Faculty Evaluation System
For
Promotion, Tenure and Annual Review
Revised, 2008
COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY

FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM

for

PROMOTION, TENURE AND ANNUAL REVIEW

FALL, 1983
Revision Approved by Faculty in 2008
TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>FACULTY EVALUATION CRITERIA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Teaching</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Scholarship</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Service</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>EVALUATION GUIDELINES</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Teaching</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Scholarship</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Service</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>THE EVALUATION PROCESS</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Faculty Activity Report</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Promotion and Tenure</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Third-Year Review</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Annual Faculty Review</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Procedures for Student Evaluation of Teaching</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>APPENDIX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Faculty Activity Report and Evaluation Summary – Appendix A</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Teaching Evaluation Instrument – Appendix B</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

The general policy regarding faculty evaluation is composed of the policy of the University of Houston and that of the College of Technology. The University policy is presented in the Faculty Handbook under the University of Houston, Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. The College policy regarding promotion, tenure and merit review is established by this document.

The evaluation system defines the basis and process to be used for evaluation of faculty activity. Such evaluations may be used to make decisions regarding the promotion, tenure and merit increments awarded to a faculty member. The basis of evaluation is defined by the Faculty Evaluation Criteria given in Section I of this document and Evaluation Guidelines to these criteria given in Section II. The process of evaluation is specified by the Procedures and Timetable presented in Section III of this document.

In all cases, the stipulations of the policy are intended to supplement those of the University; they do not supersede or replace the University policy. The University policy regarding promotion, tenure, increments, and grievance is contained in the Faculty Handbook under “Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures.” In addition, Promotion and Tenure Guidelines are published by the University to define the process of promotion and tenure. Each faculty member should be familiar with this information.

Departmental guidelines and policies are subject to policies promulgated at the college and university levels. In the case of promotion and tenure, guidelines provided by the Office of the Provost form the basis of all promotion and tenure decisions. While a college or department may choose to implement more rigorous standards than those detailed in the university-level promotion and tenure guidelines, a college or department may not implement policies that result implicitly or explicitly in the application of less rigorous standards than detailed in the in the university-level promotion and tenure guidelines. It is the obligation of the chair of the department to make all new tenured or tenure-track faculty members aware in writing of not only the university university-level promotion beyond tenure guidelines but also any college or departmental level policies or procedures that may impact their tenure and/or promotion.

These guidelines for professional evaluation of tenured and tenure-track members of the University of Houston's College of Technology are prepared as a general document without reference to particular individuals or configurations of accomplishment. They do not prescribe a uniform roster of accomplishments that must be achieved by all candidates for tenure or promotion. Rather, they suggest ways of evaluating accomplishments in research, teaching, and service by allowing flexibility in assigning relative weights to these three activities.

The University of Houston and the College of Technology recognize the following ranking definitions, designations and progressions towards promotion and tenure. More information can be found in the UH Faculty Handbook.

TENURE TRACK: A period of probation not to exceed seven (7) years during which time the faculty member must work to develop professional qualification leading to the awarding of tenure. A tenure-track faculty member applies for tenure no later than the sixth (6th) year which means that the application actually reflects activity over a five (5) year period. If tenure is denied in the sixth-year application the then the seventh (7th) year will be the last year of employment. During the tenure-track period the faculty member is on a year-to-year contract for
THIRD-YEAR REVIEW: As an aid to faculty on the tenure track the College of Technology performs an internal review of the faculty member’s professional activity at this mid-point of the tenure track.

INSTRUCTOR: A seldom used entry level position into the tenure track. It is possible to be promoted to Assistant Professor without tenure from this position. The time in the rank may count toward the probationary period.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR: The normal entry level position for a new faculty member into the tenure track. If coming from another college or university, it is possible that years at that institution will be counted in the tenure-track timeline. It is very rare that promotion and tenure will be considered in less time that the sixth-year application. In informal situations, a faculty member with an Assistant Professor appointment may be referred to as “professor.”

