

DEPARTMENT EVALUATION PLAN
Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders

**PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF FACULTY
AND INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF**

2006-2007

This Department Evaluation Plan (DEP) describes procedures to be used in the periodic performance review of faculty and instructional academic staff in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders. Reviews are conducted with individual faculty and staff for the purposes of personnel decisions and professional development. All tenure line faculty and academic staff with renewable contracts are reviewed according to this DEP.

The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) of the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders is charged with the responsibility of overseeing Departmental personnel policies and procedures. Subsequent sections of this Plan address the Committee's philosophy underlying performance reviews, the composition of the Committee and its role in reviews, performance review categories and criteria, specific review procedures, and procedures for modifying the Department Evaluation Plan.

PHILOSOPHY UNDERLYING PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

Performance reviews are driven by both institutional and individual goals. On an institutional level, reviews are intended to ensure high quality educational programs by retaining and rewarding excellence of professional staff. On an individual level, performance reviews are intended to facilitate each faculty member's professional development. The DPC views these review goals as inter-related. Reviews that enhance individual professional personnel development contribute to positive personnel decisions, which, in turn, maintain and improve the quality of educational programs.

While performance reviews are mandated by the University, it is left to departments to specify the ways in which reviews will be conducted and the procedures that will be used to gauge progress toward institutional and individual goals. In the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, the DPC affirms the belief that performance reviews should serve both institutional and individual goals. Toward that end, the Committee endorses the philosophy that both summative and formative procedures should be used. Although both types of procedures involve an evaluative element, each serves different goals. Summative procedures primarily address institutional goals in that they lead to specific personnel decisions regarding re-appointment, promotion, and/or tenure. Formative procedures primarily address individual goals in that they focus on the professional development of individual faculty.

Departmental performance review procedures are consistent with the rules and criteria articulated in the University of Wisconsin—Eau Claire *Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook* (21st Ed., Oct. 2004). However, regardless of the procedures used, the DPC considers all performance reviews to be "peer reviews," because all review activities are conducted by and/or with professional peers and colleagues of the person being reviewed.

THE DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

All recommendations related to personnel policy and actions originate at the Department level and are reviewed at appropriate administrative levels. Recommendations made by the DPC are submitted to the Department Chair who, in turn, submits his or her recommendations together with the DPC recommendations to the Dean of the College of Education and Human Sciences. Following review by the Dean, recommendations are submitted to the Vice Chancellor, the Chancellor, and the Board of Regents, if Regent approval is required.

The DPC consists of all tenured faculty, excluding the Department Chair, with an appointment of 50% or more in the Department. The DPC will select a Chair and Secretary at the end of each academic year for the coming year. In the

event that fewer than three tenured faculty members, excluding the Chair, are employed in the Department, no DPC will exist; the Department Chair will perform all activities normally assigned to the Committee. In the absence of a DPC, all tenured faculty will serve the Department Chair in an advisory or assistive capacity with respect to personnel matters.

Tenured faculty who have participated in activities of the DPC for at least two years prior to going on leave (e.g., sabbatical leave) may participate in performance review activities if they choose to do so. Collaborative planning by the DPC, the Department Chair, and the tenured faculty member on leave will lead to specification of that faculty member's participation in performance review activities during the leave.

The DPC, in consultation with the entire Departmental faculty and instructional academic staff, make policy recommendations, such as the formulation of the Department Evaluation Plan (DEP). However, the Committee's role in performance reviews varies as a function of the type of review being conducted.

Summative reviews are conducted for re-appointment, rehire, and tenure recommendations according to the University schedule with the DPC working as a committee-of-the-whole. A sub-committee of the DPC comprised of all tenured faculty members, excluding the Department Chair, above the rank to which promotion is sought, considers recommendations for promotions. In the absence of three eligible faculty members, the Department Chair will conduct the review in consultation with all eligible faculty.

Formative reviews are conducted in both the pre- and post-tenure periods. In the pre-tenure period, formative reviews may be conducted, at the discretion of the faculty member, at the time of regularly scheduled performance reviews. In the post-tenure period, formative and summative strategies comprise the procedures used in all post-tenure peer reviews. For formative reviews, the faculty or instructional academic staff member being reviewed will invite individual members of the DPC to work on the review committee. The DPC, working as a committee-of-the-whole, acknowledges completion of post-tenure formative reviews. The summative elements should include: Purdue summaries for all courses taught during the period under review for which the faculty member was responsible for the majority of the course; student written remarks for these same courses; observation summaries from a DPC member for each course taught in the semester of review for which the faculty member was responsible for the majority of the course; any evidence or documentation the faculty member wishes to submit to support the decision at hand.

All meetings of the DPC are to be announced in accord with Wisconsin open meetings and open records laws. The person being reviewed may request, and will be granted, an opportunity to meet with the DPC during the review process, or the DPC may request that the individual being reviewed meet with the Committee.

All votes pertaining to a personnel action will be conducted by voice, by show of hands, by signed ballot, or by roll call. If any member of the voting body requests a roll call or signed ballot vote, then the vote must be conducted in that manner. In the case of signed ballot or roll call, the name and specific vote cast by each voting member must be recorded, preserved, and be available for public inspection. **The minutes of each DPC meeting will record the actions taken by the committee along with the vote and when appropriate, the individual votes of all members present.**

In reporting the results of any personnel action requiring a vote, the vote count (votes for, votes against, votes abstaining) will be recorded on the appropriate official personnel form. That form will be provided to the individual under consideration in the personnel action at the same time that it is forwarded to the next appropriate administrative level (Chair, Dean, etc.). **When an official personnel form has not been specified, the actions of the DPC will be communicated to the individual under consideration and the next appropriate administrator through a narrative letter composed by the Chair and the Secretary of the DPC.**

PERFORMANCE REVIEW CATEGORIES AND PROCEDURES: FACULTY

Review Categories

The University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire personnel rules provide that the review of faculty performance shall include, but not be limited to, consideration of the following categories: Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly Activity, Academic Advising, and Service.

- **Teaching Effectiveness** is defined as “the success of the instructor in securing interest, effort, and progress on the part of students. The primary consideration is that students are stimulated to better standards of scholarship, to keener interest in learning, to greater professional understanding, and to more effective effort toward self-improvement” (University of Wisconsin--Eau Claire, *Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook*, 2004, p. 5.19).
- **Scholarly Activity** is defined as “scholarship of a live and progressive character, manifested by continued study, scholarly interests, research, productive and creative work, and professional participation and performance” (University of Wisconsin—Eau Claire, *Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook*, 2004, p. 5.19).
- **Academic Advising Ability** is defined as “the effectiveness of the instructor in providing ongoing consultation for the student; in referring students to appropriate sources of assistance when necessary; in assisting the student in the development of a comprehensive long-range academic and career plan and the selection of each semester’s courses; and in monitoring the student’s progress toward the fulfillment of all applicable requirements” (University of Wisconsin—Eau Claire, *Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook*, 2004, p. 5.19). All full-time faculty will be assigned advisees starting in the second year of employment in the Department.
- **Service to the University, the Profession, and the Public** is defined as “the acceptance and fulfillment of the responsibility to serve the University, the professions, and the public through various activities which take place outside the classroom” (University of Wisconsin—Eau Claire, *Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook*, 2004, p. 5.19).

Priority Ranking of Categories

The Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders considers Teaching Effectiveness to be the highest priority among the review categories. Although Scholarly Activity, Academic Advising, and Service are considered to be of significant importance, these categories are viewed as secondary to and supportive of Teaching Effectiveness. Priority rankings are not assigned for categories other than Teaching Effectiveness.

Professional Development Plans

Each faculty member of the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders will formulate, in consultation with the Department Chair, a one-year Professional Development Plan. This Plan will include goals for the upcoming 12-month period in the four aforementioned performance review categories. Professional Development Plans will be kept in each instructor’s personnel file in the Department.

Although the Department assigns the highest priority to Teaching Effectiveness, needs and interests of individual faculty and/or needs and resources of the Department may lead to changes in individual professional goals. Accordingly, changes in review category rankings may be negotiated at the time of initial employment in the Department prior to a contract being issued. Later in an individual’s employment within the Department, a category other than Teaching Effectiveness may be considered primary for a given time span. Consequently, changes in **category** rankings may also be negotiated at the conclusion of each performance review for a faculty member once a positive tenure decision has been reached.

