To fulfill its mission to expand minds and change lives every day by offering high-quality educational experiences, St. Louis Community College relies on a dedicated and talented faculty. Congruent with this mission, the purpose of our faculty evaluation system is to facilitate and promote life-long learning among the faculty, leading to continuous improvement in teaching and service.

This document evolved from the year-long work of the Faculty Evaluation Task Force. Composed primarily of faculty members from each campus, along with several administrators, the charge of this group was to design a new faculty evaluation system for St. Louis Community College. The system in need of replacement had been in use at the College since 1981. Throughout the 2016-2017 academic year, the Task Force researched evaluation systems employed at other schools, explored best practices, gathered input from faculty, and gradually built consensus on what the new system should look like. Built into the system is the call for periodic review, so that the system can adapt as needed.

Introduction

The 2017 faculty evaluation system represents a significant shift in purpose and focus from the previous 1981 system, and it is important to emphasize the “cultural shift” that it represents. This shift is most dramatic for the continuing faculty member. While summative assessment remains a part of the process for probationary faculty, once a faculty member has obtained continuing status, the system is aimed squarely at professional growth and development.

For continuing faculty, the new faculty evaluation system is designed to be strictly formative. It places faculty members in charge of their own continuous improvement. While deans and other administrators have a supportive role to play, they are invited to be servant leaders who partner with faculty to assist in the growth process. In the new system, deans do not “score” faculty on performance indicators nor do they place evaluations into faculty personnel records. By focusing on growth, the faculty member is freed to focus on what is most valuable and useful – from their perspective: to their ongoing development. There is no need to try to “look good” for purposes of evaluation.

The heart of the new faculty evaluation system is the faculty member’s own self-reflection on teaching and service. Feeding into that self-reflection are student evaluations (at least one per semester) and classroom observations (two per evaluation cycle). In the spring of the evaluation year (the last year of the faculty member’s evaluation cycle), the faculty member discusses their two self-reflection narratives with their dean, along with their student evaluations and classroom observations. As described further below, the reflective narratives should look both backwards at what has been accomplished since the faculty member’s last evaluation, and forward at where the faculty member would like to
grow. The meeting with the dean is intended to be a growth-oriented conversation. The only formal output from the meeting is a notice by the dean that the evaluation cycle has been completed.

To understand the purpose of the new faculty evaluation system, it is important to keep in mind the distinction between it and the promotion system. Previously, the products of the old evaluation system were typically included in promotion applications. To protect its formative nature, the new faculty evaluation system has been separated completely from promotion. No forms or data used in the new evaluation system (e.g. student evaluation forms, data or reports; classroom observation forms, data or reports) are to be included in promotion binders. However, in their promotion essays, faculty members are encouraged to reflect on what they learned and how they developed through the faculty evaluation process.

Probationary Faculty

While the new evaluation system is designed to be purely formative, a more summative evaluation system is still necessary for probationary faculty. The same documents and processes used for continuing faculty will be used annually with probationary faculty, but with one important difference. Each year, the evaluation process will conclude with the supervising dean providing a detailed letter identifying the faculty member’s strengths in the areas of teaching and service, along with any identified weaknesses. This letter will not go into the faculty member’s HR personnel file at the conclusion of the first year. However, letters at the end of the second and third years will be placed into this file.

Continuing Faculty

As indicated above, for continuing faculty the Faculty Evaluation System is a purely formative assessment system; it is designed exclusively to assist the faculty member in continuous professional growth. The system rests on the assumption that faculty are dedicated professionals who are life-long learners eager to grow in their teaching and service responsibilities. With that understanding in mind, the current system was designed to provide useful feedback that the faculty member can use to help design and direct their own continuous improvement. In the sections below, the various components of the evaluation process are described in more detail.
Evaluation Cycles

The evaluation cycle for probationary faculty is one year. The evaluation cycle for continuing faculty who have not reached the rank of full professor is three years. The evaluation cycle for continuing faculty who have reached the rank of full professor is five years. All components of the evaluation process – a student evaluation for at least one course per semester, two classroom observations, two self-reflection narratives, and a culminating conversation with the dean – must be completed by each full-time faculty member during their evaluation cycle. The culminating conversation will occur in April of the final year in the evaluation cycle. Student evaluations conducted for courses held in the spring of that year will count towards the next evaluation cycle.

Continuous Improvement

In the spirit of continuous improvement, a task force will be convened periodically to review the faculty evaluation system, and make changes if necessary.

Student Evaluations

Each semester, continuing faculty members will select at least one course to be evaluated by students. The student evaluation has both quantitative and qualitative components (see form on pages 5 and 6 of this document). The 29-item quantitative survey is based on a well-validated measure that is the most widely used student course evaluation survey in the United States. It has undergone extensive psychometric evaluation and provides the faculty member with scores on eight dimensions of teaching effectiveness: learning, enthusiasm, organization, group interaction, rapport, breadth, assessment, and assignments. The qualitative component of the survey asks students to provide comments on instructor effectiveness, course content, course design, course materials, assignments, and grading, as well as providing opportunity for general comments.