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR: The normal promotion with tenure progression from the Assistant Professor position. Experienced faculty may be hired directly in this position, with or without tenure. Direct appointment with tenure occurs only in those cases of individuals with strong evidence of professional qualification from previous employment. Appointment without tenure stipulates a maximum four (4) year probationary period. Thus, application would be made in the third (3rd) year reflecting professional activity for the previous two (2) years, plus that in previous employment. In informal situations, a faculty member with an Associate Professor appointment may be referred to as “professor.”

PROFESSOR: The highest achievement level of faculty rank. Promotion to Professor has no time limit or probationary period. Direct appointment as a tenured full professor is very rare and reserved for only those individuals with outstanding professional qualifications who have achieved significant and continuous accomplishments with publications recognized by peers. For promotion to full professor, the candidate should have a significant record of high quality scholarship with promise of continued development and national impact.
SECTION I

FACULTY EVALUATION CRITERIA
The purpose of this document is to present a summary of the criteria which will be used to evaluate the performance of the College of Technology faculty. The three major categories of evaluation criteria involve teaching, scholarship and service, and while it is expected that the candidate will be active in all three areas, teaching and scholarship are the most heavily weighted. These areas are expanded in several subcategories.

1. TEACHING

The College of Technology faces the challenge of preparing students of diverse backgrounds for specific positions in business and industry. This effort requires the faculty member to demonstrate an on-going and active participation in teaching and student-related activities. The following subcategories define this criterion.

1.1 Effective Teaching and Curriculum Development

Effective teaching requires an understanding of the objectives of the course assigned, an ability to communicate the material associated with these objectives, and effective evaluation of student performance in the context of the course objectives. Effective teachers employ traditional and innovative teaching techniques in lectures and laboratories. They participate in curriculum development requiring that the faculty member is astute to changing requirements of technology, resulting in curriculum revisions, course documentation, and the development of classroom and laboratory instructional materials. Faculty are expected to participate in the creation of new programs and development of new courses.

1.2 Student Welfare

Faculty in the College of Technology are expected to be accessible to the students outside of class and to be effective on a one-to-one basis. Faculty should participate in activities such as student advising, alumni relations, recruiting and facilitation of student organizations.

1.3 Professional Growth and Development

Effective technology faculty must always be open to expanding their knowledge in new areas. This expansion may be accomplished through pursuing further education, conducting or attending special courses or workshops in specific areas of technology, consulting or securing appropriate summer employment (within University guidelines) with business, educational, government, and industrial organizations that benefit college operations.
2. SCHOLARSHIP

A university faculty member must be a scholar and a teacher. Scholarship refers to those activities, apart from teaching, in which the faculty member engages in order to further his or her mastery of an academic discipline. For tenure, the candidate should demonstrate identification as a scholar, and there is full expectation of the candidates continued development and future contributions. For promotion to full professor, the candidate should have a record of high quality scholarship with promise of continued development and national impact. Demonstrations of scholarly activities can take many diverse forms but are typically represented by the following subcategories.

2.1 Research, Publication and Funding

As a scholar in a selected discipline a faculty member is expected to engage in activity leading to the advancement of knowledge in that discipline. The nature of the activity can take many forms, but in any case will demonstrate investigations leading to new discovery, new applications or enhanced knowledge. In accordance with the special mission of the College of Technology to provide education in the applications of modern and emerging technologies, scholarly activities may often consist of research into new, improved and enhanced methods of teaching.

The measure of achievement in scholarly activity is provided by written dissemination and acceptance of the results of such activity by peers in the discipline. Publication of the findings that result from research and other scholarly activity is the normal means for dissemination. Publication in refereed journals provides an indication of the acceptance of the work by peers, although other publications will be considered.

A faculty member is expected to pursue funding to support his or her scholarly activity. Such support can provide summer salary, allow release time during the regular academic year, fund conference attendance and pay for student assistants, equipment and supplies.

2.2 Scholarly Interaction

To be recognized for scholarly activity means that the faculty member should provide evidence for recognition of his or her mastery of the discipline by peers. This kind of recognition can take on many forms but often can be indicated by presentation of papers at local, national or international conferences. In addition, membership and service as an officer or in other capacities in professional societies is a measure of interaction. Other measures of interaction may include collaboration with industry and / or other universities or colleges.
3. SERVICE

Service can be defined as “contributions to the welfare of others.” It is important that the faculty member engage in service activities in the following areas to demonstrate satisfaction of this criterion.

