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Using Formative Assessment for Summative Assessment

Selecting evidence from formative assessments

- **Courses.** Evidence of changes in:
  - Teaching (e.g., pedagogy, assignments)
  - Students (e.g., behavior, learning, attitudes)

- **Department.** Evidence of contributions to:
  - Course & curriculum improvements
  - Student learning outcomes in the program

- **College, Institution & Discipline.** Evidence of:
  - Participation and use of teaching resources
  - Development/Dissemination of resources

Kennesaw State University’s model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Scholarly Work in all areas of faculty performance</th>
<th>Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness</th>
<th>Pedagogical Skills</th>
<th>Professionalism</th>
<th>Assessment of Student Learning</th>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>Reflective Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity and Relevance of Goals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery of Existing Knowledge</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Communication</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Results</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistently Ethical Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Documenting Teaching Effectiveness

**Students:** Student ratings of teaching; Focus groups

**Peers (Internal/External) & Chairs:** Classroom observation; Review of course materials; Contributions to course or curriculum development; SoTL reviews; Teaching awards

**Self:** Teaching philosophy; Narrative on teaching; Participation in professional development; SoTL
Qualities of Master Teachers (Buskist, et al. 2002)

Accessible
Approachable/Personable
Authoritative
Confident
Creative/Interesting
Effective Communicator
Encourages/Cares for Students
Enthusiastic
Establishes Goals
Flexible/Open Minded
Good Listener
Happy/Positive/Humorous
Humble
Knowledgeable
Prepared
Presents Current Information
Professional
Promotes Class Discussion
Promotes Critical Thinking
Provides Constructive Feedback
Manages Class time
Rapport
Realistic Expectations/Fair Respectful
Sensitive/Persistent
Strives to be Better Teacher
Technologically Competent
Understanding

Students' Top 10
1. Realistic Expectations/Fair (9)
2. Knowledgeable (1)
3. Understanding (21)
4. Approachable/Personable (5)
5. Respectful (7)
6. Creative/Interesting (8)
7. Happy/Positive/Humorous (27)
8. Encourages/Cares for Students (12)
9. Flexible/Open Minded (13)
10. Enthusiastic (2)

Faculty's Top 10
1. Knowledgeable (2)
2. Enthusiastic (10)
3. Promotes Critical Thinking (23.5)
4. Prepared (20)
5. Approachable/Personable (4)
6. Master Communicator (15)
7. Respectful (5)
8. Creative/Interesting (6)
9. Realistic Expectations/Fair (1)
10. Presents Current Information (23.5)

Feldman's meta-analysis of student ratings & achievement

Shares 30-35% of variance with student achievement

1. Teacher’s preparation; organization of the course 20. 4
2. Clarity and understandableness 15. 6

Shares 20-25% of variance with student achievement

3. Teacher pursued and/or met course objectives 18. 19
4. Perceived outcome or impact of instruction – –

Shares 10-15% of variance with student achievement

5. Teacher’s stimulation of interest in the course & subject – –
6. Teacher motivates students to do their best 8. 12
7. Teacher’s encouragement of questions; openness 9. 13
8. Teacher’s availability and helpfulness 12. 11
9. Teacher’s elocutionary skills 15. 6
10. Clarity of course objectives and requirements 1. 9
11. Teacher’s knowledge of the subject 2. 1

Criteria and Benchmarks
Chapter 6 from NRC (2003)

- Knowledge of and enthusiasm for subject matter
- Skill, experience, and creativity with a range of appropriate pedagogies and technologies
- Understanding of and skill in using appropriate testing practices
- Professional interactions with students within and beyond the classroom
- Involvement with and contributions to one’s profession in enhancing teaching and learning

http://tinyurl.com/NRC-Criteria
March 2009 Revised Draft Recommendations from Kennesaw State University's Ad Hoc Committee on Appraising Teaching Effectiveness

Provost Black has charged the committee to develop recommendations concerning institutional policies and criteria for appraising teaching effectiveness for formative assessment (e.g., faculty professional development) and summative assessment (e.g., annual review, promotion and tenure decisions). During Fall 2008, committee members reviewed literature on teaching effectiveness and examples from other institutions and distributed a draft of its preliminary recommendations in December 2008 for faculty input. In January and February 2009, the committee reviewed faculty input and revised its recommendations. The committee intends to seek additional faculty input on its revised recommendations during April 2009 and submit its final recommendations to Faculty Senate by August 2009. What follows are the committee’s draft recommendations as of March 2009.

