

COLLEGE OF NEW CALEDONIA

POLICY AND PROCEDURE

***PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF FACULTY EMPLOYED IN
INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS***

September 20, 2002

Revised: September 2005

Revised: September 2010

TABLE OF CONTENT

Policy	2
Principles	2
Core Elements to be Considered	2
Teaching	3 & 4
Professional Development	4
Instructional Development	4
Service to College	5
Evaluation Procedures	5 & 6
Probationary Faculty	6
Regular Faculty	7
Sessional Faculty	8
Part-Time Faculty	8
Sessional and Part-Time Faculty on the Non-Regular Seniority List	8
Factors to be Considered in a Comprehensive Evaluation	9
Teaching	9
Systematic Student Appraisals	9
The Questionnaire	9
Timing	10
Confidentiality	10
Added Remarks	10
Quality of Course Materials	11
Administrative Visitations (classroom, clinical, lab, shop)	11
Peer Feedback - Visitations/Consultations (classroom, clinical, lab, shop)	11
Self-Evaluation	12
Unsolicited Input	12
Professional Development	12
Instructional Development	12
Service to College	12
Special Assignments/Projects	12
Review Process	13
Collective Agreement Procedures	13
Evaluation Example Table	14
Self-Evaluation Guidelines	15
Process Guidelines	16
Self-Evaluation: Sample Questions	17
SRT Forms	18
Standard/General Format	
Adult Special Education	
Distance Learning (SSTP)	
English As A Second Language	
Health Sciences Laboratory or Clinical Instructor	

1. POLICY

The purposes for a comprehensive faculty performance evaluation policy at CNC are to:

- 1.1 Create a constructive environment, within which the instructional process can be fully explored in the interests of students' learning,
- 1.2 Create a means by which faculty performance can be evaluated to determine areas of strength and areas that may need improving as a fundamental step in faculty planning to improve effectiveness of performance,
- 1.3 Recognize and reinforce best practices,
- 1.4 Create a means by which the supporting relationship between faculty evaluation and faculty development can be understood and achieved,
- 1.5 Identify, in some circumstances, where improvement is required to maintain competency and promote high instructional standards.

2. PRINCIPLES

The faculty performance evaluation process will:

- 2.1 Be designed and implemented through a consultative process,
- 2.2 Provide constructive feedback to help faculty facilitate student learning,
- 2.3 Assist in identifying excellent performance,
- 2.4 Be applied and implemented consistently,
- 2.5 Be comprehensive, using core elements with the addition of other elements as decided by the faculty member in consultation with his/her administrator,
- 2.6 Provide input for individual faculty professional development and instructional development,
- 2.7 Provide an opportunity for faculty to address the results of their performance evaluation,
- 2.8 Undergo regular review and revision as needed.

3. CORE ELEMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED

It is intended that activities related to the following functions will be evaluated:

- 3.1 Teaching
- 3.2 Professional Development
- 3.3 Instructional Development
- 3.4 Service to the College

The evaluation of teaching activities will be the most important element in assessing faculty performance.

3.1 Teaching

As it is recognized that in most cases teaching activities will constitute a major part of a faculty member's responsibilities, more diversified and comprehensive input is sought for this activity in comparison to other core elements.

3.1.1 Components of teaching to be evaluated:

- a) Instructional Delivery Skills
 - enthusiasm
 - communication skills
 - learner-centered strategies
 - learning focus
 - organization
 - use of technology as appropriate
 - instructional techniques
- b) Instructional Design Skills
 - course outline and supplementary materials
 - tests and assessment strategies
 - course organization
- c) Content Expertise
 - knowledge of content area
 - inclusion of current knowledge in course
- d) Course Management
 - grading practices
 - office hours
 - student advising
 - book orders
 - participation in library collection development
- e) For those teaching in cost recovery areas the following will be reviewed if applicable:
 - is the instructor teaching what was agreed to and in the manner agreed?
 - case management
 - reporting requirements to external agencies (i.e. program and student progress)

- 3.1.2 Methods of Assessment (see 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 5.1)
- a) Student Reports on Teaching (S.R.T.)
 - b) Administrative visitations (classroom, clinical, lab, shop)
 - c) Peer feedback - visitations/consultations (classroom, clinical, lab, shop)
 - d) Self-evaluation
 - e) Small Group Instructional Feedback
 - f) Unsolicited input
 - g) Review of instructional materials; such as, curriculum, course outlines, tests

3.2 Professional Development

Professional Development will be defined in terms of results expected and the evaluation of the results will be the responsibility of the appropriate administrator.

