

Department of Teaching & Learning Faculty Evaluation Guidelines and Handbook

Approved by TL faculty on
September 12, 2007

Part I: Definitions, Expectations and Evaluation Tools

Part II: Preparing the Faculty Evaluation Portfolio

Part I: Definitions, Expectations and Evaluation Tools

Distinction between Evaluation Years Regarding Tenure

Year One	In year one, faculty undergo a formal evaluation of teaching/advising, research/ scholarly activity and service. In addition to the formal evaluation, faculty focus on goal setting in each of the three areas: Teaching; Research and Scholarly Activities; and Service. Emphasis is placed on setting goals for the following year, as well as subsequent years.
Year Two	In year two the emphasis is on formative evaluation with the intent of guiding development. Goal setting for subsequent years is also important. To maintain satisfactory progress towards tenure, the faculty member should maintain at least adequate ratings in all areas and achieve an excellent rating in at least one area.
Year Three	In year three the emphasis is on formative evaluation, with continued attention to development and goal setting. Some achievement of goals should be evident, particularly in the area of scholarship. Effective presentation of evaluation materials is expected. Satisfactory progress toward tenure requires maintaining at least adequate ratings in all areas and attaining an excellent rating in at least one area.
Year Four	The purpose of evaluation in year four is to provide the faculty member with constructive feedback on their progress towards tenure regarding professional accomplishments and presentation of evaluation materials. At minimum, satisfactory progress towards tenure is indicated by a rating of adequate in two areas with excellent in one area for three of the four years. Ratings of unsatisfactory indicate unsatisfactory progress toward tenure. Year four is a cumulative evaluation, including all years of tenure track work in the Department.
Year Five	To consider progress towards tenure as satisfactory in year five, faculty must not be rated unsatisfactory in any area, and must be rated excellent in one or more areas of evaluation.
Year Six	All faculty members are required to go through the tenure decision process no later than year six. Note that a faculty member may request a tenure review earlier than year six. Likewise, a faculty member may request a tenure review extension beyond year six if extenuating circumstances meet the University criteria for extension. This latter request must be made before the end of the fifth academic-year. A favorable tenure review typically requires a supportive statement from the Department Chair and a supportive statement from the College Dean. A summary of previous evaluation ratings must reveal annual achievement of at least one excellent rating in years 2, 3, 4 and 5. If there are unsatisfactory ratings in any of these years, the portfolio must reflect continued improvement in those areas. After year three, there must be no unsatisfactory ratings.
Three Year Post-Tenure	At minimum, faculty members are expected to maintain ratings of adequate in at least two of the three evaluation areas, with the third area receiving a rating of excellent.
Faculty with tenure credit from another setting	The faculty member's record of scholarly activity (e.g., articles and presentations) is reviewed in its entirety. The record of teaching and service completed in service of the department are most central to determining evaluation ratings.

Distinction between Tenure and Promotion

Currently at UND, tenure is not tied to promotion. Thus, in exceptional cases, a faculty member may choose (or be advised) to be reviewed for tenure only in year six and not promotion.

Note that tenure is largely a Department/College decision (that is affirmed by the Provost and President), whereas promotion is a Department/College and University decision. Whereas, the expectations for tenure are set by the Department, the expectations for promotion include those set by the University. The Department influences promotion expectations by establishing the following threshold expectations for faculty performance.

Assistant to Associate In the promotion seeking year, the faculty member must meet the University expectations, as well as having ratings by the Department committee of excellent in teaching and research/scholarly activity, with a rating of at least adequate in service (see department by laws for information on composition of the committee).

Associate to Full In the promotion seeking year, the faculty member must meet the University expectations, as well as have ratings by the Department committee of excellent in all three areas (see department bylaws for information on composition of the committee).

Expectations for Involvement in the Department of Teaching & Learning

A. Involvement in the Department is essential.

1. It is expected that all faculty will maintain an adequate on-campus presence, allowing for equitable participation in departmental and program area meetings, committee assignments, and accessibility to students for advisement and consultation. Office hours must be posted.
2. Faculty members in the Department of Teaching & Learning are expected to adhere to University and College policies and ethical decorum for the various professions represented in the Department.
3. Involvement that helps colleagues contribute to the mission of the department, interpersonal honesty and integrity are expected.

B. At the department level, department chair and evaluation committee reports may include a statement about a faculty member's involvement in the department.

Terms and Definitions for Areas of Evaluation

Department guidelines for decisions on rating tenure-track and tenured faculty for evaluation purposes (including promotion, tenure, annual and third year post-tenure evaluation) will be followed. Faculty members are rated in the areas of teaching effectiveness, scholarly achievement, and service achievement.

A. The rating terms used for evaluation purposes are specified in the University Faculty Handbook: excellent, adequate, and unsatisfactory.

B. Definitions for Areas of T&L Faculty Evaluation

Teaching for faculty evaluation purposes, refers to responsibility for planning, implementing and assessing instruction; supporting student learning; and cooperating with departmental programs and processes (e. g, timely submission of grades, use of technology initiatives, adherence to and consideration of accreditation standards). Evaluation of teaching focuses on courses, but also includes learning situations such as individualized student courses (e.g., 591, 995, 997, 999), field experience supervision, practica and internships. Teaching also involves keeping courses updated for content, pedagogy and assessment data. Faculty evaluation of teaching includes course work taught as part of load, including online teaching. Faculty members may include overload and summer school teaching, if desired. Since these are taught on a separate contract, inclusion is recommended but not required.

