

School of Biology Timeline of Academic Reviews for Faculty Information on Tenure and Promotion Criteria

NOTE: the first year towards tenure is your first full academic year without breaks in service. If you start in January, your first year towards tenure will start at the beginning of the Fall semester that year. Leave of Absence or other leaves may result in a year not counting towards tenure. For details discuss with Chair.

Definitions:

RPT Committee: Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee
DOTe: Director of Teaching Effectiveness; also used as a name for the teaching effectiveness review process
PPR: Periodic Peer Review

Synopsis of timeline:

Year 1:

Fall or Spring semester: informal teaching evaluation
1st week of January re-appointment materials due

Year 2:

1st Week October re-appointment materials due
Spring semester DOTe is conducted

Year 3:

Fall semester: DOTe is conducted if not already completed
1st week December 3rd Year Critical Review materials due
Spring semester Decision on 3rd year critical review

Year 4:

1st week February: re-appointment materials due

Year 5:

Before Fall semester earliest date you can submit tenure package
1st week February re-appointment materials due
February tenure decision

Year 6:

Before Fall semester normal date to submit tenure package
1st week February re-appointment materials due
February tenure decision

Year 7:

Before Fall semester late opportunity to submit tenure package
February tenure decision
End of Spring semester last day of appointment if tenure was not successful

5th year after tenure:

Mid-January: Periodic Peer Review (PPR) materials due

Every 3-5 years after first PPR:

Mid-January: PPR materials due

Details on the timeline and review processes

Year 1

Fall OR Spring semester Request your faculty mentor to give an informal evaluation of your teaching and any recommendations for improvement. You will have to go through a formal Teaching Effectiveness evaluation in either Spring of your second year or Fall of your third year, depending on when your course is taught. See attached DOTE guidelines for information on the formal review.

1st week of January: Materials due to School of Biology Chair for re-appointment. Materials include CV in Dean's format and any teaching evaluations from Fall semester. You may include a one-page summary of notable accomplishments from the year but it is not required. This package is reviewed at School level, then the Dean's level, then the President's Office.

Year 2

First week of October Materials due to School of Biology Chair for re-appointment. Materials include CV in Dean's format and any teaching evaluations from Fall, Summer and Spring semesters. You may include a one-page summary of notable accomplishments from the year but it is not required. This package is reviewed at School level, then the Dean's level, then the President's Office.

Spring semester If you are teaching a Spring course, notify your mentor so he/she can arrange to have you complete the formal Teaching Effectiveness review (usually referred to as DOTE). See attached guidelines for the DOTE review.

Year 3

Fall semester If you are teaching a Fall course and have not already completed the DOTE review, notify your mentor so he/she can arrange to have you complete it. See attached guidelines for the DOTE review.

Last week of November: Materials due to Chair of Biology RPT committee for Third Year Critical Review.

Materials include:

- CV
- Candidate's statement of teaching and research accomplishments and service contributions (no longer than six pages)
- Teaching evaluation forms for all courses taught at Georgia Tech OR Spreadsheet summarizing scores and averages
- Other evidence of teaching effectiveness
- Statement from candidate affirming the package is complete

Third Year Critical Review details: See Georgia Tech Faculty Handbook section 3.3.2.2.(e) for institute guidelines The School RPT committee and the Chair each prepare a written evaluation of the candidate (usually 2-3 pages) and make a recommendation on each decision to be made. The committee votes yes/no/abstain on each of the decisions and the vote is included in the evaluation. In cases of disagreement, the point of view of the various sides is explained. Reviews at higher levels are more brief.

The third year critical review is considered successively by 8 different parties, in the sequence shown below. Each review, recommendations and votes are added to the package and considered by subsequent reviewers.

Reviewer	Time of year
School RPT Committee (faculty selected by the School Chair)	December
School Chair	Mid-January
College RPT Committee (faculty selected by the Dean)	February?
College Dean	February?
Institute RPT Committee (Deans + selected faculty)	Spring?
Provost	Spring?
President	Spring?
Board of Regents (rubber stamped unless extraordinary circumstances)	Spring

Spring semester:

Decision made on Third Year Critical Review. There are four possible outcomes:

- 1. Reappointment:** This decision means you are on track for tenure. Good start! Keep going...
- 2. Reappointment with counseling:** This decision means you are largely on track for tenure. However, there are some concerns that you need to address. You will go up for critical review again the next year.
- 3. Reappointment with warning:** This decision means you are not on track for tenure. There are definite areas you need to work on. You will go up for critical review again the next year.
- 4. Non-Reappointment:** This decision occurs when you are clearly not making adequate progress, and your appointment at Tech will terminate at the end of the next fiscal year.

