

Institutional Report on the Annual Review of Faculty Performance
PHILLIPS COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
Academic Year: 2019-20
Submitted by Debby King, Ed.D
Vice Chancellor for Instruction

Arkansas statute (ACA 6-63-104) and AHECB policy require that each college and university conduct an annual review of each faculty member's performance. ADHE is required to monitor the evaluation process and report findings to the Coordinating Board and Legislative Council. This form will collect the information required for ADHE to satisfy its obligations.

Directions: Summarize the Annual Faculty Performance Review process at your institution. **When a description is requested, please provide only a summary on the report form—brief, concise, and to the point.** Should you need to elaborate further on any of these points, attach additional information as an appendix to this form? This report is due to ADHE by June 1, 2020.

Elements of the Faculty Performance Review Process

1. Summarize the overall faculty performance review process.

Instructional delivery and instructional design are the core components of the PCCUA Faculty Performance Review.

Instructional delivery assessment is measured by student evaluation of the faculty. Each faculty member selects two classes with a minimum enrollment of 20 (if possible) for evaluation at the beginning of each semester. Students enrolled in the two classes are one source of the faculty member's evaluation.

Instructional design assessment is measured based on peer and division dean perceptions of faculty performance. The portfolio is used to display primary artifacts which document work which include syllabi, student learning objectives, demonstrations of instruction and assessment. College service, community service, and professional development activities are also a focus of this portion of the review. One peer reviewer, division dean or chair (depending on the division) and a faculty member who is assigned by the Faculty Association are selected to review the portfolio (3 reviewers). Criteria used for the review include grades, reports, student documentation, and other evidence. In addition, classroom management resources are used to evaluate course management.

Faculty who dispute assessment outcomes provided by any or all of the reviewers may appeal the outcome of the evaluation. The process allows the Faculty Evaluation Appeal Committee to hear appeals and makes recommendations about appeal outcomes to the Vice Chancellor for Instruction. The final decision about whether to accept or reject an appeal rests with the Vice Chancellor for Instruction.

Student Evaluation of Instruction- Calendar Year 2019

Number of Full-Time Faculty Evaluated – 55

Division	Instructional Delivery	Instructional Design
Allied Health	2.81	2.89
Applied Technology	2.85	2.89
Arts and Science	2.81	2.90
Business & Information Systems	2.73	2.85
Career & Technical Center	2.80	2.89
Overall Average- Full-Time	2.80	2.88

Number of Part-Time Faculty Evaluated – 17

Part-Time	Instructional Delivery	Instructional Design
Overall Average- Part-Time	2.82	2.90

3 Year Trend –Student Evaluation

	Instructional Delivery			Overall Delivery Average	Instructional Design			Overall Design Average
	2017	2018	2019	2017-2019	2017	2018	2019	2017-2019
3 Year Trend								
Full-Time	2.81	2.76	2.80	2.79	2.89	2.87	2.88	2.88
Part-Time	2.81	2.82	2.82	2.82	2.87	2.87	2.90	2.88

2. How are faculty peers involved in faculty performance?

All faculty serve as peer reviewers. The College considers the peer evaluation a critical part of the evaluation of faculty. Each faculty portfolio is evaluated by two faculty members (peers) and the instructor’s dean, chair, or supervisor. The faculty evaluation tool was developed by faculty

and any modifications made to the tool are done so based on recommendations made by the Faculty Senate. All but first year faculty are engaged in the evaluation of peers.

3. How are students involved in faculty performance?

Instructional delivery is assessed by students enrolled in courses taught by faculty.

All students enrolled in a course are provided with an opportunity to evaluate the instructor. The evaluation tool provides a ranked response and also includes open ended response questions providing the student with an opportunity to identify strengths and weaknesses of an instructor. Two classes are identified by each faculty member for the evaluation. Typically, evaluations begin at the mid semester and the process continues for two weeks. Independent evaluators enter the classroom and administer the tool. It is administered near the end of a class session and the faculty member leaves the room and does not see the student evaluations. This ensures that the assessment is anonymous and allows each student to respond or comment without any fear of retribution from the instructor.

