

Faculty Summative Evaluation

Approved by the Faculty Senate

June 25, 1997

Table of Contents

Integrated Scholarship – What’s New (graphic).....ii

Faculty Summative Evaluation

Section I

The Integrated Scholarship Model.....1

Integrated Scholarship Assessment Frame (Table 1)...3a

Next Steps for Departments.....6

Section II: Guiding Statements and Sample Evaluation Forms

Introduction.....8

Forms by Sources: e.g. self, colleague/ chair, student

Instructional Activities.....9-16

Professional Activities.....17-20

Service Activities

Advisement.....21-24

Committee.....25-29

Integrated Scholarship.....30-31

Section III: Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Summative Evaluation

Committee

Members.....32

Integrated Scholarship Summative Evaluation

◆ What's New:

◆ Department Driven

**◆ Outcomes Based (Results oriented –
focusing on student learning)**

**◆ Integrated Approach (Utilizing uniform
framework)**

**◆ Activity (Instructional, Professional,
Service)**

**◆ Faculty Collaboration (Department goals
and objectives)**

◆ Reflection

FACULTY SUMMATIVE EVALUATION

SECTION I

The Integrated Scholarship Model

THE BACKGROUND

The Ad Hoc Faculty Summative Evaluation Committee was formed to review the existing process for evaluating faculty to make decisions concerning tenure, promotion, and merit-based adjustments to compensation. The over-all goal was to develop a common language about scholarship across all disciplines. It was further hoped that the discussion of faculty work would spark the intrinsic motivation of the faculty and promote a true community of learning. To quote Boyer, "For this to be accomplished, the evaluation of the professoriate requires rich experience, great wisdom, and even, perhaps, compassion." (Scholarship Assessed, 1994, p. 13). Based upon its review, the committee identified and addressed the following issues:

- St. Bonaventure University identifies student learning as its primary goal, so evaluation of faculty activities must emphasize learning outcomes.
- Departments should have maximum control and flexibility to shape how the process is applied.
- Evaluation must be based on actual outcomes of faculty activities rather than on the processes and efforts expended to obtain those outcomes (i.e. "student learning" rather than "teaching").
- An integrated approach is needed that will integrate across faculty activities, across the process of goal setting, acting and reflecting about success in achieving those goals, and across diverse interests and strengths of faculty within a department. Such integration can be achieved through application of a unified framework drawn from current thinking in the field of faculty evaluation.

The University Mission states that St. Bonaventure University is a university, "...that offers students an excellent liberal arts education and prepares them both for professional careers and for the challenges, discoveries, and conflicts they will face in the future". Furthermore, it says that, "The faculty of St. Bonaventure University is first and foremost a teaching faculty." Each description of academic rank in Article II of the Faculty Status and Welfare Handbook, (hereafter the "Handbook"), refers to excellence in teaching. This commitment was further recognized in the report of the Long Range Planning Committee on Faculty Performance (McAllister, 1986), from which this committee drew heavily. Hence, we the faculty charge ourselves, through the Mission Statement and Handbook statements, to strive first and foremost for excellence in student learning, as evidence for excellent teaching.

Both the Mission Statement and the Handbook recognize that teaching is enhanced and enlivened by faculty members engaging in research and remaining current with developments in their specialty. To further enhance and broaden this charge, both documents also require student advisement and service to the department, University and community. Thus, it is clear that while excellence in student learning is the primary goal of the faculty; activity in scholarship, student advisement, and service with an appropriate balance between these areas and attention to how they can support student learning are important objectives as well. We offer several guidelines:

1. While the source documents repeatedly refer to teaching excellence, the ultimate objective of the faculty is to demonstrate excellent teaching through excellence in student learning.
2. While excellence in student learning may be a goal, at least an acceptable level of student learning, as defined by the department, must be achieved. Further, excellence in the areas of professional or service activity should not be substitutes for unsatisfactory performance in promoting student learning:
3. Excellence in student learning is promoted by faculty who are current in their fields and knowledgeable about their pedagogical techniques.
4. Professional activity need not necessarily include publication. One may be active, but one's work may not be published in the traditional sense (i.e., a work of art, a software program). Two considerations may be applied: a) has a faculty member been appropriately active, and b) has a faculty member demonstrated a continual willingness to have his or her ideas and works critically evaluated by peers.
5. The criteria for evaluation should be agreed upon at the beginning of the evaluation cycle in which those criteria are used.
6. Evaluation criteria should be established through a process of negotiation with individual faculty members that provides sufficient flexibility to take advantage of the faculty member's developed strengths and interests while at the same time addressing the needs of the department, and the University.

THE ASSESSMENT FRAME

Given this general framework, the question becomes how to evaluate faculty work. After reviewing a number of models in the literature, the Committee drew heavily on a model proposed by Ernest L. Boyer, President of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, in an article entitled "Scholarship Assessed" and on the Foundation's report on Scholarship (Boyer, 1990). The Foundation's model is derived from an extensive study of scholarship done by the Foundation that extends from 4,500 year old Sumerian texts up to the present day and a Foundation study of evaluation criteria including dozens of faculty handbooks, responses from a wide range of institutions, editors of scholarly journals, and directors of scholarly presses and funding agencies.

We have chosen to use a broad interpretation of scholarship developed by the Carnegie Foundation, which we call "Integrated Scholarship". This interpretation defines scholarship as everything the faculty does and stresses the pedagogical value of all faculty activities. It is a more realistic reflection of the academic and civic expectations currently placed on faculty. Thus all components of the role fulfilled by a scholar is included as scholarship, in contrast to the narrower, traditional definition of scholarship which views it as generating knowledge in the discipline. To quote Boyer:

"We believe the time has come to move beyond the tired old 'teaching versus research' debate and give the familiar and honorable term 'scholarship' a broader, more capacious meaning, one that brings legitimacy to the full scope of academic work" (Scholarship Reconsidered, p.16).

The University's model organizes faculty responsibilities into three general categories of integrated scholarship: Professional Activity, Instructional Activity, and Service Activity. Professional Activity encompasses basic and applied research, creative expression, and professional activities. Service Activity includes advisement and counseling; and service to the University, school, department and non-academic community. Teaching Activity bridges both general categories with strong involvement in Service Activity and in Professional Activity. Service Activity may still be evaluated as a separate category, but in evaluating Instructional Activity, more emphasis than before is given to how service improves the instructional activity.

Within Professional Activities, the primary function of "traditional research" is to add to the discipline, and the function of pedagogical research is to find ways to more effectively teach the discipline. Historically, academics have undervalued pedagogical research, a form of applied research. This is inappropriate in an institution that claims to be a teaching institution. It is the Senate's recommendation that, where appropriate, pedagogical research and "traditional research" that involves students in learning experiences receive recognition equal to the recognition awarded "traditional research. All should be evaluated under Professional Activity. The integration of professional activity into the student learning process is evaluated under Instructional Activity.

The priority placed on each of these three categories of Integrated Scholarship for a particular faculty member would be determined by discussions at the beginning of the evaluation cycle between that faculty member and the chair, and would reflect an optimum combination of that faculty member's strengths and the department's need to achieve its goals through all of its faculty members. The final agreement would require the concurrence of the appropriate dean.

The University's model further specifies three phases of each of the activities to be evaluated: Planning, Outcomes, and Reflections (see Table 1). The degree to which performance meets these standards will be determined by the respective departments, chairs, and deans. Some questions would be appropriate to ask of the faculty member being evaluated, some of students, and some of chairs or deans. Some questions could also be asked of peers, but departments must be careful to insure objective information is obtained. For instance, it would be inappropriate for the peer reviewers to be selected by the person being reviewed. Finally, some questions will be

Table 1

INTEGRATED SCHOLARSHIP ASSESSMENT FRAME (with overlay)

Rev. 11/15/96

	PLANNING	OUTCOMES	REFLECTIONS
PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY	GOALS PREPARATION METHODS	COMMUNICATION RESULTS	INTERPRETATION IMPROVEMENT
INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY	GOALS PREPARATION METHODS	COMMUNICATION RESULTS	INTERPRETATION IMPROVEMENT
SERVICE ACTIVITY	GOALS PREPARATION METHODS	COMMUNICATION RESULTS	INTERPRETATION IMPROVEMENT

more appropriate to provide constructive feedback to the faculty member, and others to provide discriminating information for administrative decision making.