3.2.1 Components of P.D. that may be evaluated:

- a) Active in professional association
- b) Attendance at Articulation meeting
- c) Serving on Professional/Discipline-specific Committees
- d) Reading undertaken
- e) Research and or writing undertaken
- f) Courses/workshops taken
- g) Practical work experience in discipline
- h) Self-study and upgrading in discipline

3.2.2 Methods of Assessment

- a) Annual P.D. Plan
- b) Self evaluation - list of involvement

3.3 Instructional Development

Instructional Development refers to the design and incorporation of techniques, strategies or resources for achieving the goals of the curriculum. Instructional development is distinct from but may overlap with curriculum development.

3.3.1 Components of Instructional Development that may be evaluated:

- a) Learner-centered approaches
- b) Learning strategies; such as class exercises, manuals, tutorials, etc.
- c) Self instructional packages
- d) Audio visual aids
- e) Computer assisted learning packages
- f) Web based development

3.3.2 Methods of Assessment

- a) Self reporting
- b) Administrative visitations (classroom, clinical, lab, shop)
- c) Review of instructional materials; such as, curriculum, course outlines, and tests

3.4 Service to College

3.4.1 Components of Service that may be evaluated:

- a) Participation in trade shows as college representatives
- b) Visitation to schools
- c) Active on college committees (eg. Education Council, Faculty Association, Recruitment and Retention, Health and Safety, divisional activities)
- d) Participation in college-wide events (eg. Career Fair, Open House, Convocation)

3.4.2 Method of Assessment

- a) Self reporting of above

4. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

In any serious attempt at improving professional competence and effectiveness, evaluation cannot be considered in isolation but rather must be seen as part of a growth plan that includes the establishment of expectations, evaluation of results and identification of opportunities for development. *The appropriate administrator will meet at the beginning of the evaluation period with each faculty to be evaluated to agree upon and determine the process and activities to be pursued in the coming year and the dates that the self-evaluation and comprehensive written report will be completed.* This meeting will be followed up with a written account of the decision made.

The following procedures will be used by the appropriate administrator for review with the faculty member in accordance with sections 7.2 of the Collective Agreement. A comprehensive written report prepared by the appropriate administrator constitutes the evaluation referred to in section 7.2.5 of the Collective Agreement. The evaluator will conclude the evaluation with a statement that the faculty member's performance is either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The faculty member will have the right to bring in a colleague or Union representative to any evaluation meeting with the evaluator. A second representative of administration may be present.

For faculty who are not on a semester system, the following cycles will be used for evaluation: September - February
March - August

4.1 Probationary Faculty

Probationary faculty will be assigned a mentor, when possible, during the first two years of appointment. The emphasis during the first semester is to acquaint the faculty member with college policy and procedures in relation to performance evaluation, to provide support that acknowledges needs and opportunities for improvement.

<p align="center">SEMESTER 1/ Non Semester: Sept - Feb</p>	<p align="center">SEMESTER 2/ Non Semester: March - Aug</p>
<p><i>May be used</i> a. Administrative visitations (classroom, clinical, lab, shop) b. S.R.T.s (classroom, clinical, lab, shop)</p> <p><i>Optional</i> i. Peer feedback visitations/consultations</p>	<p><i>Required</i> a. Administrative visitations (classroom, clinical, lab, shop) b. S.R.T.s (classroom, clinical, lab, shop) c. Self Evaluation based upon Semesters 1 & 2 d. Comprehensive written report based upon Semester 2 input by the administrator followed by a debriefing with the faculty member</p> <p><i>Optional</i> i. Peer feedback – visitations/consultations ii. Small Group Instructional Feedback</p>
<p align="center">SEMSTER 3/ Non Semester: Sept - Feb</p>	<p align="center">SEMESTER 4/ Non Semester: March - Aug</p>
<p><i>Required</i> a. Administrative visitations (classroom, clinical, lab, shop) b. S.R.T.s (classroom, clinical, lab, shop)</p> <p><i>Optional</i> i. Peer feedback visitations/consultations ii. Small Group Instructional Feedback</p>	<p><i>Required</i> a. Administrative visitations (classroom, clinical, lab, shop) b. S.R.T.s (classroom, clinical, lab, shop) c. Self Evaluation based upon Semesters 3 & 4 d. Comprehensive written report by the administrator followed by a debriefing with the faculty member</p> <p><i>Optional</i> i. Peer feedback – visitations/consultations ii. Small Group Instructional Feedback</p>

