty member and other committee/ task force members contributed equally.</p> <p>The presentations or publications informed the associations' membership of the outcome.</p> <p>Evaluations document the quality</p>	<p>Faculty member assumed a leadership role that positively affected the outcome and one or more of the following apply:</p> <p>The committee/task force solved a problem, or developed a plan for a new initiative, or implemented a plan, or completed other essential work consistent with the mission and goals of the professional association and with scholarly trends in the field.</p>

	<p>and impact of the work of the group.</p>	<p>The Faculty member’s leadership shaped the planning, drafting, and completion of the report/ product.</p> <p>The presentations or publications had a positive impact beyond the membership of the association and are cited as models for others.</p> <p>Evaluations document the significance of the Faculty member’s contributions.</p>
<p>Office in a professional organization, or comparable role</p>	<p>Faculty member managed the routine business of the office to which he/she was appointed or elected.</p> <p>The Faculty member participated in decisions that affected the future of the organization.</p> <p>The Faculty member accepted the responsibilities of the office to which he/she was elected or appointed.</p> <p>The Faculty member’s work was consistent with trends in the discipline at the time.</p> <p>The Faculty member’s work was consistent with the status of the organization within the discipline at the time.</p>	<p>The Faculty member’s leadership contributed significantly to the advancement of the organization’s mission or special initiative.</p> <p>The Faculty member’s disciplinary expertise contributed significantly to the advancement of the organization’s mission or special initiative.</p> <p>The Faculty member’s leadership and/or expertise shaped decisions that affected the future of the organization.</p> <p>The Faculty member’s exemplary performance led to recognition for positive contributions and/or to being asked to assume increased levels of responsibility.</p> <p>The Faculty member’s leadership and expertise influenced trends in the discipline.</p> <p>The Faculty member’s leadership and expertise enhanced the status of the organization.</p>
<p>Depending on emphasis, some activities may be appropriately evaluated or cross-referenced under research/creative endeavor or teaching</p>		
<p>Community Service</p>		
<p>Participant in a University/ Community Partnership. Includes representing the university in professional service to/consulting for citizen and client groups; public and private organizations; governmental agencies; business and industry; and related services at the local, state, national, or international</p>	<p>The Faculty member’s participation contributed to achieving the goals of an existing partnership.</p> <p>The Faculty member contributed in routine ways to the outcome.</p> <p>The Faculty member contributed to dissemination of information within</p>	<p>The Faculty member provided leadership to an existing partnership, or initiated a new partnership to meet university and community needs.</p> <p>The Faculty member’s expertise and leadership had a significant impact</p>

<p>levels.</p>	<p>the partnership and locally.</p> <p>The Faculty member participated in improvement efforts initiated by others.</p> <p>The group served provided evidence of the Faculty member's participation.</p>	<p>on the outcome.</p> <p>The Faculty member exercised leadership in publishing or otherwise disseminating information to multiple audiences.</p> <p>The Faculty member's leadership in assessment and critique led to improvements.</p> <p>The community or professional organization provided documentation of the importance of the Faculty member's leadership.</p>
<p>Presentations to community audiences, media presentations, popular writing, and related activities</p>	<p>The group served provided evidence of the Faculty member's participation.</p>	<p>The community or professional organization provided documentation of the importance of the Faculty member's participation.</p>
<p>Depending on emphasis, some activities may appropriately be evaluated or cross-referenced under research.</p>		

APPENDIX E:

A NUMERIC APPROACH TO FACULTY EVALUATION

Data gathered for review and for evaluation are obtained from students, self, peers, external reviewers and the chairperson of the faculty member's department. The faculty in each department should agree upon a value for the degree of impact data from each source has on each role.

Each faculty member will enter into an evaluation agreement with his/her chairperson during the evaluation conference in the spring. This agreement provides the faculty member an opportunity to individualize his/her evaluation within predetermined ranges for those roles in which he/she is most heavily involved during any particular evaluation cycle.