Planning each type of activity requires goals, preparation and methods. The outcomes of each type of activity requires not only results, but communication of those results to other scholars. Finally reflection on the activity requires assessment of performance and thought about how to improve. Goals, preparation, methods, results, communication, assessment and improvement within each type of activity must be evaluated to fully assess the faculty member's performance. The Committee will provide sample questions for the components of each activity and for each category of referee for departments to use as guidance in developing Part II.

The model is based upon four principles which apply across the various components of scholarship and which should be kept in mind while developing Part II:

1. Faculty evaluation should focus on the activities and accomplishments of the scholar.

Boyer quotes the statement of C. Wright Mills, a distinguished Columbia University professor: "Scholarship is a choice of how to live as well as a choice of career." The scholar's choice, according to Boyer, is centered on knowledgeable, integrity, creativity, and productivity which form the very heart of academic life (Boyer, 1994, p. 2). The activities and accomplishments of a scholar should reflect such characteristics.

2. Evaluation of scholarly work requires agreed upon standards or criteria.

The following components were consistently found in the Carnegie Foundation's study of current practices and are reflected in the above activities and components:

Clear Goals - A well-defined goal is critical in research, teaching, counseling, and in the integration and application of knowledge.

Adequate Preparation - In every area of scholarship, the scholar must bring the wealth of knowledge, depth of experience, and combination of resources that the project requires.

Appropriate Methods - Every area of scholarship requires systematic and logical methods and procedures.

Significant results - Every act of scholarship must be judged by the significance of its outcomes or its impact.

Effective Communication - Scholarly achievement is not complete unless it is shared through effective communication, nor is learning possible without effective communication.

Reflective Critique - The scholarly experience is also not complete unless the scholar analyzes what has been done, seeks constructive criticism from others and uses this continuously to improve over time.

3. Evaluation of scholarship requires rich and varied documentation.

While portfolios are currently very popular, attention must be given to their content.

Reflective self-evaluations, peer reviews, student evaluations, and chair/dean evaluations

should be included in portfolios along with samples of work and statements of one's work philosophy and goals.

4. Successful evaluation depends on the credibility of the process.

For the evaluation process to be successful, the faculty must have confidence in the arrangements, believe the process to be fair, and have trust in those who make the critical decisions.

The statements about each faculty activity that follow are meant to guide each department in designing Part II; the actual evaluation instruments and criteria that they will use. The issues addressed in these statements should also be addressed in the evaluation of each faculty member.

References

- Boyer, E. L. (1990). Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyer, E. L., (1994). Scholarship Assessed. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- McAllister, J. P. (1986, September 15). Report of the Long Range Planning Committee on Faculty Performance. St. Bonaventure, NY: St. Bonaventure University.

NEXT STEPS FOR DEPARTMENTS

- I. Departments meet to determine appropriate and desired outcomes for teaching activities, professional activities, advising and service activities.
- II. Departments meet to determine how to assess achievement of outcomes (see sample evaluation forms in following materials).
- III. Each department chair meets with each of their faculty to determine faculty member's role in achieving department outcomes.
- IV. Each chair meets with each faculty member to review how faculty member has achieved their role.
- V. Each department meets as a group to review and reflect on department's achievement of outcomes.
- VI. On to step I above, and process reiterates indefinitely on an annual basis.