When a tenured faculty member wishes to negotiate a change in review category rankings, a written proposal must be submitted for consideration to the DPC Chair and the Department Chair within a month after the Departmental aspects

of performance review have been concluded. Under extraordinary circumstances, such written proposals may be considered if submitted at other times. The faculty member will be informed in writing within 30 days by the Department Chair whether the DPC and the Department Chair find the proposed changes acceptable.

Each faculty member's Professional Development Plan will be used in all performance reviews. For summative purposes, progress toward the goals outlined in the Professional Development Plan will be discussed during the Department Chair's annual meeting with each faculty member. Formative reviews are referenced to the faculty member's Professional Development Plan; it is expected that the review will contribute to the formulation of the next Plan.

Summative Reviews for Probationary Faculty and Faculty Promotion

Summative reviews evaluate faculty performances for the period covered by the review, and they lead to personnel actions. For tenure track faculty members, summative reviews serve as a basis for recommendations about re-appointment, tenure, and promotion. For summative reviews, the faculty member being reviewed submits required materials to the DPC. The Committee also collects other relevant information, such as classroom visits by members of the DPC and student evaluations, and all data are reviewed on a pre-specified review date. All recommendations are made following the review date.

Probationary Faculty. Summative reviews of probationary faculty are conducted for re-appointment recommendations and to monitor progress toward tenure. During the first year of employment, a summative review is conducted in fall semester even though the initial contract is for two years. During the second year, reviews are conducted in the fall semester for appointment to the third year and in the spring semester for appointment to the fourth year. In the third, fourth and fifth years of employment, reviews are conducted in the spring semester for appointment to the fifth, sixth and seventh years. For these reviews, data are collected during the semester prior to each review. In addition, a Mid-Probationary Performance Progress Review will occur for probationary faculty in the spring of their third year as part of the annual performance review. The performance of probationary faculty members will be reviewed in all categories for summative purposes. Procedures for this Mid-Probationary Review are:

- Each probationary tenure track faculty member will develop a brief individualized faculty development plan which discusses how accomplishments to date fit the plan, and what she or he expects the dossier to contain at the point of the tenure and promotion decisions. The development of this plan should be coordinated with the DPC.
- The DPC and the Department Chair will review and discuss the dossier.
- The candidate, the Chair of the DPC, and the Department Chair will meet with the College Dean to discuss the dossier. The candidate's professional development plan will be considered in addition to her or his accomplishments in accordance with the plan. The outcome of this meeting could range from a commendation for good work to strong recommendations to alter the plan and/or the implementation of it or, if it appears that no reasonable course of action will result in a favorable tenure decision, to termination. This review shall serve as the annual performance review for the candidate.
- To assist an individual in working toward the Mid-Probationary Review, faculty mentor(s) will be appointed during the first year by the Department Chair in consultation with the new appointee. The mentor(s) should assist the new faculty member in assembling the mid-probationary review dossier and will meet with the DPC at the time the candidate is considered for tenure and promotion. (An individual's mentor(s) may change, depending on the candidate's needs and/or the availability of mentors.)

The DPC typically collects teaching performance data during the semester prior to the semester in which the review is conducted. However, individual probationary faculty may request classroom visits and/or collection of student evaluations of teaching for the "off" semesters or during the summer term, and these data may be submitted to the DPC

for consideration during subsequent re-appointment, promotion, and tenure reviews. Data collected by the Department as part of the annual performance review process may also be submitted to the DPC.

Tenured Faculty. Summative reviews of tenured faculty are conducted as a basis for promotion recommendations, and reviews will address all categories outlined in this document.

Notification of Summative Review

Faculty requiring a mandated summative review will be informed about the schedule of reviews as specified in the annual administrative calendar. For summative reviews, each faculty member to be reviewed will be notified of the pending review at least 20 days prior to the review date by the Chair of the DPC. Faculty can self-nominate or be nominated by others for early tenure and early promotion. Deadlines for submitting nominations will be announced.

Review Materials and Procedures

Materials should be submitted for the period under review. Specific review purposes and the associated review periods are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1: Summative Review Purposes and Review Periods	
Review Purpose	Review Period
Re-appointment	Previous 12 months
Tenure	From initial appointment
First promotion	From initial appointment
Second promotion	From most recent promotion

All required materials relevant to the review, and including a complete professional career vita, must be submitted to the Chair of the DPC at least two weeks prior to the scheduled review. In addition, the person being reviewed may submit any additional materials he or she considers pertinent.

A statement of intent should preface all other materials submitted in support of the review. The statement should delineate factors relevant to the review, including philosophy of teaching, current career goals, professional objectives, and considerations that would alter a balanced contribution across categories secondary to Teaching Effectiveness.

All summative reviews for faculty must consider the categories of Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly Activity, Academic Advising, and Service. In addition, Workload is also considered in summative reviews. Required materials and review procedures for each of these categories will be addressed in the following sections.

Teaching Effectiveness

For re-appointment, promotion, and tenure decisions, academic teaching will be evaluated for each class being taught during the semester(s) in which data are collected. If the instructor is responsible for 50% or more of the instruction of a course, the DPC observations are mandatory. If the instructor is responsible for less than 50%, observations by the DPC may be requested by the instructor. In addition, clinical teaching will be evaluated for all types of clinical activities including direct supervision of screening, diagnostic evaluation, treatment and liaison supervision.

Academic Teaching

To evaluate academic teaching, members of the DPC will, and the Department Chair may, visit the classroom. Student evaluations will be accomplished by the DPC or its designee.

Classroom Visits. Within one week of notification of review, the instructor will furnish the DPC Chair and the Department Chair with a list of times when classroom visits are feasible. Such a listing should be provided for each class under review being taught during the data collection period.

At the time the list of visit dates is provided, the instructor will also submit to the DPC Chair a folder for each class taught during the review period. Each class folder should contain one copy of the materials listed below. The DPC will share this folder with the Department Chair.

1. Official University Syllabus
2. Class syllabus with time schedule for the current semester
3. Other relevant materials may be submitted. Such materials may include, but are not limited to, information about course assignments, classroom innovations, examinations, and the like. Other relevant materials submitted could constitute a complete teaching portfolio.

A DPC member will visit each course under review being taught by the instructor. At least two DPC members will make teaching observations; if an instructor teaches only one course, these visits will occur on separate days whenever possible. The instructor will be informed about the planned days for any visits. The DPC encourages the instructor to talk with visitors prior to any visit about the goals, objectives, and planned activities for the sessions to be visited. DPC visitors for classroom observations will use a department-approved Classroom Observation Guide. A copy of the guide can be found in Appendix A.

Following each visit, a written summary indicating perceived teaching strengths and areas to improve will be drafted by each visitor who will then arrange to discuss the summary with the instructor. These summaries are placed in a Department personnel folder but are not sent to the Dean. They are considered, however, when the DPC drafts performance review documents for transmittal to the Department Chair. This procedure provides the instructor an opportunity to write a response to the summary to the DPC if he or she chooses to do so before the close of the academic year.

Student Evaluations. During one of the class sessions visited or at a separate time, students will complete the *Instructor and Course Appraisal: Cafeteria System* ("The Purdues"). Departmental core items must be included in Purdues administered in each class; a list of these core items can be found in Appendix B. Instructor-selected items may also be included (please refer to Appendix B). Instructors should submit to the Program Assistant their list of Purdue items within one week of notification of review. Students also will be invited to generate spontaneous written comments. A DPC member or a delegated Departmental representative will collect evaluation forms and written comments. To ensure anonymity of student generated data, the Department Program Assistant will type written comments, and handwritten originals will be given to the Department Chair for appropriate records management.

The following standard announcement will be read to students before they are asked to participate in the evaluation activities:

1. The Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders is asking you to evaluate Dr./Ms./Mr. _____'s teaching effectiveness. All teaching in the Department is routinely evaluated, so this evaluation is not occurring because of any problem.
2. You are being asked to complete a questionnaire and to write comments about the teaching quality in this course. Your written comments are transcribed and then all results are given to Dr./Ms./Mr. _____.
3. You should take seriously the opportunity to participate in this process as the results of your input can affect decisions about Dr./Ms./Mr. _____'s raises, re-appointment, tenure, or promotion.
4. Your input can also be used by individuals to improve their teaching.