Advising is included with teaching and refers to faculty obligation to assist undergraduate and graduate (masters, specialist, and doctoral) students in taking responsibility for "developing meaningful educational plans" (see UND "Undergraduate Academic Advisement Philosophy Statement, 2004-05"). In the case of graduate advisement, advising also refers to chairing and serving on thesis and dissertation committees and sponsoring masters' students' final projects and independent studies (e.g., 995, 997).

Research and Scholarly Activity primarily refers to conducting, disseminating and publishing scholarly pursuits by faculty in areas of professional choice. But it also refers to maintaining scholarly membership in professional

organizations, being involved in scholarly pursuits (e.g., reviewing manuscripts and presentation proposals) and making progress towards achieving scholarly goals.

Scholarly products (in print or electronic formats) include contributions to the profession through refereed and sometimes through invited works (e.g., invited chapter in a refereed book, or invited article in a high profile publication) such as presentations, journal articles, book chapters, books, conference proceedings, reports (e.g., executive summary of a project by a professional organization) and grants. Non-refereed works at times may be included as scholarship and would depend on explanation provided by the faculty member being evaluated, but generally, nonrefereed publications and presentations are viewed as service to the profession (e.g., nonrefereed state level presentations or newsletter articles). Competitive grant-writing that is research-based or leads to securing external funds for large education-based projects is viewed as scholarly activity. Internally secured research grants (e.g., UND Senate seed money research grants) that are highly competitive are viewed as scholarly achievement. Small and/or non-competitive grants as well as on-going grant-related activities are typically considered as service to the profession.

Quality and Quantity. Quality and quantity of publications and presentations are both relevant factors in research/scholarly activity. Most typically, a refereed publication or presentation is considered the respected measure of quality used by the department. Criteria associated with high quality refereed publications and presentations include factors such as acceptance rate, readership, importance to the field, frequency of citation by other scholars, and complexity of research or project. For information on quantity of publications and presentations, see the research/scholarship guidelines under heading "Evaluation Tools" (page 6).

For further clarification, publications are divided into major and minor categories.

1. Major Publications/Scholarship

- a. refereed scholarly article in a nationally or internationally disseminated journal
- b. scholarly book chapter
- c. scholarly book—not self-published (counts for 2 or more publications)
- d. edited scholarly book (counts for 2 publications)
- e. editor of refereed conference proceedings
- f. refereed conference proceedings
- g. teaching or pedagogical scholarship resulting in a nationally or internationally disseminated publication
- h. publications that a faculty member can provide strong support for why they should be considered major
- i. invited articles published in a high profile publication or refereed journals
- j. funded competitive grants which are research-based or, for large education-based projects (external grants, UND Senate seed money grants, etc.)
- k. edits a journal or significant publication, especially if on a long term basis

2. Minor Publications/Scholarship

- a. fourth or more authorship of a refereed scholarly article in a nationally or internationally disseminated journal
- b. book reviews
- c. non-refereed and other publications that a faculty member can provide strong support for why they should be considered a minor publication, i.e. case studies
- d. reviews proposals or manuscripts, including books, for significant venues
- e. edits journal or other publication on a limited basis

Scholarly presentations include refereed and invited regional, national, or international conference presentations. Faculty must provide documentation that presentations were invited or proposed, accepted and given and the competitive nature of the conference.

Service is providing assistance to individual(s) or organization(s) associated with one's professional role. There are three areas of such service. The first area is service to the institution through such activities as committee work (university, college, and departmental levels), program or curriculum design, assessment coordination, and other work that fulfills the mission and strategic planning of the department, college, and university. Program area coordination both at the graduate and undergraduate level, for both on-campus and distance programs is considered a special form of service to the department. The second area of service is to one's professional societies and/or recognized practitioners in the field. The faculty member being evaluated must describe the nature of the work, which often includes being involved in a professional organization by reviewing proposals or manuscripts, holding an office, conference planning, a non-refereed presentation or publication. The third area is service to one's community through work in schools, agencies, or institutions related to one's professional role. The quality of participation is relevant to evaluating service activity.

For further clarification, examples for each of the three service categories are specified below.

1. Service to the institution
 - a. Committee membership and/or leadership at the program area, department, college and university levels
 - b. Program area coordination
 - c. Program planning and development
 - d. Authors departmental reports or documents
 - e. Coordinates a special service (e.g., assessment planning)
 - f. Curriculum design and development (e.g., create a new course, block of curriculum changes, develop a new minor or degree program)
 - g. Directing a graduate program
 - h. Obtains grants to improve programs and curriculum
 - i. Mentors faculty and/or students in significant ways (e.g., Fulbright or honors program or presenting)
 - j. Sponsors or presents at faculty seminars, SGID facilitator, etc.
 - k. Other department, college, and/or university mission-related and/or strategic plan work
2. Service to the profession
 - a. Holds office in professional organizations (international, national, state, local)
 - b. Plans a conference
 - c. Reviews conference proposals
 - d. Speaks or presents in non-refereed situations
 - e. Sponsors a student organization
 - f. Administers a grant (e.g., service or teaching grant)
3. Service to the community
 - a. Involved with schools/colleges/universities (e.g., accreditation, workshops, consults/advises)
 - b. State level committee membership (e.g., curriculum standards development, policy planning)
 - c. Serves on boards, liaison, representative, external reviewer to schools/colleges/universities

Evaluation Tools

The following evaluation rubrics are designed to guide peers' assessment of faculty performance in the department. They are designed as threshold tools, meaning that in tenure and promotion decision-making years, a faculty member will meet or exceed expectations as specified on the rubrics to attain tenure and/or promotion. Annual ratings and evaluation statements represent peer review of a faculty member's progress toward tenure and/or promotion. See page 2 of this document for higher level expectations for promotion than for tenure.

