FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, 2019-2020 -- Annual Report

1	Lisa Yount, Chair	CLASS	2018-2020
2	Shinaz Jindani	CLASS	2018-2020
3	Katherine Stewart	CLASS	2019-2021
4	Jordan Dominy	CLASS	2019-2021
5	Guan Jun Wang*	COBA	2018-2020
6	Yonpae Park*	COBA	2019-2021
7	Inessa Korovyakovskaya*	COBA	2019-2021
8	Tara Cox	COST	2018-2020
9	George Tessema	COST	2018-2020
10	Sujin Kim	COST	2019-2021
11	Pascal Binda	COST	2019-2021
12	Kisha Aites	COE	2019-2021

*COBA Dean Mujumdar confirmed these members 4/17/20 (there had been a miscommunication to Faculty Senate about the COBA reps previously)[1]

Evaluation Sub-committee of the Faculty Affairs Committee

The Evaluation Committee is a subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee. Its functions are to oversee evaluation processes and procedures for the faculty. (1.8.2.4)

https://www.savannahstate.edu/faculty-senate/documents/faculty-handbook-approved-by-senate-and-president-april-2019.pdf

The subcommittee is charged with:
- ✓ Developing and reviewing evaluation tools for the annual evaluation of faculty (Sections 2.8.3 and 2.8.4 and Board of Regents' Policy, Section 8.3.5). In particular, oversight/revisions to:

    i. Annual Faculty Evaluation instrument (2.8.2, 2.8.3)

        - to reflect alignment with the updated criteria in the current SSU Faculty Handbook (2019)
        - to include measurements that correspond to the workload matrix "tracks" (teaching, service, research) included in the SSU Faculty Handbook (2.8.1)
        - to include supervisor scores as well as self-evaluation scores
        - to include supervisor rating of teaching observation
        - to include updated items from Student Evaluation of Teaching instrument

        Annual Faculty Evaluation Instrument Working Group:

1	Tara Cox, convener	COST
2	Pascal Binda	COST
3	Guan Jun Wang	COBA
4	Katherine Stewart	CLASS
5	Lisa Yount	CLASS
6	Pedro Rivera*	CLASS

        *Non-Faculty Affairs member

ii. Peer/Supervisor Evaluation of Teaching instrument (2.8.2, 2.8.3)

- to be reframed as a developmental feedback form
- to include review of instructional materials/learning goals and outcomes as well as classroom observation or online course delivery observation
- to incorporate post-observation discussion and reflection

Peer/Supervisor Observation Instrument Working Group:

1	Kisha Aites, convener	COE
2	Shinaz Jindani	CLASS
3	Lisa Yount	CLASS
4	Inessa Korovyakovskaya	COBA
5	George Tessema	COST

iii. Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (2.8.2, 2.8.4)

- to reflect best practices of measurement, in alignment with other USG institutions (e.g., shorten number of items, framing of questions to provide useful, actionable feedback, etc.)
- to require student suggestions for improvement on negatively scored items
- to establish reasonable baseline expectations for response rates, as well as appropriate methodologies for securing student participation
- to incorporate a faculty response for use of results; explanation of context; etc.
- to properly weight this element in faculty evaluation, reflective of the literature on the perils associated with student bias, overall effectiveness, etc.

Student Evaluation of Teaching Instrument Working Group:

1	Lisa Yount, convener	CLASS
2	Jordan Dominy	CLASS
3	Sujin Kim	COST
4	Yonpae Park	COBA
5	David Simmonds*	COBA

*Non-Faculty Affairs member

Tasks Accomplished:

Tasks	Notes
✓ Reviewed/approved recommendations on policy for Altering Student Evaluation of Teaching during COVID-19 ✓ Reviewed the Proposed Instrument for Observation of Remote Teaching (for limited use during Spring 2020)	✓ With a majority of the quorum affirming these two items by 10am on 4/6/20, we sent them to Academic Affairs and circulated to the faculty senators on 4/6/20
✓ Secured approval from Senate on Proposed Instrument for Observation of Remote Teaching ✓ Secured approval from Senate on Motion to Alter Student Evaluation of Teaching during COVID-19	✓ Approved documents included in Appendix A
✓ Confirmed duties and responsibilities of work group members in further evaluation instrument revisions	✓ Conveners reported duties and responsibilities for work group members in Teams
✓ Work groups reviewed reference materials in Teams	
✓ Groups worked on duties and responsibilities ✓ Crafted instrument drafts and rationales for decision-making on the instruments (reflective of the literature/resources)	
✓ Turned in finalized materials to conveners	✓ Conveners posted materials in Teams
✓ Committee members attended WebEx meeting to discuss/approve Student Evaluation of Teaching revisions	✓ Members reviewed the materials in Teams to prepare for the WebEx meeting ✓ Faculty who could not attend sent feedback to the convener before the WebEx meeting
✓ Committee members attended WebEx meeting to discuss/approve Peer/Supervisor Observation of Teaching revisions	✓ Members reviewed the materials in Teams to prepare for the WebEx meeting ✓ Faculty who could not attend sent feedback to the convener before the WebEx meeting
✓ Committee members attended WebEx meeting to discuss/approve Annual Faculty Evaluation Instrument revisions	✓ Members reviewed the materials in Teams to prepare for the WebEx meeting ✓ Faculty who could not attend sent feedback to the convener before the WebEx meeting
✓ Sent copies of all revised evaluation instruments and rationales to faculty/senators/AA/deans/department chairs for review	✓ Sent a feedback link to along with the materials
✓ Secured approval from Senate on proposed revisions to evaluation instruments on 5/5/20	✓ All approved materials are included in Appendix B

Recommendations for assessing the effectiveness and need for refinements to the instruments and/or processes:

- **Per the SSU Faculty Handbook (see sections 2.8.3 and 2.8.4), evaluation instruments are to be reviewed by the Faculty Affairs committee every three years. This would indicate that during the 2022-2023 academic year, the committee should conduct a process for this review. Any revisions should be presented for Faculty Senate approval to begin during the 2023-2024 academic year.**
- **To facilitate this review, the committee should seek annual feedback about the review process and instruments from stakeholders during May 2021 and May 2022 and provide those compiled responses to the AY22-23 committee members.**

[1]There was an irregularity with COBA representation this year, in that the college put forward six representatives for AY2019-2020. As a reminder, COBA can only have three reps on the Faculty Affairs committee in a given academic year. As a corrective, Drs. Wang, Park, and Korovyakovskaya were called upon to participate in Faculty Affairs matters during spring 2020 (a blend of reps from both election cycles—2018-2020; 2019-2021). Moving forward to AY 20-21, this issue of too many COBA reps corrects itself; however, it is recommended that the college staggers their reps so that all three don't roll on or roll off at the same time. Currently, they will have this circumstance in spring 2021 unless a change is made (see below*).

VACANCIES FOR FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, 2020-2021

1	Vacancy	CLASS	2020-2022
2	Vacancy	CLASS	2020-2022
3	Katherine Stewart	CLASS	2019-2021
4	Jordan Dominy	CLASS	2019-2021
5	Ulysses Brown	COBA	2019-2021*
6	Yonpae Park	COBA	2019-2021*
7	Inessa Korovyakovskaya	COBA	2019-2021*
8	Vacancy	COST	2020-2022
9	Vacancy	COST	2020-2022
10	Sujin Kim	COST	2019-2021
11	Pascal Binda	COST	2019-2021
12	Kisha Aites	COE	2019-2021

Appendix A

I. **Faculty Affairs Committee Recommendations on Faculty Evaluation During COVID-19 (Approved 4/8/2020)**

II. **Faculty Affairs Committee Recommendations on Student Evaluations of Teaching During Significant Disruptions (Approved 4/8/2020)**

III. **Faculty Affairs Committee Recommendations on Remote Teaching Observations (Approved 4/8/2020)**

IV. **Remote Teaching Observation Form & Remote Teaching Observation Navigator, Spring 2020 (Approved 4/8/2020)**

Overview of Recommendations for Spring 2020:

1. The institution should not engage students in typical course evaluations, but should instead implement a feedback process for faculty and students regarding remote instruction, allowing the institution to maximize development and improvement in the remote teaching arena. This would apply to full-term and second mini-mester courses for Spring 2020.

2. The institution should not use Spring 2020 data from students for the purposes of annual review or promotion and tenure decisions (although leveraging positive feedback for faculty portfolios is permissible). This would apply to full-term and second mini-mester courses for Spring 2020.

3. The institution should utilize a remote teaching observation tool that is equivalent in kind to the tool used to observe a face to face classroom setting. The focus and expectation should be limited to the remote teaching context (as opposed to an intentionally designed online course), and should not exceed the scope of examining one learning unit and relevant activities in support of that unit (equivalent to on class presentation's worth of material). This is for faculty that were not observed in the classroom setting before Spring Break.

Faculty Affairs Committee Recommendations on Student Evaluations of Teaching During Significant Disruptions

Approved by Faculty Senate on 4/8/2020

The purpose of this document[1] is to offer guidance on the subject of course evaluation practices for the current (Spring 2020) semester. The Faculty Affairs committee of the Savannah State University Faculty Senate strongly recommends that the administration *not* engage students in typical course evaluations, but instead implement a feedback process for faculty and students discussed below. In addition, we urge the administration to avoid using Spring 2020 data from students for the purposes of annual review or promotion and tenure decisions (although leveraging positive feedback is non-problematic).