4. How are administrators involved in faculty performance?

Division deans and chairs evaluate the faculty portfolio and review the outcomes of the entire Evaluation which is provided from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. All full and part time faculty, with the exception of first year faculty, are evaluated. Deans or chairs and two faculty members contribute to the evaluation outcome for each faculty and these scores are averaged. Once the evaluation outcomes for the portfolio are calculated and submitted to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, the student evaluation is matched with the portfolio outcome. All of administrators review the overall assessment of teaching with each faculty member in their division. If a faculty member's evaluation reflects a poor performance in the instructional delivery or the instructional design area, this is discussed with that faculty member. An improvement plan is developed to help the faculty member identify areas which need development. Once all evaluations have been completed, the evaluation outcomes are forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for Instruction and outcomes are recorded by the Director of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness.

PCCUA has one dean and three department chairs. In addition, the college has directors for both The Secondary Area Technical Center and the Adult Education programs.

5. How do faculty members self-evaluate their performance?

All faculty members serve as peer evaluators. The portfolio evaluation is conducted by two peers and a supervisor. Of the two faculty evaluators reviewing the portfolio, one is selected by the faculty member from within the division and the other is an at-large faculty member appointed by the Faculty Association to review the portfolio. The contents of the portfolio include a highly individualized series of artifacts which demonstrate faculty instructional design and include syllabi, lessons, tests, and other evidence of effective instruction. Each faculty member completes the portfolio. What is included in the portfolio is determined by each faculty member and reflects instructional competency. The portfolio design allows the faculty member to highlight areas of growth or improvement. When the faculty member has submitted the portfolio and it has been evaluated by two peers and a dean/chair, the portfolio is forwarded to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The Director of Institutional Effectiveness makes a summary of the student survey, portfolio outcome, including the college service outcomes. This summary is shared with the faculty member being evaluated and with the faculty member's supervisor. The dean or chair meets with the faculty member to discuss the outcomes and the assessment and the form is signed by the faculty member and supervisor. The signed evaluation form is sent to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and shared with the Vice Chancellor for Instruction. This report is entered into the evaluation files and the portfolio is returned to the faculty member being evaluated. Recently, many of the faculty are providing on-line portfolios which the College strongly encourages. The meeting between the faculty member and the presiding dean or chair of the division provides an opportunity for the faculty member to make verbal or written comments about the outcome of the evaluation. If it is determined that an improvement plan is needed for the faculty member being evaluated, this plan is identified on the evaluation form.

6. Describe how faculty knowledge and use of student support tools (i.e. early alert) and advising techniques (i.e.) intrusive advising) are used to evaluate faculty performance.

PCCUA has taken steps to ensure that each student receives an instructional and advising experience that addresses enrolling in the required courses, and focuses on career exploration and individual needs outside the classroom. Over the last several years, faculty and staff have received training to do this. Each student at PCCUA completes an Individual Career Plan (ICP) upon entering the College. It includes questions about the student's current social/economic environment, and automatically matches support services with the student's answers. Each advisor has access to this information, so that they can inform the student of services available – not just on campus, but in the community. We ask the student to revisit the ICP each semester and provide updates so that advisors can monitor changes and suggest support services. At PCCUA, we require that students meet with their advisor at least three times each semester: once to register for courses, once five weeks into the semester, and once ten weeks into the semester. The College has implemented the following strategies which are dependent on faculty support.

- a. Providing financial and career coaching, developing clear and user-friendly career and academic maps (pathways), developing and scaling-up the use of Individual Career Plans (ICP). Increasing high touch experiences within the coaching model.
- b. Improved student access and use of college career maps called Individual Career Plans (ICP), tracking student progress, persistence, and completion. Additionally, we use numerous employability skills modules.
- c. Providing multiple instructional supports (early assessment and faculty intervention, tutoring, learning lab support).
- d. Increased tracking and data analytic capacity and increased technology support for faculty and students.

