

Sam Houston State University
Prospectus for Substantive Change for Distance Learning

Document 5: Policies on Faculty Evaluations

Academic Policy Statement 820317
The Faculty Evaluation System
Revised February 9, 1999

1. GENERAL FEATURES OF THE FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM

1.01 The Faculty Evaluation System is established to provide an orderly, comprehensive approach to the evaluation of faculty performance at Sam Houston State University. The system is designed to maximize objectivity and minimize opinion and bias. The evaluation system is important for purposes of (1) faculty development, (2) promotion in academic rank, (3) merit adjustments in salary, (4) contract review for probationary faculty members, and (5) decisions concerning future contracts for nontenure track faculty members.

1.02 The Faculty Evaluation System recognizes four criteria for purposes of evaluation. These four are: teaching effectiveness, scholarly and artistic endeavor, professional growth and professional activities, and nonteaching activities. Each of these criteria will be assigned a weight in accordance with the ranges delineated in Table I (FES Form 7) "Weight Range for Full- or Part-Time Teaching" attached to this policy statement. Actual weights applied to each faculty member's evaluation score in each criteria will be determined through a linear formula available through the University's Computer Services Center which results in the maximum possible Sum of Scores on FES Form 6 (Summary Rating Report). The criteria used in the Faculty Evaluation System are the same as those identified in Academic Policy Statement 800722, "Promotions in Rank and Advances in Salary Within Rank."

1.03 Provisions are made in the Faculty Evaluation System for the following:

a. A rating of teaching effectiveness, to be accomplished by the use of two forms: FES Form 1, "Chair Rating of Faculty Teaching Effectiveness." (Attachment 1.) This form is to be completed by the department chair on each member of the full-time faculty assigned to the department.

FES Form 2, "Student Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Effectiveness." (Attachment 2.) This form is to be completed by the students of each faculty member.

b. A report of scholarly and artistic endeavor, to be accomplished by the use of FES Form 3, "Report on Scholarly and Artistic Endeavor." (Attachment 3.) This form is to be completed by each faculty member as a means of indicating his/her scholarly and artistic endeavor.

c. A report of professional growth and professional activities, to be accomplished by the use of FES Form 4, "Report on Professional Growth and Professional Activities." (Attachment 4.) This form is to be completed by each faculty member as a means of indicating his/her professional growth and professional activity.

d. A report of nonteaching activities, to be accomplished by the use of FES Form 5, "Report on Nonteaching Activities." (Attachment 5.) This form is to be completed by each member of the faculty as a means of indicating his/her nonteaching activities.

e. A summary rating of each faculty member based upon information secured on FES Forms 1 through 5, to be accomplished by the use of FES Form 6 "Summary Rating Report." (Attachment 6.) This form is to be completed by the department chair and is to be signed by both the chair and the faculty member.

1.04 The forms are to reflect faculty activity for the twelve-month period beginning June 1 of each calendar year and ending May 31 of each calendar year.

1.05 The time lines for the completion of the forms are to be established by the Vice President for Academic Affairs not later than February 15 of each year.

2. CHAIR EVALUATION OF FACULTY TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

2.01 Departments may decide to use a personnel committee to perform all or part of the chair's evaluation.

2.02 The chair's rating of faculty teaching effectiveness should be based on as much supportive information as can be reasonably obtained. A variety of inputs are necessary to give the evaluation validity. Two primary sources of information should be a teaching file prepared by the faculty member and a conference with the individual being evaluated.

a. A secondary source of information may be responses to pertinent individual questions from FES Form 2, Student Rating of Faculty Teaching Effectiveness (questions 1-19 and 21). If the questions are to be used, the department should determine the appropriateness and weight given each question based on the nature of the discipline and the teaching situation of individual instructors. Other sources of information developed by the department may also be used, provided that the instructor being evaluated is informed.

b. Each faculty member should present a teaching file and update it on an annual basis. The file should provide information, which will enable the chair to evaluate the criteria listed in section 2.03 below. Extraneous material should be avoided. Because of the wide variety of programs and teaching situations, departments should develop criteria as to the appropriate content, limitations, and uses of files. Departments may decide to omit the requirement for a teaching file.

c. There should be an individual conference between the faculty member being evaluated and the chair. At this meeting, the contents of the teaching file and other sources of information should be discussed. The faculty member should be encouraged to provide

any relevant information. If improvement is needed, plans should be developed. Faculty members needing improvement should be encouraged to seek appropriate assistance in creating and implementing a development plan.

d. The following items may be appropriate for inclusion in the teaching file. Not all the material will be appropriate in all cases. Only that which is relevant should be included. Items may be added, modified, or omitted.