5. Do you have any questions about this evaluation process?

Clinical Teaching

The instructor will furnish the Chair of the DPC at least two weeks before the review with materials relevant to his or her clinical teaching for each type of clinical experience (i.e., screening, diagnostic evaluation, treatment, liaison). These materials will include, but will not be limited to, requirements, assignments, reading lists, and responsibilities for each clinical activity.

The Director of the Clinic is charged with collecting student data related to the instructor's effectiveness as a clinical teacher. If the Director of the Clinic is a member of the DPC, s/he will conduct the meeting. Otherwise the meeting is conducted by a DPC designate.

At the meeting, students will complete the Summary of Student Evaluations of Supervisors. A copy of this form can be found in Appendix C. Students also will be invited to generate spontaneous written comments. The DPC member or DPC designate will collect evaluation forms and written comments. To ensure anonymity of student generated data, the Department Program Assistant will type written comments, and handwritten originals will be given to the Department Chair for appropriate records management.

Scholarly Activity

The instructor will furnish the DPC Chair two weeks prior to the review with a list of scholarly activities and appropriate documents supporting the scholarly work. The four sub-categories for Scholarly Activity to be considered are: Scholarship of Discovery, Scholarship of Integration, Scholarship of Application, and Scholarship of Teaching (Boyer, 1990; Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997; and others).

Sub-Category A: Scholarship of Discovery

The scholarship of discovery refers to "research" in its traditional sense. It includes pursuit and discovery of knowledge through original research.

Sub-Category B: Scholarship of Integration

The scholarship of integration refers to "serious disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insight to bear on original research" (Boyer, 1990, p. 19). Further, integration involves "making connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way, often educating nonspecialists, too" (Boyer, 1990, p. 18).

Sub-Category C: Scholarship of Application

The scholarship of application refers to use of professional knowledge in serving the interests of the larger community. Scholarship of application is seen in activities where "theory and practice vitally interact, and one renews the other" (Boyer, 1990, p. 23).

Sub-Category D: Scholarship of Teaching

The scholarship of teaching refers to the consistent and systematic evaluation of teaching-learning efforts.

Evidence of Scholarly Activity

For any given sub-category of scholarly activity, instructors may present four types of evidence: major publications, presentations at professional meetings, other scholarly work, and other publications and/or participations. In the

following paragraphs, descriptions and examples of each type of evidence are provided; examples are not meant to be either inclusive or exclusive.

Major Publications

This type of evidence includes products of substantial significance to the field of Communication Sciences and Disorders and to related fields, including, but not limited to, Education, Special Education, Early Intervention, Rehabilitation, Adult Health, Psychology, Linguistics, and Psycholinguistics. Give citations and include copies of items when possible. Items will be returned to the developer on request after conclusion of the review process. If the item has not yet been published or produced, describe the status of the work (e.g., in press, submitted). The following activities are examples of Major Publications.

1. Books
2. Articles in refereed journals, in print or on-line
3. Book chapters
4. Software
5. Video taped productions
6. Other media

Presentations at Professional Meetings

This type of evidence includes an array of activities associated with presentations at professional meetings. A judgment of the quality of the professional meeting, the review process used to select participants, and the role the participant played when a formal presentation was not required is to be provided for each item listed. The following activities are examples of Presentations at Professional Meetings.

1. Papers for presentation at professional meetings
2. Other presentations at professional meetings
3. Participation in professional meetings (e.g., chairing sessions, serving as discussant, participating in round table or panel presentations)

Other Scholarly Work

This type of evidence includes activities that support an array of professional and scholarly pursuits. The person being reviewed should provide supporting details about items in the category (e.g., amount of grant support received; number of student-faculty research projects supervised with the names of students and topics; length of presentations, topics, dates). The following activities are examples of Other Scholarly Work.

1. Grants received
2. Student-faculty research, including thesis direction
3. Presentations to faculty colleagues in the Department or elsewhere at UW—EC
4. Grants and research projects proposed
5. Attendance at professional meetings
6. Attendance at professional workshops
7. Research findings implemented in courses
8. Professional awards
9. Appointment as an editor or associate editor for a book or journal
10. Curriculum development activities

Other Publications and/or Participations

This type of evidence includes material written in support of someone else's written work. The following activities are examples of Other Publications and/or Participations.

1. Reviews of articles, chapters, books, software, or other professional material

2. Minor editing for publication (e.g., reviewer for someone's article submitted to a professional journal)
3. Production of manuals
4. Reviews of materials submitted to be considered for presentations at professional conferences (e.g., recommending acceptance/rejection of papers submitted for ASHA convention)

Academic Advising

The faculty member will furnish the Chair of the DPC two weeks prior to review with information about the numbers of graduate and undergraduate students assigned as advisees and a description of any extraordinary advising responsibilities (e.g., NSSHLA, unclassified graduate students, etc.). A faculty member's academic advising ability will not be evaluated until he or she has advised students at UW – Eau Claire for at least two semesters.

Advising will be evaluated using a web-based version of the Evaluation of Advising form. A hard copy of this form can be found in Appendix D. A link to the form will be distributed to undergraduate students by the Department Chair or a designee during the spring semester. The Department Chair will distribute summary results of the evaluations to faculty members.

Results are communicated by the Department Chair to the adviser. For advisers under probationary review, results are also transmitted to the Chair of the DPC.

Service

The faculty member will furnish the DPC Chair two weeks prior to review with a list of professional activities demonstrating service. All service activities should be listed and described, including dates of service and the time devoted to service activities.

It is recognized that at particular stages of careers, a sizable commitment to one or more forms of service may occupy a significant and valid amount of an instructor's time, energy, and skills. All sub-categories of service, described below, are judged to be of equal importance.

Service to the University: Service to the university refers to service with various groups such as committees and advisory boards; at either the department, school, college, university, or system level.

Service to the Profession: Service to one's profession refers to active participation in professional organizations at the local, state, national, and international level.

Service to the Public: Service to the public refers to participation in community movements of an educational nature, or in University Outreach activities, or to using one's professional expertise in consulting or advisory capacity to agencies, businesses, or individuals, or to similar types of activities through which the University and/or the Department achieves greater recognition and prestige in the community, state, and nation.

Workload

The faculty member will furnish the Chair of the DPC two weeks prior to review with a list describing his or her workload. Workload is defined as the nature and quantity of responsibilities assigned to and engaged in by instructors and will be considered when recommendations are formulated about personnel actions. The following sub-categories should be used in reporting workload.

Courses and Credits Taught

This sub-category includes all courses and credits taught during each term of the review period, including independent studies, directed studies, and thesis direction. Courses taught through Outreach or Extension should be included if part of an assigned workload (if not, include them under professional service).

Graduate Student Supervision

This sub-category includes the number of graduate students assigned for clinical supervision. Information should be supplied separately for diagnostic and treatment activities, including credit equivalent for the activities overall.

Undergraduate Student Supervision

This sub-category includes the number of undergraduate students assigned for clinical supervision. Information should be supplied separately for diagnostic and treatment activities, including credit equivalent of the activities overall.

Teaching in Courses Assigned to Another Instructor

This sub-category includes collegial coverage within the Department and invited teaching in courses outside the Department.

Liaison Supervision

This sub-category includes liaison supervision responsibilities. Information should list sites and describe time and effort committed to these activities.

Administration

This sub-category includes administrative responsibilities. Information should describe these responsibilities and an estimate of the time and effort committed to these activities. Administrative workload will be considered in formulating personnel decisions. However, quality of administrative performance will not be considered in reaching decisions about tenure. Regardless of the administrative responsibilities assigned to an individual, expectations for the individual in regard to productivity in the areas of Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarship, Academic Advising, and Service will be identical to expectations for individuals not assigned administrative responsibilities.

Performance of administrative duties, in addition to the other categories appropriate to the type of appointment held by the person being reviewed, will be considered in making salary recommendations provided there is student, academic staff and faculty input. Survey instruments developed by the Clinical Committee for use by students, academic staff and faculty will be used for this performance review of the Clinic Director.

Summative Review Outcomes for Probationary Faculty and Faculty Promotion

Information provided to the DPC and the Department Chair during summative reviews of performance will be used to formulate a Performance Review Summary. Such summaries will characterize each review category as “*unacceptable*,” “*fair*,” “*good*,” “*very good*,” or “*excellent*.” In addition, the same descriptors will be used to characterize overall performance. These descriptors, along with information on workload, will be used as the basis for recommendations. The following guidelines will be used in formulating recommendations.

