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1. General Departmental Policies and Procedures
1.1 Departmental Review Bodies

1.1.1 Department Salary and Promotion Committee (DSPC)

1.1.1.1 Composition of the DSPC
a. The DSPC will include four members, serving two-year staggered terms.
b. At least three members must be tenured faculty.
c. The department chair may not serve as a member of the DSPC.
d. Non-tenured faculty members must have completed at least two years of their probationary appointment to be eligible to serve.

1.1.1.2 Procedure for Election of the DSPC
a. Members of the DSPC will be elected by the faculty (tenured and probationary) during the spring semester.
b. Membership eligibility extends to faculty who hold at least a 50% appointment in the department.
c. The DSPC Chair will be elected by the members of the DSPC during the spring semester.

1.1.1.3 Definition of Peer Group for Promotion and Salary Review
a. The peer group for promotion recommendations will include all full professors who hold at least a 50% appointment in the department.
b. The peer group for salary will include all faculty who hold at least a 50% appointment in the department.

1.1.1.4 Procedure for Conducting Peer Group Evaluation and Voting
a. Every faculty member is to be evaluated by his or her peers annually. All faculty will review the materials provided by the other faculty members (including Form 4: List of Activities for Calendar Year 20__) and provide input to the DSPC.
b. The DSPC will complete the official peer evaluations after considering the input from the department faculty, recording them on Form 5 (Salary Review) and, when appropriate, Form 6 (Request for Promotion to Full Professor).
c. The DSPC will act consistent with UW-Platteville affirmative action goals.
d. Voting for salary recommendations will be conducted by a show of hands.
e. Voting for promotion will be by written ballot, with ballots stored in the Department Chair’s office.

Comment [JER31]: Some members are concerned this can lead to problems, especially if they have to vote by show of hands

Comment [JER32]: What if there are only one or none- is there a department Psychology prefers supply additional full professors

Comment [JER33]: Confirm with section 6.3.2.3

Comment [JER34]: See first comment- is it problematic to have untenured faculty vote on salary for other tenured members by a show of hands
f. See Chapter 6, section 6.3.4.3 for details on voting procedures and sections 6.3.8.13 and 6.3.9.12 for information on reconsideration.

1.1.2 Renewal and Tenure Review Body (RTRB)

1.1.2.1 Composition of the RTRB/RTRBs and Voting Procedure

a. Composition:

i. The Department of Psychology includes six tenured faculty members in the discipline of psychology and one tenured faculty member not within that discipline. Patricia Bromley is the Coordinator/Advisor of the MSE Adult Education Program which is housed in the School of Education.

ii. The RTRB will include the six tenured members of the department who are in the discipline of psychology.

iii. Tenured faculty on the 20__RTRB will include C. Enright, E. Gates, C. Narayan, T. Parsons, J. Riedle and M. Wruble.

iv. If tenured, the Department Chair serves on the RTRB but may not Chair the RTRB.

v. The RTRB Chair will be elected by the members of the RTRB.

b. Voting:

i. A vote to not renew, like a vote to not award tenure, is a decision of the tenured faculty rather than a recommendation. Consequently all tenured faculty, including the department chairperson, may vote on renewal decisions.

ii. Tenure votes will be conducted by the department chairperson at a meeting of the tenured faculty and by means of written, signed ballots. Those ballots will be forwarded to the Provost for storage. All tenured faculty in the department will be eligible to vote.

iii. The RTRB will act consistent with UW-Platteville affirmative action goals.

iv. See Chapter 6, section 6.3.4.3 for details on voting procedures and sections 6.3.8.13 and 6.3.9.12 for information on reconsideration.

1.1.2.2 Composition of an Interdisciplinary RTRB and Voting Procedure (if applicable)

N/A (Given Patricia Bromley is a full professor.)
1.2 Procedure for Approving the Departmental RST Plan/Sub-Plans by the Departmental Faculty

a. The RST Plan is reviewed by the faculty during the fall semester of each academic year.

b. The plan is approved by a vote of the faculty.