- 4.2 **Regular Faculty** (Regular, regularized full and part-time - LOU# 3 & Article 6)
Regular faculty may be evaluated annually; however, as a minimum *formative evaluation [*]* is required 3 years after becoming a regular faculty member. Six years after becoming a regular faculty member a *comprehensive evaluation [**]* is required. A minimum of every 6 years thereafter, a *comprehensive evaluation is required.*

3RD YEAR AS REGULAR FACULTY [*] FORMATIVE EVALUATION	
FALL SEMESTER / Non Semester: Sept - Feb	SPRING SEMESTER / Non Semester: March - Aug
<p>Required</p> <p>a. S.R.T.s (classroom, clinical, lab, shop)</p> <p>Optional</p> <p>i. Peer feedback visitations/consultations ii. Small Group Instructional Feedback</p>	<p>Required</p> <p>a. S.R.T.s (classroom, clinical, lab, shop) b. Self Evaluation primarily based upon fall & spring semesters</p> <p>Optional</p> <p>i. Peer feedback – visitations/consultations ii. Small Group Instructional Feedback</p>
6TH YEAR AS REGULAR FACULTY THEN EVERY 6 YEARS [**] COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION	
FALL SEMESTER Non Semester: Sept - Feb	SPRING SEMESTER / Non – Semester: March - Aug
<p>Required</p> <p>a. Administrative visitations (classroom, clinical, lab, shop) b. S.R.T.s (classroom, clinical, lab, shop)</p> <p>Optional</p> <p>i. Peer feedback visitations/consultations ii. Small Group Instructional Feedback</p>	<p>Required</p> <p>a. Administrative visitations (classroom, clinical, lab, shop) b. S.R.T.s (classroom, clinical, lab, shop) c. Self Evaluation primarily based upon fall & spring semesters d. Comprehensive written report by the administrator followed by a debriefing with the faculty member</p> <p>Optional</p> <p>i. Peer feedback – visitations/consultations ii. Small Group Instructional Feedback</p>

4.3 **Sessional Faculty**

All sessional faculty will be evaluated on their *first and second* Sessional appointments and thereafter on a reasonable interval based upon results of the first evaluation and number of appointments.

Required

- a. Administrative visitations (classroom, clinical, lab, shop)
- b. S.R.T.s (classroom, clinical, lab, shop)
- c. Self Evaluation if the appointment is more than one term
- d. Comprehensive written report by the administrator followed by a debriefing with the faculty member

Optional

- i. Peer feedback - visitations/consultations
- ii. Small Group Instructional Feedback

4.4 **Part-Time Faculty**

Part-time faculty members with at least 45 regular scheduled hours annually will be evaluated by the use of S.R.T.s (classroom, clinical, lab, shop) until they reach non-regular status. A summary of the S.R.T. results, signed by the faculty member, will be placed on file.

4.5 **Sessional and Part-time Faculty on the Non-Regular Seniority List**

Once a faculty member gains status on the Non-Regular Seniority List the following will be required every 3 years:

Required

- a. Administrative visitations (classroom, clinical, lab, shop)
- b. S.R.T.s (classroom, clinical, lab, shop)
- c. Self Evaluation
- d. Comprehensive written report by the administrator followed by a debriefing with the faculty member

Optional

- i. Peer feedback - visitations/consultations
- ii. Small Group Instructional Feedback

Should a faculty member on the Non-Regular Seniority List go from having a Part-time Appointment to a Sessional Appointment, that faculty member may have his/her performance evaluated.

5. **FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION**

It is intended that activities related to the following core elements would be evaluated. Each faculty member's activities could fall into one or more of these categories:

- 5.1 Teaching
- 5.2 Instructional Development
- 5.3 Professional Development
- 5.4 Service to College
- 5.5 Special Assignments / Projects

In preparing an evaluation, the appropriate administrator may make a reference to data suggesting an inability to work in concert with others that has led to demonstrated negative impact on the faculty member's activities related to the core elements.

Any activities undertaken by faculty members that are not related to their responsibilities to the College will not be considered, except as defined in section 5.4, Service. The evaluation of teaching activities will be the most important factor in assessing performance except where other activities (which are identified in advance) are of equal or greater importance. The other Categories 5.2 through 5.5 will be of lesser importance unless otherwise noted by the appropriate administrator.

