

# Luoma Leadership Action Learning Project

## Faculty Evaluation Process

### in Two-Year Colleges



#### Luoma Leadership Action Learning Project Team

Laurie J. Becker – MSC-ST

Jo Poncelet – MSC-ST

Jeff Judge – Normandale CC

Todd Digby – Office of the Chancellor

Rhonda Bender – Northwest TC

We would like to express our sincere appreciation to our Action Project

**Executive Sponsors:**

Deb Holstad, Human Resource Director, SCTC

Barry Dahl, VP of Technology and e-Campus, Lake Superior College

**Team Advisors:**

Kristina Keller, Dean of Business and IT, SCTC

Hanna Erpestad, Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Lake Superior College

A special thank you to Kristina for all of her positive encouragement, support, and guidance through out this project. She became our sounding board, advisor, colleague and friend.

Much research went into the development of this Faculty Evaluation Process in the Two-Year College System.

- \* A request was made to all MnSCU two-year colleges to share their current process for evaluating faculty.
- \* The request was to include any forms used in their process.
- \* Our Action Project Team reviewed and analyzed each college process for its appropriateness in our vision of how this process might look.
- \* Components from many other colleges' procedures were integrated into our project.
- \* Regional data was also accessed and reviewed through internet searches.

We would like to thank the many colleges whose valuable contributions helped us to achieve our Action Project goal .

## Executive Summary

Luoma Project #2

Faculty Evaluation Process in Two-Year Colleges

Jo Poncelet, Laurie Becker, Rhonda Bender, Todd Digby, Jeff Judge

The goal of this project is to provide recommendations to update the current faculty evaluation process at two-year college campuses in the MnSCU system. Currently, each college has its own process, policy, and procedure, but recognizes the need for further development, collaboration, and consistency. For purposes herein all written procedures and documents were influenced by existing policies.

The college(s) would like to enhance the current process to include all components of evaluation and develop the infrastructure necessary to connect all evaluation activities. The project includes the research and development of an updated evaluation policy, process, and procedure for unlimited, probationary, part time, and adjunct instructors and should address face to face, online, and hybrid delivery. In addition, the process should align faculty evaluation, professional development planning (per MSCF contract), and classroom evaluation in all delivery methods. By aligning related activities the college(s) will:

- Encourage and recognize the importance of professional development;
- Support quality improvement efforts;
- Create a learning community within the college that promotes strong, collegial relationships;
- Recognize faculty knowledge, expertise, and skillful teaching;
- Align course design principles, assessment techniques, outcomes, and evaluation;
- Meet accreditation requirements

**Team Charge:** To develop a systematic, comprehensive, formative, and summative faculty evaluation process that addresses face to face and online instructional delivery methods. A recommendation to the college(s) should be applicable to all two-year colleges in the MnSCU system.

**Note:** This Action Project has been presented for comment to over 100 constituents within the MnSCU System. Included among the audience were Staff from the Office of the Chancellor, Presidents, Vice Presidents, Faculty, Deans, and Chief Human Resource Directors. These individuals were given the opportunity to peruse, dissect and react to all aspects of the project. Their feedback is reflected in this product.

### **Key Findings:**

There is high interest for streamlining this process.

The process needs to be less cumbersome and more user friendly.

No two institutions we examined carry out the process the same way.

Our processes are more alike than they are different.

A variety of institutions have different interpretations regarding supervisor rights and responsibilities, especially surrounding the issue of unscheduled observations.

Student evaluations vary greatly between institutions.

Peer reviews are underutilized.

### **Summary of Recommendations:**

Implement the above prescribed pre and post documentation in all faculty evaluations.

Encourage the use of **e-folio** when turning in and updating teaching portfolios.

Develop a future Luoma Action Project investigating a system-wide approach to student evaluations.

Encourage faculty to be active participants in their own evaluation.

Utilize the above prescribed process as part of a supervisor's own evaluation by upper administration.

Create a faculty/supervisor assessment tool eliciting feedback to be used for continuous improvement of the process

# Timeline of the Action Project Progress

- July 2009-met with Action Project sponsors
- AP Team communicated through monthly webinars
- October 2009 – AP Team met face to face
- March 2010 – met with one AP sponsor to update on project status and get feedback
- April 2010 – MSC-ST presented project information to their college Executive Council
- April 2010 – AP Team met face to face
- April 2010 – presented to statewide CHRO
- June 2010 – presented to Action Project Sponsor's Leadership Team and Faculty Leaders

## Timeline of the Action Project Progress continued

- July 2010 – sent Action Project to Jeff Wade for review
- July 2010 – present to Luoma
- October 2010 – present to CAO/CSAO/Deans
- Present to team members' colleges for consideration/implementation.

