

*Langston University*

---

***Faculty  
Professional Performance  
Plan  
(F3P)***

---

*Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service*

*Completed in August 2008*

*Approved by the University Senate May 2009*

**Langston University**  
**F3P – Faculty Professional Performance Plan**  
**Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service**

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

**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 their 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 Fall semester by an individual of the faculty member's choosing, during the class of choice.
- 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 being forwarded to the Dean. The faculty member will have an opportunity to respond to the evaluation prior to the portfolio 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 their 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 provide added support.**



**Langston University F3P  
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 check list, 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                      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
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.**

**Langston University F3P**  
**Checklist for Classroom Observation Form**

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 syllabi are in accordance with university standards

**COMMENTS:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Average Score** \_\_\_\_\_



**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 that you would like to be evaluated on.*

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 of 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:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_



**Langston University F3P  
Employee's Self Evaluation Form**

**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 instructions**
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. **Integration of technology in course assignments**
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. **Overall quality of instruction**
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. **Academic and scholarly activities**

**Average Score** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Faculty Member**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**



**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:** \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Area of Evaluation</u>	<u>Scores</u>
Administrative Responsibilities	_____
Teaching Effectiveness	_____
Scholarship	_____
Service	_____
<b>Total Scores</b>	_____

---

**Signatures:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Department Head**                      **Date**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Dean**                                      **Date**

**Comments** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Faculty Member**                      **Date**

**Comments** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_



## Langston University F3P Rating Scale for Classroom Observation

4	Exceeds Requirements
3	Meets Requirements
2	Needs Improvement
1	Unsatisfactory

## 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 area: 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)**

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

## Rubric for Professional Service

1- Below Expectations	Little or no meaningful service to the department, school, University, profession and/or community.
2- Fair	A minimal level of useful service to the department, school, University, profession and/or community.
3- Good	Consistent participation and active service to the department, school, University, profession and/or community.
4- Excellent	Displays initiative, proactive leadership, and efforts with consistently beneficial results in service to the department, school, University, profession and/or community.

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.

### **Langston University F3P**

#### **Overall Rating Scale for Performance of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service**

4	Faculty member exceeds requirements in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.
3	Faculty member meets requirements in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.
2	Faculty member needs improvement in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.
1	Faculty member is unsatisfactory in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.