

Institutional Report on the Annual Review of Faculty Performance
PHILLIPS COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
Academic Year: 2020-21
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, 2021.

Elements of the Faculty Performance Review Process

1. Summarize the overall faculty performance review process.

The Phillips Community College of the University of Arkansas (PCCUA) faculty are evaluated by examining instructional delivery, instructional design, and course management.

The instructional delivery is evaluated using a student questionnaire administered to two classes, randomly selected by the dean of the division, each fall and spring semester. If either class selected has fewer than ten students enrolled, an additional class is selected until at least twenty students are asked to complete the student questionnaire.

The instructional design is evaluated using a teaching portfolio. The teaching portfolio is an open-ended collection of materials, selected by the instructor that documents his or her teaching performance. At a minimum the teaching portfolio includes syllabi for courses taught during the year and a description of college service, community service, and professional development activities. The teaching portfolio is reviewed by the division dean and a peer review committee. The peer review committee is composed of one faculty member selected by the instructor from the instructor's division, one faculty member selected by the division dean from the division, and one faculty member from another division selected by the Faculty Development Committee.

The course management segment of the evaluation is evaluated by the division dean and addresses issues related to management in instruction (interaction, submission of grades, reports, student documentation, other reporting functions, and classroom management).

Faculty members have recourse if a peer gives a low evaluation which the instructor believes to be inaccurate or unfair. The evaluation appeal goes to a Faculty Evaluation Appeal Committee who reviews the issue and makes recommendations to the Vice Chancellor for Instruction. The Vice Chancellor reviews the appeal and makes the final decision whether to accept or reject the appeal.

Student Evaluation of Instruction- Calendar Year 2020-21

Number of Full-Time Faculty Evaluated – 55

Division	Instructional Delivery	Instructional Design
Allied Health	2.64	2.70
Applied Technology	2.29	2.38
Arts and Science	2.83	2.89
Business & Information Systems	2.55	2.72
Career & Technical Center	2.85	2.89
Overall Average- Full-Time	2.63	2.72

Number of Part-Time Faculty Evaluated – 8

Part-Time	Instructional Delivery	Instructional Design
Overall Average- Part-Time	2.79	2.82

Note: 2021 faculty evaluations will be completed in 2022. The evaluation cycle includes fall and spring terms.

3 Year Trend –Student Evaluation								
	Instructional Delivery			Overall Delivery Average	Instructional Design			Overall Design Average
3 Year Trend	2018	2019	2020	2018-2020	2018	2019	2020	2018-2020
Full-Time	2.76	2.80	2.63	2.73	2.87	2.88	2.72	2.82
Part-Time	2.82	2.82	2.79	2.81	2.87	2.90	2.82	2.86

2. How are faculty peers involved in faculty performance?

Faculty peers are an active entity to the faculty evaluation process. The teaching portfolio is reviewed by the division dean and a peer review committee. The peer review committee is composed of one faculty member selected by the instructor from the instructor's division, one faculty member selected by the division dean from the division, and one faculty member from another division selected by the Faculty Development Committee.

The entire evaluation process is organized and any changes or input about the process must go through Faculty Senate. Any faculty appeal about the process or scoring goes to a Faculty Committee. All training for the transition to an online portfolio was completed by faculty.

3. How are students involved in faculty performance?

A student questionnaire is administered to two classes taught each fall and each spring semester. If either class selected has fewer than ten students enrolled, an additional class is selected until at least twenty students are asked to complete the student questionnaire. The student questionnaire is administered during the seventh or eighth week of each semester on a class day selected by the instructor. This questionnaire is anonymous and students have an opportunity to evaluate specific aspects of instruction and to write comments concerning instruction.

4. How are administrators involved in faculty performance?

Deans/Chairs are part of the evaluation process and responsible for the course management portion of the evaluation. In addition, the dean is responsible for reviewing the evaluation outcomes with each faculty member and signs the evaluation in the presence of the instructor. The Vice Chancellor for Instruction reviews all faculty evaluations. Academic administrators provide oversight for the process, ensure all resources are available to conduct the process, engage in the evaluation process, and actively participate in the outcomes of each evaluation.