3.1 Service to the University

A university’s faculty shares authority and responsibility with the administration for the academic governance of the institution. Therefore, a faculty member is expected to participate willingly and effectively on department, college and university committees, which are the primary vehicle for exercising these rights and responsibilities. Faculty may also provide service by accepting and executing appropriate administrative assignments when called upon to do so.

3.2 Service to Professional Organizations and Community

Technology faculty members are expected to be active in professional organizations, particularly those which help to define and develop the discipline in which they teach.

It is important that an urban university have an outreach into the host community. Faculty, as representatives of the University, are expected to establish appropriate relationships to make the University an integral part of the community. This may include service to government agencies, business and industrial concerns, other educational institutions and charitable organizations.
SECTION II

EVALUATION GUIDELINES
The Faculty Evaluation guidelines that follow expand upon the subcategories of the Faculty Evaluation Criteria of Section I. These guidelines provide examples of activities which may be used to demonstrate proficiency in the evaluation areas. They have been developed to assist faculty members in identifying the type of activities that may be used to demonstrate their performance in a Criteria subcategory. Likewise, they are intended to assist administrative evaluators in determining appropriate activities for their faculty members.

It is important for both faculty and evaluator to remember the following considerations in applying the guidelines and the Criteria.

- The examples of activities given here are not to be taken as necessary or sufficient activities in the criteria areas. They are presented as thought-provoking ideas about typical types of activity to support faculty performance in the Criteria areas.

- It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide documented evidence supporting his or her performance in the areas.

Evaluation of faculty performance is facilitated by the use of the Evaluation Summary form in Appendix A. This form is used by evaluators to rate the performance of the faculty member in each of the subcategories of the faculty evaluation criteria. The following interpretations are presented to provide some focus on the activity associated with each level of performance on the form.

EXEMPLARY: The highest achievement rating for a given year in a category. Must be strongly supported by documentation showing performance of the highest caliber, far exceeding that expected of normal faculty activity in the category.

EXCEEDS EXPECTATION: Documentation presented by the faculty member must demonstrate superior activity in the category for which this rating was awarded. The documentation must show that the faculty member exhibited a performance exceeding that expected of satisfactory activity.

MEETS EXPECTATION: This is the normal rating for a faculty member in a category for the year. The documentation demonstrates some suitable activity in the category. Awarding of this rating indicates that the activity of the faculty in this category was acceptable and at a level expected for a member of the faculty.

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT: Assignment of this rating indicates that performance of the faculty member in this category was insufficient over the past year. This may be an indication that the activity was of insufficient quantity or quality but that in any event the faculty member should endeavor to improve activity in the category.

POOR: This rating is an indication that the faculty member demonstrated no activity or activity at a far inferior level in the category during the past year. It would be expected that the faculty member would take immediate steps to improve performance in the category.
Candidates will be evaluated in the categories of teaching, scholarship and service

1. TEACHING

According to the Evaluation Criteria for the College of Technology, evaluation is based on activities supporting: (1) effective teaching and curriculum development, (2) student welfare, (3) professional growth and development.

1.1 Suggested (but not inclusive) means if demonstrating effective teaching and curriculum development are the following:

1.1.1 Student satisfaction as reported by the Course and Student Evaluation Instrument (See Appendix B).

1.1.2 Effective classroom presentations or activities as demonstrated by innovative teaching methods, unique utilization of materials, lectures, laboratories, and/or special presentations.

1.1.3 Enhanced student learning demonstrated by evaluation of class performance.

1.1.4 Employment of the latest information regarding technological advances demonstrated through documented classroom presentations.

1.1.5 Effective class structures demonstrated through careful course sequencing, presentation of clear course objectives, and effective evaluation of student performance.

1.1.6 Effective curriculum development including program course and or laboratory revisions, course coordination, and preparation of special classroom materials or laboratory manuals.

