

Department of Teaching & Learning Faculty Evaluation Guidelines & Handbook

Approved by T&L faculty on September 12, 2007
Amended 10/8/08
Revised Edition approved by T&L Faculty on August 23, 2010

Revised by
Shelby Barrentine, Lynne Chalmers, Margaret Zidon



Lighting the path
to lifelong learning.

CAVEAT: This handbook cannot and does not specify every detail of the tenure and promotion process. The evaluatee is expected to be proactive and seek clarity from the Department chair when questions arise.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I	
Distinction between Tenure & Promotion & Standards for Tenure & Promotion.....	3
PART II	
Faculty Involvement, Terms & Definitions Pertaining to Evaluation	5
PART III	
Evaluation Tools.....	8
PART IV	
Preparing the Faculty Evaluation Portfolio & Summary Statement Template.....	15
Summary Statement of Professional Activity for Faculty Evaluation.....	18
PART V	
Overview of Departmental Processes, Committee & Administration Sequences of Evaluation Reports	22
PART VI	
Guidelines for Departmental Review Committee	23
College of Education & Human Development	
Evaluation Report from Department Faculty Advisory Committee.....	24
PART VII	
Excerpt from the UND Faculty Handbook.....	27
PART VIII	
VPAA Vita Format	32
PART IX	
VPAA URL and Downloadable Forms Required for Promotion and Tenure.....	33

PART I

DISTINCTION BETWEEN TENURE AND PROMOTION AND STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

Distinction between Evaluation Years Regarding Tenure

Year One	In year one, faculty undergo a formal evaluation of teaching/advising, research/ scholarly activity and service. In addition to the formal evaluation, faculty focus on goal setting in each of the three areas: Teaching; Research and Scholarly Activities; and Service. Emphasis is placed on setting goals for the following year, as well as subsequent years.
Year Two	In year two the emphasis is on formative evaluation with the intent of guiding development. Goal setting for subsequent years is also important. To maintain satisfactory progress towards tenure, the faculty member should maintain at least satisfactory ratings in all areas and achieve an excellent rating in at least one area.
Year Three	In year three the emphasis is on formative evaluation, with continued attention to development and goal setting. Some achievement of goals should be evident, particularly in the area of scholarship. Effective presentation of evaluation materials is expected. Satisfactory progress toward tenure requires maintaining at least satisfactory ratings in all areas and attaining an excellent rating in at least one area.
Year Four	The purpose of evaluation in year four is to provide the faculty member with constructive feedback on their progress towards tenure regarding professional accomplishments and presentation of evaluation materials. At minimum, satisfactory progress towards tenure is indicated by a rating of satisfactory in two areas with excellent in one area for three of the four years. Ratings of unsatisfactory indicate unsatisfactory progress toward tenure. Year four is a cumulative evaluation, including all years of tenure track work in the Department.
Year Five	To consider progress towards tenure as satisfactory in year five, faculty must not be rated unsatisfactory in any area, and must be rated excellent in one or more areas of evaluation.
Year Six	All faculty members are required to go through the tenure decision process no later than year six. Note that a faculty member may request a tenure review earlier than year six. Likewise, a faculty member may request a tenure review extension beyond year six if extenuating circumstances meet the University criteria for extension. This latter request must be made before the end of the fifth academic-year. A favorable tenure review typically requires a supportive statement from the Department Chair and a supportive statement from the College Dean. A summary of previous evaluation ratings must reveal annual achievement of at least one excellent rating in years 2, 3, 4 and 5. If there are unsatisfactory ratings in any of these years, the portfolio must reflect continued improvement in those areas. After year three, there must be no unsatisfactory ratings.
Three Year Post-Tenure	At minimum, faculty members are expected to maintain ratings of satisfactory in at least two of the three evaluation areas, with the third area receiving a rating of excellent.
Faculty with tenure credit from another setting	The faculty member's record of scholarly activity (e.g., articles and presentations) is reviewed in its entirety. The record of teaching and service completed in service of the department are most central to determining evaluation ratings.

Standards for and Distinction between Tenure and Promotion

Currently at UND, tenure is not tied to promotion. Thus, in exceptional cases, a faculty member may choose (or be advised) to be reviewed for tenure only in year six and not promotion.

Note that tenure is largely a Department/College decision (that is affirmed by the Provost and President), whereas promotion is a Department/College and University decision. Whereas, the expectations for tenure are set by the Department, the expectations for promotion include those set by the University. The Department influences promotion expectations by establishing the following threshold expectations for faculty performance.

Assistant to Associate	In the promotion seeking year, the faculty member must meet the University expectations, as well as have ratings by the Department committee of excellent in teaching and research/scholarly activity, with a rating of at least satisfactory in service (see department by laws for information on composition of the committee).
Associate to Full	In the promotion seeking year, the faculty member must meet the University expectations, as well as have ratings by the Department committee of excellent in all three areas.

NOTE: In the year prior to assembling the promotion files, the faculty member meets with the chairperson of the department in order to establish whether there is enough evidence to support a request for promotion.

PART II FACULTY INVOLVEMENT, TERMS AND DEFINITIONS PERTAINING TO EVALUATION

- A. Involvement in the Department is essential.
1. It is expected that all faculty will maintain an adequate on-campus presence, allowing for equitable participation in departmental and program area meetings, committee assignments, and accessibility to students for advisement and consultation. Office hours must be posted.
 2. Faculty members in the Department of Teaching & Learning are expected to adhere to University and College policies and ethical decorum for the various professions represented in the Department.
 3. Involvement that helps colleagues contribute to the mission of the department, interpersonal honesty and integrity is expected.
- B. At the department level, department chair and evaluation committee reports may include a statement about a faculty member's involvement in the department.

Terms and Definitions for Areas of Evaluation

Department guidelines for decisions on rating tenure-track and tenured faculty for evaluation purposes (including promotion, tenure, annual and third year post-tenure evaluation) will be followed. Faculty members are rated in the areas of teaching and advising, scholarship, and service.

A. The rating terms used for evaluation are specified in the University Faculty Handbook: excellent, satisfactory, , and unsatisfactory.

B. Definitions for Areas of T&L Faculty Evaluation

Teaching, for faculty evaluation purposes, refers to responsibility for planning, implementing and assessing instruction; supporting student learning; and cooperating with departmental programs and processes (e. g, timely submission of grades, use of technology initiatives, adherence to and consideration of accreditation standards). Evaluation of teaching focuses on courses, but also includes learning situations such as individualized student courses (e.g., 591, 995, 997, 998, 999), field experience supervision, practica and internships. Teaching also involves keeping courses updated for content, pedagogy and assessment data. Faculty evaluation of teaching includes course work taught as part of load, including online teaching. Faculty members may include overload and summer school teaching, if desired. Since these are taught on a separate contract, inclusion is not required but recommended.

Advising is included with teaching and refers to faculty obligation to assist undergraduate and graduate (masters, specialist, and doctoral) students in taking responsibility for developing meaningful educational plans (see <http://ssc.und.edu/advisingprocess.php>). In the case of graduate advisement, advising also refers to chairing and serving on thesis and dissertation committees and sponsoring masters' students' final projects and independent studies (e.g., 995, 997).