Faculty position descriptions must be taken into consideration when applying the rubrics. Note however, position descriptions in the department are designed for faculty to be able to meet the threshold criteria as specified on the rubrics. Typically, over six years, the average percentages for a tenure seeking faculty member's position description is close to 60% teaching/advising, 20% research and scholarly activity, and 20% service. The evaluation rubrics for all areas are based on these average percentages. In cases where faculty position descriptions deviate substantially from these average percentages, (especially related to scholarship) the department chair will advise the faculty member and faculty review committees, in writing, about performance expectations.

A. Evaluation of Teaching & Advising

1. Percentage of responsibility allocated to teaching typically ranges between 40-60% when teaching 12-18 credits, annually (not including summer).
2. Faculty are expected to comply with University policy and have students evaluate every course using the approved UND course assessment form, University Student Assessment of Teaching (USAT form), and for faculty evaluation purposes, to supply at least three forms of teaching data from a variety of sources. Candidates' three sources of teaching data are to be clearly stated in their evaluation document. Evaluation committees use the sources of teaching data to evaluate teaching using the rubric below.
 - Source one: USAT data (required by university)
 - Source two: Teaching analysis (required by department)
 - Source three: Candidate choice (e.g., external evaluation, peer evaluation, formative/mid-term feedback from students)
 - Recommended but optional: Summer school USAT data for faculty who teach in program areas where summer school instruction is expected or routine
 - Recommended but optional: If courses taught through the Division of Continuing Education are taught as overload (i.e., taught on a separate contract) it is recommended but optional to submit teaching evaluation data and teaching materials for evaluation).
3. Achievement criteria for Excellent, Adequate or Unsatisfactory are specified on the rubric below.

Teaching Evaluation	Excellent	Adequate	Unsatisfactory
Teaching effectiveness	<p>Teaching sources (i.e., USAT data, teaching analysis, and other sources) reveal high levels of effectiveness in most or all of the following: student learning, teaching and assessment methods, use of technology, communication, knowledge and enthusiasm for subject matter, good organization of course and subject matter, positive attitude toward students, grading practices.</p> <p>Over time, a strong pattern of means at or above 4.2 (on 5.0 scale) on student evaluations of teaching; student comments support teaching excellence.</p>	<p>Teaching sources (i.e., USAT data, teaching analysis, and other sources) reveal high levels of effectiveness in most or all of the following: student learning, teaching and assessment methods, use of technology, communication, knowledge and enthusiasm for subject matter, good organization of course and subject matter, positive attitude toward students, grading practices.</p> <p>Over time, a pattern of means 4.2- 3.8 (on a 5.0 scale) or above on student evaluations of teaching. Student comments support satisfactory teaching.</p>	<p>Teaching sources (i.e., USAT data, teaching analysis, and other sources) reveal a struggle with effectiveness in many or most of the following: student learning, teaching and assessment methods, use of technology, communication, knowledge and enthusiasm for subject matter, good organization of course and subject matter, positive attitude toward students, grading practices.</p> <p>Over time, a pattern of scores below 3.5 (on a 5.0 scale) on student evaluations of teaching. Student comments suggest unsatisfactory teaching.</p>
Responsiveness to evaluation of teaching	<p>Data sources for evaluating teaching and other documents (e.g, reflective statement) reveal responsiveness to evaluation of teaching and indicate student performance has improved or other significant teaching successes are made evident.</p> <p>Professional development, and/or innovative teaching methods or format are evident and aimed at improving student performance or gaining appropriate knowledge.</p>	<p>Data sources for evaluating teaching and other documents (e.g, reflective statement) reveal responsiveness to evaluation of teaching and indicate plans for changes with potential for course improvements; efforts to improve teaching effectiveness are evident.</p> <p>Professional development, and/or innovative teaching methods or format maybe attempted and have potential to improve student performance or gaining appropriate knowledge.</p>	<p>Minimal or no documentation in teaching materials to indicate a sufficient level of planning or efforts to improve teaching effectiveness or course. Attempts to improve teaching are not documented or are thin.</p> <p>Professional development, and/or innovative teaching methods or format are limited and/or tend not to aid student learning.</p>

Excellent Teaching: Excellent means that overall, one's teaching materials describe a preponderance of strengths; teaching effectiveness is highly evident and materials reveal high levels of responsiveness to evaluation of teaching.

Adequate Teaching: Adequate means that overall, one's teaching materials describe many strengths and indicate teaching is important to the faculty member.

Unsatisfactory Teaching: Unsatisfactory means that one's teaching materials reveal many or even mostly weaknesses and indicate that teaching is troublesome for the faculty member.

