

**Procedures for Evaluating Probationary Faculty for
Tenure and Promotion and for Evaluating Tenured Assistant Professors
for Promotion to Associate Professor**

Department of Economics

I. Introduction

"Providence College is a Catholic, Dominican, liberal arts institution of higher education and a community committed to academic excellence in pursuit of the truth, growth in virtue, and service of God and neighbor ...Providence College is committed to academic excellence and holds itself to the highest standards of teaching, learning... and scholarship." (Providence College Mission Statement). To this end the Department of Economics supports academic research, fosters excellence in economic education, provides valuable services to the community, and actively seeks to cooperate with other departments and offices in the College in pursuit of our common goals.

This document sets forth the procedures to be used by the Department of Economics for evaluating faculty candidates for tenure and promotion. Candidates for tenure and promotion in the Department of Economics will be evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service to the College and community as outlined in the Faculty Handbook, Appendix E.

Note: The procedures noted in this document apply to those seeking tenure and promotion under the eleventh edition (2015) faculty handbook. Those hired prior to 2014 and who have chosen to be evaluated for tenure and promotion under the previous departmental guidelines and faculty handbook shall be held to the procedures, dates and criterion noted in those earlier documents.

II. Probationary period evaluation (untenured faculty only)

The Faculty Handbook section 2.4.2.d requires that the Chair meets "annually with each probationary faculty member to review the previous year's activities and the faculty member's plans for the subsequent year." This annual meeting will include a discussion of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service. This meeting will take place during the spring semester, near the end of the academic year.

A. During the probationary period, a candidate's teaching effectiveness in the classroom will be evaluated two times each semester. In the fall semester the candidate will be evaluated by the department Chair and one other tenured faculty member selected by the candidate. During the spring semester the candidate will be evaluated by the department Chair and one other tenured faculty member chosen

by the department Chair. Classroom visits by the evaluators will be unannounced. The evaluators will use the Department's standardized evaluation form (attached to this form as Appendix B) to appraise the candidate's teaching effectiveness. The evaluators will also submit a narrative addendum containing information they feel is indicative of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in the classroom. Peer evaluations will be conducted every semester for the duration of the candidate's probationary period.

B. Each year, the Chair will complete a written digest of the substance of the evaluators' assessments. The digest, evaluation forms, and narrative addenda will be kept on file in the department. A copy of the digest and all evaluations will be made available to the probationary faculty member.

C. At least once per year, the Chair will hold a conference with the candidate. The purpose of this conference will be to discuss the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service. With regard to teaching, the Chair and candidate will review the candidate's teaching evaluations and make suggestions to help improve the candidate's teaching effectiveness in the classroom. The candidate is encouraged to provide a written response to the peer evaluations. The response will become part of the tenure file for future consideration by the Department, the Dean, the Committee on Academic Rank and Tenure (CART) and the President. The candidate's peer evaluations are confidential and may only be used by the Chair when preparing the Chair's tenure evaluation recommendation and by the tenured members of the Department in conjunction with their vote relative to the candidate's petition for tenure.

III. Third year review (untenured faculty only)

In accordance with the Faculty Handbook, Section 2.4.2d, probationary faculty will undergo a formal third year review to assess the candidate's progress towards meeting the standards for tenure and promotion.

During the third year of their probationary period, the faculty member is expected to make a presentation to the tenured faculty of the Economics Department. If the faculty member was hired with years of credit towards tenure, this presentation should occur no later than the equivalent of the fourth year (including credited years). This presentation will focus on the candidate's scholarship and research accomplishments during the probationary period.

The department Chair, after meeting with the tenured members of the department, should evaluate the faculty member's progress towards tenure and promotion. The candidate will be informed of the assessment and the departmental rationale within one week of the meeting, and no later than March 30.

IV. Criteria for evaluating faculty for tenure and/or promotion

A. Teaching

1. Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness. The following criteria will be used in evaluating the candidate's application for tenure and promotion:

- a. Academic Competence: The candidate will show evidence of continuing competency in the field of Economics and the ability to effectively communicate economic principles to students.
- b. Preparation and Organization: The candidate will submit detailed course syllabi to the Chair at the beginning of each semester. The syllabi shall include the course objectives, grading and testing policies, an outline of the course material to be covered, homework/project listings, as well as any deadlines. Copies of these syllabi will be provided to the tenured faculty members chosen to evaluate the candidate's teaching effectiveness prior to their classroom visit.
- c. Enthusiasm and Clarity: The candidate will demonstrate his/her ability to present economic issues in a thought-provoking manner which generates student interest in the subject matter. The candidate will demonstrate the skill to explain complex concepts and present them in a clear and systematic manner.
- d. Availability: The candidate will demonstrate willingness to assist and spend time with students inside and outside of the classroom setting. The candidate will be available to students during posted office hours and by appointment.

