Evaluation of Faculty at Clarke University

CONTENTS

Evaluation of Faculty at Clarke University

1.   INTRODUCTION

The role of faculty members in reflecting the University values of community, spiritual life, global awareness and social responsibility cannot be underestimated. Faculty members who are committed to the liberal arts, who are active in scholarship and who will continue to be active learners over their careers are central to continuing the mission of Clarke University. Their love of and commitment to teaching and students is at the heart of the BVM tradition of excellence in education.

> **"Educating is to invite students to open their minds, express their thoughts and think for themselves."   Mary Frances Clarke, BVM   1884**

Today, the demand for accountability in higher education requires a fair and objective system to evaluate professional effectiveness. Such "effectiveness" must be described in terms of the values defined in the University mission statement. It must also be described in terms that can be evaluated realistically and efficiently. This handbook describes a comprehensive approach to reviewing and evaluating the activities of faculty members at Clarke University.

While it is not possible to identify and review all the roles of a faculty member for evaluation purposes, those selected for our institution and incorporated within this system include those identified as most important to the advancement of our mission as a result of faculty discussions and those it was determined could be reviewed efficiently and effectively.   The evaluation system includes three major roles:

- ❑   Teaching
- ❑   Professional Activities
- ❑   Service.

An institutional minimum and maximum value (weight) for each role relative to the total system has been established. These values reflect the philosophy and general value system of Clarke University as to the importance of each role.

Data gathered for review and evaluation are obtained from students, self, peers and the faculty member's department chair. A value is pre-established for the degree of impact data from each source have on the evaluation of each role.

The evaluation process allows faculty members the opportunity to place greater emphasis on one or another of the three major roles in a given year. Each faculty member will enter into an evaluation agreement with the department head prior to the evaluation cycle. A preliminary agreement for the next evaluation period should be written during the final conference between the department head and the faculty member at the end of the current evaluation period. A final agreement must be written at the beginning of the academic year in which the faculty member is to be evaluated.

A) Purpose

The purposes of faculty evaluation at Clarke University are to promote individual professional development, to facilitate student learning, and to enhance institutional improvement. The evaluation process focuses on the objectives and goals of the individual and of the University. It serves both as a measure of progress toward stated goals and a discussion of expectations for the future. The evaluation is also the basis for promotion, tenure, pre-tenure and post-tenure review.

B) History of Plan Development

During the 2000-2001 academic year a task force of three faculty members was formed to consider four matters: hiring procedures, support for new faculty, faculty development and, the faculty evaluation process. Initial task force members included a member of the Faculty Policy Committee, the Faculty Personnel Board and the Faculty Development Committee. During its first semester of operation, the committee wrote a Search Handbook to be used by department chairs during the search process for new faculty members. Revision of the faculty evaluation process began in the spring of 2000. A two-day workshop given by Raoul Arreola author of *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System* was held on-campus in May 2000. Department Chairs attended a full-day workshop. Members of the Administrative Council and of the entire faculty attended respective half-day workshops.

In June 2000 the task force worked to initiate the process of developing a comprehensive plan for Clarke. Using the Clarke Faculty manual, Arreola's book and various other available resources, role descriptions were written and a time-line for implementation was drafted. The task force also surveyed five commercially available student evaluation forms and recommended CIEQ for use at Clarke. The role descriptions were revised by the faculty as a whole at the August 2000 Faculty Workshop and were adopted as a working document later that fall. Various components of the system were discussed at division meetings that year and the next. The first full copy of the Evaluation Manual was completed in spring of 2003 and sent to Faculty Policy Committee with a recommendation for full implementation. Faculty Policy Committee presented it to the Faculty Senate at its March 26, 2003 meeting. A vote to implement the process was approved by the Faculty Senate at that meeting.

In Fall 2014, the Faculty Policy Committee reviewed CIEQs and looked into alternate student evaluations. IDEA was selected for a pilot program in Spring 2015 with 18 faculty participating. The FPC considered input from the participating faculty as well as several focus groups. In Spring 2016, the FPC recommended that IDEA be adopted as the way to obtain student evaluation of faculty with concurrent changes in the Evaluation Manual. The changes were adopted in March 2016.

2. THE ROLE OF FACULTY MEMBERS

The items listed for each of the three roles are illustrations of typical activities of Clarke University faculty members. See Institutional Standards for Professional Level Performance for specific expectations related to each role. Upon agreement with the department head, the faculty member may select relevant items other than those suggested. Faculty members are responsible for submitting the appropriate documentation to reflect and support their efforts in areas selected in the annual goal setting process.

A) Teaching (50 - 80%)

Engaging in specifically designed interactions with students, which challenge them to think, and which facilitate and promote student learning.

Components of Teaching Role

i. Content Expertise (Component weight - 35%)
The formally recognized knowledge, skills, and abilities a faculty member possesses in a chosen field by virtue of advanced training, education, or experience. The faculty member
   ❑ possesses an appropriate degree, ongoing professional experience, and licensure or certifications when applicable.
   ❑ is knowledgeable about recent trends, findings and value issues within his/her discipline and incorporates this information in the teaching-learning experience.
   ❑ develops a breadth of knowledge that enriches his/her teaching by making connections to other areas within the field of expertise, to other fields including Clarke's Catholic and/or BVM tradition.

ii.   Instructional Delivery Skills (Component weight - 30%)
    The instructor creates an intellectually stimulating environment by
    ❑   demonstrating interest and enthusiasm in the student learning process.
    ❑   demonstrating effective communication skills: writing, speaking and listening.
    ❑   eliciting responsible student participation.
    ❑   respecting students and interacting with them ethically.
    ❑   being available to students outside of class time to discuss course materials.
    ❑   being punctual and consistent in class attendance.
    ❑   evaluating student achievement in terms of progress toward the outcomes stated in syllabi.
    ❑   returning student work in a timely manner.
    ❑   For hybrid/online classes, the instructor interacts with students online on a regular and timely basis.

iii. Instructional Design Skills (Component weight - 25%)
    Those technical skills in designing, sequencing, and presenting experiences which promote learning; and those skills in developing and using tools and procedures for assessing student learning (i.e. testing and grading). The faculty member
    ❑   designs courses to reflect the Clarke University mission and current knowledge in field.
    ❑   designs clear and accurate course syllabi, assignments and handouts.
    ❑   strives to improve instructional methods and techniques consistently.
    ❑   uses appropriate instructional strategies and approaches to course content.
    ❑   incorporates appropriate technology in course work.
    ❑   utilizes knowledge about recent trends, findings and values issues in pedagogy and incorporates this information in his/her teaching.

iv. Course management (Component weight - 10%)
    Those organizational and administrative tasks involved in maintaining and operating a course, including
    ❑   processing course related forms such as grade records, drop/add forms, warning notices, incomplete grade notification, final grades on time.
    ❑   arranging for and scheduling such things as supplementary resources, support services, workshops and field trips.
    ❑   preparing the instructional environment.

B) Professional Activities (10 - 40%)

Those activities in or related to a faculty member's formally recognized area of expertise (i.e. content area in which the faculty member teaches), or that promote the mission and Catholic identity of the institution, which contribute to the following components.

While individual components are not weighted, to achieve a professional level (3) for Professional Activities, the faculty member participates in activities described in instructional delivery/design components (Section 2B ii) and at least one other component in the professional activities role (Sections 2B i, iii, iv, or v).

Components of Professional Activities Role (Individual components not weighted.)

i. The development of personal professional skills or standing. Some methods of documenting this include, but are not limited to the following:
    ❑   obtaining new certifications
    ❑   obtaining an advanced degree in related field
    ❑   attending conferences, meetings, workshops, presentations, credit or non-credit courses in content area.
    ❑   doing advanced work with experts or recognized professionals.
    ❑   serving as an officer or on a committee of a professional organization.
    ❑   providing support services for the operation of a professional organization.
    ❑   editing a journal or newsletter within the faculty member's recognized area of expertise.

- ❑ organizing professional meetings.
- ❑ submitting funding proposals to government or private agencies
- ❑ receiving and administering individual research grants.
- ❑ actively participating in professional societies relevant to the area of expertise
- ❑ adjudicating juries, contests, auditions, exhibits.
- ❑ maintaining professional/clinical practice when applicable.

ii. The development of instructional delivery and instructional design skills. Some methods of documenting this include, but are not limited to the following:
- ❑ attending conferences, meetings, workshops or presentations on teaching
- ❑ participating in a teaching circle
- ❑ systematically investigating new pedagogical methods appropriate to the discipline.

iii. The development of knowledge (research) or of creative work or of professional practice.
- ❑ Research may be basic (oriented toward new knowledge), applied (oriented toward the utilization of new knowledge) or pedagogical (oriented towards methods of teaching or learning).
- ❑ Creative work may include performances, literary works, music, or art works.
- ❑ Professional practice includes the development, application, and professional evaluation of disciplinary knowledge in a professional setting.

iv. The dissemination of knowledge in the professional community. Some methods of documenting this include, but are not limited to the following:
- ❑ publishing the results of research, scholarship and creative endeavors through vehicles such as monographs, textbooks, papers, abstracts, book reviews, articles, poems, plays, musical composition, etc.
- ❑ consulting in one's area of expertise. Consulting is the application of a faculty member's recognized area of expertise in the community for pay.
- ❑ giving juried or invitational lectures/performances/exhibits of creative work.
- ❑ delivering lectures, papers, speeches or presentations at professional meetings, conventions and conferences.

v. The development of personal knowledge of Clarke's Catholic and BVM tradition. This might include, but is not limited to the following:
- ❑ attending conferences, meetings, workshops, presentations or courses on Clarke's Catholic and/or BVM tradition.
- ❑ auditing Religious Studies, Philosophy, or other courses that are directly related to Clarke's mission and/or Catholic identity.

C) Service (10- 40%)

Those activities of a faculty member in which they assume responsibilities relating to the academic and support services of the university or the community.