5.1 **Teaching**

As it is recognized that, in most cases, teaching activities will constitute a major part of an individual's responsibilities, more diversified and comprehensive input is sought for this activity in comparison to other categories for evaluation.

5.1.1 *Systematic Student Appraisals*

5.1.1.1 *The Questionnaire:*

The College's "Student Report on Teaching" will be the normal instrument for student appraisals. It is recognized that specific questions and details of administration and scheduling can be adjusted to meet the special needs of specific divisions or programs. Such adjustments will be determined by the appropriate administrator in consultation with the faculty members directly involved. In the case of all part-time faculty members, Question 10 of the S.R.T. will be eliminated.

The S.R.T. (classroom, clinical, lab, shop) results will be used to highlight areas of excellence as well as to “red-flag” any areas of concern. If necessary, clearer definition should then be pursued through the most appropriate vehicle (i.e. consultation between the instructor and the appropriate administrator, consultation with the class, classroom visitation, review of documents, more specific questionnaires, etc.) with the goal of identifying appropriate corrective action if necessary.

5.1.1.2 *Timing:*

In scheduling the administration of the S.R.T. (classroom, clinical, lab, shop), one week’s notice will be given to the instructor prior to the date of the S.R.T.’s administration. The administration of the questionnaire ***should occur during the last one-third of the course*** or as negotiated with the faculty member in special circumstances. It should be noted that administration of the S.R.T. (classroom, clinical, lab, shop) in semester/trimester courses shall take place when such courses are first offered in an academic year. If courses are repeated in the second semester/trimester, the instructor may have S.R.T.s administered in that term. Instructors will be provided with a copy of the S.R.T. results prior to the interview with an administrator.

5.1.1.3 *Confidentiality:*

To maintain anonymity, all questionnaires will be administered under the direction of the Executive Assistant to the Vice-President Academic. A standardized script will be read by those administering the S.R.T. Results shall be handled in a personal and confidential manner through direction of the office of the Vice President Academic.

5.1.1.4 *Added Remarks:*

The students’ written comments will be paraphrased by the Dean/Director in a brief written synopsis and given to the instructor during an evaluation interview after the cumulative results have been compiled. The student comments will be returned to the V-P office with direction from the Dean/Director to have them destroyed or held for release to the instructor after the final grades have been submitted (*Process Revised May 2004*). A summary of the S.R.T.s signed by the faculty member will be placed on file and that summary is to be removed upon completion of the comprehensive written report.

5.1.1.5 *Interpretation of Data:*

- a) Results of the administration of the S.R.T. (classroom, clinical, lab, shop) should be made known to faculty after final grades are submitted. Results of the S.R.T. (classroom, clinical, lab, shop) will be discussed with the faculty member.
- b) On an individual basis, historical data derived from student questionnaires may be used to indicate a trend in behaviours. The written comments may only be used to identify a trend and will not be quoted in comprehensive written reports.
- c) Manipulation of quantitative data derived from the student questionnaires which might lead to rating and rank ordering of instructors will not be done.

5.1.1.6 *Frequency:*

See Evaluation Procedures (# 4)

5.1.1.7 *Additional Student Input:*

Instructors may, of course, seek student input in addition to that proposed in this procedure but such input will not form part of the evaluation process.

5.1.2 ***Quality of Course Materials***

The appropriate administrator has the responsibility of reviewing and assessing course materials (curriculum outlines, course objectives, examinations, learning support materials, etc.) for courses offered within his/her area.

In the event that course content is the issue in question, advice will be sought from those with expertise in the specific area.

5.1.3 ***Administrative Visitations (classroom, clinical, lab, shop)***

Administrative personnel may visit classes at their discretion but such visits will be arranged with the faculty member involved (giving at least one week's notice) and will normally be limited to a maximum of three visits per year.

5.1.4 ***Peer Feedback - Visitation/Consultations (classroom, clinical, lab, shop)***

The practice of using peer assistance to improve teaching effectiveness is definitely encouraged but related input would not form part of the summative evaluation report, unless requested by the instructor.

5.1.5 *Self-Evaluation*

The practice of self-evaluation is very important as it has been determined that change is much more likely when a disparity of perceptions is recognized. Self-evaluation forms part of the assessment data, as outlined in the evaluation procedures, and will be based on the core elements under Section 3.