BROAD AND SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR APPRAISING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Chapter 5 Section IV.B. of the Faculty Handbook identifies five broad criteria for evaluating the quality and significance of scholarly work “that apply equally to all areas of faculty performance” including teaching effectiveness: Clarity and Relevance of Goals, Mastery of Existing Knowledge, Effectiveness of Communication, Significance of Results and Consistently Ethical Behavior. In the context of teaching, the University adopts the following five specific criteria for use in appraising teaching effectiveness, each of which exemplifies one or more of the broad criteria in the Faculty Handbook:

1. **Pedagogical Skills** that exemplify Mastery of Existing Knowledge, Effectiveness of Communication, and Significance of Results (e.g., Demonstrates skill, experience and creativity with a range of appropriate pedagogies and technologies; Designs courses to meet student needs at their developmental level in the subject/profession; Communicates effectively; Manages class time well; Provides effective mentoring and/or supervision of students)

2. **Professionalism** that exemplifies Consistently Ethical behavior (e.g., Demonstrates concern and respect for student welfare, learning and development; Demonstrates fairness and consistency; Is approachable and accessible to students; Upholds academic integrity)

3. **Assessment of Student Learning** that exemplifies Mastery of Existing Knowledge and Significance of Results (e.g., Gives timely feedback designed to help students improve; Conducts examinations and assignments that are fair and appropriate for the desired learning outcomes; Uses a variety of strategies to assess student learning; Documents the extent to which students achieve the learning outcomes and shares this information as appropriate for the assessment of the course or program)

4. **Professional Development** that exemplifies Clarity and Relevance of Goals and Mastery of Existing Knowledge (e.g., Pursues appropriate professional development opportunities and integrates into instruction; Stays current with practice, trends and issues related to the courses taught; Contributes to professional dialogue on teaching; Conducts research, presents, and publishes Scholarship of Teaching and Learning)

5. **Reflective Practice** that exemplifies Clarity and Relevance of Goals and Effective Communication (e.g., Uses the results of assessments to improve the quality of instruction; Examines and improves the methods of student assessment; Adjusts teaching practices based on relevant evaluations from students, peers, and/or Chair)

Each Chair should consider the quality of a faculty member’s teaching with respect to the five criteria.

---

1 A few examples of each criterion appear in parentheses. The list of examples is neither proscriptive nor exhaustive but illustrative of how faculty members may make a case for their teaching effectiveness. Refer to Appendix 2 for further discussion of how the five specific criteria connect to the five broad criteria.
MEASURES AND DOCUMENTATION OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

In order to make a strong case for their teaching effectiveness, faculty members should consider these five criteria when writing narratives and selecting supporting documents in their annual reviews and applications for promotion and tenure. Each faculty member has the flexibility to address any combination of the five criteria in the annual review document (ARD) and portfolios for third-year and post-tenure reviews. Each faculty member should address all five criteria in the promotion and tenure portfolio.

Kennesaw State University requires all faculty members to collect feedback from students in each course via student ratings of teaching (SRTs). However, judgments of teaching effectiveness (i.e., meeting, exceeding, and not meeting expectations) cannot be solely based on SRTs and require each faculty member to collect and discuss additional measures that address the five criteria. SRTs can provide only partial information concerning the faculty member’s Pedagogical Skills, Professionalism, and Assessment of Student Learning. In addition, SRTs cannot address the faculty member’s Professional Development or Reflective Practice.

Below is a partial list of suggested measures of teaching effectiveness to collect and discuss in addition to the student ratings of teaching. Faculty members should incorporate a combination of some of these or similar methods to make the case for effective teaching. Note that some methods may address more than one criterion. In all instances, it is incumbent upon the faculty member to articulate clearly the relevance of the methods selected and documentation provided for assessing the quality and significance of teaching effectiveness.

