

Faculty Evaluation Principles

Documentation and Guidelines for the Evaluation of Effective Teaching

The following documentation measures are based on required information for the current university P&T document. Others are optional. In addition, there are many other measures of effectiveness and excellence available to assess a faculty member's contribution to the teaching mission². As with all three missions, QUALITY counts more than QUANTITY but is much harder to measure.

- I. Documentation.
 - A. For each course taught, list term, course number, title, and enrollment
 - B. Unit leader assessment based on attending class(es) and/or viewing online discussion forum, etc.
 - C. Teaching portfolio
 1. Syllabus.
 2. Teaching materials.
 3. Exams and quizzes.
 4. Assignments.
 5. Samples of student work.
 - D. Student evaluations of instruction.
 1. Student evaluations should be conducted each time the course is taught.
 2. Each unit should have written protocols to ensure uniform and fair administration of the university's SPOT student evaluations. These protocols should emphasize confidentiality and impartiality.
 3. Results from SPOT student evaluations should be compared to similar courses (i.e., graduate to graduate average; core course to core course average).
 4. Other student evaluation instruments may be useful.³
 - E. Alumni evaluations of instruction.
 1. Collect for promotion and tenure, or promotion to full professor.
 2. Can be useful for award nominations, etc.
 - F. Peer Review of courses taught
 1. Conducted according to guidelines established by the unit and college.
 2. Conduct for promotion and tenure, or promotion to full professor.
 - G. No of advisees:
 1. Undergraduate
 2. Master's level- chair, co-chair, committee memberships.
 3. Doctoral level- chair, co-chair, committee memberships.
 - H. Exit Interviews with selected advisees by unit leader
 - I. Theses and dissertations completed by graduate students.
 - J. Placement of graduate students.
 - K. Honors theses directed.
 - L. Undergraduate research projects directed.
 - M. Feedback from alumni (former advisees).
 - N. Contributions to curriculum/program development.
 1. Courses developed or revised.
 2. Curricula developed.
 3. Other evidence of leadership and teamwork in the teaching mission.

- O. List other assigned duties: examples include Coordinating Counselor, Graduate Program Officer, Recruiting and Placement (undergraduate or graduate), etc.
- P. Scholarly Activity.
 - 1. Teaching publications.
 - 2. Peer reviewed items.
 - 3. Curricula.
 - 4. Web sites.
 - 5. Other educational materials.
 - 6. Teaching related grants.
 - 7. Teaching presentations.
- Q. Awards and recognitions.
- R. Service to the teaching mission.
 - 1. Peer review of courses.
 - 2. Guest lectures.
 - 3. College and university level committees.
 - 4. National, regional, state, and local teaching societies (NACTA, etc.)
 - 1. Membership, offices held, other contributions.
 - 5. Advising of student clubs and organizations.
 - 1. Accomplishments.
 - 2. Feedback from students (exit interview with unit leader).
- S. Evidence of efforts to improve one's teaching effectiveness
 - 1. Continuing education workshops.
 - 2. Teaching conferences, etc.
- II. Unit leader's evaluation of instruction.
 - A. For each course taught, using documentation provided, assess:
 - 1. Competence
 - a. Faculty member demonstrates current knowledge of discipline.
 - b. Faculty member demonstrates current competence with course content.
 - c. Faculty has engaged in teaching development activities.
 - 2. Course Organization and Management
 - a. Quality of syllabi, teaching materials, exams, and quizzes.
 - b. Unit leader's evaluation of classroom management based on sitting in, or viewing online discussion forum in an online class.
 - 3. Communication
 - a. Faculty member uses current literature, educational methods, and instructional tools.
 - b. Faculty member demonstrates efforts to actively engage students.
 - 4. Policies
 - a. Faculty member adheres to University, College, and unit teaching policies.
 - b. Faculty member is available to students outside of scheduled class or laboratory time.
 - 5. Faculty member has documented learning gains by students.
 - a. Performance on tests, quizzes, etc.
 - b. Pre and post tests
 - c. Accreditation instruments
 - d. Evaluations from outside observers
 - B. Evaluation of advising
 - 1. Time and effort spent
 - 2. Outcomes (quality)
 - C. Scholarly activity related to teaching and advising
 - 1. Review scholarly outputs
 - a. Publications
 - b. Grants

- c. Peer reviewed materials
 - d. Others
 - 2. Assess their impact.
- D. Other contributions to the teaching program.
 - 1. Recognition of the time spent accomplishing other assigned duties.
 - 2. Credit for teaching related service.
- E. Other indicators of excellence.
 - 1. Evidence of leadership.
 - 2. Evidence of teamwork.
 - 3. Awards and recognition.
 - 4. Student, alumni, and peer evaluations.

¹ Adapted from Arreola, R. A. 2000. Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system. Anker Publishing Company, Inc. Bolton, MA 230 pp.

² [American Library Association](#)

³ [Student assessment of courses and faculty](#)

Documentation and Guidelines for the Evaluation of Extension/Outreach Programs

- I. An account of the candidate's specific Extension/Outreach responsibilities.
- II. Evidence of inputs, outputs, and outcomes of Extension priority programs (based on the VCE Program Logic Model).