5.1.6 *Unsolicited Input*

When unsolicited input is received, the appropriate administrator will, as soon as possible, inform the instructor of the precise nature of the input, and, through discussion with the parties involved, attempt to establish if there is, or is not, substance to the input. If the input cannot be authenticated or if it is anonymous or irrelevant to performance it will not be recorded or used as part of the evaluation. If, in the judgment of the appropriate administrator, the input is well-grounded and relevant to performance, related documentation may form part of the formal evaluation file for reference in preparing the comprehensive written report. The source of any such input which forms part of the evaluation will be made known to the instructor.

5.2 **Professional Development**

Professional Development, like Instructional Development, will be defined in terms of results expected and the evaluation of the results will be the responsibility of the appropriate administrator.

5.3 **Instructional Development**

Development activities will be defined in terms of results, and the evaluation of those results will be the responsibility of the appropriate administrator. Instructional development is distinct from, but may overlap with, curriculum development.

5.4 **Service To College**

Service activities identified by the faculty member may be used to give recognition of contributions.

5.5 **Special Assignments/Projects**

Previously agreed duties (e.g. Co-ordinator) or special projects wherein the faculty member may receive a workload reduction should be taken into account when a comprehensive evaluation is done.

6. REVIEW PROCESS

Although the evaluation process is intended to be positive, disagreements do occur. It is recognized that there is value in third party advice when there are disagreements on matters associated with evaluation.

When the faculty member and the administrator cannot agree on the content of the evaluation, the faculty member may invoke the review process. The objective of the process is to provide independent insight into the evaluation, provide advice to both parties and provide a means to resolve the difference without immediately proceeding to grievance/arbitration should the faculty member so choose.

Within 10 working days after reviewing the evaluation, the faculty member may choose to seek a third party review by notifying in writing, the administrator and the Faculty Association. The Faculty Association appoints a faculty member and the College appoints an academic administrator to form a review team. Within 10 working days following such a hearing, each member of the review team will provide written advice to the faculty member and the administrator on all matters relating to the disagreement.

It is anticipated that the faculty member and the administrator will give serious consideration to the advice provided and attempt to resolve the differences.

7. COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT PROCEDURES

Faculty are reminded that this policy and procedures are designed for the fair and systematic implementation of the Collective Agreement reached between the Faculty Association and the College Board. Specifically this means that:

- 7.1 The evaluation process will be described in advance of its application for all faculty members.
- 7.2 The faculty member and appropriate administrator will review all evaluation results in a meeting prior to the writing of the final comprehensive written report.
- 7.3 After completion of the final comprehensive written report, the faculty member will sign the report indicating its receipt and perusal. The faculty member will also have the opportunity to add written comments to be attached to the comprehensive written report in the file or to ask for an additional meeting with the administrator.
- 7.4 As has been the practice, existing evaluation procedures will remain in force until superceded by new procedures. Evaluation procedures will be reviewed annually by the appropriate administrator at least once each calendar year at a time determined by the Vice-President, Academic.

EVALUATION EXAMPLES:

Ms. Newcomer (Ms. N): year 1 & 2 probationary, then regular faculty
 Mrs. Old Timer (Mrs. OT): regular faculty for 18 years, last evaluation 13 years ago
 Mr. Experienced (Mr. E): regular faculty for 13 years, last evaluation 5 years ago
 Mr. Middle of the Road (Mr. MR): part-time year 1 (1 course 100 hours), sessional for years 2 & 3, then regular faculty

ABBREVIATIONS AND PAGE REFERENCES:

CompEv = Comprehensive Evaluation (p. 7) Sess = Sessional (p. 8)
 Prob Ev = Probationary Evaluation (p. 6) Self Ev = Self Evaluation (p. 15)
 SRT = Student Report on Teaching (p. 9) Regular Faculty (p. 7) PT = part-time (p. 8)

Faculty Name	2002/2003	2003/2004	2004/2005	2005/2006	2006/2007	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011
Ms. N	Prob Ev	Prob Ev			SRT Self Ev			CompEv	
Mrs. OT	CompEv						CompEv		
Mr. E		CompEv						CompEv	
Mr. MR	PT 1 SRT	Sess Comp WR	Sess Comp WR			SRT Self Ev			CompEv

SELF-EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Self-evaluation is required as part of the assessment data for the performance evaluation of faculty employed in instructional areas.

