

CS Policy: CS-FAC-001

Subject: Annual Merit/Salary Setting Process

Effective Date: 2023-02-28

Supersession: None

Approved: J. Kalita, Department Chair

Introduction

This annual merit review process for faculty CS is consistent with EAS Policy EAS-FAC-001 and is governed by Article V of the Laws of the Regents and CU Regent Policies 5 and 11. These are further delineated in CU Administrative Policy Statements 1006, 1009, and 5008.

- CU Laws of the Regents Article V: <https://www.cu.edu/regents/law/5>
- CU Regent Policy 5: <https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy/5>
- CU Regent Policy 11: <https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy/11>
- CU Administrative Policy Statement 1006: <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1006>
- CU Administrative Policy Statement 1009: <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1009>
- CU Administrative Policy Statement 5008: <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/5008>

In keeping with those policies, the annual review includes flexibility in times of significant disruptions (e.g., work-life, pandemic). The department chair may exercise judgments when impacts of major life, health, professional and personal factors require adjustment, when appropriate, in understanding the context in which the work was performed and may reduce expectations.

Each of the three areas of research/scholarship, teaching, and service will be evaluated using the scale below. Then the overall value will be calculated using the three ratings proportionately applying the weights in the individual faculty's approved workload plan. The overall value from the current evaluation will be rounded to 2 significant digits and mapped to a performance rating for the year using the scale:

- 0.0 - 1.49: Fail to Meet Expectations
- 1.5 - 2.49: Below Expectations
- 2.5 - 3.49: Meeting Expectations
- 3.5 - 4.49: Exceeding Expectations
- 4.5 - 5.00: Outstanding

Salary Setting Criteria and Processes for Full-Time Faculty

Criteria: The criteria for annual merit/salary setting are based on negotiated workload for the particular year and progress made on each of the items in the workload. Productivity expectations for the negotiated workload for tenured/tenure-track faculty will be based on [EAS Policy EAS-FAC-001 \(EAS Workload and Evaluation Policy\)](#), guided by the [CS Department RPT Document](#), with appropriate adjustments for workloads not explicitly described in those documents. For Instructors at all levels, the standard full-time workload is 80% teaching and 20% service/professional development, as stated in EAS Policy EAS-FAC-001, EAS Workload, and Evaluation Policy. This document will be used for annual evaluation processes, with appropriate adjustments for workloads not explicitly described in those documents. In addition to the expected productivity based on negotiated workload for the particular year, progress toward tenure and promotion requirements will be taken into account for pre-tenure faculty. How the faculty member contributes to the overall mission and activities of the department will also be taken into account.

In the CS Department RPT document, progress is measured along the primary categories of research, teaching, and service, with added dimensions within each category, and annual evaluations help support growth in each dimension. Faculty activities and, in particular, the department's RPT criteria and EAS-FAC-001 are based on cumulative measures combining multiple dimensions, but annual evaluations need per-year criteria. Outcomes, especially in research, can vary over time, and the faculty can also vary their focus over time. While the annual reviews are based on outcomes in a single year, faculty and chair can adjust the next year's goals, to be included in the annual review document, to keep the faculty on track for averages over time on the different dimensions of their workload. Therefore, in an annual review, attention will be paid to the previous year's written review and the record of the faculty as saved in Watermark for the current year, focusing on those dimensions, if any, that were explicitly called out in the previous year's written review as needing improvement.

As per department policy, for each of the categories of teaching, research and service, peer review is necessary. The process for peer observation and review is given in Appendix 1. These peer reviews are qualitative and will be considered by the chair in the annual review process.

Appeals on annual evaluations are to be addressed to the EAS dean.

Research Expectations

The annual review for faculty with more than a year of employment at UCCS will consider the annual criteria below as modified by the workload agreement while accounting for the fact that consistent with EAS-FAC-001 policy window, results and effort need not be uniform over the three years. The expectations will also be adjusted for any approved leaves. Annual reviews for the first year after hiring will be evaluated per the criteria outlined below but allowing the chair to consider limited time for the review period.

For faculty with a 40% research workload, the annual research expectations are as follows:

Meeting Expectations:

Submitting at least two papers or patents, and publishing at least one paper or patent
AND

\$250K in funding efforts, with dollar amounts in submitted proposals counted at 1x and dollar amounts in actual research expenditures from awarded grants and contracts counted at 5x.

For example, the following would all be meeting Expectations: \$250K in grant and/or contract submissions, or \$50K in research expenditures, or mixed amounts such as \$150K in submission and \$25K in expenditures will be considered the same.