7. Describe any other activities used to evaluate faculty performance.

Community Service, College Service, and Professional Development are three categories included in the evaluation of faculty. Faculty are able to earn five service points for each activity identified within these three focus areas. Instructors have varying degrees of engagement in each area depending on individual interests. The tool is designed to reflect personal interest of faculty members and a high degree of engagement in one or two areas is greater than a low degree of

engagement in professional development, college, or community activities. Sometimes a dean or supervisor desires to praise a faculty member for outstanding contributions, work, or achievements. This kind of recognition is written on the faculty evaluation outcome form.

Faculty are evaluated in three ways: 1) student evaluation of instruction, 2) portfolio evaluation by two faculty, 3) dean/chair evaluation of portfolio. Once the evaluation is completed the dean/chair reviews the outcome with the faculty member.

Institutional Monitoring of the Faculty Performance Review Process

1. **Does the institution monitor the annual faculty review process?** Yes X No ___

2. **If yes, describe the procedures and persons responsible for the monitoring.**

The evaluation form is kept in the faculty evaluation file in the office of Institutional Effectiveness and forwarded to the Office of Instruction and placed in the faculty member's personnel file. The portfolio is returned to the faculty member. The person responsible for the Faculty Performance Review is Dr. Deborah King, Vice Chancellor for Instruction. All documents are filed with Debbie Hardy, Director of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness.

3. **If no, describe measures that are being taken to begin annual monitoring.**

N/A

Use of Review Findings

1. **How are performance results used in decisions related to promotions, salary increases or job tenure?**

PCCUA has no tenure, merit -based pay increases, or promotions based merely on performance outcomes. Although the faculty evaluation is not used for advancement, PCCUA has a reputation for advancing employees who work at the College. This is largely because it is sometimes difficult to find qualified applicants for administrative positions in rural areas. Therefore, there are occasions when a pattern of strong evaluations can be helpful to faculty who desire advancement.

2. Describe how faculty performance results are used at your institution to guide short and long-term faculty development.

PCCUA does not plan a substantive change to faculty evaluations. However, the Faculty Senate with Faculty Association approval, has decided that the faculty evaluations will be on-line. As a result of this decision, which in no ways affects the evaluation process, student surveys, or the portfolio content, a significant effort will be made to prepare faculty to enter information and use the on-line evaluation tool. The plan is to use Blackboard for this assessment.

3. Based on faculty performance results, identify the following area (s) of improvement that are being examined for the next academic year.

In the summer and fall of 2020, the faculty will have some development/training in how to create an on-line portfolio. There have not been many portfolio scoring appeals the past couple of years because there has been more portfolio training. It is hoped the on-line aspects of the portfolio information will help faculty standardize aspects of the tool such as community service, college service, and professional development.

Faculty will continue development in Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT). The Faculty Professional Development Committee of the faculty Association establishes that agenda.

The COVID-19 pandemic has heightened College awareness about a greater need for preparing faculty to teach remotely. Much of that training will occur this summer and in early fall. There is concern that there could be additional instructional interruptions causing the College to close. If that happens, faculty need to be prepared and student needs to be prepared.

Faculty requests for training which has been included in the PCCUA COVID-19 Reopening Plan include the following ideas.

- Using your smartphone or webcam to record short lectures
- Using open educational resources (OERs) in your online course
- Using third-party resources to supplement various areas of instruction
- Determining what's most important for your online course (syllabus, course schedule, tests/quizzes, etc.)
- Implementing online-specific policies into your syllabus

Blackboard-specific ideas:

- Blackboard Faculty Orientation (new users)
- Blackboard Faculty Orientation (experienced users)
- Faculty Blackboard "sharing" session
- Building your Blackboard course from ground up
- Using the grade book in Blackboard
- Creating and deploying tests and quizzes in Blackboard
- Creating assignments in Blackboard
- Using rubrics in Blackboard
- Using Zoom to meet with students virtually
- Using [Blackboard Tool] in your course (such as Announcements, Discussion Board, Journals, Respondus, SafeAssign, etc.)

English Fluency of Teaching Faculty

1. How do students and administrators review the English fluency of all teaching faculty—full-time, part-time, and graduate teaching assistants?

PCCUA has no foreign language-speaking instructors. The College is largely bi-racial with less than 1% of other ethnic backgrounds. However, English fluency is evaluated based on syllabi and the written components of the portfolio. PCCUA expects its faculty to have English spoken and written fluency.