1.1.7 Recognition of effective teaching in the form of teaching awards.

1.1.8 Participation in the development of interdisciplinary activities and/or courses

1.2 Activity in student welfare promotes an environment that is supportive of learning. Suggested means of demonstrating student welfare include:

1.2.1 Student advising regarding course selection, career opportunities, degree plan formulation, etc.

1.2.2 Participation in advising related activities such as registration, new students orientation, etc.

1.2.3 Participation in graduate advising and service on graduate thesis committees.
1. TEACHING (Cont.)

1.2.4 Interaction with students regarding college activities and policies.

1.2.5 Support of student organization through activities and policies.

1.3 Professional growth and development enhances teaching by developing faculty who are not only knowledgeable in their subject but are aware of effective educational processes. This development could be demonstrated through the following items:

1.3.1 Participation in conferences, seminars related to educational improvement or academic development.

1.3.2 Enrollment in professional course and/or degree programs.

1.3.3 Consulting in discipline-related areas.

1.3.4 Related summer employment.

1.3.5 Teaching continuing education, adult education or other special classes.
2. SCHOLARSHIP

According to the Evaluation Criteria of the College of Technology, evidence of scholarship is based upon activity in three areas: (1) Research and Publications, (2) Research Funding, and (3) Scholarly Interaction.

2.1 Research and publications refer to the following type of activities. The priority and weight of the activity depend on the candidate’s discipline.

2.1.1 Papers written and accepted by peer refereed journals.

2.1.2 Evidence that the faculty member has engaged in the development of innovative and original methods for teaching his or her discipline, using the classroom as a laboratory to test and evaluate the results.

2.1.3 Evidence that the faculty member has engaged in applied research and/or applications scholarship such as technology transfer, jointly sponsored industrial projects, and grants.

2.1.4 Papers written and accepted by trade and professional journals as appropriate to the discipline.

2.1.5 Reports, articles and professional communications written for restricted distribution, including distribution in refereed conference proceedings.

2.1.6 Books, chapters, development and dissemination of software and other forms of scholarly writing.

2.1.7 Publications of the results of scholarly studies into new teaching methodology.

2.1.8 Supervision of undergraduate and graduate research and theses.

2.1.9 Editorial or review activity, such as service as an editor or referee for a scholarly journal.

2.1.10 Patents and copyrights obtained while in the College on a full-time faculty appointment.

2.2 The pursuit of research funding is indicated by the following:

2.2.1 Grants awarded.

2.2.2 Proposals written and submitted to funding agencies.

2.2.3 Other funding sources pursued such as industrial grants.
2.0 SCHOLARSHIP (Cont.)

2.3 Scholarly interaction can be indicated by the following:

2.3.1 Invited papers presented at professional conferences.

2.3.2 Contributed papers presented at professional conferences.

2.3.3 Conference activities such as organizer, reviewer, moderator, committee membership, etc.

2.3.4 Recognition and awards for professional scholarly activity.

2.3.5 Exhibition of creative works developed while in a faculty appointment, e.g. juried and/or invited competitions and exhibitions of art, illustrations, and graphics in the candidate’s field.
3. SERVICE

According to the Evaluation Criteria for the College of Technology, evaluation of service is based on service to 1) the university, and 2) professional organizations and the community.

3.1 Service to the University is demonstrated through participation and leadership in the following areas:

3.1.1 Department committee service/leadership.

3.1.2 College committee service/leadership.

3.1.3 University committee service/leadership.

3.1.4 Indications of administrative duties in the College and/or University.

3.1.5 Participation in University activities such as special events, recruitment of faculty or students, etc.

3.1.6 Serving as a mentor for other faculty.

3.2 Service to Professional Organizations and the Community contribute to the development of the disciplines and the recognition of the College and University. Such service can be demonstrated through:

3.2.1 Membership in professional organizations.

3.2.2 Offices held in professional organizations.

3.2.3 Sponsorship of meetings; participation in conducting professional meetings.

3.2.4 Membership on local, state or national committees.

3.2.5 Participation in community activities in the name of the University.

3.2.6 Representation of the University at community events.

3.2.7 Representation of the University on industry and/or school boards including advisory committees.
Instructional Faculty

To Instructional Associate Professor

1. **Teaching:** a record of teaching at the undergraduate and graduate (if available) levels that reveal:

   1. Initiative and creativity in new course and curriculum development and existing course/program upgrades;
   2. Initiative and active participation in continuous improvement of laboratory equipment/experiments;
   3. Recognition of effective teaching and student mentoring/advising;
   4. Active participation in activities such as student advising, alumni relations, recruiting and facilitation of student organization;
   5. Record of continued guidance of students at the undergraduate and graduate levels;
   6. Interest and demonstrated participation in maintaining accreditation by the appropriate professional body;
   7. Active participation in departmental grant activities for curriculum development and laboratory improvement;
   8. Pedagogical work published in educational conferences or refereed journals, appropriate in the candidate’s professional field, is encouraged but not required.