(1) Material Focused on Courses. Documents may be arranged in terms of individual courses and/or the overall teaching function.

(a) A description of the course that amplifies and clarifies the description in the University catalogue. Comments about the value and broad goals of the course might accompany the statement.

(b) Specific objectives and strategies for teaching success. These might include rationales and explanations about syllabus, text choices, student evaluations, activities within team-taught or multi-discipline courses, and personal long-range goals for teaching the course.

(c) Sample documents given to students and colleagues. These might include annotated text-lists (including ancillary readings), syllabus, stated course objectives, means of student evaluation (including marked samples of student work), study-aid sheets, and notes for oral presentations, group work, and outside projects.

(d) Self-assessment and teaching development. Included might be a broad critique of currency, progress, successes, and failures as they relate to teaching effectiveness. Additional documents might include revisions in curricula, bibliography, syllabi, and student evaluations; ideas for workshops; proposals for grants; programs in a teaching-development center; and written evaluations from students.

(e) Proposals for innovations in teaching. These involve such items as goals and activities that go beyond the traditional classroom format or concepts about subject areas. They might include provocative approaches to subject matter, innovative exchanges among students, physical arrangements of the class, or use of technological facilities or equipment.

(f) Responses to pertinent individual questions from FES Form 2, Student Rating of Faculty Teaching Effectiveness (questions 1-19 and 21).

(2) Other Materials. If these documents are also mentioned in other FES forms, it should be noted.

(a) Statements from colleagues who have observed the professor in the classroom as a member of a departmental or interdepartmental teaching team. Such statements would ideally comment on particular, specific aspects of performance.

- (b) Statements from colleagues on a personnel committee or who are designated to conduct a peer review (should the department opt to have one) who systematically appraise documents.
- (c) Honors or other recognition from colleagues such as distinguished teaching award, speaker at College honors convocations, or Piper Professor award.
- (d) Teaching-related activities that are presented to outside agencies or groups, such as papers at pedagogical conferences, media interviews, and community/family endeavors for higher education.
- (e) Teaching related activities on other campuses such as workshops and symposia.
- (f) Participation in local, regional, state, or national activities related to teaching courses in the professor's discipline (e.g., Texas Studies courses as the core of a symposium during the Texas Sesquicentennial).
- (g) Documented research-in-progress that contributes directly to teaching.
- (h) Unsolicited statements from former students/SHSU alumni on the quality of instruction (as might appear in an alumni magazine article, in letters mailed to teaching awards committees, etc.).
- (I) Articles or editorial work for a professional journal on teaching within the discipline.
- (j) Directing theses, Honors projects, or student contributions to journals and societies (including co-authored papers).

2.03 Four required categories are identified for the rating of teaching effectiveness by chairs. Classroom presentation is covered by student evaluations in the belief that students are in the best position to evaluate classroom presentation, while the chair is in a better position to evaluate matters relating to teaching which take place outside the classroom. The chair should make clear to the faculty in advance the means used to determine the criteria listed below. Weight ranges are recommended for the categories. Actual weights will be determined by a formula available through the University's Computer Services Center which results in the maximum possible Sum of Scores on FES Form 1. The seven-point scale, described on the summary rating form (FES Form 6, "Summary Rating Report"), is to be used.

The categories are:

a. Preparation for Teaching (40-60%)

- (1) Maintains currency in field. For faculty teaching a diverse range of courses, departments should provide guidelines as to what levels of currency are appropriate for different areas and different levels of instruction.

(2) Develops appropriate, effective instructional materials. (Should not penalize instructors for trying innovations, which do not always work.)

(3) Regularly prepares for teaching.

(4) Provides appropriate subject matter.

(5) Attempts to evaluate and improve own teaching.

b. Evaluation of Student Achievement (10-20%)

(1) Applies and communicates in writing effective and equitable procedures in measuring student performance.

(2) Evaluates student performance in a reasonable manner.

(3) Provides periodic, up-to-date information regarding individual student progress.

(4) Provides appropriate feedback to students on assignments and tests beyond grades.

c. Response to Individual Student Needs (10-20%)

(1) Is reasonably available for student conferences and counseling; maintains appropriate office hours.

(2) Is reasonably sensitive to individual student's academic needs.

d. Professional Demeanor in Instructional Role (20-30%)

(1) Maintains appropriate professional demeanor in teaching situations.

(2) Adheres to teaching philosophy consistent with role and scope of university.