Research and Scholarly Activity primarily refers to conducting, and publishing scholarly pursuits by faculty in areas of professional choice. But it also refers to maintaining scholarly membership in professional organizations, being involved in scholarly pursuits (e.g., reviewing manuscripts and presentation proposals) and making progress towards achieving scholarly goals.

Scholarly products (in print or electronic formats) include contributions to the profession through refereed and sometimes through invited works (e.g., invited chapter in a refereed book, or invited article in a high profile publication) such as presentations, journal articles, book chapters, books, conference proceedings, reports (e.g., executive summary of a project by a professional organization) and grants. Non-refereed works at times may be included as scholarship and would depend on explanation provided by the faculty member being evaluated, but generally, nonrefereed publications and presentations are viewed as service to the profession (e.g., nonrefereed state level presentations or newsletter articles). Competitive grant-writing that is research-based or leads to securing external funds for large education-based projects is viewed as scholarly activity. Internally secured research grants that are highly competitive (e.g., UND Senate seed money research grants) are viewed as scholarly achievement. Small and/or non-competitive grants as well as on-going grant-related activities are typically considered as service to the profession.

Quality and Quantity. Quality and quantity of publications and presentations are both relevant factors in research/scholarly activity. Most typically, a refereed publication or presentation is considered the respected measure of quality used by the department. Criteria associated with high quality refereed publications and presentations include factors such as acceptance rate, readership, importance to the field, frequency of citation by other scholars, and complexity of research or project. For information on quantity of publications and presentations, see the research/scholarship guidelines under heading "Evaluation Tools" (page 11).

For further clarification, publications are divided into major and minor categories.

1. Major Publications/Scholarship

- a. refereed scholarly article in a nationally or internationally disseminated journal
- b. scholarly book chapter
- c. scholarly book—not self-published (counts for 2 or more publications)
- d. edited scholarly book (counts for 2 publications)
- e. editor of refereed conference proceedings
- f. article in refereed conference proceedings
- g. teaching or pedagogical scholarship resulting in a nationally or internationally disseminated publication
- h. publications that a faculty member can provide strong support for why they should be considered major
- i. invited articles published in a high profile publication or refereed journals
- j. funded competitive grants which are research-based or, for large education-based projects (external grants, UND Senate seed money grants, etc.)
- k. edits a journal or significant publication, especially if on a long term basis

2. Minor Publications/Scholarship

- a. fourth or more authorship of a refereed scholarly article in a nationally or internationally disseminated journal
- b. book reviews
- c. non-refereed and other publications that a faculty member can provide strong support for why they should be considered a minor publication, i.e. case studies
- d. reviews proposals or manuscripts, including books, for significant venues
- e. edits journal or other publication on a limited basis

Scholarly presentations include refereed and invited state, regional, national, or international conference presentations. Faculty must provide documentation that presentations were invited or proposed, accepted and given and the competitive nature of the conference.

Service is providing assistance to individual(s) or organization(s) associated with one's professional role. There are three areas of such service. The first area is service to the institution through such activities as committee work (university, college, and departmental levels), program or curriculum design, assessment coordination, and other work that fulfills the mission and strategic planning of the department, college, and university. Program area coordination both at the graduate and undergraduate level, for both on-campus and distance programs is considered a special form of service to the department and is evaluated as service (e.g., not as administration). The second area of service is to one's professional societies and/or recognized practitioners in the field. The faculty member being evaluated must describe the nature of the work, which often includes being involved in a professional organization by reviewing proposals or manuscripts, holding an office, conference planning, a non-refereed presentation or publication. The third area is service to one's community through work in schools, agencies, or institutions related to one's professional role. The quality of participation is relevant to evaluating service activity. For further clarification, examples for each of the three service categories are specified below.

1. Service to the institution

- a. Committee membership and/or leadership at the program area, department, college and university levels
- b. Undergraduate program area coordination
- c. Direct a graduate program
- d. Program planning and development
- e. Authors departmental reports or documents
- f. Coordinates a special service (e.g., assessment planning)
- g. Curriculum design and development (e.g., create a new course, block of curriculum changes, develop a new minor or degree program)
- h. Obtains grants to improve programs and curriculum
- i. Mentors faculty and/or students in significant ways (e.g., Alice Clark, Fulbright or honors program or presenting)
- j. Sponsors or presents at faculty seminars, SGID facilitator, etc.
- k. Other department, college, and/or university mission-related and/or strategic plan work
- l. Participates in departments tasks that support students (e.g., capstone tasks)
- m. Participates in department tasks that support faculty (e.g., serves on faculty evaluation committees)

2. Service to the profession

- a. Holds office in professional organizations (international, national, state, local)
- b. Plans a conference
- c. Reviews conference proposals
- d. Speaks or presents in non-refereed situations
- e. Sponsors a student organization
- f. Administrates a grant (e.g., service or teaching grant)

3. Service to the community

- a. Involved with schools/colleges/universities (e.g., accreditation, workshops, consults/advises)
- b. State level committee membership (e.g., curriculum standards development, policy planning)
- c. Serves on boards, liaison, representative, external reviewer to schools/colleges/universities

PART III EVALUATION TOOLS

The following evaluation rubrics are designed to communicate achievement expectations to faculty and to guide peers' assessment of faculty performance in the department. They are designed as threshold tools, meaning that in tenure and promotion decision-making years, a faculty member will meet or exceed expectations as specified on the rubrics to attain tenure and/or promotion. Annual ratings and evaluation statements presented in the form of Faculty Advisory Reports represent peer review of a faculty member's progress toward tenure and/or promotion. See page 4 of this document for the statement specifying the higher level expectations for promotion than for tenure.

Faculty position descriptions must be taken into consideration when applying the rubrics. Note however, position descriptions in the department are designed for faculty to be able to meet the threshold criteria as specified on the rubrics. Typically, over six years, the average percentages for a tenure seeking faculty member's position description is close to 60% teaching/advising, 20% research and scholarly activity, and 20% service. The evaluation rubrics for all areas are based on these average percentages. In cases where faculty position descriptions deviate substantially from these average percentages, (especially related to scholarship) the department chair will advise the faculty member and faculty review committees, in writing, about performance expectations.

A. Evaluation of Teaching & Advising

1. Percentage of responsibility allocated to teaching typically ranges between 40-60% when teaching 12-18 credits, annually (not including summer). A typical advising load is specific to program area and should be fairly consistent within a program area.
2. Faculty are expected to comply with University policy and have students evaluate every course using the approved UND course assessment form, University Student Assessment of Teaching (USAT form), and for faculty evaluation purposes, to supply at least three forms of teaching data from a variety of sources. Candidates' three sources of teaching data are to be clearly stated in their evaluation document, particularly in the Summary Statement. Evaluation committees use the sources of teaching data to evaluate teaching using the rubric below.
 - a. Source one: USAT data (required by university), using the Department Summary Statement format
 - b. Source two: Teaching analysis (required by department)
 - c. Source three: Candidate choice

See page 16 for description of Teaching Sources regarding information about presenting Teaching Sources in the Evaluation Portfolio.

Recommended but optional: Summer school USAT data for faculty who teach in program areas where summer school instruction is expected or routine.

Recommended but optional: For those courses taught as overload (i.e., taught on a separate contract) it is recommended but optional to submit teaching evaluation data and teaching materials for evaluation.