2. What measures are in place to assist deficient faculty in becoming English proficient?

If through the evaluation process, there were an identified problem with English proficiency, a remediation plan would be developed for the faculty member. That has not been an issue at PCCUA.

3. Summarize English deficiency findings and note action taken by the institution. There were no English deficiency findings.

No finding has been cited.

Support for Accredited Public Schools

Two Year Institutions: Describe how the institution's relationship related discipline faculty members worked collaboratively with accredited public schools in Arkansas this academic year?

PCCUA has a close relationship with local public schools, all of whom send students to the Secondary

Area Technical Center. We are engaged in career coaching in DeWitt and Stuttgart. GEAR UP funds a Curriculum Management System used by all the public schools and has purchased Chromebooks and software to assist with remote instruction.

Concurrent enrollment instructors teaching high school students at the high school are evaluated in a slightly different manner. PCCUA has about five of these adjunct instructors and because of NACEP accreditation standards; the assessment is far more rigid than the PCCUA Faculty Evaluation. These instructors are not paid by PCCUA; however, they are identified as college adjunct instructors. Each school has a PCCUA liaison responsible for examining three areas of faculty work: syllabi development, professional development, and annual visits with an instructional observation.

The PCCUA Division dean/chair of every department requires six hours of content based professional development in the academic year for concurrent instructors. The College dean/chair of a discipline visits all concurrent instructors during the academic year to observe instruction and make constructive recommendations about instruction. Concurrent adjunct faculty meet at least once at the beginning of each year for a program orientation. At this meeting syllabi, policies and procedures, and college protocols are reviewed using the PCCUA Faculty Handbook. This orientation meeting is very important because information about grades, add and drop procedures, and other student issues are addressed.

Notable Findings and Future Plans

1. List any notable findings from the annual faculty review process conducted during the year that may have implications for future annual faculty reviews.

The Faculty Performance Evaluation's primary use is for faculty improvement and it is used individually to gauge faculty instructional delivery and design. Used in this way, the

performance evaluation has been an effective development tool. It has been useful to examine departmental faculty performance outcome trends to identify if efforts toward improving performance outcomes of faculty within departments is observable. Over the last three years, significant improvement has occurred among faculty within all academic divisions. The faculty have worked hard to make sure all its faculty are more knowledgeable of the evaluation process. This is evident in the outcomes provided in the list below.

Full-time Faculty – 55 instructors evaluated
 Instructional Delivery average = 2.8
 Instructional Design average = 2.88

Adjunct Faculty – 17 instructors evaluated
 Instructional Delivery average =2.82
 Instructional Design average =2.90

2. Describe any plans or revisions to the annual faculty review process that have been developed as a result of the following noted above.

a. Notable Findings

There have been few notable findings. Performance evaluations are being used to track differences among divisions. In addition, the Assessment Committee examined outcomes and determined that adjunct evaluation outcome averages are higher than full time faculty evaluations. This suggests that it has been useful to provide constructive professional development opportunities for adjunct faculty. It has been determined that adjunct faculty will be required to receive professional development training in order to teach. Topics covered in the training are syllabus development, classroom management, and cooperative learning. The table below provides a breakdown of the number of faculty completing a portfolio.

Number of Completing Portfolio - 45 *(number does not include 8 Career and Tech Center Faculty)

Division	Portfolio Average
Allied Health	2.97
Applied Technology	2.90
Arts & Science	2.81
Business & Information Systems	2.92
Faculty Portfolio Evaluation Overall Average	2.90

Note: The COVID-19 Pandemic made it difficult to get all faculty evaluations completed.

b. The Institutional Placement Plan

PCCUA has a Faculty Inquiry Group that focuses on the completion of developmental education through gateway courses. The student survey of the faculty evaluation has been a good source of information for identifying changes, challenges students face, and obstacles they incur. These outcomes are documented and discussed among faculty and often results in changes in teaching.

c. The productivity funding formula.