Components of Service Role (Individual components not weighted.)

iv. Department Service
Those activities which directly contribute to the academic or administrative functioning of the department and which enable the department to reach its goals. Some methods of documenting this include, but are not limited to:
- ❑ serving as academic advisor to majors (recommend to annually complete Academic Advising Self-Assessment to include with Form C- Found in Appendix).
- ❑ maintaining equipment, facilities or other department resources.
- ❑ designing department Web pages, mailings or other department publications.
- ❑ actively participating in department meetings and other department functions.
- ❑ coordinating with outside agencies.
- ❑ Interacting with the business and professional community to promote student placement.

- ❑ writing and administering grants that impact the department as a whole.
- ❑ moderating department related student organizations.
- ❑ participating in recruitment activities.
- ❑ guiding senior performances or other independent study.
- ❑ maintaining contact with alumni.
- ❑ reviewing portfolios, auditions, juries.
- ❑ serving as Department Chair if appointed.

ii. University Service

Those activities that directly contribute to the academic or administrative functioning of other departments or the University as a whole, or that contribute to Clarke's mission and commitment to its community. Some methods of documenting this include, but are not limited to:
- ❑ serving as academic advisor to first-year students or undeclared majors.
- ❑ serving as Division Chair.
- ❑ serving as a Committee Chair.
- ❑ serving on University committees or task forces.
- ❑ guest lecturing in classes.
- ❑ mentoring peers.
- ❑ participating in and support of university functions including Student Life activities.
- ❑ planning and leading noncredit workshops, institutes, discussion groups, performances, presentations, tours.
- ❑ serving as a consultant for university events and publications.
- ❑ creating art for the University.
- ❑ writing and administering grants that impact the University as a whole.
- ❑ participating in university sponsored dialogue or learning related Clarke's Catholic and BVM tradition.
- ❑ creating or conducting of university sponsored events related to Clarke's Catholic and BVM tradition.

iii. Community Service

Community service activities necessarily vary widely in scope and kind, and are therefore difficult to categorize specifically. The University recognizes that worthwhile service contributions are those in which the faculty member contributes his or her knowledge, interests, and skills in a manner that clearly impacts positively on the community. In general, the value of any service activity for evaluation purposes depends upon the activity's scope and significance, the faculty member's level of involvement and the relationship to the University mission.

Although highly valued at Clarke University, and because community service is not a contractual obligation, it is not a formal part of the requirements for "Professional Level" performance.

3. COMPONENTS OF THE EVALUATION SYSTEM

A) Process

The evaluation process is standard across all of the University's academic departments, including the use of the same student rating form IDEA by all faculty members. The process has both formative and summative aspects.

Formative evaluation is intended to provide feedback for changing the activity being evaluated while the semester or the course is still in progress. This type of evaluation serves the vital purpose of faculty development or professional improvement. Aspects of the process that are formative include:
- ❑ Annual goal setting with the Department Chair,
- ❑ Chair and Peer Visits to classes as described in Tables 4.1-4.3 and in Appendix A.

Summative evaluation as the term suggests, comes at the conclusion of an activity (e.g. a faculty member's evaluation year) and they are intended to produce judgments on the adequacy or effectiveness of the faculty

member's overall performance. Summative evaluations thus provide a basis for personnel decisions such as promotion and tenure.   Aspects of the process that are summative include:
- ❑ Generation of the Annual Evaluation Summary (Form F) based on portfolio review,
- ❑ Mid-course reviews by Vice-president for Academic Affairs and the Faculty Personnel Board,
- ❑ Promotion and tenure reviews by Faculty Personnel Board, the Vice-president for Academic Affairs and the President.   Favorable recommendations by the President are forwarded to the Board of Trustees for action.

The summative process results in an Annual Evaluation Summary (Form F) which summarizes the faculty member's performance for an evaluation year.   Initially the Form F IDEA will be used to indicate trends in a faculty member's performance over multiple years. Cutoffs are not currently defined relative to promotion to higher ranks or to tenure decisions although this could be added after sufficient data is accumulated and analyzed. The Faculty Personnel Board will make its recommendations for tenure and promotion based on the accumulated evidence provided by a faculty member and any additional letters of recommendation they seek.

Peers are chosen from among the faculty members who have served at Clarke University for more than one year. See Tables 4-1, 4-2, 4-3 to determine how peer reviewers are selected. Peers for tenure review should be tenured faculty members. Generally, peers for promotion review should hold a rank at or above the one being requested. If a candidate being reviewed is a department chair, the division chair or another department chair should serve as one of the peer reviewers. If the candidate being reviewed is a division chair, then another chair should serve as one of the peer reviewers. Peers should be knowledgeable of the faculty member's duties and be willing to attend training sessions each fall. Peers should provide formative feedback to a faculty member after visiting classes (Appendix A). Usually, the same peers who visit classes during a peer review year participate in the summative review the following fall. If a faculty member's peer reviewer leaves Clarke and so is not available to complete the portfolio evaluation the following fall, Faculty Personnel Board appoints a new peer reviewer at their first meeting in August.

B) Negotiated Weight Ranges for Roles

Faculty members negotiate with department chairs the annual **role weights**, within allowable rages, to reflect differences in faculty interests and workload.   The role weights are fixed in the fall when the annual goal setting agreement is signed. While it is expected that a faculty member and his/her chair will successfully negotiate weight ranges for roles, in cases when agreement proves to be impossible, the faculty member and the chair should both include their different decisions as to the appropriate weight ranges in the portfolio, explaining their reasoning. The minimum and maximum weights allowed in the evaluation system for the three roles are as follows:

MINIMUM		MAXIMUM
50%	Teaching	80%
10%	Professional Activities	40%
10%	Service	40%

C) Component Rating

Each role has multiple **components** described. Faculty members receive ratings from each **source** within each component based on the following four-point scale. These ratings are reported directly on the Annual Evaluation Summary.

4   Exemplary Performance
This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, consistently exceeded the institution's standards of professional performance. Individuals receiving this rating stand as models of the highest levels of professional academic performance within the institution making significant contributions to their departments, university, academic field and society.

3   Professional Level
This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, consistently met the institution's standards of professional performance. The individuals receiving this rating constitute those good and valued professionals on whom the continued successful achievement of the institution's mission, goals and objectives depend.

2   Needs Improvement
This rating is given to those individuals whose performance, during the rating period, is recognized as deficient in one or more criteria, but evidence suggests that satisfactory performance is possible with appropriate professional development and assistance. This rating must be given with 1) specific feedback as to which standards of professional performance were not met, and 2) suggestions for improvement. Improvement in performance is required within the next evaluation period.

1   Unacceptable
This rating is given to individuals who, during the rating period, did not meet the institution's reasonable and minimal standards compared to other professional faculty within the University, or documentation is not provided by the faculty member when requested or prescribed in the evaluation process.

D) Disagreement with Rating

If the faculty member disagrees with the rating of any particular component as provided by the Chair or a peer reviewer, or would like to provide context for student ratings, there is space in Form F for providing an explanation or defense.

E) Sources of Information

The sources of information for the evaluation process include the Department Chair, peer reviewers (in some years), self, and students. For evaluation of faculty members who are Department Chairs, the Vice-president for Academic Affairs is the source for that portion of the evaluation.

In years with one peer reviewer, that peer is chosen by the Faculty Personnel Board. In the years that two peer reviewers are used, one is chosen by FPB and the other by the faculty member. First-year faculty members may not be peer reviewers. The same peers who visit classes during an academic year complete the evaluation of materials in the portfolio for that evaluation year. If a faculty member's peer reviewer leaves Clarke and so is not available to complete the portfolio evaluation the following fall, Faculty Personnel Board appoints a new peer reviewer at their first meeting in August. That peer reviewer would visit classes and evaluate the portfolio according to the timeline specified in section 6.

The student rating form IDEA is used in all courses except the following: internships, private lessons and courses with fewer than four students. In these cases, the IDEA form should not be used since the provider does not consider the results valid or reliable. If a faculty member's teaching load consists solely of such courses, the department should provide an alternative evaluation method/form to be used based on a similar 4-point scale. Disciplinary organizations might be the source of such evaluations. The policy committee overseeing the evaluation system must approve the evaluation form/method.

4. EVALUATION CYCLES

A) Tenure-Track Faculty with Term Appointments

Performance evaluation is based on the five or seven year cycles shown in Tables 4.1 or 4.2 following. For new faculty members who are new teachers, goal setting should focus primarily on teaching and instructional management: subject matter competence and instructional design, delivery, and management skills. For experienced faculty members who are new to Clarke University, the focus should remain on teaching but should broaden to include professional development and service activities.

The IDEA form is to be administered each semester in all courses with exceptions as noted in section 3E.

During the first semester of the first year the department chairperson will review all syllabi prepared by the new faculty member and make a classroom visitation. The Vice President of Academic Affairs or an appointee of the Vice President of Academic Affairs will have the option of a classroom visitation. The visitor(s) will provide written feedback to the new faculty member.

During the second semester of the first year, the Department Chair will schedule a classroom visit. Pre-visitation and post-visitation conferences are recommended between evaluator and instructor. (See Appendix A.) During the second and third years, a peer will participate in the review of teaching, professional activities and service. The peer is chosen by the Faculty Personnel Board. Peers may not be first-year faculty members. The peer should visit one class each semester and review the faculty member's portfolio to rate teaching materials, professional activities and service as scheduled.

Throughout the year the instructor develops his/her Professional Evaluation and Development Portfolio, inserting the required items (Section 9.0) so that it is ready for review by the Chair and Peers (if applicable) the following fall. (Tables 4.1 and 4.2) The portfolio is submitted to the department Chair no later than September 1. The Chair facilitates peer review of portfolios as scheduled. Peer review of teaching is independent of the IDEA results so they should not be included in the portfolio that peers review. The peer reviewers rate teaching, professional activities and service using the standard forms (Section 10). Once all evaluation materials are available, the faculty accumulates the scores and completes the Annual Evaluation Summary.