Promotion to Associate Professor and/or granting of tenure will be recommended only when Teaching Effectiveness and at least two of the other three sub-categories receive ratings of “*good*” or better; the remaining sub-category must receive a rating of “*fair*” or better. A recommendation for tenure will not be made if any sub-category is rated “*unacceptable*.”

- Promotion to Professor will be recommended only if performance in at least one of the four categories is rated as being “*very good*” or better and the others as “*good*” or better.

- At least a 60% supporting vote from those DPC members casting votes or from its appropriate sub-committee will be required for a recommendation to grant tenure or promotion.

The Chair and Secretary of the DPC will transmit a copy of the letter sent to their Department Chair and then meet with the person being reviewed after the final Committee vote to transmit the Committee's evaluation of performance.

At least three workdays prior to the submission of review recommendations to the Department Chair or other University administrators, the DPC will provide copies of documents relevant to the current review to the person undergoing review. Such documents may include student evaluations of classroom and clinical teaching, narratives about classroom visits, as well as the Performance Review Summary. The person being reviewed may submit a written response to these materials. If a written response is submitted, it will be attached to the original documents before the reports are forwarded to any administrators.

The DPC will forward to the Department Chair a written summary of the review along with all supporting materials that were submitted to the DPC. The Department Chair will meet with the probationary faculty member for the purpose of communicating to him/her the judgments of the Chair and suggestions regarding the faculty member's teaching and other responsibilities and to discuss progress toward tenure.

Faculty Formative Reviews

Formative reviews in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders have the purpose of facilitating the continued professional development of the faculty member being reviewed. The focus of such reviews is to expand existing areas of interest and expertise and/or to develop new ones.

In contrast to summative reviews, which are directed by the DPC, the faculty member being reviewed directs his or her formative review. Because formative reviews are faculty-driven, no materials are required for submission to the DPC. Moreover, specific timelines and procedures are not specified, and formal recommendations are not made following formative reviews. Formative reviews may be conducted in conjunction with routine performance reviews in the pre-tenure period, and probationary faculty may choose to participate in formative reviews prior to receiving tenure.

After tenure or a promotion is granted, post-tenure peer reviews, which have formative and summative components, are conducted at least every five years. During the spring semester preceding the review year, the Chair of the DPC will notify the faculty members to be reviewed of the upcoming post-tenure review. No more than two post-tenure formative reviews will occur within any one academic year. The post-tenure review should be accomplished by April 1 of the following year.

Post-tenure reviews are to be conducted according to the review process outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

PERFORMANCE REVIEW PROCEDURES: INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF

Review Categories

The University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire personnel rules provide that the review of instructional academic staff performance shall include only the specific areas for which the staff member was hired. In that regard, Teaching Effectiveness will nearly always be the area of performance and review. The areas of Scholarly Activity, Academic Advising, and Service will be included in a review to the extent that these parameters of performance have been specified in the staff member's contract. Definitions of Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly Activity, Academic Advising Ability, and Service, as specified on pages 2-3 of this document, will apply equally to instructional academic staff and to faculty. If materials related to Scholarly Activity, Academic Advising, and Service are submitted to the DPC but not part of the academic staff member's contract, these materials will be reviewed and may be commented upon but will not be the basis of the summative review.

Priority Ranking of Categories

The Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders considers Teaching Effectiveness to be the highest priority among the review categories. Although instructional academic staff may be reviewed in the areas of Scholarly Activity, Academic Advising, and Service, these categories are viewed as secondary to and supportive of Teaching Effectiveness.

Professional Development Plans

Each instructional academic staff member of the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders (except those working under a "no intent to re-hire" contract) will formulate, in consultation with the Department Chair, a one-year Professional Development Plan at the time of the annual performance review. This Plan will include goals for the upcoming 12-month period in the aforementioned performance review categories. Professional Development Plans will be kept in each instructor's personnel file in the Department.

The instructional academic staff member's Professional Development Plan will be used in all performance reviews. For summative purposes, progress toward the goals outlined in the Professional Development Plan will be discussed during the Department Chair's annual meeting with each instructional academic staff member. Formative reviews are referenced to the instructional academic staff member's Professional Development Plan; it is expected that the review will contribute to the formulation of the next Plan.

Summative Reviews for Instructional Academic Staff

For summative reviews, the instructional academic staff member being reviewed submits required materials to the DPC. The Committee also collects other relevant information, such as observations based on classroom visits and student evaluations, and all data are reviewed on a pre-specified review date designated by University policy. All recommendations are made following the review date.

Summative reviews of instructional academic staff members with one-year or multiple-year contracts are conducted annually. An academic staff member on a contract with "no intent to re-hire" may elect to be reviewed following the procedures outlined in this document. The purpose of these summative reviews is to inform recommendations to re-hire.

The Department Personnel Committee typically collects teaching performance data during the semester in which the review is conducted. However, individual probationary faculty may request classroom visits and/or collection of student evaluations of teaching for the "off" semesters, and these data may be submitted to the DPC for consideration during subsequent re-appointment or promotion reviews.

For reviews conducted during the fall semester, student data typically will be collected during the previous spring. For reviews conducted during the spring semester, data will be collected during the previous fall term. Date may be collected also during the summer term if requested by the DPC or the instructor.

Notification of Summative Review

Instructional academic staff will be informed about the schedule of reviews as specified in the annual administrative calendar. For summative reviews, each instructional academic staff member to be reviewed will be notified of the pending review at least 20 days prior to the review date.

Review Materials and Procedures

Materials should be submitted for the period under review. Specific review purposes and the associated review periods are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2: Summative Review Purposes and Review Periods	
Review Purpose	Review Period
Re-appointment	Previous 12 months
First promotion	From initial appointment
Second promotion	From most recent promotion

All required materials relevant to the review, and including a complete professional vita, must be submitted to the Chair of the DPC two weeks prior to the scheduled review. In addition, the person being reviewed may submit any additional materials he or she considers pertinent.

A statement of intent should preface all other materials submitted in support of the review. The statement should delineate factors relevant to the review, including philosophy of teaching, current career goals, professional objectives, and when appropriate, any circumstances that would lead to consideration of categories other than Teaching Effectiveness.

All summative reviews for instructional academic staff must consider the category of Teaching Effectiveness. Scholarly Activity, Academic Advising, and Service may also be considered if those parameters are specified in the staff member’s contract. In addition, Workload is also considered in summative reviews. Required materials and review procedures for each of these categories will be addressed in the following sections.

Teaching Effectiveness

It will be true, without exception, that Teaching Effectiveness will be assigned the highest priority in all performance reviews for instructional academic staff. For re-appointment or rehire decisions for instructional academic staff, academic teaching will be evaluated for each class being taught during the semester(s) in which data are collected. Academic staff members may request DPC data collection for additional semesters. In addition, clinical teaching will be evaluated for all types of clinical activities in which the person is involved, including direct supervision of screening, diagnostic evaluation, treatment, and liaison supervision.

Because it is anticipated that all academic staff will be evaluated on Academic Teaching, those procedures from pages 5-6 are reproduced here. If an academic staff member is also to be evaluated on Scholarly Activity, Academic Advising, and/or Service, please refer to pages 6-9 for descriptions of materials and procedures.

Academic Teaching

To evaluate academic teaching, members of the DPC will, and the Department Chair may, visit the classroom. Student evaluations will be accomplished by the DPC or its designee.

Classroom Visits. Within one week of notification of review, the instructor will furnish the DPC Chair and the Department Chair with a list of times when classroom visits are feasible. Such a listing should be provided for each class taught during the data collection period.

At the time the list of visit dates is provided, the instructor will also submit to the DPC Chair a folder for each class taught during the review period. Each class folder should contain one copy of the materials listed below. The DPC will share this folder with the Department Chair.

1. Official University Syllabus
2. Class syllabus with time schedule for the current semester
3. Other relevant materials may be submitted. Such materials may include, but are not limited to, information about course assignments, classroom innovations, examinations, and the like. Other relevant materials submitted could constitute a complete teaching portfolio.

A DPC member will visit each course taught by the instructor. At least two DPC members will make teaching observations; if an instructor teaches only one course, these visits will occur on separate days whenever possible. The instructor will be informed about the planned days for the visits. The DPC encourages the instructor to talk with visitors prior to any visit about the goals, objectives, and planned activities for the sessions to be visited. DPC visitors for classroom observations will use a department-approved Classroom Observation Guide. A copy of the guide can be found in Appendix A.