## **Policies for Faculty Performance Appraisal/Professional Development in the Two Year MnSCU System.**

In accordance with System Board Policy 4.9, MN Statute 43 A.20, and The Higher Learning Commission Criteria for Accreditation - Criterion 3b, the purpose of evaluation is to demonstrate the quality and effectiveness of the faculty member's work and to determine successful completion of probationary status. Evaluation is designed to support faculty in becoming outstanding educators who provide the best possible learning opportunities for our students. The organization supports and values effective teaching.

Implementation of the faculty evaluation process will be conducted in accordance with the Procedure on Faculty Evaluation. Unlimited faculty will be evaluated using a three - to five- year rotation. Probationary faculty will be evaluated on a more frequent basis in accordance with campus protocol. Adjunct and Temporary faculty will be evaluated in accordance with campus protocol. The process includes possible combination of, but is not limited to, formal written evaluations, peer reviews, students evaluations, and teaching portfolio.

## **▪Definitions**

**Performance Appraisal/Employee Evaluation/Faculty Evaluation - For the purpose of this document are interchangeable**

**Adjunct Faculty Member** – A faculty member who works fewer than five (5) credits in a term.

**Temporary Full-Time Faculty Member** – A faculty member who has been hired for a full-time assignment for an academic year.

**Temporary Part-Time Faculty Member** – A faculty member with a part-time assignment of five (5) or more credits in a semester or a summer session.

**Probationary Faculty Member** – An unlimited full-time or unlimited part-time faculty member who has not completed the required probationary period.

**Unlimited Full-Time Faculty Member** – A faculty member with a full-time assignment for an academic year that carries the assumption that such employment will continue on a full-time basis in subsequent years.

**Unlimited Part-Time Faculty Member** – A faculty member with a part-time assignment between forty percent (40%) and eighty percent (80%) over an academic year that carries the assumption that such employment will continue on a part-time basis in subsequent years.

## **MnSCU System Board Policy - 4.9 Employee Evaluation**

### **Part 1. Responsibility**

Each Minnesota State Colleges & Universities institution and the Office of the Chancellor shall have in place a procedure for evaluating employees, including faculty and administrators, on an annual basis.

Supervisors have the responsibility and authority for evaluation of employees under their supervision unless the college or university procedure provides for another process. This is consistent with requirements in Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 43A.20.

### **Part 2. Process**

Evaluations are to be completed in a manner consistent with any requirements found in Minnesota Statutes and the applicable collective bargaining agreements or personnel plan. A procedure may provide for evaluations of a limited scope in certain years if that is consistent with the language of a collective bargaining agreement.

## **Minnesota Statute 43A.20 PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND PAY.**

The commissioner shall design and maintain a performance appraisal system under which each employee in the civil service in the executive branch shall be evaluated and counseled on work performance at least once a year. Individual pay increases for all employees not represented by an exclusive representative certified pursuant to chapter 179A shall be based on the evaluation and other factors the commissioner includes in the plans developed pursuant to section [43A.18](#). Collective bargaining agreements entered into pursuant to chapter 179A may, and are encouraged to, provide for pay increases based on employee work performance.

## **Higher Learning Commission Core Component - 3b**

*The organization values and supports effective teaching.*

### *Examples of Evidence*

- *Qualified faculty determine curricular content and strategies for instruction.*
- *The organization supports professional development designed to facilitate teaching suited to varied learning environments.*
- *The organization evaluates teaching and recognizes effective teaching.*
- *The organization provides services to support improved pedagogies.*
- *The organization demonstrates openness to innovative practices that enhance learning.*
- *The organization supports faculty in keeping abreast of the research on teaching and learning, and of technological advances that can positively affect student learning and the delivery of instruction.*
- *Faculty members actively participate in professional organizations relevant to the disciplines they teach.*

# *Toolbox for the Faculty Portfolio*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

***For faculty submission to respective supervisor***

### **0. HLC Criterion and State and System Policies**

### **1. Faculty Position Data Reflection Form**

### **2. Copies of Performance Appraisals**

Include the following completed forms:

- a. Faculty Pre-appraisal Form
- b. Supervisor Classroom Performance Appraisal Form
- c. Post Portfolio Review - Summative Commentary
- d. Quality Matters Online Peer Review (for online and hybrid)

### **3. Transcripts of Courses for College Faculty Credentialing to include T&LC courses**

Depending upon your date of hire, the System Human Resource Department needs this documentation for completion of probationary status.