It is anticipated that specific faculty members may object to specific questions on either the quantitative or qualitative portion of the survey. This is inevitable. No survey can adequately represent the diverse range of course contents and teaching styles. What is an appropriate teaching methodology in an art class may be different from sound pedagogy in a math class, for example. And even in the same content area, faculty may exhibit different but equally effective pedagogies. There is no single “best” way to teach. But it is important to remember that the survey is for your use and benefit. You will not be “graded” on how your students respond. If you don’t like a question or even a whole subscale,
simply ignore it. If you want feedback on something not asked for in the survey, you can supplement the survey by asking your students to provide that feedback.

Research suggests that student evaluation data can be effective in improving teaching, but only if the results are discussed. Your dean will have access to the results so that the two of you can talk about possible areas to address in future professional growth efforts. The role of the dean is to be a supportive partner, not an evaluator. At the end of your evaluation cycle meeting, the dean will return the results of the survey to you, and you will be the sole owner of all student evaluation data reports. Assuming students have not reported illegal or clearly unprofessional behavior, the dean may not keep student evaluation data or forward it to others. Similarly, the college keeps no faculty-tied record of student evaluation data. The student evaluations and comments are collected for your benefit.
Student Evaluation Form

Instructions: This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Your responses are very important as they will be used by the instructor for purposes of professional growth and development. Your responses will remain anonymous and the summaries will not be given to the instructor until after final grades have been assigned. If a question is not relevant to the course that you are evaluating, you may leave it blank. Please use the following scale to indicate your responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 = Disagree</th>
<th>3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>4 = Agree</th>
<th>5 = Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Subscale: Learning
1. You found the course intellectually challenging and stimulating 1 2 3 4 5
2. You have learned something which you consider valuable 1 2 3 4 5
3. Your interest in the subject has increased as a consequence of this course 1 2 3 4 5
4. You have learned and understood the subject material in this course 1 2 3 4 5

Subscale: Enthusiasm
5. Instructor was enthusiastic about teaching the course 1 2 3 4 5
6. Instructor was dynamic and energetic in conducting the course 1 2 3 4 5
7. Instructor enhanced presentations with the use of humor 1 2 3 4 5
8. Instructor’s style of presentation held your interest during class 1 2 3 4 5

Subscale: Organization
9. Instructor’s explanations were clear 1 2 3 4 5
10. Course materials were well prepared and carefully explained 1 2 3 4 5
11. Proposed objectives agreed with those actually taught so you knew where the course was going 1 2 3 4 5
12. Instructor gave presentations that facilitated taking notes 1 2 3 4 5

Subscale: Group Interaction
13. Students were encouraged to participate in class discussions 1 2 3 4 5
14. Students were invited to share their ideas and knowledge 1 2 3 4 5
15. Students were encouraged to ask questions and were given meaningful answers 1 2 3 4 5
16. Students were encouraged to express their own ideas and/or question the instructor 1 2 3 4 5

Subscale: Rapport
17. Instructor was friendly toward individual students 1 2 3 4 5
18. Instructor made students feel welcome in seeking help/advice in or outside class 1 2 3 4 5
19. Instructor had a genuine interest in individual students 1 2 3 4 5
20. Instructor was adequately accessible to students during office hours or after class 1 2 3 4 5

Subscale: Breadth
21. Instructor contrasted the implications of various theories 1 2 3 4 5
22. Instructor presented the background or origin of ideas/concepts developed in class 1 2 3 4 5
23. Instructor presented points of view other than his/her own when appropriate 1 2 3 4 5
24. Instructor adequately discussed current developments in the field 1 2 3 4 5

Subscale: Assessment
25. Feedback on examinations/graded materials was valuable 1 2 3 4 5
26. Methods of evaluating student work were fair and appropriate 1 2 3 4 5
27. Examinations/graded materials tested course content as emphasized by the instructor 1 2 3 4 5
Subscale: Assignments

28. Required reading/tests were valuable
29. Readings, homework, etc. contributed to appreciation and understanding of subject

Instructions: Please use the following spaces for your personal comments on the instructor’s effectiveness and the general course value to you. Again, your responses will remain anonymous and the summaries will not be given to the instructor until after final grades have been assigned.

Course Content: Please give your comments on the course content, including whether you found the subject matter relevant and important to you.

Instructor: In what specific ways was your instructor effective and helpful?

Instructor: How could the instructor have been more effective or helpful?