**In addition to student ratings of teaching, suggested measures and documentation for appraising teaching effectiveness may include, but are not limited to, the following:**

**Pedagogical Skills**

- Samples of Course Materials: Syllabi (including daily/weekly schedule outlining content, course readings, resources, materials, standards, learning outcomes, activities, exams, project guidelines, etc.).
- Peer evaluation of classroom performance and/or course materials
- Explanation of situational context and impact on pedagogy (e.g., special courses such as large lecture courses, lab, and/or studio courses).
- Self-report on pedagogies and technologies used in the classroom (can discuss diversity of techniques and innovation).
- Explanation of quality and significance of administration and/or coordination activities, along with materials developed and commentary from faculty and/or students involved.
- Reports on students mentored and/or supervised (and in what contexts: e.g., undergraduate, graduate, research, studio, lab, teaching, clinical work).
- Written comments on teaching, mentoring, and/or supervising from students, community partners, clients—solicited or otherwise.
- Examples of student work completed under teacher’s supervision, along with descriptions of venues for presentation and any recognition.
- Letters from students commenting on mentoring/supervising that indicate how the mentoring has influence student learning.
- Letters attesting to impact of guest presentations in classes (at KSU and/or elsewhere)
- Excerpts of books, websites, or other teaching materials generated, and any letters attesting to quality/impact of those materials.
Professionalism
- Peer evaluation of classroom performance.
- Examples of work with other KSU offices (e.g., Writing Center, Library, Learning Communities, Career Center/Experiential Learning) to support teaching and student learning.
- Written comments/letters on teaching, mentoring, and/or supervising from students, community partners, clients—solicited or otherwise.
- Responses to student feedback (e.g., from student ratings of teaching, consultations with peers or chairs about student concerns)

Assessment of Student Learning
- Samples of assessments (exams, project guidelines and rubrics).
- Samples of feedback provided to students to promote learning.
- Trend data showing the impact of the teacher on student learning (e.g., includes pre- and post-tests).
- Samples of student work demonstrating student learning.
- Examples of work with other KSU offices (e.g., Writing Center, Library, Learning Communities, Career Center/Experiential Learning) to support teaching and student learning.
- Examples of any local, regional, and/or critical review and recognition of student work.

Professional Development
- Seminars attended or conducted on teaching, including description of new approaches learned from workshops or descriptions of how ideas have been incorporated into teaching.
- Examples of collaboration with faculty at KSU or elsewhere to support teaching.
- Examples/explanations about faculty colleagues mentored on teaching, including comments from colleagues about shared work.
- Evidence/explanation of participation in learning communities, book clubs, and list serves.
- Conference programs/descriptions for presentations, letters, or other evaluations of quality of presentations; samples of presentation notes or published proceedings.
- Explanation of quality and significance of department, school, college, and/or university teaching committees or presentations at KSU.
- Grant proposals, reviewer feedback on proposals, copies of articles, book chapters, texts, submitted and published.

Reflective Practice
- Internal or external teaching awards or nominations for teaching awards.
- Publication(s) or other research/presentations on teaching (Scholarship of Teaching and Learning).
- Explanation of external funding of proposals/awards related to teaching.
- Statements from professional societies, or honors/awards for contributions.
STUDENT RATINGS OF TEACHING (SRTs)

In the University System of Georgia’s Academic Handbook, Policy 803.07 states that “Each institution, as part of its evaluative procedures, will utilize a written system of faculty evaluations by students, with the improvement of teaching effectiveness as the main focus of these student evaluations.” Kennesaw State University collects feedback from students via student ratings of teaching (SRTs) and encourages faculty members and their chairs to treat SRTs as one source of data to consider in context with other data about the faculty member’s teaching effectiveness. SRTs are not sufficient as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness, and they are not appropriate for use in direct comparisons among faculty members. In order to keep the focus of SRTs on the improvement of teaching effectiveness rather than comparisons among faculty members, data from closed-ended questions (where students selected from a limited number of alternative responses) should be reported as frequency distributions (e.g., numbers and percentages of students who selected each alternative) and not as arithmetic means or other average ratings.