### **4. Samples of student evaluations**

Probationary faculty: one from each semester of probation

Non-probationary faculty: aggregate data from previous semesters

## **5. Sample syllabi of classes you have taught**

If you have taught an online course or a hybrid, please include one of each of these.

(Note: a sample Syllabus Review form is included)

## **6. Sample instructional materials – one from each course you have taught**

## **7. Copy of completed Professional Development Plan to include updates**

## **Optional Items**

- a. Curriculum Vitae
- b. Peer-to-Peer Review Form
- c. Self-Performance Appraisal Form
- d. Informal Performance Appraisal
- e. Letter of Support for Unlimited Status

## **Purpose:**

The college has a commitment to continuous improvement with a foundation of ongoing personal and professional development. The faculty performance appraisal plan is one part of the process to help achieve that goal. The primary outcome of this performance appraisal plan is to improve teaching and learning effectiveness.

We recognize that the professional responsibilities of faculty members are very diverse and complex. Our purpose is to devise a faculty performance appraisal plan to provide a systematic process that faculty can use to analyze their professional performance and discover their strengths in order to enhance both. This performance appraisal procedure will not restrict academic rights as defined in the MSCF contract in any way.

## **Assumptions:**

Many assumptions were made in establishing a procedure for the evaluation of professional performance.

We assume that faculty:

- \*are highly qualified in their respective fields
- \*desire to perform at a high level
- \*consider successful student learning a priority
- \*acknowledge that student feedback provides them with insights on how students perceive the course and how they are learning
- \*value the opportunity for self-reflection and self-directed professional growth
- \*are most qualified to develop their own goals for improvement and identify methods to achieve those goals

It is the institution's responsibility to assist faculty by providing opportunities and economic support for professional growth.

## Process for Faculty Performance Appraisal/Professional Development

1. Faculty and Supervisor will mutually agree on a date and time for scheduled observation. Supervisors maintain the option to observe classes at unscheduled times as well.
2. Supervisor will email the faculty the Observation Packet which may consist of:
  - \*Faculty Pre-appraisal Form
  - \*Supervisor Classroom Performance Appraisal Form
  - \*Professional Development Plan Outline (Full or Update)
  - \*Post Portfolio Review - Summative Commentary
  - \*Quality Matters Online Peer Review (online or hybrid)
  - \* Syllabus Review Form
  - \*Self-Performance Appraisal Form (optional)
  - \*Peer-to-Peer Review Form (optional)

3. Faculty member submits pre-observation form and class handouts and/or Power Points to Supervisor no later than 2 days prior to the scheduled class observation.

\*Faculty member requests a colleague to evaluate a scheduled classroom session. The request may be for the same classroom observation as the supervisor. (Optional item)

4. The supervisor will attend the scheduled class session and be as unobtrusive as possible.

5. The supervisor will forward a copy of the completed observation to faculty for review and response.

6. Faculty member makes arrangements for student evaluations.

7. Faculty member gathers components identified in the Tool Box, both required and optional, on an ongoing basis and places them in his or her portfolio.

\*Faculty member completes Self-Performance Appraisal Form.  
(optional)

8. Faculty member initiates or updates his or her Professional Development Plan and submits per College Policy.

9. The supervisor will arrange a follow up session with the faculty for the purpose of reviewing Professional Development and Portfolio.

10. Supervisor will forward documentation to appropriate individuals.

## Faculty Position Data Reflection Form

Summarize your experience as a part of your department/division	
Explain your campus involvement outside of the classroom	
Describe your community involvement	
Identify your ideas and goals as they pertain to your position	
Share your philosophy of teaching and learning	
Describe your current position at the college, to include years of experience, employment status and department/division etc.	
Describe your role in your program's Assessment Plan	
Faculty Name:	Date:

## **Faculty Pre-appraisal Form**

Please submit this form and any additional class handouts or Power Points to your Supervisor no later than two days prior to your classroom observation.