2. Procedures Used to Evaluate Teaching Effectiveness. The procedures used to evaluate teaching effectiveness will be applied relative to the qualifications set forth in Faculty Handbook (see 3.5.3 section (a) Teaching): *"Evidence of continuing effective performance of teaching responsibilities in and out of the classroom. This achievement may be documented in one or more ways depending on the norms of a particular discipline, which may include but is not limited to, peer evaluation, student evaluations, and teaching portfolios. Evidence of effective advising and mentoring is also considered evidence of good teaching."* The Department of Economics will use the following procedures to evaluate a candidate's teaching effectiveness:

- a. Peer Evaluation: (same procedure as part II. A – C. noted above)
- b. Student Evaluation. A candidate's teaching effectiveness will be evaluated each semester using the Department's student evaluation questionnaire (attached to this form as Appendix A) for each course

section taught. A copy of these evaluations will be given to the candidate. The results of the student evaluations will be discussed between the Chair and the candidate and used as constructive feedback to help improve the candidate's teaching effectiveness. The results of the student evaluations as well as any additional comments by the Chair will be added to the candidate's tenure file. Student evaluations will be conducted for all courses taught for the duration of the probationary period.

c. Teaching Portfolio. Candidates for tenure will maintain a portfolio of materials which provide documentation supporting their teaching effectiveness throughout the duration of their probationary period. The portfolio will contain, but is not limited to, the following materials:

- Peer evaluations from each semester taught.
- Student evaluations from each course section taught.
- Professional Development activities which provide evidence of steps taken to improve teaching effectiveness including time spent developing new courses or new approaches to existing courses, active participation in teaching workshops and seminars, or scholarship relating to teaching methodology.
- Course materials for each course taught, i.e. syllabi, examinations, and any other items related to the candidate's teaching techniques.
- Teaching awards and honors received at Providence College.

The candidate might also wish to include various supplementary items in the portfolio, such as videotapes of classroom presentations.

B. Scholarship

The department expects ongoing and continued scholarly development.

1. Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship. The candidate for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor will provide "Evidence of continuing scholarly development and performance of scholarly responsibilities. Scholarship may be reflected in a range of professional and intellectual activities depending on the faculty member's discipline and as described in the applicable department tenure and promotion (procedures)." (Faculty Handbook, 3.5.3.b) The Department of Economics will consider the following criteria as evidence of scholarship:

- The candidate's scholarly work demonstrates a high level of expertise in the discipline.

- The candidate's scholarly work has been shared with the economic community through presentations and/or publications.
- The candidate's scholarly work has undergone positive objective peer review, i.e. refereed evaluation of publications and presentations.

2. Activities Considered in the Evaluation of Scholarship. Scholarly activities considered in the tenure and/or promotion decision will include, but are not limited to, the following list:

- Refereed, indexed journal articles. The journal may be a research journal, an expository journal, or one dedicated to pedagogical issues in economics.
- Scholarly books, economics textbooks (authored, co-authored), published research notes, published instructional manuals, study guides, test guides, or monographs.
- A funded National Science Foundation (or equivalent) grant.
- Paper and proceedings article, book chapter, non-refereed journal article, published book review.
- Editing scholarly journal issues or books.
- Directing student research that is published in a review, journal, or presented at a competitive conference.
- Papers presented at professional meetings.
- Chair of a panel or discussant at professional meetings.
- Consultant with private or public companies which involves expertise and advances knowledge in the field of economics.
- Referee for a professional journal.

The inclusion of letters from economists outside of the College reviewing the candidate's body of work is encouraged. Candidates may provide a list of 5 possible reviewers to the department Chair as well as naming up to two persons not to be asked as an external reviewer. The Chair will solicit at least 2 letters from the list of possible reviewers and one other external reviewer.

C. Service

The candidate for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor will provide evidence of continuing performance of service responsibilities to the department.