1.3 Procedures for Evaluation of Departmental Faculty

1.3.1 Peer Evaluations

a. A packet of peer assessment forms will be provided to the faculty for completion. The DSPC Chair is responsible for distributing these packets to all faculty members prior to the DSPC deliberations.

b. Peer input from department at large will be collected on Psychology’s form, included in this document on page 14.

c. Both the department at-large peer assessments and DSPC peer evaluations will be completed without access to student evaluations or to summaries of student evaluations.

d. Peer assessments and evaluations will be based on materials pertinent to the current academic year; all faculty will summarize that information on Form 4 (List of Activities for Calendar Year 20__).

   i. The individual faculty member will make these relevant materials available through the Department Office.

   ii. Peers will also take into account the faculty members' professionalism and adherence to the University and American Psychological Association ethical standards.

   iii. Each tenured faculty member is encouraged to observe the probationary faculty every academic year. Collegial observations may include, but are not limited to, Small Group Instructional Diagnosis (SGID), guest lectures, videotape of lectures, and team teaching. The faculty member to be observed is expected to work with the observing colleague to determine the assessment method and feedback procedure. The observed faculty member may choose to include the evaluation(s) in their RST file.

   iv. Faculty who hold full-time appointments in the department are required to observe probationary faculty members teach a class at least once prior to the probationary faculty member’s tenure vote. Meeting this obligation will be considered during the ranked faculty member’s post-tenure review. It is the observing faculty member’s responsibility to initiate the observation.
v. Each faculty member is required to indicate on the appropriate box on the peer assessment form whether their assessment is based on direct knowledge/observation of the evaluatee's teaching performance.

e. The DSPC summarizes the departmental peer assessments, recommends a final peer evaluation rating in each category (teaching effectiveness, professional and scholarly activity, and service) and enters it on the appropriate RST form. The following scale will be used for peer ratings: Exceeds Expectations (4.3 – 5.00); Meets Expectations (3.5 – 4.29); Below Expectations (1.00 – 3.49).

f. A copy of the completed RST form(s) will be given to the faculty member. The DSPC will include, as appropriate, Form 1 (Recommendation for Renewal or Tenure), Form 2 (Renewal and Tenure: Record of Peer Evaluation by RTRB), Form 5 (Salary Review), and/or Form 7 (Post-Tenure Review).

g. The faculty member then has an opportunity to respond with a written counter statement, to be placed in the faculty member's RST file along with the RST Forms. The DSPC will flag files containing counter statements for reconsideration.

1.3.2 Student Evaluations

a. Tenured faculty members must be evaluated by students in at least one semester of every three academic years.

b. Non-tenured faculty must be evaluated by students every semester during their first three years of service. Beginning in their fourth year of service, non-tenured faculty must be evaluated by students at least once per year.

c. Non-tenured faculty must submit both current and cumulative evaluations as part of their RST file. All Form 3s (Renewal and Tenure: Record of Student Evaluation) remain in the file during the probationary period.

d. Tenured faculty going up for promotion must submit evaluations for both semesters of the preceding academic year.

e. Timing of Student Evaluations:

i. Student evaluations will be collected during the last three weeks of classes. A student or the department chair will return the sealed envelope containing the evaluations to the departmental office. The program assistant will place the sealed envelopes in a file cabinet in the department chair's office. The envelopes will remain sealed and will be kept in the department chair’s office until grades have been submitted.
ii. Exception for second year faculty -- their evaluations must be collected shortly before the second year review.

iii. Tenured faculty are responsible for requesting evaluations at least once every three years.

f. Faculty teaching courses in other departments will follow that department's policies for securing evaluations and placing them in the faculty member's RST file.

g. Psychology's current student evaluation form is attached. (See page 15.)

h. The student evaluations will be administered in one of two ways, at the discretion of the faculty member.

i. Faculty member option: The faculty member is provided a large manila envelope identified with his or her name, class and section and containing the student evaluation forms. The faculty member reads the directions to the students, distributes the evaluation forms, then leaves the room. A previously appointed student collects the forms, places them in the envelope, seals it, and returns it to the Department Chair.

ii. Department Chair option: The instructor may ask the Department Chair to administer the student evaluations.

i. All hybrid courses or sections must include student evaluations of technology and delivery method each time the course is offered. In addition to the instructor, the evaluation results must be provided to the department chair or designee. These evaluations will be incorporated into teaching evaluations as a part of the Review, Salary, and Tenure (RST) process.

j. The Department Chair will be responsible for compiling and summarizing the student evaluation data.

i. Mean and median ratings will be calculated on all Likert items. The proportion of outstanding, above normal, normal, below normal, and low ratings will be computed for each faculty member, for each class.

ii. Student evaluations will be summarized by checking the appropriate box on Form 3 (Renewal and Tenure: Record of Student Evaluations) for probationary faculty and on Form 5 (Salary Review) for all faculty. Numerical averages will not be submitted to the DSPC or RTRB.
iii. Based on the average for Question 8 (see page 15), the Department Chair will record teaching performance as Exceeds Expectations (4.2 – 5.00), Meets Expectations (3.5 – 4.19), or Below Expectations (1.00 – 3.49).

iv. Form 3 (if applicable) and Form 5 will be included in the faculty RST file and forwarded to the appropriate review bodies.

k. A copy of all forms added to the file will be given to the faculty member.

l. After the final course grades have been submitted, a summary of the student evaluation results (mean, median, and distribution of ratings on all Likert items) will be distributed to the faculty by the Department Chair. The actual/original student evaluation forms will be stored in the Department Chair’s office.

m. Student evaluations for RST purposes (see page 14) will be separate from those for self-improvement (see page 16).