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

The faculty members provide a portfolio which contains several artifacts related to instruction (syllabi, course changes, projects, samples of assessments and grading, etc.). All evidence selected for the portfolio to verify competence and quality are determined by the faculty member being evaluated. At the evaluation review the faculty member is asked to provide input into the results of the evaluation and there is an opportunity to write comments about the process, outcome, or supervision. There is also a mechanism for a faculty member to appeal a score if that instructor disagrees with the scoring or some aspect of the process was completed in an unfair or inappropriate way.

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.

Focused advising and intentional instruction is at the forefront of the College's programming. Faculty and staff have received extensive training in several areas which include culturally sensitive teaching, technology utilization, connecting via remote teaching and much more.

The first step students take is to complete an Individual Career Plan which allows advisors to determine student needs before they begin classes. It also allows advisors and instructors to make sure that students receive any benefit which could help them such as childcare or gas vouchers in Career Pathways, tutoring from Student Support Services, groceries from the Food Pantry, Food Stamps, lab support, and much more.

These are not new measures but the College continues to be committed to these activities.

- 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. Each coach is evaluated.
- 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. Each advisor and all faculty have access to

critical student information related to students needs reflected on the ICP.

- c. Providing multiple instructional supports (early assessment and faculty intervention, tutoring, learning lab support). Although the advisors are not evaluated, the college has used focus groups and the outcomes of surveys, one being the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSCCE) for input about advising and the quality of that interaction.
- d. Increased tracking and data analytic capacity and increased technology support for faculty and students. This has been a high priority, especially since the closing of the College during part of the pandemic.

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

No substantive change was made to the faculty evaluation; however, the entire process was completed virtually. The portfolio was submitted online rather than using bulky folders packed with artifacts reflecting instructional methodology. The students were provided a virtual survey for instructors, that did not work as well as having an in class monitor in terms of having a high response rate. The move to digital evaluation of faculty performance was something faculty have wanted to do and because so much teaching was virtual because of the pandemic, this was the year that made this change inevitable.

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. Included in that are three areas demonstrating engagement with community service. College service, and ongoing professional development are also important to the College and faculty are required to provide evidence of how they interact to assist with college initiatives or other activities.

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 process is monitored by the Director of Institutional Effectiveness. She compiles a summary of the overall evaluation outcomes. This information is shared with the Vice Chancellor for Instruction and Faculty Senate. As part of this process, the Vice

Chancellor for Instruction reviews the evaluation outcomes for each faculty member and a copy of the evaluation is placed in the instructor's personnel file. Additionally, the Annual Review for Faculty Performance is published on the College Website.

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?

There is no merit-based pay at PCCUA. The faculty evaluations are used for several purposes.

1. **To Inform** – The faculty evaluation process shows a clearer picture of what is really happening in a program or course and informs others of instructor's contributions.
2. **To Improve** – The faculty evaluation is formative. The portfolio activities provide a feedback loop to help shape or inform better instruction.
3. **To Prove** – The faculty evaluation is summative. Evaluation activities reflected in the surveys and portfolio provide evidence to sum up what an instructor is accomplishing and provides persuasive indicators to the instructor and supervisors about the quality of instruction provided. It also provides evidence to the faculty member about what needs to be improved to facilitate better instruction.

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

There are no plans to change the evaluation at this time. The biggest change came from the movement from face-to-face to a virtual portfolio submission. Blackboard was the best vehicle to do this.

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

There have been no faculty appeals related to scoring for the 2021 academic year. The online submission of the portfolio has helped standardize many of the items used as evidence in the portfolio.

October 2, 2020, all faculty received online portfolio training. Faculty had the option of doing the training via Zoom or face to face.

Date	Time	Topic	Location
October 2	8:30-9:30	Demonstration: Developing Online Faculty Portfolio	ZOOM and Campus labs: Helena - A110 DeWitt - B101 Stuttgart - C110 https://pccua.zoom.us/j/98167634551 Meeting ID: 981 6763 4551

Faculty's first priority is to refine the online submission of the portfolio. The student survey section of this year's faculty Evaluation did not work as well as had been planned. Faculty are going to review and make some changes to the student survey piece of the process. This will not substantively change the process, it will merely address the delivery of this process to students. The faculty want to ensure that there are ample student surveys per course but know that anonymity is very important.

Faculty do plan to continue to address changing trends in technology and teaching as a development priority. Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT) will continue for both faculty and staff.