Advising Evaluation	Excellent	Adequate	Unsatisfactory
Undergraduate	Performance advising undergraduates is excellent as evidenced by respectfulness, accuracy, availability, knowledgeable about the program, forward thinking (e.g., helps map out long term plans), resourceful in seeking answers, helpful in specialized or unique advising situations, helpful to colleagues in the advising process.	Performance advising undergraduates is successful as evidenced by respectfulness, accuracy, availability, knowledgeable about the program, forward thinking (e.g., helps map out long term plans), resourceful in seeking answers, helpful in specialized or unique advising situations.	Performance advising undergraduates is spotty: faculty member may be undependable, unavailable, pattern of advising mistakes, disrespectful to advisees, lack advising knowledge, somewhat unhelpful to student (e.g., fails to direct student toward helpful information), tends to ignore responsibilities in specialized or unique advising situations
Graduate	Performance advising graduate students is excellent as evidenced by all of the above and also includes many of the following criteria: fluent with programs in which one advises (including doctoral program), advises masters and doctoral students, serves on and chairs doctoral committees, demonstrates ability to collaborate with other faculty, is a mentor in the areas of scholarship and professional expectations, knowledgeable about research practices (e.g., methods, IRB); is sought after as an advisor; has high completion rate.	Performance advising graduate students is effective as evidenced by all of the above and including: resourceful about advising in appropriate programs (including doctoral program), advises masters students, occasionally serves on doctoral committees, generally collaborates well with other faculty on committees, guides students in the areas of scholarship and professional expectations, knowledgeable about research practices (e.g., methods, IRB)	Performance advising graduate students is questionable as evidenced by all of the above and including: not resourceful, tends to avoid advising in graduate programs, rarely asked or chooses to serve on or chair doctoral committees, may not collaborate well with other faculty on committees, unable to guide students in the areas of scholarship and professional expectations, weakly prepared to guide research (e.g., methods, IRB); has low completion rates for advisees.

Excellent Advising: Excellent means that overall, the candidate's advising materials describe a preponderance of strengths. Sources triangulate to show a pattern of excellence.

Adequate Advising: Adequate means that overall, the candidate's advising materials describe mostly strengths and indicate advising is important to this faculty member. Sources triangulate to show a pattern of satisfactory success as an advisor.

Unsatisfactory Advising: Unsatisfactory means that overall, the candidate's advising materials describe a pattern of weaknesses and indicate advising is a troublesome area for this faculty member. Sources triangulate to show a pattern of unsatisfactory behaviors as an advisor.

Evaluation of Research & Scholarly Activity

1. Percentage of responsibility allocated to research and scholarly activity is typically 20-30% for tenure seeking faculty.
2. The rubric describes a threshold accomplishment by year six, and steady progress toward the threshold is expected.
3. Refer to the list of major and minor publications for acceptable publications.
4. Three (3) minor publications may substitute for 1 major publication **OR** three (3) **presentations** from national and international conferences may be substituted for 1 major publication. *Note:* One of these substitutions is acceptable, not both. If these substitutions are made, it is important that the remaining major publications demonstrate high levels of scholarship.
5. Achievement criteria for Excellent, Adequate or Unsatisfactory are specified on the rubric below.

Research & Scholarly Activity	Excellent	Adequate	Unsatisfactory
Scholarly Agenda	<p>The candidate demonstrates an on-going sustained research program; research goals are clearly being met.</p> <p>Non tenured and promotion seeking faculty: Progress toward threshold expectations merits an excellent rating.</p>	<p>Evidence is provided that an on-going research program exists; achievement of goals may vary.</p> <p>Non tenured and promotion seeking faculty: Progress toward threshold expectations merits an adequate rating.</p>	<p>No or little evidence is provided that an on-going research program exists; program may consist of goals with minimal implementation or completion.</p> <p>Non tenured and promotion seeking faculty: Progress toward threshold expectations indicates insufficient progress.</p>
Publications & Presentations	<p>Publication accomplishments have allowed the candidate to meet departmental criteria that results in associate or full membership on the graduate school faculty.</p> <p>Publications and presentations indicate products are judged to be of value to the candidate's field. Quality indicators such as low acceptance rate, high levels of readership, importance to the field, and complexity of research or project are evident.</p> <p>Three refereed or juried presentations are made at the national and international level.</p> <p>At minimum, six total publications are achieved: 4 major publications and at least 2 minor publications. Or, equivalent publication achievements clearly meet or exceed expectations for a record of excellence.</p>	<p>Publication accomplishments have allowed the candidate to meet departmental criteria that results in associate or full membership on the graduate school faculty.</p> <p>Publications and presentations indicate products are judged to be of value to the candidate's field. Quality indicators such as low acceptance rate, high levels of readership, importance to the field, and complexity of research or project are evident.</p> <p>Three refereed or juried presentations are made at the regional, national and/or international level.</p> <p>At minimum, six total publications are achieved: 3 major publications and 3 minor publications. Or, equivalent publication achievements meet expectations for adequate.</p>	<p>Publication accomplishments have not allowed the candidate to meet departmental criteria to attain associate or full membership on the graduate school faculty.</p> <p>Publications and presentations may have been accomplished, but quality indicators such as low acceptance rate, high levels of readership, importance to the field, and complexity of research or project are not evident; or the role of the candidate in the work was limited.</p> <p>Less than three refereed or juried presentations are made, or role was routinely minimal in the work.</p> <p>The candidate has less than 3 major publications or less than 6 total publications.</p>

Excellent Scholarship: Excellent means that overall one's scholarship materials describe a pattern of accomplishments and indicate that ongoing sustained research is important to the faculty member. The candidate's scholarly agenda, and publications and presentations meet or exceed expectations of quality and quantity; progress on scholarship is paced to support meeting professional goals.

Adequate Scholarship: Adequate means that overall one's scholarship materials describe accomplishments and indicate that scholarship is important to the faculty member. The candidate's scholarly agenda, and publications and presentations meet or exceed expectations of quality and quantity; progress on scholarship is paced adequately to support meeting professional goals.

Unsatisfactory Scholarship: Unsatisfactory means that one's scholarship activities describe mostly efforts with few if any accomplishments and indicate that scholarship is troublesome for the faculty member. The candidate's scholarly agenda, and publications and presentations are limited in quality and quantity; expected progress on scholarship appears tenuous and/or unsatisfactory for meeting professional goals (e.g., achieve tenure and/or promotion).