Following each visit, a written summary indicating perceived teaching strengths and areas to improve will be drafted by each visitor who will then arrange to discuss the summary with the instructor. These summaries are placed in a Department personnel folder but are not sent to the Dean. They are considered, however, when the DPC drafts performance review documents for transmittal to the Department Chair. This procedure provides the instructor an opportunity to write a response to the summary to the DPC if he or she chooses to do so before the close of the academic year.

Student Evaluations. During one of the class sessions visited or at a separate time, students will complete the *Instructor and Course Appraisal: Cafeteria System* ("The Purdues"). Departmental core items must be included in Purdues administered in each class; a list of these core items can be found in Appendix B. Instructor-selected items may also be included (please refer to Appendix B). Instructors should submit to the Program Assistant their list of Purdue items within one week of notification of review. Students also will be invited to generate spontaneous written comments. The DPC member or a delegated Departmental representative will collect evaluation forms and written comments. To ensure anonymity of student generated data, the Department Program Assistant will type written comments, and handwritten originals will be given to the Department Chair for appropriate records management.

The following standard announcement will be read to students before they are asked to participate in the evaluation activities:

1. The Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders is asking you to evaluate Ms./Mr. ____'s teaching effectiveness. All teaching in the Department is routinely evaluated, so this evaluation is not occurring because of any problem.
2. You are being asked to complete a questionnaire and to write comments about the teaching quality in this course. Your written comments are transcribed and then all results are given to Ms./Mr. ____.

3. You should take seriously the opportunity to participate in this process as the results of your input can affect decisions about Ms./Mr. _____'s raises, re-hiring, re-appointment, and promotion.
4. Your input can also be used by individuals to improve their teaching.
5. Do you have any questions about this evaluation process?

Clinical Teaching

The instructor will furnish the Chair of the DPC at least two weeks before the review with materials relevant to his or her clinical teaching for each type of clinical experience (i.e., screening, diagnostic evaluation, treatment, liaison). These materials will include, but will not be limited to, requirements, assignments, reading lists, and responsibilities for each clinical activity.

The Director of the Clinic is charged with collecting student data related to the instructor's effectiveness as a clinical teacher. If the Director of the Clinic is a member of the DPC, s/he will conduct the meeting. Otherwise the meeting is conducted by a DPC designate.

At the meeting, students will complete the Summary of Student Evaluations of Supervisors. A copy of this form can be found in Appendix C. Students also will be invited to generate spontaneous written comments. The DPC members or DPC designate will collect evaluation forms and written comments. To ensure anonymity of student generated data, the Department Program Assistant will type written comments, and handwritten originals will be given to the Department Chair for appropriate records management.

Workload

The instructional academic staff member will furnish the Chair of the DPC with a list describing his or her workload. Workload is defined as the nature and quantity of responsibilities assigned to and engaged in by instructors and will be considered when recommendations are formulated about personnel actions.

The following sub-categories should be used in reporting workload.

Courses and Credits Taught

This sub-category includes all courses assigned and credits taught as part of load during each term of the review period, including independent studies, directed studies, and thesis direction.

Graduate Student Supervision

This sub-category includes the number of graduate students assigned for clinical supervision. Information should be supplied separately for diagnostic and treatment activities, including credit equivalent for the activities overall.

Undergraduate Student Supervision

This sub-category includes the number of undergraduate students assigned for clinical supervision. Include credit equivalent.

Teaching in Courses Assigned to Another Instructor

This sub-category includes collegial coverage within the Department and invited teaching in courses outside the Department.

Liaison Supervision

This sub-category includes liaison supervision responsibilities. Information should list sites and describe time and effort committed to these activities.

Administration

This sub-category includes administrative responsibilities. Information should describe these responsibilities and an estimate of the time and effort committed to these activities. Administrative workload will be considered in formulating personnel decisions. Regardless of the administrative responsibilities assigned to an individual, expectations for the individual in regard to productivity in the areas of Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarship, Academic Advising, and Service will be identical to expectations for individuals not assigned administrative responsibilities.

Summative Review Outcomes for Instructional Academic Staff

Information provided to the DPC and the Department Chair during summative reviews of performance will be used to formulate a Performance Review Summary. Such summaries will characterize each review category as “*unacceptable*,” “*fair*,” “*good*,” “*very good*,” or “*excellent*.” In addition, the same descriptors will be used to characterize overall performance. These descriptors, along with information on workload, will be used as the basis for recommendations.

The following guidelines will be used in formulating recommendations.

- Re-appointing or rehiring of instructional academic staff will be recommended only when Teaching Effectiveness and at least the majority of performance has received ratings of “*good*” or better; all other performance areas must receive a rating of “*fair*” or better. A recommendation to rehire will not be made if any performance is rated “*unacceptable*.”
- Promotion from Associate Lecturer to Lecturer will be recommended only if performance in the Teaching Effectiveness category has been consistently is rated as being “*good*” or better and performance in any other categories reviewed has been is rated as “*good*” or better. Associate lecturers may be eligible for consideration for promotion to Lecturer (no prefix) during the third year of experience in the position (or similar positions).
- Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer will be recommended only if a record of ratings of performance in the Teaching Effectiveness category has been “*very good*” or better and ratings of performance in the other categories reviewed has been “*good*” or better. Promotion to Senior Lecturer requires at least seven (7) years in the position at the Associate Lecturer or Lecturer levels (or similar positions).
- Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Distinguished Lecturer may be considered after a person has a minimum of ten years in the position (or comparable positions). At this level, the Teaching Effectiveness should show a record of consistency in the “*very good*” to “*excellent*” range. In addition, evidence of peer recognition on campus as well as a reputation which extends beyond UW-Eau Claire should be provided.

The Chair and Secretary of the DPC will transmit a copy of the letter sent to their Department Chair and then meet with the person being reviewed after the final Committee vote to transmit the Committee’s evaluation of performance.

At least three workdays prior to the submission of review recommendations to the Department Chair or other University administrators, the DPC will provide copies of documents relevant to the current review to the person undergoing review. Such documents may include student evaluations of classroom and clinical teaching, narratives about classroom visits, as well as the Performance Review Summary. The person being reviewed may submit a written response to these materials. If a written response is submitted, it will be attached to the original documents before the reports are forwarded to any administrators.

The DPC will forward to the Department Chair a written summary of the review along with all supporting materials that were submitted to the DPC. The Department Chair will meet with the instructional academic staff member for the purpose of communicating to him/her the judgments of the Chair and suggestions regarding the academic staff member's teaching and other responsibilities and to discuss personnel decision recommendations.

Formative Reviews for Teaching Academic Staff

Teaching Academic Staff may elect to participate in the formative review process. Formative reviews in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders have the purpose of facilitating the continued professional development of the teaching academic staff member being reviewed. The focus of these reviews is to expand existing areas of interest and expertise and/or to develop new ones.

In contrast to summative reviews, which are directed by the DPC, the faculty member being reviewed directs his or her formative review. Because formative reviews are staff-driven, no materials are required for submission to the DPC. Moreover, specific timelines and procedures are not specified, and formal recommendations are not made following formative reviews. Formative reviews may be conducted in conjunction with routine summative performance reviews, using some or all of the materials and observations generated during

Formative Review Procedures

It is assumed that instructional academic staff would wish the review process to address Teaching Effectiveness, as it is the only area included in all academic staff contracts. The other areas may be included, of course, if appropriate: Scholarly Activity, Advising, and Service.

The academic staff member being reviewed conducts the formative review collaboratively with his or her peers from among the Department's faculty or instructional academic staff. The academic staff member being reviewed will act as Team Captain and will invite at least two members from the Department to assist with his or her review. These assistants will serve as consultants, collaborators, and facilitators in the review process. The academic staff member being reviewed also may choose any additional university faculty or academic staff to assist in the review.

Formative Review Outcomes

Formative reviews are conducted for the benefit of the instructional academic staff member being reviewed, and it is expected that these reviews will contribute to the staff member's formulation of a new Professional Development Plan. In addition, because of the collaborative nature of formative reviews, it is anticipated that all members of a review team will benefit from the group's reflections on professional activity.

All formative review information other than the vita and Professional Development Plan, oral or written, becomes the exclusive property of the instructional academic staff member being reviewed. Divulging any formative review information by anyone other than the person being reviewed for any purpose is prohibited without the express permission of the staff member being reviewed.