3. Advising loads vary by program area and appropriate advising loads should be clarified with the department chair. Sources of evidence of effective advising also vary by program area. Evidence may include, but is not limited to the following:
 - Number of undergraduate, master's and doctoral advisees
 - Status of doctoral committees and role for each
 - How many students enrolled in 995, 996, 997, 999
 - Brief description of how you conduct advisement (Note: Consult the Advising Rubric for ideas regarding main points to address in this description)

4. Achievement criteria for Excellent, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory for teaching and advising are specified on the two rubrics below.

Teaching Evaluation	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Teaching effectiveness	<p>Teaching sources (i.e., USAT data, teaching analysis, and third source) reveal high levels of effectiveness in most or all of the following: student learning, teaching and assessment methods, use of technology, communication, knowledge and enthusiasm for subject matter, good organization of course and subject matter, positive attitude toward students, grading practices.</p> <p>Over time, a strong pattern of means near or above 4.0-5.0 (on 5.0 scale) on student evaluations of teaching; student comments support teaching excellence.</p>	<p>Teaching sources (i.e., USAT data, teaching analysis, and third source) reveal high levels of effectiveness in most or all of the following: student learning, teaching and assessment methods, use of technology, communication, knowledge and enthusiasm for subject matter, good organization of course and subject matter, positive attitude toward students, grading practices.</p> <p>Over time, a pattern of means 3.2-3.9 (on a 5.0 scale) or above on student evaluations of teaching. Student comments support satisfactory teaching.</p>	<p>Teaching sources (i.e., USAT data, teaching analysis, and third source) reveal a struggle with effectiveness in many or most of the following: student learning, teaching and assessment methods, use of technology, communication, knowledge and enthusiasm for subject matter, good organization of course and subject matter, positive attitude toward students, grading practices.</p> <p>Over time, a pattern of means below 3.2 (on a 5.0 scale) on student evaluations of teaching. Student comments suggest unsatisfactory teaching.</p>
Responsiveness to evaluation of teaching	<p>Data sources for evaluating teaching and other documents reveal responsiveness to evaluation of teaching and significant teaching successes are made evident.</p> <p>Professional development, and/or innovative teaching methods or format are evident and aimed at improving student performance or gaining appropriate knowledge.</p>	<p>Data sources for evaluating teaching and other documents reveal responsiveness to evaluation of teaching and indicate plans for changes with potential for course improvements; efforts to improve teaching effectiveness are evident.</p> <p>Professional development, and/or innovative teaching methods or format maybe attempted and have potential to improve student performance or gaining appropriate knowledge.</p>	<p>Minimal or no documentation in teaching materials to indicate a sufficient level of planning or efforts to improve teaching effectiveness or course. Attempts to improve teaching are not documented or are thin.</p> <p>Professional development, and/or innovative teaching methods or format are limited and/or tend not to aid student learning.</p>

Excellent Teaching: Excellent means that overall, one's teaching materials describe a preponderance of strengths; teaching effectiveness is highly evident and materials reveal high levels of responsiveness to evaluation of teaching.

Satisfactory Teaching: Satisfactory means that overall, one's teaching materials describe many strengths and indicate teaching is important to the faculty member.

Unsatisfactory Teaching: Unsatisfactory means that one's teaching materials reveal many or even mostly weaknesses and indicate that teaching is problematic for the faculty member.

Advising Evaluation	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Undergraduate	Performance advising undergraduates is excellent as evidenced by respectfulness, accuracy, availability, knowledgeable about the program, forward thinking (e.g., helps map out long term plans), resourceful in seeking answers, helpful in specialized or unique advising situations, helpful to colleagues in the advising process.	Performance advising undergraduates is successful as evidenced by respectfulness, accuracy, availability, knowledgeable about the program, forward thinking (e.g., helps map out long term plans), resourceful in seeking answers, helpful in specialized or unique advising situations.	Performance advising undergraduates is spotty: faculty member may be undependable, unavailable, pattern of advising mistakes, disrespectful to advisees, lack advising knowledge, somewhat unhelpful to student (e.g., fails to direct student toward helpful information), tends to ignore responsibilities in specialized or unique advising situations
Graduate	Performance advising graduate students is excellent as evidenced by all of the above and also includes many of the following criteria: fluent with programs in which one advises (including doctoral program), advises master's and doctoral students, serves on and chairs doctoral committees, demonstrates ability to collaborate with other faculty, is a mentor in the areas of scholarship and professional expectations, knowledgeable about research practices (e.g., methods, IRB; has high completion rate).	Performance advising graduate students is effective as evidenced by all of the above and including: resourceful about advising in appropriate programs (including doctoral program), advises masters students, occasionally serves on doctoral committees, generally collaborates well with other faculty on committees, guides students in the areas of scholarship and professional expectations, knowledgeable about research practices (e.g., methods, IRB).	Performance advising graduate students is questionable as evidenced by all of the above and including: not resourceful, tends to avoid advising in graduate programs, rarely asked or chooses to serve on or chair doctoral committees, may not collaborate well with other faculty on committees, unable to guide students in the areas of scholarship and professional expectations, weakly prepared to guide research (e.g., methods, IRB); has low completion rates for advisees.

Excellent Advising: Excellent means that overall, the candidate's advising materials describe a preponderance of strengths. Sources triangulate to show a pattern of excellence.

Satisfactory Advising: Satisfactory means that overall, the candidate's advising materials describe mostly strengths and indicate advising is important to this faculty member. Sources triangulate to show a pattern of satisfactory success.

Unsatisfactory Advising: Unsatisfactory means that over all, the candidate's advising materials describe a pattern of weaknesses and indicate advising is a problematic area for this faculty member. Sources triangulate to show a pattern of unsatisfactory teaching.

B. Evaluation of Research & Scholarly Activity

1. Percentage of responsibility allocated to research and scholarly activity is typically 20-30% for tenure seeking faculty.
2. The rubric describes a threshold accomplishment by year six, and steady progress toward the threshold is expected.
3. Refer to the list of major and minor publications for acceptable publications.
4. Three (3) minor publications may substitute for 1 major publication **OR** three (3) **presentations** from national and international conferences may be substituted for 1 major publication. Note: One of these substitutions is acceptable, not both. If these substitutions are made, it is important that the remaining major publications demonstrate high levels of scholarship.
5. Sources of evidence may include but are not limited to the following:
 - Publications, funded competitive grants
 - Submitted and/or draft manuscripts
 - Letters of acceptance, status of review from journal editors or publishers
 - Sample reviews from manuscript reviewers
 - Quality indicators such as acceptance rates, readership/membership
 - Works in progress
 - Letters of submission
 - Presentation handouts or websites
 - Letters of acceptance for presentations
 - Goals and progress statements
6. Achievement criteria for Excellent, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory are specified on the rubric below.

