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Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Faculty member (in conjunction with his/her department head) will complete and submit percentage weights form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October – December</td>
<td>Designated faculty will observe peer’s classroom instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February – March</td>
<td>Department head will observe faculty’s classroom instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Each faculty will complete Self Evaluation Form and submit documentation of work related to the performance areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Department head will complete forms and schedule annual conference with each faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Department head will submit copies of Summary form, Self Evaluation Form and Professional Decorum Form to the Dean’s office to be placed in faculty’s files.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduction**

This faculty evaluation model is designed to assess the professional performance of faculty employed by Langston University. The performance areas are teaching effectiveness, scholarship, and service. These focal points will provide direction for evaluation of a faculty member’s contribution to the mission of the University. The overall process of evaluation will allow input from all levels: student, administrative, peer, and self-evaluation. The goal is to assist faculty members in maintaining high educational standards as they constantly undergo professional development aimed at achieving excellence. This system will provide information for decision making in regard to retention of employment, promotion, and tenure.

The total evaluation process will help each individual develop as a faculty member, colleague, and collegiate member in the university setting. Feedback will be given throughout the process, and each faculty member will have the opportunity to respond if desired.
The Evaluation Process is as Follows:

1) **Portfolio:** Each faculty member will develop a portfolio documenting her/his evidence relating to the three criteria. The portfolio will be turned in no later than the second Monday in April of the academic year. The portfolio will consist of all documentation necessary to substantiate accomplishments. The portfolio must contain documentation of teaching, scholarship, service, the assigned percentile, and all evaluation materials (i.e., self evaluation, Departmental Head evaluation, Peer evaluation, Dean evaluation, and any corresponding materials).

2) Contained within the portfolio, the faculty will assess a percentile (based within the sliding scale) referencing his/her perception of quantifiable accomplishments.

3) Each portfolio will contain a *self evaluation* (format enclosed).

4) During the evaluation process, the Department Head and the Dean will calculate the percentile rating within the three criteria. This evaluation can be done as often as desired; however, it must be done during a designated time frame in the spring semester.

5) The peer evaluation will be done during the class of choice in the Fall semester by an individual of the faculty member’s choosing.

6) After the portfolio has been turned in by the faculty member, the Department Head will discuss the evaluation with the faculty member prior to the portfolio’s being forwarded to the Dean. The faculty member will have an opportunity to respond to the evaluation prior to the portfolio’s being sent forward.

7) After the Dean has evaluated each portfolio, the faculty member will have the opportunity to respond if desired.

**Tenure Track Faculty:** The purpose of the portfolio process is to help develop and build a case for promotion and tenure. The portfolio should be built upon each year and kept intact so that the faculty member will be prepared for his/her tenure year. This process is meant to help encourage collegiate growth. A copy should be kept and the portfolio must be up-to-date of all submitted materials.

**Tenured Faculty:** The purpose of evaluation is developmental in nature. The portfolio does not need to be as exhaustive as non-tenured faculty. However, faculty members must document their accomplishments for the year and turn in an annual summative portfolio.

**Summary:**

*It must be clearly understood that evaluation is a beneficial process, helping each of us become more astute as professionals. During the process, you have the freedom to respond referencing the process and to provide added support.*
### Name: ___________________________  Department: ___________________________

### Academic Year: ________________  Purpose of Evaluation: ____ Annual ____ Tenure ____ Promotion

This form must be submitted by the faculty member before September 30th of the academic year. Selected weights for the area of evaluation must total 100%. Faculty member must meet with the Department Chair to decide and confirm the selected percentage weights in the areas of evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Evaluation</th>
<th>Percentage Weights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administrative Responsibilities | %  
| %  
| Teaching                    | %  
| 20 – 70 %                  |
| Scholarship                 | %  
| 20 – 60 %                  |
| Service                     | %  
| 5 – 20 %                   |

Total Must Be 100%

Total: 100%

**Signature:**

**Note:** Faculty considering and applying for tenure and promotion must actively and consistently be engaged in Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly Activities, and Service. Actively pursuing these areas will strengthen your tenure and promotion application. For guidelines on Promotion and Tenure, view the *Langston University Promotion and Tenure Handbook.*
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Teaching Effectiveness
Summary Form

This form must be completed by the Department Head and/or Dean. A rating scale from 1 (low) – 4 (high) must be used to evaluate each of the items. Relevant documents (see indicators) must be used to determine the ratings. Peer observation should occur during the fall semester, and the department head should observe during the spring semester.