Faculty members will collect SRTs from students in each course each semester. SRTs will include, at minimum, the following six questions:

1. Overall, I would rate the quality of teaching in this course as effective.
   A. Strongly Agree     B. Agree     C. Disagree     D. Strongly Disagree     E. Neither agree nor disagree

2. What were the instructor's strengths?

3. What are ways the instructor might improve?

4. Overall, I am satisfied with this course.
   A. Strongly Agree     B. Agree     C. Disagree     D. Strongly Disagree     E. Neither agree nor disagree

5. Identify the aspects of the course that most contributed to your learning (include examples of specific materials, exercises, and/or feedback).

6. Identify the aspects of the course that might be improved (include examples of specific materials, exercises, and/or feedback).

Data collected from the SRTs will be made available to the faculty member, Chair, and Dean for use during formative and summative evaluation. In their annual review documents, faculty members should include frequency data from Questions 1 and 4 above collected from the SRTs in each course taught during the semesters covered in the review, and they should discuss these data in their annual review narratives. Faculty members are also encouraged, but not required, to provide summaries and discussion of student responses to Questions 2, 3, 5, and 6 from the SRTs in their annual review narratives.

In addition to these six questions, programs, departments, or colleges2 may include additional questions in the SRTs for the purposes of formative development of faculty or for assessment of the course or program. These additional questions may vary from semester to semester depending on the specific evaluation needs of the program, department, or college3. These additional questions could consider the following:

- Instructor characteristics (e.g. organization, clarity, intellectual stimulation, rapport, and feedback)

---

2 Note that the decision on the questions to appear on the SRTs occurs at the level of the program, department, or college, not at the level of an individual faculty member. Individual faculty members are encouraged to collect additional feedback from students separate from the SRTs; they may use this additional feedback for their own formative development, and they may report on their use of this feedback as appropriate in their ARDs and P&T applications.

3 The College of Humanities and Social Sciences is currently using a Teaching Effectiveness Form, which is available at hss.kennesaw.edu/resources/. The Coles College of Business developed a form using Digital Measures and allows public viewing of data by course or instructor at tinyurl.com/ColesStudentFeedbackSurvey.
• Course characteristics (e.g. learning objectives, course materials, workload, assessments, and instructional technology)
• Special class organizations (e.g. hybrid, online, lab, seminar, clinical, performing/studio arts, activity, and field experiences such as practicums, internships, and student teaching)
• Contextual characteristics (e.g. level or type of course, reason for enrollment, student attendance, student involvement in course, expected grade)\textsuperscript{4}

Faculty members are encouraged, but not required, to provide summaries and discussion of student responses to the optional questions from the SRTs in their annual review narratives.

**ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE**

The committee will develop the following recommendations further prior to its August 2009 report.

**ONLINE SYSTEM FOR COLLECTING DATA FROM STUDENT RATINGS OF TEACHING**

The committee strongly encourages the University (or each College) to explore the use of an online system for collecting response to SRTs (e.g., via a contract with a secure outside vendor to administer the data collection, analysis, and reporting of SRT data). The committee further recommends that, during the first few years of transition from a paper system to an online system for SRTs, the University (or each College) cautiously interpret the data from the online system (e.g., by examining any changes in the rates of student participation and the stability of patterns of student responses).

**TRAINING FOR DEANS, CHAIRS AND FACULTY MEMBERS**

The committee recommends that the University offer workshops to train Deans, Chairs, and faculty members on the appropriate use and interpretation of data from student ratings of teaching (SRTs) and additional measures of teaching effectiveness.

\textsuperscript{4} Several universities have developed pools of questions that programs, college, and departments might consider when developing their own forms. Some universities allow other institutions to adapt their items, while others have copyright protections. For more information, contact KSU’s Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, cetl@kennesaw.edu.
Appendix 1: Information about the Committee

Ad-Hoc University Committee for Appraising Teaching Effectiveness

This institutional-wide committee will review our current University-wide policy and recommend revisions to it based upon a review of existing research on assessing teaching effectiveness. Once they have preliminary recommendations, the committee should schedule multiple open forums for faculty and student input prior to submitting a final recommendation to appropriate governance groups.