MODIFICATIONS TO THE DEPARTMENT EVALUATION PLAN

The Department Evaluation Plan is conceived as a dynamic document that reflects the values, needs, and resources of the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders. Consequently, modifications to the Plan will be considered regularly to ensure that the procedures used in performance reviews continue to be responsive to changes in the departmental environment.

The Department Evaluation Plan will be **reviewed annually in the spring semester** and may be modified at that time for implementation during the following academic year. Early during each spring semester, the DPC will meet with the assembled instructional staff of the Department to discuss the Department Evaluation Plan and the procedures for conducting performance reviews. Proposed changes in the Plan will be addressed at that meeting, and instructional staff comments and suggestions will be solicited. The Department Chair will not be present at the meeting, but the Chair of the DPC will share with the Department Chair clarifications and interpretations of the Department Evaluation Plan discussed in the meeting. Before modifications to the Department Evaluation Plan may be implemented, they must be reviewed and accepted in writing by the DPC, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Vice Chancellor. Formal approval of a final, modified version of the Department Evaluation Plan should occur at all administrative levels by the end of the spring semester. The Department Chair shall distribute the approved plan to department members, thereby informing them of the agreed upon criteria.

If at any point during the development or revision of the plan, the DPC, the Department Chair, or the Dean cannot reach an agreement over any aspect of the plan, the next higher level (Department Chair, Dean, or Provost and Vice Chancellor) shall attempt to informally mediate any differences and to secure agreement so that the plan may move forward. If the Provost and Vice Chancellor's effort at informal mediation fails, the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee shall be convened by the Chancellor to examine the issues and to make a recommendation to the Chancellor concerning the portion of the plan for which an agreement could not be reached. The decision of the Chancellor is final. When the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee recommendation is supported by $\frac{3}{4}$ of those voting, the Committee can expect that its recommendation will be supported except for only the most compelling reasons.

APPENDIX A: Classroom Observation Guide

Presentation Style - The instructor:

1. _____ Provided an outline or oral overview of the major points that were to be covered in class that day.
2. _____ Used audiovisual aids: ___ blackboard ___ transparencies ___ videos/audios
3. _____ Provided handouts or referred to previously distributed handouts.
4. _____ Spoke audibly and enunciated clearly.
5. _____ Avoided distracting mannerisms.
6. _____ Made clear transitions from topic to topic.
7. _____ Interjected humor when appropriate.
8. _____ Reflected student questions accurately before answering.
9. _____ Explained concepts clearly.
10. _____ Bridged concepts with previous content or life experiences.

Apparent Student Reactions - Students:

1. _____ Asked more than 3 questions during a 50 minute class period.
2. _____ Asked questions that demonstrated an attempt to apply skills/concepts from the course.
3. _____ Asked no questions that demonstrated a complete lack of comprehension of the topic.
4. _____ Were actively involved in the learning process by doing exercises, applying concepts when asked, or by other means.
5. _____ Demonstrated that they understood a major concept by applying the concept or by applying a skill related to the concept.
6. _____ Demonstrated greater than 90% attendance ($\# \text{ attending} / \# \text{ enrolled} \times 100$).

Content - The instructor:

1. _____ Defined at least one term conceptually or by example.
2. _____ Cited at least one study pertaining to any topic discussed.
3. _____ Commented on one study's methodology in a way that reflected on its conclusions.
4. _____ Presented at least one counter argument in opposition to a point made.
5. _____ Did not omit prominent evidence and/or counter evidence that is essential to understanding a topic discussed.
6. _____ Gave time for discussion regarding clarification.
7. _____ Facilitated discussion that lead to synthesis of content.
8. _____ Encouraged students to apply content and/or practice a skill.

Course Syllabus and Course Handouts:

1. _____ Clearly state course expectations.
2. _____ Include clear instructions for assignments.
3. _____ Cite current references.
4. _____ Provide explicit criteria for grading.

APPENDIX B: PURDUE CAFETERIA ITEM CATALOG

University Core

- 201 My instructor motivates me to do my best work.
- 202 My instructor explains difficult material clearly.
- 203 Course assignments are interesting and stimulating.
- 204 Overall, this course is among the best I have ever taken.
- 205 Overall, this instructor is among the best teachers I have known.

Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders Core

- 006 My instructor has an effective style of presentation.
- 016 My instructor stimulates interest in the course.
- 025 My instructor has stimulated my thinking.
- 039 My instructor effectively blends facts with theory.
- 044 My instructor is actively helpful when students have problems.
- 070 I feel free to ask questions in class.
- 081 This course has clearly stated objectives.
- 090 This course material is pertinent to my professional training.
- 123 My final grade will accurately reflect my overall performance.
- 133 Assignments are of definite instructional value.
- 134 Assignments are related to goals of this course.
- 162 The format of this course is appropriate to course purposes.
- 272 I am well prepared for class.
- 273 I am an active participant in and/or out of the classroom.
- 274 I do my part to learn as much as possible in this course.

Clarity and Effectiveness of Presentations

- 001 I understand easily what my instructor is saying.
- 002 My instructor displays a clear understanding of course topics.
- 003 My instructor is able to simplify difficult materials.
- 004 My instructor explains experiments and/or assignments clearly.
- 005 Difficult topics are structured in easily understood ways.
- 006 My instructor has an effective style of presentation.**
- 007 My instructor seems well prepared for class.
- 008 My instructor talks at a pace suitable for maximum comprehension.
- 009 My instructor speaks audibly and clearly.
- 010 My instructor draws and explains diagrams effectively.
- 011 My instructor writes legibly on the blackboard.
- 012 My instructor has no distracting peculiarities.

Student Interest/Involvement in Learning

- 013 My instructor makes learning easy and interesting.
- 014 My instructor holds the attention of the class.
- 015 My instructor senses when students are bored.
- 016 My instructor stimulates interest in the course.**
- 017 My instructor displays enthusiasm when teaching.
- 018 This course supplies me with an effective range of challenges.
- 019 In this course, many methods are used to involve me in learning.
- 020 My instructor makes me feel involved with this course.
- 021 In this course, I always felt challenged and motivated to learn.
- 022 My instructor motivates me to do further independent study.
- 023 This course motivates me to take additional related courses.
- 024 This course has been intellectually fulfilling for me.

Note: All **bold faced items** are preselected by the University or the Department to be included on all Purdue Cafeteria Evaluation Forms generated for the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders.

Student Interest/Involvement in Learning

- 013 My instructor makes learning easy and interesting.
- 014 My instructor holds the attention of the class.
- 015 My instructor senses when students are bored.
- 016 My instructor stimulates interest in the course.**
- 017 My instructor displays enthusiasm when teaching.
- 018 This course supplies me with an effective range of challenges.
- 019 In this course, many methods are used to involve me in learning.
- 020 My instructor makes me feel involved with this course.
- 021 In this course, I always felt challenged and motivated to learn.
- 022 My instructor motivates me to do further independent study.
- 023 This course motivates me to take additional related courses.
- 024 This course has been intellectually fulfilling for me.

Broadening Student Outlook

- 025 My instructor has stimulated my thinking.**
- 026 My instructor has provide many challenging new viewpoints.
- 027 My instructor teaches one to value the viewpoint of others.
- 028 This course caused me to reconsider many of my former attitudes.
- 029 In this course, I have learned to value new viewpoints.
- 030 This course fosters respect for new points of view.
- 031 This course stretched and broadened my views greatly.
- 032 This course has effectively challenged me to think.
- 033 The class meetings helped me see other points of view.
- 034 This course develops the creative ability of students.
- 035 My instructor encourages student creativity.

Teaching/Learning of Relationships and Concepts

- 036 My instructor emphasizes relationships between and among topics.
- 037 My instructor helps me apply theory to solve problems.
- 038 My instructor emphasizes conceptual understanding of material.
- 039 My instructor effectively blends facts with theory.**
- 040 My instructor clarifies topics with developments in other fields.
- 041 My instructor makes good use of examples and illustrations.
- 042 Relationships among course topics are clearly explained.
- 043 This course builds understanding of concepts and principles.

Instructor Provides Help as Needed

- 044 My instructor is actively helpful when students have problems.**
- 045 My instructor recognizes when some students fail to comprehend.
- 046 Everything possible is provided to help me learn.
- 047 My instructor's explanations and comments are always helpful.
- 048 My instructor evaluates often and provides help where needed.
- 049 My instructor appears to grasp quickly what a student is saying.
- 050 My instructor is careful and precise when answering questions.
- 051 My instructor is readily available for consultation.