DETERMINING THE FACULTY ROLE MODEL FOR INDIVIDUAL FACULTY

The Faculty Role Model includes three main Roles for each member of the faculty: teaching; scholarship; and departmental, university and community service. Because faculty members may be asked to assume various levels of administrative and other responsibilities, the Faculty Role Model was designed to be flexible while still ensuring that teaching, scholarship and service were a part of all faculty members' responsibilities.

Annual Evaluation Conference: Determining Actual Weights for Role Values

At the annual evaluation conference, the faculty member and chairperson/senior faculty will determine what weights are appropriate for each faculty role for the up-coming academic year

Determining Weights for Role Components

Role Components have been established for all Roles of the Faculty Role Model and were listed under the heading 'Role Definitions'. The evaluation system was designed to include all the various activities in which a faculty member might participate, thus for any given faculty member not all role components will be applicable. Those not applicable should be deleted from the faculty members evaluation form.

Departments must determine the Sources of evaluation information and the Weight each of those sources will contribute to the evaluation. **It is very important that all faculty have a voice in these decisions and that all understand who or what instruments will provide evaluation data and how the data will be used.**

Determining Sources for Role Components

The sources for providing evaluation information for each role component are also listed on the Source Identification Matrix for each Role and may include Students, Peers, Chairperson, external reviewer and/or self. The term Peers can refer to internal peers or to peers who are not at the university. Sources for information are those with **first hand** knowledge of performance in the Role Component and who are credible sources.

Again, departments can adjust this model to fit their needs by either adjusting weights or by providing a more qualitative model as long as the model and evaluation criteria are delineated for the faculty. For a more qualitative model, weights may not be defined, however, sources of information must be defined. The Role Components names should remain the same across departments; however, those not applicable to a faculty member can be deleted.

Source Identification Matrices:

Sources that are to be considered should be checked “X”. Sources who do not contribute any information to a Role Component are left clear.

STUDENT CONTACT	INFORMATION SOURCES			
<u>ROLE COMPONENTS</u>	<u>Self</u>	<u>Students</u>	<u>Peers</u>	<u>Department Chair</u>
Teaching				
Instructional Design				
Instructional Delivery				
Content				
Student Learning				
Other				
Advising				
Mentoring				
Other				

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY	INFORMATION SOURCES			
<u>ROLE COMPONENTS</u>	<u>Self</u>	<u>External Peers</u>	<u>Internal Peers</u>	<u>Department Chair</u>
Research or Creative Product				
Research or Creative Process				
Professional Involvement				
Other				

SERVICE	INFORMATION SOURCES			
<u>ROLE COMPONENTS</u>	<u>Self</u>	<u>Peers</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Department Chair</u>
Departmental Governance				
University Governance				

COMPUTING THE EVALUATION SCORE IN A MATHEMATICAL MODEL

Once the role components and weights have been agreed upon by the faculty member and chairperson, it is possible, for those departments using a mathematical model to compute the overall rating for each role. This rating will be referred to as the Composite Role Rating since the rating will be derived from various sources, with each source providing information concerning various components of each role, and with the information from each source and component weighted in ways which reflect the collective value structure of the institution.

Composite Role Rating

Once data from the various evaluation instruments within each source have been averaged, the score is entered on the Faculty Composite Rating Sheet. The average score in each block is multiplied by the impact weight to produce a weight rating. The weight ratings are added across each role component. The total weighted rating for each role component within a Role are added together to produce the Composite Role Rating. The Composite Role Rating for each Role is then multiplied by the predetermined weight for the Role and gives the weight composite rating for the Role. These products are then added together to give the Overall Composite Rating.

