

PROPOSED

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The College of The Bahamas is committed to excellence in teaching. Excellence means that faculty strive to achieve high standards of teaching that contribute to the intellectual growth of their students by providing learning experiences which help students master specific bodies of knowledge and acquire problem-solving, critical thinking and lifelong learning skills. Excellence also means that faculty remain current in their disciplines and continuously seek ways to improve course content and teaching materials. Finally, excellence means that faculty serve as disciplinary role models committed to high ethical standards and full participation in their academic and professional communities.

To promote high standards in teaching, The College seeks to implement an effective process by which teaching is assessed and evaluated. The goals of this process are to:

1. improve and enhance the quality of the teaching and learning environment;
2. recognize excellence in teaching;
3. promote the scholarship of teaching; and
4. encourage teaching that is informed by research.

Maintaining high standards in teaching includes, but is not limited to:

1. utilising effective teaching methods and strategies;
2. monitoring, directing and evaluating students' progress;
3. continuously improving existing course content and developing new course materials;
4. structuring learning experiences that help students become independent learners and thinkers and that help students make connections between theory and practice and across disciplines;
5. provoking and broadening student interest in the subject matter and the discipline;
6. employing integrity, industry, versatility, open-mindedness and objectivity in teaching;
7. keeping current in one's discipline and integrating current thinking from the discipline into classroom and/or practicum instruction; and
8. participating in seminars, special courses, or workshops that develop teaching skills.

To determine whether a faculty's teaching exceeds, meets or fails to meet the standards identified above, teaching performance should be evaluated on the basis of the faculty's self-assessment of teaching activities (an integral component of the Annual Faculty Report), Student Feedback Reports and Classroom Observation Forms (integral components of the faculty member's assessment and evaluation file).

Self-Assessment of Teaching

In addition to providing an opportunity for the assessment and evaluation of teaching for the purposes of annual review, self-assessment provides the opportunity for faculty to reflect on their teaching and, by so doing, gain an understanding of their strengths and areas for improvement.

The self-assessment should present, in summary form, evidence of the steps taken or strategies used to:

1. prepare for teaching;
2. deliver instruction;
3. improve teaching; and
4. remain current in the discipline/field.

Such evidence could include:

Consequently, Student Feedback Reports should be completed during the Fall and Spring Semesters for all classes for all faculty.

Chairs should:

1. coordinate the distribution of the Student Feedback Reports, in accordance with guidelines approved by the Office of Academic Affairs;
2. submit the completed Reports for processing;
3. ensure that the analysis of the Feedback Reports as well as the completed Reports are made available to faculty as soon as possible after the submission of final course grades to the Records Department;
4. ensure that the analysis of the Student Feedback Reports along with the completed Reports are added to the faculty's assessment and evaluation file; and
5. determine the faculty's overall rating by students for the year under review by adding the faculty member's overall rating for the fall and spring semesters and dividing the total by 2. The overall rating for the academic year should be determined as follows:

Outstanding	3.5 – 4.0
Above Average	2.5 – 3.4
Satisfactory	1.5 – 2.4
Unsatisfactory	0.0 – 1.5
6. meet with faculty whose overall student rating for the year under review is unsatisfactory to discuss possible reasons for the rating and to suggest measures that could be taken to improve the rating.

Peer Review

Peer review by members of one's discipline or closely related field of expertise can provide some of the most valuable feedback with regard to teaching. Normally, peer review consists of an examination of course syllabi and selected course materials such as lecture notes, handouts, assignments, tests, web pages, etc. and classroom observations. Peer reviews are intended to provide faculty with feedback regarding their preparation for teaching, classroom performance, teacher-student interaction, etc. Such feedback is intended to help faculty identify strengths, areas for improvement, development opportunities and sources of support.

To assist with the documentation and evaluation of faculty teaching performance, the following faculty will be required to participate in a peer review process:

1. newly appointed faculty;
2. faculty on probation;
3. faculty who have not achieved two consecutive semesters of satisfactory classroom observations;
4. faculty who have been rated as unsatisfactory in the category of teaching on the Annual Faculty Evaluation Report; and
5. faculty who wish to be considered for promotion to a higher rank.