Faculty Member’s Name: ___________________________________ Department: _______________________________ Academic Year: ________________

Purpose of Evaluation: ________________________________________________________________

Description of Teaching Load (list courses taught during the academic year)
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

1. Student Evaluation
   Indicators: Result of University prepared instrument, petitions, commendations, and other related activities.

2. Peer Evaluation
   Indicators: Observation checklist, letters of support, and other related activities.

3. Department/Administrative Head Evaluation
   Indicators: Observation checklist, Professional Decorum and other related activities.

4. Self Evaluation
   Indicators: Employee’s Self Evaluation Form

5. Other

   Average Score_______ X  Weight_______  ==  Total Score_______

Signatures:
__________________  ____________________  ____________________
Department Head    Dean
Date

Comments
___________________________________________________________________________________________

Faculty Member

Date

Comments: ________________________________________________________________

**Note: Faculty considering and applying for tenure and promotion must actively and consistently be engaged in Teaching Effectiveness. Actively pursuing teaching effectiveness will strengthen your tenure and promotion application.
The following peer review process (checklist for classroom observation) should be completed by a professional colleague within your unit/school.

The following scale should be used to rate teaching dynamics:

1 = unsatisfactory  2 = needs improvement  3 = meets requirements  4 = exceeds requirements

Name of faculty: ___________________ Course/number/sec _____ / _____ / ______

Days and Time of class meeting: _______________________ Number of students attending: _____

Date of observation: ______________________

I. Instructional Strategies

___ Communicated effectively
___ Exhibited enthusiasm for the subject (or teaching)
___ Used a variety of techniques and teaching methods that are consistent with best practices
___ Created an environment for critical thinking
___ Raised challenging questions as opposed to right/wrong type
___ Encouraged students to form their own conclusions
___ Encouraged development of higher order thinking skills
___ Created an active learning environment
___ Discussed application of the subject

COMMENTS: Average Score _______

II. Content Knowledge

___ Applied a theoretical base to information
___ Added interpretation and evaluation of the subject
___ Connected subject with other fields
___ Displayed awareness of current views, research, issues, and trends

COMMENTS: Average Score _______

III. Course Syllabus

___ Objectives clear, appropriate, and significant
___ Activities well-planned and logically connected
___ Assignments and requirements sufficient to achieve objectives
___ Class materials useful and appropriate to the subject
___ Content presentation conducive to student participation
___ Rubrics and evaluation criteria clearly defined
___ Course syllabus is in accordance with University standards

COMMENTS: Average Score _______

Langston University F3P
Checklist for Classroom Observation Form
Continuation of
Checklist for Classroom Observation Form

IV. Classroom Management

___ Explained or framed the subject for the session
___ Used the board, overhead, or other technology aids effectively
___ Showed sensitivity to pace and student attentiveness
___ Dealt with disruptive or dominating students effectively
___ Brought the period to conclusion in a timely manner
___ Managed classroom time effectively

COMMENTS:

Average Score ______

V. Student Interaction

___ Encouraged dialogue and exchanges between students
___ Displayed respect for student opinions and responses
___ Conveyed enthusiasm to students regarding the subject matter
___ Demonstrated concern for student learning
___ Displayed flexibility in response to individual needs

COMMENTS:

Average Score: _______

Total Average Score__________

Observer Signature Date

Faculty Member Signature Date

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________
Langston University F3P
Scholarship
Evaluation Form

Name: ________________________________ Department: ________________________________

Academic Year: _______________ Purpose of Evaluation: ______ Annual ______ Tenure______ Promotion

Directions: The department head and/or the dean will use this form to evaluate the faculty member’s performance. At least five (5) of the items will be selected by the faculty member to be used in the assessment. A rating scale from 1 (Below Expectations) – 4 (Excellent) will give numerical value for the indicators. The evaluator (Department Head and/or Dean) will indicate the rating selected for each item. In determining the ratings, the evaluator should consider the number of activities, overall significance of the activity and the time involvement. Documents must be submitted with this form to verify activities. Place an “x” by the five (5) items on which you would like to be evaluated.

1- Below Expectations 2- Fair 3-Good 4-Excellent

CRITERIA:

_____ 1. Research
Indicators: Data collected, research underway but no data collected, proposal submitted but research not started, research based publications/presentations, and other related activities.

_____ 2. Professional Development
Indicators: Attendance at professional trainings, meetings and conferences; presentations at professional conferences, and/or appointments to boards.