Year 4

First week of February: Materials due to School of Biology Chair for annual reappointment. (Unless you had a reappointment with counseling or warning in Year 3 - then see time frame for Critical review in year 3 description). Materials include CV in Dean's format and teaching evaluations from the last year. You may include a one-page summary of notable accomplishments from the year but it is not required. This package is reviewed at School level, then the Dean's level, then the President's Office.

Year 5

Fall semester: Year 5 is the minimum time in rank to qualify for tenure and beginning the tenure/promotion process at this time would be considered an early promotion. Early promotions are unusual and are only considered when performance is outstanding and exceptional. Each case must be thoroughly justified by the School Chair. The steps taken by the candidate to initiate the promotion process are:

Step	Time of year
Notify the School Chair of your decision to be considered	May, Year 4 No later than
Contact SoB Seminar Coordinator to schedule a seminar in the Fall semester	May, Year 4
Provide information on outside reviewers to the RPT Committee Chair	June
Provide CV, Statement of Accomplishments, reprints, etc. for to outside reviewers to RPT Committee Chair	July
Arrange for DOTE evaluation of teaching	No later than early September (could be done in Spring of Year 4)
Provide materials to be considered by internal reviewers	Early September
Give a seminar to department	Late August or early September

The timeline for review of tenure packages is as follows:

Reviewer	Time of year
School RPT Committee (faculty selected by the School Chair)	September - early October
School Chair	Mid-October
College RPT Committee (faculty selected by the Dean)	December?
College Dean	December?
Institute RPT Committee (Deans + selected faculty)	February?
Provost	
President	
Board of Regents (rubber stamped unless extraordinary circumstances)	Spring

SEE SECTION BELOW ON PREPARATION OF TENURE AND PROMOTION PACKAGES

First week of February: Materials due to School of Biology Chair for annual reappointment (in case if tenure application has not been submitted) Materials include CV in Dean's format and teaching evaluations from the last year. You may include a one-page summary of notable accomplishments from the year but it is not required. This package is reviewed at School level, then the Dean's level, then the President's Office.

February

Tenure decision is announced.

If the decision is positive, you are now a tenured member of the Georgia Tech Faculty. Congratulations.

If the decision is negative you have not met the expectations for tenure at Georgia Tech. Since you had submitted your package early, you will have another opportunity in year 6 as described below. The fall of your seventh academic year as academic faculty is your last opportunity to be reconsidered

Year 6

Fall semester

Tenure Review. The steps taken by the candidate to initiate the promotion process are given above in Year 5.

SEE SECTION BELOW ON PREPARATION OF TENURE AND PROMOTION PACKAGES

February

Tenure decision is announced, if tenure was applied for in Year 6. **If the decision is positive**, you are now a tenured member of the Georgia Tech Faculty. Congratulations.

If the decision is negative you have not met the expectations for tenure at Georgia Tech. The fall of your seventh academic year as academic faculty is your last opportunity to be reconsidered.

Year 7

Fall semester

Last opportunity for tenure review. The steps taken by the candidate to initiate the promotion process are given above in Year 5.

SEE SECTION BELOW ON PREPARATION OF TENURE AND PROMOTION PACKAGES

February

Tenure decision is announced.

If the decision is positive, you are now a tenured member of the Georgia Tech Faculty. Congratulations.

If the decision is negative you have not met the expectations for tenure at Georgia Tech. Your academic faculty appointment at Georgia Tech terminates at the end of the seventh academic year.

5th year after receiving tenure

Mid-January

Materials due to School of Biology Chair for Periodic Peer Review of your performance and future goals in research, teaching, and service. If you feel that your review should exclude one of these areas or involve alternative criteria, please let the Chair know as soon as possible so discussion and decision on the criteria to be used can be undertaken in a timely manner.