After reviewing the Self-Evaluation report, the results of the IDEA evaluations, and the Professional Evaluation and Development Portfolio, the Chair and the faculty member confer to discuss performance, to prepare a plan for next evaluation cycle, and to discuss goals for improvement.

Mid-course reviews by Faculty Personnel Board occur during the spring semester of the 3rd (5-year cycle) or 4th (7-year cycle) year as scheduled.

B) Tenured Faculty

The primary goal of evaluation of a faculty member who has received tenure is to foster and maintain excellent performance. If the original decision to award a continuous appointment was justified--if appropriate evidence was assembled and careful deliberation exercised--then odds are excellent that the individual whose performance was deemed sufficient to merit tenure will continue to perform in a manner consistent with those earlier expectations.

Tenured faculty will participate annually in a performance evaluation procedure for development purposes. Each fall semester, the faculty member formulates a one-year goal setting plan --embracing all facets of the faculty role model--with the Department Chair. Department Chairs will meet with the Vice-president for Academic Affairs.

The IDEA survey is to be administered in at least one class each semester (with exceptions noted in section 3E) until the rank of full professor has been reached. Once the rank of full professor has been reached, the IDEA surveys will be administered in at least one class per year.

Throughout the year the faculty member develops his/her Professional Evaluation and Development Portfolio, inserting the required items (Section 8.0) so that it is ready for perusal by the Chair the following fall. The portfolio is submitted to the Chair no later than September 1. Once all evaluation materials are available, the faculty

accumulates the scores and completes the Annual Evaluation Summary. The Chair and the faculty member confer to discuss performance and to finalize the annual goal setting agreement for the current year.

If a tenured faculty member intends to seek promotion, the peer review process is initiated in January prior to the fall in which promotion is requested. (Table 4.3).

The Faculty Personnel Board reviews tenured faculty members every seventh year during the spring semester. Peer reviews take place during the preceding fall. If conditions are found to exist that indicate the faculty member is not continuing at the standard performance level, the Faculty Personnel Board may recommend developmental guidance and support that can assist the faculty member to overcome difficulties.   In the event that subsequent annual evaluations reveal continuing and persistent problems with a faculty member's performance that call into question his or her ability to function in that position, then other possibilities, such as a mutually agreeable reassignment to other duties, salary freeze or separation, will be explored. Tenured faculty members are already subject to dismissal for adequate cause. Other formal disciplinary procedures exist for this purpose.

No septennial reviews are required after age 60 unless the faculty member has not had one previously. It is up to the faculty member to inform the Vice President of Academic Affairs that they will not participate because they have reached this age. The Vice President of Academic Affairs will then inform FPB.

C) Part-time and Non-tenure Track Faculty

Part-time faculty members (1/2-3/4 time teaching) and non-tenure track faculty are evaluated on the same schedule as those receiving annual appointments during their first five or seven years. (Table 4.1 or 4.2) The professional level performance standard for teaching is the same as for tenure track faculty. Expectations for service and professional activities are in proportion to their contracts. They complete the same annual goal setting process and end of year reports as full-time faculty members.

Part-time and full-time non-tenure track faculty who have received annual contracts at Clarke University for more than 7 years are evaluated according to the schedule in Table 4.3.

Since it is understood that these appointments terminate at the end of the term, no procedure for non-reappointment need be stated.

D) Adjunct Faculty and Visiting Faculty with Limited-Term Appointments (i.e. replacement faculty)

Because only teaching and instructional management can be evaluated, the IDEA survey (Course/Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire) is to be administered during the course. Either the Department Chair or Vice President of Academic Affairs may visit the course at least once during the semester to provide guidance and moral support. The evaluator may also interview students. (Pre-visitation and post-visitation conferences are recommended between evaluator and instructor).

Since it is understood that this appointment terminates at the end of the term, no procedure for non-reappointment need be stated.

TABLE 4.1 CYCLE OF EVALUATION FOR ALL FACULTY HIRED AS INSTRUCTORS OR ASSISTANT PROFESSORS (FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME)

	Teaching	Professional Development	Service
Year 1	**Faculty Member**: sets annual goals (Form A) by Sept. 1; conducts an IDEA survey in all classes each semester, completes Form B by the end of the spring semester, turns in Portfolio by Sept 1 of second year **Chair:** visits one class during each semester, reviews annual goals; assists with annual portfolio development, provides feedback **FPB**: assigns Year 2 Peer Reviewer in Spring term **Vice President for Academic Affairs:** visits a classroom during the first semester, provides feedback	**Faculty Member:** evaluates activities **Chair:** assists with annual portfolio development and provides feedback	**Faculty Member:** evaluates activities **Chair:** assists with annual portfolio development and provides feedback
Year 2	**Faculty Member**: sets annual goals (Form A) and submits portfolio to Chair by Sept. 1; conducts an IDEA survey in all classes each semester **Chair:** reviews annual goals and evaluates portfolio; conducts class visits as needed **Peer Reviewer:** visits one class each semester; submits Form D for Department Chair and Faculty Member Reviewee by the end of spring semester	**Faculty Member:** evaluates activities **Chair:** evaluates portfolio and provides feedback	**Faculty Member:** evaluates activities **Chair:** evaluates portfolio and provides feedback
Year 3	**Faculty Member**: sets annual goals (Form A) and submits portfolio to Chair by Sept. 1; conducts an IDEA survey in all classes each semester **Chair**: visits one class, evaluates portfolio **Peer Reviewer (same person as Year 2)**:submits Form D to Department Chair and Faculty Member reviewee by Oct.1 Peer Reviewers: (Midcourse): Visit classroom **FPB:** assigns mid-course peer reviewers in Spring semester (Chair or alternate, one reviewer chosen by the reviewee, and one assigned by FPB)	**Faculty Member:** evaluates activities **Chair:** evaluates portfolio and provides feedback **Peer Reviewer (same person as Year 2):** evaluates portfolio and provides rating on Form D by Oct 1	**Faculty Member:** evaluates activities **Chair:** evaluates portfolio and provides feedback **Peer Reviewer (same person as Year 2):** evaluates portfolio and provides rating on Form D by Oct 1

	Teaching	Professional Development	Service
Year 4	SUMMATIVE MID-COURSE REVIEW (SPRING) **Faculty Member**: sets annual goals (Form A) and submits annual portfolio to Chair by Sept. 1; conducts an IDEA survey in all classes each semester, prepares midcourse portfolio to be turned in to FPB by Feb 15.**Chair**: reviews annual goals and evaluates portfolio; conducts class visits as needed **Peer Reviewers**: complete visits for midcourse review, evaluate midcourse portfolio. Submit Form D to Chair, FPB, and reviewee by Feb 15 FPB: Reviews collection of Years 1-3 materials..	SUMMATIVE MID-COURSE REVIEW (SPRING) **Faculty Member:** evaluates activities **Chair:** evaluates portfolio and provides feedback Annual Goal Setting in spring	SUMMATIVE MID-COURSE REVIEW (SPRING) **Faculty Member:** evaluates activities **Chair:** evaluates portfolio and provides feedback Annual Goal Setting in spring
Year 5	**IDEA**: All classes each semester **Chair**: visits one class, evaluates portfolio **Peers**: none unless requested. Preliminary goal setting in spring	Evaluated by Self and Chair Annual Goal Setting in spring	Evaluated by Self and Chair Annual Goal Setting in spring
Year 6	**IDEA**: All classes each semester **Chair**: visits one class, evaluates portfolio **Peers:** One class visit each semester by two peers; one assigned by FPB, one chosen by the faculty member. Both peers must be tenured if applying for tenure. Different types of classes if possible. Preliminary goal setting in spring	Same as above + Peer Review rating Same Peers who visit classes review portfolio Annual Goal Setting in spring	Same as above + Peer Review rating Annual Goal Setting in spring
Year 7	Review by FPB in fall if eligible for Tenure Review by FPB in spring if not eligible for Tenure	Tenure Review by FPB in fall or spring	Tenure Review by FPB in fall or spring

TABLE 4.2 CYCLE OF EVALUATION FOR ALL FACULTY HIRED AS ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS OR PROFESSORS (FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME)

		Teaching	Professional Development	Service
Year 1		Initial Goal Setting with Chair in early fall **IDEA:** All classes each semester **Chair:** visits one class during each semester, evaluates portfolio, provides feedback **Vice President of Academic Affairs:** Has the option of a classroom visit during the first semester, provides feedback (*Changed 12/04*) Preliminary goal setting in spring	Evaluated by Self and Chair	Evaluated by Self and Chair
Year 2		**IDEA**: All classes each semester **Chair**: no class visits unless requested, evaluates portfolio **Peer:** one class visit each semester by a peer reviewer assigned by FPB. Different types of classes if possible. Preliminary goal setting in spring	Same as above + Peer Review rating Same Peer who visit classes review portfolio	Same as above + Peer Review rating Same Peer who visit classes review portfolio
Year 3		SPRING – Mid-course Review of collection of Year 1-2 materials by Faculty Personnel Board **IDEA**: All classes each semester **Chair**: no visits unless review warrants it, evaluates portfolio **Peers**: no visits unless review warrants it Preliminary goal setting in spring	SPRING – Mid-course Review of collection of Year 1-2 materials by Faculty Personnel Board Evaluated by Self and Chair	SPRING – Mid-course Review of collection of Year 1-2 materials by Faculty Personnel Board Evaluated by Self and Chair
Year 4		**IDEA**: All classes each semester **Chair**: visits one class, evaluates portfolio **Peers:** One class visit each semester by two peers; one assigned by FPB, one chosen by the faculty member. Both peers must be tenured if applying for tenure. Different types of classes if possible. Preliminary goal setting in spring	Same as above + Peer Review rating Same Peers who visit classes review portfolio	Same as above + Peer Review rating
Year 5		Review by FPB in fall if eligible for Tenure Review by FPB in spring if not eligible for Tenure	Tenure Review by FPB in fall or spring	Tenure Review by FPB in fall or spring

TABLE 4.3 EVALUATION OF FACULTY POST-TENURE AND NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY OR PART-TIME FACULTY WHO HAVE RECEIVED ANNUAL APPOINTMENTS AT CLARKE FOR MORE THAN 7 YEARS.