C. Evaluation of Service

1. Percentage of responsibility allocated to service is typically 15-20% for tenure seeking faculty.
2. Achievement criteria for Excellent, Adequate or Unsatisfactory are specified on the rubric below.

Service Evaluation	Excellent	Adequate	Unsatisfactory
1. Service to Institution	Well-documented, well-described service that impacts the faculty, students or staff, and/or the mission and/or strategic plan of the department, college and/or university. Service is varied and/or deeply dedicated to selective tasks. Involvement in the department supports collegial achievement of goals.	Service is sufficiently documented and documentation reveals service has had some impact on the faculty, students or staff, and/or the mission and/or strategic plan of the department, college and/or university. Involvement in the department supports collegial achievement of goals.	Service documentation tends to be spotty or unclear. Impact on the faculty, students or staff, and/or the mission and/or strategic plan of the department, college and/or university is limited or not made evident. Involvement in the department may not support collegial achievement of goals or representation of department may be unprofessional or lack diligence.
2. Service to Profession	Well-documented, well-described service to one's professional societies and/or recognized practitioners in the field. Service is varied and/or deeply dedicated to selective tasks. Evaluation materials provide evidence of impact and high quality leadership and/or participation.	Variety or depth of service to profession is sufficiently documented and evaluation materials provide evidence of impact and high quality participation.	Variety or depth of service to profession is insufficient or not well documented or unclear. Evaluation materials tend not to provide clear information about type, impact or quality of service provided.

3. Service to Community	Well-documented, well-described service to communities such as schools colleges, universities, state or other agencies. Service is varied and/or deeply dedicated to selective tasks. Evaluation materials provide evidence of positive impact and quality participation.	Variety or depth of service is to community is sufficiently documented and evaluation materials provide evidence of impact and high quality participation.	Variety or depth of service to profession is insufficient or not well documented or unclear. Evaluation materials tend not to provide clear information about type, impact or quality of service provided.
4. Other Service	Other service constitutes equal or greater value and quality than those above noted as excellent.	Other service is adequately carried out, documented, and explained.	Other service is unsatisfactory in carry-through or documentation or explanation.

Excellent Service: For an overall excellent rating, service must be well-documented, clearly explained (as needed), and materials indicate service roles fulfilled are significant through leadership, effort, and/or impact. High quality participation is evident. Usually excellent service includes instances of high quality service in more than one area of service. Excellent service **MUST** include high quality service to the department.

Adequate Service: For an overall rating of adequate, evidence of the potential for significant leadership, effort, and/or impact should be evident; and/or candidate's service roles typically assist in accomplishing the expected goals/plans. At least one area of service indicates more than minimal leadership, effort, or impact.

Unsatisfactory Service: An overall rating of unsatisfactory indicates a lack of significant leadership, effort, and/or impact overall or no evidence of service in one or more areas or service roles may not support collegial accomplishment of goals.

Part II: Preparing the Faculty Evaluation Portfolio

Proposed Document

The faculty evaluation portfolio organizes and communicates your professional goals and accomplishments for the given period of time being reviewed. Your portfolio assists review committees and others to understand the quality and significance of your work. Some of the information you will provide in your portfolio is explained in the following sections. The information aims to be a guide, not a prescription. Note, however, some forms and documents are specified by the department, college or university as required. Still, it is up to the faculty member to present his or her work in an organized, documented, and carefully constructed manner that represents your work thoroughly, meaningfully, and succinctly.

I. Document Information

The faculty member being evaluated prepares various documents to be included in the evaluation portfolio. Portfolio documents that require explanation include the following: vita, Summary Statement of Professional Activity for Faculty Evaluation, sources of data for evaluation of teaching (e.g., USAT data, choice form(s) of teaching data, and teaching analysis), reflective statement, and goals.

A. Vita: The curriculum vita adheres to the VPAA format. See the Appendix of this Handbook, the Faculty Handbook, <http://www.und.nodak.edu/dept/registrar/senate/FacultyHandbook/>, and State Board of Higher Education Website, <http://www.ndus.nodak.edu/sbhe/default.asp>, for more complete information, as needed.

B. Summary Statement of Professional Activity for Faculty Evaluation: Please see this form on pages 19-21. The candidate uses the form to clearly summarize professional information and activities for the review committees.

1. The summative statement clearly and succinctly organizes background information, teaching/advising, research/scholarly activity, and service. The purpose of the summative statement is to organize your professional data for the committees, preventing the need for committee members to count or sort out numbers of course taught, numbers of advises or make guesses about which publications are in print or in press, refereed or non-refereed, etc. The faculty member creates this summary statement to make very clear the work that has been completed or is on-going during the review period. Faculty may include charts, grids, bulleted lists or other means to summarize this information. (Note: While the vita also presents this information, there it is presented in a more general format.)

a) In the case of teaching, faculty are asked to provide information on courses taught by semester or year, class size and other relevant information (e.g., online, overload, etc.).

b) In the case of research/scholarly activity, the faculty member presents the detail about publications and scholarly events. The faculty member states clearly what work is to be considered as working towards meeting threshold expectations for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review.

c) In the case of service, levels of service to the institution (program, department, college, or university) and other categories of service are clearly stated.