Exceeding Expectations:

Submitting at least three papers or patents, and publishing two papers or patents (Note that significant publications, as defined in departmental RPT criterion, count as 2x) *AND* \$500K in funding efforts, with dollar amounts in submitted proposals counted at 1x and dollar amounts in actual research expenditures from awarded grants and contracts counted at 5x.

For example, \$500K in submissions, or \$100K in research expenditures, or a mixture of \$250K in submission and \$50K in expenditures will be considered the same.

Outstanding:

Requires substantially more publications or more grants than the Exceeding criterion.

The numbers above are expectations for annual evaluation for faculty at a 40% research workload. For differentiated workloads, the expected levels of effort are

linearly weighted unless explicitly overridden in the differentiated workload agreement, which must be approved by the faculty, the chair, and the dean.

Teaching Expectations

The following guidelines will be used to evaluate faculty teaching based on performance in the merit review. It is at the chair's discretion to identify performance scores that best match based a faculty's performance. This is for "normal" teaching load based on rank and is adjusted linearly for differentiated teaching load. Consistent with university policy regarding the use of FCQ, FCQ's count for no more than 1/3rd of the teaching evaluation.

- *Meets Expectations*: Faculty earn this level of performance by teaching the required number of courses AND obtaining average peer teaching evaluations AND with average FCQ ratings on the RPT-specified questions being within one standard deviation of average for the department.
- *Exceeds Expectations*: Faculty earn this level by meeting the requirements of the above performance level and earning at least two points from the Teaching Element Point Values in Appendix 2
- *Outstanding*: Faculty earn this level by meeting the requirements of Exceeding Expectations performance level and earning at four (total) points from the Teaching Element Point Values in Appendix 2.

Service Expectations

- *Meets Expectations*: Faculty earn this level of performance by earning four service points as defined in the Service Element Point Values in Appendix 2.
- *Exceeds Expectations*: Faculty earn this level by earning of six service points. The chair will assign point values for activities not listed in Appendix 2.
- *Outstanding*: Faculty earn this level by earning eight service points. Activities not listed in Appendix 2 will be assigned a point value by the chair.

Process and Timing of Evaluations

A faculty member's Scholarly Report will be completed at the time set by the college. and will provide the basis for the start of the review. Using the criteria and process outlined in this document, the chair will have the flexibility to make the appropriate evaluation. Faculty members will meet with their Department Chair following the submission of reports for the purpose of reviewing the faculty member's performance. At this meeting, the Department Chair's expectations of the faculty member during the next year will be discussed, and, if appropriate, written goals for the next year may be

generated and included in the current review. Also, at this meeting, the faculty member will be given, in writing, the Department Chair's overall evaluation of his/her performance for the past year and the reasons for that evaluation. The Chair will also indicate his/her intention to recommend an above-average, average, or below-average raise for the coming year, corresponding to the results of the evaluation.

Sabbatical Leave Salary Setting Process

Whenever possible, the faculty member on sabbatical leave will submit a Scholarly Report at the usual time on all activities that occurred at the University before the faculty member left on sabbatical leave. An additional written report will be submitted to cover the time absent from the University while on sabbatical leave. This written report will be attached to the Scholarly Report. The sabbatical plan should address the modified workload.

Other Leaves

For leaves as approved by the chair, the evaluation process will be based on approved leave paperwork, with contributions weighted based on the expected workload.

For any faculty on leave, sabbatical or otherwise, the meeting with the Department Chair will be waived if circumstances and location of the leave make this meeting inconvenient. In this case, the faculty member on leave will be sent a written evaluation of his/her performance during the past year.

Appendix 1

Peer Observation and Review Plan for CS Faculty

The peer observation plan is divided into three parts: Peer Observation of Teaching, Peer Observation of Research, and Peer Review of Service.

Peer Observation of Teaching

Description

The faculty members of the Department of Computer Science at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs (UCCS) are committed to continuous improvement of teaching and instruction in its various forms, including lecture, laboratory, collaborative research, club advising, and service-learning. The goal of this Peer Observation Program is to help all Department members, regardless of rank or teaching duties, become more effective educators who are better at engaging, challenging, and nurturing students. This formal observation plan focuses on observing concrete examples of effective teaching, encouraging those behaviors, and identifying possible areas for improvement including self-assessment and peer mentoring. This is a formal program and is a component of the annual review process for all faculty including tenure-track, instructors, and adjuncts. This program encourages faculty members of all ranks to continually reflect on their teaching and to consider ways to improve in their role as educators. This program also provides concrete data regarding the effectiveness of a faculty member's in-class teaching for the annual review process, complementing the FCQ and Watermark data, serving as an additional voice to encourage and document excellence in teaching.