A newly established Assessment Committee has been formed. All faculty are engaged in revising assessment outcomes. This year faculty have been very busy with assessment and several days have been dedicated to assessment work.

Faculty do plan to continue to address changing trends in technology and teaching as a development priority. Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT) will continue for both faculty and staff.

A newly established Assessment Committee has been formed. All faculty are engaged in revising assessment outcomes. This year faculty have been very busy with assessment and several days have been dedicated to assessment work.

Curriculum Maps and Faculty Survey

Curriculum maps are the blueprint for assessment. In other words, curriculum maps help faculty align courses with program learning outcomes and programs with PCCUA's Core Competencies. Curriculum maps also highlight any assessment gaps at both the course and institutional levels. In addition to curriculum maps, faculty assessment surveys provide a separate blueprint for determining which courses are being assessed, how they are being assessed, and when they will be assessed.

Faculty Assessment Workday Agenda

- Reviewed course Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) to ensure accuracy (across departments and divisions, external accreditations, ACTS definitions., etc.) *All faculty had a copy of the most recent syllabus for each course that they teach.
- Introduced curriculum mapping
- A faculty survey was administered to determine if and how courses are being assessed
- Reviewed how assessment data is collected and who is collecting that data

Assessment Web Page Subcommittee

Members of the assessment committee were asked to:

- Research other institution assessment web pages as well as our own current pages
- Determine what information to include based on our institutional needs
- Determine what needs to be written, revised, etc.
- Develop an assessment web page plan

April Meeting Overview

- Reviewed faculty curriculum mapping
- Reviewed and discussed the faculty survey
- Reviewed data collection process
- Considered possible assessment cycles
- Reviewed and determined division/institutional reporting (this needs to be uniform across all divisions)

The Assessment Committee worked very hard this year. At this time, it is uncertain how this work might be folded into the faculty evaluations but the work is critical to improved instruction so it is possible that at some point, faculty will want evidence of that work.

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.

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

English fluency is evaluated as part of the written components of the portfolio. There are no foreign language speaking instructors at PCCUA. Faculty are expected to teach using standard English.

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

The College serves school districts in Phillips, Arkansas, parts of Lee and parts of Monroe Counties. There has always been a symbiotic relationship with the K-12 public schools and the college because of the nature of community colleges. We are reflective of the communities we serve. PCCUA has a Secondary Area Technical Center on all three campuses and we have a strong NACEP accredited concurrent enrollment program. There is a high school relations coordinator on each campus who serves as the liaison between the

college and the schools. PCCUA faculty are required to remain current in their teaching field. Content based development is a priority for the college (See Attachment 2).

PCCUA has a strong Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP). This is a grant funded by the United States Department of Education. The program is designed to increase the number of low-income students who are prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary education.

GEAR UP provides services to students in underserved, low-income communities to ensure they develop the academic and personal skills needed for postsecondary success. Partnership among PCCUA and eight school districts include:

- Helena-West Helena
- Barton-Lexa
- Marvell-Elaine
- Lee County
- Stuttgart
- DeWitt
- Dumas
- Lakeside (Lake Village)
- other community partners

Services include activities that promote:

- Increased academic performance and preparation for post-secondary education;
- Increased high school graduation and participation in post-secondary education;
- Increased student and family knowledge of post-secondary education options, preparation and financing;
- Increased post-secondary success; and
- Professional development for teachers.

High school student programming and concurrent enrollment allows high school students the opportunity to enroll in college level courses while continuing their high school courses and activities. Many options are open to high school students.

1. Concurrent enrollment—PCCUA's concurrent enrollment program is accredited by the National Alliance for Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP) and is available for high school

students eligible to enroll in college courses. These classes are typically taught on the high school campus, by a high school instructor, for college credit.

2. PCCUA Career and Technical Center-Offers programs to local high school students under the auspices of the Arkansas Department of Workforce Education. Often referred to as the Secondary Center, courses offered through this program are taught on all three PCCUA Campuses. Programs on each campus are listed: DeWitt Campus offers Agriculture, Criminal Justice, Medical Professions Education, Manufacturing/Renewable Energy Technology and Welding. Helena-West Helena Campus offers Advanced Manufacturing, Computer Engineering, Criminal Justice and Medical Professions Education. The Stuttgart Campus offers Criminal Justice, Medical Professions Education, and Manufacturing.
3. Dual enrollment is available to high school students. They can enroll in college classes at PCCUA in several ways. This form of enrollment places them in classes with other college students.
4. Combinations-Students may enroll in a combination of two or three programs as concurrent, Secondary Center, and dual enrolled status. All high school enrollment classes are college level courses available to high school students. Students may receive high school and college credit simultaneously.

