CEC SAMPLE EVALUATION METRICS

Units that do not have documented and approved annual evaluation criteria must develop their own. A sample template and approach are provided below, **but is not intended for direct use by any unit**. Faculty evaluations will be based on expected productivity measures in teaching, research and service outlined in this section. The overall evaluation will be a **weighted average of the three constituent components (or four components if there is an administrative assignment), consistent with the annual assignments, on the following university-mandated scale: UNSATISFACTORY=1, SATISFACTORY=2, GOOD=3, VERY GOOD=4, OUTSTANDING=5**. For instance, a faculty member rated VERY GOOD in teaching (23% assignment), OUTSTANDING in research (67% assignment) and GOOD in service (10% assignment) will receive an overall score of .23*4+.67*5+.10*3=4.57, which will score as OUTSTANDING overall. The overall score above 3.0 will be rounded to the nearest whole number, and scores below 3.0 will be rounded down. Notwithstanding the weighted average computation, no faculty member can receive an overall OUTSTANDING if they are UNSATISFACTORY in any area of performance, or if they have a research assignment and that component is not rated OUTSTANDING, and faculty with a formal disciplinary action issued during the period being evaluated, cannot be rated higher than SATISFACTORY.

a. Teaching Activities

Overview: For this evaluation, prepare a two- to four-page narrative that summarizes your teaching over the past academic year. If you require additional space to present data from your evaluation activities, you may submit up to six pages of appendices.

Instructions: Prepare a narrative that includes the following three sections. Attach the narrative in Panther180 "Additional Documents: Supplemental Materials" section and include short summaries (less than 500 characters) in the Teaching Innovation section as appropriate.

- Section I: Overview of courses taught. Provide a paragraph per course that highlights the major course outcomes, critical components of the course design (e.g., pedagogical techniques used, major course activities), any changes made to the course as compared with previous semesters, and how the course design is supported by one of the three pillars (i.e., inclusive, evidence-based, and learner-centered). *For the courses that you do not reference in Section II and III, include an additional paragraph that summarizes the overall outcomes of your evaluation of your course. Include relevant data as appropriate (e.g., course evaluations, course outcomes).*
- Section II: Present data sources, evaluation activities and results of those activities for one of your courses. Describe what data you collected from peers, your students, as well as yourself to evaluate the effectiveness of the course design in achieving course outcomes. In your explanation, connect the evaluation activities with the three pillars using supporting evidence and examples as appropriate. Please also describe the frequency with which each data source was collected (e.g., once or twice a semester).

Please be sure to also summarize the data that you collected from peers, students, and yourself.

- Section III: Reflect on the evaluation activity results for course from Section II. Make connections between the evidence collected from the data sources and the outcomes of the course, as well as intended changes for future courses (this one or others). Be sure to explain how the intended changes align with the teaching pillars as appropriate.

Definitions: Alignment with one or more of the pillars refers to the extent to which faculty address/highlight how the data they have collected from students, peers, and/or themselves informs their progress and/or leadership in instructional practices that are:

Learning-centered	Faculty showing growth toward or leadership in ***learning-centered teaching*** are working to improve student learning outcomes. This is frequently characterized by targeting particularly challenging or commonly misunderstood concepts/behaviors, adjusting teaching & learning strategies to target learning in that area, and measuring learning outcomes to gauge improvement over time or to compare to other groups.
Evidence-based	Faculty showing growth toward or leadership in ***evidence-based teaching*** are building a teaching practice that uses data/information to make decisions about instructional design and/or practices. This can include using practices supported by the education research literature but also includes faculty using data from their own classrooms.
Inclusive	Faculty showing growth toward or leadership in ***inclusive*** **teaching** are working to establish learning environments in which students' identities are recognized and respected and, in the best scenarios, used as a resource in the learning process. Inclusive teaching, which includes culturally responsive teaching, can be characterized by an asset view of students and their experiences; challenging cooperative learning tasks; clear expectations and criteria for performance; assignments that highlight personal, community, and/or career relevance; and/or opportunities for students to help each other learn.