(3) Exercises reasonable care of university facilities, equipment, and supplies.

(4) Is punctual and dependable.

(5) Maintains high standards of honesty and objectivity.

2.04 FES Form 1 is used to reflect the chair's rating of teaching effectiveness for each faculty member.

2.05 The official copy of the teaching file will be maintained by the individual faculty member for at least one year after the evaluation.

3. STUDENT EVALUATION OF CLASSROOM TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

3.01 Student responses on FES Form 2 are used for administrative decisions (e.g., tenure, promotion, and merit pay) and for development purposes. Responses to questions 1-19 and 21 assist the chair in both areas. The average (mean) score of responses to question

20 is intended solely for administrative decisions; it will be the rating used on FES Form 6, Activity IB. The appropriateness and weights to be given to questions 1-19 and 21 for the department and for faculty members in different teaching situations should be determined by the department.

3.02 FES Form 2 is to be distributed to all classes of each faculty member at the end of either the fall or spring semester each year, the option of the semester being determined by the individual faculty member. Individual colleges or departments may elect to have this evaluation performed in more than one semester. This will facilitate the establishment of norms against which the scores of an individual faculty member may be compared.

3.03 It is suggested that the evaluation be conducted at the beginning of the period (15-20 minutes). The class instructor should explain the use and importance of the evaluation and stress serious student involvement. The instructor should appoint a student to gather and deliver the completed forms to the department chair's office.

3.04 The instructor may hand out the forms to the class but must then leave the classroom. Each student's anonymity must be protected. For this reason, the class instructor should not have access to completed individual FES Form 2 or score summaries until after all grades have been turned in to the Registrar. Knowledge of student evaluations should be limited to the instructor, the chair and other administrators responsible for administrative and development activities.

3.05 Evaluation for merit pay purposes should be based on data covering only the specific time period.

4. REPORT ON SCHOLARLY AND ARTISTIC ENDEAVOR

4.01 This report is to be completed by each faculty member and submitted to his/her department chair on FES Form 3.

4.02 Scholarly activities shall be interpreted to include, but are not limited to, involvement in basic and applied research, writing and publication, and presentations to professional and learned societies. The distinction between scholarly activities and professional or university service is often difficult to discern. A faculty member should judge the primary focus of an endeavor from the perspective of his/her involvement, and categorize it appropriately.

4.03 Different disciplines and individuals define art in different ways, engage in different types of artistic endeavors, and evaluate art differently. As such, the criteria for evaluation can be defined here in only the most general terms. Each department should define its own specific criteria. Ultimately, individuals must be evaluated on the merit of their art and the level of their critical success.

5. REPORT ON PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

5.01 This report is to be completed by each faculty member and submitted to his/her department chair on FES Form 4.

5.02 Professional growth and professional activities will be interpreted to include activities in relation to three major categories: professional associations, continuing professional education, and professional service.

6. REPORT ON NONTEACHING ACTIVITIES SUPPORTIVE OF DEPARTMENTAL, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS

6.01 This report is to be completed by each faculty member and submitted to his/her department chair on FES Form 5.

6.02 Nonteaching activities supportive of departmental, college, or university programs are interpreted to include: committee service; student recruitment; student advisement; acquisition and development of facilities, equipment, and other resources; and program development.

7. SUMMARY RATING REPORT

7.01 This report is to be completed by the department chair on FES Form 6. Once completed, this form is to be signed by the chair and by the faculty member. The signature of the faculty member represents an indication that the completed report has been reviewed with the faculty member by the chair.

7.02 Judgements of faculty performance for each of the four activity areas are to be made with a seven-point rating scale as defined below:

7 EXCEPTIONAL This rating should be used only in rare cases. It carries the implication that the individual's performance in a particular area of activity reflects the highest degree of productivity and effectiveness.

6 VERY GOOD

5 GOOD

4 AVERAGE

This rating should always be interpreted in a favorable light. In any group, no matter what level, there is a middle range of performance. This rating implies that the individual has been productive and effective in the area that is being evaluated. It is expected that this rating will be the one that is most frequently applied.

3 MARGINAL

**2 SIGNIFICANT
DEVELOPMENT**

REQUIRED

1 UNSATISFACTORY The individual's performance in the area which is being evaluated has not been productive or effective.

7.03 Each department should use the 1 - 7 scale as a basis for meritorious, highly meritorious, or exceptionally meritorious recommendations to the dean for promotion and/or merit pay increases for faculty members.

APPROVED:

Bobby K. Marks, President

[820317 Form 1](#)