

A Quest for Well-Structured Methods Focusing on Restructuring FES 1 and 2 of the Faculty Evaluation Process at SHSU

Report from the Academic Affairs Subcommittee of Faculty Senate:

Members: Sheryl Murphy-Manley, Chair (CFAMC), Paul Loeffler (COS), James Crosby (CHSS), Rick White (COS), Kevin Clifton (CFAMC), William Jasper (COS), Doug Ullrich (COS)
Sam Houston State University, Faculty Senate Meeting: May 2, 2013

I. Procedure for the Task of Revising FES 1 and 2

A. Sponsored by the Provost, the Faculty Senate and the Academic Affairs Subcommittee will host Town Hall Meetings with the Faculty, providing information on the proposed University-wide adoption of the following changes. Given that we inherently use IDEA in a comparative system, the goal of this policy revision is to seek uniformity and fairness in the application and use of IDEA scores across the University.

1. The Academic Affairs Committee recommends that the *adjusted score* of the IDEA Summary Evaluation be used for all faculty on the FES 2 form.
2. The Academic Affairs Committee recommends that the IDEA *short form* be used University-wide. The Committee encourages DPTACs to develop discipline-specific questions to be used on the short form for formative purposes.
3. The Academic Affairs Committee recommends that the wording, including FES form numbers, be changed to clarify the categories on FES Form 6 as is presented below under section III of this report.

II. The faculty member's final evaluation, FES Form 6, currently looks like this:

I. Teaching	
A. Chair Rating	(FES 1)
B. Student Rating	(FES 2)
II. Scholarly & Artistic Endeavor	<i>(FES 3)</i>
III. Professional Growth & Professional Activities	<i>(FES 4)</i>
IV. Non-teaching Activities & Supportive of University Programs	<i>(FES 5)</i>

III. The Committee suggests the following clarification and revision to FES Form 6.

I. Teaching	
A. Chair Rating of Teaching including Faculty Effectiveness [redefined below]	(FES 1)
B. IDEA Summary Adjusted Score	(FES 2)
II. Scholarly & Artistic Endeavor	(FES 3)
III. Professional Growth & Professional Activities	(FES 4)
IV. Non-teaching Activities & Supportive of University Programs	(FES 5)

FES 1

Revised: *Chair Rating of Teaching including Faculty Effectiveness (FES 1)*

1. The Chair's Assessment is redefined and clarified by the following:
 - This score will be independent of the IDEA score; the Chairs should not begin nor base their evaluation on the IDEA score.
 - The Chair, in consultation with the DPTAC, will create written guidelines for the Chair's Evaluation of Teaching and Faculty Effectiveness in the Department. These guidelines will be published at least one year in advance of implementation.
 - Chairs will maintain a portfolio of comparative documentation demonstrating the variety of inputs he or she used in determining the ratings of Faculty.
 - Chairs, in consultation with the DPTAC, may set up a variety of systems to evaluate teaching, including the option to use peer observations by professionals trained in the evaluation of teaching in the department's disciplines.

2. The Chair's Assessment may include, or consider, the following:
 - Conferences with the faculty member
 - Demonstration that the faculty member meets student outcome measures and/or student performance in subsequent courses, exit exams, barriers, juries, etc.
 - Comments from students during the course of the semester, and consultations with the faculty member when appropriate
 - Maintains appropriate professional demeanor in teaching situations
 - Prepares regularly for teaching
 - Keeps up-to-date in his/her content area, renewing lessons and content material as appropriate
 - Explains course material clearly
 - Demonstrates teaching that is effective with his/her students
 - Seeks, and participates in, professional development aimed at improving teaching effectiveness
 - Displays an interest in students and their learning
 - Demonstrates the importance and significance of the subject matter
 - Uses fair and appropriate grading practice(s)
 - Is available for student conferences
 - Explains reasons for criticisms of students' performances
 - Maintains ethical standards of honesty and objectivity
 - Adheres to university/college/department/school timelines, policies, and procedures
 - Submits grades, reports, etc. in a timely manner
 - Uses syllabi that contain all pertinent information for course, including methods of assessment and course goals

- Demonstrates commitment to course or program assessments
- Attends departmental meetings
- Is constructive in the department's welfare
- Is invested in the success of new faculty members, and demonstrates commitment to mentoring new faculty

3. The Chair may also choose to seek information from the individual faculty member concerning:

- Development of new courses
- Additional work with students outside the classroom
- Teaching methods
- Publication, and/or development, of electronic instructional materials
- Supervision of undergraduate and/or graduate students
- Preparation and research activities for teaching
- Self-evaluation and improvement of teaching
- Course subject matter: relevance and quality of content presented
- Supporting educational materials (handouts, lessons, electronic tutorials, etc.)
- Methods of assessments (tests, assignments, quizzes, etc.)
- Use of pedagogical resources
- Syllabi
- Demonstration of student performance in subsequent courses
- Effective use of technology
- Pedagogical or content-related innovations
- Demonstration of timely, clear, informative and appropriate feedback to students on assignments, tests, and on student progress
- Incorporation of civic engagement, service-learning, community-based teaching strategies or internships when appropriate

FES 2

Revised Wording: *IDEA Summary Adjusted Score (FES 2)*