_____ 3. Writings
Indicators: Articles in refereed journals, books, chapter(s) in book(s), submitted proposals, manuals, brochures, book reviews, and other related activities.

_____ 4. Written and/or Funded Proposals
Indicators: University, state, federal, private foundation, and other related activities.

_____ 5. Professional and/or Consultative Activities
Indicators: Workshops, institutes, training sessions, seminars, and other related activities.

_____ 6. Scholarship of Instruction and Learning
Indicators: New programs, new courses, instructional materials, and other related activities.

_____ 7. Scholarly Artistic Development
Indicators: Displays, demonstrations, poster presentations, artistic performances, special events and other related activities.

_____ 8. Awards / Recognitions
Indicators: Teacher of the year, Who’s Who nomination, professional organization recognition, community award, and other related activities.

_____ 9. Community Engaged Scholarship (CES)
Indicators: Community partnership activities with documented peer reviews and dissemination of scholarly product, etc.
10. Other scholarly activities not listed above (please explain):

**Note: Faculty considering and applying for tenure and promotion must be actively and consistently engaged in completing scholarly activities of writings, research, professional development, CES, proposal writing, etc. (Refer to Promotion and Tenure Document). Actively pursuing these indicators will strengthen your promotion and tenure application.

Average Score _______ X Weight _________ == Total Score ___________

Signatures:

Department Head Date

Dean Date

Comments: _______________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Faculty Member Date

Comments: _______________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
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Service
Evaluation Form

Name: ___________________________ Department: ___________________________

Academic Year: _____________ Purpose of Evaluation: __________________________

The department head and/or the dean should use this form to evaluate each item. A rating scale from
1 (Below Expectations) – 4 (Excellent) must be used to evaluate and activities.

1. Service to the University
   Indicators: University committees, boards, task forces, organizations, etc.

2. Service to the School
   Indicators: School committees, boards, organizations, etc.

3. Service to the Department
   Indicators: Department committees, boards, organizations, etc.

4. Student Support Services
   Indicators: Academic advisement, tutoring, consultation/referral, organization advisement

5. Service to the Professional Community
   Indicators: Boards, commissions, task forces, membership in professional organizations, and/or other.

6. Service to the local Community and Educational Agencies
   Indicators: Tutoring, advisement, PTO/PTA participation, neighborhood organizations and/or other.

7. Presentations/Performances/Participation
   Indicators: Artistic, musicals, charity events, support groups and/or other.

8. Others not listed. (Please explain):

________________________________________________________________________

Average Score ______ X Weight ______ = Total Score ____________

Signatures:

Department Head Date Dean Date

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

Faculty Member Date

Comments:

**Note: Faculty considering and applying for tenure and promotion must actively and consistently be engaged in service to the Department, School, University, Profession, and Community. Actively pursuing and demonstrating service will strengthen your tenure and promotion application.**
Name: ______________________________  Department: ______________________________

Course: ____________________________  Academic Year: ____________________________

Purpose of evaluation: _____________________________________________________________

Use a rating scale of 1 (low) - 4 (high) to evaluate your performance related to the following items. The average score of this form must be included on the Teaching Effectiveness Summary Form. Additionally, please attach a narrative describing your accomplishments during this academic year and your goals for the next year.

_____ 1. Qualifications to teach the course content
_____ 2. Quality of the course syllabus
_____ 3. Diligence in keeping accurate attendance records
_____ 4. Consistency in keeping office hours
_____ 5. Effective communication and interaction with students
_____ 6. Use of effective classroom managements skills
_____ 7. Integration of various teaching strategies in the classroom
_____ 8. Use of visual technology and other visuals to enhance instruction
_____ 9. Integration of technology in course assignments
_____10. Overall quality of instruction
_____11. Academic and scholarly activities

Average Score_______

Signature: ______________________________

Faculty Member                  Date
This form should be completed by the Department Head or the Dean to assess the performance of faculty in the listed items. A rating scale of 1 (low) – 4 (high) should be used to rate.

| __   | 1.       | Service on committees                       |
| __   | 2.       | Interaction with colleagues                 |
| __   | 3.       | Interaction with students                   |
| __   | 4.       | Reporting grades                             |
| __   | 5.       | Keeping office hours                         |
| __   | 6.       | Effective student advisement                 |
| __   | 7.       | Attendance at department meetings           |
| __   | 8.       | Attendance at college meetings              |
| __   | 9.       | Attendance at university conferences        |
| __   | 10.      | Attendance at graduation                    |
| __   | 11.      | Others ___________________________          |
|      |          | (Specify)                                    |

Average Score ________

Signatures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Head</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments / Recommendations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Langston University F3P
Summary of Evaluation Form

This form must be completed by the Department Head and/or the Dean. Information must be taken from the appropriate forms to determine the weights and average scores.