The purpose of self-evaluation is to provide an opportunity for faculty to:

- reflect on what you do and how you do it
- determine areas of strength and areas that may need improving
- develop professional development plans around instructional issues
- recognize and reinforce best practices

As outlined in Section 5.1.5 of the “Policy and Procedures for Performance Evaluation of Faculty Employed in Instructional Areas”, self-evaluation is one factor to be considered in a comprehensive evaluation.

Section 4 of the “Policy and Procedures for Performance Evaluation of Faculty Employed in Instructional Areas” identifies when self-evaluation is required [refer to specific section of the Policy and Procedures]

Probationary Faculty: Semesters 2 - 4 (Section 4.1)

Regular Faculty: 3rd year after becoming regular faculty (Section 4.2)
6th year after becoming regular faculty and every six years as part of a comprehensive evaluation (Section 4.2)

Sessional Faculty: first and second Sessional Appointment (if the appointment is more than one year) and thereafter on a reasonable interval (Section 4.3)

Sessional and Part-time Faculty on the Non-Regular Seniority List: required every 3 years as part of a comprehensive evaluation (Section 4.5)

It is intended that the activities related to the Core Elements (Section 3, Policy and Procedures for Performance Evaluation of Faculty Employed in Instructional Areas) will be evaluated:

- Teaching (most important element)
- Professional Development
- Instructional Development
- Service to the College
- Special Assignments / Projects (if applicable)

PROCESS GUIDELINES

In a year when a comprehensive report is occurring, the faculty member will meet at the beginning of the evaluation period with the appropriate Administrator to determine the process and activities to be pursued in the coming year. At that meeting, the process/format for self-evaluation will also be discussed. It is intended that the self-evaluation will be discussed at the debriefing meeting upon completion of the evaluation. The self-evaluation forms part of the evaluation data and will be placed in the faculty member's file (Human Resources).

In a year when SRTs and self-evaluation are required, the faculty member will meet with the appropriate Administrator at the beginning of the evaluation period to discuss the process/format for self-evaluation. After the self-evaluation is completed, the faculty member and the appropriate Administrator will meet. There will be acknowledgment of the self-evaluation and the self-evaluation will be placed in the faculty member's file.

The intent of the self-evaluation process is for the faculty member to determine the method that works best for him/her to reflect, evaluate and plan for development.

Self-evaluation could take the form of:

- an essay
- a self assessment inventory
- a teaching portfolio
- a case study of a student
- an analysis of a week in your teaching life
- a video
- a written discussion of goals set and how met over the year
- a written discussion of how fulfilling each criteria on the SRT
- any other form discussed and agreed upon with the appropriate Administrator

Self-evaluation could include:

- results of peer visitation
- an analysis of small group instructional feedback
- a written discussion on the observations from administrative visitations
- any other pertinent information
- reflections on the current or previous years

The following questions are an example of questions that could be used to form the basis of a self-evaluation tool.

SELF-EVALUATION SAMPLE QUESTIONS

1. Describe your teaching philosophy.
2. How is this philosophy reflected in your interaction with the students? Be specific.
3. What delivery strengths do you bring to the classroom? What content strength and experiences do you bring to the classroom. Provide concrete examples/anecdotes.
4. How do you keep current in your content area? How has this current knowledge been included in your course(s)?
5. What do you evaluate in your students? What assessment strategies/tools do you use to do this?
6. In what ways are you prepared and organized as an instructor? Give examples.
7. Describe any areas of your teaching you would like to change.
8. In what ways do you make a contribution to your department, to your discipline or CNC (general)?
9. After having answered these questions, is there any follow-up action you intend to pursue?

SRT FORMS

Standard / General Format

Adult Special Education

Distance Learning (SSTP)

English As A Second Language

Health Sciences Laboratory or Clinical Instructor

COLLEGE OF NEW CALEDONIA
STUDENT REPORT ON TEACHING - S.R.T.

