

*WELCOME TO THE FACULTY
FORUM ON THE FACULTY
EVALUATION SYSTEM*

Thank you for coming!
November 2002

Objectives of the Faculty Evaluation and Development Task Force

- review current faculty evaluation system
- make appropriate revisions to current evaluation system
- design faculty development program

Faculty Evaluation and Development Task Force

Dr. Bob Cason – Chair

Dr. Steve Lohmann – ex-officio member

Dr. James Bowen

Dr. Mike Knedler

Dr. Dorothy Day

Dr. Marcia Fear

Dr. Cindy Pfeifer-Hill

Dr. Jim Yates

Mr. Tim Maharry

Mrs. Tammy Brown

Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System

CEDA Workshop

St. Louis, MO

October 14-15, 2002

Current Faculty Evaluation System

- summative
- used primarily for personnel decisions
- based on limited sources
 - student evaluation
 - academic dean evaluation

Key Elements for the Revised Faculty Evaluation System

1) promotes faculty development
in addition to providing information
for personnel decisions

2) collects information from a number of different sources while adhering to the “best source principle”

“best source principle: get information from those who have *first hand experience* with the performance in question”

Raoul A. Arreola, Ph.D.

3) involves faculty in the development of the evaluation system including input on what areas are evaluated

4) allows for consistency and flexibility

“Controlled Subjectivity”

The process of evaluation is subjective by definition. *Consistency of conclusions*, however, may be achieved through “controlled subjectivity.”

This is achieved with “the consistent application of a consensus-based set of values in the interpretation of measurement data.”

Raoul A. Arreola, Ph.D.

You still can individualize the evaluation to reflect differing responsibilities and assignments.

Recommended Development Procedure

Based on "Developing a
Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation
System" by Raoul A. Arreola, a CEDA
Workshop

Arreola, R. A. (2000) *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System, 2nd ed.* Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Step #1 – Determine the Faculty Role Model

Determine which activities that faculty engage in should be evaluated. These are the “roles” that make up the faculty role model.

Examples of Roles

- Teaching
- Advisement
- Professional Development
- Scholarly Activity and Research
- Administration and Management
- Institutional Involvement

Step #2 – Determine the Faculty Role Model Parameter Values

Determine the relative importance of each role to Northwestern faculty. Answer the question of how much weight should be placed on each role. The weights will be in ranges of percents.

Example of a Dynamic Faculty Role Model:

Minimum

weight

50%

0%

10%

5%

Teaching

Scholarly Activity

Faculty Service

Community Service

Maximum

weight

85%

35%

25%

15%

Step #3 – Define the roles

Define each role of the faculty role model utilizing performances or products that can be observed or documented. Each role will consist of components that can be observed or documented.

Examples of components of the “Teaching” Role

- content expertise
- instructional design skills
- instructional delivery skills
- course management

Step #4 – Determine Roles' Component Weights

Determine how much weight will be placed on each component of each role.

Example component weights for the "Teaching" role

instructional delivery skills	35%
instructional design skills	35%
content expertise	25%
course management	<u>5%</u>
	100%

Step #5 – Determine Appropriate Sources of Information

Determine who will provide the information for each component of each role. Remember to obtain information from those who have first hand experience with the performance that is being evaluated.

Possible sources:

- students
- department chair
- peers
- self
- others

Step #6 – Determine Source and Source Impact Weights

Determine how much value or weight will be given to each selected source for each component of each role.

Example of Source Impact Weights

Evaluation of Instructional Design Skills

<u>Source</u>	<u>Weight</u>
students	30%
department chair	35%
peers	35%

Step #7 – Determine How Information Will be Gathered

Determine the method to be used to gather information from each source. Examples include questionnaires, checklists, interviews, etc.

Possible techniques:

- Peers utilize a checklist to evaluate course materials presented in a portfolio.
- Students complete a questionnaire.
- Department chair completes a checklist during an interview.

Step #8 – Design or Select Appropriate Form(s)

Design, develop, or select questionnaires, checklists, and other procedures to be utilized for information gathering.

Once the system has been developed, policies and procedures must be developed to govern use and application of the system.

Possible Applications:

- Promotion
- Tenure
- Raises
- Merit pay

Arreola's 8-Step Process

1. Determine the Faculty Role Model
2. Determine the Faculty Role Model Parameter Values
3. Define Roles
4. Define Roles' Component Weights
5. Determine Appropriate Sources of Information
6. Determine Source & Source Impact Weights
7. Determine how information from each source should be gathered
8. Design or select appropriate form(s)

Final Goal:

The faculty evaluation system is linked to a faculty development system to promote self-improvement and faculty learning.

For maximum effectiveness faculty evaluation must be linked to faculty development programs



The next step:

- Academic deans address faculty input with department chairs
- During department meetings faculty will develop lists of activities on which to be evaluated for purposes of developing the faculty role model for Northwestern

Discussion Period