This is congruent with SACSCOC's recent COVID-19 statement: ""If an exception to institutional policies is required due to the current crisis, it is expected that exceptions will be aligned with good educational practice, done in consultation with faculty, and are limited in scope."[2]

Key Points to Consider

- **Student evaluations of teaching are best used in the context of comparisons over time,** for the same instructor teaching the same course. They capture the effect of changes to a course and for the instructor, on student perspectives and experience in the course. With the significant shift to remote instruction for the final part of the semester, it is difficult to interpret student evaluations of teaching in this compare-and-contrast manner. As a result, typical tools for student evaluation of teaching are not a particularly useful way to evaluate teaching effectiveness in present circumstances.

- We recommend **a mindset shift from "evaluation of teaching" to "gathering feedback"** – particularly for the Spring 2020 semester. The University should focus on finding out about student and instructor experiences as a way to inform future actions and decision-making (for both unit leadership and for individual instructors).

- **Student bias** on student evaluations of teaching is a well-studied phenomenon. **During this time of heightened emotional and mental stress, we can expect this type of bias to increase.** An adapted student feedback on teaching tool, should include the following statement:

  > *"Student evaluations of teaching play an important role in the review of faculty. Your opinions influence the review of instructors that takes place every year. We recognize that student evaluations of teaching are often influenced by students' unconscious and unintentional biases about the personal characteristics of the instructor. Further, the added stress and disruption caused by our move to remote instruction may further enhance this unintended bias.*

  > *As you fill out this course evaluation, please focus on the quality of instruction and the content of the course, while generously assuming that your instructor has done what they can during these unusual weeks."*

- One of the challenges faced by student evaluations of teaching is the simple fact that **more recent events tend to play a more significant role in their ratings of instruction**, and it is difficult to take a longer term view of things. As a result, it is likely that students asked to evaluate their experience in a course this semester will almost surely provide feedback that is highly informed by their experience during this segment of the semester even if prompted to focus on the first part of the semester. As a result, student feedback on teaching should be interpreted very carefully.

Please continue reading for recommended alternatives to traditional student evaluations of teaching.

---

[1] This recommendation is adapted with permission from a brief circulated by University of Georgia's Center for Teaching and Learning, https://ctl.uga.edu/.
[2] https://sacscoc.org/app/uploads/2020/03/SACSCOC-Flexibilities-Policy-regarding-COVID-19.pdf

Alternatives to Traditional Student Evaluations

Instructor Self-Reflection & Reporting

Instructor reflection on their teaching is a good practice to encourage every semester, and it can be particularly useful after significant changes have been made to a course. In addition to contributing to iterative course development, this reflection on teaching practices can help individuals become more aware of their development as an instructor. Given the larger scale disruption to instruction experienced this semester, it may also be useful to ask instructors in your unit for specific feedback to help inform your approach to key courses during the next academic year.

Below are five questions we could have instructors to answer as part of the annual performance evaluation:

1. What did I do as an instructor to reduce student apprehension and anxiety during this time of disruption? What might I do more of next time?

2. Which course modifications were most/least successful in terms of my ability to:
   a. maintain student engagement in their learning?
   b. effectively identify student progress and barriers to learning along the way?
   c. effectively assess student learning for their final grade?

   What (specifically) worked well?

3. What unexpected student/instructor needs did I encounter? What did I learn from those experiences?

4. What (if anything) might I do differently in the future to build flexibility into my course, in case of other (hopefully less significant) disruptions to my teaching?

5. Given my students' experience in my course this semester, what adjustments or special considerations should be made for AY2020-21 courses? For example, is there an anticipated impact on student readiness for the next course in a specific sequence?

This data could be shared as an opportunity to reflect as a group and to facilitate the sharing of ideas and best practices among faculty.

End-of-Semester Student Feedback

In soliciting feedback from students about experiences with learning in their courses, we recommend asking students to provide examples of what they consider to have been best practices from instructors during the remote-instruction portion of the semester. A list of questions for university-wide collection of student feedback will be developed and administered through the Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness link on the SSU website homepage, in replacement of the previous instrument. Once collected, these student responses should be shared with program/department faculty in order to cultivate conversation around improved practices for the future.

Three questions to pose to students to gather actionable feedback for improvement:

1. What positive strategies or approaches did your instructor use to assist your learning during the transfer to remote instruction in spring 2020?

2. In the remote (online) version of this course, what should your instructor

   (a) keep? (b) add? (c) revise?

3. What additional comments would be helpful to share with your instructor?

Need:

- to provide an instrument to conduct a teaching observation equivalent to a face to face classroom observation in the remote setting

Constraints:

- remote teaching is not the same as online instruction and should be reviewed differently than online instruction[1]

- the scope of evaluation should be limited to teaching materials related to one learning unit (on par with material delivered in a single class setting); materials can be synchronous, asynchronous, or a combination of the two

- faculty to be observed must submit the Remote Teaching Observation Navigator form to the observer before the review

- the observer should use the "Non-Applicable" rating on the items on the Remote Teaching Observation instrument, when necessary, to acknowledge the likely challenges in demonstrating all items in the remote teaching environment and/or the necessary gaps between teaching in the face to face classroom versus remotely. Items marked with this rating are not figured in any overall average score.

---

[1] See "The Difference Between Emergency Remote Teaching and Online Learning," https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning.

![Savannah State University logo]

Department of
REMOTE TEACHING OBSERVATION FORM

Instructor: _____   Course/CRN: _____

Observer: _____   Semester: _____   Date/Time: _____

Directions: Rate the instructor on each item, giving the highest scores for unusually effective performances.
Place in the space before each statement the number that reflects your rating.

Not Evident	Developing	Nearing Proficiency	Proficient	Exceeding Proficiency	Mastery	Not Applicable
0	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

_____ Objectives for this activity were made clear to students.

_____ Activity was well planned and organized.

_____ Delivery style was appropriate and effective.

_____ Relevant examples, metaphors and analogies were used to establish connections with students'
experience and learning.

_____ Students had enough time to successfully engage in the activity.

_____ Critical thinking and analysis were modeled and encouraged.

_____ Instructional techniques required a majority of students to be actively involved.

_____ Respect for diverse opinions was communicated.

_____ Warm and accepting atmosphere was evident.

_____ Instructor interest in student learning was communicated.

_____ Instructor mastery of subject matter was clear and thorough.

_____ Appropriate and effective use was made of instructional technology to support activity objectives.

_____ Related easily with students.

_____ Integrated information from other areas within and outside of her/his discipline.

_____ Displayed empathy or provided accommodations to support students.

_____ Demonstrated enthusiasm for teaching and learning.

_____ Discovered student misunderstandings and misconceptions.

_____ Students were engaged to what was happening in the class activity.

Date of Feedback with Instructor: _____

Instructor Comments: Observer Comments:

_____   _____
Signature of Instructor/Date   Signature of Observer/Date

Remote Teaching Observation Navigator (Spring 2020)

This form is to be completed by faculty being observed in the Remote Teaching setting and provided to the observer prior to the review.

Observation in the remote teaching context is purposefully distinguished from criteria applied to courses that are intentionally designed for online delivery. Observation in the remote teaching context should not exceed the scope of examining one learning unit and relevant activities/materials in support of that unit.

After reviewing the items included on the Remote Teaching Observation instrument, faculty should identify the following:

1. Faculty Member's Name_____

2. Course (Prefix, Name, CRN)_____

3. Brief Description of the Learning Unit Topic (not to exceed the equivalence of one face to face class presentation's worth of material)

[OVER]

Description of Activity or Learning Materials	Location in D2L / link to follow to access the element	Notes/Additional Details

Appendix B

  I. Faculty Affairs Committee Recommendations on Supervisor & Peer Observations of Teaching (Approved 5/5/2020)

  II. Faculty Affairs Committee Recommendations on Student Evaluations of Teaching (Approved 5/5/2020)

 III. Faculty Affairs Committee Recommendations on the Annual Faculty Evaluation Instrument (Approved 5/5/2020)

IV. Annual Faculty Evaluation Instrument (Approved 5/5/2020)
    Tab 1: Instrument Guidelines and Instructions
    Tab 2: Faculty Load Ratios (SSU Faculty Handbook)
    Tab 3: Evaluation Instrument

Faculty Affairs Committee Recommendations on Supervisor & Peer Observations of Teaching

Approved May 5, 2020

Teaching observations are an important source of data for evaluating effective teaching; however, documentation of teaching quality should be holistic and based on multiple sources of data (see the SSU Faculty Handbook for other relevant categories). The data gathered from observation of teaching practices should be grounded in evidence-based strategies that enhance student learning, and should be focused on observable teaching behaviors, understood in common language and criteria. Thus, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate makes the following recommendations to improve the process of teaching observation, to be implemented beginning fall 2020.

Specific Recommendations of the Committee:

1) To provide proper emphasis on the developmental nature of teaching observations, as a measure of continuous improvement for faculty development, we recommend that both the supervisor and peer observation process include a pre-observation consultation; the observation of teaching itself; and a post-observation debriefing.
2) We recommend the practice of having department chairs conduct observations throughout the academic year, beginning after the midterm period, to accommodate the improved observation process. A faculty's peer observation should ideally occur during the opposite semester as the supervisor's observation.
3) Because reflection is essential to improved practice, we recommend that evaluations of teaching should be qualitatively driven, wherein justifications undergird any quantitative ratings.
4) We recommend the use of the documents in appendices I-IV below to implement these revisions to the peer observation of teaching process.

