

**Department of Education**  
**Formative Evaluation Plan for Teaching**  
**Fall 2002**

A. The Instructor<sup>1</sup> will prepare a “self evaluation” similar in form to the personal statement required during the summative evaluation process. The Instructor will assemble a portfolio that would contain examples of pedagogical means such as class syllabi, examinations, class handouts, and samples of the instructor’s comments on student work.

Both tenured faculty members in the Department of Education (or, if the number of faculty in the department increases, at least two tenured faculty members in the department) will serve as Mentors. The Instructor will select one additional tenured faculty member from the college to serve as a third Mentor. Mentors will be responsible for attending the classes of the Instructor and discussing the Instructor’s development as teacher with him or her. At the beginning of each academic year, the Instructor and Mentors will prepare a schedule for class observations. At minimum, each Mentor will observe two class periods of the same course per year. Each classroom visit will be framed by a pre-observation discussion and a post-observation discussion between the Instructor and the Mentor. The department offers the following outline as a guideline.

Pre-observation discussion

- the Instructor and Mentor should select points for evaluation;
- the Instructor should provide the Mentor with course syllabus and handouts or assignments for the class to be observed several days prior to the pre-observation meeting.

Post-observation discussion

- the Instructor should provide the Mentor with samples of evaluated student work related to the topic observed prior to the post-observation meeting;
- the Instructor and the Mentor will discuss suggestions and focus on issues raised in the pre-observation meeting during the post-observation meeting;
- the Instructor and the Mentor will discuss ways to improve student learning, general assessment of strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for improvement during the post-observation meeting.

Written Feedback

- the Mentor should provide the Instructor with written comments regarding agreed-upon issues within two weeks of the post-observation meeting.

B. One of the Department of Education Mentors will also be responsible for reading the Instructor’s portfolio, and will provide guidance regarding the Instructor’s development as a teacher of the discipline. This is meant to be an on-going process with discussions

---

<sup>1</sup> In this document “Instructor” will refer to an untenured, tenure-track faculty member in the Department of Education.

that occur at the initiation of the Instructor. At minimum, the two will discuss the Instructor's portfolio once each academic year.

C. The Instructor and the Department of Education Mentors will meet once a year, preferably near the middle of the spring term, to discuss the teaching qualities and characteristics of the Instructor.

D. In the year prior to a senior review, the Professor<sup>2</sup> will prepare a "self evaluation" similar in form to the personal statement required as part of the senior review process. The Professor will assemble a portfolio that would contain examples of pedagogical means such as class syllabi, examinations, class handouts, and samples of the Professor's comments on student work.

All other tenured faculty members in the Department of Education will serve as Mentors. Mentors will be responsible for attending the classes of the Professor and discussing the Professor's development as teacher with her or him. At the beginning of the academic year, the Professor and Mentors will prepare a schedule for class observations. At minimum, each Mentor will observe two class periods of the same course over the course of the year. Each classroom visit will be framed by a pre-observation discussion and a post-observation discussion as described above.

Mentors will also be responsible for reading the Professor's portfolio, and will provide guidance regarding the Professor's development as a teacher of the discipline. This is meant to be an on-going process with discussions that occur at the initiation of the Professor.

The Professor and the Department of Education Mentors will meet at least once in the year prior to the senior review to discuss the teaching qualities and characteristics of the Professor.

E. The Department of Education will assess its Formative Evaluation Plan for Teaching every six years.

---

<sup>2</sup> In this document "Professor" will refer to a tenured faculty member of the Department of Education.

## Appendix 1

an incomplete list of elements one might evaluate in the learning-teaching process

### 1. Course Goals

- (a) Does the professor have clear goals for the course? If so,
  - Are the goals communicated to students?
  - Are the goals appropriate for the course?
- (b) Does the professor have plans to achieve the course goals? If so,
  - Are they appropriate?
  - Are they executed properly?
  - Are they successful?

### 2. The Course

- (a) Is the pedagogy of the course effective?
- (b) Does the course help students realize connections across disciplines or help students integrate knowledge of a particular discipline into a larger perspective?
- (c) Does the course introduce students to the value of learning and the “play of ideas”?
- (d) Is the course challenging and rigorous?
- (e) Does the professor manage class time well?
- (f) Does the professor use appropriate assessment instruments?
- (g) Are tests and other assigned work evaluated and returned in a timely fashion?
- (h) Are the evaluation standards appropriate?
- (i) Does the feedback on tests and assignments enhance the learning process?

### 3. Interaction with Students

- (a) Is the professor knowledgeable?
- (b) Is the professor prepared for class?
- (c) Does the professor engage students intellectually?
- (d) Is the material presented in a clear and organized fashion?
- (e) Do assignments, tests, etc. promote learning?
- (f) Does the professor communicate enthusiasm about the subject?
- (g) Are student questions addressed properly and adequately?
- (h) Does the professor encourage open exchange of ideas?
- (i) Does the professor use instructional materials (chalkboards, overheads, computer-based demonstrations, etc.) effectively?
- (j) Does the professor treat students with respect and interest?
- (k) Is the professor available for discussion of course related material outside of class? If so, are students aware of the professor's availability?
- (l) Is the classroom environment one where ideas are challenged? Are students given the opportunity to support their positions?

#### 4. Student Outcomes

- (a) Have students made progress toward achieving course goals?

#### 5. Development

- (a) What particular strengths does the professor have?
- (b) What changes would you suggest for this course?
- (c) What particular weaknesses does the professor have?
  - Has there been an improvement in these areas since the professor's last review?
  - What steps are recommended to address these weaknesses?
- (d) Is the pedagogy consistent with the instructor's own goals as a professor?