Data Sources: This list is not inclusive of all possible data sources. Additional data sources will be added each year and should be shared among the faculty to support the use of creative and diverse methods of course evaluation. Please feel free to include anecdotal data/data in the form of emails or conversations from other stakeholders, such as students, faculty or staff on campus.

Data Type	**Examples**
Student Data	- Identity/Disposition Survey

	- Mid-semester Feedback - Pre- / Post-test Assessment - SPOTs* (this will always be available, but faculty may want to have other sources of information from about students) - Other activity to collect information from/about students.
Peer Data	- Syllabus exchange - Collaboration on Course Redesign - Classroom Visit/Observation by Peer or Center for Advancement of Teaching staff - Learning Community participation (focused on course) - Teaching mentor meetings - Scholarship of Teaching and Learning presentation with feedback - Other activity to collect information from peer(s).
Self Data	- Post-class (or module) self-check - SPOTs Self Completion - Journaling/Blog - Other activity faculty may use to critically explore own teaching.

Evaluation Rubric Overview: Teaching will be evaluated based on four criteria, equally weighted as shown in the rubric that follows: (1) Alignment between course design and the teaching pillars, (2) Evaluation Design, (3) Evaluation Outcomes, and (4) Reflective Practice. Overall averages above 2.0 will be rounded to nearest integer to determine final rating. If the overall average is below a 2.0, the overall rating will be "Unsatisfactory (1)". Please note additional data gathered from peers and students as well as trends from previous years' evaluations may be used in this evaluation by the Chair or Director as appropriate.

		Outstanding (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Alignment (From Section 1)	**Course Designs and Teaching Pillars Alignment**	Alignment between course design and teaching pillars is strong across all courses taught. For all courses taught, faculty provide a powerful argument for the alignment that includes supporting evidence/examples.	Alignment between course design and teaching pillars is strong across all courses taught. For at least one of the courses, faculty provide a strong case for the alignment that includes supporting evidence/examples.	Alignment between course design and teaching pillars is evident across some or all courses taught. Faculty provide a case for the alignment with supporting evidence/examples, to some extent.	Alignment between course design and teaching pillars is minimal or somewhat evident, with connections more clearly communicated for some courses than others.	No alignment between course design and teaching pillars across all courses.
Evaluation Design (Average score of all three rows)	**Peer Data**	Faculty reported **at least 1** peer-focused evaluation activity that was collected multiple times throughout the semester **OR** activities that utilized **more than 2** different data sources, **AND/OR more than 3** distinct evaluation activities.	Faculty reported engaging in more than 2 evaluation activities to collect feedback from peers.	Faculty reported engaging in more than 1 evaluation activity to collect feedback from peers.	Faculty reported engaging in at least 1 evaluation activity to collect feedback from peers.	Faculty did not report engaging in peer-focused evaluation activities as previously defined by departmental guidelines.
	Student Data	Faculty reported **at least 1** student-focused evaluation activity that was collected multiple times throughout the semester **OR** activities that utilized **more than 2** different data sources, **AND/OR more than 3** distinct evaluation activities (beyond SPOTs).	Faculty reported engaging in more than 1 evaluation activities to collect student data in addition to SPOTs	Faculty reported engaging in at least 1 evaluation activity to collect student data in addition to SPOTs	SPOTs satisfy this requirement. All faculty should receive at least a 2 in every course taught.	Overall rating of instructor average on SPOTs instrument is less than 2 in any course.
	Self Data	Faculty reported **at least 1** self-focused evaluation activity that was collected multiple times throughout the semester **OR** activities that utilized **more than 2** different data sources, **AND/OR more than 3** distinct evaluation activities.	Faculty reported engaging in more than 2 evaluation activities to collect self data.	Faculty reported engaging in more than 1 evaluation activity to collect self data.	Faculty reported engaging in at least 1 evaluation activity to collect self data.	Faculty did not report engaging in evaluation activities to collect self data OR engaged in activities that were not previously approved by the department.
Evaluation Outcomes	**Results of Data Collection Across All Courses**	Across all courses taught, the outcomes and student evaluations were very positive, as emphasized through the data collected, including but not limited to SPOTs evaluations and student outcomes. *This score cannot be given if any courses have SPOTs scores below a 3.*	Across all courses taught, the outcomes and student evaluations were positive overall, as emphasized through the data collected, including but not limited to SPOTs evaluations and student outcomes. *This score cannot be given if any courses have SPOTs scores below a 3.*	Across all courses taught, the outcomes and student evaluations were mostly positive, as emphasized through the data collected, including but not limited to SPOTs evaluations and student outcomes. *This score cannot be given if any courses have SPOTs scores below a 3.*	One or more of the courses taught resulted in student outcomes that were concerning and/or student evaluations that were negative overall. This could include SPOT evaluations below a 3 and/or at or below 15% percentile among all CEC faculty.	One or more of the courses taught resulted in student outcomes that were very concerning and/or student evaluations that were negative overall. This could include SPOT evaluations below a 2 and/or at or below 10% percentile among all CEC faculty.
Reflective Practice	**Synthesis of Data Collected and Plans for Future Courses**	Faculty made explicit and systematic connections between the evidence they collected to specific outcomes in their course(s) and/or outline distinct changes they have made/intend to make to their course(s) based on that evidence. The alignment with more than one of the teaching pillars is directly evident.	Faculty made explicit connections between the evidence they collected to specific outcomes in their course(s) and/or outline distinct changes they have made/intend to make to their course(s) based on that evidence. The alignment with at least one of the teaching pillars is directly evident.	Faculty made explicit connections between the evidence they collected to general outcomes in their course(s) and/or describe broad changes they have made/intend to make to their course(s) based on that evidence. The alignment with at least one of the teaching pillars is somewhat evident.	Faculty made loose connections between the evidence they collected to general outcomes in their course(s) and/or describe some broad changes they have made/intend to make to their course(s) based on that evidence. The alignment with the teaching pillars is not clearly evident.	Faculty failed to make any connections between the evidence they collected from students, peers, and self to outcomes in their course and/or describe any changes they could potentially make to their course(s) based on that evidence.

b. Research Activities:

Table 3 provides the overall criteria for research effectiveness. Table 4 provides further definition of research activities and outcomes.

Table 3. Research Effectiveness Criteria

UNSATISFACTORY (1)	SATISFACTORY (2)	GOOD (3)	VERY GOOD (4)	OUTSTANDING (5)
Minimal or No Research Activity	**Presence of Research Activities**	**Substantive Presence of Research Activities and Outcomes**	***Significant*** **Presence of Research Activities and Outcomes**	***Exceptional*** **Presence of Research Activities and Outcomes**
A faculty member will receive an **UNSATISFACTORY** evaluation in Research and Creative Activities if s/he demonstrates **fewer than three** items in the list of Evidence of Research Activity (ERA).	In order to achieve a **SATISFACTORY** evaluation in Research, a faculty member must **demonstrate at least three participatory items** in the list of Evidence of Research Activity (ERA) e.g. the faculty member attended a technical conference and submitted one technical proposal to an external funding agency.	In order to achieve a **GOOD** evaluation in Research, a faculty member must demonstrate a solid contribution in **at least two of the items** in the list of Evidence of Research Outcome (ERO) e.g. the faculty member has authored one book chapter and one refereed publication in a top technical journal.	In order to achieve a **VERY GOOD** evaluation in Research, a faculty member must demonstrate a solid contribution in **at least four of the items** in the list of Evidence of Research Outcome (ERO).	In order to achieve an **OUTSTANDING** evaluation in Research, a faculty member must demonstrate **significant contribution in at least four ERO items**. Singular examples would be significantly above average monetary funding award and/or current performance as PI on such an award from federal agencies or industry. The significance is assessed by comparing the activities to accomplishments by his/her peer group.