	Teaching	Professional Development	Service
Annually	Goal Setting with Chair in early fall **IDEA IF NOT TENURED**: All classes each semester **IDEA IF TENURED:** At least one class each semester until the rank of full professor has been reached. **IDEA IF FULL PROFESSOR:** at least one class per year **Chair**: review of portfolio and IDEA materials, no class visits unless requested. **Peers**: if requested by faculty member or chair for development purposes Preliminary goal setting in spring	Evaluated by Self and Chair	Evaluated by Self and Chair
Every seventh year	**Chair:** class visits and review of portfolio and IDEA materials in fall. **Peer:** class visits and portfolio review in fall by one peer picked by Faculty Personnel Board Review by Faculty Personnel Board in spring	Review in the fall by chair and one peer picked by Faculty Personnel Board Review by Faculty Personnel Board in spring	Review in the fall by chair and one peer picked by Faculty Personnel Board Review by Faculty Personnel Board in spring

TABLE 4.4 EVALUATION OF FACULTY APPLYING FOR PROMOTION

	Teaching	Professional Development	Service
By the January prior to a fall promotion request	**IDEA IF NOT TENURED:** All classes each semester. **IDEA IF TENURED:** At least one class each semester until the rank of full professor has been reached **IDEA IF FULL PROFESSOR:** at least one class per year(*Changed 12/04*) **Chair**: one class during spring, one during fall semester **Peers**: One class visit each semester by two peers; one assigned by FPB, one chosen by the faculty member. Different types of classes if possible Preliminary goal setting in spring	Chair, Self and Peers	Chair, Self and Peers
Year of request	Review by FPB in fall if eligible		

5. INSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS FOR PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE.

Clarke faculty members as professional educators are expected to pursue excellence in their three roles. (See Introduction.) The standard for earning a rating of 3.0 (Professional Level) is described in the tables following. Annual evaluation is based on materials submitted by the faculty member in the Professional Portfolio as well as specific evidence that the evaluators know and can document.

An evaluator (self, chair or peers) must provide explicit rationale and evidence for giving the Exemplary rating of 4.0. All qualities indicated in Level 3 Professional Level performance must first be met. In general, a rating of 4.0 should only be given to recognize quality that could merit nomination for the University's highest teaching award, the Meneve Dunham Award.

Any rating indicating that performance is unacceptable (1.0) or that improvement is needed (2.0) must be accompanied by the specific expectation for improvement that needs to occur in the next evaluation cycle.

A) Teaching – Content Expertise (Evaluators: Self, Chair, Peers when specified)

Unacceptable (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Professional Level (3)	Exemplary (4)
No progress toward needed degree, certification or licensure. Teaching materials evidence static or out-of-date content. Failed to respond to items of needed improvement from previous year.	Has not made sufficient progress toward needed degree, certifications or licensure within time frame agreed upon in the initial contract. Recent trends and findings in discipline are not evidenced in teaching materials.	Possesses an appropriate terminal degree, ongoing professional experience, and licensure or certifications when applicable OR Is progressing toward needed degree, certifications or licensure agreed upon in initial contract. Knowledgeable about recent trends, findings and value issues within his/her discipline and incorporates this information in the teaching-learning experience. Develops a breadth of knowledge that enriches his/her teaching by making connections to other areas within the field of expertise or in other fields.	**Additional expertise that may earn a faculty member a 4.0 rating depends on the <u>extent or importance of the work</u> and must be supported by explicit documents provided by the faculty member or colleagues. Examples include:** Engaged in significant, ongoing academic pursuits to enhance and extend knowledge base and contribute to disciplinary knowledge Actively participates in influencing developments in the discipline and contributes new knowledge to the discipline. Expertise is sought out by others both within and outside the university Significant demonstration of a breadth of knowledge is evident.

B) Teaching - Instructional Delivery (Evaluators: Self, Peers when specified): These standards are primarily for use by self and peers.

It is expected that all faculty members will meet all assigned class hours unless advance arrangements have been made with the chair and/or Vice President of Academic Affairs, or classes are canceled because of illness, professional meeting attendance, weather, or other compelling reasons. Ordinarily, faculty members are expected to communicate cancellations with their students.

Unacceptable (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Professional Level (3)	Exemplary (4)
Routinely disregards course syllabus to point that students do not know expectations. Generally unavailable to students outside of class time. Fails to demonstrate interest and enthusiasm in the student learning process Assessment strategies are incongruent with course content, level of student. Instructor not interactive with students. Interaction with some students is negative, demeaning, sarcastic or inappropriate.	Does not routinely follow course syllabus. Availability to students is inconsistent and unpredictable. Inconsistently demonstrates interest and enthusiasm in the student learning process Assessment strategies are too narrow or inadequate or not clearly connected to outcomes. Instructor is inconsistently interactive with students. Interactions are generally appropriate but may reflect occasional inconsistencies, favoritism, or disregard for students.	Conducts all classes in accordance with course syllabus. Maintains regular office hours (at least 8 hours each week for full-time faculty). Demonstrates interest and enthusiasm for the student learning process. Elicits responsible student participation. Assessment strategies are varied and reflect course level, content and objectives. Instructor is consistently interactive with students. Interactions with students are respectful and professional.	*Additional activities may earn a faculty member a 4.0 rating depending on <u>level of significance</u>. They must be supported by documentation provided by the faculty member or colleagues. Examples include:* Demonstrates qualities that would merit nomination for the University's highest teaching award, the Meneve Dunham Award Ability to arouse curiosity, and to stimulate independent learning and the development of critical thought. Innovation in the design and delivery of content and course materials. Innovation in the design of assessment strategies that are relevant and creative and assist student learning. Instructor provides insightful comments and is consistently interactive with students.

C) Teaching - Instructional Design   (Evaluators: Self, Chair, Peers when specified)

Unacceptable (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Professional Level (3)	Exemplary (4)
No syllabus is provided for the course

Many required components of the syllabi are missing

Learning activities are not suitable to students or instructional goals. (They do not follow an organized progression and do not reflect recent professional research.)

Instructional methods or materials reflect no changes over considerable time and are inappropriate for course content or level of student.

Congruence between departmental and institutional mission is not apparent

Is unaware of or does not take advantage of available University resources that would enhance courses.

For hybrid/online classes: fails to meet most of the requirements for the "Quality Matters" rubric | Some required components of the course syllabi are not present.

Technical errors in grammar/spelling occur or format makes some course materials difficult to read.

Some activities are not suitable to students or instructional goals.

Instructional methods need improvement, do not reflect recent changes in field or are not consistently appropriate for course level, content and objectives.

Course congruence with departmental and institutional mission needs to be clarified.

Utilization of available University resources that would enhance courses is limited.

For hybrid/online classes: fails to meet some of the requirements for the "Quality Matters" rubric | All required components of course syllabus are present.

Course materials are free of technical errors in spelling and grammar.

Learning activities are suitable to students and instructional goals.

Consistent and ongoing evaluation of course is evident.

Effort to improve teaching is evident in course design over time.

Selects teaching strategies that are appropriate for course level, content, and objectives and that promote student participation in course and engagement in area of study.

Course is congruent with departmental curricula and institutional mission.

Is fully aware of and uses available university resources in a way that augments the quality of teaching and enhances student learning.

For hybrid/online classes: meets the requirements for the "Quality Matters" rubric | *Additional activities may earn a faculty member a 4.0 rating depending on level of significance. They must be supported by evidence provided by the faculty member or colleagues.*
Examples include:

Syllabi and related materials provide students with a guide to learning and direction for further study

Learning activities are unusually creative and promote student engagement in the course beyond usual expectations.

Evidence of assisting others in improving courses is provided

Institutional mission is creatively and effectively interwoven throughout the course.

Actively seeks out supplemental resources available to enhance courses.

For hybrid/online classes: exceeds the requirements for the "Quality Matters" rubric |

D) Teaching - Course Management   (Evaluator: Chair)

Unacceptable (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Professional Level (3)	Exemplary (4)
Fails to administer student evaluations. Fails to complete required administrative tasks related to teaching assignment and/or communicate grades or other course information. Frequently needs to change class strategy or cancel class because needed resources were not scheduled. Frequently uses beginning of scheduled class time to complete photocopying or to prepare other needed materials.	Student evaluations are not administered in some courses. Grades or other course information are filed late. Scheduled class activities are occasionally disrupted because needed resources were not available due to lack of planning. Occasionally does not have materials ready when class begins (i.e. photocopying, other materials.)	Student evaluations administered according to policy. (SRI administered by IDEA) Processes course related information in a timely manner. Schedules use of supplementary resources and support services as needed. Insures that necessary resources are available when class begins.	***Examples of additional activities that may earn a faculty member a 4.0 rating depending on <u>level of significance</u> include:*** Contributes significant time and effort to create an environment that enhances student learning and/or safety.

E) Professional Activities   (Evaluators: Self, Chair, Peers when specified)

Unacceptable (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Professional Level (3)	Exemplary (4)
Failed to respond to items designated as needs improvement from previous year. Exceeds agreed upon time-line for completing terminal degree. Lost required professional licensure or certification.	Is not a member of an appropriate professional organization. Did not work toward completion of terminal degree if hired with that expectation or, did not work toward maintaining needed professional licensure or certification when applicable Did not participate in sufficient activities in instructional delivery/design skills and other professional activities components. Did not adequately fulfill agreed upon department criteria.	Holds membership in a professional organization of the discipline or of higher education. (Departments may specify up to two memberships if deemed necessary. Departments may specify particular organizations.) Is actively working toward completion of terminal degree if hired with that expectation. Maintains professional licensure or certification when applicable. Participates in activities described in instructional delivery/ design components (Sections 2B ii) and at least one other component in the professional activities role. (Sections 2B i, iii, iv, v) Fulfills any department criteria agreed on during the goal setting process. (e.g., fine arts may require some form of creative work annually) The expectation of the ranks of Associate or Full Professor, activities in the development of knowledge <u>and</u> the dissemination of knowledge components are expected. (Sections 2B iii, iv)	***Additional activities that may earn a faculty member a 4.0 rating depending on <u>level of significance.</u> Examples include:*** An exceptional number or quality of professional activities. A significant role in organizing a major professional meeting Receiving an external award or recognition for professional activities.