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.

The College also has a Secondary Area Technical Center Director who ensures that all Secondary center instructors acquire ongoing professional development and works with the

faculty to provide oversight for teaching. The director is engaged with instructors throughout the academic year and assists with instructional tips and makes useful recommendations about instruction. Secondary Center faculty meet frequently, have a formal program orientation each year, and participate in specific professional development activities. Like all college faculty, they are given information about the syllabi, use the same syllabus template, and are made aware of new and old policies, procedures, and college protocols.

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.

Improvement in teaching is the primary purpose of the Faculty Performance Evaluation. The instructional delivery and design are important aspects of the faculty evaluation. Through the evaluation process, faculty and others are able to gauge effectiveness so the evaluation tool is essential to determining the quality of faculty teaching.

Notable Findings

1. Evaluation scores were down in all areas. It is difficult to explain but there was a slight drop in assessment outcomes for faculty in every area of teaching. This may be because of the difficulty students and faculty encountered during the pandemic. All three areas averaged together show a downward trend. This was not the case in the past three years, in fact faculty were improving outcomes.

3 Year Trend –Student Evaluation								
	Instructional Delivery			Overall Delivery Average	Instructional Design			Overall Design Average
3 Year Trend	2018	2019	2020	2018-2020	2018	2019	2020	2018-2020
Full-Time	2.76	2.80	2.63	2.73	2.87	2.88	2.72	2.82
Part-Time	2.82	2.82	2.79	2.81	2.87	2.90	2.82	2.86

2. All adjuncts were evaluated. However, the sharp enrollment drop meant fewer adjuncts were used. Any additional classes were assigned to full time faculty to assure course loads were met. In the 2019-20 year there were seventeen adjunct faculty evaluated.

Adjunct Faculty – 8 instructors evaluated
 Instructional Delivery average =2.79
 Instructional Design average =2.82

3. 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 - 47

Division	Portfolio Average
Allied Health	2.94
Applied Technology	2.68
Arts & Science	2.78
Business & Information Systems	2.88
Career and technical Center	2.41
Faculty Portfolio Evaluation Overall Average	2.74

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

b. The Institutional Placement Plan

As part of the Strong Start to Finish Initiative, PCCUA has several plans in place to address remediation.

MATH CHANGES

All students needing math remediation take MS 1023

1. Students with ACT 14 or below or 227 or below on the NG Accuplacer must enroll in the following corequisite course.

MS 1023 and lab MS 1002

2. Students with ACT 15-16; or a 228-236 on the NG Accuplacer must enroll in the following course:

MS 1023 NO LAB

3. Students with 17-18 or above; 237-248 on the NG ACCUPLACER QAS or complete MS 1023 may enroll in either of the following courses:

- Tech Math, MS 143
- College Algebra MS 123 and MS 1121
- Quantitative Reasoning/Literacy, MS 193 and the Lab-MS 1191

4. Students with ACT 19 or above, or a 249 or above on the NG ACCUPLACER QAS may enroll in either of the following courses:

- Tech Math, MS 143
- College Algebra MS 123
- Quantitative Reasoning/Literacy, MS 193

Note: Students with a 16 on the ACT or a 237 on the NG ACCUPLACER who are earning an AAS may enroll in Tech Math, MS 143 if they are not Nursing or MLT majors. STEM majors must take College Algebra, MS 123.

READING AND WRITING CHANGES IN DEWITT AND STUTTGART

The actual changes to curriculum that may impact students' schedules are in Basic Writing I & II and in Intro to Reading, DS 103 and College Reading Strategies, DS 123. In the Fall of 2020, PCCUA began enrolling students in open labs on the DeWitt and Stuttgart campuses. The labs associated with the reading and writing are the actual instructional times and the lecture portion has now become the student self-guided

reading and writing improvement time. This allows the instructor to provide one on one support when needed and is much more individualized than past instruction.

