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PURPOSE
The Faculty Evaluation Process was designed to provide performance feedback throughout the year, while also providing for a summary evaluation at the end of the appraisal cycle. The process would consist of formative evaluations for the development of full-time faculty, and a summative evaluation that could form a basis for personnel decisions.

ORGANIZATIONAL SCOPE OR AUDIENCE
Full-time faculty

DEFINITIONS
Course Evaluation: A part of the faculty evaluation process involving review of faculty performance relating to their course(s) consisting of reviewing the syllabus, assessment methods and methods of instruction in the classroom.

Student Evaluation of Instruction: A part of the faculty evaluation process involving review by students of faculty classroom performance.

POLICY
In an effort to maintain the highest possible standards for faculty, the College will engage in an annual evaluation process to promote the effectiveness for full-time faculty in conjunction with the College mission, goals and changing needs. Elements of the evaluation process will relate to activities that assure success of both individuals and the College as well as assess individual performance over the evaluation period.

PROCEDURE
Faculty Evaluation
Full-time faculty evaluation will consist of student evaluations, course evaluation, supervisor evaluation, self-evaluation, goal setting, and a summary evaluation. Regions may augment the system with other forms of evaluation, but these form the minimum necessary requirements. For instance, nursing faculty may decide to conduct student
evaluations at clinical sites, in addition to Student Evaluation of Instruction for classroom evaluation. Likewise, a region may decide to add an open ended student questionnaire on faculty performance to Student Evaluation of Instruction.

**Goal Setting**

Goal setting for the upcoming year could be done as a part of the summary evaluation from the previous year, or in a separate meeting. During the meeting, the evaluator and faculty member would arrive at mutually agreeable goals for the upcoming evaluation period. Benchmarks and benefits of the goals, as well as any needs, will be discussed at this time.

The faculty member and his/her supervisor would also determine evaluative weights for each of the main categories of faculty performance. The weights should reflect the relative importance of each area for that faculty member in the coming year. These weights may vary given the flexible nature of duties and special assignments. For instance, faculty may usually allocate 2-5% of their time for College wide, Campus, and/or Community Service. However, if they are working on a state committee that would comprise a significant part of their job, a weight higher than 5% would be assigned. In a different example, a faculty member may usually assign 80% to Instruction. If that faculty member were developing an internet offering, that Instruction weight may be reduced and the College wide, Campus, and/or Community Service weight would increase. The sum of the weights must equal 100%. Weights may be changed within the year, at the mutual agreement of supervisor and employee, if events warrant.

**Student Evaluation of Instruction**

Student evaluations will be done in accordance with current state policy.

**Course Evaluation**

The evaluation could be done by a peer, chair or Dean, depending on regional preference. The evaluation would be done at least once per evaluation cycle. The regional administration will determine the frequency, and adhere to it consistently. The evaluation consists of three parts: curriculum review, assessment review, and classroom review. The review would be scheduled with the instructor. Syllabus and assessment materials would be given to the evaluator prior to the classroom review.

The curriculum review would involve a review of the syllabus and its components. The course objectives and description should agree with those developed by statewide curriculum committees. The syllabus should describe how the objectives will be attained, and how students will be evaluated.

The assessment review would involve a review of available tests and instructions for other forms of assessment (i.e., essays, portfolios, lab projects, etc.). The review is designed to ensure assessment materials are consistent with course objectives.
The classroom review involves observing a class for no less than one hour. The evaluator should be conscious of those elements described that indicate good instructional methodology.

Within a week of the classroom review, the evaluator should discuss the evaluation with the instructor. The evaluator should comment on strengths and give suggestions for improvement. Repeat observations would be left to the discretion of the evaluator.

**Self-Evaluation**
The Self-Evaluation is designed for the faculty members to conduct a performance review on themselves. Faculty should acknowledge every question at the depth they feel necessary. Faculty may answer the questions in two to three words, or provide additional support material for their response. The self-evaluation should be completed at least one month prior to the summary evaluation.

**Summary Evaluation**
The Faculty Annual Summary Evaluation would be completed at the end of the evaluation period, by the chair or school Dean. The Summary Evaluation has three components: evaluation of specific job related responsibilities, evaluation of goals, and other comments.

In evaluating job specific responsibilities, evaluators would rate faculty on each of the categories, and supply comments. Ratings would be based on discussions from that evaluation period, as evidenced in student evaluations, course evaluation, self-evaluation, or other communicated observations. The average score for the factors in each section would be multiplied by the evaluative weight to determine a numerical rating for each section. The sum of the numerical score for each section will be used to define a numerical score for the faculty member. The final score could be used, at regional discretion, for merit or other personnel decisions. Recommendations for the statewide use of these scores would be pending a review of the process in the future.

The summary evaluation involves a review of the goals from the evaluation period. The evaluation would consist of the benefits of the goal and a discussion of any barriers.

The final section asks for any additional comments from evaluator or employee.

**Academic Chair Evaluation**
The Academic Chair Evaluation would mirror the steps in the faculty evaluation, with three exceptions: Goal Setting, Academic Chair Self-Evaluation and Summary Evaluation.

**Goal Setting**
Goals would be appropriate for Academic Chairs. Evaluative weights would also be determined for the additional chair roles. Weights would vary depending on the relative importance of that role to each chair level and/or special duties. For instance, Program Administration and Enrollment Management should involve more time and importance for a School Dean than a Program Chair, and the weights should reflect that.
**Academic Chair Self-Evaluation**
The Academic Chair would be expected to complete the faculty self-evaluation in addition to the Chair self-evaluation. The Chair self-evaluation focuses on those areas unique to Chair responsibilities.

**Summary Evaluation**
The Chair Annual Evaluation reflects Chair responsibilities.

In addition, there are Chair responsibilities which must be discussed throughout the evaluation period for which there are no appropriate evaluation instruments. Appropriate secondary and postsecondary linkages should be discussed on an ongoing basis, and may be evidenced through the effectiveness of formal or informal agreements. Advisory Committee effectiveness can be demonstrated through Advisory Committee Surveys and Committee minutes, and should be discussed. The Technical Program Review and the Plan for the Improvement of Teaching and Learning can also present itself as an opportunity for supervisors to discuss Chair performance.
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