Faculty:

Course:

Room:

Day:

Time:

1. What are your course outcomes for this class session?
2. Is this the introductory lesson, reinforcing lesson, or concluding lesson?
3. What teaching technique(s) will you be using?
4. Is there anything that you want an observer to pay special attention to during the class?
5. How will you assess whether you accomplished your outcomes?

## **Classroom Observation of Instruction – Supervisor Performance Appraisal Form**

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Unclear</u>
Lesson objectives were made clear to the students			
Faculty's presentation was well organized			
Speaks with effective vocal quality/emphasis/volume/rate			
Recognized nonverbal language that could enhance/hinder			
Presented content in logical order			
Presented content appropriate to real world applications			
Monitored student learning and adjusted instruction			
Explained concepts with clarity			
Presented examples to clarify points			
Varied explanations for complex material			
Summarized key points throughout and at the end of the session			
Related today's lesson to future lessons			
Defined terms or gave background information when necessary			
Involved students in learning by: simulation, role playing or other			
Listened to student questions/comments and provided feedback			
Used questions to assess student learning			
Used a variety of questioning techniques			
Asked probing questions when response incomplete			
Fostered a learning environment of mutual respect/diverse viewpoints and of academic integrity/intellectual curiosity			
Utilized technology/materials to enhance learning environment			

On the whole: Faculty is an effective teacher

Strengths and/or Opportunities for Growth:

Faculty Response:

Faculty signature:

Date:

Supervisor signature:

Date:

Appraisal Date:

Time:

Room:

Faculty Name:

Course and Section:

## Self-Performance Appraisal Form

Faculty\_\_\_\_\_

Date\_\_\_\_\_

Please complete a self performance appraisal of perceived strengths/concerns, and areas for development stating in narrative fashion your personal reflections on your teaching. This self appraisal should include reflection on your overall pedagogical teaching style. It should also include evidence of continuing preparation and study, contributions to student growth and development, and finally services to college and community. You are encouraged to incorporate any goals identified into your Professional Development Plan.

---

Comments:

Faculty Signature:

Date:

## **POLICY & PROCEDURE**

This policy is written in accordance with MnSCU Board Policy 3.32 and System Procedure 3.321 regarding Faculty Credentialing. The professional development plan process will be administered by the Academic Affairs Office.

\* **FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS**

\* **ACADEMIC PLAN PROGRESS FORM**

Hello fellow Deans,

I am a member of a Luoma Leadership Team working on an Action Project entitled "Faculty Evaluation Process in Two-Year Colleges". Our goal is to provide recommendations to update the current faculty evaluation process at two year college campuses in MnSCU. We feel we have some exciting information which we will share with all of you upon completion of the project.

One of the last pieces we are reviewing is the "Student Course Evaluation". Since there are a variety of these evaluations currently being used, we would like to create a repository to share with all of you.

With this in mind I do have a request...would you be willing to send the following information to me

College Name, The Student Course Evaluation you are currently using, Pro's and Con's of the evaluation you use, and Cost of the Survey

Thank you for any help you can provide. We look forward to sharing our work with you.

## Student Course Evaluations

College	Tool	Pro's	Con's	Cost
Mesabi Range College	Student Comment Form.	easy to duplicate, low cost	not accessible to students taking online courses, not easily modified, slow turnaround time for results to be tallied	The cost of the survey includes copy costs and tallying costs of person complying the results. This tallying cost is included in a fee we pay to our district for the services of an institutional researcher
Minneapolis Community and Technical College	SIRII	gives a quick snapshot of what's happening in the classroom	returns for online courses not good; very labor-intensive to distribute and track	not sure, but could find out if you really need this
St Cloud Technical College	The Student Instructional Report II	very easy to use. The company does all the processing and produces a report that is "normed" with other colleges. They send a disc of all the data.	Costly	<a href="http://www.ets.org">www.ets.org</a>

Rochester Community and Technical College	we have piloted IDEA this past fall (faculty = 21) and will be moving to this product, more than likely, in the future.	Ability to provide flexibility to faculty who teach in remarkably different ways, national data comparisons, ability to use to tract progress toward core College outcomes, ability for individual faculty to add up to 12 more individualized questions, focus on evaluation AND self improvement.	To date, the only issue is the greater length of time needed to have students complete the instrument	unsure, at this time. Probably in the neighborhood \$10,000 per year (Rochester has >6000 students, >350 faculty)
Pine Technical College	Academic Assessment Committee just revised the questions			

Inver Hills	<p>We have our copy center copy this onto a Scantron Form No. 20-S-WS. We use Scantron Form No. 9870 to tally the results.</p> <p>We type the comments into a summary opinion form and we type the tally results into a summary home document. I have attached those also.</p>			
Normandale	AUTODATA SYSTEMS	allows us to customize, aggregate, and synthesize students responses and data. It also reads hand-written comments and transcribes them.	The con's haven't yet presented themselves – except to say that it's a small company and who knows how long they'll be around	The cost is really cheap.