Research & Scholarly Activity	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Scholarly Agenda	<p>The candidate demonstrates an on-going sustained research program; research goals are clearly being met.</p> <p>Non tenured and promotion seeking faculty: Progress toward threshold expectations merits an excellent rating.</p>	<p>Evidence is provided that an on-going research program exists; achievement of goals may vary.</p> <p>Non tenured and promotion seeking faculty: Progress toward threshold expectations merits an adequate rating.</p>	<p>No or little evidence is provided that an on-going research program exists; program may consist of goals with minimal implementation or completion.</p> <p>Non tenured and promotion seeking faculty: Progress toward threshold expectations indicates insufficient progress.</p>
Publications & Presentations	<p>Publication accomplishments have allowed the candidate to meet departmental criteria that results in associate or full membership on the graduate school faculty.</p> <p>Publications and presentations indicate products are judged to be of value to the candidate's field. Quality indicators such as low acceptance rate, high levels of readership, importance to the field, and complexity of research or project are evident.</p> <p>Three refereed or juried presentations are made at the national and international level.</p> <p>At minimum, six total publications are achieved: 4 major publications and at least 2 minor publications. Or, equivalent publication achievements clearly meet or exceed expectations for a record of excellence.</p>	<p>Publication accomplishments have allowed the candidate to meet departmental criteria that results in associate or full membership on the graduate school faculty.</p> <p>Publications and presentations indicate products are judged to be of value to the candidate's field. Quality indicators such as low acceptance rate, high levels of readership, importance to the field, and complexity of research or project are evident.</p> <p>Three refereed or juried presentations are made at the regional, national and/or international level.</p> <p>At minimum, six total publications are achieved: 3 major publications and 3 minor publications. Or, equivalent publication achievements meet expectations for adequate.</p>	<p>Publication accomplishments have not allowed the candidate to meet departmental criteria to attain associate or full membership on the graduate school faculty.</p> <p>Publications and presentations may have been accomplished, but quality indicators such as low acceptance rate, high levels of readership, importance to the field, and complexity of research or project are not evident; or the role of the candidate in the work was limited.</p> <p>Less than three refereed or juried presentations are made, or role was routinely minimal in the work.</p> <p>The candidate has not achieved the minimum of 3 major publications and three minor publications.</p>

Excellent Scholarship: Excellent means that overall one's scholarship materials describe a pattern of accomplishments and indicate that ongoing sustained research is important to the faculty member. The candidate's scholarly agenda, and publications and presentations meet or exceed expectations of quality and quantity; progress on scholarship is paced to support meeting professional goals.

Satisfactory Scholarship: Satisfactory means that overall one's scholarship materials describe accomplishments and indicate that scholarship is important to the faculty member. The candidate's scholarly agenda, and publications and presentations meet or exceed expectations of quality and quantity; progress on scholarship is paced satisfactorily to support meeting professional goals.

Unsatisfactory Scholarship: Unsatisfactory means that one's scholarship activities describe mostly efforts with few if any accomplishments and indicate that scholarship is problematic for the faculty member. The candidate's scholarly agenda, and publications and presentations are limited in quality and quantity; expected progress on scholarship appears tenuous and/or unsatisfactory for meeting professional goals (e.g., achieve tenure and/or promotion).

C. Evaluation of Service

1. Percentage of responsibility allocated to service is typically 10-20% for tenure seeking faculty.
2. Sources of evidence may include but are not limited to the following:
 - Letters of recognition, appreciation, and awards
 - Letters or emails related to funded grants
 - Letters of outreach to communities for partnerships
 - List of committee members from official source (e.g., UND website, professional organization website)
 - Products of committee work showing duties, duration of assignments, accomplishments, completed tasks (e.g., program coordinators and graduate directors may include curriculum change accomplishments, reports, subcommittee assignments, etc.)
 - Trainings attended related to service (e.g., leadership workshops)
 - Notes or emails describing accomplishments
3. Achievement criteria for Excellent, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory are specified on the rubric below.

Service Evaluation	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1. Service to Institution	Well-documented, well-described service that impacts the faculty, students or staff, and/or the mission and/or strategic plan of the department, college and/or university. Service is varied and/or deeply dedicated to selective tasks. Involvement in the department supports collegial achievement of goals.	Service is sufficiently documented and documentation reveals service has had some impact on the faculty, students or staff, and/or the mission and/or strategic plan of the department, college and/or university. Involvement in the department supports collegial achievement of goals.	Service documentation tends to be spotty or unclear. Impact on the faculty, students or staff, and/or the mission and/or strategic plan of the department, college and/or university is limited or not made evident. Involvement in the department may not support collegial achievement of goals or representation of department may be unprofessional or lack diligence.
2. Service to Profession	Well-documented, well-described service to one's professional societies and/or recognized practitioners in the field. Service is varied and/or deeply dedicated to selective tasks. Evaluation materials provide evidence of impact and high quality leadership and/or participation.	Variety or depth of service is to profession is sufficiently documented and evaluation materials provide evidence of impact and high quality participation.	Variety or depth of service to profession is insufficient or not well documented or unclear. Evaluation materials tend not to provide clear information about type, impact or quality of service provided.
3. Service to Community	Well-documented, well-described service to communities such as schools colleges, universities, state or other agencies. Service is varied and/or deeply dedicated to selective tasks. Evaluation materials provide evidence of positive impact and quality participation.	Variety or depth of service is to community is sufficiently documented and evaluation materials provide evidence of impact and high quality participation.	Variety or depth of service to profession is insufficient or not well documented or unclear. Evaluation materials tend not to provide clear information about type, impact or quality of service provided.
4. Other Service	Other service constitutes equal or greater value and quality than those above noted as excellent.	Other service is satisfactorily carried out, documented, and explained.	Other service is unsatisfactory in carry-through or documentation or explanation.

Excellent Service: For an overall excellent rating, service must be well-documented, clearly explained (as needed), and materials indicate service roles fulfilled are significant through leadership, effort, and/or impact. High quality participation is evident. Usually excellent service includes instances of high quality service in more than one area of service. Excellent service MUST include high quality service to the department.

Service: For an overall rating of satisfactory, evidence of the potential for significant leadership, effort, and/or impact should be evident; and/or candidate's service roles typically assist in accomplishing the expected goals/plans. At least one area of service indicates more than minimal leadership, effort, or impact.

Unsatisfactory Service: An overall rating of unsatisfactory indicates a lack of significant leadership, effort, and/or impact overall or no evidence of service in one or more areas or service roles may not support collegial accomplishment of goals.

Approved August 2019

PART IV

PREPARING THE FACULTY EVALUATION PORTFOLIO AND SUMMARY STATEMENT TEMPLATE

The faculty evaluation portfolio organizes and communicates your professional goals and accomplishments for the given period of time being reviewed. Your portfolio assists review committees and others to understand the quality and significance of your work. Some of the information you will provide in your portfolio is explained in the following sections. The information aims to be a guide, not a prescription. Note, however, some forms and documents are specified by the department, college or university as required. Still, it is up to the faculty member to present his or her work in an organized, documented, and carefully constructed manner that represents your work thoroughly, meaningfully, and succinctly.

The faculty evaluation portfolio will consist of a separate notebook containing Essential Documents. A separate set of information will consist of evidence of performance related to teaching/advising, scholarship, and service. In years four and six, and third year post tenure, the portfolio is cumulative.

A. Essential Documents Notebook

Note that some materials included in the Essential Documents Notebook are cumulative.

