Tips on the 1PC and 2PC annual evaluation process for CY2014
Briggs Advisory Council (BAC)

Introduction

This document contains information intended to help you complete 1PC and 2PC (1 and 2 person committee) reports as part of the annual LBC evaluation process. The objective is to increase consistency among the reports received by the Dean. To make the process more equitable, each 1PC or 2PC report should contain the same basic information. However, the 1PC or 2PC report is not supposed to re-list everything the person did; rather, it should provide commentary that adds context and provides evaluation. Although reports need not be restricted to the topics and questions below, in most cases, these are considered to be the most important criteria, as consistent with the LBC Faculty Evaluation Procedures ([http://lbc.msu.edu/faculty/faceval.pdf](http://lbc.msu.edu/faculty/faceval.pdf)). After completing the 1PC or 2PC report, remember to send it to the person you have evaluated at least 1 week before the deadline (see date below); if possible, meet with them to discuss the report and the committee’s recommendations. They have the right to see the report and provide the BAC and the Dean with written comments regarding the report, prior to its being submitted.

1PC and 2PC reports are due to the individual being evaluated on **February 20, 2014; the person being evaluated has the right to review and comment on the report before it is turned in to the BAC.** The final 1PC or 2PC report is due to the Dean on **February 27, 2014.** It is the responsibility of the LBC 1PC or 2PC member to inform any non-LBC reviewers of the process and to ensure that deadlines are met.

Suggested Report Template

**Name of Faculty Member Being Evaluated:**
**Name of LBC Faculty Evaluator:**
**Name and Unit of Non-LBC Faculty Evaluator:**
**Date:**
**Date Approved by Faculty Member Being Evaluated:**

**Teaching**

[Note: the 1PC/2PC Reports should be written with the LBC Evaluation of Teaching Rubric (Needs new link) in mind. It is this document that will be used by BAC to evaluate teaching performance.]

Read the Self-Evaluation form and materials provided in support of teaching. Attempt to address each of the questions below.

1. Details: what courses were taught during calendar year (title, course number, credits) and how many students were taught in each?

2. Goals: Please examine the faculty member’s course syllabi. Are learning goals articulated on each syllabus? Are they vague (e.g. will become critical thinker) or specific & measurable (e.g. can identify thesis of article)?

3. Example: Please examine the faculty member’s single provided example of an “alignment” of one learning goal, activities and assessments. Does that example help clarify that their approach for assessment is robust and laudable?
4. Peer feedback--Teaching Observation: Please use of Reformed Teaching Observation Protocol (RTOP ¹) in a qualitative manner for the teaching observation. Comment on the faculty member’s use of modern teaching practices/pedagogy. Please also include your notes from the peer observation as an appendix to your 1PC/2PC report.

5. Student feedback--Teaching Evaluation: What is the implication of the range of SIRS/SALG summary scores and commentary provided by students?

6. What evidence is there of a commitment to improved teaching and learning? For example, attending Lilly Seminars, or the Spring Institute, or using innovative classroom techniques?

7. Were there external factors that might have affected teaching during this calendar year (e.g., joint appointment responsibilities, career stage, time-to-date at Briggs, or leave time taken)?

8. Comment qualitatively on the faculty member’s teaching activities in the CYUR. Please provide specific examples. In other words, what specifically did he/she do well and could he/she do to improve for next year? How does self-evaluation point out strengths and identify areas where improvements are still underway?

Research (Note that although 1PC reports need only contain information about teaching, commentary on research accomplishments that the individual has reported is appreciated.)

1. By the standards of the individual’s discipline how would you rate his/her research? Please provide commentary about things such as: publications (please specify whether peer-reviewed or not and what the likely impact of the journal/publisher is), presentations (please indicate poster or oral, on or off-campus), funding applied for and/or secured (please indicate internal or external and amount), mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students (number and extent), etc. A reasonable standard of comparison is a faculty member in a good liberal arts college/university. Again, we are not looking for an excerpted list here from the individual’s CV, but a summary of the impact of their contributions.

2. How much progress did the individual make on research projects from which substantial products are expected to arise in future years?

3. Were there external factors that might have affected productivity during this calendar year (e.g., high teaching responsibilities, career stage, time to date at Briggs, or leave time taken)?

¹ RTOP website and online video training is available at: http://physicsed.buffalostate.edu/AZTEC/RTOP/RTOP_full/index.htm
1. How would you rate the individual’s contributions to his/her joint department? Comment on both the quantity and quality of his/her contributions.

2. How would you rate the individual’s level of service commitment to the disciplinary field (e.g., book reviews, journal article and grant reviews, professional society committees, etc...)? Comment on both the quantity and quality of his/her contributions.

3. Were there external factors that might have affected service during this calendar year (e.g., career stage, time to date at Briggs, or leave time taken)?

Cross-cutting
1. Are there ways in which the faculty member’s research, teaching, and service efforts complement one another? Are there items that fall into more than one of these three categories? Examples include: scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL; if that isn’t the faculty member’s main line of research), bringing research into the classroom, mentoring undergraduate research students, or service-learning in the classroom.