

**MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** December 1, 2009  
**TO:** CAHNRS Department Chairs and R&E Directors  
**FROM:** Kimberlee Kidwell, Associate Dean; Dan Bernardo, Dean  
**SUBJECT:** Guidelines for Assessing Teaching Performance for Annual Review

The annual review process creates an opportunity for chairs to acknowledge excellent contributions to teaching, as well as to work with faculty to address concerns related to teaching performance. In order for us to continue to strive for excellence in teaching in CAHNRS, we request that you address **the following questions/issues with faculty during the annual review process:**

1. Discuss the major contributions of the faculty member to teaching and/or supporting academic programs in 2009. Include efforts that extend beyond classroom delivery when appropriate (i.e. participation in student recruitment, service as undergrad or grad coordinator, advising, sponsoring undergrad research, internship support, etc.).
2. Discuss whether the course load and contributions of the faculty member to academic programs align with their appointment split (use the recently developed course delivery document to frame expectations). If not, identify specific adjustments that will be made to align the faculty member's appointment split with their contribution to academic programs.
3. Discuss the assessment plan or strategy that is being used by the faculty member to evaluate each of their courses. For example, how does the faculty member gather feedback about their courses from students and peers? How does the faculty member determine whether the goals of their courses align with the academic program goals of the department?
4. Utilize as many performance measures as possible when evaluating teaching performance. Do not simply rely on student evaluation results. Other performance measures might include peer evaluations, student feedback from exit interviews, teaching materials employed in the course, and the use of innovative instructional methods.
5. Review student and peer evaluation results with faculty to identify adjustment opportunities. For example, if a rating is low, or specific issues or concerns are identified in the peer or student comments, create a strategy with the faculty member to address these concerns. Include an action plan and timeframe for making each adjustment, and an assessment plan for determining whether the adjustment improved results (i.e. how will the faculty member know their effectiveness is improving?).
6. If the faculty member is struggling in the classroom, proactively engage with them to create an action plan outlining what they will do to improve their results. Examples: Identify workshops provided by the newly formed Office of Assessment and Innovation (OAI), CAHNRS, etc. that the faculty member will participate in before the next review cycle. Identify a mentor to support the faculty member with improving their teaching ability. Ask the faculty member to witness excellent instructors in action to identify successful strategies that they might find useful in their classrooms.
7. If a faculty member's teaching performance does not meet expectations, their rating for the teaching portion of their annual review must be below a 3.0. Our goal is to raise the bar to "good" for all instructors in CAHNRS. We can accomplish this by sending a unified message through the annual review process emphasizing that mediocre teaching is not acceptable in this college. Concerns, plans of action and timelines must be noted in the annual review statement to ensure that expectations have been clearly defined for the faculty member.