Background

For evaluative observations, it is especially important to use common standards and expectations to increase the fairness of reviews.[1] The Critical Teaching Behaviors framework (see Appendix I) is a helpful basis for establishing these foundations. To maximize an emphasis on development and improvement, instructors should have a chance to self-assess, receive feedback, and reflect on appropriate professional development goals related to teaching. Other best practices in teaching observation conceive of the exchange as an iterative, supportive, and collaborative cycle.[2]

---

[1]See Lauren Barbeau and Claudio Cornejo Happel, *Critical Teaching Behaviors*, 2020. https://static.sched.com/hosted_files/sotlcommonsconference2020/2b/CTB%20Peer%20Teaching%20Observation%20Introduction.pdf

[2]See *Peer Observation, Feedback and Reflection: A Practical Guide for Teachers.* https://www.education.vic.gov.au/Documents/school/teachers/teachingresources/practice/Peer_observation_feedback_and_reflection_practical_guide_for_teachers.pdf

The Cycle of Teaching Observation[3]

Circular diagram with five outer circles arranged around a central magnifying-glass icon:

- **Teacher self-reflection**
- **Pre observation conversation**
- **Teaching observation**
- **Teacher and observer reflection**
- **Post observation conversation**

Inner ring segments:

- Implementation of new strategies and improved teaching and learning
- Self-reflection informs future observation activities
- Underpinned by supportive and collaborative protocols and a developmental approach
- Teachers learning from peers and supervisors, building a shared understanding of effective practice
- Provides structured feedback and reflection, based on agreed criteria, focused on progressing student learning

[3] Adapted from *Peer Observation, Feedback and Reflection: A Practical Guide for Teachers.*
https://www.education.vic.gov.au/Documents/school/teachers/teachingresources/practice/Peer_observation_feedback_and_reflection_practical_guide_for_teachers.pdf

Appendix I:
Critical Teaching Behaviors
Framework and Guidelines for the
Observation Process

- Strategies, behaviors, and documentation listed in each category are intended to provide examples rather than serve as an exhaustive list; observers will likely identify other things that can also serve as evidence of achievement in the six Critical Teaching Behaviors.
- Additionally, it is not expected that instructors demonstrate all items listed in every single class. However, it is important that behaviors from most, if not all, categories are present in the class period observed and that they are well integrated into the outcomes and flow of the class.

Critical Teaching Behaviors Framework

Categories and Definitions	Specific, observable instructor behaviors	How can I document critical teaching behaviors in this category?
Align Instructors who align components of learning experiences start with clearly defined learning outcomes. Teaching and learning activities, assessment tasks, and feedback build on each other to support student progress towards these outcomes.	• Define learning outcomes at course, module, lesson, and assignment levels • Draw connections between course components and communicate to students • Connect course outcomes to program/department outcomes and accreditation standards as applicable	• Course and/or Curriculum map • Course materials and assignments that explicitly show alignment across course components • Test blueprints • Learning outcomes at course, module, lesson, and assignment levels
Integrate Technology Instructors who integrate technology responsibly use tools to provide access to high quality instructional materials and accessible, engaging learning opportunities beyond traditional barriers of place and time.	• Consult with instructional designers to deve lop online course materials • Create course media using lightboard, Kaltura, or other available campus technologies • Attend technology training • Select technology tools appropriate to learning outcomes • Limit technology tools used • Evaluate technology tools for accessibility and privacy • Use LMS provided by institution • Prioritize LMS tools over other technology tools • Evaluate cost/ benefit of using tech tools • Use responsive design (for use of materials on different size screens)	• Syllabus (i.e. accessibility statement, statement on technology integration) • Assignment instructions/ prompts • Instructor -created tutorials • Instructor -created web content [text, video, audio, etc.] • Course map/ lesson plan • Student feedback • Teaching observations and reviews (peers, CTE, QM, etc.) • Online courses/ modules
Include Instructors who create an inclusive learning environment plan for student diversity by utilizing accessibility standards when designing and delivering content. They cultivate an atmosphere in which students experience a sense of belonging conducive to emotional well-being for learning	• Incorporate varied instructional strategies • Design instruction based on Universal Design for Learning principles • Use people-first language • Create and share accessible digital content • Provide support for students with disabilit ies • Select course materials representing a range of diverse voices • Conduct classroom discussions with respect for all students and viewpoints • Structure classroom discussions to promote equity in s Seek feedback from faculty development staff on alignment of course component • peaking time for all students • Respond to students and encourage professional relationships (including office hours, open door policy, etc.) • Mentor students • Model appreciation and respect for diversity in all modes of communication • Demonstrate consideration for student well –being • Co-create governing classroom policies with student input	• Diversity statement • Course map/ lesson plan • Instructor -created digital materials • Syllabus (accessibility statement, inclusive language, content/ material choices, communication policy/ office hours, multiple means of contact) • Teaching Philosophy Statement • Discussion and active listening guidelines • Discussion roles/activities • Teaching awards or recognition related to diversity • Student feedback • Teaching observation • Mentorship agreement and products of mentorship • Documentation of student job placement/ internship

Categories and Definitions	Specific, observable instructor behaviors	How can I document critical teaching behaviors in this category?
Engage Instructors who engage students purposefully select research-based techniques to ensure that students actively participate in the learning process and take responsibility for their intellectual development.	• Engage students using one or more of the following strategies: discussion, active learning, collaborative projects, metacognitive activities, reflection prompts, service learning, lab work, etc. • Establish and maintain social presence in online course components • Ensure participation of all students • Plan and facilitate adaptive learning experiences • Connect students with campus and learning support resources • Use examples, anecdotes, and autobiographical illustrations in explaining difficult concepts • Express genuine concern for helping students learn • Collect just-in-time feedback on student learning • Create opportunities for students to ask questions • Relate course content to real-world, relevant examples • Appropriately chunk lecture material • Facilitate integration of knowledge by encouraging students to make connections between course material and other courses • Encourage student ownership of learning • Encourage civic engagement of students • Engage in disciplinary scholarship, creative projects, and professionalization	• Student feedback (mid-term and/or SRI) • Teaching Observations (by peers and/or CTE) • Activity instructions/ prompts • Lesson plan • Online module • Transcript of online discussion board • Teaching awards • Check-in emails to update or congratulate students on progress • Assignment instructions/ prompts • PowerPoint slides • Student work samples • Video recording of classroom teaching/ video lecture
Assess Instructors who integrate assessment into their teaching develop and facilitate transparent, meaningful assessment tasks to provide students with timely feedback on their learning and measure achievement of learning outcomes. They regularly review data to improve instruction.	• Schedule regular summative assessments • Embed formative assessments in lesson plans • Provide timely feedback to students • Create opportunity for students to self-assess progress • Define purpose, criteria, and task for assessments • Provide a range of assessment tasks to make relevant to a variety of student interests • Assign scaffolded tasks	• Prompts/ instructions for formative and summative assignments • Example feedback to students • Student work samples • Student data demonstrating achievement of learning outcomes • Rubrics/ Grading criteria • Course calendar (distribution and variety of assessments over the course of the term) • Syllabus (grading policies, turn around time, grade distribution)
Reflect Instructors who reflect regularly gather feedback on their teaching from self-assessment, students, and peers to identify opportunities for growth. They pursue improvements to their instruction through professional development and research activities.	• Journal to reflect on classroom experience • Consult with professional development staff to enhance teaching methods • Analyze student feedback (mid-term and end-of-term) • Review student performance data • Conduct a SoTL project • Attend professional development events dedicated to teaching • Invite feedback on teaching from students and colleagues • Build content expertise through on-going reading, research, and professional development in field of study	• SoTL paper/presentation/award/fellowship • CTE badges/certificates/workshop transcript • Teaching presentations / workshops • Student feedback (SGID/SRIs) • Written reflections • Observation • Professional development plan

GUIDELINES FOR THE TEACHING OBSERVATION PROCESS[1]:

Recommendations for the Observer:

- **Prior to observation**: Ask the instructor to share their course syllabus, course calendar/schedule, relevant instructional materials related to the class under observation, and to complete a reflection on the course. Have them review their worksheet notes before the pre-observation conversation. The observer should be familiar with the CTB categories and possible strategies in each area.
- **During the observation**: Take notes on what is happening in the classroom. Consider bringing a copy of the teaching observation evaluation form to prompt your note taking.
  - How is the instructor presenting information?
  - Are students engaged in learning? Are they attentive?
  - What do the instructor's and students' behaviors indicate about the learning environment in this course? How does the environment feel?
  - How does the instructor use technology?
  - How do class structure and activities support each other and prepare students to perform desired tasks?
  - How does the instructor know students achieved the learning outcomes for the lesson (assessment)?
  - Jot down any questions you want to ask the instructor – what additional information do you need?
- **After the observation:** Review your notes and write comments on each of the criteria given on the teaching observation evaluation categories. Be sure to note categories in which the instructor demonstrates particular strength as well as categories for potential growth. Schedule a meeting with your colleague soon after the observation to discuss the observation.

Recommendations for the Instructor:

- **Prior to the observation:** Share a copy of your syllabus, course schedule/calendar, and your reflection on the course with the observer as well as any additional materials you would like your observer to have (i.e. lesson plan, student worksheets, etc.). Review the CTB Framework categories and strategies in each area.
- **During the observation:** Relax! Teach the class as you would normally to ensure a realistic observation.
- **After the observation:** Reflect on how the class went – What went well? What would you do differently in the future? Write reflective comments for each of the category criteria. Soon after the observation, send the post-observation reflection form to the observer to inform the follow-up discussion.