Reading

Intro to College Reading, DS 103

Reading Lab I DS 1031

College Reading Strategies, DS 123

Reading Lab for DS 123 is DS 1231

Writing

Basic Writing I, EH 1013

Basic Writing Lab I, EH 1011

Basic Writing II, EH 1023

Basic Writing II Lab, EH 1021

PCCUA faculty are 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.

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.

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

The faculty survey revealed that the average rate for the overall satisfaction with the annual review process was 7.2 on a 1-10 scale with 10 being the highest ranking. Faculty were given a survey asking them to share if they liked the new virtual process and they unanimously responded that they did.

Faculty have changed from paper submission to virtual submission of the documents needed to evaluate the portfolio, college service, community service, and professional development. Since it is the first year for online submissions, representatives from the Faculty Senate committees were asked to rate the process. Although the move to virtual submission was requested and unanimously approved by Faculty Senate, it did require that the College provide faculty training. The rate of return for the student survey done virtually was not as high as the face-to-face response rate. Faculty will examine this concern during the summer and make decisions for next year's administration of the evaluation.

Three Year Trend of Portfolio Average

3 Year Trend	2018	2019	2020	2018-2020
Overall Portfolio Average	2.78	2.90	2.74	2.81

**Attachment 1A: 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 1B: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>
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>
<u>No</u>			
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.

Attachment 2: Professional Development Tables

Table 1: Online Portfolio Training

Date	Time	Topic	Location
October 2	8:30-9:30	Demonstration: Developing Online Faculty Portfolio	ZOOM and Campus labs: Helena - A110 DeWitt - B101 Stuttgart - C110 https://pccua.zoom.us/j/98167634551 Meeting ID: 981 6763 4551

Table 2: Faculty Portfolio Schedule

Faculty Portfolio Training Schedule			
Fall 2020			
Date	Time	Topic	Location
October 2	8:30-9:30	Demonstration: Developing Online Faculty Portfolio	ZOOM and Campus labs: Helena - A110 DeWitt - B101 Stuttgart - C110 https://pccua.zoom.us/j/98167634551 Meeting ID: 981 6763 4551
October 9 (If needed)	8:30-9:30	Scanning documents to convert to PDF	ZOOM and Campus labs: Helena - A110 DeWitt - B101 Stuttgart - C110
October 30	8:30-10:00	Section 1: Teaching	ZOOM and Campus labs: Helena - A110 DeWitt - B101 Stuttgart - C110
November 6	8:30-10:00	Section 2: College Service Section 3: Professional Development Section 4: Community Service	ZOOM and Campus labs: Helena - A110 DeWitt - B101 Stuttgart - C110
January - TBA		Evaluating Peer Faculty Portfolios	ZOOM and Campus labs: Helena - A110 DeWitt - B101 Stuttgart - C110

Table 3: Spring Professional Development Schedule

Spring 2021 Professional Development Schedule				
Date	Time	Training	Location	Presenter
February 26	9:00 a.m.	Workday Overview in Blackboard	Zoom: https://pccua.zoom.us/j/96785882108 Meeting ID: 967 8588 2108 On-Campus Locations: Helena A110 Stuttgart C110 Dewitt B101	Michelle Waites
March 3 (Wednesday)	2:30 p.m.	Portfolio Evaluation Training	Zoom: https://pccua.zoom.us/j/96837220326 Meeting ID: 968 3722 0326 On-Campus Locations: Helena A110 Stuttgart TBA Dewitt TBA	Blake Cannon Debbie Hardy Kayla Holland
March 5	9:00 a.m.	Respondus Monitor	Zoom: https://pccua.zoom.us/j/93928438730 Meeting ID: 939 2843 8730 On-Campus Locations: Helena A110 Stuttgart C110 Dewitt B101	Michelle Waites
March 12	9:00 a.m.	Blackboard Ally (Accessibility)	Zoom: https://pccua.zoom.us/j/97110916772 Meeting ID: 971 1091 6772 On-Campus Locations: Helena A110 Stuttgart C110 Dewitt B101	Michelle Waites
April 9	9:00 a.m.	Advanced Excel Training	Zoom: https://pccua.zoom.us/j/95519759637 On-Campus Locations: Helena A110 Stuttgart C110 Dewitt B101	Cindy Grove