2. **Service:**

   1. Adequate involvement in professional contributions to the department, the college, the university, the professional societies, and the community;
   2. Continuous involvement in professional growth and developmental activities.

3. **Research:**

   1. Instructional faculty members are encouraged to engage in scholarly activities.
   2. Pedagogical work published in educational conferences or refereed journals, appropriate in the candidate’s professional field, is encouraged but not required.

To Instructional Professor

1. **Teaching:** a record of teaching at the undergraduate and graduate (if available) levels that reveal:

   1. Established approval from students and/or peers in course organization, clarity of presentations, and overall instructional efficiency;
   2. Record of having initiative and creativity in new course and curriculum development and existing course/program upgrades;
   3. Leadership abilities in maintaining accreditation by the appropriate professional body;
4. Record of undergraduate student mentoring and substantial guidance of students at the undergraduate and graduate levels;
5. Record of synergetic teaching activities;
6. Pedagogical work published in educational conferences or refereed journals, appropriate in the candidate’s professional field;
7. Leadership in departmental grant activities for curriculum development and laboratory improvement.

2. Service:

1. Record of high quality and professional contributions to the department, the college, the university, the professional societies, and the community;
2. Established interaction with professional peers as evidenced by presentations in local, national and international conferences, or other venues;
3. Demonstrated leadership abilities in mentoring Junior Faculty members.

3. Research:

1. Instructional faculty members should engage in scholarly activities.
2. Pedagogical work published in educational conferences or refereed journals, appropriate in the candidate’s professional field;
   Leadership in departmental grant activities for curriculum development and laboratory improvement
SECTION III

THE EVALUATION PROCESS
1. FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORT

The form in Appendix A presents the title page, table of contents, and organizational structure of the Faculty Activity Report.

It is via this report that faculty provide written documentation of their activities. The report must describe, summarize, and reference activities for the review period using the Evaluation Guidelines in Section II of this document. It is not necessary to provide copies of actual work within the Faculty Activity Report; however, the work should be organized and available upon request.

2. PROCEDURES AND TIMETABLE FOR PROMOTION/TENURE REVIEW

The following timetable presents the order of activities necessary to support the University requirements for participation in the promotion and tenure process. The faculty member will be notified of the results of each evaluation step as it is performed. The faculty may withdraw the request for promotion review at any time.

In preparing the promotion documents, the faculty member should use a format that is consistent with University guidelines.

By April 30

The faculty member must write a memo requesting an appointment with the department chairperson, expressing his or her intent to seek promotion and/or tenure.

May-August

2.1 The faculty member shall prepare documents for the promotion and/or tenure process. These documents must conform to the University requirements.
2.2 The chairperson shall formally request and obtain at least three external letters of recommendation for the faculty member.

September 10

2.3 The candidate submits his/her completed dossier to the department chairperson.
2.4 The chairperson forms and charges a department evaluation committee.
2.5 The dean forms the College Promotion/Tenure Evaluation Committee per College By-laws.

October 1

The department evaluation committee completes its evaluation of the candidate’s activities and presents its findings to the department chairperson. Negative committee recommendations on promotion and tenure shall be conveyed by the department chair to the candidate prior to submitting them to the dean.
October 10

The chair makes a recommendation regarding the candidate’s promotion/tenure. The candidate is informed of a negative recommendation before this recommendation is submitted to the dean.

October 15

The department chair submits his/her recommendation to the dean.

October 20

The dean forwards all promotion/tenure documents to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

November 15

The College Promotion and Tenure Committee completes and transmits their recommendations on all candidates to the dean.

December 1

The dean informs each candidate of the College decision regarding the promotion/tenure request prior to submitting the documents to the Provost’s Office, with the dean’s recommendation.