1. **Curriculum vita that adheres to the VPAA format and clearly indicates refereed, nonrefereed, and invited publications and presentations. The vita is always cumulative for all evaluations.** The curriculum vita adheres to the VPAA format. See the PART VIII (p. 33) of this Handbook, the Faculty Handbook, <http://www.und.nodak.edu/dept/registrar/senate/FacultyHandbook/>, and State Board of Higher Education Website, <http://www.ndus.nodak.edu/sbhe/default.asp>, for more complete information, as needed.
2. Summary Statements of Professional Activity for Faculty Evaluation. The Summary Statement is a departmental requirement and is completed annually by all faculty. It is cumulative in years 4, 6 and third year post tenure. Refer to the Summary Statement (see p. 19-22). The candidate uses the form to clearly summarize professional information and activities for the review committees.

The summative statement clearly and succinctly organizes background information, teaching/advising, research/scholarly activity, and service. The purpose of the summative statement is to organize your professional data for the committees, preventing the need for committee members to count or sort out numbers of course taught, numbers of advises or make guesses about which publications are in print or in press, refereed or non-refereed, etc. The faculty member creates this Summary Statement to make very clear the work that has been completed or is on-going during the review period. Faculty may include charts, grids, bulleted lists or other means to summarize this information. (Note: While the vita also presents this information, there it is presented in a more general and integrated format.)

3. Fully signed position description forms, *cumulative* for years toward tenure and promotion and for third year post tenure. These forms represent the annual agreements between faculty members and department chairs, which are now mandated by the ND Board of Higher Education.
4. Academic Record and/or October Supplement Forms, cumulative for years toward tenure and promotion and for third year post tenure.
5. Letters/evaluation reports from evaluation committees, department chair, college dean, and other administration from the previous evaluations, cumulative.
6. USAT Summary forms for all courses taught during the period under review, cumulative.
7. Analysis of Teaching Statements, cumulative for years 4 and 6.

B. Supporting Documents

The Supporting Documents section of the portfolio includes Teaching/Advising, Research/Scholarly Activity, and Service. Portfolio includes documentation in the three areas of evaluation. In the case of tenure or promotion decision, the portfolio must minimally include the requirements identified by the VPAA/Provost. The following lists state basic expectations. Faculty can personalize their portfolios, as desired.

Teaching & Advising

1. Vita

2. Teaching Sources of data for evaluation of teaching: NDUS requires that faculty make available three forms of data for evaluation of teaching. NDUS requires evaluation include student provided data and that student feedback be used for evaluation purposes. The NDUS policy states that other forms of teaching data can vary by department. In the Department of Teaching and Learning teaching data source two is a teaching analysis, and source three is faculty choice. See below for more information on each source. These data forms must be stated clearly on the Summary Statement of Professional Activity for Faculty Evaluation.

a. Source One, USAT data: The Department of Teaching & Learning uses the USAT summary forms and student comments as a uniform tool to obtain student input on faculty evaluation of teaching. The USAT Summary Statements and the Student Comment Forms must be available upon request. The Summary Statement provides the format for presenting the USAT data.

b. Source Two, Teaching analysis—required by the department: a statement that provides analysis of one's teaching in at least one course during the review period. The purpose is to demonstrate teaching effectiveness and responsiveness to teaching evaluation; additionally, the purpose is to avoid reducing evaluation of teaching to numerical scores such as USAT means. The following offers ideas about preparing a teaching analysis statement—note, however, these are ideas, not prescriptions.

1. Demonstrate responsiveness to student feedback with documentation, organization and explanation of formative student feedback and subsequent course improvements (see OPTIONAL table idea on p. 20).
2. Bring together the other teaching sources of data to demonstrate student learning (e.g., demonstrate student achievement by analyzing performance information on a critical task, assignment, or exam.)
3. Provide documentation and explanation about course revisions that improve student learning through use of technology, innovative learning experiences, and/or student performance.

c. Source Three, Choice form(s) of teaching data: Suggestions follow. Please include brief explanatory information to show how the data shows responsiveness to evaluation and/or supports teaching effectiveness.

1. Instructor-Provided Materials/Portfolios - may include reflective statements on teaching, syllabi, descriptions of class activities, writing assignments, tests, videotapes, evidence of scholarly activity related to teaching, lists of classes taught, independent projects or theses supervised, graduate committees served on, reports on course or curriculum development work, written responses to student feedback, etc.
2. Documented Evidence of Student Learning or Performance – student work samples, performances, test results, etc.
3. Documented Data from Peers - based on formal observation of classroom teaching, review of teaching materials/portfolios, or observations of other teaching-related work (in graduate committees, curriculum planning sessions, etc.)

4. Documented Data from the Chair - based on formal observation of classroom teaching, review of teaching materials/portfolios, or observations of other teaching-related work (in graduate committees, curriculum planning sessions, etc.)

Advising is evaluated with teaching, but has a separate rubric. Please provide documentation to reveal your advising processes, accessibility to students, knowledge of the programs in which you advise, and other relevant information. You may include lists of advises (no EMPL IDs). Refer to the Summary Statement for advising summary format.

Research and Scholarly Activity

1. Vita
2. Publications, Grants and Presentations (and equivalents)
3. Letters of acceptance for in-press articles and grants and accepted presentation proposals
4. Letters of submission for submitted articles and grants and submitted presentation proposals
5. Manuscripts and other works in progress
6. Explanatory evidence regarding quality of scholarship
7. Evidence of on-going scholarly agenda
8. Membership status on the Graduate School Faculty
9. Goals information

Service

1. Vita
2. Clear, explanatory, well organized documentation demonstrating active involvement in service activities (e.g., letters, documents, reports, etc.)

Summary Statement of Professional Activity for Faculty Evaluation

Candidate:

Current Rank:

Academic Year/Evaluation

Purpose of Evaluation (check all that apply):

Tenure ___ Promotion ___ Annual Review ___ Post Tenure ___

Number of Years in Department of Teaching & Learning _____

Years brought in toward tenure (if applicable) _____

Candidate's Position Description for current academic year:

Teaching: ___% Research ___% Service ___% Other ___%

List any special assignments.

I. TEACHING AND ADVISING SUMMARY

A. Teaching Sources

1. Source One: Analysis of USAT ratings

a. Complete the following table (adapt as needed) and describe your USAT ratings using the statements below.

Summary of Courses Taught for Period Under Review

Semester	Course Number & Title (list each course separately)	Delivery Format	No. of Students	Range of Means for USAT Items 5-22	Average Mean for USAT Items 5-19	Average Mean for USAT Items 21-22

b. Summarize the table with the following statements:

The average mean for questions 5-19 for all courses during the (list the semesters here) semesters ranged from ___ to ___.

The average mean for the two critical questions; instructor was effective in promoting my learning and course was worthwhile to my university experience ranged from ___ to ___ for the semesters including (list the semesters here).

c. Finally, in the analysis of the USAT forms, state whether or not your average means are within the Department's expectation (see the rubric in the guidelines for the area of teaching).

2. Source Two: Teaching Analysis

Use this source to show your responsiveness to evaluation and if appropriate, teaching effectiveness.

OPTIONAL Table Template for Formative Evaluation Data (adapt as needed)

State the question that was addressed in the formative assessment in each table as a title of the table when the formative assessment was completed for the class over several semesters or if for one semester, state the question addressed in the "semester" column.

Semester(s):

Course Number and Title:

Semester and/or Question Addressed	Students' Comments	Response to Student Feedback

3. Source Three: Summarize your third source of teaching data.

Use this source to show your strengths, specializations and unique qualities and achievements as a teacher.