Post-Observation Conversation

- Allow time for both instructor and observer to share their thoughts on the class period observed, as well as the instructor's post-observation reflection form. Address any questions that emerged.
- Discuss a professional development plan based on both the strength and improvement areas. Determine 2-5 concrete action steps; these may include ideas for relevant professional development options, ideas for strategies to incorporate in future classes, recommendations for strategies to continue using, scholarship of teaching and learning projects, etc.
- Observer should finish the teaching observation evaluation based on the discussion and share a final version with the instructor. The instructor shall include the teaching observation evaluation in their portfolio as one component towards documenting effective teaching.

---

[1]Adapted from Lauren Barbeau and Claudio Cornejo Happel, *Critical Teaching Behaviors*, 2020.
https://static.sched.com/hosted_files/sotlcommonsconference2020/2b/CTB%20Peer%20Teaching%20Observation%20Introduction.pdf

Appendix II:
Pre-Teaching Observation Worksheet

Pre-Teaching Observation Worksheet[1]

Prior to the scheduled observation, the instructor should answer the following questions and share this sheet and a copy of the course syllabus, schedule/calendar, and relevant course materials with the observer.

Course Title:	
Course Location and Time:	
Number of Students Enrolled:	
Learning Outcomes for Lesson to be Observed:	
Course Overview ● How many times have you taught this course? ● How has it evolved over time? ● What are you particularly happy with? ● What would you change and why?	
Requests Do you have specific questions for the observer (i.e. request for feedback on specific activities or classroom interactions)?	
Other Notes/Information Is there anything else to share that would be helpful for the observer to be aware of?	
List of Materials Attached Attach a copy of your syllabus, course schedule/calendar and other relevant course materials. **Date Submitted**	

[1]Adapted from Lauren Barbeau and Claudio Cornejo Happel, *Critical Teaching Behaviors*, 2020.
https://static.sched.com/hosted_files/sotlcommonsconference2020/f1/CTB%20Peer%20Teaching%20Observation%20Worksheet.pdf

Appendix III:
Teaching Observation Evaluation

Teaching Observation Evaluation[1]

This report is based on the observer's review of course materials provided by the instructor (ex: syllabus, course materials, assessments, etc.), observations during the class period, and points raised during the debrief with the instructor.

Faculty Member Observed: **Course/Date/Time:**

Observer Name: **Number of Students in Attendance:**

❑ **Supervisor**

❑ **Peer**

Mastery 5.0 - 4.5	Exceeding Proficiency 4.4 – 4.0	Proficient 3.9 – 3.5	Nearing Proficiency 3.4 – 3.0	Developing 2.9 – 2.5	Not Evident 0 *this rating indicates that a critical element was not incorporated into the teaching demonstration	N/A *this rating does not factor into any overall averages; it indicates that the criteria was not necessary given the context

Critical Teaching Behaviors* Categories and Definitions	Rating	Observer Notes Narrative examples and evidence of behaviors
Align: Instructors who align components of learning experiences start with clearly defined learning outcomes. Teaching and learning activities, assessment tasks, and feedback build on each other to support student progress towards these outcomes.		
❑ Aligned course outcomes and learning activities		
❑ Stated course outcomes in syllabus and defined student learning outcomes for the class meeting		
❑ Communicated course and classroom organization through syllabus, policies, and course calendar		
❑ Used class time effectively and efficiently		
❑ Reviewed relevant prior knowledge and made connections between lesson content and other learning in course		
❑ Presented content and engaged students at multiple, appropriate Bloom's levels		
❑ Summarized important concepts by referring back to SLOs (or prompts students to do so)		
❑ Conveys the purpose of each class activity or assignment		

[1]Adapted from Lauren Barbeau and Claudio Cornejo Happel, *Critical Teaching Behaviors*, 2020. https://static.sched.com/hosted_files/sotlcommonsconference2020/f1/CTB%20Peer%20Teaching%20Observation%20Worksheet.pdf

Mastery 5.0 - 4.5	Exceeding Proficiency 4.4 – 4.0	Proficient 3.9 – 3.5	Nearing Proficiency 3.4 – 3.0	Developing 2.9 – 2.5	Not Evident 0 *this rating indicates that a critical element was not incorporated into the teaching demonstration	N/A *this rating does not factor into any overall averages; it indicates that the criteria was not necessary given the context
Critical Teaching Behaviors* Categories and Definitions		**Rating**	**Observer Notes** Narrative examples and evidence of behaviors			

Integrate Technology: Instructors who integrate technology responsibly use tools to provide access to high quality instructional materials and accessible, engaging learning opportunities beyond traditional barriers of place and time.

❑ Selects technology to enhance student learning		
❑ Operates technology effectively and efficiently		
❑ Presents information on board/screen in organized, legible matter		
❑ Instructs students to use technology and provides support		
❑ Uses Learning Management System		

Include: Instructors who create an inclusive learning environment plan for student diversity by utilizing accessibility standards when designing and delivering content. They cultivate an atmosphere in which students experience a sense of belonging conducive to emotional well-being for learning.

❑ Makes time to be available to students and cultivates approachable persona		
❑ Explains content with examples, demonstrations, visual aides, anecdotes from personal & student experiences, etc.		
❑ Treats students respectfully, for example, by using names and adhering to stated policies		
❑ Invites student questions, examples, and experiences and listens carefully when students speak		
❑ Models and promotes respectful interactions in the classroom		
❑ Selects course materials that represent diversity of sources, perspectives, and authorities in field of study		
❑ Attends to student comprehension or confusion		
❑ Recognizes diversity of student needs and circumstances		

Mastery 5.0 - 4.5	Exceeding Proficiency 4.4 – 4.0	Proficient 3.9 – 3.5	Nearing Proficiency 3.4 – 3.0	Developing 2.9 – 2.5	Not Evident 0 *this rating indicates that a critical element was not incorporated into the teaching demonstration	N/A *this rating does not factor into any overall averages; it indicates that the criteria was not necessary given the context

Critical Teaching Behaviors* Categories and Definitions	Rating	Observer Notes Narrative examples and evidence of behaviors
Engage: Instructors who engage students purposefully select research-based techniques to ensure that students actively participate in the learning process and take responsibility for their intellectual development.		
❑ Shows enthusiasm for course material and clarifies relevance and importance by relating material to practical applications		
❑ Incorporates current research in the field		
❑ Moves about room and maintains eye contact with students		
❑ Speaks clearly and varies tone to emphasize important material and maintain interest		
❑ Generates participation by asking questions, allowing appropriate wait time for responses, posing probing questions, and responding encouragingly		
❑ Includes active learning strategies		
❑ Provides clear guidelines for class activities		
❑ Stimulates discipline-specific critical thinking		
Assess: Instructors who integrate assessment into their teaching develop and facilitate transparent, meaningful, assessment tasks to provide students with timely feedback on their learning and measure achievement of learning outcomes. They regularly review data to improve instruction.		
❑ Provides explicit outcomes and directions for tasks		
❑ Clearly communicates how tasks will be evaluated through grading policies and rubrics		
❑ Selects appropriate formative and summative assessment tools		
❑ Assesses student performance regularly and/or provides opportunities for self- assessment to gauge understanding		
❑ Designs course assignments to scaffold student learning		

*This evaluation form is based on the Critical Teaching Behaviors (CTB) framework, which provides a set of observable, evidence-based instructor actions proven effective in increasing student learning gains and retention. The report provides an overview of the six categories of Critical Teaching Behaviors and lists select examples of concrete instructor actions in each category. This is not an exhaustive list of behaviors; feedback on strategies observed—including unlisted strategies—demonstrating one of the six Critical Teaching Behaviors will be noted in written comments.

Date of Post-Observation Meeting:

_____   _____
Observer Signature   **Date**   **Instructor Signature**   **Date**

Appendix IV:
Post-Teaching Observation Reflection

Post-Teaching Observation Reflection[1]

This worksheet is to be completed by the instructor AFTER the teaching observation, but BEFORE the post-teaching observation meeting. It should be provided to the observer prior to the meeting to guide the conversation and completion of the Teaching Observation Evaluation by the observer.

Faculty Member Observed: **Course/Date/Time:**

Mastery 5.0 - 4.5	Exceeding Proficiency 4.4 – 4.0	Proficient 3.9 – 3.5	Nearing Proficiency 3.4 – 3.0	Developing 2.9 – 2.5	Not Evident 0 *this rating indicates that a critical element was not incorporated into the teaching demonstration	N/A *this rating does not factor into any overall averages; it indicates that the criteria was not necessary given the context
Critical Teaching Behaviors* Categories and Definitions			**Self-Rating**	**Instructor Reflection** Narrative examples and evidence of behaviors		
Align: Instructors who align components of learning experiences start with clearly defined learning outcomes. Teaching and learning activities, assessment tasks, and feedback build on each other to support student progress towards these outcomes.						
❑ Aligned course outcomes and learning activities						
❑ Stated course outcomes in syllabus and defined student learning outcomes for the class meeting						
❑ Communicated course and classroom organization through syllabus, policies, and course calendar						
❑ Used class time effectively and efficiently						
❑ Reviewed relevant prior knowledge and made connections between lesson content and other learning in course						
❑ Presented content and engaged students at multiple, appropriate Bloom's levels						
❑ Summarized important concepts by referring back to SLOs (or prompts students to do so)						
❑ Conveys the purpose of each class activity or assignment						

[1]Adapted from Lauren Barbeau and Claudio Cornejo Happel, *Critical Teaching Behaviors*, 2020. https://static.sched.com/ hosted_files/sotlcommonsconference2020/f1/CTB%20Peer%20Teaching%20Observation%20Worksheet.pdf

Mastery 5.0 - 4.5	Exceeding Proficiency 4.4 – 4.0	Proficient 3.9 – 3.5	Nearing Proficiency 3.4 – 3.0	Developing 2.9 – 2.5	Not Evident 0 *this rating indicates that a critical element was not incorporated into the teaching demonstration	N/A *this rating does not factor into any overall averages; it indicates that the criteria was not necessary given the context
Critical Teaching Behaviors* Categories and Definitions			**Self-Rating**	**Instructor Reflection** Narrative examples and evidence of behaviors		

Integrate Technology: Instructors who integrate technology responsibly use tools to provide access to high quality instructional materials and accessible, engaging learning opportunities beyond traditional barriers of place and time.