Examples of service to the department include (but are not limited to) participation in Department committees, moderator of the Economics Club, moderator of the St. Antoninus Honor Society, attendance at Department-sponsored events, and assistance in the recruitment and selection of faculty.

The candidate is also expected to provide evidence of continuing performance of service in one or more of the following areas:

1. Service to the College. Participation in College Committees, undeclared advising, moderator of student clubs, participation in recruiting activities, participation in Alumni events, and attendance at College-sponsored events.
2. Service to the Economics Profession. Serving as officer or committee member, or assuming a leadership role in regional or national professional organizations, editor of professional journals, organizer or moderator of professional advisory boards.
3. Service to the community. Activities that entail the application of the candidate's areas of expertise, significant scholarship, diagnostic skills, or development of creative methodologies, as well as contributions to the public welfare, or addressing real-world problems, issues or concerns. This might evolve in response to internal requests by the College Administration or from outside agencies. This may include, but is not limited to, the provision of public policy analysis for local, state or national agencies, testimony before legislative or congressional committees, expert witness to public bodies, assistance with neighborhood programs, and membership on local agency boards.

Procedures for Promotion to Full Professor

Department of Economics

I. Introduction

This document sets forth procedures for the promotion to Full Professor of eligible Economics faculty who have completed the prescribed number of years in appropriate ranks in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook, 3.4.4.

Candidates eligible to seek promotion will present their request with all materials relevant to their promotion to the Chair and, through the Provost, to the Committee on Academic Rank and Tenure. The Chair will in turn provide these materials to the appropriate members of the Department prior to September 15. The Chair will schedule a Department Meeting to take place no less than two weeks from the time the candidate submitted the required materials, but prior to October 15, in order to allow the members of the Department sufficient time to review the candidate's materials. Eligible members of the Department will assess the candidate in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service by secret ballot using a standard form provided by the Provost. The Chair will prepare his or her promotion evaluation according to the procedures outlined in Appendix E of the Faculty Handbook and forward the results to the Provost prior to October 15. In addition, the candidate may include any letters in support of promotion as well as a formal statement by the candidate indicating how the criteria for promotion (teaching, scholarship, service) have been achieved.

In accordance with the Faculty Handbook (3.4.1) promotion to Full Professor requires, *"Evidence of distinguished achievement in teaching, scholarship and service..."*

Note: The procedures noted in this document apply to those seeking promotion to full professor under the eleventh edition (2015) faculty handbook. Those hired prior to 2014 and who have chosen to be evaluated for promotion to full professor under the previous departmental guidelines and faculty handbook shall be held to the procedures, dates and criterion noted in those earlier documents.

II. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

A. Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness. The following criteria will be used in the candidate's application for promotion:

1. Academic Competence: The candidate will show evidence of competency in the field of Economics and the ability to effectively communicate economic principles to students.

2. Preparation and Organization: The candidate will submit detailed course syllabi to the Chair at the beginning of each semester. The syllabi shall include the course objectives, grading and testing policies, an outline of the course material to be covered, homework/project listings, as well as any deadlines.

3. Enthusiasm and Clarity: The candidate will demonstrate his/her ability to present economic issues in a thought-provoking manner which generates student interest in the subject matter. The candidate will demonstrate the skill to explain complex concepts and present them in a clear and systematic manner.

4. Availability: The candidate will be willing to assist and spend time with students inside and outside of the classroom setting. The candidate will be available to students during posted office hours and by appointment.

B. Procedures Used to Evaluate Teaching Effectiveness. The procedures used to evaluate teaching effectiveness will be conducted relative to the qualifications involving rank set forth in Faculty Handbook 3.5.3.a: *"Evidence of continuing effective performance of teaching responsibilities in and out of the classroom. This achievement may be documented in one or more ways depending on the norms of a particular discipline, which may include but is not limited to, peer evaluation, student evaluations, and teaching portfolios. Evidence of effective advising and mentoring is also considered evidence of good teaching."* The Department of Economics will use the following procedures to evaluate a candidate's teaching effectiveness.