Last year the College implemented the faculty early assessment based on funding formula outcomes. The formula has forced the college to be more completion focused. Course completion is not the only area of focus but the College is interested in program completion that results in a certificate or degree. In addition, the College has implemented several new short-term, high wage, high demand programs such as CDL/Truck Driving, HVAC, Cyber Security, construction, and a few others. Our productivity outcomes increased significantly because we focused on improving degree credential attainment which is worth 45% of the funding formula. The following table shows how effective this effort has been.

PRODUCTIVITY EFFORTS ARE EVIDENT

Metric	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	Action to Improve Outcome
Credentials 45% of the formula	-5.5%	-6.1%	-1.1%	15.0%	Increased short term, high wage, high demand programs
Progression 20% of the formula	-9.7%	-4.1%	-3.8%	-3.0%	Increase speed of progression

This work so important to student success and productivity it has been included in the PCCUA 2020-25 Strategic Plan

In addition, the College moved from being in the lowest ranking colleges for productivity to the second highest ranking in productivity from all two and four-year colleges in the entire state.

	BASE	CURRENT	Change in		
	Total	Total	Outcomes		
	Outcomes	Outcomes	Index		
	Index	Index			
4	ASUJ	29,395	30,728	1,333	4.54%
5	ATU	22,344	22,669	324	1.45%
6	HSU	7,616	7,879	263	3.46%
7	SAUM	10,571	11,111	539	5.10%
8	UAF	59,490	62,714	3,224	5.42%
9	UAFS	11,954	12,211	258	2.15%
10	UALR	21,209	21,367	159	0.75%
11	UAM	6,036	6,352	316	5.24%
12	UAPB	6,994	7,290	296	4.23%
13	UCA	23,998	24,838	840	3.50%
14	TOTAL	199,607	207,159	7,552	3.78%
15					
16					
	BASE	CURRENT	Change in		
	Total	Total	Outcomes		
	Outcomes	Outcomes	Index		
	Index	Index			
18	ANC	2,829	2,990	160	5.66%
19	ASUB	9,944	9,753	(191)	-1.92%
20	ASUMH	3,466	3,342	(124)	-3.56%
21	ASUMS	2,726	2,779	53	1.96%
22	ASUN	5,309	5,671	362	6.83%
23	ASUTR	2,938	2,884	(54)	-1.83%
24	BRTC	3,793	3,618	(175)	-4.61%
25	CCCUA	3,144	3,228	84	2.68%
26	EACC	2,033	2,215	182	8.94%
27	NAC	3,896	3,814	(82)	-2.11%
28	NPC	4,693	4,821	127	2.72%
29	NWACC	12,593	13,299	706	5.61%
30	OZC	2,587	2,740	153	5.92%
31	PCCUA	2,344	2,558	214	9.13%
32	SACC	3,329	3,355	26	0.77%
33	SAUT	3,593	3,751	158	4.40%
34	SEAC	3,155	2,923	(232)	-7.35%
35	UACCB	2,930	2,976	46	1.55%
36	UACCHT	3,348	3,585	237	7.07%
37	UACCM	5,673	5,868	194	3.42%
38	UACCRM	1,666	1,842	176	10.56%
39	UAPTC	13,250	12,170	(1,079)	-8.15%
40	TOTAL	99,240	100,181	941	0.95%
41		298,847	307,340	8,493	2.84%
42					

Level of Faculty Satisfaction with Current Process

1. On the scale below, indicate the faculty's overall sense of satisfaction with the annual review process. If the rating is low (1 or 2), briefly describe corrective measures that will be implemented.

1---2---3---4---5---6---7---8---9---10
 low high

On a scale of 1-10 faculty give the Faculty Performance Evaluation a rate of 7. The evaluation process was developed by faculty with administrative input. Some are tired of using the portfolio process because it is quite burdensome and next year the process will be online. The use of on-line portfolios is being encouraged by the College because it is so much easier to review the information. However, because it has been voluntary, not many faculty have been completing the portfolio online.

There is improvement in scores faculty have received for portfolios during the last three years.

Three Year Trend of Portfolio Average

3 Year Trend	2017	2018	2019	2017-2019
Overall Portfolio Average	2.79	2.78	2.90	2.82

Attachment 1: Peer Evaluation Form Used in Fall
Peer Evaluation of Faculty Member

Please use the scale below for each rating:

5-Exceptional. This job performance is outstanding in almost every aspect. An exceptional rating implies that virtually any knowledgeable observer would recognize the overall high quality results in all major areas of job emphasis.