The following documentation needs to be submitted for the review:

- A current CV
- A statement up to five pages detailing accomplishments and goals, provided by the faculty member.
- Reviews of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness, such as student evaluations, peer evaluations, etc.
- Summaries of annual performance evaluations (to include rebuttals) for years under consideration as prepared by Chair and reviewed by faculty member.

Any promotion review of a tenured faculty member handled by the Institute's Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee will be considered as equivalent to a scheduled Periodic Peer Review. (In this case, a faculty member has to notify RPT Committee about his/her decision to undergo promotion review by May of the previous year, and follow the schedule of promotion and tenure application as outlined above for Year 5.) Review outcomes will include a decision that the next review occur after either 5 years or 3 years. Reviewees identified by the review committee as having major and chronic deficiencies will be recommended for a three-year review. See Section 3.7 of the Faculty Handbook for detailed Institute guidelines.

Every 3-5 years after first Periodic Peer Review:

Mid-January

Materials due to School of Biology Chair for Periodic Peer Review of your performance and future goals in research, teaching, and service. If you feel that your review should exclude one of these areas or involve

alternative criteria, please let the Chair know as soon as possible so discussion and decision on the criteria to be used can be undertaken in a timely manner.

The following documentation needs to be submitted for the review:

- A current CV
- A statement up to five pages detailing accomplishments and goals, provided by the faculty member. This will include specific information on how goals from the previous PPR review have been met.
- Reviews of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness, such as student evaluations, peer evaluations, etc.
- Summaries of annual performance evaluations (to include rebuttals) for years under consideration as prepared by Chair and reviewed by faculty member.

Guidelines for Preparation of Tenure and Promotion packages.

The package you submit to the Biology RPT Committee must include:

1. Curriculum vitae
2. Candidate's statement of teaching and research accomplishments and service contributions (no longer than six pages). The candidate should be aware that this statement will be read both by experts and non-experts in their field. If the candidate's research involves a significant collaborative effort, there must be some indication of relative contributions in the research statement. The Chair or faculty committees will evaluate this information.
3. Teaching evaluation forms for all courses taught at Georgia Tech; DOTE report, information on mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students in research.
4. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness (if any)
5. Statement from candidate affirming the package is complete

Criteria Used for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Publications are essential. Quantity of publications, quality of journals, and impact of specific papers are considered. While there are many examples for which successful applicants for tenure published two (or more) publications in refereed journals per year during the tenure-track period it should be noted that numbers per se neither guarantee nor prevent tenure recommendations, as quality and impact are at least as important. Publications coauthored with doctoral and postdoctoral advisors tend to be discounted by the RPT Committee.

Letters from outside reviewers are solicited by the School RPT Committee. Typically, fewer than half of reviewers are chosen from the list proposed by an applicant, and more than half of the reviewers are chosen from the list proposed by the RPT Committee. The basic question that the letters are expected to answer is whether or not the candidate has established a strong reputation in the field. Generally, the referees should not have personal or professional relationships with the candidates (i.e., as collaborators, mentors, or co-workers). If letters from such persons are included, they must be justified by the RPT Committee Chair and identified as such. The candidate will be asked to sign a statement indicating that he or she will not ask to see external reference letters or the identity of the external referees. The candidate will be asked if there are potential outside referees who they would not want to have review their work. Such requests are normally honored.

Has the candidate been successful in obtaining **grant support**? This is important for two reasons. First, it is generally assumed that good scientific research cannot be conducted without outside support (although there could be exceptions in some cases). Second, successful grants (especially from competitive sponsors such as NSF or NIH) are indications of approval by experts in the field.

Evidence of effective **teaching**. Teaching is important to the Institute, but the effectiveness of teaching is difficult to document. In the past heavy reliance was placed on written surveys of student opinions. However, this system has been replaced by a web-based survey, and the response rate is much poorer, unless faculty proactively encourage students to complete the online surveys. Peer evaluation of teaching via DOTE is also an important component. Statements from individual students are usually not considered because of large variance in how individual students perceive individual classes and teachers.

Any documentation of **recognition** of research accomplishments is useful. Examples might be awards by societies of researchers, election to society offices, editorships, coverage of results in press releases and popular press, etc. This more commonly applies to more senior faculty.

Citations of papers published by the candidate are typically considered, especially for candidates whose publications have had several years to accumulate citations.