With regard to faculty identified in 1 - 4 above, peer review teams should arrange at least two classroom observations every semester for three consecutive semesters. Peer review teams should comprise at least two of the following:

1. the Chair;
2. the Head of Department and/or Programme Coordinator; or
3. a faculty member holding the rank of Associate Professor or higher. In those instances where there is no faculty member in the School/Institute holding the rank of Associate Professor or higher, an Assistant Professor with at least 5 years above average tertiary-level teaching experience may be asked to participate in the peer review process.

- Adhering to assessment policies/procedures as identified on the Academic Board approved course outline;
- Adhering to The College's grading policy;
- Collaborating in the development of mid-semester and final examinations for multi-sectional courses; -
- Preparing and submitting final examinations in a timely manner;
- Invigilating tests and/or examinations;
- Adhering to School/Institute and/or departmental guidelines regarding the submission of final grades;
- Preparing and submitting final grade sheets and final grades in a timely manner;
- Attending at least one seminar, colloquium, workshop, etc. for the improvement of teaching and learning;
- Having Student Feedback Reports rated as satisfactory;
- Having classroom observations rated as satisfactory.

Above Average Teaching (Predicated on fulfillment of satisfactory requirements)

Performance should be recognized as above average when faculty demonstrate and document at least three of the following:

- Preparing current, thorough and challenging course materials, assignments and/or examinations;
- Effectively supervising and evaluating Internship, Teaching Practice or Clinical Practice beyond the normal workload;
- Teaching a course that is being offered at The College for the first time;
- Teaching a variety of subject areas within a specific discipline and/or School;
- Teaching in a complex environment (for example, distance);
- Designing materials and using strategies to stimulate and engage students of varying abilities and/or learning styles;
- Serving as a designated teaching mentor to other faculty in accordance with approved guidelines;
- Integrating current thinking from the discipline into classroom/practicum instruction;
- Participating in interdisciplinary/interdepartmental curriculum development;
- Attending at least two seminars, colloquia, workshops, etc. for the improvement of teaching and learning;
- Participating in faculty exchange programmes involving teaching;
- Having Student Feedback Reports rated as above average;
- Having classroom observations rated as above average.

Outstanding Teaching (Predicated on fulfillment of satisfactory requirements)

Faculty who are clearly outstanding should document at least three of the following:

- Using new pedagogical methods and technologies in the classroom and sharing these with colleagues via workshops, seminars, etc.;
- Developing and sharing new course materials with colleagues via workshops, seminars, etc.;
- Sharing successful teaching techniques with colleagues via workshops, CD-ROMS, etc.;
- Developing and successfully delivering a new course;
- Leading/chairing interdisciplinary/interdepartmental curriculum development;
- Presenting at seminars or colloquia for the improvement of teaching and learning.
- Having Student Feedback Reports rated as outstanding;
- Having teaching evaluations rated as outstanding;

3. a detailed progress report of an ongoing research project;
4. a detailed summary of research findings;
5. a detailed discussion of how research findings effected a change in a practice, procedure or policy;
6. a summary analysis of a policy or technical report;
7. a detailed progress report of the steps taken to mount and execute a programme review;
8. a detailed progress report of the steps taken to mount an exhibition of original artistic/creative works;
9. a discussion of a successful teaching technique that was shared with colleagues;
10. a description and analysis of a website constructed and developed to provide a forum for the exchange of scholarly ideas, research problems, teaching materials, etc.;
11. a summary analysis of a new course that was developed or an existing course that was revised;
12. a summary analysis of an article, chapter, monograph, text or instructional software accepted for publication;
13. a discussion of a teaching module developed and used for a training programme;
14. a list of prizes or awards for excellence of scholarly, artistic or creative work.

