

## Part-Time Faculty Evaluation: Guideline for Sources of Information

Information Tool	Representative samples of student work
Core Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Efficient way to see the quality of teaching</li> <li>• Provide a quick overview of the course curriculum taught</li> <li>• Efficient way to see how many of the course goals/objectives and learning outcomes are accomplished</li> <li>• Efficient way to see course assessment/grading standards used</li> </ul>
Core Shortcomings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Samples can be self-selected to show only exemplary student work</li> <li>• Careful review of the samples takes time and conversation among the reviewers</li> <li>• Cannot provide data on classroom interaction</li> </ul>
Minimum Requirement for Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department must collect at least three samples of student work from a specific assignment, representing '<u>exceptional</u>,' '<u>average</u>,' and '<u>inadequate</u>' categories</li> <li>• Instructor submits a purpose statement (or other materials given to students) for the assignment and a copy of relevant assessment/grading standards used for the assignment</li> </ul>

Information Tool	College-wide student evaluation of teaching
Core Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Efficient way to collect student perceptions of the instructor's teaching practices and student engagement</li> <li>• Standardized evaluation form allows comparison and longitudinal tracking</li> <li>• Student comments provide helpful elaboration or explanation of quantitative evaluation data</li> </ul>
Core Shortcomings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subjective nature of the data requires careful interpretation and usage</li> <li>• Students in required courses tend to rate their instructors more harshly than students in elective courses</li> <li>• Subject to inappropriate abuse by students</li> </ul>
Minimum Requirement for Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must examine multi-semester data</li> <li>• Examine individual data in the context of department, School and College data and historical trends</li> </ul>

Information Tool	<b>Classroom observation</b>
Core Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective way to see instructor-student interaction and student engagement during class time</li> <li>• Provides a quick overview of the teacher's classroom management</li> <li>• Effective way to see how much of planned materials are actually taught</li> </ul>
Core Shortcomings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Snapshot view of teaching, difficult to generalize without considering other factors</li> <li>• Observational data are better suited to formative evaluation (developmental) than summative evaluation (evaluative)</li> <li>• Collecting valid and reliable peer observation data is time consuming</li> </ul>
Minimum Requirement for Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department should have an established template that is used for all classroom observations</li> <li>• Observer should notify instructor well in advance on classroom observation</li> <li>• Observer should give the instructor a copy of the department template when the observation is scheduled</li> <li>• Observation session(s) should be at least twenty minutes in length.</li> <li>• Observer should document the results of the observation in writing and give a copy to the instructor.</li> </ul>

Information Tool	<b>Review of teaching materials – syllabi, class assignments, reading lists, tests</b>
Core Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence on how course curriculum is being carried out</li> <li>• Efficient way to see how course goals, learning outcomes, grading standards and the instructor's expectations are communicated</li> <li>• Demonstrate linkages between the teaching materials (i.e., assignments, reading lists, tests, etc.) and the course goals and learning outcomes</li> <li>• Provide evidence for instructional planning</li> </ul>
Core Shortcomings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cannot show how closely actual instruction followed the faculty's plan</li> <li>• Cannot determine quality of the instructor's efforts in communicating the teaching materials to students</li> </ul>

Minimum Requirement for Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At minimum, course syllabi and materials on class assignments from one course must be included in the review</li> </ul>

Information Tool	<b>Student self-assessment of course learning outcomes</b>
Core Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides a quick checklist of learning outcomes that students perceive to have learned or have not learned</li> </ul>
Core Shortcomings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students' self-reported data</li> <li>Does not show the level of learning, only students' perception of whether or not a particular learning outcome has been covered by the instructor</li> </ul>
Minimum Requirement for Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In-class student survey on learning outcomes listed in course syllabi from one course taught by the instructor (Research, Evaluation and Planning can assist in developing this survey form)</li> </ul>