Service is usually not critical for the tenure decision, unless the candidate is way out of the norm. Nonetheless, it is important to document service, usually by listing participation in School and Institute committees in the CV. Service to the profession, such as editorships, arranging meetings, etc., is also considered.

Evaluation of Publications

Realize that few of the people doing the evaluations (outside of the Biology RPT Committee) have time to read whole papers, and more objective evidence of the quality and impact of publications is often sought.

The reference letters usually provide useful information on the quality of a candidate's publications as perceived by prominent scientists in the field. In addition, to the extent practical, the School RPT Committee attempts to objectively evaluate the quality and impact of publications. Often this involves assessing the quality of the journal in which the publication appears. The ISI impact factor of a journal (# citations / # papers, over some time period) provides the basic data. However, impact factors vary significantly between fields, and the most useful data is ISI's ranking of journals within subdisciplines (<http://jcrweb.com>). It is recognized that review journals usually rank higher than primary journals publishing research results. For candidates with longer publication records, counts of citations of the specific papers may be considered.

In spite of these evaluations, it should be recognized that as the review progresses to higher levels, with people more removed from the field and dealing with larger numbers of candidates, there is an increasing tendency for discussions to be dominated by the shorthand of "number of publications". What is usually counted is # titles in "refereed" journals, with review articles considered separately from original research papers. This forms the base from which other considerations add or subtract.

Letters of Reference

Obviously letters from more prominent scientists carry more weight. So it is advantageous for faculty members to be known to prominent scientists in their field. (Networking is important in research as in many other activities.)

Note that some important individuals in the decision process discount letters from people suggested by the candidate. Usually requests are made to 8-10 individuals in order to get at least 5 or 6 letters.

Grants

Successfully obtaining funding for one's research is important. Sufficient funding from diverse sources to support a prominent and successful ongoing research program is necessary. Successful grants from very competitive, peer reviewed sources such as NIH or NSF count most. Research contracts from industry count less. (If you are not free to publish the results, they may be worthless for promotion and tenure.)

Unsuccessful grant proposals cut both ways. A candidate who doesn't have funding and hasn't submitted many proposals (< 1/yr) is perceived as not trying very hard. On the other hand, a candidate who has submitted many proposals (> 3/yr) without success in getting funding may be viewed as unable to write good proposals or choosing poor research problems. (Only information you provide is generally available to committee members.)

Independence of Research

The Institute and the School expect that individual faculty members will be independent researchers, leading their own group and not dependent on other faculty members. Thus, it is important that the candidate is Principle Investigator (PI) on at least some grants and has several papers for which he/she acts as corresponding author. Particularly problematic is the candidate that is always co-author with another more senior researcher, especially if the co-author was a mentor of the candidate.

Another complication in evaluating research productivity is the increasing appearance of collaborative papers with large numbers of authors. How should these be counted? Co-authors from the candidate's own research group (students, technicians, or postdocs paid from grants of which the candidate is the PI) are no problem. But papers resulting from collaboration between research groups may be credited only in part to each group. For these papers, it is helpful to provide a description of the input of each group. Papers on which candidate is corresponding author are more heavily weighted, compared to those on which he/she is not.

Timing

Generally, there is a range of years during which an individual is eligible to be considered for promotion or tenure. Normally, at least 5 years of service at Georgia Tech are required.

Usually, each individual would like to get promotion and tenure as early as possible. However, an unsuccessful attempt can leave a negative impression, and it is usually best to wait until you have the strongest case you are likely to have. For example, it may be better to go up just after you have been awarded a 3-year grant than just after one has terminated.

The decision of the Institute is about predicting the future performance of an individual and there is often a tendency to extrapolate recent performance rather than average over the whole record. On the other hand, publishing only before the tenure after a lack of publications in the previous period can lead to doubts about how the candidate would perform after receiving tenure.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor.

Candidates for the promotion to Full Professor are expected to demonstrate that they have become established leaders in their fields. The same parameters as for promotion to Associate Professor are considered but expectations are higher, both in numbers and in quality. At the School level, more attention is given to citations, *h* indices, etc. While research remains a major factor for promotion, service contributions are also seriously considered at this stage.