Committee Charge:

This committee is to review the current university-wide system for assessing teaching effectiveness through a combination of student perceptions [conforming to Policy 803.07 from Section 4.08 of the Academic Affairs Handbook from the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (http://www.usg.edu/academics/handbook/section4/4.08.phtml)] and additional research-based teaching evaluation methods that:

(a) focus on research-based "best practices" for assessing teacher effectiveness in different teaching contexts (i.e., on-ground, hybrid/blended, online);

(b) permit Colleges and Departments flexibility to assess teacher effectiveness in ways that honor discipline-specific conventions for course content and delivery methods (e.g., lecture, seminar, laboratory);

(c) make a clear distinction between how evaluation data should be used for formative and summative evaluation;

(d) make recommendations as to strategies for assessing differential levels of teaching effectiveness; and

(e) use technology effectively and efficiently to collect, analyze, and disseminate data. This charge includes exploring university-wide options for establishing online evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Representative unit</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flageolle, Molly</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Student Representative (Fall 2008)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mflageol@students.kennesaw.edu">mflageol@students.kennesaw.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagin, Steve</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Department of English</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shagin@kennesaw.edu">shagin@kennesaw.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King-McKenzie, Ethel</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Department of Elementary &amp; Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Bagwell College of Education</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ekingmck@kennesaw.edu">ekingmck@kennesaw.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, Scott</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
<td>College of Science and Mathematics</td>
<td><a href="mailto:slewis57@kennesaw.edu">slewis57@kennesaw.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matson, Ron</td>
<td>Chair, Department of Biology and Physics</td>
<td>Chairs Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmatson@kennesaw.edu">rmatson@kennesaw.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pusateri, Tom (Chair)</td>
<td>CETL Associate Director for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tpusater@kennesaw.edu">tpusater@kennesaw.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall, Chris</td>
<td>CETL Associate Director for Technology Enhanced Learning</td>
<td>Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning</td>
<td><a href="mailto:crandal2@kennesaw.edu">crandal2@kennesaw.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Karen</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Department of Theatre and Performance Studies</td>
<td>College of the Arts</td>
<td><a href="mailto:krobins1@kennesaw.edu">krobins1@kennesaw.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robley, Lois</td>
<td>Professor, School of Nursing</td>
<td>College of Health and Human Services</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lrobley@kennesaw.edu">lrobley@kennesaw.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Debbie</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Department of University Studies</td>
<td>University College</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dsmith1@kennesaw.edu">dsmith1@kennesaw.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Susan Kirkpatrick</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Department of Geography and Anthropology</td>
<td>College of Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>ss <a href="mailto:smith1@kennesaw.edu">smith1@kennesaw.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart, Randy</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Department of Marketing and Professional Sales</td>
<td>Coles College of Business</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rstuart@kennesaw.edu">rstuart@kennesaw.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Connections between the Broad and Specific Criteria for the Quality and Significance of Teaching Effectiveness

The Faculty Handbook defines each of the broad criteria for the quality and significance of a faculty member’s scholarly work. This appendix provides those definitions and describes the connections between the broad and specific criteria for teaching effectiveness.

Clarity and Relevance of Goals: “Faculty members should clearly define the goals of scholarly work in [teaching],” which they may demonstrate via Reflective Practice, Professional Development, or both.

- Faculty members may demonstrate their goals of teaching in the narratives they include in their annual review documents (ARDs) and their applications for promotion and tenure (P&T). The quality of the narrative is the primary evidence for the faculty member’s Reflective Practice of teaching.
- Faculty members may also refine their goals by participating in Professional Development (PD) related to teaching. In their narratives, they may indicate participation in workshops, seminars, or other professional development opportunities, and they may describe how their goals have changed as result of their participation, using supporting documentation such as revisions to syllabi, instructional materials, or course assessments.

Mastery of Existing Knowledge: “Faculty members must be well-prepared and knowledgeable about developments in the relevant context of their [teaching],” which they may demonstrate by documenting Pedagogical Skills, Assessments, or Professional Development.

