PROCEDURES

Annual evaluation of teaching will be conducted by the AUH and carried out on the following basis. Each continuing faculty member (tenured, tenure-track, and RTA) will convey to the Department office student evaluations of his or her courses—all courses, in the case of non-tenured faculty, and at least two out of three courses (including one upper-level and one lower-level course) in the case of faculty with tenure—along with final grades for all courses taught in that academic year. Further, each continuing faculty member will submit, as part of his or her annual report of activities and accomplishments, a brief written overview and assessment of his or her teaching-related activities for the year. This narrative may make reference, as appropriate, to the performance indicators listed under “Guidelines,” below. The narrative should be as concise as is possible for purposes of effectively summing up one’s overall performance. If one wishes, the narrative may also be supplemented with supporting materials. (For examples of possible supporting materials, see below, under “Guidelines.” In cases where the materials in question are particularly numerous or voluminous, one should simply provide a reasonably representative sample.)

Student evaluations, grade distributions, the faculty member’s narrative, and any supporting materials supplied therewith will all factor into the Head’s evaluation. The faculty member will be rated excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory on the basis of his or her teaching effectiveness, commitment to teaching, and service to the teaching mission of the Department and the University, and in accordance with the guidelines that follow.

GUIDELINES

The following lists of indicators, while meant to be reasonably comprehensive, need not be considered exhaustive; nor is their numbering meant to imply any strict ranking in order of importance. The lists are meant to serve as good indices of satisfactory (or better) performance for both the faculty member and the Head.

Indicators of satisfactory performance:

1. Fulfilling basic teaching duties (meeting classes as scheduled; being well-prepared; holding regular office hours; grading in a timely fashion; assigning course grades that are reasonably distributed, given the types of courses taught, etc.)

2. Achieving a mean score of 3.0 or lower on all questions on the multiple-choice portion of the student evaluation questionnaire.

3. Principally garnering positive and/or neutral comments on students’ written evaluations, such that negative comments are outweighed, in quantity and/or quality, by positive or neutral ones.

Student evaluations, both numerical and written, are to be interpreted in a way that controls for: (i.) the type of course in question (required GenEd course vs. upper-level elective, for example), and (ii.) students’ anticipated and/or actual course grades. Accordingly, taken all by themselves, largely favorable student evaluations will not absolutely
guarantee a satisfactory performance rating; nor will largely unfavorable evaluations automatically entail an unsatisfactory one.

Whether positive, negative, or neutral, written comments that clearly address questions of pedagogy (such as overall organization, day-by-day preparation, clarity of delivery, quality of feedback, and so on) will be counted at a premium. Comments that are comparably inarticulate, or that focus instead on more superficial or peripheral matters (such as an instructor’s overall personability or a student’s own attitudes on course content) will be given less weight. Outliers will not be given undue weight for purposes of overall assessment.

4. (If applicable.) Being rated “satisfactory” or better based on class observations, or some other sort of peer review, conducted by the PAC, AUH, or other qualified observers.

5. (If applicable.) Submitting additional teaching-related materials of good or better quality.

   For example: Syllabi are duly clear concerning course objectives and organization, grading standards and other policies, etc. Assignments or exams contain clear directions, are of an appropriate level of difficulty, and so on. Instructor-authored teaching materials clearly supply aids to understanding, fodder for discussion, good guidelines for completing assignments, and so forth.

**Indicators of excellent performance:**

6. Earning superior scores on questions on the multiple-choice portion of the student evaluation questionnaire.

7. Garnering strongly positive substantive comments, with appreciable frequency, on students’ written evaluations.

   Again, student evaluations, both numerical and written, are to be interpreted in a way that controls for: (i) the type of course in question (required GenEd course vs. upper-level elective, for example), and (ii) students’ anticipated and/or actual course grades. Accordingly, largely glowing student evaluations will not, all by themselves, guarantee an excellent performance rating.

   Whether positive, negative, or neutral, written comments that clearly address questions of pedagogy (such as overall organization, day-by-day preparation, clarity of delivery, quality of feedback, and so on) will be counted at a premium. Comments that are comparably inarticulate, or that focus instead on more superficial or peripheral matters (such as an instructor’s overall personability or a student’s own attitudes on course content) will be given less weight. Outliers will not be given undue weight for purposes of overall assessment.

8. Being rated “excellent,” or otherwise much better than simply satisfactory, based on class observations, or some other sort of peer review, conducted by the PAC, AUH, or other qualified observers.

9. Receiving, being a finalist for, or being nominated for a teaching/advising grant/award.

10. Attending or giving a presentation at a conference, institute, etc., on college/university level teaching.

11. Designing and delivering a new course or program, or making substantial changes to an existing course or program.

12. Submitting additional teaching-related materials of very high quality.
Examples: Instructor-authored teaching materials that are exceptionally thorough, clear, and/or numerous; assignments or exams that are exceptionally well-conceived and carefully constructed; comments on students’ work that are exceptionally thorough and pedagogically apt; and so on—not an exhaustive list.

13. Acting as reader or director on an honors thesis, or otherwise supervising student research.

14. Teaching an independent study, especially one that goes beyond what one usually covers in the classroom.

15. Teaching in extra-departmental contexts (e.g., study abroad, seminars for the public, guest lecturing in colleagues’ classes, outreach programs, etc.).

16. Advising students in extra-departmental contexts (e.g., freshman advising, interdisciplinary program advising, outreach programs, etc.).

17. Serving on teaching-related committees at the college or university level.