College of Sciences Normal Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

1. Research

- a) This is first and foremost in the evaluation for tenure and promotion.
- b) Based on the evaluation of Impact and Discovery.

2. Teaching

- a) Good teaching is necessary (but not sufficient) for tenure and promotion.
- b) Make sure you have documented evidence (evaluations, etc.)

3. Service

- a) Service to the profession and Georgia Tech.
- b) Service does not normally play a pivotal role in consideration for tenure (but often does in promotion to Full Professor).

Frequently Asked Questions

1. What is used to evaluate Impact and Discovery at the School level?

Impact and Discovery are determined by a function of (Number of papers) X (Impact of papers). The number of papers of faculty awarded tenure has varied from two to many. Also, while one may write lots of papers, if they have no impact the net "score" is zero.

Impact is determined by such things as:

- Prestige of journals in which candidate has published. This will vary by discipline. The Chair and RPT committee will have substantial input on the discipline specific journal classifications.
- External reference letters (please see below for the procedure for how these are selected)
- Scientific Awards
- Citation Indices (Used only for promotion to Full due to their time lags.)

- Grants Awarded from National Competitions (ie. NIH, NSF, NASA, etc.)
- Graduate Students trained and impact of their work
- Invited papers
- Invitations to give seminars

2. How do the committees at levels beyond the School evaluate Impact and Discovery?

A CoS RPT committee member presents the candidate's case. The School Chairs are present to answer CoS P&T committee questions. The Dean presents the case and answers questions at the Provost's level. In addition, each committee considers the whole file including the external letters.

3. Why are grants so important?

First, of course, is the fact that money is needed to run and maintain a laboratory, equipment, and graduate students. Secondly, getting a peer-reviewed grant from a scientific funding agency (such as NIH, NSF, etc.), is a further indicator of your status in the scientific community.

4. What types of service are good to do?

- Service on Institute and School committees
- Professional review panels (e.g., NIH review panels, National Lab review panels, Advisory Boards, etc.)
- National committees (e.g., scientific society committees)
- Organizing and/or chairing sessions at scientific meetings
- Reviewing journal articles
- Recruiting graduate students

NOTE: Large service roles at Tech are not expected of faculty until after tenure.

6. What do I do if I feel overloaded with service responsibilities?

First of all, it is important to know that turning down any committee work at Tech will not count against your tenure. Service is not pivotal for tenure but often plays a role in promotion to Full Professor. The Institute wants to support your efforts to establish your national reputation. So, you may want to focus on the service activities that further that goal.

7. What if I am interested in getting involved with more service at Tech?

Often large service roles at Tech are not expected by faculty until after tenure. So, your Chair or other administrators may be trying to protect you from too many service duties. Talk to them if you'd like to change this.

For more information:

The Chair of the current Biology RPT committee can address questions related to any of the academic reviews.

The Faculty Handbook Section 3 gives Institute guidelines on each of these academic reviews.

DOTE: Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness of Biology Faculty

Goals of the Evaluation

The primary goal of the evaluation plan is provide faculty members with information that will assist in the improvement of their teaching technique and effectiveness. They also provide a peer review of teaching effectiveness to complement information from the course instructor survey completed by students.

Evaluation plan

Evaluation committee:

The evaluation will be carried out by an evaluation committee which will consist of one or two Biology faculty members and the director of teaching effectiveness of the School of Biology (dote). The member(s) of the evaluation committee will be selected jointly by the faculty member to be evaluated (candidate) and by the dote. If no agreement can be reached about the members of the evaluation committee, each, the candidate and the dote shall select one faculty member to the evaluation committee. Since there is a considerable amount of work involved, serving on an evaluation committee shall be viewed as equivalent to service on a School of Biology committee. The primary role of the evaluation committee is to observe the candidate in lecture, examine course-related material and assist the candidate in an advisory capacity. The evaluation committee will prepare a written report that reviews the candidate's teaching skills, identifying strong elements and potential problems. If weaknesses are identified, a plan will be worked out between the candidate and the dote to address potential problems.

Director of teaching effectiveness (dote)

The responsibility of the dote is to implement the teaching effectiveness evaluation plan. The dote will insure that the review is carried out objectively according to the evaluation standards developed by the School of Biology and that any criticism is supported by evidence. The dote will coordinate the preparation of the teaching evaluation report and will discuss the report with the candidate. If desired, the candidate can include a statement, which addresses any concerns the candidate may have with the evaluation report. A copy of the evaluation report will be included to the candidate's personal file.