F) Service   (Evaluators: Self, Chair, Peers when specified)

Unacceptable (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Professional Level (3)	Exemplary (4)
Consistent failure to attend and participate in department, division and/or faculty senate meetings or at formal academic convocations without good cause. (i.e. teaching duties) Unwillingness to accept non-teaching duties or failure to fulfill non-teaching duties within the department agreed upon in annual goal setting. Unwillingness to serve on university committees or task forces as evidenced by consistent failure to be nominated for committees. Failure to document service activities.	Irregular attendance at, and participation in department, division and/or faculty senate meetings or at formal academic convocations without good cause. (i.e. teaching duties) Inadequate fulfillment of non-teaching duties within the department agreed upon in annual goal setting. No service on university committees or task forces as evidenced by failure to self-nominate or to be nominated for committees. Insufficient participation in regular department and/or university service activities. Failure to fully document service activities.	Regular attendance at, and participation in department, division and/or faculty senate meetings and at formal academic convocations. Fulfillment of departmental non-teaching duties as defined by the department and agreed upon in annual goal setting. Serving on a university committee or task force is generally expected after year 1. Participation in a number of university service activities as agreed upon in annual goal setting.	*Additional service (beyond regular department duties) may earn a faculty member a 4.0 rating depending on <u>level on contribution</u>. It must be supported by explicit documents provided by the faculty member or colleagues. Examples include:* Service on more than one major committee or taskforce. Service as the chair of a major committee or task force. Steering major curricular initiatives. Substantial community service activities that reflect the mission of the university.*

* Community service activities necessarily vary widely in scope and kind, and are therefore difficult to categorize specifically. The University recognizes that worthwhile service contributions are those in which the faculty member contributes his or her knowledge, interests, and skills in a manner that clearly impacts positively on the community. In general, the value of any service activity for evaluation purposes depends upon the activity's scope and significance, the faculty member's level of involvement and the relationship to the University mission.

Although highly valued at Clarke University, because community service is not a contractual obligation, it is not a formal part of the requirements for "Professional Level" performance.

6. TIME-LINE FOR FACULTY EVALUATION PROCESSES

The evaluation year is from June 1 through May 31 of the next calendar year.

May-August	❑ Spring SRI reports returned to faculty member ❑ Faculty member completes portfolio for previous academic year including self-assessment ❑ Administration of SRI for summer courses
August	❑ Orientation of new faculty to evaluation system
September 1	❑ Completed Faculty portfolios due to Department Chair ❑ Conference between department chair and faculty member to review previous evaluation year and finalize evaluation agreement for current year. ❑ Reviewee facilitates portfolio distribution if peer review was scheduled for previous evaluation year. ❑ By September 20 Peer evaluators complete rating form and return to Reviewee and Department Chair of Reviewee
October	❑ By October 1 Completed portfolios available for Faculty Personnel Board promotion/tenure decisions. ❑ By October 15 Faculty member compiles final information and generates Annual Evaluation Summary and sends to Director of Institutional Research or VPAA designee
October - November	❑ Administration of SRI for fall courses.
December	❑ Fall SRI reports returned to faculty member.
January-February	❑ By February 4 Peer evaluators complete rating form and return to Reviewee and Department Chair of Reviewee ❑ By February 15 Completed portfolios available for Faculty Personnel Board for midcourse/septennial reviews.
March-April	❑ By March 1 Peer Reviewers assigned by Faculty Personnel Board ❑ Administration of SRI for spring courses
April-May	❑ Faculty member prepares preliminary evaluation agreement for next year and meets with chair to discuss plan (To be completed by September 1.) ❑ Meeting of faculty member with Vice-President for Academic Affairs after mid-course review if scheduled. ❑ Form B due to Department Chairs (content required for End of Year Report generated by Department Chairs due June 1).

When specific dates fall on a weekend, the due date will be the first class day following the date listed.

Peer reviewers undertake their responsibilities after the assignment of peers and before materials are due. **The Reviewee is responsible for initiating contact with the reviewers to facilitate review.**

7.   RESPONSIBILITES IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

A) Faculty Member

Faculty members are responsible for fully participating in the process. This includes
- Participating in the goal setting process with the Department Chair each fall.
- Maintaining a thorough Professional Evaluation and Development Portfolio needed for the chair and/or peers to carry out their rating responsibilities.
- Completing a self-evaluation of the previous year's goals each year and providing the chair with the completed portfolio by September 1 annually.
- Completion of Annual Evaluation Summary.
- Administering the SRI in all classes each semester as required.
- Responding to student perceptions of course content and/or faculty performance in those courses based, in part, on the student rating form.
- Identifying a peer reviewer in years when a peer reviewer chosen by the faculty member is required.
- Cooperating with peers who visit classes. Attempts should be made to have courses evaluated that are representative of the teaching responsibilities.
- Responding to concerns raised by peers.
- Initiating a promotion review process when eligible and ready.

B) Department Chair

The department chair is responsible for
- Fully participating in the evaluation process as a faculty member.
- Assisting the department faculty members in setting reasonable and worthwhile goals.
- Identifying specific department expectations for service to the department.
- Encouraging professional development activities.
- Insuring the administration of the SRI forms.
- Visiting classes as scheduled in the Cycles of Evaluation (Tables 4.1 and 4.2) and at other times as needed.
- Reviewing and rating the department faculty member's portfolio annually according to the professional standards. This includes written justification all ratings.
- Facilitating peer review of portfolios and receiving the rating sheets and comments.
- Reviewing the Annual Evaluation Summary for each faculty member in the department.
- Communicating the results of the evaluation including copies of the peer and chair reviews and the Annual Evaluation Summary to the faculty members and to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs.
- Maintaining permanent department files for each faculty member, including SRI results for all courses, the annual goal-setting sheet the faculty members' self-evaluation, the peer review comments and the Annual Evaluation Summary.
- Assisting the faculty member in development in needed areas.
- Participating in the mid-course review of faculty members with the Vice-president for Academic Affairs.
- Forwarding concerns about any aspect of the evaluation process to the Faculty Policy Committee.

C) Vice-President of Academic Affairs

The Vice-President of Academic Affairs
- Completes the "chair" duties for each department chair related to annual evaluation.
- Sets the SRI administration windows for the academic year by May 1 of the previous academic year in consultation with the FPC.
- Facilitates availability of the SRI forms each semester in a timely manner.
- Instructs new chairs in the evaluation process and assists all chairs in fulfilling their duties.
- Educates new faculty in the evaluation process.
- Shares responsibility with the Department Chairs and the Faculty Policy Committee for establishing and maintaining appropriate professional standards for faculty evaluation.

- Is responsible for reviewing Annual Evaluation Summary and the rating justification for each full-time faculty member.
- Maintains file for each faculty member that includes transcripts, curriculum vitae, SRI forms, and Annual Summary Evaluation Forms.
- Notifies faculty when they are required to initiate mid-course, tenure and septennial reviews.
- Receives recommendations from the Faculty Personnel Board regarding promotion and tenure and forwards his/her recommendation to the President.

D) Director of Institutional Research or Academic Affairs Office Representative

The Director of Institutional Research and Assessment or the designated representative from the Office of Academic Affairs is responsible for:
- Assisting the faculty with the interpretation of SRI results.
- Calculating departmental, divisional, and university-wide SRI averages to assist goal setting and faculty development efforts.
- Assisting chairs with comparing evaluation data.
- Provides Faculty Personnel Board with a statistical analysis of available university-wide SRI scores each fall prior to the promotion/tenure review process.
- Provides Faculty Personnel Board with a statistical analysis of available university-wide Annual Evaluation Summary data each fall prior to the promotion/tenure review process.

E) Peer Evaluators

The role of peer evaluators is to
- Visit classes to which they are assigned as peer reviewers. This includes pre- and post- conferences with the faculty member.
- Review and rate the faculty member's annual portfolio according to the professional standards. This includes written justification for all ratings.
- Completes the rating form (Form D) and returns it to the reviewee and department chair by Sep 20/ Feb 4.
- Midcourse/Septennial /Promotion/Tenure Reviews – Completes the rating form (Form D), writes letter of evaluation, and returns it to the chair of the Faculty Personnel Board.
- Peer evaluators are encouraged to review courses that are representative of the teaching responsibilities of the reviewee (i.e. general education, lower level courses, upper level courses, laboratory courses, hybrid courses, online course management modules)

F) Students

Students use the SRI survey to rate faculty. They should be encouraged to provide free responses to assist the faculty member to improve and enhance the course.

G) Faculty Personnel Board

The Faculty Personnel Board is responsible for
- Selecting peer reviewers as specified.
- Inviting letters at time of promotion and tenure review from the candidate's department colleagues or committee colleagues as appropriate.
- Reviewing all materials submitted for mid-course review and making recommendations regarding progress toward tenure.
- Verifying Annual Evaluation Summary data if necessary.
- Forwarding tenure and promotion recommendations to the Vice-president for Academic Affairs.
- Provide feedback to the Faculty Policy Committee regarding the evaluation process and needed clarifications or changes.

H) Faculty Policy Committee

The Faculty Policy Committee is responsible for
- ❑ Reviewing the evaluation process on a regular cycle and recommending modifications to the Faculty Senate.

8. REBUTTAL OF ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF FACULTY

The only component of the Annual Performance Review that may be refuted is the Department Chair's Evaluation of Faculty Performance, including the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, service, and professional activities.

Faculty evaluations by department chairs must be signed and dated by the faculty member and the department chair at the time of evaluation. The faculty member's signature indicates review of the evaluation only (failure to sign the evaluation by the faculty member could become grounds for disciplinary action). A faculty member who wishes to refute an evaluation by a department chair should follow the procedure outlined below:
- ❑ The faculty member should review and discuss the annual evaluation with the department chair before the evaluation is placed in the personnel file.