FACULTY SUMMATIVE EVALUATION

Section II

Section II

Guiding Statements and Sample Evaluation Forms

Introduction

In the following pages, for each area of faculty activity and for various providers of evaluations, statements are provided which identify the issues of concern in evaluating faculty performance within the proposed assessment frame. These statements and the sample forms are meant to guide departments in developing the specific materials and procedures that they will implement for their departmental evaluation process. While the sample forms could be used as is, they are really meant to be examples only. The forms actually put in use by each department should reflect the idiosyncratic goals and outcomes identified as important by that department.

The revised Faculty Status and Welfare Handbook proposes two levels of evaluation; a comprehensive evaluation every 5 years for tenured faculty, with a less comprehensive evaluation in between. With this in mind, departments may want to develop two sets of forms, one for each type of evaluation.

Community Service is not formatted according to the selected standards. The assessment of this additional component is subject to the goals and accomplishments of a particular organization. Faculty should provide reliable documentation as to the importance of their service to a civic organization.

The University's model organizes faculty responsibilities into three general categories of integrated scholarship: Professional Activity, Instructional Activity, and Service Activity. Professional Activity encompasses basic and applied research, creative expression, and professional activities. Service Activity includes advisement and counseling; and service to the University, school, department and non-academic community. Teaching Activity bridges both general categories with strong involvement in Service Activity and in Professional Activity. Service Activity may still be evaluated as a separate category, but in evaluating Instructional Activity, more emphasis than before is given to how service improves the instructional activity.

Within Professional Activities, the primary function of "traditional research" is to add to the discipline, and the function of pedagogical research is to find ways to more effectively teach the discipline. Historically, academics have undervalued pedagogical research, a form of applied research. This is inappropriate in an institution that claims to be a teaching institution. It is the Senate's recommendation that, where appropriate, pedagogical research and "traditional research" that involves students in learning experiences receive recognition equal to the recognition awarded "traditional research. All should be evaluated under Professional Activity. The integration of professional activity into the student learning process is evaluated under Instructional Activity.

Instructional Activity

Sample Forms:

Self-Evaluation

Colleague/ Chair Evaluation

Student Evaluation

Instructional Activity: Self Evaluation

Key:

1 (strongly agree) 2 (agree) 3 (undecided) 4 (disagree) 5 (strongly disagree) NA (not applicable)

PLANNING

Goals:

1. I have a philosophy of teaching and have put it into words.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. My goals in teaching are consistent with those of my students and colleagues.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. My goals in teaching motivate me; i.e. They are challenging and worthwhile.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
4. My goals in teaching are compatible with my goals in other areas of my scholastic work.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
5. I set goals for a course and specific objectives for each class meeting.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Preparation:

6. I have made a commitment to my own professional development.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
7. I engage in activities that advance my expertise in my discipline.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
8. I engage in activities that increase my pedagogical knowledge and skill.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
9. I engage in activities that increases my skill in managing students.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
10. I engage in activities that improve the way I work alone and with colleagues.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Methods:

11. I use guidelines to select a method of instruction (e.g. lectures, discussions, collaborative learning, case studies.)
1 2 3 4 5 NA
12. I implement a variety of instructional methods to assess the effectiveness of my teaching.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

OUTCOMES

Communication:

1. I established an atmosphere of openness and encouraged students to speak.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. I shared contemporary research.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. My written communications (e.g. syllabus, assignment guidelines) from this instructor were clear and easy to understand.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
4. I did help students of all levels and ability and from diverse social backgrounds.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
5. I was an effective speaker.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
6. My course syllabus contained all the sections and information that it should.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Results:

7. The strategies I used to design the course and plan work for students was effective.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
8. I have developed ways to determine that a method of instruction is effective.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
9. When a method of instruction was not working, I modified what I was doing.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
10. The methods I used to evaluate and grade student work were accurate and fair..
1 2 3 4 5 NA
11. I was successful in establishing productive working relationships with students.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
12. Class atmosphere promoted learning.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

REFLECTION:

Interpretation:

1. As revealed by peer observations or video taping, I am aware of my teaching performance.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. I am aware of the impact that I have had on alumni both professionally and personally.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

3. I reviewed student work to interpret my effectiveness in teaching.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
4. My oral communications were effective, i.e., I can gain and maintain student attention.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
5. My expectations for student work were clear. My student did not seem uncertain or confused.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
6. I have shared my practice-based insights and discoveries with colleagues.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
7. I have published the results of my formal or informal research on teaching.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
8. The results of my scholarly activities on teaching have been shared.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Improvement:

9. After teaching a course, my knowledge in my discipline has increased.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
10. After teaching a course, my motivation to teach has increased.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
11. I revise the syllabus based on student/chair/colleague feedback.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
12. To reflect on my teaching, I asked myself questions such as, "Am I satisfied with my teaching goals, preparations, methods and results? What do I want to change? What changes are the most feasible to make? Would research on student learning and motivation done by myself in my own classroom give me useful information to make the changes I desire? Has the process of getting feedback from students and colleagues helped me?"
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Comments:

Instructional Activity: Colleague or Chair Evaluation

Key:

1 (strongly agree) 2 (agree) 3 (undecided) 4 (disagree) 5 (strongly disagree) NA (not applicable)

PLANNING

Goals:

1. The instructor did state the goals and objectives at the beginning of the class.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. The goals of the instructor were consistent with those stated by his or her department.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. The information presented to the students was related to the goals of the course.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Preparation:

4. The instructor did present information that was up-to-date, yet appropriate for his or her students.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
5. The instructor did research to inject the course with fresh, new information.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
6. The instructor did appear to have sufficient command of the information he or she presented.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
7. The instructor did carefully plan the time spent with his or her students.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Methods:

8. An overview or outline of the information to be conveyed was shared with his or her students.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
9. The method of instruction for the day (e.g. lecture, discussion, group work, case study, simulations) were appropriate.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
10. The instructor had the expertise to effectively implement the method of instruction.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
11. The instructor did use additional resources (e.g. AV equipment, speakers, internet archives), if appropriate, to augment the effectiveness of his or her chosen method of instruction.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
12. Tests or other methods of performance evaluation were appropriate, accurate, and fair.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

OUTCOMES

Communication:

1. The instructor established an atmosphere of openness and encouraged students to speak.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. The instructor shared contemporary research.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. The instructor did help students of all levels of ability and from diverse social backgrounds.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
4. The instructor was an effective speaker.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
5. The written communications (e.g. syllabus, assignment guidelines) used by the instructor were clear and useful.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
6. The course syllabus contained all the sections and information that it should.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Results:

6. The instructor did show respect for students.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
7. The instructor did inspire interest in the subject matter of the course.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
8. The instructor's students appeared to be learning the foundation knowledge of the course.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
9. The instructor's students were asked to do work that advanced their higher-order thinking skills.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

REFLECTION:

Interpretation:

1. The instructor has published articles or presented papers on teaching in his or her discipline.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. The instructor shared insights on teaching at SBU workshops or discussions in teaching.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

3. When you discussed your observations, the instructor critically reflected on the results.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

4. The instructor collected mid-semester feedback or other early feedback from students to assess their learning or gauge their reactions to his or her teaching.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Improvement:

5. The instructor's approach to teaching was flexible.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Comments:

Instructional Activity: Student Evaluations

Key:

1 (strongly agree) 2 (agree) 3 (undecided) 4 (disagree) 5 (strongly disagree) NA (not applicable)

PLANNING

Goals:

1. Your instructor clearly stated the major goals and objectives of the course.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. The goals and objectives of each class were clearly stated.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. The goals set by your instructor were challenging and worthwhile.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Preparation:

4. Your instructor was adequately prepared for each class.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
5. The materials that the instructor handed out were well-prepared.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
6. Each class was well organized.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Methods:

7. Instructional methods were appropriate to meet course objectives.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
8. Instructor used a variety of appropriate instructional materials.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