B. Advising Summary

The following table template summarizes the number of undergraduate, master's and doctoral advisees and doctoral committees. Adapt as appropriate.

Semester	No. Undergraduate Advisees	No. Masters Advisees	No. Masters Advisees Graduated	No. Doctoral Advisees	No. Doctoral Advisees Graduated	No. Doctoral Committees

Accomplished and New Teaching Goals:

Accomplished and New Advising Goals:

II. RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY SUMMARY

Begin with a summary statement of how many major publications and grants, minor publications and grants, and presentations you have. Then complete a descriptive paragraph of accomplishments in each of the three areas. In the case of refereed publications and conference presentations, include explanation of quality indicators (e.g., blind and/or peer-reviewed, refereed, invited, acceptance rate, notoriety of journal/organization, your part in the research and writing; for grants, include the amount of funding, competitive information, etc.). It is not recommended that unfunded grant applications be listed.

Publications

(Number of) major publications and grants:

Provide a listing of the major publications with enough detail in each listing to provide evidence that it meets the criteria for a major publication, including indicators of quality

(Number of) minor publications and grants:

Provide a listing of the minor publications with enough detail in each listing to provide evidence that it meets the criteria for a minor publication.

(Number of) manuscripts/grants in review:

Provide a listing of manuscripts and any that are currently in review.

(Number of) manuscripts/grants in progress:

Provide a listing and description of manuscripts, if any, that are in progress. Note deadlines and sources for submission.

Presentations

Provide a listing of presentations

(Number of) International

(Number of) National

(Number of) State

(Number of) Local

In summary:

___ major publications

___ minor publications counting toward one (1) major publication **OR**

___ presentations counting toward one (1) major publication

Accomplished and New Research/Scholarly Activity Goals:

In addition to listing and briefly commenting on your goals, describe your research agenda and indicate in what way your work demonstrates an on-going research agenda. It is recommended that non-tenured faculty and those seeking promotion, briefly reflect on your progress toward the threshold expectations for tenure and/or promotion.

III. SERVICE SUMMARY

The following is a table for a 4th year review summary of service. The same table could be used for a single year review. Use boldface type for any committees to which you were elected.

Academic Year	Department	College	University	Professional	Community

In summary: __ department, __ college, __ university, __ professional, __ community.

Summary of committees: (This section should be a brief summary of the purpose of each committee/activity listed in the table, as well as a statement about how the service activity “impacts faculty, students, or staff, and/or the mission and/or strategic plan of the department, college, and/or university.”)

Department:

College:

University:

Professional:

Community:

Service Goals:

PART V

OVERVIEW OF DEPARTMENTAL PROCESSES, COMMITTEE AND ADMINISTRATION SEQUENCES OF EVALUATION REPORTS

A. Departmental Evaluation Committee Sequence

1. Annually, the department Chair conducts a separate evaluation of all benefited, non-tenure track faculty as well as all tenure track and tenured faculty.
2. For tenure track faculty, in years 1, 2, 3, and 5, and third year post tenure, the chair evaluation report is preceded with an evaluation by a peer committee. The peer committee report is advisory to the Chair. The annual peer evaluation report includes a rating of the faculty member's achievement, commentary in relationship to department evaluation tools, and a recommendation about the faculty member's employment status.
3. The Chair's report parallels the peer advisory report. It rates faculty achievement, provides commentary based on the faculty member's portfolio relative to the advisory report and department evaluation tools, and makes a recommendation about the faculty member's employment status. The Chair's report process is consistent with college guidelines and with the responsibilities as outlined in the North Dakota University System Faculty Handbook. The Chair's report is advisory to the Dean of the college.
4. The evaluation report generation follows an established sequence.
 - a) Tenure track and year third post tenure evaluation reports from the chair are forwarded to the EHD dean; the dean writes a report which is forwarded to the Vice President of Academic Affairs.
 - b) In tenure and promotion seeking years, there are additional university level committees and/or administrators that become involved in the decision process. *Please confer with the department chair to obtain details about these additional layers of committees.*
 - c) In tenure and promotion seeking years there is additional paperwork that the department Chair or evaluatee should initiate. The paperwork can be accessed on the web pages of the Vice President of Academic Affairs. *Evaluees should consult with the department Chair if there are any questions.*
5. Except for faculty who must go up for tenure and/or promotion (e.g., sixth year tenure-track faculty), all other faculty members who intend to seek tenure and/or promotion, must notify the department chair *in writing* by May 15 of the year preceding the request for tenure or promotion.

B. Evaluation Support

1. The second faculty meeting of the year, the Chair of the Department of Teaching & Learning provides a review of expectations for writing the "Evaluation Report from the Departmental Faculty Advisory Committee" (see page 24-26).
2. Each spring semester, the Chair of the Department of Teaching & Learning provides a session in which the promotion and tenure expectations and guidelines are explained. These sessions are intended particularly for tenure-track and/or promotion-seeking faculty in the department, but should be available to any member of the department.

PART VI GUIDELINES FOR DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEES

A. Selection of Annual Review Committees

1. Pre-tenure, tenure-track committee selection. Three faculty members constitute the annual review committee. The department chair recommends the committee membership, and annually, the faculty member being evaluated approves the committee. For tenure-track faculty reviews during years 1, 2, 3 and 5, the members of the committee must be full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty and, at least one review committee member must be a tenured senior faculty member. Whenever possible, one or more members of the faculty review committee should be retained from year to year to support and mentor the tenure-seeking faculty member over time and also provide important background information to other review committee members.

2. Post-tenure committee selection. In the case of tenured faculty, the chair of the department will conduct post-tenure annual reviews with the exception of every third year. All members of review committees for third year post tenure reviews are comprised of tenured faculty. The evaluatee recommends a three person committee to the department chair. The three-year post tenure review committee members must be tenured senior faculty members. In unusual situations (e.g., no faculty member in the department is available), the evaluatee can request a member from another department.

B. Guidelines for How Advisory Committees Operate

1. The Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee must be elected no later than May 15 for the following year.
2. Typically, faculty members will serve annually on no more than two faculty review committees.
3. Tenure-track and post-tenure committees follow the same operational guidelines.
 - a. Three faculty constitute membership (see above).
 - b. After receiving evaluation report deadlines directly from the Department chair, the committee decides the timeline and how the files will be managed.
 - c. The draft report is discussed among the committee members and revisions are made.
 - d. The final draft is shared with the evaluatee who reads the report for accuracy.
 - e. The committee meets with the faculty member being evaluated and goes over the written evaluation as well as the ratings for teaching, scholarship, and service. The committee also advises the reviewed faculty member regarding goals to reach before the next annual review.
 - f. Each member of the committee signs the evaluation report.
 - g. The reviewed faculty signs the evaluation report, even if the faculty disagrees with the report and ratings at the time it is shared by the committee. A signature merely denotes that the report has been read. Should the faculty disagree with the report, that faculty member may write a response to the review that is then included with the T&P file. The committee may review that response.
 - h. The evaluation report (and any response) is advanced to the chairperson of the department.