4-Excellent. This job performance is at a fully effective level in all areas of job emphasis and *noticeably exceeds that level* in several important areas.

3-Fully Effective. This is a job performance at the level intended for the job. Overall performance does not noticeably deviate from an acceptable level.

2-Needs Improvement. This job performance is short of fully effective. Further development and/or experience on the job is needed before fully effective performance can be achieved.

1-Unsatisfactory. This level of performance would cause virtually any knowledgeable observer to consider whether retention of this employee in his or her present job is justified.

Instructor Being Evaluated: _____

I. Teaching

A. Instructional Delivery Skills (average of questions 1-12 on student evaluations, will be recorded by dean)

B. Instructional Design Skills

1. Has current and relevant syllabi
 (Two current syllabi are provided)

Administrative procedure #363.02 suggests the following sections be included in a course syllabus:

- A general description of the course, that is, an “expansion of the catalog detailing what is expected of the course and why,”
- A course outline including a schedule of assignments and class activities such as deadlines, examinations, guest lectures, and so forth,
- An explanation of the conduct of the course that includes “information about types of examinations, absence policies, grading, participation, outside reading-whatever is expected of students and how it will be assessed.”

B1 -1. Syllabi submitted:

	Course Number	Rating (R)
1.	_____	_____ (R1)
2.	_____	_____ (R2)

Average Rating B1 (R1+R2)/2= [_____]

Comments:

B2 - 2. Reviews and/or updates of course materials.
(Areas of revision of syllabi submitted are indicated in Portfolio Section A or three examples of course materials that reflect significant revision since the last evaluation is included.)

Comments:

Rating B2: [_____]

B3 - 3. **Uses evaluation methods that are related to and appropriate for course content.** (Examples of two methods such as tests, assignments, or procedures used in the evaluation of students are included in Portfolio Section A.)

Comments:

Rating B3: [_____]

B4 - 4. **Informs students of the objectives of the course.** (Evidence is provided in Portfolio Section A that course objectives are communicated to students in handouts.)

Comments:

Rating B4: [_____]

Compute and record average peer rating for Instructional Design Skills and record below and also on Peer Evaluation of Faculty Member Summary.

**Average Peer Rating for
Instructional Design Skills**

(B1+B2+B3+B4)/4 [_____] □

**□ Record also on Peer Evaluation of Faculty Member Summary
(last page)**

II. College Service [Documentation not necessary]

Activities

Comments:

Peer Rating for College Service

[] □

Record also on Peer Evaluation of Faculty Member Summary

III. Professional Development [Documentation not necessary]

Activities

Comments:

Peer Rating for Professional Development

[] □

Record also on Peer Evaluation of Faculty Member Summary

IV. Community Service [Documentation not necessary]

Attachment 2: Modified Peer Evaluation Form (all criteria are the same, the process for evaluation has not changed, the response to evaluation questions has changed from a 1-5 scale to a yes, no, or effective, needs improvement.

Peer Evaluation of Faculty Member

Please use the following scale for rating in Section I Teaching:

2 – Effective

1 – Needs Improvement

Please use the scale below for each rating in College Service, Professional Development and Community Service:

3 – Exceptional. This is a job performance that is outstanding in almost every aspect. An exceptional rating implies that virtually any knowledgeable observer would recognize the overall high quality results in all major areas of job emphasis.

To earn a rating of *exceptional* in College Service, Professional Development and Community Service the faculty member should have *over 10* total points.

2 – Effective. This is a job performance at the level intended for the job. Overall performance does not noticeably deviate from an acceptable level.

To earn a rating of *effective* in College Service, Professional Development and Community Service, the faculty member should have *5 - 10* total points.

1 – Needs Improvement. This is job performance that is short of effective. Further development and/or experience on the job is needed and there should be improvement within the next year.

To earn a rating of *needs improvement* in College Service, Professional Development and Community Service, the faculty member should have *less than 5* total points.