Process

For each faculty member in the program both full-time and part-time IRC faculty, a peer will be assigned on an annual basis and the two faculty members will observe each other's classes and discuss and reflect on their observations with the goal of identifying areas for improvement and celebrating strengths. Teaching by lecturers will be observed and evaluated by the chair of the department.

The detailed process is as follows:

- Faculty members are paired with a single peer for a calendar year by the promotion and tenure committee. Every attempt will be made to assign faculty a peer of a different rank or position so that inexperienced faculty are paired with experienced faculty. Peers will be rotated between years so that the same faculty members are not paired in subsequent years.
- Faculty members will observe a single class session in an academic year, subject to sabbatical, leave or major life events.

- The faculty pair discuss which class session will be attended and agree to a specific session prior to the observation. This can be done during the pre-observation meeting but should probably be done prior so that both faculty can come to the pre-observation meeting prepared.
- The following steps will be completed for each member of the pair, but meetings can be combined to reduce the time commitment.
 - Pre-Observation Meeting
 - The pair meet to discuss the learning objectives for the class session to be observed and the techniques that will be employed to promote learning by the students in the class.
 - Questions about the topic to be addressed should be discussed at this time. If the observer is unfamiliar with the content in the class, the observee should take the time during this meeting to familiarize the observer with the content and answer any questions they might have.
 - The pair completes the pre-observation component of the Peer Observation form along with identifying which elements will be observed by marking the Observe checkboxes.
 - Class Observation
 - The observer attends and observes the observee's entire class session, documenting the techniques used to promote learning, communication styles used, student involvement, etc. as described in the Peer Observation form, given in Appendix 4.
 - The observer completes the observation comments of the Peer Observation form.
 - Post-Observation Meeting
 - The pair meet after the observation to review the observation and discuss the faculty member's strengths and areas for improvement.
 - Specific ideas should be presented and discussed to help the observee understand how they might improve their teaching to better help students learn.
 - Final Report
 - The observee then writes a self-evaluation of their performance and plans for improvement based on the discussions from the observation.
 - Both the Peer Observation form and the Self-evaluation are provided to the annual review individual or committee.

Challenging an Observation

If a faculty member does not agree with the observation comments, they may challenge those comments in their self-evaluation or request another department faculty member, of their choice, to observe their class to obtain a second observation report and complete another self-evaluation. Both reports and self-evaluations will be provided as part of the annual review.

Peer Review of Research

Description

The faculty members of the Department of Computer Science at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs (UCCS) are committed to continuous improvement of research in its various forms including publishing, applying for and administering of grants, supervising undergraduate and graduate students' research, reviewing publications and grants, and serving a conference or journal in a leadership capacity. The goal of this Peer Review program is to provide interpretation of the contributions of a tenure-track faculty member in their area(s) of research within the context of that/those research area(s). Recognizing that different research areas have different levels of opportunity including grant funding and publications, it is important to capture impact relative to those opportunities. This formal review process is part of the annual review process for all tenure-track and research faculty. This process encourages faculty members of all ranks to continually reflect on their research activities and to consider ways to improve in their role as researchers. This process also provides an interpretation of the impact of a researcher's work in their specific area(s) of expertise.

Process

All tenure-track and research faculty both part-time and full-time at all ranks, will select an individual within the department that they consider a peer in their area of expertise. It is not necessary that the peer be of the same promotional level, especially if no one with the appropriate area of expertise exists at the same promotional level. The more important consideration should be a shared understanding of the faculty member's area(s) of research and awareness of current research and grant opportunities in the research area(s). Multiple faculty may be selected as reviewers if the contributions are in several research areas. Once selected, the faculty member will request the peer write a review of their research contributions over the previous year. The review will be based on their Watermark annual evaluation "dossier", provided by the reviewee, with the potential to add examples of grant applications, publications, student research, etc. that demonstrates the reviewee's efforts along with brief descriptions of other research-related contributions. A listing of all work will be provided, but only a few examples of research products need to be included. A faculty member may refuse to provide a review after being approached and the reviewee will need to request a review from another faculty member. Review form in Appendix 4.