C. Development of Advisory and Chair Reports

1. Advisory committees and the department Chair are expected to use departmental evaluation guidelines and rubrics when composing evaluation reports. Committees are expected to express the evaluatee's achievements in terms of the departmental rubrics. Reports address the evaluatee's performance relative to the categories specified on the rubrics (e.g., Teaching Effectiveness and Responsiveness to Evaluation of Teaching).
2. Advisory committees are expected to use the modified College of Education & Human Development template for the Faculty Advisory Committee which is modified to include departmental rubric categories for evaluation (see pages 24-26).
3. The Department Chair is expected to reference the information in the Advisory Committee Report when composing the chair's report for the evaluatee.

College of Education & Human Development
EVALUATION REPORT FROM DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

I. Identifying Information

Candidate:

Current Rank:

Department:

Academic Year/Evaluation:

Purpose of Evaluation (check all that apply):

Tenure ____ Promotion ____ Annual Review ____ Post Tenure ____

Candidate's Position Description for current academic year:

Teaching ____% Research ____% Service ____% Other 100%

List any special assignments.

<i>Names of Members of Evaluation Committee</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Tenure Status</i>
--	--------------------	-----------------------------

Chair		
-------	--	--

Committee member		
------------------	--	--

Committee member		
------------------	--	--

Because different departments use different procedures to conduct their evaluation, give a brief description of the process used to conduct this evaluation (or if easier, attach a copy of pertinent documents, e.g., minutes of meetings, policy statements).

List special assignments used in conducting the review when appropriate (e.g., primary author of report, section authors, interviewers, classroom observers)

II. Summary of Evaluation of Teaching, Research, and Service

Summaries in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, research, and service should address quality, as well as quantity.

A. Summary of review of teaching and student advisement, including sources of information used for the evaluation:

_____ Excellent _____ Satisfactory _____ Unsatisfactory

Teaching Effectiveness

Responsiveness to evaluation of teaching:

Undergraduate advising (if applicable):

Graduate advising (if applicable):

B. Summary of review of Research/Scholarly Activity:

_____ Excellent _____ Satisfactory _____ Unsatisfactory

Scholarly agenda:

Publications and presentations:

C. Summary of review of University/Professional service:

_____ Excellent _____ Satisfactory _____ Unsatisfactory

Service to institution, profession, community, and other:

D. Summary of review of administrative or other areas if applicable, (e.g. program coordinator):

_____ Excellent _____ Satisfactory _____ Unsatisfactory

Administrative reviews are not applicable in the Department of Teaching & Learning for faculty review. Program coordination and graduate directing are evaluated as service. Faculty position descriptions should include these types of duties under service.

III. Committee Recommendation

Any statements of dissent or responses to the recommendation of the committee (List and attach the statements):

Committee Chair's Signature _____ Date _____

Committee Member's Signatures

Faculty Member's Signature _____ Date _____

The faculty member's signature does not necessarily imply agreement with the contents of this report, only that it is recorded with the full knowledge of the faculty member being evaluated. A written response may be provided to any statements contained in this report.

Approved August 2010

5.1 ACADEMIC RANKS OF UND FACULTY

To the extent each characteristic is called for by the promotion candidate's contracts and tenure plans, the ranks in faculty of the University of North Dakota, and the characteristics of each rank are:

PROFESSOR

Recognition for teaching excellence
Recognition for scholarly and/or creative accomplishment
Recognition for leadership within his or her profession
Recognition for demonstrated spirit of concern for society

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Marked teaching effectiveness
Scholarly and/or creative accomplishment
Substantial contribution to his or her profession
Demonstrated spirit of concern for society

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Effective as a teacher
Scholarly and/or creative endeavor
Active in his or her profession
Spirit of concern for society

INSTRUCTOR

Promise as a teacher
Interest in his or her profession

Approved: UND Senate, 01-08-70; amended 02-05-98

5.2 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTIONS IN RANK

Promotions in rank are initiated by a written recommendation from the department chairs to the dean of their college or school. This recommendation must include a thorough evaluation of the qualifications of the candidate. This evaluation must take into account, and speak with reference to, the tenure plan or plans under which the candidate has served, specifying the candidate's duties and goals, identified by the candidate's contract(s) as required by Board of Higher Education Policy Manual §605.1 Subpart 3 b. (1) and (2). Recommendations are then submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost who, after seeking recommendations from the University Promotions Committee and a committee of deans, makes a recommendation to the President. In accordance with State Board Policy 305.1.3.d, the President will approve or disapprove the recommendation.

Promotions are regarded as recognition of superior intellectual attainment as evidenced both in teaching and in distinctive contributions to one's discipline or profession. A truly effective faculty member will also demonstrate a commitment to society. While individuals will possess these qualities in varying degrees, they will be considered for promotion on the basis of the following criteria as specified to be pertinent to the individual in her or his contract(s) and tenure plan(s) identified in such contract(s):

A. Teaching

Effective teaching is an indispensable criterion for promotion. Evidence of effective teaching need not be restricted to formal classroom or seminar activity, but may include such things as the direction of graduate studies and contributions to curriculum design and implementation. Since there are a number of ways in which a faculty member may be a demonstrably effective teacher, no firm guidelines for judging this qualification are suggested. Rather, it shall be the responsibility of the department chairperson to submit meaningful statements, accompanied by whatever evidence or documentation he or she deems appropriate, concerning the candidate's effectiveness in various types and levels of instruction.

B. Contributions to One's Discipline or Profession

A second indispensable criterion for promotion is evidence of noteworthy contributions to one's discipline or profession in the form of research and creative work and/or outstanding professional competence and activity.

- 1. Research and creative work:** Evidence of scholarship and creative work is found in the candidate's published research or recognized literary or artistic productions. Research publication and other creative accomplishments are to be evaluated, not merely enumerated, and there should be evidence that the candidate is continuously and effectively engaged in creative work of high quality and significance.
- 2. Professional competence and activity:** Contributions to one's field are often in the form of demonstrated distinction in the special competencies characteristic of the profession or discipline. Recommendations based on this criterion should be accompanied by evidence of leadership in the field and progressiveness in the development and implementation of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems.

C. Contributions to Society

Other areas of activity are recognized as crucial to the effective functioning of the University. A faculty member may contribute special knowledge to the benefit of society as a whole, and may serve the University in administrative roles, committee memberships, and the like. It is expected that all faculty members will devote a certain amount of time and effort to these functions.

More detail is available from the Academic Affairs Office.

Approved: UND Senate, 01-08-70; revised 02-05-98

Appendix

4.3 UND POLICY ON EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The evaluation of teaching as two distinct purposes: formative and summative. Formative evaluation is that which gathers information for the use of the instructor in improving his or her own teaching. Summative evaluation gathers information to be used by colleagues and administrators for the purpose of making decisions about retention, tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases.

Although the policy set forth here applies only to summative evaluation of teaching, the information collected in the course of the evaluation process may also be used for formative evaluation when appropriate. It is important to note, however, that information gathered solely for purposes of formative evaluation is intended only for the use of the faculty member, and should be used in summative reviews only with his/her permission.

1. Frequency and Extent of Evaluation

The teaching performance of all instructors, regardless of their academic rank or tenure status, is subject to evaluation annually.

* All faculty, regardless of status (probationary, tenured, and non-tenure track), must be evaluated as part of the annual review process, as well as for decisions regarding tenure and promotion. In each case, the faculty member being evaluated is expected to provide evidence of effective teaching in the form of at least three sources of data, one of which must be students. (See below for a list of potential sources of data.)

