

Department of Chemistry – Evaluation of Teaching

The following descriptions of the Department of Chemistry's policies and procedures for evaluation of teaching are extracted from the department's charter:

2.2 Evaluation of Teaching

Teaching will be evaluated in accordance with University policy. Teaching evaluations will consist of a review of student course evaluation scores and evaluations of classroom teaching and course materials by department faculty.

Any member of the department may request a formal or informal evaluation of his/her teaching at any time. Informal evaluations can be coordinated by the Chair or by any other member of the department. Formal evaluations will be conducted by tenured faculty under the direction of the Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment (TPR) Committee. The TPR Committee may also request help in teaching evaluations from untenured faculty who are in their 5th and 6th year.

Formal peer evaluation of all classroom teaching will be conducted by at least two members of the faculty including unannounced visits to a class in session each fall and spring semester for pre-tenured faculty and once per year for all other faculty. Faculty may request additional in- class visits.

The in-class evaluation will consider the following criteria as appropriate:

- Appropriateness of pedagogical strategies (e.g. lecture, discussion, group work, etc.).
- Quality of class involvement and response.
- Quality of presentation (oral communication, organization, relevant focus, illustration or examples, voice, use of instructional resources, handouts, etc.).
- Ability to initiate and direct discussion or group work.
- Achievement of effective classroom atmosphere (presence, rapport).

In addition, the peer evaluation must address the following:

- Caliber of texts and reading material, assignments and exams, course content, and lab activities, as appropriate.
- Adequacy of the course syllabus, which should clearly state requirements, procedures, grading policy, etc., and comply with senate requirements.
- Implementation of prior assessment recommendations.

After each classroom visit each faculty evaluator will summarize his/her findings in a written and signed report [*see attached instrument*] and there must be evidence that all the items listed above were examined. The reports will be presented to the TPR Committee, which will prepare an overview report for each candidate.

In addition, the charter describes the following criteria for teaching evaluation for purposes of appointment and promotion:

For Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with Tenure:

The quality and extent of contributions to the teaching mission will be evaluated by considering the following criteria demonstrated in both upper and lower division courses:

- Peer evaluations
- Student evaluations
- Efforts towards curriculum improvement and innovation.

Additional items that may be considered include:

- Obtaining grants or gifts for educational programs
- Professional production of instructional materials such as software, videos, etc. enjoying a national distribution.
- Participation in assessment of student learning outcomes
- Participation in accreditation activities

For Promotion from Associate to Full Professor:

Evidence for excellence in teaching will be evaluated by the following criteria:

- National or local awards and citations
- Evaluation of teaching as described in section 2.2.
- Authorship of widely adopted texts and monographs
- Authorship of influential articles pertaining to education
- Nationally recognized contributions to curriculum development
- Invitations to visit major universities as a visiting professor
- Selection for editorship of recognized educational journals or text series
- Scholarly activity beyond quality classroom instruction and normal course development, which are expected of all candidates for promotion to Professor.
- Demonstrated leadership in assessment of student learning outcomes
- Demonstrated leadership in accreditation activities

For continued Appointment as Lecturer:

Lecturers should:

1. Demonstrate continued quality teaching.
2. Maintain effective participation in department and university service.

For Promotion or Appointment to Senior Lecturer:

In addition to the criteria for reappointment to Lecturer, a Senior Lecturer is expected to have:

1. Demonstrated excellence in teaching and leadership in education.
2. Developed new courses, teaching methods and procedures that have substantial impact within the department and across the University.
3. Maintained effective participation in professional activities in the area they are teaching.
4. Demonstrated leadership in assessment of student learning outcomes
5. Demonstrated leadership in accreditation activities

For Promotion or Appointment to Principal Lecturer:

In addition to the expectations for lecturers and senior lecturers, a principal lecturer is expected to demonstrate exceptional achievements in teaching and education, either by fundamental contributions to the University's mission or by broad national or international impact.

In all of the above, evidences and criteria for quality of teaching will be considered holistically, with no single factor is taken in isolation. Apart from the student evaluations of instruction, the evaluations by peers, TPR Committee and the department chair are not quantitative in nature.

Each semester, the department chair will review the student evaluation of instruction statistics supplied by the Jackson Center for Teaching and Learning for each instructor. The chair will meet with instructors identified by the Provost's office for follow up, based on low scores on the "Average of 7 dimensions", and works with the instructor to develop a plan for improvement. As appropriate, the department chair will recognize and/or reward instructors for outstanding achievements in criteria as outlined above (e.g. through nominations to various teaching awards).

Evaluation of TT Faculty member: _____

Course Number and Name: _____

Date: _____

The in-Class evaluation will consider the following criteria where appropriate:

1. Appropriateness of pedagogical strategies:

- Lecture:

- Discussion:

- Group Work:

- Other:

2. Quality of class involvement and response:

3. Quality of presentation:

- Organization:

- Relevant Focus:

- Illustration or Examples:

- Voice:

- Use of Instructional Resources:

- Handouts:

- Other:

4. Ability to initiate and direct discussion or group work:

5. Achievement of effective classroom atmosphere (presence, rapport):

In addition, the peer evaluation will address the following:

1. Appropriateness of text, material, assignments and course content:

2. Implementation of successful assessment efforts (were midterm evaluations conducted and what changes resulted):

Evaluation conducted by (Name)

Signature **DATE**

I understand that the contents of this review will be shared with the faculty member as part of the annual performance review and mentoring process.