Dossier

The goal of the dossier is to provide the reviewer with a sufficient overview of the research work completed over the course of the previous year. This requires the Watermark report and reviewees can include, or reviewer can request, one more example of each relevant product listed below. If the reviewee did not produce any relevant work for one or more of the following areas, they do not need to include examples. For contributions from research-related activities that do not have a tangible product, like reviewing grants or papers, a short description of the

faculty member's activities is appropriate. All products and contributions listed should be elements that would count toward the research component of the Promotion and Tenure process. Relevant activities not listed below may be included as well, appropriately documented. Most of these descriptions can be provided directly by the Watermark report, if the reviewee chooses.

Products

Concrete products submitted by the reviewee or their students. A complete listing of all products should be included but only one example of each is required.

- Grant applications
- Papers published/submitted
- Presentations/talks slides
- Master's Project/Thesis proposed/defended
- PhD Dissertation proposed/defended; Oral Exam completed

Contributions

Description of all research-related activities that do not have an associated product.

- Reviewing papers for a conference or journal
- Reviewing grant applications
- Serving as leadership for a conference or journal
- Presenting research at a conference

Review Letter

After reviewing the dossier provided by the reviewee, the reviewer will compose a letter discussing the significance of the reviewee's contributions to their area(s) of research, providing context from the research area(s), and specific examples from the dossier. The letter should address the following:

- Relevance of contributions within the reviewee's area(s) of research
- Areas of strength for the reviewee
- Areas for improvement for the reviewee and suggestions for improving those areas

The letter will be provided to the reviewee and the reviewer and reviewee may optionally meet to discuss the contents of the letter, for possible revision, prior to submission by the reviewer, for the annual review process.

Self-Evaluation Letter

In response to the reviewer's letter, the reviewee should write a self-evaluation of their contributions, areas of strength, and areas for improvement and include a specific plan for improving those areas. The reviewee may also use the letter to rebut the reviewer's conclusions or provide additional evidence.

Challenging a Review

If the reviewee feels like their work has been unfairly represented and does not agree with the reviewer's conclusion, they may request another faculty member provide an additional review. All reviews will be provided as part of the annual review process.

Peer Review of Service

Description

The faculty members of the Department of Computer Science at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs (UCCS) are committed to continuous improvement of service in its various forms including service to students, the department, the college, the University, the UC system, and the greater non-UCCS community. The goal of this Peer Review program is to provide an interpretation of a faculty member's contributions based on their classification as IRC or tenure-track faculty. Recognizing that different faculty classifications have different levels of opportunity to participate in service activities, it is important to capture service relative to those opportunities. This formal review process is part of the annual review process for all tenure-track and IRC faculty with the exception of adjunct faculty. This process encourages faculty members of all ranks to continually reflect on their service activities and to consider ways to improve in their service to the community. This process also provides interpretation of the impact of a faculty member's service in their classification.

Process

All tenure-track and IRC faculty both part-time and full-time at all ranks with the exception of adjunct faculty, will select an individual within the department that is their peer in classification and if possible, promotional level. It is more important that the peer be of the same classification (tenure-track or IRC) than that the peer be at the same promotional level.

Once selected, the faculty member will request the peer write a review of their service activities over the previous year. The review will be based on a dossier, provided by the reviewee, with descriptions of the service activities of the faculty member during the previous year. A faculty member may refuse to provide a review after being approached and the reviewee will need to request a review from another faculty member.

If convenient and appropriate, the same individual(s) used for the Teaching Observation or Research Review may also complete the Service Review.

Dossier

The goal of the dossier is to provide the reviewer with a comprehensive understanding of all of the service work completed over the previous year. Most of these descriptions can be provided directly by the Watermark report if the reviewee so chooses.

Review Letter

After reviewing the dossier provided by the reviewee, the reviewer will compose a letter discussing the significance of the reviewee's service activities, providing context based on the reviewee's classification, and specific examples from the dossier. The letter should address the following:

- Relevance of activities within the reviewee's classification (IRC or tenure-track)
- Areas of strength for the reviewee
- Areas for improvement for the reviewee and suggestions for improving those areas

The letter will be provided to the reviewee and the reviewer and reviewee may optionally meet to discuss the contents of the letter, for possible revision, prior to submission by the reviewer, for the annual review process.

Self-Evaluation Letter

In response to the reviewer's letter, the reviewee should write a self-evaluation of their activities, areas of strength, and areas for improvement and include a specific plan for improving those areas. The reviewee may also use the letter to rebut the reviewer's conclusions or provide additional evidence.

Challenging a Review

If the reviewee feels like their work has been unfairly represented and does not agree with the reviewer's conclusion, they may request another faculty member provide an additional review. All reviews will be provided as part of the annual review process.

Appendix 2

Teaching and Service Point Values

Teaching Element Point Values:

The following point allocations per activity will be used as a general guide for evaluation that call for point values. Additional activities not listed here may be eligible to count toward the teaching evaluation but must be addressed review and assigned point values by the chair. Elements that are duplicated from the teaching elements under service may count for either Teaching or Service, but not for both (the candidate is advised to document where they want these to count in their review). Additional points may be awarded by the Chair for extraordinary examples such as a web-based tutorial series, book adoption by multiple institutions, FCQs more than ½ standard deviation above department average, extensive professional development course, etc.

1. (1 pt) Writes one proposal for curriculum or student scholarship
2. (1 pt) Develops online materials (website, tutorials, etc.) that are distributed online with demonstrated use by non-UCCS members
3. (1 pt) Completes a professional development course (may be non-credit earning) to expand their knowledge or teaching skills and applies that new knowledge to the development of their courses
4. (1 pt) Attendance at a conference relevant to the content they teach (include CS Education conferences also)
5. (1 pt) Earning a professional certification or academic certificate
6. (1 pt) Design a new course to the department or completely redesign a course (including a MOOC)
7. (1 pt) Significantly Positive Peer Review (as determined by Chair)
8. (1 pt per full day) Teaching a workshop for K-12 or non-UCCS community
9. (1 pt per 3-credit course or equivalent) Working toward a graduate degree, academic certificate, or professional certificate that enhances the instructor's knowledge relevant to their courses
10. (1 pt per preparation above 4) Teaches more than 4 preparations in a year
11. (2 pts) Achieves annual FCQ analysis at least ½ standard deviation above comparable classes for the FCQ questions listed above (questions not listed above, they're below)
12. (2 pts) Wins one grant for curriculum or student scholarship
13. (3 pts) Completing a graduate degree that enhances the instructor's knowledge relevant to their courses (including advanced education degrees as well)
14. (3 pts) Develops a textbook adopted by at least one other institution, credit when adopted.
15. (3 pts) Develops and delivers one or more MOOCs
16. (3 pts) Developing and teaching a course new to the instructor

17. (5 pts) Developing a new degree program for the department (only if we launch the program)
18. (5 pts) Converting an existing course to an online course.

Service Element Point Values:

The following point allocations per activity will be used as a general guide for evaluation where point values are used. These elements must be addressed in the required review. Additional activities not listed here may be eligible to count toward the service evaluation but must be addressed in the review and assigned point values by the Chair. Elements that are duplicated from the teaching elements under service may count for either Teaching or Service, but not for both (the candidate is advised to document where they want these to count in their portfolio). Additional points may be awarded by the Chair for extraordinary examples such as receiving a particularly large grant, chairing an important or broadly reaching committee like Faculty Senate, or administering an ongoing service requiring extraordinary commitment like an outreach activity for middle school students that meets weekly for a workshop, etc. Points are calculated per event, class, activity, etc.

1. (1 pt) Serving on a standing or ad hoc department, UCCS, or system committee include Primary Unit Committee, hiring committees, curriculum committees, Diversity-Equity-Inclusiveness committees, etc., with exceptions for larger time commitments listed individually below.
2. (1 pt) Representing UCCS at a non-UCCS community event (promotional booth, career day, etc.)
3. (1 pt) Completes a professional development course (maybe non-credit earning) to expand their knowledge or teaching skills and applies that new knowledge to the development of their courses
4. (1 pt) Serving on a conference program or organizing committee or journal editorial board.
5. (1 pt) Instructor only: Submitting a grant as an investigator or consultant on the grant
6. (1 pts per year) Instructor only: Administering a grant as or bring an investigator or consultant on the grant
7. (1 pt) Mentoring a faculty member for at least 10 or more hours
8. (1 pt) Student Club Faculty Advisor
9. (1 pt) Serving as the designated course coordinator for classes with multiple sections
10. (1 pt) Serving as the designated course coordinator for core courses where consistency of content and presentation are required
11. (1 pt for each course) Participating in ABET-related course assessment
12. (1 pt per partial or full day) Teaching a workshop for K-12 or non-UCCS community
13. (1 pt per 3-credit course) Working toward a graduate degree that enhances the instructor's knowledge relevant to their courses
14. (1 pt for every 10 students enrolled) Serving as a Program Director for a PhD or Master's program
15. (1 pt for every 50 students) Serving as a Program Director for a Bachelor's or Minor program