(Yellow form)

The following questionnaire is intended to provide students with the opportunity to provide feedback on their instructor's teaching performance. Please be objective and helpful in your responses. The results and comments will be made available to the instructor **after final grades for the course are submitted.**

Date:

INSTRUCTOR RATING	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
1. At the beginning of the course, the instructor made the course objectives / goals clear.						
2. At the beginning of the course, the instructor made the method of evaluation clear.						
3. The course objectives are being met.						
Comments:						

INSTRUCTOR RATING	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
4. The instructor encourages questions and/or discussion of concepts and ideas.						
5. The instructor handles student questions appropriately and competently.						
6. I found the assignments to be effective for increasing my understanding and knowledge of the subject.						
Comments:						
OVER >>						

INSTRUCTOR RATING	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
7. The instructor presents the course material well.						
8. The instructor demonstrates an understanding of the material.						
9. The classes are well organized.						
Comments:						

INSTRUCTOR RATING	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
10. The instructor is available either through office hours, by appointment, by e-mail, and/or phone.						
11. The grading of the assignments is prompt (where applicable).						
12. The grading of the exams is prompt (where applicable).						
Comments:						

INSTRUCTOR RATING	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Very Poor
13. On the basis of my answers to the above questions, I would rate the instructor's overall teaching performance as:					
Comments:					

**COLLEGE OF NEW CALEDONIA
STUDENT REPORT ON TEACHING - S.R.T.
Adult Special Education**

The following questionnaire is intended to provide students with the opportunity to provide feedback on their instructor's teaching performance. Please be objective and helpful in your responses. The results and comments will be made available to the instructor **after final grades for the course are submitted.**

Date:

INSTRUCTOR RATING	YES	NO	NO COMMENT
1. At the beginning of the program, the instructor explained what I would be learning.			
2. At the beginning of the program, the instructor explained how I would be evaluated.			
3. The program is what I was told it would be.			

INSTRUCTOR RATING	YES	NO	NO COMMENT
4. The instructor lets me ask questions.			
5. The instructor lets me share my ideas.			
6. The class work is related to employment.			

INSTRUCTOR RATING	YES	NO	NO COMMENT
7. The instructor teaches in a way that I understand.			
8. I know where the instructor's office is.			
9. I am welcome to talk to the instructor in his/her office.			

STUDENT REPORT ON TEACHING - S.R.T. (Cont'd)

INSTRUCTOR RATING	YES	NO	NO COMMENT
10. The instructor meets with me to let me know how I am doing.			
11. The work I do in class helps me prepare for job training.			
12. At the end of my training, I was given a clear evaluation of what I did well and what I need to improve on.			

INSTRUCTOR RATING	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Very Poor
13. On the basis of my answers to the above questions, I would rate the instructor's overall teaching performance as:					

Comments:

a) The things I feel the instructor does well are:

b) Things the instructor could do to improve are:

COLLEGE OF NEW CALEDONIA
STUDENT REPORT ON TEACHING - S.R.T.
Distance Education

(Blue form)

The following questionnaire is intended to provide students with the opportunity to provide feedback on their instructor's teaching performance. Please be objective and helpful in your responses. Return in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided. The results and comments will be made available to your instructor **after final grades are submitted**. Please circle your response.

Course:

Date:

INSTRUCTOR RATING	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
1. At the beginning of the course, the instructor made the course objectives clear.						
Comments:						
2. At the beginning of the course, the instructor made the grading policies clear.						
Comments:						
3. All the course objectives were met.						
Comments:						
4. The schedule of contact hours was made clear at the beginning of the course.						
Comments:						
5. The procedure for contacting the instructor was made clear at the beginning of the course.						
Comments:						
6. The instructor could be contacted during scheduled contact hours.						
OVER						

INSTRUCTOR RATING	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
7. The instructor demonstrated an understanding of the material.						
Comments:						
8. The instructor encouraged questions.						
Comments:						
9. The instructor encouraged discussion of course related topics.						
Comments:						
10. The instructor handled student questions appropriately.						
Comments:						
11. The assignments increased my understanding of the subject.						
Comments:						
12. The instructor provided sufficient support.						
Comments:						
13. The grading of work was prompt.						
Comments:						

INSTRUCTOR RATING	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Very Poor
14. Overall, I would rate the instructor's teaching performance as:					
Comments:					

COLLEGE OF NEW CALEDONIA
STUDENT REPORT ON TEACHING - S.R.T.
English As A Second Language

(Purple form)

The following questionnaire is intended to provide students with the opportunity to provide feedback on their instructor's teaching performance. Please be objective and helpful in your responses. The results and comments will be made available to the instructor **after final grades are submitted**.

