I. TEACHING DEFINED

Teaching is a complex and multi-dimensional activity that is difficult to define and evaluate. Although it is virtually impossible to identify all aspects of teaching, it is possible to identify some of the major elements of effective teaching and to evaluate these elements through the collection of relevant data. Thus, for the purposes of this document, teaching is defined in terms of the following dimensions (Arreola 1995, 19-22; Centra 1987, 5-12):

- Content Expertise
- Instructional Delivery Skills
- Instructional Design Skills
- Course Management Skills
- Evaluation of Students
- Faculty/Student Relationships
- Facilitation of Student Learning

For the non-teaching library faculty, teaching is defined in terms of the following dimensions:

- Interpretation and Use of Resources
- Selection and Development of Resources
- Organization and Governance of Resources
- Application and Utilization of Automation and Digital Data
- Program Administration and Personnel Management
- Leadership and Effectiveness within the Organization

II. SOURCES OF DATA FOR EVALUATING TEACHING

Because teaching is a complex activity, several sources of data must be used to evaluate the quality of any instructor's teaching (Arreola 1995, 35; Centra et al 1987, 41-45). In addition the sources selected must have first-hand knowledge of the activity being evaluated and the activity must be documented whenever possible. When evaluating an instructor's teaching for tenure, promotion, and reappointment, all departments must include data from at least the following three sources:

- Student assessments of teaching
- Instructor's self-report and assessment
- Colleagues review of teaching (classroom observation and/or teaching materials)

Optional sources of data may include alumni, department heads, or deans (Arreola 1995, 31). In addition, as required by UNC General Administration (see Administrative Memo #338 of 9/23/93), all non-tenured faculty must be evaluated by direct observation of classroom teaching. For the library faculty data must be included from at least the following three sources:

- Client assessments
- Faculty member's self-report and assessment
- Colleagues review of teaching as defined for library faculty (relevant materials)

Each of the above listed sources is defined as follows:

**Student Assessments**

Some form of student assessments must be included for each faculty member. Each faculty should obtain student assessments of at least one course each semester. In order to assure student assessment forms are reliable and valid and provide useful information, it is
recommended that either a well-known commercially available student rating form be adopted or that departments carefully develop their own. For reviews of commercially available forms, guidelines for choosing a commercial form, and guidelines for developing rating forms that are valid, reliable and that provide useful information see Arreola (1995).

Instructor's Self-Report and Assessment

The instructor's self-report and assessment should address each of the seven dimensions of teaching identified in Section I. The report should be accompanied by a packet that includes items such as a statement of a teaching philosophy; a description of goals, methods, and strategies used; and selected teaching materials for the courses taught during the period of the review. For sample forms for this purpose, see Centra et al 1987, 17-20.

Colleague's Review of Teaching

Teaching Materials. A department should designate for each instructor being evaluated a committee of at least two faculty colleagues, exclusive of the department head, to review and evaluate a packet of teaching materials prepared by the instructor being evaluated. Materials to be reviewed typically include course syllabi, examinations, and quizzes, reading and assignment lists, study guides, informational handouts, slides and overhead transparencies, computer programs, etc. Where feasible, reviewers should be colleagues from the candidate's department, but, in small departments, reviewers may be selected from outside the department. Each department should develop a protocol to guide the review of materials. Reviewers may evaluate the materials in a narrative statement; a checklist developed and approved by the faculty members in the department, or a combination of narrative and checklist (see Centra et al 1987, 37-39).

Direct Observation of Classroom Teaching (for non-tenured faculty only). Direct observation of teaching should only be used as a supplement to the basic data sources listed above. Because classroom observation based on a single visit by a single observer tends to be highly subjective and dependent on the observer's biases and preconceived notions of effective teaching, it should never be used as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. For instructors who are required to be observed, observation should be used only to verify or qualify evidence from other sources of data. It is recommended that departments select a limited set of behaviors to be observed, determine the format/scale for recording classroom observation, and select as observers colleagues who have experience or training in observational evaluation (Centra et al 1987, 21-23 and 53-56).

III.CRITERIA FOR JUDGING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Once all data have been collected, a departmental personnel committee or the department head should review the data specifically addressing the seven dimensions listed below plus any other considerations that may be pertinent to a discipline. As indicated in Section I, these dimensions do not represent all aspects of effective teaching, but they are major elements that are amenable to evaluation based on the data collected from the sources outlined in Section I above. The seven dimensions do not have to be considered of equal importance in judging overall teaching effectiveness. Each department may assign weights to the various dimensions, but each dimension should be evaluated. The appropriate committees/individuals at the department, college, and university level should review the form shown below and make any additions or adjustments that seem appropriate for specific cases, and use the resulting form to evaluate teaching.
Instructions: Rate each item listed below on the following scale:

- Performance superior in all areas
- Performance acceptable in all areas
- Performance deficient in one or more areas but can be improved with professional assistance
- Performance does not meet minimal standards or adequate documentation not provided
- Not applicable for this situation

- **Content Expertise**: Instructor displays adequate knowledge of the subject. According to Arreola (1995), content expertise includes the “body of skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced experience, training, or education” (p. 19)

- **Instructional Delivery Skills**: Instructor communicates information clearly; creates environments conducive to learning; uses an appropriate variety of teaching methods.

- **Instructional Design Skills**: Instructor designs course objectives, syllabi, materials, activities, and learning experiences that are conducive to student learning.

- **Course Management Skills**: Instructor gives timely feedback to students; makes effective use of class time; handles classroom dynamics, interactions, and problematic situations effectively (e.g. academic dishonesty, tardiness, etc.)

- **Evaluation of Students**: Instructor designs assessment procedures appropriate to course objectives; ensures fairness in student evaluation and grading; provides adequate constructive feedback on student work

- **Faculty/Student Relationships**: Instructor displays a positive attitude toward students; shows concern for students by being approachable and available; presents an appropriate level of intellectual challenge along with sufficient support for student learning; has respect for diversity

- **Facilitation of Student Learning**: Instructor maintains high academic standards; prepares students for professional work and development; facilitates student achievement; provides audiences for student work.

  **Note**: The descriptors following each of the seven teaching effectiveness criteria are meant to be illustrative of that dimension, rather than exhaustive.
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