A subcommittee of BAC ("The Green Ribbon Committee") met in 2012-13 to provide an equitable and transparent method for evaluating teaching during the Annual Review merit raise process. They based their guidelines (below) on the already approved and in-force addendum to the LBC By-Laws, entitled “LYMAN BRIGGS COLLEGE FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, PROMOTION, AND SALARY RAISES”, which lists ten criteria that shall be used to evaluate instruction (see p. 2, http://lbc.msu.edu/faculty/faceval.pdf). These ten criteria will be used by the Briggs Advisory Council, within the framework outlined below, to score faculty performance with regards to the category of TEACHING for CYUR 2014.

**In Class Practice — The Lesson Plan, Teaching Practices, Pedagogy Used in the Execution of the Course or Class Meetings**

1) Classroom performance and instructional materials, based on “scholarly teaching” methods. This includes course content, structure, organization, and presentation (Bylaws criteria 1 & 6).
2) Teaching load in terms of credits, class size, and number of sections, preparations, TA’s, and laboratories (Bylaws criterion 9).
3) Efforts to “bridge the two cultures” and nurture and inclusive teaching environment (LBC Mission Statement).

Evaluator Score for “In Class Practice”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Student Learning Gains — Evidence that Students Learned or Mastered Learning Goals of Course(s)**

1) Evidence of student learning (examples of student excellence or progress, e.g. example of alignment of one goal, one assessment and sample student work) (Bylaws criterion 4 expanded)
2) Student course evaluations (SALG instrument, optional/additional feedback) (Bylaws criterion 4)
3) Inside or outside-of-class student scholarship (Bylaws criteria 3 & 5), which may include, but is not limited to: H-options; thesis oversight; mentoring; undergraduate research, independent studies, etc.

Evaluator Score for “Student Learning Gains”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Pedagogical Development — Evidence that Professional or Curricular Development Occurred**

1) Institutes, workshops, and programs attended/led relevant to instruction (Bylaws criterion 8).
2) Experimental instruction techniques or other course innovations (Bylaws criterion 7).
3) Contributes to course and curriculum development at College level (Bylaws criterion 2).

Evaluator Score for “Pedagogical Development”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Extra Credit — All Other Material that the Faculty Member Believes is Germaine to the Support of Instruction or to the Recognition of Outstanding/ Innovative/ Collaborative Work (Bylaws criterion 10).**

 Which may include, but is not limited to:

- Awards related to teaching and learning
- Grants and publications that directly impact course instruction (can apply here or in Research)
- Innovative study abroad/away experiences

Evaluator Score on by-laws approved 1 to 6 scale will be built from sub-score for each category, with rationale given.

---

1 The term “scholarly teaching” as used here means that instructional practices initially should be based on and explicitly tied to best practices as described in peer-reviewed educational literature, pedagogical workshops, etc. Over time, a faculty member’s instructional practices should evolve based on analysis of assessment data from his/her own courses or those of his/her colleagues.