OUTCOMES

Communication:

1. The instructor was available and helpful.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. The instructor was an engaging speaker and spoke clearly.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. The written communications (e.g. syllabus, assignment guidelines) from this instructor were clear and easy to understand.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
4. The instructor gave you prompt feedback on your work.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
5. The instructor shared contemporary research.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Results:

6. The methods used by the instructor facilitated your learning.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
7. The procedures used to evaluate your work were accurate and fair.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
8. The assignments of the course enhanced your learning.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
9. The work assigned required a steady, but reasonable amount of effort from you.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
10. The instructor showed respect for students.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
11. The instructor helped you learn the subject matter of this course.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
12. What you learned was valuable and important.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
13. The instructor achieved the stated goals of the course.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
14. The instructor generated interest in the subject matter of the course.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
15. You acquired new skills as a result of this course.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

REFLECTION:

Interpretation:

1. Instructor conducted on-going assessment of your performance throughout the course.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. The instructor assessed your performance to give you feedback before assigning final grades.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. While the course was in progress, the instructor asked for feedback from you.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Improvement:

4. The instructor modified the course based on feedback from students.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Professional Activity

Sample Forms:

Self-Evaluation

Chair Evaluation

Professional Activity: Self-Evaluation

Planning

- A. List professional activities of the past year.

- B. List the professional activities accomplished/in progress.

Outcomes

- A. List activities communicated to students.

- B. List professional activities shared with SBU colleagues.

- C. List the activities shared with professional audiences beyond SBU.

Professional Activity: Self-Evaluation

Key:

1 (strongly agree) 2 (agree) 3 (undecided) 4 (disagree) 5 (strongly disagree) NA (not applicable)

PLANNING

Goals:

1. Professional activities were aligned with departmental goals and objectives.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Preparation:

2. Activities displayed evidence of appropriate sources.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. Activities were based upon current state of research in the discipline.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Methods:

4. Appropriate methodology was implemented for professional activities.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

OUTCOMES

Communication:

1. The results of the activities/communication with SBU students were effective.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. The results of the activities/communication with SBU colleagues were positive.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. The results of the activities/communication with professional audiences beyond SBU were effective.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

REFLECTION:

Interpretation:

1. Feedback from the audiences were considered.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. Feedback was carefully considered for implications to change professional activities.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Improvement:

3. Planned changes appear appropriate and feasible in professional activities.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Professional Activity: Chair

Key:

1 (strongly agree) 2 (agree) 3 (undecided) 4 (disagree) 5 (strongly disagree) NA (not applicable)

PLANNING

Goals:

1. Professional activities were aligned with departmental goals and objectives.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Preparation:

2. Activities displayed evidence of appropriate sources.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. Activities were based upon current state of research in the discipline.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Methods:

4. Appropriate methodology was implemented for professional activities.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

OUTCOMES

Communication:

1. The results of the activities/communication with SBU students are effective.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. The results of the activities/communication with SBU colleagues were positive.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. The results of the activities/communication with professional audiences beyond SBU were effective.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

REFLECTION:

Interpretation:

1. Feedback from the audiences were considered.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. Feedback was carefully considered for implications to change professional activities.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Improvement:

3. Planned changes appear appropriate and feasible in professional activities.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Service Activity

Sample Forms:

Self-Evaluation of Student Advisement

Student Evaluation of Student Advisement

Self-Evaluation of School, University and
Community Service

Evaluation of Committee Chair

Service Activity: Faculty Self-Evaluation of Student Advisement

Key:

1 (strongly agree) 2 (agree) 3 (undecided) 4 (disagree) 5 (strongly disagree) NA (not applicable)

PLANNING

Goals:

1. Assisted advisees in making transition from high school to college.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. Helped advisees choose an academic plan appropriate for them personally.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. Helped advisees to take progressive responsibility for their academic and career choices.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
4. Insured that advisees progress toward graduation in a responsible and timely fashion.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
5. Helped advisees make reasonable post-graduate plans and assist them in preparation.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Preparation:

6. Determined schedule which insures availability to students when needed.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
7. Read available material pertaining to incoming advisees..
1 2 3 4 5 NA
8. Maintained knowledge of current university and department requirements.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
9. Maintained knowledge of contemporary opportunities and prerequisites for success in the appropriate fields.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
10. Maintained knowledge of university support services.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Methods:

11. Was available to all advisees when necessary.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
12. Met with advisees as early as possible in their academic careers.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

13. Talked to advisees about developing an academic plan consistent with their interests and abilities.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
14. Made certain that advisees register for the necessary courses.
1 2 3y4 o NA
15. Monitored advisees academic progress and reacted appropriately.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
16. Was willing and available to discuss advisees progress and problems.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
17. Encouraged advisees to use university support services when necessary.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

OUTCOMES

Communication:

1. Made sure that advisees are aware of faculty willingness and ability to utilize methods above.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. Talked to other faculty about progress and problems of advisees when appropriate.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. Told department chair of upcoming course needs of advisees.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
4. Talked to outside contacts about opportunities for particular advisees.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Results:

5. Arranged for advisees to complete requirements within graduation time limits.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

REFLECTION:

Interpretation:

1. Discussed whenever possible careers and academic preparation with former advisees.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Improvement:

2. Read the above frequently.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Service Activity: Student Evaluations of Student Advisement

Key:

1 (strongly agree) 2 (agree) 3 (undecided) 4 (disagree) 5 (strongly disagree) NA (not applicable)

PLANNING

Goals:

1. Faculty set the goals for student advisement.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. Urged me to plan and set goals.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Preparation:

3. Advisor had office hours appropriately posted.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
4. Advisor knew about general university requirements.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
5. Advisor understood requirements of the major..
1 2 3 4 5 NA
6. Advisor was knowledgeable about opportunities with the major.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
7. Advisor was helpful in finding or using other university services.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Methods:

8. Advisor was available for discussion.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
9. Advisor informed me about academic options and possibilities.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
10. Advisor discussed career possibilities.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
11. Advisor helped to select courses consistent with my preparation, interest & ability.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
12. Advisor helped with advisement on secondary concentration.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
13. Advisor discussed preparation for graduate study.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

OUTCOMES

Communication:

1. He/she enjoyed the role of advisor.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. He/She encouraged me to talk.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. He/She discussed expectations with me.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
4. He/she inspired me to work harder.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Results:

5. I am pursuing my academic program successfully and confidently.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
6. I am becoming better prepared to seek a job or further my studies.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

REFLECTION:

Interpretation:

1. Advisor asked for feedback concerning advisement process.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Improvement:

2. Advisor modified the process based on student feedback.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Comments:

Service Activity: Self-Evaluation

Key:

1 (strongly agree) 2 (agree) 3 (undecided) 4 (disagree) 5 (strongly disagree) NA (not applicable)

PLANNING

Goals:

1. I helped to define the goals of the organization/activity.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. I have provided the organization with the expertise needed to achieve these goals.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Preparation:

3. I attended meetings.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
4. I made an effort to arrive on time.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
5. I shared researched information.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
6. I was open to views and concerns of committee members..
1 2 3 4 5 NA
7. I helped the organization to plan activities such as meetings, fairs, field trips, and fund-raising activities.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Methods:

8. I have demonstrated leadership in guiding members to use other resources (e.g. research material, literature, publicity, speakers) to accomplish the goals of the committee.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
9. I have suggested innovative ways to present a special motion, proposal, or project during the year.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

OUTCOMES

Communication:

1. I respected opinions of committee members in meetings.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. I presented new proposals for implementation.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. I was proactive.

1 2 3 4 5 NA

Results:

4. I showed expertise in understanding issues and discussions.

1 2 3 4 5 NA

REFLECTION:

Interpretation:

1. I sought feedback from SBU community when appropriate..

1 2 3 4 5 NA

2. I used my expertise in effective ways to achieve the goals of the committee.

1 2 3 4 5 NA

3. My contributions were valuable to the university community because of his/her skills, leadership, knowledge, and experience.