Merit Determination

Merit pay is defined to be that pay/percentage raise, which may be given, based on evidence of meritorious performance, performance which is above the university recognized standard. The Overall Composite Rating (OCR) may be used as a basis for determining who is eligible for Merit Pay. As the university standard is "GOOD or MEETS EXPECTATIONS" which is an OCR of three (3), **in order to be considered for merit**, a faculty member's rating must **be greater than 3.0, or in a qualitative model greater than "Good or Meets Expectations"**.

APPENDIX F: ANNUAL FACULTY RECORD SHEET

Faculty Record Sheet

Name:

Academic Year:

Please use this sheet to record your activities and reflections about your work in Teaching, Scholarship and Service this year. This should be returned to your department chair by the date requested and will be used for your annual evaluation discussion and merit recommendations.

Rank (current year):

Department (and Program if applicable):

TEACHING

- Courses:** list all the courses you taught during the fall, spring and summer terms. Under type, note whether the course was a lecture, seminar, laboratory, practicum, internship, clinical, etc. Note if the course was team taught and indicate with whom you taught. Cross listed courses that were taught as one course should be entered in the same Course ID cell and the total enrollment reported. *Add rows to the table as needed.*

Term	Course ID	Type	Enrollment	Co-Instructor
Fall				
Fall				
Fall				
Fall				
Spring				
Spring				
Spring				
Spring				
Summer				
Summer				
Summer				

- Student Research:** list research activities in which you were involved with students. Note the type of student (Chancellor’s Scholar, Summer Research Fellow, grant supported, graduate student etc.), the name of the project and the number of students with whom you worked.

Type	Title	# of Students

Presentations, Performances, Theses, and Dissertations: list the student presentations, performances, theses and dissertations you directed, served on the committee for, or evaluated.

Type	Title	Semester	Directed/ Served/ Evaluated

3. Advising and Mentoring:

Number of Pre-major Advisees	
Number of Major Advisees	
Number of Minor or Interdisciplinary (BIS) Advisees	
Number of Clinical Advisees (outside of courses)	
Other (define)	
Describe the work you do with students or student groups, such as mentoring, informal advising, tutoring, etc.	

4. Course and Curriculum Development:

- a. Please describe any course or curriculum development in which you engaged this year, including generation of new materials, new approaches such as but not limited to active learning and problem based learning, inclusion of new technologies, and new approaches to assessment. Indicate if you received funding for the development or revisions.
- b. Describe your participation in workshops, colloquia, seminars or other events related to teaching and course/curriculum development.
- c. List any additional responsibilities related to your teaching effort you want included.

5. **Write a brief narrative** that provides **context** and **reflection** about your teaching efforts this year.

SCHOLARSHIP

(For works published, performed or exhibited between July 1 and June 30 of this year).

- 1. **Publications, Performances and Exhibitions:** please list only those works from this year. Works in press should have an anticipated publication date within this year. If the work includes student co-authors, please indicate.

--	--	--

5. Patents, Copyrights, Trademarks:

Role	Description	

6. Additional Professional Scholarship Activities: Please list any additional education, professional, or other activities not requested elsewhere.

7. Write a brief narrative that provides **context** and **reflection** about your scholarship efforts this year.

SERVICE

(For work between July 1 and June 30 of this year)

1. List administrative, committee or other service for the program, department, college/school, and university.

- Type:** program, department, department, college/school, university
- Role:** specify your contribution
- Description:** title, administrative, committee, task force, assessment, etc.

Type	Role	Name or Description

2. List any service to the profession, awards or professional recognition.

- Type:** professional service, award, recognition
- Role:** specify your contribution if applicable
- Description:** organization; elected, appointed, volunteer

Type	Role	Name or Description

3. List any community service.

Type: university representative or academic expertise

Role: specify your contribution

Description: organization; appointed, volunteer, paid consultant

Type	Role	Name or Description

4. List any other service activities or awards not requested elsewhere.
5. **Write a brief narrative** that provides **context** and **reflection** about your service efforts this year and the impact you have made on your department, college/school, university, profession, or community.