Instructor Being Evaluated: _____

I. Teaching

A. Instructional Delivery Skills (average of questions 1-12 on student evaluations, will be recorded by the dean)

B. Instructional Design Skills

1. Has current and relevant syllabi
(Two current syllabi are provided)

Course Number of Syllabi

1. _____

2. _____

After reviewing the content of Syllabi in the Portfolio, place a check for either Yes or No for each item listed below:

Administrative procedure #363.02 **suggests** the following sections be included in a course syllabus:

	<u>Syllabus 1</u>		<u>Syllabus 2</u>
<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>
Instructor Contact Information <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Title Page with Title of Course & Date <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Course Outline <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Class Activities <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deadlines (assignments, projects, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assignments Listed <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Exams Listed <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Attendance Policy <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Grading Scale <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
College Catalog Description of the Course <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
College Core Competencies <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Campus Support Services <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ADA Policy <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FERPA Policy <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Insurance <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ACTS <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

In addition to the requirements, the course syllabi **could** include the following:

Syllabus 1

Syllabus 2

<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Pre/Co Requisites	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Class Participation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Group Projects/Portfolio	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Community Service/Activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Computer Activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Field Trips	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Guests – appearances	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Outside Reading/s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Textbook/Reading Assignments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Total points (Tally the checks) (R1) _____ (R2) _____

Rating of 2 - Effective

Rating of 1 - Needs Improvement

***Place the proper number rating in the blank below for each syllabus.**

	Course Number	Rating (R)
1.	_____	_____ (R1)
2.	_____	_____ (R2)

Comments:

B1-1: TWO SYLLABI SUBMITTED:

AVERAGE RATING B1: $(R1 + R2)/2 =$ _____

B2 - 2. Reviews, modifies and/or updates course materials.

Yes

No



******(Areas of revision of course submitted are indicated in Portfolio Section A or three examples of course materials that reflect significant revision since the last evaluation is included. **Should reflect revision within a 3 year period.**)

****** Not applicable

This is a new instructor at PCCUA and is their first portfolio prepared for the evaluation

Rating of 2 - Effective

Rating of 1 - Needs Improvement

***Place the proper number rating in the blank below for each syllabus.**

Rating B2: Syllabus 1: _____

Syllabus 2: _____

Comments:

B3 - 3. Uses evaluation methods that are related to and appropriate for course content.
(Examples of **two methods** such as **tests, assignments, or projects, rubrics** used in the evaluation of students are included in Portfolio Section A.)

Other methods of evaluation:

Rating of 2 - Effective

Rating of 1 - Needs Improvement

***Place the proper number rating in the blank below for each syllabus.**

Total points (Tally the checks) B3 _____

Comments:

Faculty Equity Committee Member	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distance Learning Committee Member	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>
Instruction and Curriculum Team Member	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>
College Council Team Member	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Financial Aid Exceptions Member	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student Success Team Member	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>
Institutional Planning & Effectiveness	Team <input type="checkbox"/>	Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>
Information Technology Team	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>
Resource Development Committee Member	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>
Achieving the Dream Member	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Graduation Committee Member	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>
Special Events Committee Member	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student Retention & Recruitment Member	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student Activities Committee Member	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student Club/Organization Member	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/>
Early Alert Committee	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Carl Perkins	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Title III	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Career Pathways	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Student Support Services	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Presentation for college tours from area schools	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Plan, set up and participate in career fair (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Attend career days or Career Fairs	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Guest lecturer in area schools	<input type="checkbox"/>		

List Any Additional College Service Activities/Committees:

_____	<input type="checkbox"/>

Over 10 points = Rating of 3 - Exceptional
5 –10 points = Rating of 2 - Effective

Below 5 points = Rating of 1 - Needs Improvement

*Place the proper number rating in the blank below for each syllabus.

Total points (Tally the checks) and additional activities.

Peer Rating for College Service _____

Comments:

III. Professional Development [Documentation not necessary]

Please check the appropriate boxes.