Minnesota State Community and Technical College	Have developed our own survey in using survey select. The survey is administered online. Students are provided a survey link.	Students complete the survey online, so there is no manual compilation of surveys. Academic Assistants pull the survey data into a pdf which is sent to the appropriate faculty/supervising dean.	Survey questions are standard and designed for land based course delivery. With the addition of more online programs the survey is not the best tool to use.	We pay \$450.00 for the year for the annual maintenance for Survey Select, we paid \$537.00 for the original license back in January of 2006.
Minnesota State College-Southeast Technical	We have used an in-house course evaluation for the last 3 years. I don't know how we would calculate the cost since it's a project that comes out of the IR office. Before that we used CIEQ	The in-house eval is that it is custom designed to include all the questions that instructors want	Lack of national comparison for results.	CIEQ which cost about \$3000

North Hennepin Community College	<p>The surveys are 1) course evaluation, 2) Nursing Clinical –Instructor evaluation and 3) Nursing Theory – Instructor evaluations.</p> <p>Survey Tracker Plus 5.3 software from Training Technologies, a scanner is also required. The forms are ordered from SCANTRON in CA,</p> <p>Scantron's phone number is 1-800-722-6876.</p> <p>Website: Survey Tracker - <a href="http://www.surveytracker.com">www.surveytracker.com</a></p>	<p>With the use of the scanner and software, the data can be stored for as long as we choose. The back pages of each of the surveys, provides each student the opportunity to make written comments, these comments can then be stored as pdf's. Individual reports are printed for review by the appropriate Department Deans as well as the faculty.</p>		cost varies
Century College	<p>we do not have a formal evaluation tool for faculty for the college-at least not one that I am aware of. Faculty complete a Professional Development plan each year.</p>			

**Based on MnSCU Board Policy 3.22**

## **Course Outline Checklist**

(Course outlines will be held on file in the Academic Affairs Office)

### **Required Information**

- Course Title
- Course Description
- Prerequisites
- Total Credit Length (semester)
- Lecture/Lab Credit Breakdown
- Student Learning Outcomes
- Heading (College name & address)
- Disclaimers (The College has the right to change the Course Outline)
- Date of Course Creation or Revision

## **Course Syllabus Checklist**

Within the first week of the class meeting, students must be given a copy of the course syllabus. When courses are offered in a condensed format, the time frame for distribution of the syllabus shall be adjusted accordingly.

### **Required Information**

- Course Title
- Course Description
- Prerequisites
- Total Credit Length (semester)
- Lecture/Lab Credit Breakdown
- Student Learning Outcomes
- Heading (College name & address)
- Disclaimers (The College has the right to change the Course Outline)
- Statement of Diversity, ADA and Equal Opportunity \*\*
- Date of Course Creation or Revision

The following required items may be provided on a separate sheet along with the course outline.

- Standards for Evaluation of Student Learning (grading information)
- Additional information that reflects the creative work of the faculty

Other suggested items that faculty are encouraged to include in the syllabus or on a separate sheet.

- \_\_\_\_\_ Attendance Policy (Is REQUIRED if part of the course evaluation/grading process)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Any textbooks and references (titles, authors & editions)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Course requirements (exams, quizzes, projects, field trips, etc.)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Student contributions
- \_\_\_\_\_ Office hours (when available, office phone no. and/or e-mail address)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Important dates (when major assignments due, midterms, finals, etc.)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Required hardware & software
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other items unique to the course
- \_\_\_\_\_ Course Focus
- \_\_\_\_\_ List of required Library Resources

\*\* This statement complies with Office of Civil Rights 1B.4 part3, Access for Individuals with Disabilities and Title VI, Title IX, and Section 504 policy statement(s) of nondiscrimination

## **MnSCU Board Policy 3.22 Course Syllabi**

**Part 1. Purpose.** The course syllabus is prepared to provide students with information on the course content, course requirements, and course expectations.