1. Peer Evaluation. Candidates seeking promotion are required to be evaluated in the classroom by Department evaluators who possess the requisite qualifications as outlined in the Faculty Handbook. Classroom visits will be unannounced. The qualified evaluators will be provided with a copy of the candidate's course syllabus prior to the evaluation. The evaluators will visit the candidate's class and appraise the candidate's teaching effectiveness using the Department's standardized evaluation form (attached to this form as Appendix B). As part of the candidate's appraisal, the evaluator will submit a narrative addendum which the evaluator feels is indicative of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in the classroom. A copy of these evaluations will be given to the candidate seeking promotion. Within two weeks the Chair will hold a conference with the candidate to discuss the evaluations and make suggestions to improve the candidate's teaching effectiveness in the classroom. The candidate is encouraged to provide a written response to the peer evaluations which will then become part of the candidate's promotion file for future consideration by the Department and by CART. The results of the candidate's peer evaluations are confidential (but available to the candidate). Candidates for promotion are encouraged to

request at least two peer evaluations prior to the filing of a request for promotion. These peer evaluations should occur during the academic year prior to the candidate's application for promotion to Full Professor.

2. Student Evaluation. A candidate's teaching effectiveness will be evaluated using the Department's student evaluation questionnaire, attached to this form as Appendix A. All Department Faculty are encouraged to administer student evaluations each semester to help assess their teaching effectiveness over time. The results of the student evaluations will be discussed and given due consideration by the members of the Department who are eligible to consider the candidate's promotion to Full Professor.

3. Teaching Portfolio. Candidates for promotion are encouraged to maintain a portfolio of teaching materials which provide documentation supporting their teaching effectiveness. The portfolio will contain, but is not limited to, the following materials:

- Peer evaluations.
- Student evaluations.
- Professional development activities which provide evidence of steps taken to improve teaching effectiveness including time spent developing new courses or new approaches to existing courses, active participation in teaching workshops and seminars, or scholarship relating to teaching methodology.
- course materials for each course taught, i.e. syllabi, examinations, and other items related to the candidate's teaching techniques.
- teaching awards and honors received at Providence College.

The candidate might also wish to include various supplementary items in the portfolio such as videotapes of his/her classroom presentations.

III. Evaluation of Scholarship

The department expects ongoing and continued scholarly development.

A. Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship. Candidates for promotion in the Department of Economics will provide *"Evidence of continuing and distinguished scholarly development and performance of scholarly responsibilities. Scholarship may be reflected in a range of professional and intellectual activities depending on the faculty member's discipline as described in the applicable department tenure and promotion (procedures),"* (Faculty Handbook, 3.5.3.b). The following will constitute evidence for scholarship in the candidate's assessment for promotion:

- The candidate's scholarly work demonstrates a high level of economics- related expertise in the discipline.
- The candidate's scholarly work has been shared with the economic community through presentations and/or publications.
- The candidate's scholarly work has undergone positive, objective peer review, i.e. refereed evaluation of publications and presentations.

B. Activities Considered in the Evaluation of Scholarship. Scholarly activities considered in the promotion decision will include, but are not limited to, the following list:

1. Refereed, indexed journal articles. The journal may be a research journal, an expository journal, or one dedicated to pedagogical issues in economics.
2. Scholarly books, economics textbooks (authored, co-authored), published re- search notes, published instructional manuals, study guides, test guides, or monographs.
3. A funded National Science Foundation (or equivalent) grant.
4. Paper and proceedings article, book chapter, non-refereed journal article, published book review.
5. Editing scholarly journal issues or books.
6. Directing student research that is published in a review, journal, or presented at a competitive conference.
7. Papers presented at professional meetings.
8. Chair of a panel or discussant at professional meetings.
9. Consultant with private or public companies which involves expertise and advances knowledge in the field of economics.
10. Referee for a professional journal.

The inclusion of letters from economists outside of the College reviewing the candidate's body of work is encouraged. Candidates may provide a list of 5 possible reviewers to the department Chair as well as naming up to two persons not to be asked as an external reviewer. The Chair will solicit 2 letters from the list of possible reviewers and one other external reviewer.

IV. Evaluation of Service

The candidate for promotion to Full Professor will provide evidence of continuing performance of service responsibilities to the department. Examples of service to the

department include (but are not limited to) serving as Department Chair, participation in Department committees, moderator of the Economics Club, moderator of the St. Antoninus Honor Society, attendance at Department-sponsored events, and assistance in the recruitment and selection of faculty.