❑ Selects technology to enhance student learning		
❑ Operates technology effectively and efficiently		
❑ Presents information on board/screen in organized, legible matter		
❑ Instructs students to use technology and provides support		
❑ Uses Learning Management System		

Include: Instructors who create an inclusive learning environment plan for student diversity by utilizing accessibility standards when designing and delivering content. They cultivate an atmosphere in which students experience a sense of belonging conducive to emotional well-being for learning.

❑ Makes time to be available to students and cultivates approachable persona		
❑ Explains content with examples, demonstrations, visual aides, anecdotes from personal & student experiences, etc.		
❑ Treats students respectfully, for example, by using names and adhering to stated policies		
❑ Invites student questions, examples, and experiences and listens carefully when students speak		
❑ Models and promotes respectful interactions in the classroom		
❑ Selects course materials that represent diversity of sources, perspectives, and authorities in field of study		
❑ Attends to student comprehension or confusion		
❑ Recognizes diversity of student needs and circumstances		

Mastery 5.0 - 4.5	Exceeding Proficiency 4.4 – 4.0	Proficient 3.9 – 3.5	Nearing Proficiency 3.4 – 3.0	Developing 2.9 – 2.5	Not Evident 0 *this rating indicates that a critical element was not incorporated into the teaching demonstration	N/A *this rating does not factor into any overall averages; it indicates that the criteria was not necessary given the context
Critical Teaching Behaviors* Categories and Definitions			**Self-Rating**	**Instructor Reflection** Narrative examples and evidence of behaviors		

Engage: Instructors who engage students purposefully select research-based techniques to ensure that students actively participate in the learning process and take responsibility for their intellectual development.

❏ Shows enthusiasm for course material and clarifies relevance and importance by relating material to practical applications		
❏ Incorporates current research in the field		
❏ Moves about room and maintains eye contact with students		
❏ Speaks clearly and varies tone to emphasize important material and maintain interest		
❏ Generates participation by asking questions, allowing appropriate wait time for responses, posing probing questions, and responding encouragingly		
❏ Includes active learning strategies		
❏ Provides clear guidelines for class activities		
❏ Stimulates discipline-specific critical thinking		

Assess: Instructors who integrate assessment into their teaching develop and facilitate transparent, meaningful, assessment tasks to provide students with timely feedback on their learning and measure achievement of learning outcomes. They regularly review data to improve instruction.

❏ Provides explicit outcomes and directions for tasks		
❏ Clearly communicates how tasks will be evaluated through grading policies and rubrics		
❏ Selects appropriate formative and summative assessment tools		
❏ Assesses student performance regularly and/or provides opportunities for self- assessment to gauge understanding		
❏ Designs course assignments to scaffold student learning		

Instructor Reflection

How many times have you taught this course? How has it evolved over time? How have you incorporated ideas from teaching-related professional development in this course?

Professional Development Plan (complete this section after your post-observation meeting)

Based on observations, reflections, and the follow-up conversation, what steps do you plan to take to enhance teaching strengths and address areas for improvement? What professional development options are available to you (i.e. CTL programs, Teaching conferences, etc.)? What other resources might you take advantage of (i.e. conversations with peers, student mid-term feedback, recent publications on teaching, etc.)

[*]This worksheet is based on the Critical Teaching Behaviors (CTB) framework, which provides a set of observable, evidence-based instructor actions proven effective in increasing student learning gains and retention. The report provides an overview of the six categories of Critical Teaching Behaviors and lists select examples of concrete instructor actions in each category. This is not an exhaustive list of behaviors; feedback on strategies observed—including unlisted strategies—demonstrating one of the six Critical Teaching Behaviors will be noted in written comments.

Date Submitted:

_____

Instructor Signature   **Date**

Faculty Affairs Committee Recommendations on Student Evaluations of Teaching

Approved May 5, 2020

Given the well-documented problems and shortcomings of Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET) in higher education literature, the need to revise current instruments and methods for the collection of SET at Savannah State University, and our commitment to being a student-centered institution, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate makes the following recommendations on SET, to be implemented beginning summer 2020:

Specific Recommendations of the Committee

1) Student evaluations must be weighted appropriately within a holistic approach to analyzing teaching effectiveness. Faculty performance in teaching should be comprised of several relevant dimensions enumerated in the SSU Faculty Handbook such as review of classroom materials and learning design, observation of classroom teaching practices by peers and supervisors, continued professional development and application of best practices and pedagogy, and student feedback on their learning experiences. As such, student feedback should not be valued as more than 10% of an overall teaching effectiveness review.

2) Student evaluation instruments should be designed to elicit from our students the most objective and actionable feedback possible and should focus on their learning experience rather than on their opinions of individual instructors. Further, student evaluation instruments should be designed to require students to provide additional comments to further explain any negative responses to survey items so that improvements can be made. Therefore, we recommend the revised instrument of Student Evaluation of Learning found in Appendix I of this document.

3) A clear campus-wide standard based on best practices of statistical analysis in teaching evaluation submissions must be implemented to determine reasonable response rates for a significant sample. So, we recommend adopting the thresholds found in Appendix II of this document to determine reasonable response rates by class size.

4) There must also be clear guidelines and expectations on the appropriate methodologies for securing student participation and administration of student evaluations. Incentivizing student participation by making it a course requirement that is reflected as component of the course grade (e.g., a low-stakes pass/fail "participation" for credit) is our recommendation for increasing participation.

5) We recommend that faculty should incorporate a response to the student feedback as part of their annual evaluation process. In this way, faculty have the opportunity to contextualize student feedback and demonstrate how they intend to use the results of the student feedback on a yearly basis.

A growing body of literature is reevaluating and often refuting conventional wisdom about the appropriate use of SET in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness of faculty. Many of these studies uncover implicit biases that students can harbor against instructors, especially women and people of color. Other recent studies examining the premises of prior studies, ones were used to support the use of SET in the evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness, demonstrate the problems of the statistical significance of student surveys of teaching effectiveness. Because of this well-documented and growing evidence, SET ought to have a limited, clearly defined role in the evaluation of faculty's teaching effectiveness.

What Student Evaluations of Teaching Can Tell Us

Many of the studies that have been used to justify the use of SET in the evaluation of faculty's teaching effectiveness, even in critical decisions like tenure and promotion, date from the 1980s. These early studies found a correlation between an instructor's high scores on SET and student learning. However, a 2017 study of these older studies argues that they were flawed by "small sample size and publication bias" and that their review of the original studies' data "revealed no significant correlations between [SET] ratings and learning."[1] New scholarship is finding that **higher faculty SET scores do not indicate greater achievements in student learning**, and in fact, "The entire notion that we could measure professors' teaching effectiveness by simple ways such as asking students to answer a few questions about their perceptions of their course experiences, instructors' knowledge and the like seems unrealistic given well-established findings from cognitive sciences such as strong associations between learning and individual differences including prior knowledge, intelligence, motivation, and interest."[2]

Another problem with SET is that they often request students to comment on items for which they have no reasonable expertise. One example of this is asking students' opinion on the instructor's mastery of the subject being taught. Much other work produced by university faculty is reviewed by expert peers and supervisors; however, the need for the non-expert evaluation of teaching in the form SET has not earned the scrutiny that it deserves. Given the wide variation among students' prior knowledge, this is something that generally speaking students are not capable of judging precisely because they are in the course to learn its subject. Since students are not able to speak to it objectively, students often base their responses on their subjective opinions and biases. For example, SET are far more connected to students' expectations of grade for the course rather than what they have perceived to have learned.[3] Therefore, **items included on SET must be appropriately focused on student experiences and observations in the learning environment rather than asking students to judge things outside their purview.**

These statistical and methodological problems noted in the research are exacerbated by clear gender bias in students' responses to SET. Even the language and word choices used by students in their comments on SET for male instructors are substantially different from the language that students use in

---

[1]Bob Uttl, Carmela A. White, and Daniela Wong Gonzalez, "Meta-analysis of faculty's teaching effectiveness: Student evaluation of teaching rating and student learning are not related," *Studies in Education Evaluation* 54 (September 2017): 22-42.
[2]Ibid.
[3]Anne Boring, Kellie Ottoboni, and Philip B. Stark, "Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness," *Science Open Research* (7 Jan 2016).

their evaluation of female instructors.[4] These biases against female instructors manifest so prominently that one study found that when male and female instructors taught the exact same online course content, the male instructors score higher than female instructors.[5] Moreover, this bias can be so great that it can cause instructors who rate as effective by other measures to be rated lower on SET than instructors who rate as less effective in other measures.[6] As Boring, Ottoboni, and Stark demonstrate in their study, "SET measure students' gender biases better than they measure the instructor's teaching effectiveness. Overall, SET disadvantage female instructors. There is no evidence that this is the exception rather than the rule."[7] Their research, and research by others, shows that to make SET a significant consideration in the evaluation of faculty for performance, merit pay, and tenure and promotion may represent a form of gender discrimination.