Name: _________________________ Department: _____________________________

Academic Year: _______________ Purpose of Evaluation: _____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Evaluation</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Decorum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Scores

Signatures:

Department Head Date Dean Date

Comments

Faculty Member Date

Comments
List individual goals/objectives for next year 2009-2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal/Objective 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal/Objective 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal/Objective 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal/Objective 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal/Objective 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal/Objective 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Please note you can include a narrative and/or supporting documentation.

The following faculty evaluation was tailored from Tennessee State University and redesigned to fit the Langston University F3P – Faculty Professional Performance Plan for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.
Langston University F3P
Rating Scale for Classroom Observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceeds Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Meets Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Langston University F3P
Rubric for Average Score of Classroom Observation

The following rubric displays where each faculty member ranks based on his/her average score in each of the following areas: Instructional Strategies, Content Knowledge, Course Syllabus, Classroom Management, and Student Interaction.

1- Unsatisfactory
Unsatisfactory performances; Indifference toward or unreasonable resistance in meeting instructional teaching standards in two or more of the following areas: instructional strategies, content knowledge, development of course syllabus, classroom management, and student interaction.

2- Needs Improvement
Demonstrates minimal qualitative expectations in the classroom as it relates to one or more of the following areas: instructional strategies, content knowledge, development of course syllabus, classroom management, and student interaction.

3- Meets Requirements
Meets teaching responsibilities and displays evidence of solid work in/on content knowledge, instructional strategies, development of course syllabus, classroom management, and student interaction.

4- Exceeds Requirement
Fulfills and exceeds all teaching responsibilities. Demonstrates proficiency and evidence of overall excellence in content knowledge, instructional strategies, development of course syllabus, classroom management, and student interaction.

The following rubric was tailored from *The College of Arts and Sciences, Santa Clara University* (California Academic Press [www.calpres.com](http://www.calpres.com)), and redesigned to fit the Langston University F3P – Faculty Professional Performance Plan for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.
# Langston University F3P

## Rubric for Academic Scholarship Activities

(Research, Professional Development, Writings, Funded Proposals, Professional and/or Consultative Activities, Scholarship of Instruction and Learning, Artistic Scholarly Development, Awards/Recognitions, Community Engaged Scholarship, and other Scholarly Activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Below Expectations</td>
<td>Demonstrates little or no academic scholarship or creative activities; materials or activities are not displayed in a scholarly manner and/or not approved through a peer review process, academic unit, or public/private sector entity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Fair</td>
<td>Minimal academic scholarship activities or research productivity is of acceptable quality; material or activity is displayed in a scholarly manner and/or approved through a peer review process, academic unit, or public/private sector entity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Good</td>
<td>Demonstrates solid academic scholarship activities and productivity; individual displays well-documented evidence of scholarly activities relative to the respective academic discipline; materials or activities are displayed in a scholarly manner and/or approved through a peer review process, academic unit, or public/private sector entity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Excellent</td>
<td>Substantial academic scholarship activity efforts; significant and/or rigorous evidence of academic scholarship and/or evidence of creative work in prestigious venues. Scholarly works support and impact state, regional, national and/or international academic communities. Materials and/or activities are displayed in a scholarly manner and/or approved through a peer review process, academic unit, or public/private sector entity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Rubric for Professional Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Below Expectations</td>
<td>Little or no meaningfully service to the department, school, University, profession, and/or community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Fair</td>
<td>A minimal level of useful service to the department, school, University, profession, and/or community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Good</td>
<td>Consistent participation and active service to the department, school, University, profession, and/or community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Excellent</td>
<td>Displays initiative, proactive leadership, and efforts with consistently beneficial results in service to the department, school, University, profession, and/or community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following rubrics were tailored from *The College of Arts and Sciences, Santa Clara University* (California Academic Press [www.calpres.com](http://www.calpres.com)), and redesigned to fit the Langston University F3P – Faculty Professional Performance Plan for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Faculty member exceeds requirements in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Faculty member meets requirements in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Faculty member needs improvement in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Faculty member is unsatisfactory in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>