- ❑ If the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, the faculty member may write a memorandum of rebuttal or explanation of any parts of the evaluation with which there is disagreement. Within *five working days* of the evaluation conference, he/she should send the memorandum to the department chair with copies to the Vice-president for Academic Affairs.

- ❑ Upon receipt of a memorandum of rebuttal from a faculty member, the department chair will acknowledge receipt in writing.

- ❑ Any changes in the annual evaluation made as a result of either the conference or the faculty member's written rebuttal must be noted in writing by the department chair. This written acknowledgment of change will be appended to the original evaluation and all copies become a part of the evaluation record along with the memorandum of rebuttal.

- ❑ If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the outcome of the rebuttal, then the formal university grievance procedure is followed.

9. CONTENTS OF THE FACULTY PROFESSIONAL PORTFOLIO

Note: Portfolios which are missing content (that the reviewee has control over)will not be reviewed by Faculty Personnel Board. This includes everything below except C. iii and C. iv.

A) General Information

i. Statement of **YOUR** Teaching Philosophy. (This is a personal teaching philosophy)

ii. Curriculum Vitae (Resume) including the following sections:
   a) Name, Address, Phone Number (Home and Office), Email Address
   b) Education
   - Degrees or certifications (list most recent first)
   - Field of study in which the degree or certification was awarded
   - Dates received
   - Universities which issued the degrees
   - Other Professional Credentials (licensures and certifications; dates obtained; most recent first)

c) Teaching Experience
- Professional rank, include the year rank was awarded
- Professional teaching experience prior to coming to Clarke or other professional experience related to teaching (List institutions other than Clarke, dates of employment, most recent first)
- Courses Taught for Clarke (most recent first)
- Other Relevant Professional Experiences (most recent first)

d) Professional Development (last five years)
- Professional Organizations (list all in which you are currently a member)
- Leadership Roles in Professional Organizations
- Publications (include full bibliographic information, list in reverse chronological order)
- Professional Presentations
- Conferences Attended or Organized
- Workshops Attended or Organized
- Performances
- Exhibits
- Awards Received
- Grants Received – include the name of the granting agency, the date of the grant, and a very brief description of the grant
- Sabbaticals (date awarded, brief description of accomplishments)

e) Service (last five years)
- Advising
- Directing Student Projects
- Departmental Service
- University Service (list all committees, subcommittees, task forces, etc.)
- Community Service

B) **Annual Reports**

The following forms from the previous FOUR years must be in the portfolio in reverse chronological order.

i.   Goals and declaration of weights to be used in evaluation (Form A). The goal statement is signed by the department chair or for chairs, by the academic vice-president. Form A for the current year should also be included.

ii. Faculty End-of-Year Activities Report (Form B). This is completed at the end of each academic year. It provides specific documentation of service and professional activities for the year and optionally, any explanation related to meeting the stated goals and/or exemplary rating.

iii. Narrative self-evaluation of the goals for the evaluation year (completed before September 1 of the next year). (Form C)

iv. Copies of the Peer Reviews (Form D) and Chair Reviews (Form E) accumulated during the preceding FOUR annual reviews.

v.   The Annual Evaluation Summary (Form F) for each year. This must be completed by the faculty before Oct 15 each year. Note: Since the Annual Evaluation Summary will be implemented starting the academic year 2016-17, faculty should include their OCRs for previous years.

C) __Self- Assessment and Future Plans.__

The portfolio submitted at the time of Mid-Course/Tenure/Promotion or Septennial Review should include the following materials.

i. A narrative self-assessment of the progress made in developing as a faculty member regarding teaching, professional activities and service during the preceding four years and plans for continued improvement. Note: If the faculty member has not followed the SRI administration process laid out in Section 3E during the review period, the reason should be noted in the self-evaluation.

ii. The letter from the Vice President of Academic Affairs based on the most recent FPB review.

D) __Course Materials.__

Faculty should include materials from TWO courses in this section. The FPB strongly recommends that the courses should be among those visited by peer reviewers during peer review years. In other years, it is recommended that faculty rotate the courses so the chairs do not see the same course every year. If the review process indicates that significant changes were recommended for a previous inclusion, then the revised course must be included. Please provide context for the course materials submitted.

i. Samples of syllabi from two current courses. (selected as above)

ii. Examples demonstrating how you assess student achievement on the expected course outcomes for the same two courses. (test samples, rubrics, paper assignments)

Student samples should NOT be included in this section, only assessment instruments.

iii. No more than three sample items from the following categories:

Instructional support material designed to help student's master concepts and content I.e. study guides, original problem solving sets, concept maps, annotated bibliographies.
Materials demonstrating innovative instruction.
Materials demonstrating integration of knowledge from other disciplines.
Materials demonstrating integration of recent disciplinary trends, findings and value/issues.
Materials demonstrating the use of writing in a course.
Materials demonstrating efforts to incorporate technology into course content. Reference to the URL may be included if any course materials are available on the web.

E) __Professional Materials.__

Materials related to professional development and service should be included in this section. Examples of such materials are listed below.
- Abstracts of published articles (or if appropriate, entire article)
- Copy of front page of a published book (or if appropriate, whole book)
- Copy of poster presented at a research conference.
- Evidence of scholarly or service impact (newspaper article, etc.)

Faculty should not include thank you notes or letters (solicited or unsolicited).

In addition,

The Faculty Personnel Board will obtain all summary sheets from the annual student surveys from the preceding three to four years directly from the Vice President of Academic Affairs office.

The Faculty Personnel Board will invite letters from among any faculty member in the candidate's department, anyone who has taught with the candidate, served with the candidate on a committee or task force, or anyone

who has special knowledge pertaining to the candidate's record in the areas of teaching, professional development and service. Questions to be addressed should include:

        *Does the candidate faithfully attend meetings?

        *Would you describe the candidate as an active participant in meetings?

        *Would you describe the candidate as a "leader"?

        *What do you see as the candidate's strengths, weaknesses?

        *Is there anything else FPB should know about the candidate?

Checklist for Portfolio Content

Note: Portfolios which are missing content (that the reviewee has control over) will not be reviewed by Faculty Personnel Board

Item	Annual Portfolio reviews in Fall following evaluation year	Portfolio at time of mid-course, promotion, tenure or septennial reviews by FPB
Statement of Teaching Philosophy	✓	✓
Curriculum Vitae	✓	✓
Annual Evaluation Agreement (Form A)	✓	✓
Faculty Activities Sheet – Annual End of Year Report (Form B)	✓	✓
Self-Evaluation of Faculty Member (Form C)	✓	✓
Peer Reviews (Form D)		✓
Chair Review (Form E)	✓	✓
Annual Evaluation Summary (Form F)	✓	✓
Self-Narrative		✓
Letter from the Vice President of Academic Affairs based on the most recent FPB review		✓
Course materials: a. Samples of syllabi from two courses (as described in 9 B iii.)	✓	✓
b. Examples demonstrating how you assess student achievement on the expected course outcomes for the same two courses. (as described in 9 B iii.)	✓	✓
c. Supplementary samples (as described in 9 B iii.)	✓	✓
Professional Materials	✓	✓

10. FORMS

Forms A - G

These are Word documents available for download at http://my.clarke.edu/facultystaff/etf/index.htm

http://www.clarke.edu/page.aspx?id=11758

 The comment length is not restricted to the box size shown here.

FORM A. Annual Evaluation Agreement
Evaluation Period : June 1, _____ to May 31, _____.

Faculty member's name: _____
Department: _____

For each role, indicate the agreed value to be assigned based on the assigned teaching and instructional duties as well as the expected and planned activities in each role.

I. TEACHING (50 - 80%)   _____ %
   List several goals or planned activities

II. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES (10-40%)   _____ %
   List several goals or planned activities

III. SERVICE (10%-40%)   _____ %
   List several goals or planned activities

Faculty member's signature: _____Date: _____
Department head's signature: _____Date: _____

FORM B. Faculty Activities Sheet – Annual Report

Academic Year:

Faculty Member:

Department:

I. TEACHING LOAD (Include any independent studies directed.)

1st Semester
Courses: By Number; Title   Credit Hours   Enrollment
a.
b.
c.
d.

2nd Semester
Courses: By Number; Title   Credit Hours   Enrollment
a.
b.
c.
d.

II. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES (SEE ROLE DESCRIPTION)

(Documentation must include dates, places and length of meetings, workshops or performances, standard bibliographic citations for publications, specific information of granting organization, etc.)

Professional Organizations in which you hold memberships and offices currently held:

Meetings attended:

Workshops or courses:

Publications, presentations, exhibits, recitals, etc.:

Grants written or received (granting agency, project title or brief description amount, status)

III. SERVICE ACTIVITIES (SEE ROLE DESCRIPTION)

Department:

University:

Community:

Faculty member's signature: _____Date: _____

FORM C. Self-Evaluation of Faculty Member

Faculty Member: _____

Academic Year: _____

Using the four point rating scale and the standards described in Section 5, rate the faculty member on each of the roles and components.

4 – Exemplary   consistently exceeded the institution's standards of professional performance.
3 - Professional Level   consistently met the institution's standards of professional performance.
2 - Needs Improvement   deficient in one or more criteria, but evidence suggests that satisfactory performance is possible with appropriate professional development and assistance.

1 - Unsatisfactory   did not meet the institution's reasonable and minimal standards compared to other professional faculty within the university, or documentation is not provided by faculty member.

	Rating
Teaching – Content Expertise	
Teaching – Instructional Delivery	
Teaching – Instructional Design	
Course Management	
Professional Activities	
Service	

YOU <u>MUST</u> PROVIDE JUSTIFICATION FOR EACH RATING. PLEASE ADDRESS PROGRESS TOWARDS ANNUAL GOALS.