Providing Feedback to Students

- 052 My instructor regularly checks and rewards progress in learning.
- 053 My instructor suggests specific ways I can improve.
- 054 My instructor recognizes and rewards success in this course.
- 055 My instructor can gauge what I know and what I should do next.
- 056 Exams are used to help me find my strengths and weaknesses.
- 057 My instructor returns papers quickly enough to benefit me.

Adapting to Individual Differences

- 058 This course shows a sensitivity to individual interests/abilities.
- 059 My instructor adjusts to fit individual abilities and interests.
- 060 The flexibility of this course helps all kinds of students learn.
- 061 My instructor tailors this course to help many kinds of students.
- 062 The design of this course lets me learn at my own pace.
- 063 Students proceed at their own pace in this course.
- 064 I was able to keep up with the work load in this course.
- 06 My background is sufficient to enable me to use course material.

Respect and Rapport

- 066 A teacher/student partnership in learning is encouraged.
- 067 Each student is encouraged to contribute to class learning.
- 068 I am free to express and explain my own views in class.
- 069 When I have a question or comment I know it will be respected.
- 070 I feel free to ask questions in class.**
- 071 I feel that I am an important member of this class.
- 072 Mutual respect is a concept practiced in this course.
- 073 My instructor respects divergent viewpoints.
- 074 My instructor respects constructive criticism.
- 075 I feel free to challenge my instructors ideas in class.
- 076 My instructor relates to me as an individual.
- 077 My instructor deals fairly and impartially with me.
- 078 My instructor readily maintains rapport with this class.
- 079 This instructor encourages divergent thinking.
- 080 The climate of this class is conducive to learning.

Course Goals or Objectives

- 081 This course has clearly stated objectives.**
- 082 The objectives of this course were clearly explained to me.
- 083 The stated goals of this course are consistently pursued.
- 084 I understand what is expected of me in this course.
- 085 The course objectives allow me to know when I am making progress.
- 086 I was able to set and achieve some of my own goals.
- 087 I had an opportunity to help determine course objectives.
- 088 Lecture information is highly relevant to course objectives.
- 089 The course content is consistent with my prior expectations.

Usefulness/Relevance of Content

- 090 This course material is pertinent to my professional training.**
- 091 This course contributes significantly to my professional growth.
- 092 I can apply information/skills learned in this course.
- 093 This course will be of practical benefit to me as a student.
- 094 My technical skills were improved as a result of this course.
- 095 This course directly contributes to my vocational preparation.
- 096 This course is a valid requirement for my major.
- 097 The relationship of this course to my education is apparent.
- 098 The practical application of subject matter is apparent.
- 099 This course gives me an excellent background for further study.
- 100 This course is up-to-date with developments in the field.
- 101 This course includes adequate information on career opportunity.
- 102 This course includes a sufficient number of practical exercises.
- 103 The content of this course is relevant to my needs.
- 104 The amount of material covered was reasonable.

Discussion

- 105 My instructor develops classroom discussion skillfully.
- 106 There is sufficient time in class for questions and discussions.
- 107 My instructor allows student discussion to proceed uninterrupted.
- 108 My instructor encourages students to debate conflicting views.
- 109 My instructor does not monopolize classroom discussion.
- 110 One real strength of this course is the classroom discussion.
- 111 Challenging questions are raised for discussion.
- 112 This course provides an opportunity to learn from other students.

Exams and Grades

- 113 Exams accurately assess what I have learned in this course.
- 114 Exams are fair.
- 115 Exams are free from ambiguity.
- 116 Exams cover a reasonable amount of material.
- 117 Exams stress important points of the lectures/text.
- 118 Exams in this course have instructional value.
- 119. Exams are creative and require original thought.
- 120 I know how I stand relative to others in the class on exams.
- 121 Exams are reasonable in length and difficulty.
- 122 Exams are coordinated with major course objectives.
- 123 My final grade will accurately reflect my overall performance.**
- 124 Grades are an accurate assessment of my knowledge in this course.
- 125 Grades are assigned fairly and impartially.
- 126 The grading system was clearly explained.
- 127 The contract grading method is used appropriately in this course.
- 128 My instructor has a realistic definition of good performance.

Assignments

- 129 The assigned readings significantly contribute to this course.
- 130 The assigned reading is well integrated into this course.
- 131 Length and difficulty of assigned readings are reasonable.
- 132 Assigned readings are interesting and hold my attention.
- 133 Assignments are of definite instructional value.**
- 134 Assignments are related to goals of this course.**
- 135 Complexity and length of course assignments are reasonable.
- 136 Directions for course assignments are clear and specific.
- 137 The number of course assignments is reasonable.
- 138 Class projects are related to course goals and objectives.
- 139 The course's programmed learning materials are effective.
- 140 The group work contributes significantly to this course.
- 141 Student presentations significantly contribute to this course.
- 142 Student presentations in class are interesting/stimulating.
- 143 I am generally pleased with the text(s) required for this course.
- 144 I find the course emphasis on individual projects stimulating.
- 145 My instructor is not overly demanding of my time.

Media: Films, TV, etc.

- 146 This course has made excellent use of TV.
- 147 The televised portions of class are a great help to learning.
- 148 TV reception was of good quality.
- 149 Audio reception (TV, recorder, etc.) was of good quality.
- 150 The use of television made the course very interesting.
- 151 Media (films, TV, etc.) used in this course are well chosen.
- 152 Media (films, TV, etc.) are an asset to this course.

- 153 Films in this course contributed significantly to my learning.
- 154 This course has made excellent use of films.
- 155 Films in class were well-integrated with course topics.

Team Teaching

- 156 Team teaching is effectively used in this course.
- 157 Instruction is well-coordinated among the team teachers.
- 158 Team teaching provided insights a single instructor could not.
- 159 The team teaching approach meets my needs/interests.

General Method

- 160 Course topics are dealt with in sufficient depth.
- 161 Teaching methods used in this course is appropriate to course purposes.
- 162 The format of this course is appropriate to course purposes.**
- 163 The teaching strategy used in this course is appropriate.
- 164 This course is accurately described in the catalog.
- 165 Lecture information is adequately supplemented by other work.
- 166 Class lectures contain information not covered in the textbook.
- 167 Bibliographies for this course are current and extensive.
- 168 Mimeographed handouts are valuable supplements to this course.
- 169 The guest speakers contribute significantly to this course.
- 170 The speakers who addressed us communicated effectively.
- 171 An appropriate number of outside lecturers are used.

Laboratory

- 172 Lab procedures are clearly explained to me.
- 173 My instructor thoroughly understands lab experiments/equipment.
- 174 Assistance is always available throughout lab sessions.
- 175 The lab sessions are well organized.
- 176 The content of the lab is a worthwhile part of this course.
- 177 Lab assignments are reasonable in length and complexity.
- 178 Lab assignments have instructional value.
- 179 The lab in this course has adequate facilities.
- 180 My lab assignments are promptly returned to me.

General Student Perceptions

- 181 The class mixture of Fr., So., Jr., Sr., or Grad. is appropriate.
- 182 The size of this class is appropriate to course objectives.
- 183 The facilities for this course are excellent.
- 184 I have easy access to equipment/tools required in this course.
- 185 I had sufficient opportunity to use lab/practice room facilities.
- 186 The lab/practice room is well equipped.
- 187 I highly recommend this course.
- 188 I would enjoy taking another course from this instructor.
- 189 I like the way the instructor conducts this course.
- 190 Frequent attendance in this class is essential to good learning.
- 191 I am satisfied with my accomplishments in this course.
- 192 These items let me appraise this course fully and fairly.
- 193*
- 194*
- 195*

*Items 193, 194, and 195 are instructor applied questions (i.e., blackboard or handout) and produce frequency response data only on the evaluation reports. The response form question appears as "Instructor-Supplied Item Number 1, (2, 3)."