Table 4. Research Activities and Outcomes.

Evidence of Research Activity (ERA)	Evidence of Research Outcomes (ERO)
1. Submission of articles on research topics in peer- reviewed journals and acceptance of at least one article 2. Active in research grants 3. Submission of at least one extramural grant proposal as PI or Co-PI within the past two years 4. Submission of books or book chapters and acceptance of at least one book or book chapter 5. Involvement in research and industry partnerships 6. Interdisciplinary research as PI or co-PI 7. Conferences papers and workshops 8. Invention, patent disclosure, software, copyright, and other related works	1. Publication of multiple articles on original research topics in high impact peer-reviewed journals 2. Award and/or current performance on an award as PI or Co-PI of research funding from external funding agencies 3. Research expenditure (compared to his/her peer group) 4. Leadership in research partnerships or multidisciplinary research team 5. Publication of authored or co-authored books or book chapters 6. Refereed, high-impact conference publications (compared to his/her peer group) 7. Conferences/workshops/tutorials as keynote or invited speaker 8. Competitive regional, national or international research awards 9. Receiving patents, producing innovative hardware and/or software inventions 10. Selection as a Distinguished Member or Fellow of a professional organization (e.g., Fellow of a Society, NAE, NAS, NAI member, etc.) or other major national/international awards during the evaluation period 11. Graduating Ph.D. students

c. Service Activities:

Table 5 provides the overall criteria for service effectiveness. Table 6 provides further definition of service activities and outcomes.

Table 5. Service Effectiveness Criteria

UNSATISFACTORY (1)	SATISFACTORY (2)	GOOD (3)	VERY GOOD (4)	OUTSTANDING (5)
No or Minimal Service Activity	**Participation of Services**	**Leadership Position & Presence of Service Activities and Outcomes**	**Leadership Position & Significant Presence of Service Activities and Outcomes**	**Leadership Position & Exceptional Presence of Service Activities and Outcomes**
A faculty member will receive an **UNSATISFACTORY** evaluation in Service if s/he demonstrates **fewer than two** items in the list of Evidence of Service Activity (ESA)	In order to achieve a **SATISFACTORY** evaluation in research, a faculty member must demonstrate **at least three** items in the list of Evidence of Service Activity (ESA)	In order to achieve an **GOOD** evaluation in Service, in addition to ***at least three items*** in **ESA**, a faculty member must demonstrate **at least one** of the items in the list of Evidence of Service Outcome (ESO)	In order to achieve a **VERY GOOD** evaluation in service, in addition to ***at least three items*** in **ESA**, a faculty member must demonstrate **at least two** of the items in the list of Evidence of Service Outcome (ESO)	In order to achieve an **OUTSTANDING** evaluation in service, a faculty member must demonstrate service outcomes well above the **VERY GOOD** level, e.g. **at least 3 items** in the list of Evidence of Service Activity (ESA) and **at least three items** in the list of Evidence of Service Outcome (ESO). The significance is assessed by comparing the activities to accomplishments by his/her peer group.

Table 6. Service Activities and Outcomes.

Evidence of Service Activity (ESA)	Evidence of Service Outcomes (ESO)
1. Actively contributing member of a professional organization 2. Actively contributing member of a department committee 3. Actively contributing reviewer for professional conference 4. Actively contributing reviewer for professional journal 5. Actively contributing member of a college committee 6. Actively contributing member of a university committee 7. Mentor to a new faculty member 8. Advisor to student organization	1. Officer of a professional organization 2. External reviewer or panel member at state or national levels, such as NSF panel or publicities (TV interview, etc.) on his/her academic work 3. Chair or member of major college, or university committee 4. Chair of departmental committee 5. Organizer/Chair of a professional conference 6. Member of a professional conference committee 7. Editor, associate editor, guest editor for professional journal 8. Member of editorial board for professional journal