2. See the Appendix for this form (Note—eventually we should be able to access this form from TL webpage.)

C. Sources of data for evaluation of teaching: NDUS requires that faculty make available three forms of data for evaluation of teaching. NDUS requires evaluation include student provided data and that student feedback be used for evaluation purposes. The NDUS policy states that other forms of teaching data can vary by department. In the Department of Teaching and Learning, faculty members have choice about the second form of data, and the third form of data is a teaching analysis (required--see below for more information). These data forms must be stated clearly on the Summary Statement of Professional Activity for Faculty Evaluation.

1. USAT data: The Department of Teaching & Learning uses the USAT summary forms and student comments as a uniform tool to obtain student input on faculty evaluation of teaching.

2. Choice form(s) of teaching data, as specified in the University of North Dakota Faculty Handbook:

a) Instructor-Provided Materials/Portfolios - may include reflective statements on teaching, syllabi, descriptions of class activities, writing assignments, tests, videotapes, evidence of scholarly activity related to teaching, lists of classes taught, independent projects or theses supervised, graduate committees served on, reports on course or curriculum development work, written responses to student feedback, etc.

b) Documented Evidence of Student Learning or Performance – student work samples, performances, test results, etc.

c) Documented Data from Peers - based on formal observation of classroom teaching, review of teaching materials/portfolios, or observations of other teaching-related work (in graduate committees, curriculum planning sessions, etc.)

d) Documented Data from the Chair - based on formal observation of classroom teaching, review of teaching materials/portfolios, or observations of other teaching-related work (in graduate committees, curriculum planning sessions, etc.)

3. Teaching analysis—required by the department: a statement that provides analysis of one's teaching in at least one course during the review period. The purpose is to demonstrate teaching effectiveness and responsiveness to teaching evaluation; additionally, the purpose is to avoid reducing evaluation of teaching to numerical scores such as USAT means. The following offers ideas about preparing a teaching analysis statement—note, however, these are ideas, not prescriptions.

a) Bring together the other teaching sources of data to demonstrate student learning (e.g., demonstrate student achievement by analyzing performance information on a critical task, assignment, or exam.)

b) Demonstrate responsiveness to student feedback with documentation, organization and explanation of formative student feedback and subsequent course improvements.

c) Provide documentation and explanation about course revisions that improve student learning through use of technology, innovative learning experiences, and/or student performance.

D. Reflective Statement: The reflective statement is an essay, typically serving as the initial document in your annual portfolio. It is a key source of information for committees and other reviewers (e.g., department chair and college dean). The reflective statement provides a frame of reference for your portfolio. In it, you present information such as the following: priorities, rationale for the professional choices you have made, strengths, the extent to which you have met your goals, circumstances that promoted or inhibited achievement of goals, significance of your work, and a brief introduction to your portfolio. You present your perspective on your work and work experience, and offer explanation and/or clarification, as needed.

E. Goal Statements: Your goals are stated on the Summary Statement of Professional Activity for Faculty Evaluation and progress toward or achievement of goals is processed in the Reflective Statement. Faculty goals are personalized, but aim to meet threshold requirements to achieve tenure and promotion. Sample goal statements are as follows:

- Incorporate more technology into my instruction and have students demonstrate increased use of technology in my courses, particularly TL _____ (course title).
- Submit article on (topic) to (journal title) on or before May 15, 2009.
- Present three juried papers (presentations) at national conferences by my fourth year.
- Complete the following curriculum changes for (program) on or before October 2008.

II. The faculty member being evaluated prepares two portfolios documenting his or her work. The first portfolio is the Essential Documents Portfolio. The second portfolio(s) is the Teaching/Advising, Research and Scholarly Activity, and Service Portfolio.

A. The Essential Documents Portfolio includes:

1. Reflective Statements which are a reflection on one's work, connections to past review statements, goals and major accomplishments, etc., cumulative.
2. Curriculum vita that adheres to the VPAA format
3. Summary Statements of Professional Activity for Faculty Evaluation, cumulative.
4. Fully signed position description forms, cumulative for years toward tenure and promotion. These forms represent the annual agreements between faculty members and department chairs, which are now mandated by the ND Board of Higher Education.
5. Academic Record and/or October Supplement Forms, cumulative for years toward tenure and promotion.
6. Letters/evaluation reports from evaluation committees, department chair, college dean, and other administration from the previous evaluations, cumulative.
7. USAT Summary forms for all courses taught during the period under review, cumulative. (Are these required?)
8. Analysis of Teaching Statements, cumulative

B. The Teaching/Advising, Research and Scholarly Activity , Service Portfolio includes documentation in the three areas of evaluation. In the case of tenure or promotion decision, the portfolio must minimally include the requirements identified by the VPAA/Provost. The following lists state basic expectations. Faculty can personalize their portfolios, as desired.

1. Teaching and Advising

- a. Vita
- b. Three sources of teaching data
 - i. USAT data
 - ii. Candidate Choice(s)
 - iii. Teaching Analysis: a statement that provides analysis of student learning in at least one course during the review period; purpose is to demonstrate teaching effectiveness and responsiveness to teaching evaluation.
- c. List of advisees
- d. Documentation of effective advising (graduate and undergraduate)

2. Research and Scholarly Activity

- a. Vita
- b. Publications, Grants and Presentations (and equivalents)
- c. Letters of acceptance for in-press articles and grants and accepted presentation proposals
- d. Letters of submission for submitted articles and grants and submitted presentation proposals
- e. Manuscripts and other works in progress
- f. Explanatory evidence regarding quality of scholarship
- g. Evidence of on-going scholarly agenda
- h. Membership status on the Graduate School Faculty
- i. Goals information

3. Service

- a. Vita
- b. Clear, explanatory, well organized documentation demonstrating active involvement in service activities (e.g., letters, documents, reports, etc.)

