

FACULTY AND COURSE EVALUATION: PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES

(Faculty Approval: May 10, 1994; Revised: May 9, 2000)

PART I: FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Faculty evaluation procedures must be guided by four boundary conditions. First, the 1977 Document (see Section 2 of the *Faculty Handbook*, Part III; section A: Item 2) directs that the "Retention Criteria" serve as the criteria used for evaluations, promotions and salary determinations. Two of these criteria (more appropriately termed "dimensions" in this evaluation context) pertain to "experience" and "credentials" and do not bear directly on an annual evaluation of faculty performance. Another dimension centers on the administrative effectiveness of department chairs and also can be removed as a consideration. Thus, six dimensions are salient for evaluation: (1) Performance in Teaching, (2) Continuing Scholarship, (3) General Cooperation with Faculty and Administration, (4) Participation in College Life, (5) Participation and Performance on Faculty Committees, and (6) Participation in Community Life.

Second, these dimensions are not to be given equal weight in evaluations: The first four are to be accorded more importance (see Part II: item 4). Other than this general directive, relative weight assignments are not specified. Third, other faculty responsibilities appear in the *Faculty Handbook* (see Section 1.6a) and must be evaluated. Fourth, The Department Chair is the person responsible for providing an evaluation of each faculty member within that unit (see Section 1.5a).

(i) Faculty Evaluations at Catawba: Purpose and Uses

The purposes of faculty evaluations at Catawba are to assess, gauge, enhance and document the professional performance and contributions of each faculty to the College community. The two uses made of faculty evaluation outcomes at Catawba include: Professional development (e.g., feedback to improve pedagogy, setting of professional goals, reviews of accomplishments) and professional reward (e.g., salary increases, retention, tenure, and promotion).

(ii) Dimensions for Faculty Evaluation at Catawba

All faculty at Catawba College will be evaluated along the six dimensions of faculty evaluation that appear in the 1977 Document. These dimensions (described more completely in Part II, section A: item 3) are included within the Evaluation Form used by department chairs (available from the Dean's Office). A department has the option of tailoring specific features that define each dimension to be consistent with the mission of that department. For example, specific features to "Continuing Scholarship" or "Constructive Participation in Community Life" likely will vary among departments. Both quantitative and qualitative assessment indices can be provided in support of an evaluation of any dimension.

(iii) Descriptors and Descriptor Loadings Used to Effect Evaluations

Each department chair will evaluate each faculty member on each of the six dimensions using one of five descriptors given at the side. Specific performance referents for descriptors are not given so the departments can determine their own criteria for "At Standard" performance within that unit (which, as noted above, likely will vary among departments). All evaluation ratings must be accompanied by supportive descriptions by the Department Chair.

Descriptor	Descriptor Load
Excellent	5
Above Standard	4
At Standard	3
Below Standard	2
Unsatisfactory	1

(iv) Quantifying the Faculty Evaluation

Once a dimension has been assigned an evaluative descriptor by the department chair, the corresponding "descriptor load" will be multiplied by the weight assigned to that dimension as given on the Evaluation Form. These weights correspond to the percent-

allocations given below. The sum of these products is the quantitative index to the aggregate faculty evaluation for that academic year.

Dimension	Weight

a. Performance in Teaching.....	50%
An aggregate evaluation based on separate assessments of:	
Student evaluations.....	40%
Department Chair evaluation.....	40%
Faculty member's self report.....	20%
b. Continuing Scholarship.....	25%
c. Institutional Service.....	25%
(To include: reasonable cooperation with faculty and administration, constructive participation in College life, participation and performance on faculty committees, constructive participation in community life, administrative service, external representation of the College, non-academic advising duties, and/or other evidence of performance.)	

	Total: 100%

The various "routine procedures, policies and practices" under which faculty are to operate (described above in Item c) are subsumed as elements of the "Institutional Service" Dimension.

(v) Procedures to be Followed in Effecting A Faculty Evaluation

The faculty evaluation procedures will be completed before the end of the academic term in May and will encompass the expiring academic term, i.e., August-to-May (and any pertinent activities from the summer months prior to the term). Documentation pertinent to a faculty evaluation (e.g., the "Faculty Professional Activities Report" which will include the "self report," summaries of student evaluations of courses) will be received by the department chair no later than the study day prior to the final exam period for the Spring term.

The department chair will (1) effect the evaluation, (2) provide the completed evaluation to the faculty member and obtain a signature acknowledging review of the evaluation form, and (3) file the evaluation with the Dean of the College before the end of the May contract period. A faculty member can submit a supplemental letter to the Dean in which an aspect of the department chair's evaluation is protested.

(vi) Procedures to be Followed in Effecting Student Evaluations of Courses

Students perform their evaluation of courses on-line during the week before and after study day. A faculty member and her/his department chair can access the tabulated summaries beginning the day after the students' evaluation period closes.

PART II: EVALUATING TEACHING PERFORMANCES

(i) Documenting Excellence in Teaching

Given that teaching responsibilities are the primary but not the sole duty of a faculty member the purposes of an evaluation of excellence in teaching are:

1. To have the means to value the teaching component of the faculty's responsibility and
2. To have a means for faculty to monitor the quality of their own teaching.

Because the primary responsibility of a faculty member is to engage in quality teaching, at least half of any aggregate faculty evaluation value will be based on indices of teaching excellence. A number of commonly-recognized products of good teaching are available as indices, including (but not limited to) the following:

- * Students' scores on teacher-made or standardized tests.
- * Student laboratory workbooks and other kinds of workbooks or logs.
- * Student essays, creative work and project or field-work reports.
- * Publications by students on course-related work.
- * A record of students who select and succeed in advanced courses in the field.
- * A record of students who elect another course with the same professor.
- * Evidence of effective supervision of honors or masters' theses.
- * Setting up or running a successful internship program.
- * Evidence of the effect of courses on a student career choice.
- * Evidence of help given by the professor to students in securing employment.
- * Evidence of help given to colleagues on teaching improvement.

No one single source can index these products of good teaching, so three information sources (or means) will be called upon to yield an evaluation of teaching, and each is illustrated below:

- * Student evaluation of courses,
- * Evaluation of teaching by the department chair, and
- * A self report by the faculty member

(ii) Means for Obtaining Indices of Good Teaching Criteria

1. Student Sources (load = 40%). The primary basis for student inputs into the teaching evaluation process is their responses to course evaluations. These student course and teaching evaluation data suggest improvements and/or produce an overall rating of effectiveness or satisfaction. However, these formal assessments can be supplemented by other student inputs such as:

- * Written comments from a student committee to evaluate courses and provide feedback.
- * Unstructured (and possibly unsolicited) written evaluations by students, including written comments on exams and letters received after a course has been completed.
- * Documented reports of satisfaction with out-of-class contacts.
- * Interview data collected from students after completion of a course.
- * Honors received from students, e.g., selected "Teacher of the Year."

2. From the Department Chair (load = 20%). The general evaluation of a faculty member that submitted by a unit head MUST include an assessment of teaching that is based on information obtained in addition to what is gleaned from the formal student evaluations. These alternate sources might include:

- * Direct observations of teaching by the unit head.
- * Statements from colleagues who have observed teaching, either as members of a teaching team or as independent observers of a particular course, or who teach other sections of the same course.
- * Written comments from those who teach courses for which a particular course is a prerequisite.
- * Evaluation of contributions to course development and improvement.
- * Statements from colleagues from other institutions on such matters as how well students have been prepared for graduate studies.
- * Honors or recognition, e.g., a distinguished teacher award, or election to a committee on teaching.
- * Requests for advice or acknowledgement of advice received by a committee on teaching or similar body.

3. Faculty Member Self Report (load = 20%). Each faculty member will contribute to the evaluation process by submitting information about each of two broad but important dimensions to teaching. This self report provides the faculty member an opportunity to give information about her/his service in teaching that otherwise might escape attention.

- a. Descriptive material on current and recent teaching responsibilities and

- P 7. My instructor helped to clarify and explain through the effective use of examples, illustrations and clear summaries.
- O 8. My instructor is readily available for consultation.
- O 9. I understand what is expected of me in this course.
- O 10. Examinations reflected important aspects of this course.
- O 11. Graded work (e.g., presentations, projects, assignments) reflected important aspects of this course.
- O 12. The grading system was clearly defined and explained.
- O 13. Exams and papers were graded and reported in a reasonable amount of time.
- O 14. Overall, this course was well designed.
- O 15. Overall, this person was an effective instructor.

=====