The candidate is also expected to provide evidence of continuing performance of service in one or more of the following areas:

- A. Service to the College. Participation in College Committees, undeclared advising, moderator of student clubs, participation in recruiting activities, participation in Alumni events, and attendance at College-sponsored events.
- B. Service to the Economics Profession. Serving as officer or committee member, or assuming a leadership role in regional or national professional organizations, editor; of professional journals; organizer or moderator of professional advisory boards.
- C. Service to the community. Activities that entail the application of the candidate's areas of expertise, significant scholarship, diagnostic skills, or development of creative methodologies, as well as contributions to the public welfare, or addressing real-world problems, issues or concerns. This might evolve in response to internal requests by the College Administration or from outside agencies. This may include, but is not limited to, the provision of public policy analysis for local, state or national agencies, testimony before legislative or congressional committees, expert witness to public bodies, assistance with neighborhood programs, and membership on local agency boards.

V. Conclusion

This document summarizes and outlines the techniques by which the Department of Economics will evaluate a candidate's achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service with regards to promotion to Full Professor. Once the candidates for promotion to Full Professor have submitted their portfolios to the Department for evaluation and the members of the Department have voted on the acceptability of the candidates, the candidate will be informed whether or not the majority outcome of the vote is in favor of promotion to Full Professor.

Appendix A

SIR-II Student Evaluation Questionnaire



SIR II STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT II (SIR II)

SIR II Report Number

--	--	--	--	--	--

This questionnaire gives you the chance to comment anonymously about this course and the way it was taught. Using the rating scale below, mark the one response for each statement that is closest to your view. Fill in the appropriate circle to the right of the statement.

- (5) Very Effective
- (4) Effective
- (3) Moderately Effective
- (2) Somewhat Ineffective
- (1) Ineffective
- (0) Not applicable, not used in the course, or you don't know. In short, the statement does not apply to the course or instructor.

As you respond to each statement, think about each practice as it contributed to your learning in this course.

A. Course Organization and Planning

- | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. The instructor's explanation of course requirements | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 2. The instructor's preparation for each class period | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 3. The instructor's command of the subject matter | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 4. The instructor's use of class time | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 5. The instructor's way of summarizing or emphasizing important points in class | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |

Very Effective
 Effective
 Moderately Effective
 Somewhat Ineffective
 Ineffective
 Not Applicable

B. Communication

- | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 6. The instructor's ability to make clear and understandable presentations | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 7. The instructor's command of spoken English (or the language used in the course) | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 8. The instructor's use of examples or illustrations to clarify course material | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 9. The instructor's use of challenging questions or problems | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 10. The instructor's enthusiasm for the course material | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |

C. Faculty/Student Interaction

- | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 11. The instructor's helpfulness and responsiveness to students | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 12. The instructor's respect for students | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 13. The instructor's concern for student progress | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 14. The availability of extra help for this class (taking into account the size of the class) | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 15. The instructor's willingness to listen to student questions and opinions | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |

D. Assignments, Exams, and Grading

- | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 16. The information given to students about how they would be graded | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 17. The clarity of exam questions | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 18. The exams' coverage of important aspects of the course | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 19. The instructor's comments on assignments and exams | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 20. The overall quality of the textbook(s) | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 21. The helpfulness of assignments in understanding course material | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |

E. Supplementary Instructional Methods

Many different teaching practices can be used during a course. In this section (E), rate only those practices that the instructor included as part of this course.

Rate the effectiveness of each practice used as it contributed to your learning.

- | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 22. Problems or questions presented by the instructor for small group discussions | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 23. Term paper(s) or project(s) | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 24. Laboratory exercises for understanding important course concepts | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 25. Assigned projects in which students worked together | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 26. Case studies, simulations, or role playing | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 27. Course journals or logs required of students | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| 28. Instructor's use of computers as aids in instruction | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |

Very Effective
 Effective
 Moderately Effective
 Somewhat Ineffective
 Ineffective
 Not Used

Questionnaire continued on the other side. ➡

For the next two sections (F and G), use the rating scale below. Mark the one response for each statement that is closest to your view. Fill in the appropriate circle to the right of each statement.

- (5) **Much More** than most courses
- (4) **More Than** most courses
- (3) **About the Same** as others
- (2) **Less** than most courses
- (1) **Much Less** than most courses
- (0) **Not applicable**, not used in the course, or you don't know. In short, the statement does not apply to the course or instructor.