Summary Statement of Professional Activity for Faculty Evaluation

Candidate: _____ Current Rank: _____

Academic Year/Evaluation _____

Purpose of Evaluation (check all that apply):

Tenure ____ Promotion ____ Annual Review ____ (Year ____) Post Tenure ____

Number of Years in Department of Teaching & Learning _____

Years brought in toward tenure (if applicable) _____

Candidate's Position Description for current academic year:

Teaching ____% Research ____% Service ____% Other ____%

List any special assignments.

Specify the three (or more) sources of teaching data provided for teaching evaluation purposes.

1.

2.

3.

Other

TEACHING SUMMARY

Summarize your teaching and advising for this review period. For teaching, please include course number, title, credits, class size, average USAT means, and other relevant information (e.g., face-to face delivery, online, overload, courses involved in teaching analysis, etc.)

ADVISING SUMMARY

For advising, specify graduate or undergraduate, and other relevant information.

TEACHING/ADVISING GOALS

RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY SUMMARY

Summary of major and minor scholarly activity for this review period (including manuscripts in press, in review and in progress; indicating refereed/non-refereed status for articles and presentations).

Clearly state your research/scholarly activity plan, i.e., state how you intend to meet or exceed the threshold expectations for this area of evaluation. Refer to the Evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity section (and evaluation tool), if needed.

RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY GOALS

SERVICE SUMMARY

Institution (Program, Department, College, University)

Profession

Community

SERVICE GOALS

▲ ◀ II-5 PROMOTIONS ▶ ▼

5.1 ACADEMIC RANKS OF UND FACULTY

To the extent each characteristic is called for by the promotion candidate's contracts and tenure plans, the ranks in faculty of the University of North Dakota, and the characteristics of each rank are:

PROFESSOR

Recognition for teaching excellence
Recognition for scholarly and/or creative accomplishment
Recognition for leadership within his or her profession
Recognition for demonstrated spirit of concern for society

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Marked teaching effectiveness
Scholarly and/or creative accomplishment
Substantial contribution to his or her profession
Demonstrated spirit of concern for society

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Effective as a teacher
Scholarly and/or creative endeavor
Active in his or her profession
Spirit of concern for society

INSTRUCTOR

Promise as a teacher
Interest in his or her profession

Approved: UND Senate, 01-08-70; amended 02-05-98

5.2 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTIONS IN RANK

Promotions in rank are initiated by a written recommendation from the department chairs to the dean of their college or school. This recommendation must include a thorough evaluation of the qualifications of the candidate. This evaluation must take into account, and speak with reference to, the tenure plan or plans under which the candidate has served, specifying the candidate's duties and goals, identified by the candidate's contract(s) as required by Board of Higher Education Policy Manual §605.1 Subpart 3 b. (1) and (2). Recommendations are then submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost who, after seeking recommendations from the University Promotions Committee and a committee of deans, makes a recommendation to the

President. In accordance with State Board Policy 305.1.3.d, the President will approve or disapprove the recommendation.

Promotions are regarded as recognition of superior intellectual attainment as evidenced both in teaching and in distinctive contributions to one's discipline or profession. A truly effective faculty member will also demonstrate a commitment to society. While individuals will possess these qualities in varying degrees, they will be considered for promotion on the basis of the following criteria as specified to be pertinent to the individual in her or his contract(s) and tenure plan(s) identified in such contract(s):

A. Teaching

Effective teaching is an indispensable criterion for promotion. Evidence of effective teaching need not be restricted to formal classroom or seminar activity, but may include such things as the direction of graduate studies and contributions to curriculum design and implementation. Since there are a number of ways in which a faculty member may be a demonstrably effective teacher, no firm guidelines for judging this qualification are suggested. Rather, it shall be the responsibility of the department chairperson to submit meaningful statements, accompanied by whatever evidence or documentation he or she deems appropriate, concerning the candidate's effectiveness in various types and levels of instruction.

B. Contributions to One's Discipline or Profession

A second indispensable criterion for promotion is evidence of noteworthy contributions to one's discipline or profession in the form of research and creative work and/or outstanding professional competence and activity.

- 1. Research and creative work:** Evidence of scholarship and creative work is found in the candidate's published research or recognized literary or artistic productions. Research publication and other creative accomplishments are to be evaluated, not merely enumerated, and there should be evidence that the candidate is continuously and effectively engaged in creative work of high quality and significance.

- 2. Professional competence and activity:** Contributions to one's field are often in the form of demonstrated distinction in the special competencies characteristic of the profession or discipline. Recommendations based on this criterion should be accompanied by evidence of leadership in the field and progressiveness in the development and implementation of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems.

C. Contributions to Society

Other areas of activity are recognized as crucial to the effective functioning of the University. A faculty member may contribute special knowledge to the benefit of society as a whole, and may serve the University in administrative roles, committee memberships, and the like. It is expected that all faculty members will devote a certain amount of time and effort to these functions.

More detail is available from the Academic Affairs Office.

Approved: UND Senate, 01-08-70; revised 02-05-98

4.3 UND POLICY ON EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The evaluation of teaching as two distinct purposes: formative and summative. Formative evaluation is that which gathers information for the use of the instructor in improving his or her own teaching. Summative evaluation gathers information to be used by colleagues and administrators for the purpose of making decisions about retention, tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases.

Although the policy set forth here applies only to summative evaluation of teaching, the information collected in the course of the evaluation process may also be used for formative evaluation when appropriate. It is important to note, however, that information gathered solely for purposes of formative evaluation is intended only for the use of the faculty member, and should be used in summative reviews only with his/her permission.