In the face of this growing evidence, colleges and universities across the nation are rigorously reevaluating the role of SET in evaluating faculty. These compounding problems with SET as they have typically be constructed and implemented have led some institutions to eliminate the use of SET in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness altogether; others are entertaining the possibility.[8]

Implications of the Literature for Our Institutional and System Contexts

As a state university and HBCU with a teaching-driven mission, we have an obligation to use the most effective measurements of the teaching effectiveness of our faculty. Our institution is complex, and so is the learning process. The existing literature shows that it can be difficult to measure what it is that students learn and what one instructor's individual pedagogical practices may have to do with that as opposed to another. Nonetheless, we also need an effective method of soliciting our students' carefully considered feedback on learning environments so that we may understand what students value, what resonates with them, and how to continue to improve and meet their needs.

A survey of SET instruments and practices at our fellow University System of Georgia institutions shows how we can resolve these needs in our revisions of SET materials and practice. The most important feature of SET instruments at many of our fellow campuses are questions on student surveys that attempt to focus student's evaluation of the course to its effectiveness, content, and the clarity with which it is communicated rather than perceptions of the instructor's expertise. This principle informs the suggested questions and format for a revised SET instrument provided in Appendix I.

---

[4] Kristina W. Mitchell and Jonathan Martin, "Gender Bias in Student Evaluations," *Political Science & Politics* 51, Issue 3 (2018): 648-652.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Boring, Ottoboni, and Stark.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Colleen Flahery, "Teaching Eval Shake-Up," *Inside Higher Ed* (22 May 2018): https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/05/22/most-institutions-say-they-value-teaching-how-they-assess-it-tells-different-story

Appendix I:
Recommended Questions/Format for Revised Student Evaluations of Learning

OVERVIEW of this revision: This form is divided into 5 basic sections. Some selected questions will have a required open response question to provide rationale for the rating given. This allows us to gather actionable feedback from students.

SCALE: 1 = STRONGLY DISAGREE to 5 = STRONGLY AGREE; N/A response also available.

I. **Student-Centered Questions**
   1. I was well-prepared for class and actively participated in all class discussions and activities.
      i. 1-5, N/A
   2. When I struggled with understanding course content, I sought help from the instructor or from resources provided by my instructor or SSU.
      i. 1-5, N/A
   3. I learned important material in this course that I can use in my future classes at SSU, in my future career, or both.
      i. 1-5, N/A
      ii. Open-ended, required: Please explain with specific details of your experience in this course why you provided the rating you did for this question and any comments or suggestions you would include for this item.

II. **Class/Discipline-Centered Questions**
   1. Class discussions, assignments, and/or activities helped me understand the subject matter.
      i. 1-5, N/A
      ii. Open-ended, required: Please explain with specific details of your experience in this course why you provided the rating you did for this question and any comments or suggestions you would include for this item.
   2. Required course texts and/or materials helped me to understand the subject matter.
      i. 1-5, N/A
   3. Tests and/or assignments required by this class required me to solve problems, apply things I learned in the course, or required me to think a lot.
      i. 1-5, N/A

III. **Syllabus/Course Material-Centered Questions**
   1. The syllabus and/or assignment prompts clearly explained course expectations.
      i. 1-5, N/A
   2. The syllabus and/or assignment prompts clearly explained how students will be evaluated.
      i. 1-5, N/A
   3. The syllabus and/or assignment prompts were well-organized.
      i. 1-5, N/A
      ii. Open-ended, required: Please explain with specific details of your experience in this course why you provided the rating you did for this question and any comments or suggestions you would include for this item.

IV. **Instructor-Centered Questions**
   1. The instructor communicated effectively.

    i.   1-5, N/A
  2. The instructor provided feedback on assignments in a reasonable time period.
    i.   1-5, N/A
  3. The instructor demonstrated respect for students.
    i.   1-5, N/A
    ii. Open-ended, required: Please explain with specific details of your experience in this course why you provided the rating you did for this question and any comments or suggestions you would include for this item.
  4. The instructor offered and was available for individual assistance.
    i.   1-5, N/A

V.   **Open-Ended Questions, required**
  1. What I would recommend keeping in this course:
  2. What I would recommend revising in this course:
  3. The following teaching techniques helped my learning in this class (please also indicate how they were helpful):
  4. I would suggest altering the following teaching techniques (please indicate why):
  5. Any other observations/comments/suggestions:

Appendix II:
Recommended Minimum Response Rates Threshold by Group Size

We propose the thresholds listed below as the way to establish minimum response rates required for validity of data in a liberal condition of surveying, for a variety of population sizes (Nulty, 2008; Chapman and Joines, 2017).[9]

Table 1
Suggested Minimum Response Rates Required for Validity of Data (Adapted from Nulty, 2008)

Class Size	Recommended Rates under Liberal Conditions*	Recommended Rates under Stringent Conditions**
10	75%	100%
30	48%	96%
50	35%	93%
70	28%	91%
100	21%	87%
200	12%	77%
300	8%	70%
500	5%	58%

*10% sampling error; 80% confidence level; **3% sampling error; 95% confidence level

---

[9]See Diane D. Chapman and Jeffrey A. Joines, "Strategies for Increasing Response Rates for Online End-of-Course Evaluations," *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education,* Vol. 29, No. 1, 2017, 47-60 and Duncan D. Nulty, "The Adequacy of Response Rates to Online and Paper Surveys: What Can Be Done?," *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education,* Vol. 33, No. 3, June 2008, 301-314.

Faculty Affairs Committee Recommendations on the Annual Faculty Evaluation Instrument

The Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate recommends the adoption of the revised Annual Faculty Evaluation Instrument to be used across all colleges and departments in accordance with the guidelines provided in the instrument.

Background

In April 2007, the Faculty Senate adopted a university-wide evaluation instrument in the form of a fillable Excel spreadsheet. It divided areas of evaluation into Teaching Effectiveness, Institutional Service, and Scholarship/Research/Creative Production. The area of Teaching Effectiveness was further divided into subsections that addressed the "Department's View," which included 17 specific Senate approved attributes and the "Student's View" in the form of questions from the Teaching Effectiveness Survey, current to that time. Aside from the items and weights in the "Student's View," Faculty were allowed to choose a range of specific items and weights in the other sections, to rate for their self-evaluation. In the years since, colleges and departments have revised this instrument to better suit their own evaluation needs, and in some instances abandoned it altogether.

Faculty Affairs Revisions, May 2020

In an effort to reestablish a common, consistent, and equitable instrument for faculty annual evaluations across the entire university, the Faculty Affairs Committee of Faculty Senate revised the instrument approved by the Faculty Senate in 2007 by: (1) surveying and incorporating versions of some of the changes that were independently implemented in departments and colleges over the years; (2) altering the instrument to reflect the committee's recommended revisions to the Student Evaluations of Learning and Peer/Supervisor Observations of Teaching; and (3) ensuring the revised instrument reflects and aligns with the 2019 revisions to the SSU Faculty Handbook.

Here is an overview of significant changes:

- Faculty now choose the annual workload weight of Teaching/Service/Research in consultation with their chairs, according to the Faculty Load Matrix, approved in 2019.

- Under Teaching Effectiveness:

  - Sections 1a and 1b correspond directly to the supervisor's and the peer's observation of teaching, and each are a fixed 20% value of the Teaching Effectiveness load portion of the instrument.
  - Section 1c corresponds directly to the revised Student Evaluations of Learning and is a fixed 10% value of the Teaching Effectiveness load portion of the instrument.
  - The first section of 1d includes 11 items that are basic responsibilities all teaching faculty must meet. These have fixed weights and should not be altered. The second section of 1d includes a further list of items, from which faculty must choose 7-10 items to

demonstrate teaching effectiveness. They may also choose the weighting of these additional 7-10 items as described in the instrument. Faculty may add up to 5 items not listed in any other criteria in this section. Section 1d is a fixed 50% value of the Teaching Effectiveness load portion of the instrument.

- Under Service:

  o Faculty must choose 7-10 items to demonstrate effective service. They may also choose the weighting of these items as described in the instrument. Faculty may add up to 5 items not listed in any other criteria in this section.

- Under Scholarship/Research/Creative Production:

  o Faculty must choose 7-10 items to demonstrate effective scholarship/research/creative production. They may also choose the weighting of these items as described in the instrument. Faculty may add up to 5 items not listed in any other criteria in this section.

INSTRUMENT GUIDELINES AND INSTRUCTIONS

At beginning of evaluation period (early fall semester)

      I. Faculty member meets with chair to develop objectives and load ratios

      II. Load ratios must be based on faculty handbook guidance (see sheet: load ratios)

           Fields that should be completed in this instrument after the chair consultation:

                *TOTAL Teaching Variable Ratio (NOTE: do NOT alter any of the sub-heading ratios under teaching, e.g., "Supervisor Observation of Teaching Ratio")

                *Service Load Variable Ratio

                *Research Load Variable Ratio

                These cells three cells should sum to 100%

During annual evaluation reporting (spring semester)

      I. Faculty member self-evaluates based on guidance below

      II. Faculty member and chair meet to agree on final values

      III. Chair and Faculty member print and sign evaluation, copy entered into performance record

Specific guidance for filling out the remainder of the spreadsheet:

      NOTE: automatic cells will turn red if there is an error (i.e., a value does not fit the parameters).