**Part 2. Definitions.**

**Subpart A. Course Outline.** The course outline is the document approved by the college or university curriculum committee and shall include the course title, course description, prerequisites, total credits, lecture/lab breakdown, and student learning outcomes.

**Subpart B. Course Syllabus.** The course syllabus is a document that contains the elements of the corresponding course outline, standards for evaluation of student learning, and additional information which reflects the creative work of the faculty member.

**Part 3. Dissemination to Students.** Each college and university shall establish institutional procedures which assure that each student enrolled in a course shall be provided a course syllabus within a maximum of one week from the first class meeting. When courses are offered in a condensed format, the time frame for distribution of the syllabus shall be adjusted accordingly.

**Part 4. Dissemination to College or University Administration.** The faculty member shall, upon request, provide a copy of the current course syllabus to the college or university administration according to institutional procedures.

## **1B.4 Access for Individuals with Disabilities**

### **Part 3. Availability and Notice.**

Each college and university shall post notices in an accessible format to the public describing 1) college or university prohibition against discrimination, and 2) college or university contact for requesting reasonable accommodation or information.

# **Title VI, Title IX, and Section 504 policy statement(s) of nondiscrimination**

## **B. POLICY DISSEMINATION**

### **Office of Civil Rights Guideline IV.(O):**

Requires colleges to issue public notification that all occupational and career opportunities will be offered without regard to race, color, national origin, sex, or handicap; and, if necessary, disseminate public notification materials in the language of persons of national origin.

## **GUIDELINE/STANDARD**

### **Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: 34 CFR 100.6**

Each college shall make available to participants, beneficiaries, and other interested persons such information regarding the provisions of this regulation.

### **Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972: 34 CFR 106.9**

Each college shall implement specific and continuing steps to notify applicants for admission and employment, students, and employees that it does not discriminate on the basis of sex in educational programs or activity which it operates.

## **ELEMENT OF PROOF**

College's documents and publications containing Title VI, Title IX, and Section 504 policy statement(s) of nondiscrimination.

Statement(s) or write-up(s) used to notify public of nondiscrimination in career and technical opportunities including date(s) issued.

List or example(s) of local newspapers, publications, and/or other media used to disseminate public notification.

## **EXHIBIT DOCUMENTATION**

Policy statement(s) of nondiscrimination for Title VI, Title IX, and Section 504 are disseminated on a **continuing** and **consistent** basis through:

- News media
- Student & employee handbooks
- Course catalogs
- Program/employee application forms
- Semester Course offering brochures/flyers
- Recruitment materials
- College Web site

GUIDELINE/STANDARD	ELEMENT OF PROOF	EXHIBIT DOCUMENTATION
<p><b>Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973: 34 CFR 104.8</b></p> <p>A college shall take appropriate initial and continuing steps to notify participants, beneficiaries, applicants, and employees, including those with impaired vision or hearing, and unions or professional organizations holding collective bargaining or professional agreements with the college that it does not discriminate on the basis of handicap. The notification shall state, where appropriate, that the college does not discriminate in admission or access to, or treatment or employment in, its program or activity.</p>	<p>Example(s) of public notification written in a language or media other than English if necessary.</p> <p>If college identifies a community of national origin minority persons with limited English language skills, public notification materials must be disseminated to the community in its native language.</p>	<p>Prior to the beginning of each academic year, the college advises students, employees, and the general public that all career and technical opportunities will be offered without regard to race, color, national origin, sex or disability. A brief summary of program offerings and admission criteria should be included in the announcement; also the name, address and telephone number of the person designated to coordinate Title IX and Section 504 compliance activity.</p>

GUIDELINE/STANDARD	ELEMENT OF PROOF	EXHIBIT DOCUMENTATION
<p><b>B. POLICY DISSEMINATION</b>  <b>OCR Guideline IV.(O)</b></p>		<p>Public notification is disseminated in a manner that is accessible to students, parents, employees and the general public that occupational and career opportunities will be offered without regard to race, color, national origin, sex or disability through publication in media that reach the general public, program beneficiaries, minorities, women, and disabled persons.</p> <p>Public notification is written in a language or media other than English, if population concentration warrants.</p> <p>Public notification includes an assurance that the lack of English skills should not be a barrier to admission and participation.</p>

## • Syllabus Review Form

• Faculty:  
Course:

Date:

• The syllabus is an expansion of the common course outline that includes details relevant to the instructor, course, semester offered and statements to comply with the OCR standards. Per MSCF contract and System Policy 3.22 the syllabus must be developed and disseminated during the first week of classes to all students registered in the course.