1. Frequency and Extent of Evaluation

The teaching performance of all instructors, regardless of their academic rank or tenure status, is subject to evaluation annually.

* All faculty, regardless of status (probationary, tenured, and non-tenure track), must be evaluated as part of the annual review process, as well as for decisions regarding tenure and promotion. In each case, the faculty member being evaluated is expected to provide evidence of effective teaching in the form of at least three sources of data, one of which must be students. (See below for a list of potential sources of data.)

* Graduate teaching assistants must be evaluated annually as well, in a manner appropriate to their teaching assignment.

2. Aspects of Teaching to be Evaluated

The evaluation process should reflect the full range of teaching activities, including classroom teaching, mentoring, course and curriculum development, laboratory, clinical, or studio supervision, direction of independent research projects, scholarly/grant activity related to teaching, learning assessment activity, advising, etc.

Although it is important to acknowledge the unique nature of each individual's teaching situation, and to set flexible standards accordingly, it is expected that all instructors will be able to show evidence of these five basic hallmarks of good teaching:

- respect for students
- command of the subject matter
- careful preparation
- effective communication
- continuing professional growth.

3. Roles of the Various Parties

Role of the College. It is the role of the college to ensure that evaluation of teaching is conducted in a fair and reasonable manner, and with as much consistency as possible across the college. In addition to the expectations outlined here, each college may specify other aspects of teaching to be evaluated and other sources of data on teaching to be supplied by the department and/or faculty member.

Role of the Department. It is the role of the department to set reasonable expectations in regard to teaching, to communicate those expectations clearly, and to assist and support faculty in their professional development as teachers. Toward this end, each department shall develop a written statement of expectation for effective teaching within the department. At minimum, this statement should address the basic expectations outlined in (2) above. In addition to university and college expectations, each department may specify other aspects of teaching to be evaluated, additional expectations to be met, and additional documentation materials to be supplied by the faculty member. The department's statement on teaching evaluation policy should be kept on file in the department, distributed to each department member, and attached to all recommendations regarding retention, tenure, promotion, and reward going beyond the department. The department should also be prepared to assist faculty in meeting departmental expectations, and/or to refer them to appropriate campus resources to support their teaching.

Role of the Faculty Member. It is the role of the faculty member, in collaboration with the department chair, to take an active part in his or her evaluation by providing materials that give a complete picture of his/her teaching, by organizing those materials in an accessible manner, and by making herself/himself available for discussion of those materials with peers and administrators. In addition to materials required by the department, college, and university, the individual faculty member may submit any additional materials deemed appropriate to the evaluation process.

4. Potential Sources of Data

As noted earlier, each faculty member being evaluated is expected to provide evidence of effective teaching in the form of at least three sources of data in consultation with the chair, one of which must be students.

Student-Provided Data - may be gathered using the USAT or other student feedback forms, and/or by carefully documenting student feedback gathered by the department chair or immediate teaching supervisor. All student data will be offered voluntarily.

The other two sources of data to be used in the evaluation of teaching may vary from one department to the next. They include:

Instructor-Provided Materials/Portfolios - may include reflective statements on teaching, syllabi, descriptions of class activities, writing assignments, tests, videotapes, evidence of scholarly activity related to teaching, lists of classes taught, independent projects or theses supervised, graduate committees served on, reports on course or curriculum development work, written responses to student feedback, etc.

Documented Evidence of Student Learning or Performance – student work samples, performances, test results, etc.

Documented Data from Peers - based on formal observation of classroom teaching, review of teaching materials/portfolios, or observations of other teaching-related work (in graduate committees, curriculum planning sessions, etc.)

Documented Data from the Chair - based on formal observation of classroom teaching, review of teaching materials/portfolios, or observations of other teaching-related work (in graduate committees, curriculum planning sessions, etc.)

5. Use of Student Feedback

NDUS policy states that "evaluations of all teaching faculty must include significant student input" (Section: 605.1.6 - Academic Freedom and Tenure; Academic Appointments). In order to present a broad and accurate view of teaching, summative data should be gathered regularly, from a wide range of classes over several semesters. It is the responsibility of the department and/or college, to create appropriate mechanisms for gathering student input.

Informal Feedback. In addition to soliciting formal feedback for summative purposes, faculty are encouraged to solicit frequent informal feedback for purely formative purposes--that is, for the sole purpose of improving teaching and learning. Informal feedback may take the form of SGIDs, informal surveys, or other classroom assessment techniques and may be used by the individual teacher as he or she sees fit. Unless and until the instructor chooses to offer such data to evaluators, it should not be part of the evaluation process.

Mixed Data. When formal numerical data is mixed with informal written data, as is often the case with student feedback forms, only the numerical data will be reported to the chair and dean. However, because it is important that teaching not be reduced to a numerical rating, it is recommended that faculty share student written comments with evaluators as well. At the same time, because written student comments represent only the perspective of those who choose to make them, it is also recommended that department and college evaluators recognize the limitations of such data and seek to corroborate it using other sources. Because written data provided by students on anonymous end-of-semester questionnaires is protected by FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act), all reasonable care must be taken to see that such data is not traceable to individual students.

Aggregate Data. Aggregate data from the USAT forms will be compiled by the Office of Institutional Research and distributed to individual faculty members, department chairs, and deans. Any other aggregate data used for comparison purposes in the evaluation of individual faculty members should also be made available to those faculty members.

UND Senate, 05-01-03