I. Teaching Effectiveness

      A. Supervisor Observation (fixed at 20% of total teaching effectiveness)

           *See teaching observation documents for more detail.

           *Scores from the observer evaluation form should be entered: 0-5 or N/A

           *If observer score was N/A for an item, leave the score blank and mark "no" in the left hand column (this will redistribute weights equally over scored items)

      B. Peer Observation (fixed at 20% of teaching effectiveness)

           *See teaching observation documents for more detail.

           *Scores from the observer evaluation form should be entered: 0-5 or N/A

           *If observer score was N/A for an item, leave the score blank and mark "no" in the left hand column (this will redistribute weights equally over scored items)

      C. Student Observation (fixed at 10% of teaching effectiveness)

           *See student evaluation of learning for more detail

           *Weighted values are fixed

           *Scores are 1-5

      D. Teaching Effectiveness -- other considerations (fixed at 50% of teaching effectiveness)

           The first 11 items are fixed; these are expectations of all faculty and should not be changed

                *Weighted values are fixed at 3% each, with assessment counting for 6%

                *Scores are 1-5; 1=never; 5=always

           In the next section, faculty choose 7-10 to rate at 5-20% each

                *Scores are 1-5; 1=never; 5=always

                *Lines that are not used or are not applicable should be weighted to 0% in the weighting column

                *Faculty may add up to 5 additional lines representing teaching effectiveness to record/specify things note covered/addressed in existing lines

                *If faculty do multiple instances of an item on the list, they may add them as a line (e.g., designing two new courses: rating on the list for the first course -- label by course name;

                    then add a line for rating the second new course, labeled by course name)

                *Double-check that total evaluation weights equal 100% (cell in column D).

      TOTAL Teaching Variable Ratio is dependent on the matrix in Load Ratios

           This ratio should be determined at the beginning of the evaluation period in a meeting between the faculty member and the dept. chair

II. Institution/Community Service

*Faculty choose 7-10 items
*Assign each item a weight between 5-20%; no more than 2 items can be weighted at 20%
*Lines that are not used or are not applicable should be weighted to 0% in the weighting column
*Faculty may add up to 5 additional lines representing service to record/specify things not covered/address in existing lines
*If faculty do multiple instances of an item on the list, they may add them as a line (e.g., chairing two committees: rating on the list for the first chaired committee -- label by committee name;
        then add a line for rating the second chaired committee, labeled by committee name)

Service Load Variable Ratio is dependent on the matrix in Load Ratios
        This ratio should be determined at the beginning of the evaluation period in a meeting between the faculty member and the dept. chair

III. Scholarship/Research/Creative Contribution

*Faculty choose 7-10 items
*Assign each item a weight between 5-20%; no more than 2 items can be weighted at 20%
*Lines that are not used or are not applicable should be weighted to 0% in the weighting column
*Faculty may add up to 5 additional lines representing scholarship to record/specify things not covered/address in existing lines
*If faculty do multiple instances of an item on the list, they may add them as a line (e.g., presenting at two conferences: rating on the list for the first conference presentation -- label by conference name;
        then add a line for rating the second conference presentation, labeled by conference name)

Research Load Variable Ratio is dependent on the matrix in Load Ratios
        This ratio should be determined at the beginning of the evaluation period in a meeting between the faculty member and the dept. chair

Load Ratios approved by Faculty Senate, 2019

Activity	24 Credits Annual Teaching			21 Credits Annual Teaching			18 Credits Annual Teaching		
	Teaching Track (min - max)	Scholarship Track (min - max)	Service Track (min - max)	Teaching Track (min - max)	Scholarship Track (min - max)	Service Track (min - max)	Teaching Track (min - max)	Scholarship Track (min - max)	Service Track (min - max)
Teaching	70% - 90%	60% - 80%	60% - 80%	70% - 85%	55% - 70%	55% - 70%	N/A	50% - 65%	50% - 65%
Scholarship/ Creative Activity	5% - 15%	15% - 35%	5% - 10%	5% - 20%	25% - 45%	5% - 15%	N/A	30% - 45%	5% - 20%
Service	5% - 15%	5% - 10%	15% - 35%	5% - 20%	5% - 15%	25% - 45%	N/A	5% - 20%	30% - 45%

SSU's Comprehensive Faculty Performance Evaluation System: | *April, 2020* (date) | **(Revised April 2020)** | **FILL OUT ALL CELLS IN GREEN**

Academic Unit:		*Academic Year:*	*(Per SENATE/SSU handbook specs.)*
Instructor:	**Jane Doe (example)**	*Academic Unit Head:*	YES

Col I	Col 2		Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	NO
				Performance Judged	(Calculated)	Performance Component	Instructor's Performance	
			Teaching	(0-5 Scale)	Item Score	Relative Load	Load Score	
	Ia. Teaching Effectiveness (Supervisor Observation):		Items	*Inadequate = 0;*	*(Weighted)*	100% Total		
	(items adopted by Senate; not subj. to unit revision)		Weights	*Mastery = 5*	*(Col3 X Col4)*	**100%**	1.00	
YES	Aligned course outcomes and learning activities		4%	5	0.18			
NO	Stated and defined learning outcomes		0%	5	0.00	*Supervisor to conduct pre-, during, and post-review		
YES	Communicated organization		4%	5	0.18	*See teaching observation documents for more information		
YES	Used class time effectively		4%	5	0.18	*If observer score was N/A for an item, leave the score blank and mark "no"		
YES	Reviewed knowledge and made connections		4%	5	0.18	in the left column (this will redistribute weights equally over scored items)		
YES	Engaged at multiple Bloom's levels		4%	5	0.18			
YES	Summarized important concepts		4%	5	0.18			
YES	Conveyed purpose of assignments		4%	5	0.18			
NO	Selected appropriate technology to enhance learning		0%	5	0.00			
YES	Operated technology effectively		4%	5	0.18			
YES	Presented information in organized manner		4%	5	0.18			
YES	Instructed students to use technology		4%	5	0.18			
YES	Used LMS		4%	5	0.18			
YES	Made time to be available to students		4%	5	0.18			
NO	Explained content well		0%	5	0.00			
YES	Treated students respectfully		4%	5	0.18			
YES	Invited student questions		4%	5	0.18			
YES	Modeled and promoted respectful interactions		4%	5	0.18			
YES	Selected course materials that represented diversity		4%	5	0.18			
YES	Attended to student comprehension		4%	5	0.18			
YES	Recognized diversity of student needs		4%	5	0.18			
NO	Showed enthusiasm		0%	5	0.00			
YES	Incorporated current research		4%	5	0.18			
YES	Moved about room and had eye contact		4%	5	0.18			
YES	Spoke clearly and varied tone		4%	5	0.18			
YES	Generated participation by asking questions, etc.		4%	5	0.18			
YES	Included active learning strategies		4%	5	0.18			
NO	Provided clear guidelines for class activities		0%	5	0.00			
YES	Stimulated critical thinking		4%	5	0.18			
YES	Provided explicit outcomes and directions		4%	5	0.18			
NO	Clearly communicated how tasks will be evaluated		0%	5	0.00	supervisor observation fixed at 20% of total teaching effectiveness load		
YES	Selected appropriate assessment tools		4%	5	0.18			
YES	Assessed student performance regularly		4%	5	0.18			
YES	Designed course assignments to scaffold learning		4%	5	0.18			

	Supervisor Observation Weighted Score	**100.0%**

Total of Teaching Item Weights =	**100%**	*(must total 100%)*	

Supervisor Obs. Of Teaching Ratio	Observation Load Score
20%	**0.20**

1b. Teaching Effectiveness (Peer Observation):

			Item	(0--5 Scale)		
	(items adopted by Senate; not subj. to unit revision)		Weights	*Inadequate = 0; Mastery = 5*		
YES	Aligned course outcomes and learning activities		5%	5	0.23	*Supervisor to conduct pre-, during, and post-review
YES	Stated and defined learning outcomes		5%	5	0.23	*See teaching observation documents for more information
YES	Communicated organization		5%	5	0.23	*If observer score was N/A for an item, leave the score blank and mark "no"
YES	Used class time effectively		5%	5	0.23	in the left column (this will redistribute weights equally over scored items)
NO	Reviewed knowledge and made connections		0%	5	0.00	
YES	Engaged at multiple Bloom's levels		5%	5	0.23	
YES	Summarized important concepts		5%	5	0.23	
YES	Conveyed purpose of assignments		5%	5	0.23	
YES	Selected appropriate technology to enhance learning		5%	5	0.23	
NO	Operated technology effectively		0%	5	0.00	
YES	Presented information in organized manner		5%	5	0.23	
YES	Instructed students to use technology		5%	5	0.23	
YES	Used LMS		5%	5	0.23	
NO	Made time to be available to students		0%	5	0.00	