16. (1 pt) Substantially above average Service Peer Review (as decided by Chair)
17. (2 pts) Serving on a Compass Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate, or other committee with bi-weekly meetings.
18. (2 pts) Developing a new Bachelor's or Master's program proposal (+1 if we launch the program)
19. (2 pts) Serving as the chairperson of an ad hoc or standing department, UCCS, or system committee
20. (2 pts) Completing a graduate degree that enhances the instructor's knowledge relevant to their courses (include advanced education degrees as well) Counts as service or teaching but not both.
21. (2 pts) Submitting a scholarship grant proposal for funding as Principal or Co-principal Investigator (Count as service or teaching but not both)
22. (2 pts) Receiving a scholarship grant as a Principal or Co-principal Investigator Count as service or teaching but not both)
23. (2 pts per year) Administering a scholarship grant as a Principal or Co-principal Investigator
24. (2 pts) Serving on a Faculty/Instructor Search Committee within the department
25. (3 pts) Chairing a Faculty/Instructor Search Committee within the department
26. (5 pts) Serving as the ABET committee chairperson in an evaluation year

Appendix 3

Publications

A *refereed publication* is a paper that receives multiple formal written reviews provided before acceptance and publication and is not viewed by the primary unit committee as a predatory publisher. A candidate can request a faculty vote on if a publisher is predatory before submitting a publication. The reviews will be included in the dossier.

Significant publications are those that are more likely to have long term impact or have demonstrated significance by their level of citations. We define *Significant publications* to include journal, conference, workshop and other papers, which meet either of the following two properties:

1. Refereed paper in a venue from top 20 listed Google Scholar Engineering and Computer Science subcategory or a venue with a Google metric h-index of at least 20. The portfolio will include supporting data. As the metrics can change candidates will capture the metrics in the year when the paper is published/submitted. Ideally capture the metrics in the year when the paper is submitted.
OR
2. Any paper or patent with at least 30 non-self-citations in Google Scholar. The candidate will need to list the citations in the dossier. Papers with higher citation numbers can be considered very significant papers, which may be counted as more than regular papers with each 30 non-self-citations counting as an added non-significant paper.

The department values multi-author publications and does not place any difference on the weight on papers based on author ordering on publications.

Peer Observation of Teaching Report

Observee: _____

Observer: _____

Course Name and number: _____

Pre-Observation and Post-Observation Meetings: General goals and objectives

Pre-observation (Instructor completes) **Post-observation** (Reviewer completes)

Personal teaching goals for this session:	Reviewer: Comments on goal achievement

Observation Procedure:

Instructor: Place a check in the box labeled “**Observe**” opposite any statement that you would like to have viewed by the peer.

Reviewer: Please indicate areas of “**Strength**”, “**Competence**”, or “**Improvement**” for each item (where appropriate) and provide specific examples under each category.

Organization

(O)bserve, Area of (S)trength, (C)ompetence, (I)mprovement

O	Description	S	C	I
	Reviews prior class material to prepare students for today			
	Clearly states the goal or objective for the period			
	Summarizes and distills main points at the end of class			
	Appears well-prepared for class			

Comments:

Presentation

(O)bserve, Area of (S)trength, (C)ompetence, (I)mprovement

O	Description	S	C	I
	Speaks clearly and at a rate that facilitates note-taking			
	Establishes/maintains eye contact with students			
	Communicates enthusiasm toward the content			
	Effectively incorporates appropriate Media is clear/organized			

Comments:

Rapport and Classroom Interactions

(O)bserve, Area of (S)trength, (C)ompetence, (I)mprovement

O	Description	S	C	I
	Creates an environment of respect, conducive to learning			
	Encourages diverse points of view			
	Checks for student comprehension of course material			
	Encourages student involvement, e.g., questions, discussion			

	Responds constructively to students' comments/questions			
--	---	--	--	--

Comments:

Content

(O)bserve, Area of (S)trength, (C)ompetence, (I)mprovement

O	Description	S	C	I
	Relates content to previous or future course material			
	Examples are relevant			
	Explanations of difficult terms/concepts are done with clarity			
	Varied perspectives are presented when appropriate			

Comments:

Classroom Activities

(O)bserve, Area of (S)trength, (C)ompetence, (I)mprovement

O	Description	S	C	I
	Clearly explains the goal, directions, or procedures			
	Provides clear demonstrations if appropriate			

	Allows sufficient time for completion of task(s)			
	Provides constructive verbal feedback when necessary			
	Students have appropriate skills to complete task successfully			

Comments:

Additional Comments