3. PROCEDURE AND TIMETABLE FOR THIRD-YEAR REVIEW

The Third-Year Review applies to faculty who begin employment at the University with fewer than two accredited years on the tenure track. The purpose of the Third-Year Review is to assist in the academic development of faculty on the tenure track and to determine the faculty member’s potential for receiving tenure within the next three years. As a result of this review, the faculty member will be given direct feedback regarding (1) his/her performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service, (2) a decision as to the merits of continued association with the College. If it is apparent that there is little potential for tenure within three years, the faculty member may be recommended for a one-year terminal contract.

April

The department chair notifies the faculty members that they are to collect materials for the Third-Year Review process. These materials should include: (1) a composite Faculty Activity Report, (2) a current vita, and (3) any other documents supporting their activities in teaching, service and scholarship.
May-August

The faculty member compiles materials as describes in item (2.1).

September 10

The faculty member submits Third-Year Review materials to the department chair. The review process will include the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

October 15

The department chair and appropriate faculty bodies evaluate the materials and prepare a formal report and meet with the dean to discuss: (1) perceptions and recommendations regarding the candidate’s potential for tenure, and (2) suggestions and/or feedback to be presented to the faculty member. As a result of this evaluation and discussion, it will be specified that (a) the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure, (b) the candidate has some specific weaknesses that must be addressed if the candidate is expected to receive tenure at the end of his/her sixth year or (c) the candidate has demonstrated no potential for tenure and should be recommended for a final year terminal contract.

December 1

The department chair discusses the outcome of the Third-Year Review with the faculty member.

3.1 If the recommendation is positive, the Third-Year Review process is concluded with the dean and chair/candidate interview.

3.2 If the dean/chair recommendation is negative, a terminal contract will be recommended and the materials will be submitted to the Provost’s office by December 20.

A formal report of the results of the Third-Year Review will be prepared by the dean and given to the department chair and the candidate. A copy if this report is to be retained in the faculty member’s permanent file.
4. PROCEDURE AND TIMETABLE FOR ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEW

May-September

The departmental faculty member shall determine with the department chair the faculty member’s plan for the forthcoming review, whether it will be used for merit increment or it will be used as part of the faculty member’s history.

February 15

The faculty member submits the Faculty Activity Report for the previous calendar year (spring, summer and fall semesters). The report will be used to evaluate the faculty member for any merit increment for that year. Furthermore, the report will be filed as academic history of the faculty member.

March 15

The department chair will prepare an evaluation summary for each faculty member (as shown in Appendix A) and submit to the dean.

March 31

The dean will review department chair evaluation to determine the final recommendations. The recommendations will then be transmitted to the department chair to be discussed with each faculty member.

April 30

The department chair will report to faculty members on their strengths and weaknesses; the chair will note those areas that need attention. The faculty member has the right to include comments on the form. The chair and faculty member will sign and date the form.
5. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Student evaluations of faculty provide one source of information regarding teaching effectiveness. They do not provide complete evidence of effective teaching. Thus, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to compile other indicators of teaching effectiveness. Some of the items that can be used in this regard appear in Section II of this document. Course/Instruction (C/I) evaluations will be conducted at least once during a given academic year using the form in Appendix B in accordance with the following procedures.

1. The Associate dean will initiate the C/I evaluation process in a timely manner.

2. A designee of the Associate Dean will compile an evaluation packet for each class offering. The packet will consist of (1) sufficient copies of the C/I Evaluation Instrument [see Appendix B], (2) mark-sense answer forms, and (3) instructions for instrument administration. These packets will be distributed to the appropriate department.

3. C/I evaluations will be administered during a three-week period that begins at least 8 weeks into a 15 week semester. Each faculty member will choose the specific day on which the evaluation will be conducted.

4. During the chosen evaluation period, the faculty member will pick up the evaluation packets from the departmental office.

5. The evaluation materials will be administered to the class by a student. To encourage students to take their time writing comments and responding to the items, the evaluations should be administered during the class period. Instructors will not be present during the evaluation and should allow 15-20 minutes to complete the instrument. Completed instruments and answer sheets should be returned to the departmental office by the student administering the evaluation.