• Information items included in the course syllabus:

• Yes      No

- \_\_\_\_\_ Course description
- \_\_\_\_\_ Instructor contact information
- \_\_\_\_\_ Common course outline elements
- \_\_\_\_\_ Learning Outcomes
- \_\_\_\_\_ Readings/required textbooks
- \_\_\_\_\_ Methods of assessing student learning
- \_\_\_\_\_ Calendar of assignments/exams/due dates
- \_\_\_\_\_ Attendance policy
- \_\_\_\_\_ Grading policies/evaluation procedures
- \_\_\_\_\_ Statement of academic integrity
- \_\_\_\_\_ Statement of Diversity, ADA and Equal Opportunity
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other misc items

• Supervisor Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

The following items are for discussion between a supervisor and the faculty and should be evaluated by the supervisor using the scale provided. The supervisor will also use this form to summarize comments of the Performance Appraisal. This form also provides an opportunity for the faculty member to respond to those comments. This form will be placed in the personnel file at a date to be determined by the College. This review is being conducted according to System Policy 4.9, MN Statute 43A.20 and in compliance with HLC Criterion 3b.

1-Unsatisfactory    2-Marginal    3-Satisfactory    4-Above Average    5-Exceptional    NA-Not Applicable

- 1. Planning and Preparation (prepared and organized for class, meets deadlines, maintains appropriate records)
- 2. Knowledgeable Instruction (demonstrates knowledge of subject matter)
- 3. Instructional Support ( uses a variety of instructional techniques, is available to students outside of class for additional help and advising)
- 4. Classroom Management (communicates and enforces expectation for student behavior)
- 5. Classroom Organization (presents content in logical order, summarizes class objectives)
- 6. Interpersonal Skills (Extremely responsive to others. maintains high level rapport and professional relationships)
- 7. Professional Ethics and Integrity (exhibits high standard of professional ethics when dealing with colleagues, students, administration)
- 8. Assessment Techniques ( uses a variety of assessment techniques when evaluating learning or skill development)
- 9. Communication Technique ( gets students involved, solicits feedback and addresses questions)
- 10. Use of Technology (appropriately uses a variety of technology in the classroom)
- 11. Adhere to Policies ( follows system and college policies and procedures)
- 12. Professional Characteristics ( remains current in assigned field, participates in continuous improvement, receptive to suggestions to try new things)
- 13. Professional Portfolio ( Professional Development Plan, Self Evaluation, optional Tool Box items, evidence of continuing education, course workshops, publications, community involvement, committee work, new curriculum, innovative teaching techniques)
- 14. Syllabus Review (Refer to Syllabus Review Form)
- 15. Student Evaluations (Refer to data submitted)

## Post Portfolio Review Summative Commentary

---

Information Included in the Portfolio:

---

Supervisor's Summative Comments:

---

Faculty Summative Comments:

---

Faculty Signature :  
(I have read the above information)

Date:

Supervisor Signature : Date:

cc: Faculty Member, Personnel File

## Quality Matters Rubric Standards 2008-2010 edition with Assigned Point Values

	Standard	Points
Course Overview and Introduction	1.1 Instructions make clear how to get started and where to find various course components.	3
	1.2 A statement introduces the student to the purpose of the course and to its components; in the case of a hybrid course, the statement clarifies the relationship between the face-to-face and online components.	3
	1.3 Etiquette expectations (sometimes called "netiquette" for online discussions, email, and other forms of communication) are stated clearly.	1
	1.4 The self-introduction by the instructor is appropriate and available online.	1
	1.5 Students are asked to introduce themselves to the class.	1
	1.6 Minimum student preparation, and, if applicable, prerequisite knowledge in the discipline are clearly stated.	1
	1.7 Minimum technical skills expected of the student are clearly stated.	1
Learning Objectives	2.1 The course learning objectives describe outcomes that are measurable.	3
	2.2 The module/unit learning objectives describe outcomes that are measurable and consistent with the course-level objectives.	3
	2.3 All learning objectives are stated clearly and written from the students' perspective.	3
	2.4 Instructions to students on how to meet the learning objectives are adequate and stated clearly.	3
	2.5 The learning objectives are appropriately designed for the level of the course.	2
Assessment and Measurement	3.1 The types of assessments selected measure the stated learning objectives and are consistent with course activities and resources.	3
	3.2 The course grading policy is stated clearly.	3
	3.3 Specific and descriptive criteria are provided for the evaluation of students' work and participation.	3
	3.4 The assessment instruments selected are sequenced, varied, and appropriate to the content being assessed.	2
	3.5 "Self check" or practice assignments are provided with timely feedback to students.	2
Resources and Materials	4.1 The instructional materials contribute to the achievement of the stated course and module/unit learning objectives.	3
	4.2 The relationship between the instructional materials and the learning activities is clearly explained to the student.	3
	4.3 The instructional materials have sufficient breadth, depth, and currency for the student to learn the subject.	2
	4.4 All resources and materials used in the course are appropriately cited.	1
Learner Engagement	5.1 The learning activities promote the achievement of the stated learning objectives.	3
	5.2 Learning activities foster instructor-student, content student, and if appropriate to the course, student-student interaction.	3
	5.3 Clear standards are set for instructor responsiveness and availability (turn-around time for email, grade posting, etc.)	2
	5.4 The requirements for student interaction are clearly articulated.	2
Course Technology	6.1 The tools and media support the learning objectives, and are appropriately chosen to deliver the content of the course.	2
	6.2 The tools and media support student engagement and guide the student to become an active learner.	3
	6.3 Navigation throughout the online components of the course is logical, consistent, and efficient.	3
	6.4 Students have ready access to the technologies required in the course.	2
	6.5 The course components are compatible with current standards for delivery modes.	1
	6.6 Instructions on how to access resources at a distance are sufficient and easy to understand.	1
	6.7 The course design takes full advantage of available tools and media.	1
Learner Support	7.1 Course instructions articulate or link to clear description of the technical support offered.	2
	7.2 Course instructions articulate or link to an explanation of how the institution's academic support system can assist the student in effectively using the resources provided.	3
	7.3 Course instructions articulate or link to an explanation of how the institution's student support services can help students reach their educational goals.	1
	7.4 Course instructions answer basic questions related to research, writing, technology, etc., or link to tutorials or other resources that provide the information.	1
Accessibility	8.1 The course incorporates ADA standards and reflect conformance with institutional policy regarding accessibility in online and hybrid courses.	3
	8.2 Course pages and course materials provide equivalent alternatives to auditory and visual content.	2
	8.3 Course pages have links that are self-describing and meaningful.	2
	8.4 The course ensures screen readability.	1

To meet Quality Matters review expectations a course must: Answer each of the 30 point-based standards to 80% or better points.

MyLaurelOnline, Inc. ©2009. All rights reserved. Please contact LaurelOnline, Inc. ([www.qualitymatters.org](http://www.qualitymatters.org)) for information or reprint permission.

# **Classroom Observation of Instruction**

## **Peer-to-Peer Review Form**

Faculty:

Course:

Room:

Date:

Time:

How would you rate the faculty's :

1. Statement of the purpose of the lesson?	Excellent	A	B	C	D	E	poor
2. Knowledge of the subject matter	Excellent	A	B	C	D	E	poor
3. Ability to communicate subject matter?	Excellent	A	B	C	D	E	poor
4. Respect and concern for students?	Excellent	A	B	C	D	E	poor
5. Ability to encourage active student engagement in the lesson?	Excellent	A	B	C	D	E	poor
6. Organization of the lesson?	Excellent	A	B	C	D	E	poor
7. Use of a variety of teaching strategies and techniques	Excellent	A	B	C	D	E	poor
8. Expectations of the students?	Realistic	A	B	C	D	E	unrealistic
9. Summary statement at the close of the lesson?	Excellent	A	B	C	D	E	poor
10. Overall, how would you rate the faculty's teaching effectiveness?	Excellent	A	B	C	D	E	poor

# Comments.....Questions.....

## Luoma Leadership Action Learning Project Team

Laurie J. Becker - MSC-ST

Jo Poncelet - MSC-ST

Jeff Judge -Normandale CC

Todd Digby - Office of the Chancellor

Rhonda Bender - Northwest TC