Additional Items

- 196 My instructor identifies major or important points in the course.
- 197 I have put much effort into this course.
- 198 I feel that I have done very well in this course.
- 199 Field trips offered insights that lectures or readings could not.
- 200 Field trips, relative to course objectives, are well planned.
- 206 Presents content in an organized manner.
- 207 Answers questions precisely.
- 208 Shows enthusiasm for teaching.
- 209 Suggests reading in subject area.
- 210 Helps students to discover new points of view.
- 211 Helps students appreciate validity of alternative points of view.
- 212 Presents ideas and concepts clearly.
- 213 Uses examples to clarify major points.
- 214 Points out relationship content to developments in the field.
- 215 Fosters use of appropriate information to validate conclusions.
- 216 Provides feedback relative to student's performance.
- 217 Encourages student participation in learning experiences.
- 218 Is responsive to student's ideas.
- 219 Develops a sense of mutual respect with students.
- 220 Is fair in dealing with students.
- 221 Builds content on course objectives.
- 222 Demonstrates expertise in relation to nursing.
- 223 Helps students integrate theory into clinical experiences.
- 224 Provides support to students in difficult situations.
- 225 Provides time for individual clinical conferences with students.
- 226 Gives feedback to students regarding performance.
- 227 Appraises students of evaluation criteria prior to assignments.
- 228 Is available to work with students in clinical situations.
- 229 Is a positive role model for students.
- 230 Is well prepared for class.
- 231 Presents content consistent with course objectives.
- 232 Points out relationship of content to developments in nursing.
- 233 Presents content and concepts clearly.
- 234 Uses examples to clarify major points.
- 235 Paces presentations suitably.
- 236 Teaches in an interesting and challenging manner.
- 237 Fosters student involvement in learning.
- 238 Helps students appreciate alternative points of view.
- 239 Fosters ability to analyze data to reach appropriate conclusions.
- 240 Presents content at a level appropriate to the learner.
- 241 Answers questions clearly.
- 242 Responds respectfully to students' questions and comments.
- 243 Recognizes when information needs to be restated or reinforced.
- 244 Provides feedback and constructive suggestions.
- 245 Test items reasonably measure degree of learning achieved.
- 246 Demonstrates professionalism.
- 247 Shows enthusiasm for nursing.
- 248 Assigns learning experiences appropriate to course objectives.
- 249 Promotes use of nursing process in preparing clinical assignment.
- 250 Helps students integrate course content into clinical experience.
- 251 Promotes teacher/student partnership in learning.
- 252 Fosters exploration of various alternatives in nursing care.
- 253 Is sensitive to student needs for assistance and supervision.
- 254 Returns papers quickly enough to benefit learning.
- 255 Allows time for interaction with individual students.
- 256 Informs students early of evaluation criteria.

- 257 Gives feedback to students at adequate intervals.
- 258 Evaluates performance based on identified criteria.
- 259 Is available to work with students in the clinical situation.
- 260 Provides support in difficult situations.
- 261 Fosters use of problem-solving approach.
- 262 Demonstrates nursing expertise.
- 263 Is positive role model for students.
- 264 Demonstrates positive regard for clients.
- 265 Interacts professionally with other health care providers.
- 266 Demonstrates positive regard for clients.
- 267 Provides examples which include both sexes in a variety of roles.
- 268 Provides examples which show ethnic minorities in a variety of roles.
- 269 Does not make disparaging remarks about minorities and women.
- 270 Avoids humor that is racist or sexist in nature.
- 271 My instructor's explanations and comments promote learning.
- 272 I am well prepared for class.**
- 273 I am an active participant in and/or out of the classroom.**
- 274 I do my part to learn as much as possible in this course.**

Demographic Items Appearing on All Purdue Forms

- Student's year in school.**
- Reason for taking the course.**
- Course type (lecture, lab , discussion).**
- Student's school.**
- Grade expected.**

APPENDIX C: Summary of Student Evaluations of Supervisors

Supervisor: _____

Semester/Year: _____

No. Responding: _____ Graduate _____ Undergraduate

	A Strongly Agree	B Agree	C Undecided	D Disagree	E Strongly Disagree	F Not Applicable
201. There is sufficient opportunity for consultation with this supervisor						
202. This supervisor observes clinical sessions frequently enough.						
203. This supervisor provides sufficient constructive feedback to me about my performance in a clinical situation.						
204. This supervisor demonstrates knowledge of clinical rationale and methods.						
205. This supervisor provides an appropriate amount of direction through the clinical practicum experience.						
206. This supervisor communicates information and ideas clearly.						
207. This supervisor has helped me toward development of my professional attitudes and behaviors						
208. This supervisor has helped me improve my clinical interaction skills.						
209. This supervisor has helped me to improve my clinical record keeping and report writing skills.						
210. This supervisor has helped me to improve my clinical problem solving ability.						
211. This supervisor has helped my growth toward clinical competence.						
212. This person is an effective supervisor.						

APPENDIX D: Evaluation of Advising Rating Form

EVALUATION OF ADVISING SURVEY

**Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders (CSD)
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire**

Current Advisor: [drop-down menu here with all options available]

Current Standing: [drop-down menu here with all options available]

Number of semesters (including current) assigned to this advisor: [drop-down menu here with 1-11]

Check here if you have never met with this advisor: (Then do NOT complete the remainder of this survey. Simply select **Submit** below.)

RATE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS IN RESPECT TO THE ADVISING YOU'VE RECEIVED FROM THE ADVISOR NAMED ABOVE.

	0 Cannot Rate	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Agree	4 Strongly Agree
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					

◆ Please provide specific feedback for any rating scale items above that you rated as "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree."

PLEASE ASSIGN AN OVERALL RATING TO THE ADVISING YOU RECEIVED.
[HAVE CHECK-BOX OPTION ON EACH 1-5 BELOW. ONLY ONE BOX SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO BE CHECKED.]

1	2	3	4	5
Low	Below Average	Average	Above Average	High

- ◆ What did you value most about your advising experience?
- ◆ Given the opportunity, how would you have changed your advising experience?
- ◆ Additional comments.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME!

**Larry Solberg, Ph.D., Chair
Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire
Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54702-4004**

APPENDIX E: Verification of Successful Post-Tenure Peer Review

**VERIFICATION OF POST-TENURE PEER REVIEW
The University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire
Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders**

I, _____, along with _____
(Faculty under review) (DPC Assistant)

and _____, have successfully completed my
(DPC Assistant)

_____ Post-Tenure Peer Review.
(Academic Year)

Faculty Member

DPC Assistant

DPC Assistant

Date

APPENDIX G: Merit Raise Plan
Adopted by the CSD DPC
November 5, 2002

1. All faculty and academic staff on renewable contracts shall be considered eligible for merit raises.
2. The Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders adopts the "FLAT" merit raise plan.
3. The following system for awarding merit raises will be used.
 - a. Activities that should be considered for merit raises are:
 - teaching effectiveness, including academic teaching and clinical teaching
 - scholarly activity
 - academic advising
 - service
 - workload, including administration
 - b. An individual may be considered for the following levels of merit:
 - 1 = Solid performance: no additional raise for merit
Solid performance is defined as a performance level "typical" for our department and the usual, high expectations we hold for ourselves.
 - 2 = Initial level of merit raise on top of percentage raise (1 merit point)
 - 3 = Middle level of merit raise on top of percentage raise (2 merit points)
 - 4 = Highest level of merit raise on top of percentage raise (3 merit points)
 - c. One (1) to 2 merit points may be awarded to an individual in the areas of teaching effectiveness and/or scholarly activity. One point for activities noticeably above the typical performance in the department; two points for activities outstanding in the department. One (1) merit point may be awarded for excellent performance in academic advising, service, and/or workload.
 - d. The Chair of the Department is charged with deciding how many merit points each individual should be awarded. Any merit increases for part-time employees will be based on the person's percent of appointment. The Chair's recommendation for level of merit raise for each person is forwarded to the Provost.
 - e. According to the UW-Eau Claire Faculty and Academic Staff Comprehensive Salary Plan, the Chair's recommendations "along with any documentation supporting this rating, shall be shared with the faculty or instructional academic staff member at least two weeks prior to submission to the Provost and Vice Chancellor's Office. During those two weeks, the faculty or instructional academic staff member may request a meeting with the [Chair] to appeal his/her salary rating and to review his/her salary rating relative to the other ratings (without names) assigned by the [Chair]. In the event that the [Chair] and the faculty or instructional academic staff member cannot reach an agreement on an appropriate salary rating, the [Dean] shall meet with both the immediate supervisor and the faculty or instructional academic staff member to mediate the disagreement. The decision of [Dean] is final."
4. The merit play plan is to be included in the Department Evaluation Plan and thus included in the mandated annual review by the faculty and academic staff of the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders.