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*Each academic department is required by University Handbook policy to develop department documents containing criteria, standards, and guidelines for promotion, tenure, reappointment, annual evaluation and merit salary allocation. These documents must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty members in the department, by the department head or chair, by the dean concerned, and by the provost. In accordance with University Handbook policy, provision must be made to review these documents at least once every five years or more frequently if it is determined to be necessary. Dates of revision (or the vote to continue without revision) must appear on the first page of the document.
This document describes the Annual Merit Evaluation System to be used for the faculty of the Department of Diagnostic Medicine/Pathobiology. The system functions within the procedures and constraints of University policy and is in conformance with applicable sections of the University Faculty Handbook. Components of this document have been drawn from the Faculty Handbook; the University Guideline for Evaluation of Unclassified Personnel; the Office of Unclassified Affairs and University Compliance; the University of Georgia Guideline for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure; as well as past and current Departmental documents.
INTRODUCTION

The purposes of this annual evaluation process are to i) assess the performance of each faculty member in comparison with their pre-established goals and objectives, ii) review and establish new goals and objectives for each faculty member in relation to Departmental missions, iii) evaluate and adjust the percent effort each faculty member applies to various areas of responsibilities, and iv) review and establish new Departmental directions and areas deserving special emphasis.

This Annual Evaluation System is designed to reflect the unique aspects of the Department of Diagnostic Medicine / Pathobiology in terms of its missions while recognizing the diversity of faculty interests, abilities, assignments, and academic/scientific disciplines. Within this context, the Evaluation System is designed to promote and recognize excellence in all areas of academic responsibility without favoritism or preference given to any activity or discipline. The System is designed to balance the quality and quantity of a faculty member’s contribution and to match the changing needs of the Department with the evolving talents of the faculty and needs of the state/nation.

Given the diversity of faculty assignments, disciplines, and responsibilities within the Department (one of the broadest in the University), this Evaluation System is based on the understanding that evaluations should be based on multiple sources of input from different perspectives. In this regard, it is important to recognize that evaluation of faculty performance in a professional environment is complex and multifactoral, so that even highly specific evaluation criteria may not accurately reflect a faculty member’s contribution. Within this environment, adequate evaluation requires a degree of professional judgment by qualified peers. Peers are particularly well-qualified to assess the relative importance of an activity and the degree of individual versus shared contributions, while balancing the quality and quantity of the faculty member’s accomplishments.

The Department’s Evaluation System is based on the precept that multiple professional judgments provided by academic peers, the Diagnostic Laboratory Director* and the Department Head reduce the likelihood of unfounded subjective assessments. Competent persons will ordinarily arrive at similar, although not identical, judgments regarding the merit of professional activities, and the pooled judgment of several competent professionals tends to be more reliable than the judgment of any one person. Use of multiple raters enhances the reliability with which things such as scientific/professional publications, instructional materials, student rating of teaching effectiveness, and various service activities are evaluated. Although it is recognized that the use of multiple raters (in this case peers) increases both the cost and complexity of the evaluation, the use of peer groups provides a reasonable and desirable tradeoff.

Faculty assignments are set individually for each faculty member via an agreement between the Department Head, the Diagnostic Laboratory Director* and the faculty member at the beginning of each evaluation year and must reflect the faculty member’s goals and objectives. It is important for the assignment to be established as early in the evaluation period as practically possible. If the Department Head, the Diagnostic Laboratory Director* and the faculty member do not reach an agreement, the opinion of the Head will be followed. In such cases, the faculty member will be informed in writing of the reasons for the assignment. The faculty member retains the right to appeal the decision per University policy. Faculty assignments are subject to renegotiation in the event of changes in the faculty member’s responsibilities or to meet unanticipated needs of the Department.

* For those faculty with directed service appointment.
PROCEDURES

Faculty merit salary adjustment is an annual procedure, and University policies specify the responsibilities of the Faculty, Department Head, the Diagnostic Laboratory Director* and higher level administrators. The Department’s annual evaluation document (this document) describes the specific policies, procedures, and performance standards/guidelines.

Any evaluation of faculty performance requires thoughtful judgment and should not be done superficially, carelessly, or with undue haste. At the same time, it is a task that often must be performed relatively quickly. The University’s budgetary calendar imposes limits on the time available, but the strain that the process may place on working relationships is equally important. It is important that the Department Head guide the process in a deliberate fashion that allows it to be completed with minimum disruption while preserving accuracy and fairness.

Also related to timing is the need to have clear and reasonable deadlines for the submission of materials for evaluation. All faculty members should be made aware of when the materials are due. Nevertheless, both professional courtesy and practicality dictates that the exact deadline for a given year should be announced sufficiently early to provide ample opportunity to assemble and submit the required materials. If a faculty member, in spite of reasonable notice, fails to provide the necessary information, the Department Head will send a written reminder.

If, after being informed of the possible consequences, the faculty member still does not make the materials available, the Department Head may assign that faculty member a “fails to meet minimum performance expectations” evaluation. Since annual evaluation provides the basis for salary adjustment recommendations, faculty who fail to submit materials provides the Department Head with justification to recommend no salary increase.

One of the most fundamental elements of effective evaluation is maintaining clear communication between the Department Head, the Diagnostic Laboratory Director* and Departmental Faculty. Two major communication requirements associated with the evaluation process are: 1) to create a mutual understanding as to what the individual will be held accountable for in the coming year in terms of assignments, the relative importance of each assignment, and the specific methods that will be used to assess performance, and 2) to communicate the results of the evaluation clearly and constructively.

Within the Department of Diagnostic Medicine / Pathobiology, annual faculty evaluations are based on the combined rating of the Department Head (50%) or a combination of Department Head and the Diagnostic Laboratory Director* (50%) and the rating of faculty peers (50%). In the case of those faculty with directed service appointments, the 50% Departmental Administration rating will be proportioned according to the faculty members percent directed service component. For example: in the case of a faculty member with 50% directed service and 50% teaching/research, the Administrative rating would be the combined rating of the Department Head (25%) and the Diagnostic Laboratory Director (25%). In the case of a faculty member with 30% directed service and 70% teaching/research, the Administrative rating would be the combined rating of the Department Head (35%) and the Diagnostic Laboratory Director (15%). The Director of the Diagnostic Laboratory participates in the administrative review of all faculty with directed service as a component of their appointment and provides evaluation of the directed service activities of those faculty members.

Faculty membership in a peer group is determined by assignment percentage for the evaluation period. Those faculty in a peer group who have specific/special knowledge are encouraged to provide a rating of all other faculty in their peer group. Performance assessments in areas a peer does not feel qualified to evaluate are not required to provide a peer rating. In addition, faculty who are members of another peer group, but feel qualified to provide a rating of faculty in one or more area(s) of responsibility, are free to do so.

* For those faculty with directed service appointment.
Faculty Peer Groups:

Group 1: Instruction: Research and/or Service  
Group 2: Research*: Instruction and/or Service  
Group 3: Service: Instruction and/or Research

*Given the number of members in the research peer group is sufficiently large to place an undue burden on faculty to review every member of the group, the group will be randomly divided into two approximately equal cohorts (see Step 4 of the process).

Near the beginning of the evaluation period, each faculty member will meet with the Department Head or jointly with the Department Head and Diagnostic Laboratory Director* to review their performance during the previous evaluation period and to establish personal goals, objectives, and distribution of effort for the new evaluation period, and to discuss the relative importance of these areas within the context of the Department’s priorities and subunit goals.

The Department Head and the Diagnostic Laboratory Director* should see that the results of this discussion are embodied in the Statement of Expectations for the individual faculty member for the upcoming evaluation period. This Statement is intended to guard against misunderstandings regarding work assignments and expectations. It should be clear to all concerned it may be necessary to modify the Statement during the evaluation period, as it is impossible to anticipate all contingencies that may require redistribution of a faculty member’s assignment and/or the modification of objectives and goals. Justification for each modification should be attached to the Objectives, Goals, and Plan of Work.

The Department Head’s and the Diagnostic Laboratory Director’s* written evaluation of each faculty member must be carefully prepared and contain four distinct parts: (1) a review of the individual’s assignment and the weight attached to each responsibility during the previous evaluation period; (2) succinct assessments of effectiveness in performing each responsibility and a statement of the overall evaluation, which must be consistent with the weights assigned to the individual ratings; (3) a summary of the substantive evidence used to arrive at evaluation judgments and recommended salary adjustment category; and (4) where appropriate, formative suggestions for improvement.

Once the Evaluation Report has been prepared, the Department Head will recommend a salary adjustment category for each faculty member (see Overall Performance Categories). The recommended percentage increase is based on the principle that salary adjustments for faculty with higher levels of accomplishment shall exceed those for faculty with lower levels of accomplishment. There is no requirement that the number of faculty within performance categories be the same or normally distributed.

For the purpose of annual salary adjustments, the overall performance of each faculty member will be rated using the following “Overall Performance Categories:”

1. Fails to meet established minimum performance expectations.  
2. Meets minimum expectations but improvement is necessary if possible.  
3. Meets individually established expectations.  
4. Meets individually established expectations at a high level.  
5. Exceeds individually established expectations.

Each faculty member will review and must be given the opportunity to discuss the final written evaluation with the Department Head and the Diagnostic Laboratory Director*. Before the Department Head submits it to the next administrative level, each faculty member must sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review and react to the Evaluation and Overall Performance Category. Because the amount of funds available for merit salary increases is generally not known at the time, specific percent increases may not be discussed at this stage. When this information becomes available, the Department Head will inform each faculty member in writing of the recommended percent salary adjustment.

* For those faculty with directed service appointment.
SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

Step 1: At the beginning of the evaluation period, the Department Head will call a faculty meeting to discuss how well the Department collectively met its missions and specific priorities (including subunit objectives) during the previous evaluation period. At this meeting, the Department Head will also present proposals concerning new or modified Departmental priorities for the upcoming year.

Step 2: Department Head will inform the faculty of the projected calendar for completing the evaluation process. The Department Head will distribute the Department’s Annual Evaluation Documents and request that each faculty provide an Annual Performance Report, as well as draft Annual Objectives, Goals, Plan-of-Work, and Estimated Percent Effort for the next evaluation period.

Step 3: Department Head will review the documents submitted by each faculty member for completeness, make adjustments in peer group assignments as required, and distribute copies of the Annual Performance Reports, and Peer Assessment Summary form to faculty peers. Copies of these documents will be held on file in the Departmental Office for review by faculty choosing to provide peer assessments for faculty in peer groups other than their own. The faculty member’s Objectives, Goals, and Plan-of-Work documents will be retained by the Department Head.

Step 4: Departmental faculty will review the documents of their peers and provide ratings for peer group members as well as those faculty for which they feel qualified to assess, but are not in their peer group. Peer Group 2 (Research: Instruction and/or Service) will be randomly divided into two approximately equal cohorts. The selection of members of each cohort will be completed each year by Departmental administrative assistant without the involvement of the Department Head. The annual reviews for all members of Peer Group 2 will be distributed to all members of the Group, but peer evaluations are only required for those members that have been assigned.

Step 5: The Department Head will tabulate peer ratings, formulate ratings of faculty, and calculate the final numerical assessment using the Annual Evaluation Worksheet for that year.

Step 6: The Department Head will meet with each faculty member to review the peer and Department Head’s numerical assessments for the previous evaluation period. For those faculty members with directed service appointments, the Department Head and Director of the Diagnostic Laboratory will participate in the evaluation of the faculty member. At this meeting the Department Head and the Diagnostic Laboratory Director* and the faculty member will discuss the faculty member’s proposed objectives, goals, plan-of-work, and percent effort distribution for the next year. In some cases additional meetings may be necessary to arrive at agreement. In cases where the faculty member, the Diagnostic Laboratory Director and the Department Head do not agree, the Department Head’s position will be followed. The faculty member retains the right to challenge this determination through the established University appeal and grievance procedures.

* For those faculty with directed service appointment.
**Step 7:** The Department Head will prepare and distribute to each faculty member, his or her Annual Performance Summary. The faculty member will be given an opportunity to correct factual errors and provide additional clarification concerning the Annual Performance Summary. Based on this input the Department Head in consultation with the Diagnostic Laboratory Director* is free to amend the Annual Performance Summary. In response the faculty member may prepare a written statement concerning the Review and will sign the Annual Performance Summary.

**Step 8:** At the completion of the annual review process, the Department Head will inform the faculty as to the membership in the peer groups for the next year, review the collective outcome of the review process, and suggest improvements in the process.

* For those faculty with directed service appointment.
SERVICE CODES

A - UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION: All activities related to teaching of undergraduate courses (less than 500 level). To include: a) preparation of course content, b) time in the classroom/laboratory, c) direct contact with students related to the course, d) time spent in evaluations of student performance, e) administrative duties related to the course (supervision of assistants, coordination between instructors/classes, etc.), and f) activities related to improving general instruction (excluding committee work).

B - GRADUATE / PROFESSIONAL INSTRUCTION: All activities related to teaching of graduate courses (500 level or higher). To include a) preparation of course content, b) time in the classroom/laboratory, c) direct contact with students related to the course, d) time spent in evaluations of student performance, e) administrative duties related to the course (supervision of assistants, coordination between instructors/classes, etc.), and f) activities related to improving general instruction (excluding committee work).

C - UNDERGRADUATE / PROFESSIONAL STUDENT ADVISING: Activities related to the general advising of undergraduate/professional students including time spent on enrollment, career choice, general academic issues, and personal counseling related to academic issues.

D - GRADUATE ADVISING: Activities related to all aspects of graduate education and post-doctoral training. Included in this is time spent with graduate students on enrollment issues, career choices, academic issues, and personal counseling related to academic issues. Also included is time spent working with graduate students on thesis/reports and dissertation research as the Major Professor or member of the supervisory committee.

E - DEPARTMENTAL / COLLEGE FUNDED RESEARCH / CREATIVE WORK: Research and other creative activities are directly supported by the Department’s or College’s operational budget. Included in this is work done on books, book chapters, monographs, presentations at professional/scientific meetings, grant writing, and unfunded management of grant activities. Also included in this is independent research and other creative work directed at the generation, synthesis, or dissemination of knowledge.

F - RESEARCH / CREATIVE WORK FUNDED FROM EXTERNAL SOURCES: Research and creative activities that are supported by the Agricultural Experiment Station, state and federal grants, contracts/grants from private/public companies or not-for-profit organizations, or any other source of research support other than that provided via the Department’s or College’s operational budget.

G - DIRECTED / PUBLIC SERVICE: Activities associated with the collection and dissemination of information to individuals and the general public through written, oral, or electronic media. Activities in this area involve the application of institutional resources and expertise that extends beyond those normally provided in support of instruction and research. Among other things this includes faculty time involved in the application of knowledge or special expertise in the area of animal disease diagnosis and public health.

H - UNIVERSITY / COLLEGE / DEPARTMENTAL SERVICE: All activities related to serving and chairing standing and special committees / task forces on issue or tasks at the Departmental, College, or University level. This includes the initiating, working on, and/or providing support for projects of all types which support the goals, objectives and missions of the Department, College and/or University. Also included in this is time spent attending Departmental, College, and University meetings.

I - PROFESSIONAL SERVICE: Activities involved with participating in professional or scientific groups. This would include time spent in leadership roles outside the University. This also includes service activities provided to the public or private organizations because of special expertise (editorial boards, grant review panels, expert panels, advisory boards, expert witness, etc.).
J - PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Activities associated with the development or improvement of a faculty member’s skills and abilities. This includes sabbatical leaves, courses, workshops, training programs, research seminars, and clinical rounds. Also included are less formal development efforts undertaken by individual faculty to develop or improve his or her knowledge or skills in a specific area or discipline. Examples include the preparations for specialty board certification or “retooling” in areas that a faculty member is returning to after a period of absence.

K - ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION: Activities associated with the administrative functions in support of Departmental or College instruction, research, and service missions. This includes the administrative activities of the Department Head, assistant/associate Department Head, as well as faculty who direct sections/laboratories involved in the delivery of specialized services to the public. Included in these are such administrative functions as interviewing prospective employees, supervising and reviewing of employee performance, developing and reviewing polices, budget and equipment management, and so forth.

L - RESIDENT TRAINING: Activities related to all aspects of resident training. Included in this is time spent with residents in individual and group training section, section rounds, individualized instruction and advising that pertains to skills needed for academic, industrial, or private specialty positions, as well as the planning or other activities relating to the goals of a residency training program.
# FACULTY PERCENT EFFORT REPORT

**NAME:** ________________________  **EVALUATION PERIOD:** __________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Percent Effort for the Evaluation Period</th>
<th>Actual Percent Effort for the Evaluation Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction</strong></td>
<td><strong>Instruction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (A) ___</td>
<td>Undergraduate (A) ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (B) ___</td>
<td>Professional (B) ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate (B) ___</td>
<td>Graduate (B) ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising (C/D) ___</td>
<td>Advising (C/D) ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Training (L) ___</td>
<td>Resident Training (L) ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> ___</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong> ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally Funded (E) ___</td>
<td>Internally Funded (E) ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externally Funded (F) ___</td>
<td>Externally Funded (F) ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> ___</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong> ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directed Service</strong></td>
<td><strong>Directed Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ___</td>
<td>Total ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Directed Service</strong></td>
<td><strong>Non-Directed Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (G) ___</td>
<td>Public (G) ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department (H) ___</td>
<td>Department (H) ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College (H) ___</td>
<td>College (H) ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (H) ___</td>
<td>University (H) ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (I) ___</td>
<td>Professional (I) ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> ___</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong> ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Develop. (J)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Professional Develop. (J)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ___</td>
<td>Total ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration (K)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Administration (K)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ___</td>
<td>Total ___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total** 100 %  **Grand Total** 100%

Reason(s) for difference between estimated and actual percent effort.

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________
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ASSESSMENT OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE

NAME: ________________________

EVALUATION PERIOD: ______________

FACULTY PEER REVIEWER: _____________________________

INSTRUCTIONS

All faculty (including those not in the same peer group) are encouraged to provide peer evaluation in the areas that they have direct knowledge of the faculty member’s performance. If a fair peer evaluation is not possible, completion of the review is not required. All evaluation criteria within a performance category should be completed.

The faculty performance rating number in each of the five appointment categories (instruction, research, directed service, non-directed service, and administration) is derived from the sum of the evaluation criteria ratings multiplied by its assigned weight.

For each activity area (instruction, research, service, etc.), rate the individual components that contribute to the overall rating for the activity. Use the examples listed after these components as guidelines for determining your rating. Then provide the overall rating for the activity. It does not necessarily have to be the average of the individual component ratings. The overall rating is the assessment you feel most accurately reflects the faculty member’s performance in the area of activity. Please transfer your rating to the Peer Evaluation Summary Sheet.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATING GUIDELINES

1 = UNSATISFACTORY: Fails to meet minimum performance standards.

2 = More than 1, but less than 3.

3 = PASSABLE: Meets performance standards but does so at a level lower than normally expected and indicates the need for improvement.

4 = More than 3, but less than 5.

5 = PROFEICENT: Meets performance requirements at an expected level.

6 = More than 5, but less than 7.

7 = SUPERIOR: Exceeds performance requirements at a level that merits recognition.

8 = More than 7, but less than 9.

9 = DISTINGUISHED: Exceeds performance requirements at a level that merits special recognition.
INSTRUCTION

Summative evaluation of student instruction should include evidence of content expertise; classroom effectiveness; quality of instructional materials, syllabi and student assessment; course management skills; and teaching scholarship. Evaluation of these criteria should be based on objective evaluations including review of website or teaching materials, classroom evaluations, student and/or peer evaluations, and other submitted materials such as teaching portfolios or other documentation of instructional skills.

INSTRUCTION

Using the performance evaluation ratings (1-9) with 9 being the best, rate the faculty peer for each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating (1-9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of instructional materials and student assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Management Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rating* (1-9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Overall rating does not have to be the average of the key components.

Content Expertise

All faculty with teaching tenths are required to make available information that is provided to students (e.g., syllabus, objectives, textbook requirements, copied notes, website address, examinations, etc.). If this information is not available on a course website, it must be made available during the annual peer evaluation period.

Examples of some factors that may contribute to Content Expertise that may be considered in your rating include but are not limited to:

- Depth, breadth, and currency of subject matter mastery.
- Appropriateness of course content (alignment of goals, objectives, and course content).
- Students coming from other schools specifically to study with the instructor.
- Adoption of a faculty member’s textbooks and other instructional materials, especially repeated adoptions by other instructors.
- Letters from colleagues evaluating instructors’ content expertise.
- Certificates or certifications attesting to mastery of specific content (e.g., Board certification in the discipline).
**Teaching effectiveness**

Standardized student assessment of instruction is required of all faculty with teaching tenths (e.g., Teval, clinical rotation assessments, etc.). Peer reviews of teaching effectiveness by tenured faculty are recommended for probationary faculty as additional documentation of teaching effectiveness for both formative and summative purposes (use recommended evaluation form – Assessment of Instruction by Peer Observers, page 14).

Examples of some factors that may contribute to teaching effectiveness that may be considered in your rating include but are not limited to:

- Student ratings from norm-referenced instruments that provide objective assessment of teaching effectiveness rather than popularity, and are adjusted for such known sources of bias as student motivation and class size.
- Assessment by faculty colleagues who are familiar with the teacher’s performance or have taught the same students in subsequent courses.
- Compiled student comments (such as from student evaluations or exit interviews) that address a teacher’s abilities to arouse student interest, stimulate extra learning, and ability to motivate achievement by students.
- Letters of evaluation from former students.
- Accomplishments of the teacher’s present and former students; i.e., information showing the students’ success in learning the subject matter of the discipline and pursuing it to a point of intellectual significance.
- Evidence of excellence in supervision of students being trained in clinical activities and practical experiences: this includes, but is not limited to, the Veterinary Medical Teaching Hospital and the Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory and approved educational programs such as internships and preceptorships.
- Quality of instruction provided to professional students, interns, residents, and graduate students while engaged in performance of directed service activities.
- Mentoring of post-doctoral students and other trainees.

**Quality of instructional materials and student assessment**

Probationary faculty are encouraged to provide evidence of quality of instructional materials (see below). Copies of exams or student evaluation methods are required of all faculty with teaching tenths.

Examples of some factors that may contribute to quality of instructional materials and student assessment that may be considered in your rating include but are not limited to:

- Individual student mentoring, guidance, or supervision of independent studies, thesis or dissertations, and special student projects.
- Effective and diligent advisement of students in pursuing their academic programs.
- Successful performance of teaching responsibilities that are unusually demanding or require special expertise or preparation.
- Materials produced for individual courses such as reading lists, syllabi, and other instructional materials.
Quality of student assessment methods (exams) and other materials and methods used to assess student achievement.

Preparation of innovative teaching materials or instructional techniques, or creative contributions to the Department’s instructional program.

Course portfolio.

**Course Management Skills**
Course coordinators are encouraged to include materials highlighting their course management skills (see below).

Examples of some factors that may contribute to Course Management Skills that may be considered in your rating include but are not limited to:

- Successful performance of teaching responsibilities that are unusually demanding or require special expertise or preparation.
- Special contributions to effective teaching for diverse student populations (e.g., ADA accommodations, etc.)
- Effective course administration, e.g., maintaining office hours and punctuality in performing teaching-related paper work, such as turning in textbook orders, reporting grades, and filing syllabi.
- Versatility in contributing to the Department’s teaching mission, e.g., effective performance at all levels of instruction appropriate to the Department, including membership on the Graduate Faculty and certification to direct Ph.D. programs.

**Scholarship of Teaching**
Examples of some factors that may contribute to Scholarship of Teaching that may be considered in your rating include but are not limited to:

- Receipt of competitive grants and contracts to fund innovative teaching activities or investigations into effective teaching.
- Selection for teaching in special honors courses and programs.
- Honors or special recognition for teaching accomplishments.
- Presentation of papers, presentations, posters, or abstracts on teaching before learned societies.
- Professional publications on teaching or preparation of material for use in teaching such as textbooks, published lectures, and audio-visual or computerized instructional materials.
- Receipt of competitive grants or contracts to fund innovative teaching activities or investigations into effective teaching methods.
- Membership on special bodies concerned with teaching e.g., accreditation teams and special commissions.
- Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching related grants/contracts and providing consulting services to groups concerned with educational programs.
- Selection for special teaching activities outside of the University, especially in international assignments, e.g., Fulbright awards, special lectureships, panel presentations, seminar participation, and international study and development projects.
ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTION BY PEER OBSERVERS

Faculty: ________________________________  Peer Observer: ________________________________

Course Title: ___________________________________________  Observation Date: _________________

General topic(s) area covered during this class period: _______________________________________________

AS IS APPROPRIATE FOR THE CLASS, PLEASE COMMENT ON THE TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS OF THE INSTRUCTOR (Attach additional sheets as needed)

Recommendations for instructor:

Peer Observer: ________________________________  Date: __________________
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RESEARCH

Using the performance evaluation ratings (1-9), rate the faculty peer for each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating (1-9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Research       ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity with Respect to Assignment and Available Resources ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the Subject      ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of Research to Departmental Mission(s)   ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Interaction with Colleagues    ______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Rating*  (1-9) ______

*Overall rating does not have to be the average of the key components.

Examples of some factors that may contribute to research performance that may be considered in your rating include but are not limited to:

- Books, reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles, and other scholarly works published by reputable journals, scholarly presses, and publishing houses that accept works only after rigorous review and approval by professional peers.

- Scholarly reviews of the faculty member’s publications or critical reviews of research activities.

- Accomplishments of the faculty member’s present and former graduate students.

- Grants and contracts to finance the development of ideas or performance, these grants and contracts being subject to rigorous peer review and approval.

- Prizes and awards for excellence of accomplishments.

- Development of, and where appropriate, obtaining patents or copyrights for processes or instruments.

- Membership on important scholarly expeditions or explorations.

- Awards of special fellowships for research activities or selection for assignment at special institutes for advanced study.

- Invitations to testify before governmental groups concerned with research or other creative activities.

- Presentations of research papers and reviews before peers at scholarly meetings and learning societies.
Receiving significant extramural funding for research. Sources of support could include competitive grants that are subject to peer review and grants/gifts received from for-profit or not-for-profit organizations.

Citation in scholarly publications, reprints or quoting of publications.

Recognition by peers in the field, e.g., fellowships, research awards, or publication awards.

Grant/contract reviewer for research organizations and institutions, e.g., USDA, NIH, NSF, etc.

Invitations to present seminars and lectures at other institutions or recognized national and international conferences.

Invitations to testify before government groups concerned with research or other creative activities.

Serving on editorial boards/panels of reputable scientific journals.

Being invited to serve as a consultant for government agencies or corporations.

Oral and written presentations or publications of scholarly activities derived from material received and examined during performance of directed service activities.

Initiation of research projects, or funding awarded to conduct research based on material examined in performance of directed service activities.

Participation in Departmental and interdepartmental research projects.
**DIRECTED SERVICE**

Using the performance evaluation ratings (1-9), rate the faculty peer for each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating (1-9)</th>
<th>Knowledge and Skills</th>
<th>Quantity and Quality of Performance Relative to Assignment</th>
<th>Reliability, Responsibility, Judgment</th>
<th>Flexibility, Decisiveness, Enthusiasm</th>
<th>Responsiveness, Promptness, Turn-Around Time</th>
<th>Collaborative Interaction with Colleagues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Rating* (1-9) _____**

*Overall rating does not have to be the average of the key components.

Examples of some factors that may contribute to directed service performance that may be considered in your rating include, but are not limited to:

- Ratings by clients with respect to quality of service.
- Instructional or service materials developed, and informal training activities (seminars, rounds).
- Assessment by practicing professionals who come in contact with the faculty member.
- Assessment by students of the educational quality of clinical services delivered.
- Assessment by peers or supervisors who observe and are qualified to rate the delivery of professional services.
- Evaluation by peers who received the professional services.
- Leadership in promoting improvement of service quality and delivery.
- Efficiency in delivery of high quality service.
- Oral and written presentations or publications of scholarly activities derived from materials received and examined during performance of directed service activities.
- Initiation of research projects, or funding awarded to conduct research based on materials examined in performance of directed service activities.
- Generation of revenue that is available to support other activities.
NON-DIRECTED SERVICE (Institutional, Professional, Public)

Using the performance evaluation ratings (1-9), rate the faculty peer for each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating (1-9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Contribution     ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of the Contribution      ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Leadership Provided     ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of the Contribution ______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Rating* (1-9) ______

*Overall rating does not have to be the average of the key components.

Examples of some factors that may contribute to non-directed service to the institution that may be considered in your rating include, but are not limited to:

- Chairing of, membership on, and contributions to standing or ad hoc committees of the University.
- Chairing of, membership on, and contributions to bodies participating in faculty governance, such as the Faculty Senate and associated committees, the Graduate Council, and College Committees.
- Performance of unbudgeted administrative responsibilities at the Departmental level.
- Special assignments such as representing the Department, College, or University at State, National, and International meetings.
- Honors or special recognition for contributions to the Department, College or University.

Examples of some factors that may contribute to non-directed service to the profession that may be considered in your rating include, but are not limited to:

- Holding office in professional associations and learned societies.
- Service on State, National, and International committees in professional organizations.
- General presentations or addresses at conventions and other professional meetings.
- Reviewing or editing for professional journals, e.g., writing book reviews for publication and service as editor, associate editor, book review editor, or member on editorial boards.
- Membership on panels judging grant/contract proposals.
- Service as consultant on problems appropriate to the discipline.
- Honors or special recognition for contributions to an organization, discipline, or profession.
Non-directed public service involves the application of a faculty member’s professional time and expertise for the benefit of non-academic audiences. This category does not include all activities a faculty member might perform for the public good, but only those that are job related. This evidence encompasses evaluations of the performance of activities by members and leaders of the groups served. Examples of some factors that may contribute to non-directed service to the public that may be considered in your rating include, but are not limited to:

- Written dissemination of professional knowledge or information to non-academic audiences through general interest publications.
- Oral dissemination of professional knowledge or information to civic, religious, or private groups.
- Providing expert testimony to courts or legislative bodies.
- Consulting for State, National, and International public and private groups engaged in educational, scholarly, and artistic endeavors.
- Consulting for individuals or corporations engaged in business or industry.
- Providing technical consultation to professional or non-academic groups.
- Engaging in the delivery of technology through involvement on development projects, especially in international assignments.
- Generation of restricted-fees revenue that is available to support other scholarly activities.
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Using the performance evaluation ratings (1-9), rate the faculty peer for each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating (1-9)</th>
<th>Importance to the Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Importance/Relevance to Departmental Missions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of the Activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Rating* (1-9) ____

*Overall rating does not have to be the average of the key components.

Examples of some factors that may contribute to professional development that may be considered in your rating include, but are not limited to:

- Sabbatical leaves designed to enhance abilities.
- Training programs/workshops attended.
- Informal training activities (seminars, journal clubs, readings).
- Attendance at special courses designed to increase professional competency or to learn new techniques.
- Attendance at local, regional, national, or international meetings directly related to specialty or assigned areas of responsibility.
- Attendance and participation in continuing education activities at the Departmental or interdepartmental level (seminars, study groups, conferences) designed to increase professional competence and the level of patient care, both individually and collectively.
ADMINISTRATION

Using the performance evaluation ratings (1-9), rate the faculty peer for each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rating (1-9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Rating* (1-9)  

*Overall rating does not have to be the average of the key components.

Examples of some factors that may contribute to inclusiveness that may be considered in your rating include, but are not limited to:

- Actively solicits faculty input in formulating Departmental goals and policies.
- Keeps faculty informed on matters of importance.

Examples of some factors that may contribute to management that may be considered in your rating include, but are not limited to:

- Contribution towards providing a better/more effective workplace.
- Administrative efficiency.
- Acts to improve morale.
- Takes steps to improve quality of instructional, research, and service programs.
- Follows established procedures and policies in all personnel decisions.
- Effective advocate for the Department as well as individual faculty
Examples of some factors that may contribute to responsiveness that may be considered in your rating include, but are not limited to:

- Takes criticism constructively and acts on it.
- Provides leadership in response to changing trends in education, research, and service.

Examples of some factors that may contribute to fairness that may be considered in your rating include, but are not limited to:

- Resolves conflicts fairly using established policies and procedures.
- Is fair and impartial in assessing problems, people, and issues.
- Does not take punitive actions against programs or individuals that disagree.

Examples of some factors that may contribute to communication that may be considered in your rating include, but are not limited to:

- Effectiveness in resolving disputes.
- Advocacy for programs and individuals.
- Cooperation/coordination with other administrative units.
- Effectively communicates policies and procedures.
- Clearly states personal as well as Departmental goals to the faculty and staff both inside and outside of the Department.
- Effectively explains the rationale for decisions and actions.
- Allocates resources on the basis of well-understood criteria.
- Lets faculty and staff know what is expected of them.
PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD GUIDELINES

Definition

The Professorial Performance Award (PPA) rewards strong performance and sustained productivity by a full-time Professor with at least six years of tenure since the last promotion or PPA, as detailed in the University Handbook Section C: Identity, Employment, Tenure (C49.1-C49.14). The salary increase will be in addition to the merit raise provided for by the annual evaluation process. The performance evaluation will be in one or more of the following areas of responsibility: administration, research, teaching, service and outreach.

The award is not a right accorded to every full-time Professor and is not given simply as a result of fulfilling assigned responsibilities with a record free of notable deficiencies. In other words, the award is for performance that goes beyond ‘met expectations’ of the job. It is a recognition of continued demonstration of sustained professional development, dedication to scholarship, teaching, service, outstanding leadership in managing the department, and a commitment to furthering knowledge through research and student mentoring.

Evaluation of strong performance and sustained productivity is based on the Professor’s national and/or international recognition for a distinguished career exemplifying excellence in administration, teaching, research, and outstanding service and outreach.

Expectations

1. Promotion to the rank of Professor is based on the candidate’s national and international reputation and recognition of a distinguished career based on scholarship including teaching, research and directed service; therefore, all three components must be considered in awarding the PPA. The criteria in each area of responsibility will be those described in the Department of DMP document, Criteria for the Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure of Ranked Faculty. According to this document, “Scholarship includes discovery and development of new knowledge by unique, effective means and awakening an area of scholarship for new exploration. Scholarship is not limited to research efforts, but is attainable in all areas of responsibility.”

2. Professors in DMP with teaching appointments as the individual’s primary responsibility may demonstrate excellence in instruction of veterinary medical students, graduate and postgraduate students and/or involvement with other educational programs appropriate to the mission of the Department. The professor is expected to demonstrate an unusual level of excellence. He/she should be active in educational research and the teaching must fulfill a critical need in either DMP or the College of Veterinary Medicine. Candidates for the PPA should consult the criteria used to determine excellence in teaching listed on pages 6 and 7 in the DMP document cited above.

3. Professors in DMP with research appointments are expected to maintain a high quality research program in their area of expertise with a national and international reputation and consistent external funding from agencies such as the National Institutes of Health and the USDA-NRI and from industrial partners in the health sciences field. Criteria identifying quality research are included on pages 7 and 8 in the DMP document cited above.

4. Professors in DMP with major responsibilities in directed service are expected to demonstrate scholarship in these duties. Criteria used to document scholarship in directed service can be found in the DMP document cited above.

5. Professors in DMP are expected to be leaders in the Department, College of Veterinary Medicine and at Kansas State University. They are expected to serve as mentors for junior faculty.
6. Professors in DMP are expected to serve on national committees, study sections and editorial boards.

7. Based on these expectations of Professors in the Department of DMP, the following are the criteria for the PPA consideration:

   a. The candidate must be at the rank of full Professor for at least six years at Kansas State University since either the last promotion (promotion from Associate Professor) or receiving the PPA. This six-year period does not include approved leaves of absence (e.g. maternity, medical and sabbatical).

   b. The candidate’s productivity and performance in all of his/her areas of responsibility must be comparable to or higher than when the individual was promoted to the rank of Professor and must clearly identify the candidate as an outstanding faculty member when compared with faculty in other departments at Kansas State University and within the College of Veterinary Medicine. This level of productivity and performance must either meet or exceed current DMP promotion standards and criteria.

   c. The candidate must receive annual merit ratings of “Meets High Expectations” or above for all six years, as expressed in the DMP Faculty Annual Merit Evaluation System document.

   d. The candidate must demonstrate a sustained record of productivity in the primary areas of responsibility consistent with his/her annual percent effort:

      • A sustained record of research funding as an investigator/co-investigator from external agencies such as the NIH, USDA-NRI or industrial sources. Research productivity must be documented by publications in peer-reviewed journals;
      • Continued above average teaching evaluations and/or evidence that teaching effectiveness has remained consistent during the six years;
      • Continued delivery of high quality directed service in veterinary medical and diagnostic investigations that serves multiple constituencies (academia, the veterinary profession, producers, the livestock industry and citizens who own pets).

Procedures for Recommending

1. If a Professor has met the eligibility criteria for the PPA before December 31, then the Professor may submit with the Faculty Annual Merit Evaluation Report a nomination file that documents his/her professional accomplishments for the previous six years in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines outlined above.

2. After confirming that the Professor is eligible for the PPA, the Department Head will write an evaluation of the submitted materials using the criteria, standards, and guidelines outlined above. The Department Head’s document is to state if his/her recommendation is for or against the person receiving the award. If the recommendation is not favorable, the reasons will be specified and reported to the Professor in writing.

3. The Department Head’s recommendation and the Professor’s nomination file will be forwarded to the College Dean with the submission of the annual evaluations of all faculty.

4. After evaluation of submitted materials and letters, the Dean will write his/her recommendation letter that states if he/she does or does not support the nomination. If the recommendation is not favorable, the reasons will be specified and reported to the Professor and the Department Head in writing.

5. The Dean’s recommendation, the Department Head’s recommendation, and the Professor’s nomination file are to be submitted to the Provost with the submission of the annual Department faculty evaluations.
# PEER ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

**PEER BEING EVALUATED:** __________________________

**PEER EVALUATOR:** ________________________________  **EVALUATION PERIOD:** ___________

## INSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Delivery Skills and Characteristics</th>
<th>Rating (1-9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Design Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Management Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Rating* (1-9) ______**

## RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Research</th>
<th>Rating (1-9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Productivity with Respect to Assignment and Available Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of Research to Departmental Mission(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Interactions with Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Rating* (1-9) ______**

## DIRECTED SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge and Skill</th>
<th>Rating (1-9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity and Quality of Performance Relative to Assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability, Responsibility, Judgment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility, Decisiveness, Enthusiasm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness, Promptness, Turn-Around Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Interaction with Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Rating* (1-9) ______**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON-DIRECTED SERVICE (Institutional, Professional, Public)</th>
<th>Rating (1-9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Contribution</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of the Contribution</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Leadership Provided</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of the Contribution</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rating* (1-9)</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>Rating (1-9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importance to the Individual</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance/Relevance to Departmental Missions</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Area</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Activity</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rating* (1-9)</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th>Rating (1-9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusiveness</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rating* (1-9)</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Overall rating does not have to be the average of the key components.

Additional Comments:
_______________________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________________

26
EVALUATION WORKSHEET  
(Confidential)  
To be completed by Department Head

NAME: ______________________________________  EVALUATION PERIOD: ______________________

PEER GROUP:  _____ Group 1: Instruction: Research and/or Service  
                _____ Group 2: Research: Instruction and/or Service  
                _____ Group 3: Service: Instruction and/or Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUM: ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______

NUMBER OF PEERS: ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______

DEPARTMENT HEAD/
Diagnostic Laboratory Director: ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______
EVALUATION WORKSHEET
(Continued)
To be completed by Department Head

NAME: ______________________________________ EVALUATION PERIOD: ________________

### INSTRUCTION

\[
\frac{\text{Peer Sum}}{\text{No. of Peers}} + \frac{\text{Head/Director}}{\text{Rating Percentage}} \times \text{Appointment} = \text{Final Score}
\]

### RESEARCH

\[
\frac{\text{Peer Sum}}{\text{No. of Peers}} + \frac{\text{Head/Director}}{\text{Rating Percentage}} \times \text{Appointment} = \text{Final Score}
\]

### DIRECTED SERVICE

\[
\frac{\text{Peer Sum}}{\text{No. of Peers}} + \frac{\text{Head/Director}}{\text{Rating Percentage}} \times \text{Appointment} = \text{Final Score}
\]

### NON-DIRECTED SERVICE

\[
\frac{\text{Peer Sum}}{\text{No. of Peers}} + \frac{\text{Head/Director}}{\text{Rating Percentage}} \times \text{Appointment} = \text{Final Score}
\]

### PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

\[
\frac{\text{Peer Sum}}{\text{No. of Peers}} + \frac{\text{Head/Director}}{\text{Rating Percentage}} \times \text{Appointment} = \text{Final Score}
\]

### ADMINISTRATION

\[
\frac{\text{Peer Sum}}{\text{No. of Peers}} + \frac{\text{Head/Director}}{\text{Rating Percentage}} \times \text{Appointment} = \text{Final Score}
\]

Note: If in the opinion of the Department Head/Diagnostic Laboratory Director, the number of peer evaluations that are submitted are not adequate to provide a fair assessment of performance, the Department Head’s or Diagnostic Laboratory Director’s assessment may count for more than 50% of the overall rating in that category. In such cases, the Department Head or Diagnostic Laboratory Director must indicate this in the Performance Summary.
OBJECTIVES, GOALS, AND PLAN OF WORK

NAME: ______________________________________       EVALUATION PERIOD: _____________________

Describe your objectives, goals and plan of work in the area for which you have responsibility. Be as specific and objective as appropriate. These statements will serve as the basis for your annual merit evaluation for the evaluation period.

Indicate your estimated overall percent effort in each area of responsibility (see guidelines). If your predicted percent effort is different from the past evaluation period, please explain the circumstances associated with this shift in effort. (Attach additional sheets as required)

INSTRUCTION:  (Estimated Percent Effort, _____ %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional delivery skills and characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional design skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course management skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESEARCH:  (Estimated Percent Effort, _____ %)

DIRECTED SERVICES:  (Estimated Percent Effort, _____ %)

NON-DIRECTED SERVICES:  (Estimated Percent Effort, _____ %)

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:  (Estimated Percent Effort, _____ %)
ADMINISTRATION:  (Estimated Percent Effort, _____ %)

Predicted Peer Evaluation Group:

_____  Group 1:  Instruction:  Research and/or Service
_____  Group 2:  Research:  Instruction and/or Service
_____  Group 3:  Service:  Instruction and/or Research

Faculty Member: ___________________________________________  Date:  ______________________

Department Head/Diagnostic Laboratory Director:  ______________________  Date:  ______________________

GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING PERCENT EFFORT

To be fair to all faculty regardless of differences in their percent-effort assignments, it is important that some degree of calibration be used to establish a degree of equivalency related to responsibilities, effort, and performance. Indeed, it would not be fair to expect the same degree of performance from a faculty member who devotes 20% effort to a specific task as for faculty member who devotes 50% towards completion of the same or equivalent responsibility. Nevertheless, because circumstances change and few activities undertaken by different faculty are exactly the same, the following are meant to be guidelines only and to serve as a starting point in assessing the appropriate percent effort dedicated to instructional activities at the time the faculty member and department head/diagnostic laboratory director agree on the next year’s activities. Modifications and allowances should be granted broadly and among others may include the nature of the subject, instructional style, frequency, and alterations in content.

Given that instructional effort often forms the base from which total percent-effort distributions are made, it is a good starting point for most faculty. The actual percent effort is to be determined via consultation between the faculty member and the Department Head.

Initial estimates of percent effort for instruction will be calculated using the following general formula: 
(contact time) + (instructional contact time with students x standard factor) / standard appointment of 1,760 hours/year = percent effort).

Specifically,

1 hr. lecture x 3.5
1 hr. laboratory x 2.5
1 hr. recitation/small group rotations x 2.0
1 hr. clinical instruction x 1.5
4 hrs. graduate, post-doctoral, resident student / week
PROBATIONARY FACULTY
MERIT EVALUATION REPORT

NAME: _______________________________ EVALUATION PERIOD: ____________________

Peer Evaluation Group:

_____ Group 1: Instruction: Research and/or Service
_____ Group 2: Research: Instruction and/or Service
_____ Group 3: Service: Instruction and/or Research

In each of the following areas for which you have had responsibilities during the past year, describe your accomplishments as related to your objectives, goals, and plan of work. In each category, please include accomplishments, work in progress, as well as recognition and awards received.

The information provided will be included in the annual reappointment process. As such, complete descriptions of new approaches and ongoing efforts which present evidence of advancement towards tenure and promotion are appropriate. Faculty are strongly encouraged to review the Department’s document detailing the criteria used for promotion and tenure, and to related their annual report so that it specifically addresses the successful accomplishment of these criteria or steps being made towards that goal.

The information that is (Attach additional sheets as required)

INSTRUCTION: (Percent Effort, _____ %)

Attach student assessment data and peer observation input as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional delivery skills and characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional design skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course management skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESEARCH: (Percent Effort, _____ %)
DIRECTED SERVICES: (Percent Effort, _____ %)

NON-DIRECTED SERVICES: (Percent Effort, _____ %)

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: (Percent Effort, _____ %)

ADMINISTRATION: (Percent Effort, _____ %)
TENURED FACULTY
MERIT EVALUATION REPORT

NAME: ____________________________ EVALUATION PERIOD: _____________________

Peer Evaluation Group:

____ Group 1: Instruction: Research and/or Service
____ Group 2: Research: Instruction and/or Service
____ Group 3: Service: Instruction and/or Research

In each of the following areas for which you have had responsibilities during the past year, describe your accomplishments as related to your objectives, goals, and plan of work. In each category, please include accomplishments as well as recognition and awards received. Tenured faculty should, to an appropriate degree, limit this to completed accomplishments and refrain from listing works in progress, papers in preparation or under review, but not as yet accepted for publication, etc. Appropriate exceptions may include those things that represent efforts in new areas or with new approaches, as well as tasks that required an unusual amount of time or effort but as yet have not been successful or fully accomplished.

(Attach additional sheets as required)

INSTRUCTION: (Percent Effort, _____ %)

Attach student assessment data and peer observation input as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional delivery skills and characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional design skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course management skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESEARCH: (Percent Effort, _____ %)

DIRECTED SERVICES: (Percent Effort, _____ %)
NON-DIRECTED SERVICES:  (Percent Effort, _____ %)

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:  (Percent Effort, _____ %)

ADMINISTRATION:  (Percent Effort, _____ %)
PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

NAME: ______________________________________       EVALUATION PERIOD: _____________________

Department Head’s or Diagnostic Laboratory Director’s written assessment of overall performance, specific merit salary adjustment recommendation, and basis for this recommendation. If the Department Head’s or the Diagnostic Laboratory Director’s evaluation is substantially different from that of their peers, an explanation must be provided. (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

Overall Annual Performance Rating (1-5) _____________

Department Head/Diagnostic Laboratory Director ______________________   Date _______________

Faculty Member’s Response

I have met with the Department Head and Diagnostic Laboratory Director to review the above statement. In addition, I would like to add the following: (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

Faculty Member ________________________________________________________ Date ________________

(Signing this verifies that this report was read. It does not indicate agreement regardless of whether or not comments are provided by the faculty member).
### Appendix I

**Student Evaluation of Instruction and Course**

**Description of Forms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form A</strong></td>
<td>Small lecture-discussion courses. Emphasis is on clarity and quality of explanations. Also includes items on classroom interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form B</strong></td>
<td>Large lecture courses. Emphasis on course organization and explanations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form C</strong></td>
<td>Seminar-discussion courses. Emphasis on quality of discussion, course organization, interest level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form D</strong></td>
<td>Problem-solving courses, such as engineering. Emphasis on explanations, student difficulties, quality of problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form E</strong></td>
<td>Skill-oriented, “hands-on,” such as art studio, social-work field experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form F</strong></td>
<td>Discussion sections. Emphasis on classroom interaction, explanations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form G</strong></td>
<td>Lecture courses which strongly emphasize textbook, such as Math. Emphasis on textbook and homework problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form H</strong></td>
<td>Laboratory instruction. Emphasis on preparedness, organization, safety, interest level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. INSTRUCTOR’S ORGANIZATION OF THE COURSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptionally well-organized</td>
<td>O O O O O O O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticeable lack of organization</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. INSTRUCTOR’S VOICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very clear and understandable</td>
<td>O O O O O O O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to understand</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. INSTRUCTOR’S EXPLANATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very easy to follow</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to follow</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ABILITY TO PRESENT ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>O O O O O O O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not effective</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. USE OF EXAMPLES AND ILLUSTRATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very helpful examples</td>
<td>O O O O O O O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples not helpful</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. QUALITY OF QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS RAISED BY INSTRUCTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality</td>
<td>O O O O O O O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low quality</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. STUDENT CONFIDENCE IN INSTRUCTOR’S KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appears to have exceptional knowledge</td>
<td>O O O O O O O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appears to have inadequate knowledge</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. INSTRUCTOR’S ENTHUSIASM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very enthusiastic</td>
<td>O O O O O O O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacks enthusiasm</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ENCOURAGEMENT GIVEN STUDENTS TO EXPRESS THEMSELVES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students strongly encouraged</td>
<td>O O O O O O O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students not encouraged</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ANSWERS TO STUDENT QUESTIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appears to have exceptional knowledge</td>
<td>O O O O O O O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appears to have inadequate knowledge</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. AVAILABILITY OF EXTRA HELP WHEN NEEDED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily available</td>
<td>O O O O O O O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally not available</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION AND COURSE

**Diagnostic Medicine/Pathobiology**

**FORM B**

Thank you for taking the time to consider these items carefully. Please use a number 2 pencil to blacken the circle that most closely corresponds to your observation. Read the title and the descriptions before you decide on your response. Please evaluate each item separately.

1. **INSTRUCTOR’S ORGANIZATION OF THE COURSE**
   - Exceptionally well-organized
   - Noticeable lack of organization
   - No Comment
   
   | O | O | O | O | O | O |

2. **SEQUENTIAL PRESENTATION OF CONCEPTS**
   - Sequence was Logical and orderly
   - Sequence was confusing and seemed out of order
   - No Comment
   
   | O | O | O | O | O | O |

3. **INSTRUCTOR’S EXPLANATIONS**
   - Very easy to follow
   - Difficult to follow
   - No Comment
   
   | O | O | O | O | O | O |

4. **ABILITY TO PRESENT ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS**
   - Very effective
   - Not effective
   - No Comment
   
   | O | O | O | O | O | O |

5. **USE OF EXAMPLES AND ILLUSTRATIONS**
   - Very helpful examples
   - Examples not helpful
   - No Comment
   
   | O | O | O | O | O | O |

6. **INSTRUCTOR’S ENHANCEMENT OF STUDENT INTEREST IN THE MATERIAL**
   - Maintained a high level of interest
   - Usually dull
   - No Comment
   
   | O | O | O | O | O | O |

7. **STUDENT CONFIDENCE IN INSTRUCTOR’S KNOWLEDGE**
   - Appears to have exceptional knowledge
   - Appears to have inadequate knowledge
   - No Comment
   
   | O | O | O | O | O | O |

8. **INSTRUCTOR’S ENTHUSIASM**
   - Very enthusiastic
   - Lacks enthusiasm
   - No Comment
   
   | O | O | O | O | O | O |

9. **CLARITY OF COURSE OBJECTIVES**
   - Objectives clearly stated
   - Objectives not clear
   - No Comment
   
   | O | O | O | O | O | O |

10. **INTEREST LEVEL OF CLASS SESSIONS**
    - High level of Interest maintained
    - Generally not interesting
    - No Comment
    
    | O | O | O | O | O | O |

11. **AVAILABILITY OF EXTRA HELP WHEN NEEDED**
    - Easily available
    - Generally not available
    - No Comment
    
    | O | O | O | O | O | O |

---
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STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION AND COURSE
Diagnostic Medicine/Pathobiology

FORM C

Instructor __________________ Course _______ Section _______

Thank you for taking the time to consider these items carefully. Please use a number 2 pencil to blacken the circle that most closely corresponds to your observation. Read the title and the descriptions before you decide on your response. Please evaluate each item separately.

1. INSTRUCTOR’S ORGANIZATION OF THE COURSE
   Exceptionally well-organized
   Noticeable lack of organization
   No Comment
   O O O O O O

2. INSTRUCTOR’S PREPARATION FOR CLASS
   Obviously well-prepared
   Often appeared to be unprepared
   No Comment
   O O O O O O

3. INSTRUCTOR AS A DISCUSSION LEADER
   Discussions were well-directed
   Discussions were without direction
   No Comment
   O O O O O O

4. INSTRUCTOR’S CONTRIBUTION TO DISCUSSION
   Introduced new and fresh ideas
   Repeated textbook material
   No Comment
   O O O O O O

5. ATMOSPHERE FOR STUDENT LEARNING
   Highly conducive to learning
   Did not contribute to learning
   No Comment
   O O O O O O

6. QUALITY OF QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS RAISED BY INSTRUCTOR
   High quality
   Low quality
   No Comment
   O O O O O O

7. STUDENT CONFIDENCE IN INSTRUCTOR’S KNOWLEDGE
   Appears to have exceptional knowledge
   Appears to have inadequate knowledge
   No Comment
   O O O O O O

8. INSTRUCTOR’S ENTHUSIASM
   Very enthusiastic
   Lacks enthusiasm
   No Comment
   O O O O O O

9. ENCOURAGEMENT GIVEN STUDENTS TO EXPRESS THEMSELVES
   Students strongly encouraged
   Students not encouraged
   No Comment
   O O O O O O

10. INSTRUCTOR’S OPENNESS TO STUDENTS’ VIEWS
    Very willing to consider students’ views
    Not open to considering students’ views
    No Comment
    O O O O O O

11. INTEREST LEVEL OF CLASS SESSIONS
    High level of interest maintained
    Generally not interesting
    No Comment
    O O O O O O

39
Thank you for taking the time to consider these items carefully. Please use a number 2 pencil to blacken the circle that most closely corresponds to your observation. Read the title and the descriptions before you decide on your response. Please evaluate each item separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR’S ORGANIZATION OF THE COURSE</th>
<th>Noticeable lack of organization</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exceptionally well-organized</td>
<td>O O O O O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seemed confusing and out of order</td>
<td>O O O O O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SEQUENTIAL PRESENTATION OF CONCEPTS</td>
<td>Very easy to follow</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not effective</td>
<td>O O O O O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR’S EXPLANATIONS</td>
<td>High quality Low quality</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very helpful Examples not helpful</td>
<td>O O O O O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ABILITY TO PRESENT ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS</td>
<td>Very enthusiastic Lacks enthusiasm</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very effective Not effective</td>
<td>O O O O O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>USE OF EXAMPLES AND ILLUSTRATIONS</td>
<td>Assignments are very helpful</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignments are not helpful</td>
<td>O O O O O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>QUALITY OF QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS RAISED BY INSTRUCTOR</td>
<td>Very effective Ineffective</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Comment</td>
<td>O O O O O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CONTRIBUTION OF ASSIGNMENTS TO UNDERSTANDING COURSE CONTENT</td>
<td>Available help when needed</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generally not available</td>
<td>O O O O O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR’S ENTHUSIASM</td>
<td>Very effective Ineffective</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very enthusiastic Lacks enthusiasm</td>
<td>O O O O O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR’S EFFECTIVENESS IN DEALING WITH STUDENTS’ DIFFICULTIES</td>
<td>Very effective Ineffective</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very effective Ineffective</td>
<td>O O O O O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ANSWERS TO STUDENT QUESTIONS</td>
<td>Very satisfactory not satisfactory</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Answers are very satisfactory</td>
<td>O O O O O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY OF EXTRA HELP WHEN NEEDED</td>
<td>Generally not available</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easily available</td>
<td>O O O O O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **OPPORTUNITY FOR PRACTICING WHAT WAS LEARNED**
   - Very extensive
   - Insufficient
   - No Comment
   - O O O O O O

2. **INSTRUCTOR’S PREPAREDNESS**
   - Very well-prepared
   - Often appeared to be unprepared
   - No Comment
   - O O O O O O

3. **EXPLANATIONS OF UNDERLYING RATIONALES FOR NEW TECHNIQUES OR SKILLS**
   - Very helpful
   - Not helpful
   - No Comment
   - O O O O O O

4. **DEMONSTRATIONS OF EXPECTED SKILLS**
   - Clearly presented
   - Lacking
   - No Comment
   - O O O O O O

5. **INSTRUCTOR’S CONFIDENCE IN STUDENTS’ ABILITY**
   - Very appropriate level
   - Inappropriate level
   - No Comment
   - O O O O O O

6. **RECOGNITION OF STUDENT PROGRESS BY INSTRUCTOR**
   - Clearly evident
   - Not evident
   - No Comment
   - O O O O O O

7. **STUDENTS’ CONFIDENCE IN INSTRUCTOR’S KNOWLEDGE**
   - Appears to have exceptional knowledge
   - Appears to lack knowledge of subject
   - No Comment
   - O O O O O O

8. **FREEDOM FOR STUDENTS TO DEVELOP OWN SKILLS AND IDEAS**
   - Strongly encouraged
   - Strongly discouraged
   - No Comment
   - O O O O O O

9. **INSTRUCTOR’S EFFECTIVENESS IN DEALING WITH STUDENTS’ DIFFICULTIES**
   - Very effective
   - Ineffective
   - No Comment
   - O O O O O O

10. **ATMOSPHERE FOR STUDENT LEARNING**
    - Highly conducive to learning
    - Did not contribute to student learning
    - No Comment
    - O O O O O O

11. **AVAILABILITY OF EXTRA HELP WHEN NEEDED**
    - Easily available
    - Generally not available
    - No Comment
    - O O O O O O
STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION AND COURSE  

Diagnostic Medicine/Pathobiology  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional:  
Comment Sheet #  
______________

Thank you for taking the time to consider these items carefully. Please use a number 2 pencil to blacken the circle that most closely corresponds to your observation. Read the title and the descriptions before you decide on your response. Please evaluate each item separately.

1. **EXPLANATIONS**
   - Very easy to follow
   - Difficult to follow
   - No Comment

2. **USE OF EXAMPLES AND ILLUSTRATIONS**
   - Very helpful examples
   - Examples not helpful
   - No Comment

3. **QUALITY OF QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS RAISED BY INSTRUCTOR**
   - High quality
   - Low quality
   - No Comment

4. **INSTRUCTOR’S ENTHUSIASM**
   - Very enthusiastic
   - Lacks enthusiasm
   - No Comment

5. **STUDENT CONFIDENCE IN INSTRUCTOR’S KNOWLEDGE**
   - Appears to have exceptional knowledge
   - Appears to have inadequate knowledge
   - No Comment

6. **ENCOURAGEMENT GIVEN STUDENTS TO EXPRESS THEMSELVES**
   - Students strongly encouraged
   - Students not encouraged
   - No Comment

7. **ANSWERS TO STUDENT QUESTIONS**
   - Answers are usually not satisfactory
   - Answers are very satisfactory
   - No Comment

8. **INTEREST LEVEL OF DISCUSSION SECTIONS**
   - High level of interest maintained
   - Generally not interesting
   - No Comment

9. **OPENNESS TO STUDENTS’ VIEWS**
   - Very willing to consider students’ views
   - Not open to considering students’ views
   - No Comment

10. **EFFECTIVENESS IN DEALING WITH STUDENTS DIFFICULTIES**
    - Very effective
    - Ineffective
    - No Comment

11. **AVAILABILITY OF EXTRA HELP WHEN NEEDED**
    - Easily available
    - Generally not available
    - No Comment
STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION AND COURSE
Diagnostic Medicine/Pathobiology

Instructor __________________________ Course __________________ Section ___________

Thank you for taking the time to consider these items carefully. Please use a number 2 pencil to blacken the circle that most closely corresponds to your observation. Read the title and the descriptions before you decide on your response. Please evaluate each item separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR’S ORGANIZATION OF THE COURSE</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR’S EXPLANATIONS</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR’S CONTRIBUTION TO YOUR ABILITY TO SOLVE PROBLEMS</th>
<th>USE OF EXAMPLES AND ILLUSTRATIONS</th>
<th>DIFFICULTY OF HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTION OF EXAMINATIONS TO UNDERSTANDING COURSE CONTENT</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR’S ENTHUSIASM</th>
<th>RELEVANCE AND USEFULNESS OF THE TEXTBOOK</th>
<th>ANSWERS TO STUDENT QUESTIONS</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LECTURES AND TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exceptionally well-organized</td>
<td>Noticeable lack of instruction</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Questions strongly encouraged</td>
<td>Questions not encouraged</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Very easy to follow</td>
<td>Difficult to follow</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very helpful examples</td>
<td>Examples not helpful</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Appropriate level</td>
<td>Inappropriate level</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Significant contribution</td>
<td>Little or no contribution</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Very enthusiastic</td>
<td>Lacks enthusiasm</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Excellent textbook</td>
<td>Poor textbook</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Answers are very satisfactory</td>
<td>Answers are usually not satisfactory</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Strong relationship</td>
<td>Little relationship</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION AND COURSE

## Diagnostic Medicine/Pathobiology

**FORM H**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Thank you for taking the time to consider these items carefully. Please use a number 2 pencil to blacken the circle that most closely corresponds to your observation. Read the title and the descriptions before you decide on your response. Please evaluate each item separately.

1. **LAB INSTRUCTOR’S EXPLANATION**
   - **Very easy to follow**
     - O
   - **Difficult to follow**
     - O
   - **No Comment**
     - O

2. **PREPAREDNESS FOR LAB SESSIONS**
   - **Well-prepared**
     - O
   - **Often appeared to be unprepared**
     - O
   - **No Comment**
     - O

3. **QUALITY OF QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS RAISED BY THE LAB INSTRUCTOR**
   - **High quality**
     - O
   - **Low quality**
     - O
   - **No Comment**
     - O

4. **ENTHUSIASM**
   - **Very enthusiastic**
     - O
   - **Lacks enthusiasm**
     - O
   - **No Comment**
     - O

5. **STUDENTS’ CONFIDENCE IN LAB INSTRUCTOR’S KNOWLEDGE**
   - **Appears to have adequate knowledge**
     - O
   - **Appears to have inadequate knowledge**
     - O
   - **No Comment**
     - O

6. **ABILITY TO SOLVE UNEXPECTED PROBLEMS**
   - **High ability**
     - O
   - **Low ability**
     - O
   - **No Comment**
     - O

7. **LAB INSTRUCTOR’S EFFECTIVENESS IN DEALING WITH STUDENT DIFFICULTIES**
   - **Very effective**
     - O
   - **Ineffective**
     - O
   - **No Comment**
     - O

8. **INTEREST LEVEL OF LAB SESSIONS**
   - **High level of interest maintained**
     - O
   - **Generally not interesting**
     - O
   - **No Comment**
     - O

9. **COMMUNICATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF SAFETY PROCEDURES**
   - **Very effective**
     - O
   - **Ineffective**
     - O
   - **No Comment**
     - O

10. **ANSWERS TO STUDENT QUESTIONS**
    - **Answers are usually satisfactory**
      - O
    - **Answers are usually not satisfactory**
      - O
    - **No Comment**
      - O

11. **AVAILABILITY OF EXTRA HELP WHEN NEEDED**
    - **Generally not available**
      - O
    - **No Comment**
      - O
## Appendix II
Individual Student Comment Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Your comments will be used by the instructor to improve this course and his/her teaching methods for future courses. Please be as thoughtful and constructive as possible in your comments. This sheet with your handwritten comments will not be seen by your instructor until after your grades have been turned in. (You are not required to answer any of these questions.)

### I. What aspects of the teaching or content of this course do you feel were especially good?


### II. What changes could be made to improve the teaching or the content of this course?


### III. Please use the back of this sheet for any additional comments or special questions. Thank you for your participation!
Clinical-Track Faculty

The primary responsibility of faculty on clinical-track appointments is to provide high quality diagnostic service and role model/practicum teaching, to include, but not limited to necropsy, diagnostic testing, results interpretation, disease informatics (epidemiology, geospatial analysis), outreach, and field investigation services to veterinary practitioners, animal owners, researchers and other laboratory users. The distribution of effort for clinical-track faculty consists of substantial service appointment in the Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory. There is no stated requirement for activities in the areas of either research or teaching; however, clinical teaching of veterinary students on diagnostic rotations and/or field investigations and applied research are often components of the appointment. Clinical-track faculty members may participate in classroom and laboratory teaching in the veterinary and graduate curriculum and participate in collaborative research programs or in some cases develop independent research projects. These activities will be considered in promotion and reappointment decisions. Clinical-track faculty may also participate in the graduate and post-doctoral training programs in the Department and College.

Clinical-track faculty are classified by the University and Board of Regents as regular or term appointments (University Handbook, Section C, Faculty position by rank, C12.2). A clinical-track faculty member on a regular appointment is a member of the general faculty and is afforded all perquisites accorded to the general faculty (University Handbook, Section C, Faculty position by rank, C12.2). Clinical Assistant Professors on regular appointments receive one-year, annually renewable appointments. Clinical Associate Professors on regular appointments receive renewable three-year appointments which are annually reviewed. Clinical Professors on regular appointments receive renewable five-year appointments which are annually reviewed. Notice of non-reappointment must be given 12 months before the end of the contract. Recommendations for appointment are made by the Head of the Department with input from the Director of the Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory according to the guidelines and procedures described in the University Handbook (Section C, Appointment, C20-C25). Faculty appointed to regular clinical-track positions should have credentials appropriate to the discipline. Board certification in an appropriate specialty may be expected for some appointments. Clinical-track faculty rank is determined as defined by the Diagnostic Medicine/Pathobiology Criteria for the Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure of Ranked Faculty, and in accordance with the University Handbook (Section C, Faculty position by rank, C10-C15). Individuals appointed to these ranks may expect to be appointed or promoted on the basis of demonstrated merit in relationship to their association with the laboratory and department missions and the guidelines within the Diagnostic Medicine/Pathobiology Criteria for the Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure of Ranked Faculty. Each higher rank demands a higher level of effectiveness and scholarship in service, applied research and clinical teaching, consistent with the expectations for tenure-track faculty. Annual evaluation and promotion consideration for regular appointments
are conducted using the same guidelines for tenure-track faculty as described in the Diagnostic Medicine/Pathobiology Criteria for the Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure of Ranked Faculty.

Reappointment of Clinical Assistant Professors on regular appointments requires annual evaluation of accomplishments for the prior contract year and a vote by faculty of higher rank for recommendation to the Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine to be made by the Head of the Department with input from the Director of the Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory. Reappointment of clinical-track faculty on regular appointments for 3 and 5-year terms is based on a mandatory evaluation during the penultimate year of appointment. All reviews for reappointment of multi-year contracts require submission of a dossier documenting performance in the areas reflected in the distribution of effort for the preceding contract years. The dossier (University Recommendation for Promotion and Tenure – Sections I – VII) should contain a current CV, narratives by the faculty outlining accomplishments, and documentation of the quality of these accomplishments (i.e. – letters from clients, student evaluations of teaching, grants obtained as principal investigator or collaborator, etc.). Recommendation for reappointment of Clinical Associate Professors is determined by the outcome of the performance evaluation and a vote by professorial rank faculty for recommendation to the Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine to be made by the Head of the Department with input from the Director of the Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory. Recommendation for reappointment of Clinical Professors is determined by the outcome of the performance evaluation and a vote by professorial rank faculty for recommendation to the Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine to be made by the Head of the Department with input from the Director of the Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory. Clinical track faculty members wishing to withdraw from reappointment consideration to a subsequent appointment may do so by resigning their position effective at the end of the final contract year.

Clinical-track faculty on regular appointments will participate in faculty governance processes as defined by the department, College of Veterinary Medicine, and University Handbook. Clinical-track faculty members have voting rights in college and department matters and elections, and may serve on department, college, and university committees unless policies limit membership to tenured or tenure-track faculty. Clinical-track faculty members are eligible to submit grant applications and direct research as principal investigators (Kansas State University Policy and Procedures Manual 7010.060). Clinical-track faculty members are eligible for graduate faculty status, which allows them to serve as major professors, graduate committee members, and course coordinators for graduate-level courses (Graduate Handbook, Chapter 5, Section C). Clinical-track faculty members may be course coordinators in the College of Veterinary Medicine without graduate faculty status. Clinical-track faculty members on regular appointments are eligible for sabbatical leave (University Handbook, Section E2) and are eligible for faculty development funds, if available.
Faculty may transfer one-time from a tenure track to a regular clinical track appointment or from a regular clinical track to a tenure track appointment (Board of Regents:1-19-06). Transfer approval is determined by a vote of the departmental faculty of higher rank to the faculty member under consideration, and by recommendation of the Head of the Department with input from the Director of the Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory. Years of service on regular clinical track appointments will not be credited towards consideration for tenure for faculty transferring from a clinical track appointment to a tenure track appointment. Final approval is determined by the Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine.

Faculty policies and guidelines for clinical track faculty on regular appointments do not apply to visiting faculty, adjunct faculty, or temporary (term) appointments. Clinical faculty with term appointments are appointed by the Head of the Department and/or the Director of the Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory with dean’s approval. Term clinical faculty appointments may be at the rank of assistant, associate, or full professor, and term clinical faculty may be on full- or part-time appointments. Service on a term appointment carries no expectation of continued employment beyond the period stated in the contract. Years of service on a term appointment may not be credited towards tenure, and the standards for notice of non-reappointment do not apply (University Handbook, Section C, C12.2).
Post-Tenure Review:

The purpose of post-tenure review at Kansas State University is to enhance the continued professional development of tenured faculty. The process is intended to encourage intellectual vitality and professional proficiency for all members of the faculty throughout their careers, so they may more effectively fulfill the mission of the university. It is also designed to enhance public trust in the University by ensuring that the academic community undertakes regular and rigorous efforts to hold all of its members accountable for high professional standards.

Kansas State University recognizes that the granting of tenure for university faculty is a vital protection of free inquiry and open intellectual debate. It is expressly recognized that nothing in this policy alters or amends the University's policies regarding removal of tenured faculty members for cause that are stipulated in the University Handbook. This policy and any actions taken under it are separate from and have no bearing on the chronic low achievement or annual evaluation policies and processes.

The department policy on post tenure review follows the overarching purpose, principles, objectives and procedures in the university policy on post tenure review (University Handbook, Appendix W).

Upon reaching the 6th year following tenure, promotion, or other notable achievement as outlined in Appendix W 2e, the head of the Department will request that, in conjunction with other materials submitted for annual review as part of the Faculty Annual Merit Evaluation System, the faculty member to be evaluated will also submit: 1) a brief (1-2 page) narrative outlining his/her major accomplishments and professional growth during the past 6 years, 2) a current CV, 3) copies of faculty annual merit evaluation summaries for the past 6 years. The narrative of accomplishments will reflect the nature of the faculty member’s appointment and be based on the criteria outlined in the Diagnostic Medicine/Pathobiology Criteria for the Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure of Ranked Faculty.

Review of the submitted post-tenure materials will be conducted by: 1) the department head, with input from the Director of the Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory for faculty with significant service appointments, and 2) the department promotion and tenure committee. This committee will review the documents provided and make a recommendation to the department head. This recommendation will include an assessment of whether the faculty member is demonstrating appropriate professional growth expected of their professorial rank. Faculty will be considered to be making appropriate contribution to the university mission if: 1) All annual evaluations for the review period meet expectations or above, and 2) the faculty member has demonstrated professional growth over the 6 year period. For faculty whose professional growth does not meet these criteria, a plan for professional growth and development will be made by the faculty member in conjunction with the department head. The department head will submit the outcome of the review to the Dean.