 (Note: Enlarge these boxes as necessary)

Teaching – Content Expertise

Teaching – Instructional Delivery

Teaching – Instructional Design
Teaching – Course Management
Professional Activities
Service

Signature:

Date:

FORM D. Peer Evaluation of Faculty Member

Faculty Member: _____

Academic Year: _____

Using the four point rating scale and the standards described in Section 5, rate the faculty member on each of the roles and components.

4 – Exemplary   consistently exceeded the institution's standards of professional performance.
3 - Professional Level   consistently met the institution's standards of professional performance.
2 - Needs Improvement   deficient in one or more criteria, but evidence suggests that satisfactory performance is
                        possible with appropriate professional development and assistance.

1 - Unsatisfactory   did not meet the institution's reasonable and minimal standards compared to other
                        professional faculty within the university, or documentation is not provided by faculty.

	Rating
Teaching – Content Expertise	
Teaching – Instructional Delivery	
Teaching – Instructional Design	
Course Management	
Professional Activities	
Service	

YOU <u>MUST</u> PROVIDE JUSTIFICATION FOR EACH RATING. PLEASE ADDRESS PROGRESS TOWARDS ANNUAL GOALS.

Enlarge the boxes as needed.

Teaching – Content Expertise

Teaching – Instructional Delivery

Teaching – Instructional Design
Professional Activities
Service

Signature:

Date:

Return signed copy to the Reviewee and Department Chair of the person evaluated by Sep 20/ Feb 4.

Send signed copy along with a summative evaluation letter to FPB for mid-course, septennial, promotion and tenure by the FPB due date.

FORM E. a) Chair Evaluation of Faculty Member

Faculty Member: _____

Academic Year: _____

Using the four point rating scale and the standards described in Section 5, rate the faculty member on each of the roles and components.

4 – Exemplary   consistently exceeded the institution's standards of professional performance.
3 - Professional Level   consistently met the institution's standards of professional performance.
2 - Needs Improvement   deficient in one or more criteria, but evidence suggests that satisfactory performance is possible with appropriate professional development and assistance.

1 - Unsatisfactory   did not meet the institution's reasonable and minimal standards compared to other professional faculty within the university, or documentation is not provided by faculty member.

	Rating
Teaching – Content Expertise	
Teaching – Instructional Delivery	
Teaching – Instructional Design	
Course Management	
Professional Activities	
Service	

YOU <u>MUST</u> PROVIDE JUSTIFICATION FOR EACH RATING. PLEASE ADDRESS PROGRESS TOWARDS ANNUAL GOALS.

 (Enlarge the boxes as needed.)

Teaching – Content Expertise

Teaching – Instructional Design

Teaching – Course Management
Professional Activities
Service

Signature:

Date:

FORM E. b) Chair Evaluation of Adjunct Faculty Member

Adjunct: _____

Academic Year: _____

Using the four point rating scale and the standards described in Section 5, rate the faculty member on each of the roles and components.

4 – Exemplary   consistently exceeded the institution's standards of professional performance.
3 - Professional Level   consistently met the institution's standards of professional performance.
2 - Needs Improvement   deficient in one or more criteria, but evidence suggests that satisfactory performance is possible with appropriate professional development and assistance.

1 - Unsatisfactory   did not meet the institution's reasonable and minimal standards compared to other professional faculty within the university, or documentation is not provided by faculty member.

	Rating
Teaching – Content Expertise	
Teaching – Instructional Delivery	
Teaching – Instructional Design	
Course Management	

PLEASE PROVIDE COMMENTS FOR EACH SECTION

Teaching – Content Expertise
Teaching – Instructional Delivery
Teaching – Instructional Design
Teaching – Course Management

Signature:
Date:

Form F. Annual Evaluation Summary

Faculty Member: _____   Review Year: _____

Self, Chair and Peer Evaluations (out of 4)

Components	Agreed Weights	Self	Chair	Peer 1*	Peer 2*
Teaching (50-80%)					
Content Expertise					
Instructional Delivery					
Instructional Design					
Course Management					
Professional Activities (10-40%)					
Service (10-40%)					

* if applicable.

Student Evaluations (out of 5)

Courses	No. students enrolled	Summary Evaluation	Progress on Relevant Objectives	Overall Ratings

(Optional Comments: Max 100 words)

Signature:

Date:

FORM G. STATEMENT OF ELIGIBILITY FOR PROMOTION &/or TENURE

☐   I am eligible for tenure review from status of tenure track to tenured.

☐   I am eligible for promotion review from the rank of _____ to the

rank of _____ .

My Graduate Training includes:

     Highest Degree _____ in field _____ .

     From (institution) _____ .

     Date Degree Awarded: _____ .

     My years of Service at Clarke include: Dates: _____ .

     Relevant Experience Elsewhere: Dates: _____ .

My Most Recent Promotion to Current Rank
Rank of _____ Date: _____ .

Faculty Personnel Board will ask your department chair (or a division chair if you are the chair) and one other faculty member to submit a written evaluation of you. You will need to select another faculty member to complete a third written evaluation and this faculty member must give their consent.
Peers for tenure review should be tenured faculty members at Clarke University.
Peers for promotion review should usually be at or above the rank you are seeking and have taught at least one year at Clarke.

The faculty colleague from whom I will seek recommendation (and from whom I have received consent) is:

Date: _____ Signature: _____ .

Form G must be submitted to the FPB Chair by Feb 1

Appendix A. PEER REVIEW

A) RATIONALE FOR PEER EVALUATION

Peer collaboration is a crucial part of evaluation because faculty members have knowledge, expertise and experience that is uniquely theirs, apart from what students and administrators can contribute to instructional improvement. Because faculty best understand the complexities and challenges of classroom performance, they are likely to tolerate teaching idiosyncrasies while still providing valuable support and critical feedback. This peer review necessarily includes both classroom observation and the review of instructional materials and design. The presumption is that even senior faculty can benefit from collaboration with teaching colleagues. A further presumption is that peer evaluation should be a part of both formative and summative review. Classroom performance/observation may refer to both traditional face-to-face as well as online teaching formats.

Formative Peer Evaluation
> Formative peer evaluation is a valuable part of the overall evaluation process because:
> - ❑ It helps faculty learn how to teach more effectively. It gives faculty an opportunity to experiment with new teaching techniques and approaches.
> - ❑ It provides classroom performance feedback from faculty with knowledge and expertise in the same field.
> - ❑ It provides classroom performance feedback from faculty in other fields who have an "outsider's" objective perspective.
> - ❑ It allows instructors to receive coaching from fellow faculty in connection with classroom instruction, syllabi, learning activities, assignments and grading practices.
> - ❑ It helps an instructor identify strengths and weaknesses.

Summative Peer Evaluation
> Summative peer evaluation is a valuable part of the overall evaluation process because:
> - ❑ It provides classroom performance feedback from faculty with knowledge and expertise in the same field.
> - ❑ It provides classroom performance feedback from faculty in other fields who have an "outsider's" objective perspective.
> - ❑ It allows instructors to receive information from faculty and administration in connection with classroom instruction, syllabi, learning activities, and assignments.

B) PEER CLASSROOM VISITATION

When peers are assigned to or volunteer to participate in the review process, they should use the following guidelines in order to make the class visits effective.

Step 1: Pre-observation Conference
Step 2: Classroom Observation
Step 3: Post-observation Conference

Note: In Step 2, Classroom Observation, the reviewer need not respond to all questions listed. Items agreed upon in the Pre-observation Conference will be emphasized.

STEP 1. PRE-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE

The peer observer will review the following guidelines with the instructor before the classroom visit. All of these questions should be addressed so that the reviewer clearly understands the class plan and knows what to look for. Additional questions should be added as appropriate.

- ❑ Briefly, what will be happening in the class I will observe?
- ❑ What are your goals for the class? What do you hope the students will gain from the session?
- ❑ What do you expect the students to do in the class to attain your goals?
- ❑ What can I expect you to do in class? What role will you take? What teaching methods will you use?
- ❑ What have the students been asked to do to prepare for this class?
- ❑ What was done in earlier classes to lead up to this one?
- ❑ Will this class be generally typical of your teaching? If not, what will be different?
- ❑ Is there anything specific on which you would like me to focus during the class?
- ❑ Additional questions?

STEP 2. CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

The peer reviewer should be fully acquainted with the questions listed below before entering the classroom. The reviewer should check off certain items for special consideration, as identified in the pre-observation conference with the instructor. (No reviewer is expected to make all the observations listed below.) Additional criteria should be added as appropriate.

CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE/DELIVERY

1. Knowledge of Field
   - ❑ Does the instructor exhibit knowledge and mastery of the course content?
   - ❑ Is the depth and breadth of material covered appropriate to the level of the course and this group of students?
   - ❑ Does the material covered relate to the syllabus and the goals of the course?
   - ❑ Does the instructor present the origin of ideas and concepts?
   - ❑ Does s/he contrast the implications of various theories?
   - ❑ Does s/he emphasize a conceptual grasp of the material?
   - ❑ Does s/he use examples to clarify abstract concepts?
   - ❑ Does s/he distinguish fact from opinion?
   - ❑ Does s/he present recent developments in the discipline?
   - ❑ Does s/he present divergent points of view?
   - ❑ Is the content presented considered important within the discipline or within related disciplines?
   - ❑ Are connections with other disciplines introduced?
   - ❑ Other Comments:

2. Organization

Introduction
- ❑ Does the instructor provide an overview of the class objectives?
- ❑ Does s/he relate the day's lesson to previous class sessions?
- ❑ Does s/he use an outline on the board or overhead projector?
- ❑ Does s/he provide a "Getting Started" component for online/hybrid courses?
- ❑ Other Comments:

Organization and Clarity
- ❑ Is the sequence of covered content logical?
- ❑ Does s/he demonstrate the relevance of the material to course goals and students' lives?
- ❑ Is the instructor able to present content in a clear and logical manner that is made explicit to students?
- ❑ Does s/he provide transitions from topic to topic, make distinctions between major and minor points, and periodically summarize the most important ideas
- ❑ Does s/he define new concepts and terms?
- ❑ Does s/he use illustrations and examples to clarify difficult ideas?
- ❑ Does s/he use relevant examples to explain major points?
- ❑ Does s/he provide handouts when appropriate?
- ❑ Is there too much or not enough material included in the class session?
- ❑ Is the navigation of the hybrid/online course logical, consistent, and efficient?
- ❑ Other Comments:

Closure
- ❑ Does the instructor summarize and integrate major points of the class session at the end of the period?
- ❑ Does s/he relate the class session to upcoming class sessions or topics?
- ❑ Are assignments presented clearly? Hurriedly or drawn out?
- ❑ Are assignments appropriate to class goals and course level?
- ❑ Other Comments:

3. Presentation Strategies

Verbal Communications
- ❑ Does the instructor use grammatically correct English?
- ❑ Dos s/he use a vocabulary and patterns of speech understandable to students?
- ❑ Can h/er voice be clearly heard?
- ❑ Does s/he raise or lower voice for variety and emphasis?
- ❑ Is the rate of speech appropriate? Too fast or too slow? Appropriate for note taking?
- ❑ Are speech fillers (e.g., "you know" or "in fact") distracting?
- ❑ Does the instructor talk to the class, not to the chalkboard or the ceiling?
- ❑ Is humor used appropriately?
- ❑ Other Comments:

Nonverbal Communications
- ❑ Does the instructor look directly at students?
- ❑ Does s/he scan the class when asking or responding to questions?
- ❑ Does s/he focus on particular students or sides of the room?
- ❑ Do facial and body movements contradict speech or expressed intentions?
- ❑ Does the instructor use facial expressions (such as raised eye brows), body posture (sitting, standing, folding arms), or body motions (proximity to students, clenched fists, pointing) to sustain student's interest?
- ❑ Does s/he respond to student nonverbal cues indicating boredom, curiosity or confusion?
- ❑ Does the instructor exhibit enthusiasm about/passion for the subject matter?
- ❑ Other Comments:

Online Communications
- ❑ Does the instructor interact with the students?
- ❑ Is spelling/grammar accurate (abbreviations may be appropriate)?
- ❑ Is Netiquette followed?
. Classroom Interaction
Engaging Student Interest
- ❑ Does the instructor prepare students for the learning that is to follow by assessing what they know about the topic through use of analogy, a thought-provoking question, a reference to a common experience, etc.?
- ❑ Does s/he exhibit interest in the subject matter?
- ❑ Other Comments:

Introduction to Discussion
- ❑ How is discussion initiated?
- ❑ Are the purposes and guidelines clear to students?
- ❑ Does the instructor encourage student involvement?
- ❑ Are students addressed by name?
- ❑ Does the instructor model his/her expectations?
- ❑ Other Comments:

Use of Questions
- ❑ Are questions rhetorical or real? One at a time or multiple?
- ❑ Does the instructor use centering questions (to refocus students' attention on a particular topic), probing questions (to monitor students understanding and to require students to go beyond a superficial or incomplete answer), or follow-up questions (to ask for clarification or agreement from others in the class)?
- ❑ Other Comments:

Level of Questions
- ❑ What level of questions does the instructor ask? (Lower-level questions usually have a fixed or "right" answer while higher-level questions require students to compare, contrast, analyze.)
- ❑ Other Comments:

What Is Done With Student Questions/Responses?
- ❑ Are questions answered in a direct and understandable manner?
- ❑ Are questions answered politely and enthusiastically?
- ❑ How long does the instructor pause for student responses? (Formulating answers to difficult questions takes a few minutes.)
- ❑ Does s/he use verbal reinforcement?
- ❑ Does s/he use nonverbal responses (*e.g.,* smile, nod, puzzled look)?
- ❑ Does s/he repeat questions when necessary so the entire class can hear?
- ❑ Is s/he receptive to student suggestions or viewpoints contrary to h/er own?
- ❑ Does s/he connect responses to class goals?
- ❑ Other Comments:

Facilitation Skills
- ❑ Does the instructor appropriately introduce activities to the class?
- ❑ Does s/he link activities to previous/subsequent class activities?
- ❑ Does s/he intervene during an activity only when appropriate?
- ❑ Does s/he adapt instruction or terminate activities when necessary?
- ❑ Are activities linked to relevant course objectives?
- ❑ Does the instructor initiate discussion or review at the conclusion of an activity?
- ❑ Hybrid/online: Is an opportunity for online community provided (*e.g.,* discussions, peer review, introduction of students)?
- ❑ Other Comments:

5. Instructional Materials and Design
   - ❑ Are the instructor's teaching methods appropriate for the goals of the class?
   - ❑ Is s/he able to vary the pattern of instruction through movement around the class, gestures, voice level, tone, and pace?
   - ❑ Doess/he use a variety of methods such as media, discussion, lectures, questions, case studies, etc.?
   - ❑ Are groups and group dynamics structured effectively?
   - ❑ Are visual aids effective? Are they clear and well organized?
   - ❑ If appropriate, does s/he use students' work (writing assignments, homework assignments, etc.)?
   - ❑ Are the various teaching strategies effectively integrated?
   - ❑ Does the instructor use instructional materials that actively engage the students?
   - ❑ Other Comments:

6. Classroom Management
   - ❑ Does the instructor arrive on time and hold class for the assigned time?
   - ❑ Does s/he make effective use of time?
   - ❑ Is the room arrangement workable?
   - ❑ Does s/he maintain a comfortable and safe learning environment?
   - ❑ Does s/he treat all students respectfully, equitably and fairly?
   - ❑ Does s/he respond to both individual and group needs?
   - ❑ Does s/he handle disruptive or dominating students effectively?
   - ❑ Hybrid/Online: Is the instructor consistently present online?
   - ❑ Other Comments:

7. Students' and Instructor's Attitudes and Behaviors

   Before Class
   - ❑ Do students arrive noticeably early or late?
   - ❑ Do they talk to each other?
   - ❑ Do they prepare for class? Take out books and notebooks?
   - ❑ What does the instructor do before class (write on board, encourage informal discussion with students, sit behind the desk)?
   - ❑ Other Comments:

   During Class
   - ❑ What are the note taking patterns in the class? (Do students take few notes, write down everything, write down what instructor puts on the board, lean over to copy others' notes in order to keep up?)
   - ❑ Are students attentive and actively involved until the class session ends?
   - ❑ Do students listen or talk when other students or the instructor are involved in discussion?
   - ❑ Are students actively engaged during group activities?
   - ❑ Other Comments:

   After Class
   - ❑ What happens after class? Are there informal discussions among students or between the instructor and students after class?
   - ❑ Other Comments:

STEP 3. POST-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE

The peer reviewer should meet with the instructor promptly after the classroom observation session and address the following questions, plus any additional questions agreed upon during the pre-observation conference.

- ❏ In general, how do you think the class went?
- ❏ What do you think about your teaching during the class?
- ❏ Did students accomplish the goals you had planned for the class?
- ❏ Is there anything that worked well for you in class today--that you particularly liked? Does it usually go well?
- ❏ Is there anything that did not work well--that you disliked about the way the class went? What could you do next time to address/avoid this?
- ❏ What were your teaching strengths? Did you notice anything you improved or any personal goals you met?
- ❏ What were the weaknesses in your teaching or areas that still need improvement?
- ❏ Do you have any ideas or strategies for improvement?
- ❏ Additional questions?

Appendix B STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

Clarke University will use the Student Ratings of Instruction (SRI) developed by IDEA (Individual Development and Educational Assistance). IDEA was established in 1975 and extensive research has been done in the development of SRI forms.

Information about IDEA and the Student Ratings of Instruction are provided at the following website: http://ideaedu.org/services/student-ratings-of-instruction/.

More specific information about the use of the diagnostic tool can be gleaned at http://ideaedu.org/services/student-ratings-of-instruction/diagnostic-feedback/.

The office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) is in charge of administration of the SRIs in consultation with the Faculty Policy Committee (FPC) as described below.

A) TIMELINE
The VPAA will consult with the FPC in April to decide on the windows for SRI administration for the following academic year. These timeframes will be communicated to all the faculty.
- The SRIs will be open for 10 – 14 days for full semester courses and 4 – 5 days for eight week courses.
- The Objective Selection Forms (OSF) will be filled out in the week preceding the administration window.
- Tenured faculty will communicate with the VPAA or the person designated by the VPAA if they are NOT administering student evaluations in a course. Those courses will not appear during the administration window.
- The office of the VPAA is responsible for all communication with IDEA and setting up the administration of the SRIs.
- The results of the SRIs will be available to the faculty after grades are posted.

B) Completing the Objective Selection Form
Faculty will select those course objectives important for the course being evaluated. Since the IDEA scores are dependent upon correct identification of course objectives, it is the responsibility of the faculty to ensure the forms are filled out before the administration window. Faculty will have the opportunity to add additional questions to the instrument to obtain feedback specific to their course.
The VPAA's office will communicate with the faculty so that OSFs are filled out in a timely fashion.
Tenured faculty who have chosen not to administer SRIs for a particular course will not have to fill out the OSF for that course.

C) Administering the SRIs
In order to ensure the validity and reliability of student evaluations, it is important that students take the instrument seriously and feel free to provide accurate feedback.
- Faculty must set aside time in their courses for administering the SRIs. It is recommended that 15 minutes be set aside at the beginning or end of class time.
- Faculty must ensure that adequate technology is available to all students to fill out the SRIs. Smartphones are sufficient if computer/tablet access is an issue.
- The faculty member being evaluated should NOT be in the classroom during the SRI administration. The faculty can ask a colleague or a student proctor to monitor the classroom and let the faculty know when they could come back into the classroom.

D) Confidentiality of Feedback
The results of the SRIs will be available to the faculty after grades are posted. Faculty will receive full feedback including student comments and analysis for additional questions they may have added to the instrument.
The Chair of the department, the FPB and the VPAA will receive the overall statistics and aggregate numbers for the course. They will NOT receive any student comments or data from additional questions the faculty may have added.