6. The forms will be scored by campus testing services.

7. Results of Part I through III of the evaluation instrument will be returned to the faculty member no later than two weeks into the Spring semester for Fall evaluations, no later than two weeks into the first Summer semester for Spring evaluations, and no later than two weeks into the Fall semester for Summer evaluations. Copies of the results of Parts I through III of the evaluation instrument will also be retained by the Department Chair. Part III results will be used for purposes of curriculum development only, not for purposes of merit review. A copy of the evaluation results will be kept on record in the Dean’s office.

8. Upon completion of the evaluation process, the answer forms (without reference to individual faculty members) will be used by the Associate Dean to establish College norms for Part II.

9. Supplementary questions may be added to the standard form at the discretion of the department and/or faculty member.
APPENDIX A

FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORT AND
ANNUAL EVALUATION SUMMARY
College of Technology Faculty Evaluation System

College of Technology

University of Houston

COVER PAGE

ANNUAL FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORT

Year: (January 1 to December 31)

Name: ___________________________  Rank: ___________________________

Department: ___________________________  Time in Rank: ________________

Year Joined the University of Houston: __________________________

The following pages present evidence of my professional activity over the past year in the following areas:

1. Teaching

   Effective Reaching & Curriculum Development
   Student Welfare
   Professional Growth and Development

2. Scholarship

   Research, Publications & Funding
   Scholarly Interaction

3. Service

   Service to the University
   Service to Professional Organizations & the Community
College of Technology Faculty Evaluation System

College of Technology
University of Houston

FACULTY EVALUATION SUMMARY

EVALUATION PERIOD: January 1st to December 31, 20__

FACULTY NAME: ___________________________    DEPARTMENT: ____________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PR.</th>
<th>N.I</th>
<th>M.E.</th>
<th>E.E.</th>
<th>EXM.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 EFFECTIVE TEACHING &amp; CURRICULUM DEVELOP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 STUDENT WELFARE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOLARSHIP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 RESEARCH, PUBLICATIONS &amp; FUNDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 SCHOLARLY INTERACTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 SERVICE TO PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS &amp; THE COMMUNITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PR. = POOR; N.I. = NEEDS IMPROVEMENT; M.E. = MEETS EXPECTATION; E.E. = EXCEEDS EXPECTATION; EXM. = EXEMPLARY.

**COMMENTS**

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

Signatures & Date
APPENDIX B

TEACHING EVALUATION INSTRUMENT
PURPOSE

The purpose of this brief questionnaire is to determine the extent to which the instructor has conducted a well-organized course consistent with the goals of the student’s degree plan. The evaluation will be used by the department and the College to assist in evaluating the instructor, and by the instructor to assist in development of the course. Your responses will be kept completely confidential. Summaries of these questionnaires are returned to the instructor only after the course is over and grades have been turned in.

PART I COMMENTS

The questions in Parts II and III may not cover a basic strong point or weak point of the course which you might want to relate. Thus, you are encouraged to write comments related to the course. If you need more space, use the back of this sheet or a blank sheet of paper. It would be especially helpful if you would answer (a) and (b).

a) What have you liked most about the course?

b) What have you liked least about the course?

c) Other comments.
COURSE AND TEACHER EVALUATION INSTRUMENT: PARTS II AND III

For Part II, indicate your response to each item by marking the appropriate blank on the answer sheet (please note the item numbers and respond in the correct place). Use the following scale.

5  Strongly Agree
4  Agree
3  Neither Agree nor Disagree
2  Disagree
1  Strongly Disagree

PART II  INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

1. The instructor presents material in an understandable way.
2. The instructor welcomes student questions.
3. The instructor is available to help students outside of class.
4. Grading is fair.
5. The instruction is well organized.
6. The instructor is very effective.

For Part III, indicate your response to each item by marking the appropriate blank on the answer sheet (please note the item numbers and respond in the correct place). Use the following scale.

5  Strongly Agree
4  Agree
3  Neither Agree nor Disagree
2  Disagree
1  Strongly Disagree

PART III  COURSE EVALUATION

7. I had a desire to take this course.
8. The texts used in this course were useful.
9. This course contributed to my professional growth and development.
10. This course met my expectations.
11. This course was relevant.
12. I would recommend this course to others.
13. This was an excellent course.