Teaching Effectiveness Evaluation Criteria of the School of Biology

The teaching effectiveness evaluation will be conducted during the time of the course offering. The evaluation process will focus on classroom instruction, substantive course content, instructional material, course assignments, student assessment, student advisement and results of student evaluation. These criteria will be addressed by the evaluation committee and the dote.

Review of general course information and content:

The instructor will provide the following material (if available):

Course information, typically handed out to the students at the beginning of a course which may include the course syllabus (course content), description of course objectives, course policies, assignments, instructional material, exams, grade sheets and teaching evaluation results. If a lab is associated with the course, the instructor will provide the lab manual course with a statement addressing the instructor's involvement in the selection of experiments, preparation of the manual and teaching of the lab.

The course information material will be evaluated by the members of the evaluation committee and the date by answering a questionnaire. If a reviewer perceives a deficiency, a short comment addressing the problem and a possible solution should be provided

Based on classroom observation, the evaluation committee and the date will complete a second questionnaire that reviews the instructor's teaching style. Short comments addressing potential problems and possible solutions will be provided.

In a final report the date will present the results of the teaching effectiveness evaluation, summarizing the review of the lecture activities, quality of syllabus, course material, class assignments and grading policy of the instructor

Questionnaire for the review of general course information and course content.

To be filled out after review of the course information that is handed out to the students. Circle the statement and/or the number on a scale from 1 to 5 that represents best your judgment. Leave comments according to your choice.

• **Statements about class attendance in the syllabus**

	Not observed	Attendance not required	Attendance required
Comments:			

• **Statements about excused absences in the syllabus**

	Not observed	Insufficiently mentioned	Adequately addressed	Clearly formulated
Comments:				

• **Office hours**

	1	2	3	4	5
Not observed	Insufficient office hours		Adequate office hours		Generous office hours
Comments:					

• **The number of exams and the timing of the exams are**

	1	2	3	4	5
Not observed	Inadequate		Adequate		Well-planned
Comments:					

• **Course objectives (what should the student learn from the course)**

	1	2	3	4	5
Not observed	Insufficiently mentioned		Adequately addressed		Clearly formulated

Comments:

- **Lecture topics, reading assignments and lecture dates as listed in the syllabus are:**

	1	2	3	4	5
Not observed	Not listed in sufficient detail		Adequately listed		Detailed and clearly listed; topics and lecture dates are well correlated

Comments:

- **The number of exams and timing of the exams are:**

	Not observed	1	2	3	4	5
		Inadequate		Adequate		Well planned

Comments:

- **Does the course material listed in the syllabus cover all topics that should be addressed in this course (compare with catalogue description, course objectives and syllabi of other faculty members)**

	1	2	3	4	5
Not observed	Insufficiently mentioned		Adequately addressed		Excellent coverage of all pertinent topics

Comments:

- **Are the course topics adequate for the level of the course? Is the course material challenging, are there any repetitions of material already covered in other courses ?**

1	2	3	4	5
Not observed	Topics are too basic	Adequate for the level of the course	Challenging course, students will be exposed to a variety of interesting topics	Course topics are too complex for the level of the course

Comments:

• **Student effort:**

1	2	3	4	5
Students will be challenged moderately		The course material is challenging, demanding a reasonable effort by the students		The course material is very challenging, demanding a significant effort by the students

Comments:

• **Overall organization of the course syllabus:**

	Not observed	1	2	3	4	5
		Disorganized		Organized		Clearly organized

Comments:

• **Suitability of instructional material (handouts, audio visuals, study guides, web sites)**

Not observed	1	2	3	4	5
	Adequate		Useful information that will promote a better understanding of the material		Will significantly help the students to study and to understand the material and prepare them for the exams

Comments:

Review of the exams

• Length of the exam

1	2	3	4	5
Too short		Appropriate length		Too long

Comments:

- **Are the questions relevant and relate to the major topics to be addressed in the course**

1	2	3	4	5
questions do not focus on the important topics, but on relatively unimportant details		questions focus adequately on the major topics discussed		questions address very well all the major topics discussed

