



**Criteria and Procedures for Evaluation of Part-time Faculty
Draft – December 9, 2019**

Kreg Ettenger, Director

Overview

Maine Studies is an interdisciplinary program within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Unlike most departments, it does not have fulltime faculty appointments, either joint or exclusive. It relies heavily on part-time faculty to teach its slate of courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Evaluations of faculty are done following broad guidelines provided by the Agreement between the University of Maine System and The Maine Part-Time Faculty Association (PATFA), American Federation of Teachers Local #4593, AFL-CIO.

The Agreement stresses that individual units are responsible for determining evaluation procedures and criteria, and for conducting regular evaluations of part-time faculty. The Agreement also includes policies for initial appointment rank of faculty, promotion, and salary ranges. The following guidelines are based on the 2017-2019 PATFA Agreement; a new one has yet to go into effect. Article 9, Evaluations, is included here as Appendix A for reference.

I. Evaluation Criteria

The following criteria will be used to “assess qualifications and competency” (Article 9.A) of all part-time instructors teaching in the Maine Studies Program. These criteria fall within the three areas of evaluation specified by the contract, namely: “Instruction; Course and curricular development; and Other areas, where appropriate, [which] may include: creative works in discipline; departmental, college, campus and University assignments and service; professional activities; public service in discipline; publications and papers; research; scholarly writing; [and] student advising.” Individual evaluations may stress one or two of these areas as appropriate, given the specific nature of the individual’s service to the Maine Studies Program over the review period.

A. Teaching

As the Maine Studies Program is primarily an instructional unit, evaluation of teaching performance is normally considered of highest priority. A continuous record of quality teaching, with ample evidence of effectiveness as determined by course evaluations and other measures, will be considered strongly in the overall evaluation. While development of new courses and revision of existing ones will also be considered, it is the effective teaching of existing courses, especially those required for current degrees, tracks, and certificates, that will be considered most heavily in the evaluation. The following subsections spell out in more detail the criteria for the review of teaching effectiveness as part of the evaluation.

1. Included Items

The items that will normally be included in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness include:

- a. A “Teaching Statement” of 2-4 pages (800-1500 words) that describes the faculty member’s teaching philosophy, strategies, priorities, and other material information [required].
- b. Summary and copies of all formal teaching evaluations of courses by students [required].
- c. Review of course materials, including syllabi, assignments, and other items [required].
- d. Structured observations of teaching through in-class or online observations [recommended].
- e. Post-course reviews of Blackboard/CMS course shells and materials [recommended].
- f. Reviews of completed assignments, exams, etc., with/without instructor comments [optional].
- g. Student or former student emails, letters, or other communication [optional].

2. Teaching Statement Review

The review of the Teaching Statement will be based on how clearly and thoughtfully the faculty member can present their views on teaching as practice, including use of different pedagogies, appropriate use of instructional technologies (in class or online), general strategies or philosophies of teaching, goals and strategies with respect to inspiring students, methods for encouraging critical and independent thinking, importance of class discussion, and so on. It will also include an assessment of the faculty member’s willingness and ability to further develop their teaching skills and effectiveness, as demonstrated in part by formal training, and in part by their own reflection about their teaching practices and evolution.

3. Course Evaluation Review

In terms of course evaluations, items directly related to teaching effectiveness, knowledge of subject matter, respect for students, and ability to inspire an interest in the subject matter will be considered most heavily, especially for undergraduate courses. Graduate course evaluations will be looked at with special regard for how much students were encouraged to think for themselves, the quality of class discussions and interactions, and whether the class was seen as challenging.

Course comments are often uneven and can provide a biased view of a faculty member. For that reason, they will be reviewed but will not be a primary basis for an evaluation decision. The exception might be if there is a clear pattern in comments suggesting that the faculty member did not demonstrate respect for students, did not return assignments in a timely manner, or otherwise seemed to lack concern for his/her/their teaching effectiveness.

4. Course Materials Review

Course materials, including syllabi, assignment instructions, exams, etc., will be reviewed and evaluated to assess their clarity of writing, appropriateness to the course objectives, and overall quality and strength of content. Syllabi will be reviewed to ensure that they comply with all university guidelines for content, including [required syllabus statements](#) regarding sexual discrimination, academic honesty, accessibility services, and observance of religious holidays;

that they provide clear and consistent descriptions of course requirements and grading criteria; and that they include a course schedule that is accurate and matches the relevant academic calendar. Course workload should also be distributed evenly across the semester, and assignments should be weighted fairly (e.g., no final exam or term paper that is worth 80% of the course grade).

Assignment instructions should be clearly and concisely written, giving the student an adequate idea of the instructor's expectations for the assignment, grading criteria, needed resources, and any other information needed to successfully complete the assignment. Quizzes, exams and other assessments should include clear instructions, including regarding time limits; and questions should be clearly worded and not confusing or misleading. Adequate time should be given to complete all questions as directed. Deadlines for assignments should be clearly stated, with any deductions or other policies regarding late or incomplete assignments also clearly outlined.

5. Observations of Online or Classroom Teaching

If an observation is made of the faculty member in the classroom, or online, it will include an overall assessment of teaching style and effectiveness, as well as sections on:

- a. Faculty member's engagement with students, ability to draw out responses, willingness to hear their views, ability to have students engage with one another, and similar skills.
- b. Instructor's ability to present material in a clear and organized style, respond to student questions with appropriate answers, and gauge student reactions to and understanding of material.
- c. Classroom management skills, including time management, use of technologies, balancing of different pedagogies, etc.
- d. For online observations, assessment will also include a review of Discussion Forums or other places of interaction; overall structure of course shells; ease of navigating online classroom; and other best practices as determined by CITL or other online learning specialists.
- e. Due to the fact that most Maine Studies courses are online, particular attention will be paid to how well the instructor appears to be able to interact with and engage students in this format. A sense of class community, regular and meaningful feedback, and opportunities for discussion in one or more formats (e.g., Forums, synchronous discussions, etc.) will be highly valued.

6. Other Items

In addition, the review may include a summary of any issues that have arisen during the review period involving the instructor's teaching, but which do not fit any of the above criteria. This might include, for example:

- a. Communications the unit director has received from students regarding the instructor if they are seen as having direct bearing on the instructor's effectiveness, behavior, professionalism, or other matters related to teaching.
- b. Any student grievances filed against the faculty member, including regarding grades, along with a summary of the resolution of the issue.

c. Any information the unit director has first-hand knowledge of, or has received information about from others, that is directly relevant to a full and accurate evaluation of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness, professionalism, etc.

B. Course and Curriculum Development

While development of new courses is not normally a high priority, when a part-time faculty member initiates or takes part in such course development, this will be noted in the review. In addition, occasionally there are needs for graduate or undergraduate curriculum development and revision, such as changes in required courses or the creation of certificates. When part-time faculty lead or take part in these efforts, this will be considered an important part of their scheduled reviews. The nature of their participation, along with impacts on the program, will be noted.

C. Other Areas

According to the PATFA Agreement, several other areas may be evaluated (Appendix A, paragraph D). For the Maine Studies Program, the following areas may be considered as part of the formal review process. Not all faculty will have accomplishments in each of these areas during every review period; therefore individual reviews will vary in terms of which areas they include.

1. Scholarship and Creative Works

This category includes academic publications, conference papers, ongoing research projects, creative works (whether written or other media), and related accomplishments. Whatever the specific item, it should be related to the faculty member's work for the reviewing unit in some way.

2. Unit-level and Other Service

This includes service (e.g., committee work) at the program, college, university or system level; participation in department pedagogical or other meetings; or service to the public if it relates in some way to the position.

3. Other Professional Activities

This is a general category that can include, for example, community activities involving the faculty member's expertise, professional development (such as conference attendance), and so on.

4. Advising and Mentoring

This would include formal advising of students, including membership on graduate thesis committees, as well as more informal mentoring and development of students (graduate or undergraduate).

5. Awards and Recognition

This might include teaching awards or other recognition from the unit, college or university. It can also include grants received for travel or research, recognition in news media (internal or external), etc.

6. Other Activities

Includes any other areas that the unit member believes should be included in their review, and which are not directly related to the above areas.

II. Evaluation Procedures

In general, procedures for review of part-time faculty are spelled out in the UMS/PATFA Agreement. The relevant section (Article 9) is attached as Appendix A. The following is simply a brief summary of this procedure, with some additional clarification of unit guidelines.

A. Schedule of Reviews

Following the Agreement between UMS and PATFA, part-time faculty in Maine Studies will be evaluated at the following points in their service:

1. For new faculty members, there is a probationary review in the second semester of teaching, before the faculty members becomes a member of the PATFA bargaining unit.
2. Additional evaluations are conducted during the fourth semester of teaching, and every fourth semester of teaching thereafter. See Appendix A, paragraph A for details.
3. Faculty may request an informal, internal review at any time, such as when teaching a newly developed course, teaching an established MES course for the first time, or teaching in a new delivery format, such as online. This can be a partial review, such as conducting an observation of a class session, or reviewing an online course as an observer.
4. If a PATFA member requests a change in their academic rank, this will include an evaluation of materials similar to the biennial review. This can be requested at any time, including when the faculty member is scheduled for their regular (fourth semester) review.

B. Peer Reviewers

As per the PATFA Agreement, reviews will be conducted by “full-time faculty peers and other appropriate administrators” and “may consist of input from students, faculty and/or appropriate administrators.” As the Maine Studies Program does not have a core group of fulltime faculty, reviews will be led by the Program Coordinator, who may create committees including fulltime faculty from other departments who are closely connected with Maine Studies. In all cases, the faculty member under review will be informed about who will conduct the review and have access to his/her/their materials. If they have any objections to any of the participating reviewers, they may express these to the Program Coordinator, who will take all reasonable steps to address these concerns, including finding alternates. The final review letter will be prepared by the Program Coordinator, with approval by other committee members.

In addition to those conducting the review, input might be sought from others seen as familiar with the faculty member and able to comment on their performance during the period under review. As stated in the PATFA Agreement, this can include students as well as other faculty members and administrators. In these cases, review materials would normally not be shared with such individuals. Instead, they would be asked to comment on specific aspects of the faculty member under review, limited to those areas with which they have direct knowledge. For example, former students might be asked to comment on the instructor's engagement with students, level of professionalism, clarity of communication, and so on. In all cases where such input is sought, the identity of consulted individuals will remain confidential.

C. Schedule and Timing

The schedule of reviews will be set in accordance with PATFA rules and CLAS procedures. The Program Coordinator will inform the faculty member about an upcoming review, and provide all materials and instructions needed. The period under review will not typically include the semester during which the review is actually taking; only the prior four semesters will be included. For materials other than course evaluations, such as publications, items going back as far as the previous evaluation may be included. Normally reviews will take place during the academic year, not in the summer.

In terms of schedule, the normal procedure will be for the Coordinator to let the faculty member know at the beginning of the semester about the review, and provide instructions and materials. The faculty member will then have until roughly the midpoint of the semester to submit all materials (exact dates will be given for each individual review). The review will be completed no later than one month after materials have been submitted. The review letter will be shared with the faculty member, who will then have two weeks to provide written comments if desired. There will also be an opportunity to discuss the review and any plans for improving areas deemed less than satisfactory. The review and all responses should be completed by the end of the semester.

D. Outcome of Reviews

As provided in the UMS-PATFA Agreement, the review will result in a finding of "Satisfactory" or "Not Satisfactory." Satisfactory performance means "the part-time unit member has successfully met or exceeded all departmental requirements and expectations as outlined in the academic department's/unit's evaluation criteria and has no pattern of adverse materials in his/her personnel file within the preceding four (4) semesters of employment" (Appendix A, paragraph F).

E. Probationary (Second Semester) Review

The probationary review for part-time faculty will normally be completed in the second semester of teaching. New new faculty members will be provided with the review policies at the time of hire. The director will notify the instructor of the review during the first month of the second semester. They will then meet with the faculty member to answer any questions about the process.

By the end of the semester, the faculty member will provide the following to the director:

1. The syllabi used for the course(s) taught in the first and second semesters.
2. All assignment guidelines, quizzes, exams, etc. from the different courses taught.
3. Selected papers showing the instructor's feedback to student work, and the grade.
4. An 800-1000 word reflective statement on teaching practices and philosophy.

A class visit (or online observation) will normally be arranged in the second or third month of the semester. The instructor will be asked to provide a brief reflective statement (2-3 pages) on their teaching during the review period (see section below). Suggestions for improvement will be offered orally or in writing to the faculty member in regard to any issues identified.

Completed reviews will take the form of a letter, normally no longer than two pages. The letter will be copied to the PATFA member and to the personnel file. The PATFA member will have the right to respond in writing within two weeks of receiving the review. This response will be added to the personnel file. The director will forward the letter, along with any response from the PATFA member, to the Office of Human Resources.

F. Fourth Semester Review and Subsequent Reviews

All PATFA faculty are evaluated in the fourth semester of teaching and every fourth semester thereafter. The fourth semester review is a cumulative review covering activities since the previous review. Early in the semester, the director will begin the review. The director will meet with the faculty member before the review begins to clarify the process and discuss any concerns.

The faculty member will be asked to provide the following materials to the director:

1. A list of all courses taught during the review period, organized by semester.
2. The most recent syllabus for each course taught during the review period.
3. At least one assignment, as well as sample quizzes and exams, from each course taught.
4. Selected papers showing the instructor's feedback to student work, including grades.
5. A reflective statement of 2-4 pages (800-1500 words) on their teaching practices, philosophy, pedagogies, use of technology, and other aspects of their teaching, including concerns and steps taken to improve or address deficiencies and to learn new skills.

The director will evaluate the materials submitted, as well as student evaluations and other items as specified in Section A (Evaluation Criteria) above. A class visit or online observation may be arranged, normally in the second or third month of the semester. After the visit, the director will meet with the faculty member to discuss the class session and materials submitted.

Completed reviews will take the form of a letter, normally no longer than two pages. The letter will be copied to the PATFA member and to the personnel file. The PATFA member will have the right to respond in writing within two weeks of receiving the review. This response will be added to the personnel file. The director will forward the letter, along with any response from the PATFA member, to the Office of Human Resources.

G. Faculty Teaching in More Than One Unit

Many part-time instructors teach in more than one unit at the University of Maine. In such cases, the appropriate university or college administrator will determine which unit will conduct the evaluation for each faculty member in a given period. In some cases the review may be carried out jointly by multiple units, or input given by one unit to the unit conducting the evaluation. In all cases, this information will be provided to the PATFA member prior to the evaluation. The review form (Appendix B) contains spaces for indicating the Primary Unit conducting the review, and any Other Units involved.

APPENDIX A

*Agreement Between the University of Maine System
and
The Maine Part-Time Faculty Association
American Federation of Teachers Local #4593, AFL-CIO
September 1, 2017 – August 31, 2019*

Article 9 – Evaluations

- A. Unit members will be evaluated to maintain and promote academic standards and to assess qualifications and competency. Evaluations will be conducted at each campus for which a unit member teaches. Evaluations will normally be conducted in the fourth semester a unit member teaches at a campus and every fourth subsequent semester of teaching at that campus. The evaluation of part-time faculty as described below will be based on the academic judgment of full-time faculty peers and other appropriate administrators.
- B. Evaluations may consist of input from students, faculty and/or appropriate administrators.
- C. Unit members shall conduct student evaluations in each class taught using the approved form which may be a paper or electronic form. Student evaluations shall be part of a unit member's personnel file as follows:
1. Student evaluation forms and/or summaries shall be placed in the personnel file.
 2. Unsolicited student commentaries regarding a unit member's teaching performance which are contained on the evaluation form shall normally be included in the personnel file when the student has self-identified and, by mutual consent, may be included even if not self-identified.
 3. Individuals who review the results of student evaluations are cautioned not to place undue emphasis on any single measure of performance and be sensitive to the limitations of the statistical analysis of ordinal data.
- D. Evaluations will ordinarily consider these areas:
1. Instruction
 2. Course and curricular development
 3. Other areas, where appropriate, may include: creative works in discipline; departmental, college, campus and University assignments and service; professional activities; public service in discipline; publications and papers; research; scholarly writing; student advising.
- E. When faculty and department or division chairs or other appropriate academic administrators conduct evaluations, the evaluations shall be reasonable, in writing and in conformity with departmental standards and criteria. Each academic department or other appropriate unit will utilize approved evaluation criteria and procedures applicable to part-time faculty which recognize the unit member's

overall performance of his/her assigned academic responsibilities. The University will notify the unit member about evaluation criteria and procedures at the time they are notified of their appointment or at the beginning of the semester in which they are to be evaluated. This may be accomplished by posting criteria and procedures on existing academic unit webpages. The evaluation will include a review of the students' course evaluations, and consideration of any other additional information and materials pertaining to the unit member's assignments for the applicable semester(s).

- F. The evaluation shall result in an overall finding of "satisfactory" performance or "not satisfactory" performance. For the purpose of this Agreement, "satisfactory" performance shall be defined to mean the part-time unit member has successfully met or exceeded all departmental requirements and expectations as outlined in the academic department's/unit's evaluation criteria and has no pattern of adverse materials in his/her personnel file within the preceding four (4) semesters of employment. If no evaluation within the prior four (4) semesters is in the personnel file and there is no pattern of adverse material in the personnel file within the preceding four (4) semesters of employment, the unit member's evaluation during the designated period under review shall be deemed to be satisfactory.

- G. A copy of the evaluation shall be provided to the unit member at his/her home address or by email. The unit member shall have two (2) weeks to supply written comments which, if provided, will be attached to the evaluation and placed in the personnel file.
 - 1. The evaluation, with response, if any, shall be placed in the unit member's personnel file by the custodian of the file.
 - 2. Except in the case of student evaluations, all written evaluations shall include specific suggestions for improvement when appropriate.
 - 3. Upon request of the unit member, the appropriate administrator shall within thirty (30) days meet with the unit member to jointly review the unit member's evaluation.

- H. Except in the case of student evaluations, unit members shall be informed of the presence of any evaluators attending a class session.

- I. Unit members who desire to apply for promotion in rank shall consult with the appropriate administrator in order to assure that written evaluations occur and are placed in the unit member's personnel file.

APPENDIX B – PART-TIME FACULTY REVIEW FORM

Instructions

Please fill in all of the following blank sections as directed. Do not type in the shaded cells. If a particular section is not applicable for the period under review, write “Not applicable.” Note that this form is to be filled out as a Word document, expanding the text boxes as needed for each answer. Please do not print out before completing. When completed, return the form electronically according to the directions given to you by the department.

Full Name:		Employee ID:		DOB		
Current Rank:		Semesters Under Review				
Primary Unit		Other Unit (optional)				
Is a new rank requested as part of this review? (see PATFA agreement for info)				Yes	No	N/S

1. Teaching Experience and Qualifications					
Courses Taught		Provide a list of all UMaine courses taught, by semester, for ONLY the period under review. Specify whether each course was face-to-face, online, or another format, and any cross-listings (please see the example). If more than one course was taught in a semester, add more rows as needed.			
Semester	Course #	Course Title	Format	Enroll.	Comments
<i>SP 19</i>	<i>MES 101</i>	<i>Intro to Maine Studies</i>	<i>Online</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>New text; also had Academ-E section</i>
Course Evaluations		Provide a summary of course evaluations for the period under review. This should include your analysis of the quantitative data, such as describing where your scores were strongest, where they were weakest, and any steps taken to improve. Also include some representative examples (positive and negative) from the signed comments received in your courses.			
Professional Development		Describe any teaching-related training or professional development you have done in the period under review. This could include CITL or other workshops, online training, self-education, etc.			

2. Course and Curriculum Development	
New or Revised Courses	Please describe any new courses developed, proposed, and/or taught during the period under review. Also note any substantial revisions made to existing courses taught.
Other Curriculum Development	Describe any curriculum development you undertook in this period, either on your own initiative or at the request of administrators (e.g., changes to the degree, developing certificates, etc.).

3. Additional Activities	
Publications	Please list below any articles, conference papers, or other publications from the period under review.
Research and Creative Activity	Describe briefly below any research projects, creative works, or other activity that you see as pertinent to this review, or that connects with your teaching. This should also include grants received.
Professional Service	Describe any service performed for this program, the college or university, or others.
Advising and Mentoring	Please describe any formal academic advising or informal mentoring you have done for students in the period under review. Also list any graduate student committees you have served on.
Awards & Recognitions	Please list or describe any awards, prizes, or special recognitions you may have received over the period of review. These could be internal to the unit, college or university, or external awards.
Other	Describe any other activities or accomplishments you see as relevant to this review.
4. Supplemental Materials	
Please attach the following materials to this application in electronic form.	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A "Teaching Statement" of 2-4 pages (800-1500 words) that describes your teaching philosophy, strategies, priorities, and other material information about your approach to teaching as a profession. 2) A current <i>Curriculum Vitae</i> that lists education, work experience, all courses taught, publications, and other information regarding your lifetime professional experiences. 3) Course evaluation results from all University of Maine courses taught during the review period only. These should not be redacted or edited in any way. Contact DLL if you need assistance getting copies of these. 4) Course syllabi, sample assignments, sample assessments (quizzes/exams), and any other relevant materials from the courses you taught during the review period. The portfolio should include one syllabus for each course, at least two writing assignment instructions, two or more quizzes and/or exams, and grading rubrics or other information provided to students. 5) Samples of graded assignments and/or feedback to students from at least two courses. In addition to papers, this could include (for example) instructor responses to Discussion Forum posts, comments on exams, etc. 6) You may also submit writing samples, examples of creative work, or other materials produced during the period under review, although these are not required. In all cases, they should be connected to your position. 7) If desired, you may attach letters, emails or other communications from students and former students (from the review period only) that contain endorsements not found in the course evaluations. These are entirely optional. 	