* Graduate teaching assistants must be evaluated annually as well, in a manner appropriate to their teaching assignment.

2. Aspects of Teaching to be Evaluated

The evaluation process should reflect the full range of teaching activities, including classroom teaching, mentoring, course and curriculum development, laboratory, clinical, or studio supervision, direction of independent research projects, scholarly/grant activity related to teaching, learning assessment activity, advising, etc.

Although it is important to acknowledge the unique nature of each individual's teaching situation, and to set flexible standards accordingly, it is expected that all instructors will be able to show evidence of these five basic hallmarks of good teaching:

- respect for students
- command of the subject matter
- careful preparation
- effective communication
- continuing professional growth.

3. Roles of the Various Parties

Role of the College. It is the role of the college to ensure that evaluation of teaching is conducted in a fair and reasonable manner, and with as much consistency as possible across the college. In

addition to the expectations outlined here, each college may specify other aspects of teaching to be evaluated and other sources of data on teaching to be supplied by the department and/or faculty member.

Role of the Department. It is the role of the department to set reasonable expectations in regard to teaching, to communicate those expectations clearly, and to assist and support faculty in their professional development as teachers. Toward this end, each department shall develop a written statement of expectation for effective teaching within the department. At minimum, this statement should address the basic expectations outlined in (2) above. In addition to university and college expectations, each department may specify other aspects of teaching to be evaluated, additional expectations to be met, and additional documentation materials to be supplied by the faculty member. The department's statement on teaching evaluation policy should be kept on file in the department, distributed to each department member, and attached to all recommendations regarding retention, tenure, promotion, and reward going beyond the department. The department should also be prepared to assist faculty in meeting departmental expectations, and/or to refer them to appropriate campus resources to support their teaching.

Role of the Faculty Member. It is the role of the faculty member, in collaboration with the department chair, to take an active part in his or her evaluation by providing materials that give a complete picture of his/her teaching, by organizing those materials in an accessible manner, and by making herself/himself available for discussion of those materials with peers and administrators. In addition to materials required by the department, college, and university, the individual faculty member may submit any additional materials deemed appropriate to the evaluation process.

4. Potential Sources of Data

As noted earlier, each faculty member being evaluated is expected to provide evidence of effective teaching in the form of at least three sources of data in consultation with the chair, one of which must be students.

Student-Provided Data - may be gathered using the USAT or other student feedback forms, and/or by carefully documenting student feedback gathered by the department chair or immediate teaching supervisor. All student data will be offered voluntarily.

The other two sources of data to be used in the evaluation of teaching may vary from one department to the next. They include:

Instructor-Provided Materials/Portfolios - may include reflective statements on teaching, syllabi, descriptions of class activities, writing assignments, tests, videotapes, evidence of scholarly activity related to teaching, lists of classes taught, independent projects or theses supervised, graduate committees served on, reports on course or curriculum development work, written responses to student feedback, etc.

Documented Evidence of Student Learning or Performance – student work samples, performances, test results, etc.

Documented Data from Peers - based on formal observation of classroom teaching, review of teaching materials/portfolios, or observations of other teaching-related work (in graduate committees, curriculum planning sessions, etc.)

Documented Data from the Chair - based on formal observation of classroom teaching, review of teaching materials/portfolios, or observations of other teaching-related work (in graduate committees, curriculum planning sessions, etc.)

5. Use of Student Feedback

NDUS policy states that "evaluations of all teaching faculty must include significant student input" (Section: 605.1.6 - Academic Freedom and Tenure; Academic Appointments). In order to present a broad and accurate view of teaching, summative data should be gathered regularly, from a wide range of classes over several semesters. It is the responsibility of the department and/or college, to create appropriate mechanisms for gathering student input.

Informal Feedback. In addition to soliciting formal feedback for summative purposes, faculty are encouraged to solicit frequent informal feedback for purely formative purposes--that is, for the sole purpose of improving teaching and learning. Informal feedback may take the form of SGIDs, informal surveys, or other classroom assessment techniques and may be used by the individual teacher as he or she sees fit. Unless and until the instructor chooses to offer such data to evaluators, it should not be part of the evaluation process.

Mixed Data. When formal numerical data is mixed with informal written data, as is often the case with student feedback forms, only the numerical data will be reported to the chair and dean. However, because it is important that teaching not be reduced to a numerical rating, it is recommended that faculty share student written comments with evaluators as well. At the same time, because written student comments represent only the perspective of those who choose to make them, it is also recommended that department and college evaluators recognize the limitations of such data and seek to corroborate it using other sources. Because written data provided by students on anonymous end-of-semester questionnaires is protected by FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act), all reasonable care must be taken to see that such data is not traceable to individual students.

Aggregate Data. Aggregate data from the USAT forms will be compiled by the Office of Institutional Research and distributed to individual faculty members, department chairs, and deans. Any other aggregate data used for comparison purposes in the evaluation of individual faculty members should also be made available to those faculty members.

UND Senate, 05-01-03

**PART VIII
VPAA VITA FORMAT**

<http://www.und.edu/dept/vpaa/rtf/Final/Materials%20Needed%20in%20Packet.doc>

**UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA
PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE MATERIALS TO BE FORWARDED TO VPAA**

- A. Curriculum Vitae to include:
1. Educational Background
 2. Professional Experience
 3. Courses Taught:
 - Regular Assignments and Continuing Education
 - Advisees (Undergraduate/Graduate)
 - Theses/Dissertation/Graduate Projects Directed
 - Graduate Committee Service
 - Curriculum Development Activities
 4. Institutional Service
 - University
 - College
 - Department
 5. Publications/Performances/Exhibits (Please indicate full citations, and the order of multiple authorships)
 - Juried/Non-juried
 - Refereed/Non-refereed
 - Invited
 - Other
 6. Professional Presentations
 - National/International
 - Regional
 - State/Local
 7. Grants and Contracts
 - Submitted
 - Funded
 8. Professional Associations
 - Offices Held
 9. Professional Education/Consultant Activities
 10. Honors/Awards
- B. Letter of assessment and evaluation from department citing scholarship, teaching, and service (the UND Faculty Evaluation form can serve this purpose.)
- C. Letter of assessment, evaluation and recommendation from department chairperson
- D. Letter of assessment, evaluation and recommendation from dean
- E. Letters of outside peer evaluators (if used)
- F. Copies of all prior annual evaluations since hire (for tenure candidates)
- G. Copies of all prior annual evaluations since last promotion at UND (for promotion candidates)

The following materials are to be available upon request only and are not to be forwarded to the VPAA office:

1. Copies/examples of course syllabi/course materials
2. Student Assessments
3. Peer review evaluations of teaching
4. Peer review evaluations of creative activities
5. Letters of professional recognition for awards/honors
6. Publications
7. Verifications of creative performances/exhibits

PART IX
VPAA URL and Downloadable Forms Required for Promotion and Tenure (ret. 2010)

<http://www.und.edu/dept/vpaa/acadaffr/AAForms.html>

8. Faculty Promotion and Tenure

Faculty Promotion Form

 [Download the Word Faculty Promotion to your computer](#)

Tenure Candidate Recommendation Form

 [Download the Word Tenure Candidate Recommendation to your computer](#)

Approved August 2010