Comments:

- **Degree of difficulty of the questions**

1	2	3	4	5
Too easy	Are of modest difficulty	Appropriately difficult	Challenging	Too difficult

Comments:

- **Do the students need to have a conceptual knowledge of the material to answer the questions ?**

1	2	3	4	5
Need to memorize only facts and definitions			Need to have some conceptual knowledge of the material	Need to know complex relationships, which go beyond mere memorization of facts

Comments:

- **How suitable are other methods used for student evaluation ?**

1	2	3	4	5
Not observed	Unsuitable	Suitable		Very suitable

Comments:

- **The grading system used by the instructor is:**

1	2	3	4	5
Questionable		Adequate		Very reasonable

Comments:

Questionnaire for the review of teaching performance in the class room

To be filled out after attending the lecture or viewing a video tape of the lecture

Lecture room

- **Adequate teaching environment (room, caustics, temperature, board, visual aids)**

1	2	3	4	5
Inadequate, not suitable for teaching		Adequate with some shortcomings		Excellent in every aspect

Comments:

Organization of the Lecture

- **Was a lecture outline given at beginning of the class ?**

1	2	3	4	5
No outline given	Briefly addressed	Acceptable		Very well

Comments:

- **Have the topics been presented in a logical sequence ?**

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

No clear sequence

Adequate

Topics are presented
in logical sequence

Comments:

- **What is the relationship between pace of the presentation and amount of material discussed ?**

1 2 3 4 5
Too slow Well paced Too fast

Comments:

- **The class time has been appropriately used**

1 2 3 4 5
Inappropriately used Adequate Excellent use

Comments:

Lecture Content

- **How well is the material related to the course syllabus**

1 2 3 4 5
Not observed Not related Acceptable Very well

Comments:

- **The value of the lecture content was**

1 2 3 4 5
Inadequate Useful Very valuable

Comments:

- **The content relates to current progress in the field.**

1	2	3	4	5
The material is outdated		Adequate		Very current

Comments:

- **The material has been covered with appropriate breadth**

1	2	3	4	5
Too narrow		Well balanced		Too broad

Comments

- **Has the material has been covered with appropriate depth ?**

1	2	3	4	5
Too shallow		Well covered		Too deep

Comments:

- **Was the level of difficulty of the material appropriate for the course ?**

1	2	3	4	5
Too easy		Well balanced		Too difficult

Comments:

- **Was the difficulty material explained ?**

1	2	3	4	5
Poorly		Adequately		Extremely well explained

Comments:

- **What was the quality of examples used in the lecture ?**

1 2 3 4 5
None given Useful examples Excellent examples

Comments:

Presentation of the Lecture

- How clearly does the instructor speak ? (pronunciation, accent, volume, speed)

1 2 3 4 5
Poorly Adequate very well

Comments:

- **Does personal mannerism interfere with the presentation ?**

1 2 3 4 5
Distracting Mildly noticeable Mannerism quite suitable

Comments:

- **How readable is the instructor's handwriting ?**

not observed 1 2 3 4 5
poor acceptable very good

Comments:

- **How well is the written material arranged on the board ?**

1 2 3 4 5

Not observed Poor Acceptable Very good

Comments:

- **Does the written and spoken material complement each other ?**

Not observed 1 2 3 4 5
Not well correlated Acceptable Very well

Comments

- **How involved is the instructor in the presentation ?**

1 2 3 4 5
Appears bored Neutral Very enthusiastic

Comments:

- **Does the instructor engage the students during the lecture ?**

1 2 3 4 5
Student participation is discouraged Responds to questions Encourages students to participate

Comments:

- **Does the instructor stimulate student thinking ?**

1 2 3 4 5
No stimulation Adequate stimulation Very stimulating

Comments:

- **How are the students responding to the lecture ?**

1 2 3 4 5
 Appear bored Neutral Very attentive

Comments:

- **The instructor demonstrates respect for the students ?**

 1 2 3 4 5
 Not observed No respect Indifferent Appropriately respectful

Comments:

Summary

- **The overall effectiveness of the instructor**

1 2 3 4 5
 Ineffective Adequately effective Highly effective

Comments:

What are the instructor's strengths ?

What are the instructor's weaknesses ?

Recommendations