Date:

INSTRUCTOR RATING	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
1. At the beginning of the course, the instructor explained the course goals clearly.						
2. At the beginning of the course, the instructor explained the method of marking clearly.						
Comments:						

INSTRUCTOR RATING	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
3. The instructor encourages questions and discussion.						
4. The instructor answers student questions well.						
5. The assignments helped me learn.						
Comments:						

OVER >>

INSTRUCTOR RATING	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
6. The instructor teaches the course material well.						
7. The instructor shows that he/she understands the material.						
8. The classes are well organized.						
Comments:						

INSTRUCTOR RATING	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
9. It is possible to talk to the instructor in his/her office, on the phone or by e-mail.						
10. The instructor gives back our corrected work quickly.						
11. The instructor marks quizzes quickly.						
Comments:						

INSTRUCTOR RATING	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Very Poor
12. The instructor's teaching is:					
Comments:					

Approved: May 2002
 Minor Revision: September 2005

COLLEGE OF NEW CALEDONIA
FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF
HEALTH SCIENCES
LABORATORY OR CLINICAL INSTRUCTOR

Your assistance in evaluating your Laboratory or Clinical Instructor is greatly appreciated. Please be fair, honest, realistic and as objective as you possibly can.

It is most helpful if you can provide constructive comments, examples and specific suggestions that would promote your instructors's development. Section "E" and "F" are provided for your comments.

This evaluation is confidential and the collective 'instructor ratings' are typed out separately to ensure anonymity. The 'original' results and comments will be made available to the instructor after final grades for the course are submitted.

If a question does not apply to you, please choose N/A (Not Applicable).

Thank you for taking the time to complete this form.

COLLEGE OF NEW CALEDONIA

**FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF
HEALTH SCIENCES
LABORATORY OR CLINICAL INSTRUCTOR**

Name of the course: _____

Date: _____

Length of laboratory or clinical experience: _____ weeks

Please circle your response for sections A, B and C according to the following key:

Consistently
1

Usually
2

Sometimes
3

Rarely/Never
4

A. Professional Competence

1. Is a professional role model	1	2	3	4	N/A
2. Assists students to relate underlying theory to clinical/laboratory situations	1	2	3	4	N/A
3. Demonstrates enthusiasm for practice	1	2	3	4	N/A
4. Recognizes own limitations in clinical situations	1	2	3	4	N/A
5. Applies basic principles of practice	1	2	3	4	N/A
6. Provides appropriate experiences to meet clinical/lab objectives	1	2	3	4	N/A
7. Applies established standards of practice	1	2	3	4	N/A
8. Demonstrates professional behaviours (e.g. confidentiality)	1	2	3	4	N/A
9. Demonstrates appropriate clinical skills when needed	1	2	3	4	N/A
10. Assigns patients appropriately to my learning needs	1	2	3	4	N/A
11. Provides rationale for clinical/laboratory decisions	1	2	3	4	N/A
12. Acts as a student advocate in clinical setting	1	2	3	4	N/A

B. Interpersonal Skills

1. Encourages a climate of mutual respect	1	2	3	4	N/A
2. Is approachable	1	2	3	4	N/A
3. Provides support and encouragement to students	1	2	3	4	N/A
4. Demonstrates empathy	1	2	3	4	N/A
5. Demonstrates confidence in students	1	2	3	4	N/A
6. Is patient with students	1	2	3	4	N/A
7. Encourages appropriate discussions during conferences	1	2	3	4	N/A
8. Shows genuine interest in patients and their care	1	2	3	4	N/A
9. Provides direction in new situations without taking over	1	2	3	4	N/A
10. Encourages a relaxed clinical atmosphere	1	2	3	4	N/A
11. Is flexible when necessary	1	2	3	4	N/A
12. Interacts well with patients and staff	1	2	3	4	N/A
13. Demonstrates honesty when dealing with me/students	1	2	3	4	N/A

C. Evaluation Skills

1. Provides appropriate feedback on written assignments	1	2	3	4	N/A
2. Identifies student's strengths and limitations objectively	1	2	3	4	N/A
3. Provides negative feedback tactfully	1	2	3	4	N/A
4. Provides positive reinforcement appropriately	1	2	3	4	N/A
5. Clearly defines clinical expectations	1	2	3	4	N/A
6. Provides timely feedback throughout the rotation	1	2	3	4	N/A
7. Provides accurate and adequate feedback	1	2	3	4	N/A

Laboratory/Clinical Progress Record

D. Based on your clinical experience with this instructor, how would you rate this instructor's overall laboratory or clinical teaching ability. Please circle your response.

Excellent Very Good Good Satisfactory Needs Improvement

E. How was this instructor able to meet or promote your laboratory/clinical learning needs?
You may include specific examples or rationales.

F. What suggestions would you like to make for this instructor?