1 2 3 4 5 NA

Improvement:

5. I was willing to accept constructive criticism concerning committee performance.

1 2 3 4 5 NA

Comments:

Service Activity: Faculty Evaluation by Committee Chair

Key:

1 (strongly agree) 2 (agree) 3 (undecided) 4 (disagree) 5 (strongly disagree) NA (not applicable)

PLANNING

Goals:

1. The faculty member helped to define the goals of the organization.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. The faculty member provided the organization with the expertise needed to achieve these goals.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Preparation:

3. The faculty member was attended meetings.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
4. The faculty member was on time.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
5. The faculty member shared researched information.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
6. The faculty member was open to views and concerns of committee members..
1 2 3 4 5 NA
7. The faculty member helped the organization to plan activities such as meetings, fairs, field trips, and fund-raising activities.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Methods:

8. The faculty member demonstrated leadership in guiding members to use other resources (e.g. research material, literature, publicity, speakers) to accomplish the goals of the committee.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
9. The faculty member suggested innovative ways to present a special motion, proposal, or project during the year.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

OUTCOMES

Communication:

1. The faculty member respected opinions of committee members in meetings.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. The faculty member presented new proposals for implementation.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. The faculty member was proactive.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Results:

4. The faculty member showed expertise in understanding issues and discussions.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

REFLECTION:

Interpretation:

1. Committee member respected his/her leadership capacities.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. Committee member sought feedback from the SBU community.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. The faculty member used his/her expertise in effective ways to achieve the goals of the committee.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
4. The faculty member's contributions were valuable to the university community because of his/her skills, leadership, knowledge, and experience.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Improvement:

5. The committee member was willing to accept constructive criticism concerning committee performance.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Comments:

Integrated Scholarship

Sample Forms:

Self-Evaluation - Reflection and Contemplation

Integrated Scholarship: Self Evaluation (Reflection and Contemplation)

Key:

1 (strongly agree) 2 (agree) 3 (undecided) 4 (disagree) 5 (strongly disagree) NA (not applicable)

PLANNING

Goals:

1. I set aside ample time to reflect on my goals and objectives in terms of integrated scholarship.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. I adjusted and redefined goals based on feedback from students, peers, and other scholars from inside and outside of my field of specialty.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. My defined purpose explicitly reflected a "connectedness" or integrated view of knowledge.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Preparation:

4. I demonstrated a knowledge of all areas of faculty work (integrated view).
1 2 3 4 5 NA
5. I integrated expertise from my scholarly activity into all appropriate areas of scholarship.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Methods:

6. I have stayed current with methods used for all forms of scholarship. (e.g. interdisciplinary research, teaching, and service)
1 2 3 4 5 NA
7. These current methods have been demonstrated consistently in my work in all scholarships.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

OUTCOMES

Communication:

1. I communicated with colleagues in other fields to discover common professional interests.
1 2 3 4 5 NA
2. A larger, more comprehensive understanding was conveyed as a result of my rigorous attention to all areas of scholarship.
1 2 3 4 5 NA

Results:

3. I have contributed over time (defined by the department) to all scholarship areas.

1 2 3 4 5 NA

4. There has been positive growth in all areas over time.

1 2 3 4 5 NA

REFLECTION:

Interpretation:

1. I have accurately assessed my integrated work.

1 2 3 4 5 NA

Improvement:

2. I utilized constructive criticism to better balance my skills in all areas.

1 2 3 4 5 NA

Comments:

Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee On Summative Faculty Evaluation

May, 1996 - June, 1997

Committee Members:

Dr. David L. Carpenter, Chair

Dr. John Biter

Dr. Alva Cellini

Dr. Nancy Chicola

Dr. Eleanor English

Dr. Michael Russell

Dr. Harry Sedinger

Dr. Charles Walker