Course Design: Please offer any suggestions for improvement in the course syllabus, course objectives, or other aspects of course design:

Course Materials, Assignments and Grading: What suggestions (if any) do you have for improving the course materials, assignments, assessments, and/or grading practices?

Other Comments: Please provide any other comments you would like to offer about the course.
Classroom Observations

Instructions:

During each evaluation cycle, the faculty member will arrange two classroom observations. The faculty member’s dean will conduct one of those observations. The faculty member may ask a qualified person, such as a peer, dean, department chair or program coordinator, to conduct the other. This individual does not have to come from the faculty member’s home campus. The faculty member also has the option of asking his or her dean to conduct the second observation. The faculty member should meet with the second observer to discuss and reflect on the observed class. This of course is an option for the faculty member and his/her dean, as well. Towards the end of the evaluation cycle, the faculty member and dean will meet to discuss and reflect on both observed classes, as part of a larger, culminating conversation about the evaluation process.

Form for Dean/Other Observer, Including Classroom and Online Observation:

Faculty member:
Observed by:
Class or meeting observed:
Date:
Time:

Describe the learning environment, the setting and the day’s activities:

Describe the classroom interactions:

Describe the content and organization of class materials:

Describe any observed strengths or challenges during the observation period:

Optional -- Reflect on any specific areas the observer was asked to focus on by the instructor during the observation:
Self-Reflection Narratives

St. Louis Community College is committed to academic excellence, learning, and integrity. We are accountable to our mission and core values, and we support innovative approaches to realizing our vision. We strive to foster an environment which respects the dignity of all individuals though civil dialogue. St. Louis Community College cultivates an understanding and appreciation of intercultural diversity. If helpful, faculty may link their two self-reflection narratives to the mission, vision, values, or strategic plan for St. Louis Community College.

Narrative I. Professional Growth in Teaching

Instructions: Reflecting on your professional growth in teaching, in written narrative form, is part of the faculty evaluation process. In your narrative, describe how you have developed as a teacher in one or more areas since your last evaluation cycle, and how you plan to grow professionally during your next cycle. Given the formative nature of our evaluation system, the remarks and comments you make with regard to your teaching, even your challenges, are considered evidence of strength and dedication. Furthermore, any suggestions you may make regarding ways in which the College can better serve the needs of its students are considered constructive input, and not a complaint. Try to keep this narrative to one page, single-spaced. Towards the end of your evaluation cycle, you will discuss your self-reflection with your dean as part of a larger conversation about your entire evaluation process.

Since teaching is a complex endeavor, there are many areas of teaching that can provide rich opportunities for professional growth. You may find a list of suggested areas helpful. The following are suggestions only:

a. Expertise in your content area(s)
b. Course Design
c. Instructional Methodology
d. Faculty-Student Interaction
e. Learning Assessment
f. Course Administration
g. Peer Collaboration/Observation
h. Classroom Innovation
i. Technology in the classroom
**Narrative II. Professional Growth Through Service**

**Instructions:** Reflecting in written narrative form on how you have served as a faculty member is part of the faculty evaluation process. Service provides rich opportunities for professional growth, as well as opportunities to make a positive impact in your professional and/or personal environments. In your narrative, describe the impact you have had through your service, and how that service has helped you develop professionally, since your last evaluation cycle. Also describe the service opportunities you hope to pursue during your next cycle. Keep in mind that "service" may be understood broadly here: for instance, obtaining a new certification or license in your discipline could count as service towards your department or profession. *Try to keep this narrative to one page, single-spaced.* Towards the end of your evaluation cycle, you will discuss your self-reflection with your dean as part of a larger conversation about your entire evaluation process.

You may wish to discuss the following area(s) of service in your narrative. These are given as suggestions *only*:

a. your program
b. your department
c. your discipline
d. your academic division
e. your campus
f. St. Louis Community College
g. your profession
h. the community in which you live
**Conversation with the Dean**

The conversation with the dean is meant to be a supportive, culminating conversation between division dean and faculty member. The dean’s role is one of support, encouragement, and observation. The dean should prepare for the meeting by thoroughly reviewing the faculty member’s two self-reflection narratives, two classroom observations, and student evaluation data. The conversation reflects back on the faculty member’s full evaluation cycle. Upon the completion of the conversation, all materials are returned to the faculty member for his/her records. The division dean then completes a memo indicating the faculty member has completed the evaluation process as required. This memo is sent to the faculty member for his/her records and to HR for the individual’s personnel file.

**Due dates for Conversation with the Dean**

By the [date TBD], faculty in an evaluation year (the final year of their evaluation cycle) will submit their evaluation materials to the Division Dean.

The Division Dean will review all evaluation materials prior to meeting with individual faculty members.

The Division Dean will meet with all faculty in their evaluation year during the month of April.

All memos indicating whether or not faculty members have completed the evaluation process as required must be submitted to faculty and HR by [date TBD].