Approved by Faculty Senate 5/5/2020

YES	Explained content well	5%	5	0.23
NO	Treated students respectfully	0%	5	0.00
NO	Invited student questions	0%	5	0.00
YES	Modeled and promoted respectful interactions	5%	5	0.23
NO	Selected course materials that represented diversity	0%	5	0.00
YES	Attended to student comprehension	5%	5	0.23
YES	Recognized diversity of student needs	5%	5	0.23
YES	Showed enthusiasm	5%	5	0.23
NO	Incorporated current research	0%	5	0.00
NO	Moved about room and had eye contact	0%	5	0.00
YES	Spoke clearly and varied tone	5%	5	0.23
YES	Generated participation by asking questions, etc.	5%	5	0.23
NO	Included active learning strategies	0%	5	0.00
YES	Provided clear guidelines for class activities	5%	5	0.23
YES	Stimulated critical thinking	5%	5	0.23
NO	Provided explicit outcomes and directions	0%	5	0.00
NO	Clearly communicated how tasks will be evaluated	0%	5	0.00
NO	Selected appropriate assessment tools	0%	5	0.00
YES	Assessed student performance regularly	5%	5	0.23
YES	Designed course assignments to scaffold learning	5%	5	0.23

peer observation fixed at 20% of total teaching effectiveness load

Peer Observation Weighted Score	**100.0%**

Total of Student Evaluation Item Weights = **100%** (must total 100%)

Peer Obs. of Teaching Ratio	Observation Load Score
20%	0.20

1c. Teaching Effectiveness (Student Observation):
(items adopted by Senate; not subj. to unit revision)

	Item Weights	*(1-5 Scale)* *Avg. Student Rating*	
Assignments/activities helped understanding	10%	5	0.50
Text/materials helped understanding	10%	5	0.50
Tests/assignments required thinking/application	10%	5	0.50
Syllabus/assignments clearly explained expectations	10%	5	0.50
Syllabus/assignments clearly explained evaluation	10%	5	0.50
Syllabus/assignments well-organized	10%	5	0.50
Instructor communicated effectively	10%	5	0.50
Instructor feedback in a reasonable time period	10%	5	0.50
Instructor demonstrated respect	10%	5	0.50
Instructor available for assistance	10%	5	0.50

Weights should not be changed

student observation fixed at 10% of total teaching effectiveness load

Student Observation Weighted Score	**100.0%**

Total of Student Evaluation Item Weights = **100%** (must total 100%)

Stud. Obs. of Teaching Ratio	Observation Load Score
10%	0.10

1d. Teaching Effectiveness (other considerations):
Below items are faculty duties; MUST retain these weights

	Item Weights	*(1--5 Scale)* *Never = 1;* *Always = 5*	
Completes institutional assessment requirements	6%	5	0.30
Demonstrates appropriate planning/prep for classes	3%	5	0.15
Adheres to clear and established course outcomes	3%	5	0.15
Assigns appropriate readings and instructional materials	3%	5	0.15
Utilizes clearly established grading criteria	3%	5	0.15
Displays enthusiastic student-teacher interaction patterns	3%	5	0.15
Attends required meetings (dept/coll/univ/committee)	3%	5	0.15
Meets scheduled classes and office hours	3%	5	0.15
Maintains/submits accurate class records on time	3%	5	0.15
Annually submits portfolio to document effective teaching	3%	5	0.15
Evidence of clear teaching philosophy	3%	5	0.15
			0.00

The first 11 items are expectations of all faculty and thus must have fixed weights (6% for assessment; 3% for others)

(choose 7-10 of the following)

			0.00
Received teaching award	20%	5	1.00
Developed new course	10%	5	0.50
Developed online course	7%	5	0.35
Regularly utilized early warning system	7%	5	0.35
Identified & took action on plagiarism case	7%	5	0.35
Developed special skills in Banner	7%	5	0.35
Effectively proctored suitable testing situations	6%	5	0.30

*Choose 7-10 additional items
*Weights may be 5-20%; no more than 1 can be valued at 20%
*For any not chosen, make the weight 0%
*May write in up to 5 items

Approved by Faculty Senate 5/5/2020

Incorporated specific pedagogies in course design	5	0.00
Incorporated appropriate technology in pedagogy	5	0.00
Used multiple assessments to evaluate students	5	0.00
Developed new instructional materials	5	0.00
Involved students in research/creative processes	5	0.00
Secured student participation in professional org. activity	5	0.00
Expanded student participation in campus club/organ.	5	0.00
Provided timely feedback to students	5	0.00
Provided substantive feedback to students	5	0.00
Developed critical thinking/analytical capacity of students	5	0.00
Participated in collaborative teaching	5	0.00
Developed/improved student numeracy	5	0.00
Developed/improved student literacy	5	0.00
Employed alternate strategies for diverse learning styles	5	0.00
Meaningful out-of-class interaction with students	5	0.00
Used creative/innovative teaching/learning strategies	5	0.00
Employed field experience or hands-on applications	5	0.00
Employed cooperative work or internship program	5	0.00
(insert here & weight any other criteria to be used)	5	0.00

other considerations fixed at 50% of total teaching load

Other Consid. Teaching Ratio	Other Load Score
50%	0.50

Teaching Load variable ratio set by faculty in consult with chair
*see matrix in faculty handbook for more information

Other Teaching Considerations Weighted Score	**100.0%**

Total of Student Evaluation Item Weights = **100%** (must total 100%)

	TOTAL
TOTAL Teaching Variable Ratio	Teaching Load Score
50%	0.50
(50-90%)	

	Service Item Weights	(1-5 Scale) Never = 1; Always = 5	Item Weighted Score
2. Institutional/Community Service Contribution:			
(choose **7-10** of the following)			
Effective service on USG system committee	*10%*	5	0.50
Effective service on SSU committee	*10%*	5	0.50
Effective service on College committee	*10%*	5	0.50
Effective service on Departmental committee	*10%*	5	0.50
Formal academic leader role (chair, director, coordinator)	*10%*	5	0.50
Formal institutional governance role (officer/committee)	*10%*	5	0.50
Taught overload	*10%*	5	0.50
Effective academic advisement/faculty mentoring provided	*10%*	5	0.50
Raised funds for University (documented)	*10%*	5	0.50
Recruited students to campus or program	*10%*	5	0.50
Assisted in curriculum revisions		5	0.00
Effectively advised student club, organization, activity		5	0.00
Represented Univ. formally in external community		5	0.00
Consulted/advised external community agency/group		5	0.00
Served as guest lecturer/speaker for community activity		5	0.00
Served as judge/evaluator in external educational activity		5	0.00
Planned/participated in external community academic activity		5	0.00
Maintained Univ. facilities/properties w/ professional skills		5	0.00
Special contribution to instructional mission of Univ.		5	0.00
Contributed to retaining students in institution		5	0.00
Officer on board of external agency/organization		5	0.00
Participated in formal mentoring of colleague		5	0.00
(insert here & weight any other criteria to be used)		5	0.00

*Choose 7-10 items
*Weights may be 5-20%; no more than 2 can be valued at 20%
*For any not chosen, make the weight 0%
*For each listed activity, if did multiple times, can add lines for each instance
*May write in up to 5 items

Service Load variable ratio set by faculty in consult with chair
*see matrix in faculty handbook for more information

		Service Contribution Weighted Score	100.0%
Total of Service Item Weights =	**100.00%**	(must total 100%)	

	Service Load Variable Ratio
	45%
	(5% - 45%)

Service Contribution Load Score
0.45

	Research Item Weights	(1-5 Scale) Never = 1; Always = 5	Item Weighted Score
3. Scholarship/Research/Creative Production:			
(choose **7-10** of the following)			
Published refereed book/anthology	*10%*	5	0.50
Published refereed chapter	*10%*	5	0.50
Published refereed monograph	*10%*	5	0.50
Published refereed article	*10%*	5	0.50
Published non-refereed book/anthology/monograph	*10%*	5	0.50
Published non-refereed chapter/article	*10%*	5	0.50
Exhibited/performed creative work for public community	*10%*	5	0.50
Research/creativity in discipline-related pedagogy	*10%*	5	0.50
Received academic award, honor, or recognition	*10%*	5	0.50
Edited book/anthology/collection/special journal issue	*10%*	5	0.50
Reviewed book/chapter/monograph/article		5	0.00
Served as proposal reviewer for professional org./conf.		5	0.00
Prepared successful grant or contract proposal		5	0.00
Directed effective grant or contract project		5	0.00
Submitted a grant or contract proposal		5	0.00
Documented formal research/creativity in discipline		5	0.00
Presented a paper at professional conference/meeting		5	0.00
Chair of professional committee--external to univ.		5	0.00
Participated in discipline-related workshop/conference/event		5	0.00
Officer in appropriate professional organization		5	0.00
Supervised undergrad. research or graduate thesis rsch.		5	0.00
Participated in curriculum/program development		5	0.00
Attend teaching/learning professional conference		5	0.00
Updated knowledge of effective teaching learning theory		5	0.00
(insert here & weight any other criteria to be used)		5	0.00

*Choose 7-10 items
*Weights may be 5-20%; no more 2 can be valued at 20%
*For any not chosen, make the weight 0%
*For each listed activity, if did multiple times, can add lines for each instance
*May write in up to 5 items

Research Load variable ratio set by faculty in consult with chair
*see matrix in faculty handbook for more information

	Research Load Variable Ratio
	5%
	(5% - 45%)

Research Production Load Score
0.05

		Scholarship Production Weighted Score	100.0%
Total Research/Creative Production Item Weights =	**100.00%**	(must total 100%)	

Instructor's Overall Performance Raw Score =	1.00
Instructor = Jane Doe (example)	0
Instructor's Overall Performance Percent Score =	**100%**
by: 0 Head/Evaluator; Unit = **0**	

_____   _____   _____   _____
Chair Signature   Date   Faculty Signature   Date