Documentation in support of research and scholarship includes such items as:

1. sample teaching materials that have been developed and shared with colleagues;
2. Academic Board course outline of a revised or new course;
3. sample module for a training programme;
4. sample surveys, questionnaires;
5. letter confirming that a research proposal has been accepted;
6. letter confirming that funding has been secured for a research proposal or artistic/creative activity;
7. letter confirming that an article, monograph, book, etc. has been accepted for publication;
8. invitation to serve as a reader or editor for an academic/scholarly journal, translate a work for publication, write an article, a case study, chapter, participate in a performance, scholarly expedition or exploration, exhibit original work, etc. (or thank you letters for the same);
9. first page of a published journal article, front matter of a book;
10. executive summary of a grant, with listing of principal investigators, budget and letter of award;
11. unsolicited thank you cards, notations, letters from research partners, clients, agencies, organizations, etc.;
12. abstract of a research paper presented at a seminar, colloquium or scholarly meeting;
13. scholarly review of an article, chapter, publication or critical review of creative/artistic work or performance;
14. citations of research in scholarly publications or written acknowledgement of artistic/creative works by peers.

Rating of Research and Scholarship

Faculty research and scholarship performance should be rated as Outstanding (4), Above Average (3) or Satisfactory (2). Faculty whose research and scholarship performance is less than Satisfactory should receive a rating of Unsatisfactory (1) and should be required to meet with the Chair and relevant Head of Department and/or Programme Coordinator to discuss the rating,

College, profession and wider community. Excellence also means that faculty serve as role models of good citizenship through their active participation and leadership in College and/or community committees, boards, organizations, etc. Finally, excellence means that faculty engage in a variety of professionally related activities for the benefit of The College, the community and the profession.

To promote high standards in service, The College seeks to implement an effective process by which service is assessed and evaluated. The goals of this process are to:

1. increase faculty involvement in professionally related service activities;
2. increase faculty involvement in service to The College and the profession;
3. recognize excellence in service;
4. promote service as an integral component of good citizenship.

Maintaining high standards in service includes, but is not limited to:

1. respect, collegiality and a commitment to the pursuit of shared goals;
2. employing integrity, open-mindedness, objectivity and ethical principles in one's interactions with others;
3. active participation in service activities;
4. accepting responsibility for the timely, effective completion of service activities.

To determine whether a faculty's service exceeds, meets or fails to meet the standards identified above, service performance should be evaluated on the basis the faculty's self-assessment of service activities (an integral component of the Annual Faculty Report). The self-assessment should present, in summary form, evidence of service to the department, School/Institute, college, profession and/or community. Such evidence could include:

1. a summary analysis of active participation on a committee, task force, organization or board ;
2. a description of participation in recruitment, student life, student development, advising, etc.;
3. honours or special recognition for contributions to the department, School/Institute, College, community, profession.

Documentation in support of service includes such items as:

1. letter of invitation to serve on a committee, task force or board (or thank you letter for the same)
2. letter of invitation to serve as a faculty advisor to a student club or organization;
3. letter to invitation to chair a national, regional or international committee, organization
4. letter of invitation to serve on an editorial board, as session chair, moderator, discussant;
5. letters of commendation, appreciation or certificates of recognition;

Rating of Service

Faculty performance in the category of service should be rated as Outstanding (4), Above Average (3) or Satisfactory (2). Faculty whose service performance is less than Satisfactory should receive a rating of Unsatisfactory (1) and should be required to meet with the Chair and relevant Head of Department and/or Programme Coordinator to discuss the rating, identify development opportunities, strategies and sources of support and devise a plan of action for improvement. This plan should be attached to the Annual Faculty Evaluation Report.

undertaken during the summer, their plan of action, anticipated outcomes, resources needed and the activity or project's relevance to career goals and research interests as well as department, School/Institute and College goals. All such activities will be evaluated during the performance assessment of the subsequent year.

The **Annual Faculty Report** must include an analysis of professional development activities undertaken during the previous summer and a discussion of how these activities have contributed to the faculty's overall professional development.