Much More Than most courses
 More Than most courses
 About the Same as others
 Less than most courses
 Much Less than most courses
 Not Applicable

F. Course Outcomes

29. My learning increased in this course (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
30. I made progress toward achieving course objectives (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
31. My interest in the subject area has increased (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
32. This course helped me to think independently about the subject matter (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
33. This course actively involved me in what I was learning (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)

G. Student Effort and Involvement

34. I studied and put effort into the course (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
35. I was prepared for each class [writing and reading assignments] (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
36. I was challenged by this course (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)

H. Course Difficulty, Work Load, and Pace

37. For my preparation and ability, the level of difficulty of this course was:
 (5) Very difficult (4) Somewhat difficult (3) About right (2) Somewhat elementary (1) Very elementary
38. The work load for this course in relation to other courses of equal credit was:
 (5) Much heavier (4) Heavier (3) About the same (2) Lighter (1) Much lighter
39. For me, the pace at which the instructor covered the material during the term was:
 (5) Very fast (4) Somewhat fast (3) Just about right (2) Somewhat slow (1) Very slow

I. Overall Evaluation

40. Rate the quality of instruction in this course as it contributed to your learning (try to set aside your feelings about the course content):
 (5) Very effective (4) Effective (3) Moderately effective (2) Somewhat ineffective (1) Ineffective

J. Student Information

41. Which one of the following best describes this course for you?
 (1) A major/minor requirement (2) A college requirement (3) An elective (4) Other
42. What is your class level?
 (1) Freshman/1st year (2) Sophomore/2nd year (3) Junior/3rd year (4) Senior/4th year (5) Graduate (6) Other
43. Do you communicate better in English or in another language?
 (1) Better in English (2) Better in another language (3) Equally well in English and another language
44. Sex (1) Female (2) Male
45. What grade do you expect to receive in this course?
 (1) A (2) A- (3) B+ (4) B (5) B- (6) C (7) Below C

K. Supplementary Questions If the instructor provided supplementary questions and response options, mark your answers in this section. Mark only one response for each question.

46. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA) 48. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA) 50. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA) 52. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA) 54. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA)
47. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA) 49. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA) 51. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA) 53. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA) 55. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA)

L. Student Comments If you would like to make additional comments about the course or instruction, use a separate sheet of paper. You might elaborate on the particular aspects you liked most as well as those you liked least. Also, how can the course or the way it was taught be improved? An additional form may be provided for your comments. Please give these comments to the instructor.



If you have any comments about this questionnaire, please send them to Student Instructional Report II, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ 08541-0001.



Additional Question • #46 • SIR II

**Please mark your response in the
bubble on the survey form**

On average, how many hours per week do you spend doing work for this course outside of class meeting times?

- ① 2 hours or less
- ② more than 2 hours but less than 4 hours
- ③ more than 4 hours but less than 6 hours
- ④ more than 6 hours but less than 8 hours
- ⑤ 8 hours or more

THANK YOU FOR YOUR THOUGHTFUL PARTICIPATION!

Appendix B

Class Meeting Appraisal Form

(A) TITLES (To be completed by the Chair before distribution to evaluator)

Instructor (PFM) _____ Location of Class _____

Course Title & Series _____ Academic Year _____

Date of Visit _____ Term _____

Time of Visit _____ Evaluator _____

(B) INSTRUCTIONS

In your capacity as evaluator please respond to the following question to the best of your ability. You may elaborate on your response to any question by using the reverse side of this sheet. You are required to indicate your reason for any "X" response which you make. Please note that this completed form must be returned in the attached sealed envelope to the department office within twenty-four hours of your class-meeting visit.

(C) DIRECTIONS

Rate the teaching performance of the PFM (Probationary Faculty Member) on each question by using the following response key.

Superior	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Don't Know X
5	4	3	2	1	

_____ 1. Were the objectives of the class meeting made clear?

_____ 2. How well was the class presentation organized?

_____ 3. Were the important ideas as set forth in the class objectives clearly explained?

_____ 4. How would you judge the PFM's mastery of the course content?

_____ 5. Was class time well used?

_____ 6. Did the PFM encourage critical thinking and analysis?

_____ 7. Did the PFM encourage relevant student involvement in the class?

_____ 8. How did the PFM react to student viewpoints different from his own?

_____ 9. How would you describe the attitude of the students in the class toward the PFM?

_____ 10. Overall evaluation of PFM

(D) SUMMARY

Do you believe that your visitation was at a time when you were able to fairly judge the nature of the teaching-learning process?

YES _____

NO _____

Comments:

Signature of Evaluator

Date of Evaluation