A program is a coordinated set of learning experiences focused on a problem and aimed at achieving predetermined expectations or objectives. A program should be based on issues, needs, and/or assets documented through a situation analysis.

Inputs - Inputs are resources, contributions, and investments that go into the program.

- III. When assessing inputs, consider the following:
 - A. Involvement of campus and/or field faculty.
 - B. Involvement of other organizations or agencies, where appropriate.
 - C. Utilization of volunteers, where appropriate.
 - D. Sponsored, Extension, or other grants secured to support priority programs and leverage program base funding (e.g., materials; equipment; travel; curriculum development, revision, piloting, and implementation; county and campus faculty time or positions, etc.)
 - E. Scholarly evidence associated with inputs:
 1. Situation analysis report
 2. Grants secured

Outputs - Outputs are activities, services, events and products that reach people who participate or who are targeted in the program.

- IV. When assessing outputs, consider the following:
 - A. A program plan that includes a valid, peer reviewed outcome-based curriculum.
 - B. Training conducted for field faculty involved in the program, where appropriate.
 - C. Campus and field faculty appropriately involved in program delivery.
 - D. On-going monitoring of program delivery to gauge curriculum effectiveness and learner satisfaction.
 - E. Multistate or integrated research and Extension work.
 - F. Scholarly evidence associated with outputs:
 1. The program plan.
 2. Peer reviewed curriculum.
 3. Numbered and other Extension publications.
 4. Trade journals, newsletters, other papers and reports, web sites, multimedia, etc.
 5. Formal training programs (e.g., workshops, in-service, etc.) or other presentations at conferences.

Outcomes/Impacts - Outcomes/impacts are the results or changes to individuals, groups, communities, organizations, or systems as a result of implementing the program.

When assessing outcomes/impacts, consider the following:

- G. Documented outcomes/impacts of the program both anticipated from the objectives and unanticipated. They can be:

1. Learning (short term) - increased awareness, knowledge gains, changed attitudes, skills acquired, increased motivations and aspirations.
 2. Implementation (medium term) - behavior change, practice adoption, new policy adoption.
 3. Societal (long term) - social, economic, civic, and environmental changes.
- H. Peer evaluations concerning the effectiveness and impact of the program and its design.
- I. Recognitions and awards associated with the program.
- J. Scholarly evidence associated with outcomes/impacts:
1. Peer reviewed reports documenting program outcomes/impacts.
 2. Peer evaluations of programs.
 3. Recognitions and awards.
- V. Professional achievements in Extension/Outreach not associated with the Extension priority programs documented above.
- A. Recognitions and awards.
 - B. Evidence of community engagement, organizational service, and team contributions in Extension/Outreach (e.g., ELC work, committee work, volunteer development)
 - C. Contributions to professional Extension/Outreach associations.
 - D. Other pertinent Extension/Outreach work.

Documentation and Guidelines for the Evaluation of Research

- I. Scholarly activity
 - A. Refereed publications.
 - B. Books, book chapters-
 - 1. Includes textbooks.
 - C. Refereed proceedings.
 - D. Reviews.
 - E. Patents.
 - F. Peer reviewed items.
 - 1. Web sites, applications, and software.
 - 2. Other materials.
- II. Evidence of leadership in research
 - A. Participation in grant peer review panels.
 - B. Editorships of journals, books.
 - C. Editorial Board memberships.
 - D. Invited presentations (expenses paid).
 - E. External program reviews.
- III. Other
 - A. Research-related grants.
 - 1. Number submitted.
 - 2. Number funded, percent contributions.
 - 3. Grant expenditures.
 - B. Research presentations.
 - C. Research awards.
 - D. Postdoctoral scientists, fellows, and other professional personnel in the faculty member's program.
 - 1. Placement of postdoctoral scientists and fellows.
 - E. Translations and published abstracts.
 - F. Research-related service, such as elected offices in national organizations, College- and University-level committees, etc.
- IV. Unit leader's evaluation of research
 - A. Assessment of scholarly activity-- three-year average.
 - 1. ISI Impact factor for each journal article published.
 - 2. Publications with students and postdoctoral fellows/scientists.
 - 3. Corresponding author.
 - B. Review of grant submissions for assessment of fundability- three-year average.
 - 1. Does it appear that the proposals are well done, current, and submitted with proper formats?
 - 2. What are the panel priority scores and written reviews?
 - C. Review of narrative to assess research impacts.
 - 1. Is the program relevant?
 - 2. Is the program focused?
 - D. Assessment of the research program itself.
 - 1. Is the scientist's program active, current, and timely?
 - 1. Laboratory activity level, currency, and timeliness.
 - 2. Field activity level, currency, and timeliness.
 - 2. Is the program competitive and publishable?
 - 1. Grant acceptance and submission rates over time.
 - 2. Publication acceptance over time.
 - 3. Number and quality of graduate students recruited and graduated over time.