- Faculty members may demonstrate mastery of existing knowledge by articulating the connections between the learning objectives, instructional materials, and assessment of student learning in their courses.
- The context of the teaching environment may also include an understanding of how students learn. Faculty may demonstrate their understanding of the student learning process by indicating their participation in professional development opportunities related to teaching, describing how they have incorporated what they have learned from professional development opportunities or through their own work in the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Effectiveness of Communication: “Faculty members should communicate effectively with their audiences and subject their ideas to critical inquiry and independent review.” The audiences for teaching include students, peers, and chairs. Faculty may demonstrate their effectiveness of communication via Pedagogical Skills, Reflective Practice, or both:

- Students may provide feedback on a faculty member’s Pedagogical Skills by their responses on the student ratings of teaching forms.
- Peers and chairs may provide feedback on a faculty member’s Pedagogical Skills by classroom observation, review of course materials (e.g., syllabi, course activities, assignments, organization of course Web sites), or contributions to course/curriculum development.
- Faculty members may demonstrate Reflective Practice by commenting on how they used feedback from students, peers, and chairs to improve the effectiveness of communication in their courses.
Significance of Results: “Faculty members should demonstrate the extent to which they achieve their expressed goals and to which their scholarly accomplishment(s) may have had significant professional impact.” In the context of teaching, the most direct evidence of results involves Assessment of Student Learning and Reflective Practice. Faculty members may also provide indirect evidence of their Pedagogical Skills that support student learning.

- Faculty members may use pretest/posttest comparisons, representative examples of student work, or other evidence of student learning.
- Faculty members may include publications or presentations in scholarship of teaching and learning, evidence of awards, honors, or external funding related to teaching.
- Faculty members may provide examples and discuss how their assignments and scoring rubrics are connected to the learning outcomes for their courses.
- Faculty members may use indirect evidence from student ratings of teaching and peer review of their course materials that pertain to the quality of learning in their courses.

Consistently Ethical Behavior: “Faculty members should conduct their work with honesty, integrity, and objectivity. They should foster a respectful relationship with students, community participants, colleagues, and others who participate in or benefit from their work. Faculty members should uphold recognized standards for academic integrity.” This can be demonstrated through student or peer (including chair) ratings of the faculty member’s Professionalism.

- Faculty members may use responses from student ratings of teaching that pertain to the quality of interactions with students in and out of the classroom.
- Faculty members may also use comments from peers to demonstrate their professionalism.
- Chairs or deans may evaluate a faculty member’s professionalism based on feedback from students.

The table on the next page further indicates the connections between the broad criteria, specific criteria, and suggested measures and documentation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity and Relevance of Goals</th>
<th>Pedagogical Skills</th>
<th>Professionalism</th>
<th>Assessment of Student Learning</th>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>Reflective Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Connections between learning objectives, instructional materials, and course assessments.</td>
<td>* Revisions to course goals, syllabi, instructional materials, or assessments as a result of professional development.</td>
<td>* Connections between learning objectives, instructional materials, and course assessments.</td>
<td>* Quality of ARD and P&amp;T narratives on teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery of Existing Knowledge</td>
<td>* Student feedback (e.g., student ratings of teaching, feedback from advisees or supervised students). * Peer or Chair feedback (e.g., observations of classes; review of course materials; contributions to course or curriculum committees).</td>
<td>* Incorporation of professional development on student learning into teaching. * Participation in the scholarship of teaching and learning.</td>
<td>* Description of how a faculty member incorporated feedback from students, peers, or chairs to improve their communication skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Communication</td>
<td>* Examples of assignments and scoring rubrics. * Student feedback (from student ratings of teaching, feedback from advisees or supervised students). * Peer or Chair review of course materials.</td>
<td>* Representative examples of student work. * Pretest-posttest comparisons or other evidence of student learning.</td>
<td>* Publications or presentations in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning * Teaching awards or other honors for teaching contributions * External funding related to teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Results</td>
<td>* Student feedback (e.g., student ratings of teaching). * Peer or chair feedback (e.g., observation of classes; interactions with students) * Work with other KSU offices (e.g., Writing Center, Library, Learning Communities)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistently Ethical Behavior</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>