Professional Development Activities (minimum of 5):

2 Additional Points For:
Presenter

Moderator Panelist

				2pts
2pts	2pts			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attend AATYC (2 points)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	State Conference/s for Your Discipline (2 points)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conference Name _____ (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conference Name _____ (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	National/International Conference/s (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conference Name _____ (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conference Name _____ (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Book Discussion Group/s		<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Book Group		<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Book Group		<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Book Group		<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Textbook Reviewer	<input type="checkbox"/>		

- One-time consulting (one visit) □
- Consulting (two or more contact visits) (2 pts) □□
- Publications (2 pts) □□
- Graduate Class (2 pts) □□
- Attend On Campus Workshop/s □
- Plan & present In-Service (2 pts) □□
- Plan & present On Campus Workshops (2pts) □□
- Design & implement personal web page (2 pts) □□
- Membership in Professional Organizations
- Name _____ □
- Name _____ □
- Name _____ □
- Name _____ □

List Any Additional Professional Development Activities:

- _____ □
- _____ □
- _____ □
- _____ □
- _____ □
- _____ □
- _____ □
- _____ □
- _____ □

Over 10 points = Rating of 3 - Exceptional
5 – 10 points = Rating of 2 - Effective
Below 5 points = Rating of 1 - Needs Improvement

***Place the proper number rating in the blank below for each syllabus.**

Total points (Tally the checks) and additional activities.
Peer Rating for Professional Development _____

Record also on Peer Evaluation of Faculty Member Summary

Comments:

IV. Community Service (minimum of 5): [Documentation not necessary]

Faculty will receive one point for each Community Service Activity.

List All Community Service Activities:

Chair, Organizer, President

_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Over 10 points = Rating of 3 - Exceptional

5 – 10 points = Rating of 2 - Effective

Below 5 points = Rating of 1 - Needs Improvement

***Place the proper number rating in the blank below for each syllabus.**

Total points for community service activities.

Peer Rating for Community Service _____

Record also on Peer Evaluation of Faculty Member Summary

Comments:

Peer Evaluation of Faculty Member Summary

To be completed by peer team member

Instructor Being Evaluated: _____

Instructional Design Skills

Peer Rating: _____

College Service

Peer Rating: _____

Professional Development

Peer Rating: _____

Community Service

Peer Rating: _____

Peer Evaluator's Signature

Date

NOTE: Upon completion of evaluation: Forward entire Peer Evaluation of Faculty Member Form and Summary document to Debbie Hardy, Director of Assessment. (Do Not Remove last page.)

Attachment 3: Student Evaluation



Student Evaluation of Instruction Survey

Instructions: Please shade the appropriate circle for each question.

My instructor:

1. Starts and ends the class/lab on time.
 Always **Usually** **Needs Improvement**
2. Is prepared for class/lab.
 Always **Usually** **Needs Improvement**
3. Demonstrates enthusiasm for his or her subject.
 Always **Usually** **Needs Improvement**
4. Gives tests/assignments reflecting course objectives/lessons taught.
 Always **Usually** **Needs Improvement**
5. Encourages students' interest, attention, and participation.
 Always **Usually** **Needs Improvement**
6. Presents material in a way I can understand.
 Always **Usually** **Needs Improvement**
7. Grades and returns test/assignments within two(2) weeks.
 Always **Usually** **Needs Improvement**
8. Provides homework, exercises, or other assignments to help me learn the information taught. **Always** **Usually** **Needs Improvement**
9. Is available, approachable, and easy to talk to.
 Always **Usually** **Needs Improvement**
10. Informs students of their progress in the course.
 Always **Usually** **Needs Improvement**
11. Uses class time to effectively teach the subject.
 Always **Usually** **Needs Improvement**
12. Uses some of these teaching methods: lecture, group activities, demonstrations, discussions, and others. **Always** **Usually** **Needs Improvement**
13. Demonstrates knowledge in his or her subject area. **Yes** **No**
14. My grade is determined by a variety of factors (activities, tests, quizzes, assignments, lab work, outside readings, group work, etc.) **Yes** **No**

15. Does this form allow you to say the things about the course and/or instructor that you feel are important?

Excellent **Unsatisfactory**

(If you rate it "unsatisfactory", please provide comments on what you would include.

Note: You may use the back your answer sheet for your personal comments on Teacher Effectiveness and General Course Value.