1.3.3 Additional Types of Evaluation (if applicable)

N/A

1.4 Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty with Non-Teaching Assignments

a. Annual Review of the Chairperson

i. The DSPC Chair receives the Dean’s memo and the LAE form “Faculty Evaluation of Department Chairperson” and distributes that form to all faculty and any academic staff who have been given voting rights, who will complete and return the evaluations to the DSPC Chair.

ii. The DSPC Chair returns the completed forms and a summary to the Dean’s office. This summary is also placed in the Department Chairperson’s RST file.

b. See Chapter 6, section 6.3.5.7, for a complete list of Department Chair responsibilities. The Chair’s responsibilities related to RST include:

i. The Chair supervises the student evaluation process.

ii. The Chair advises faculty of review dates for reappointment at least 20 days prior to the DSPC meeting.

iii. The Chair reminds faculty of the DSPC deadlines for submitting their files.
iv. The Chair summarizes recommendations, confirms that files with counter statements have been flagged, and forwards files and summary to the appropriate review bodies.

v. The Chair conducts tenure votes.

c. Annual Review of Coordinator/Advisor of the MSE Adult Education Program.

i. This position is currently held by a tenured member of our department, Patricia Bromley. When she is no longer the Coordinator/Advisor, this section of our RST plan will be deleted.

ii. Dr. Bromley’s performance as Coordinator/Advisor is evaluated by the Provost. Dr. Bromley will provide the Provost with an annual statement of her progress toward goals.

iii. The Provost will issue a written evaluation letter, including a performance ranking using the scale “Below Expectations,” “Meets Expectations”, or “Exceeds Expectations.” That letter will be included by Dr. Bromley in her RST file.

iv. Dr. Bromley teaches three courses per year, two for the Criminal Justice online program and one for the MSE program. Her students will be asked to evaluate her teaching using whatever teaching evaluation forms are employed by those programs.

v. Dr. Bromley will provide her teaching evaluations (or a complete, unedited copy of them) to the Psychology Department chairperson who will summarize them on Form 5 (Salary Review) for inclusion in Dr. Bromley’s RST file. Possible rankings include “Below Expectations,” “Meets Expectations”, or “Exceeds Expectations.”

vi. The DSPC will complete the peer evaluation section of Form 5 (Salary Review) for Dr. Bromley by including the peer evaluations from her last semester as part of our undergraduate program.

vii. Based on the Provost’s ranking of Dr. Bromley’s performance and her current student evaluations, the DSPC will make a salary recommendation. Two rankings of “Exceeds Expectations” would be required for a recommendation of high merit. In a given year, one ranking of “Below Expectations” would still qualify Dr. Bromley for merit. In a given year, two rankings of “Below Expectations” would result in a recommendation of no merit.
1. Renewal of Probationary Faculty

2.1 Departmental Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Professional/Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service

2.1.1 Teaching Effectiveness
a. Weighted at 65%

b. Teaching includes an array of activities that provide students opportunities for learning in and beyond the classroom (e.g., syllabi, samples of tests or assignments, use of new technology, academic and career advising, supervision of independent work, student organizations, internships, student-faculty projects, field trips, and laboratory work, availability to students and colleagues, and individual tutoring).

c. Teaching effectiveness shall receive top priority. Consistent deficiencies in teaching effectiveness cannot be offset by superior achievements in scholarship and service.

2.1.2 Professional, Scholarly, and Creative Activity
a. Weighted at 20%

b. The evaluation of scholarly and professional activities will be based on the quality and quantity of scholarly and professional activities submitted as part of the RST file.

i. Examples of such scholarly and professional activities include published research, presentation of research (including research co-authored by students), participation in professional meetings, unpublished materials, holding office in professional organizations, service as a consultant, clinician or professional teacher (outside of usual UW-Platteville responsibilities), continued formal and informal study, etc.

ii. Copies of publications and descriptions of presentations and summaries of other work will assist in the qualitative part of this review.

2.1.3 Service to the University and to the Community
a. Weighted at 15%

b. University service will be rated in accordance with the responsibilities assumed outside of teaching and research (e.g., system, university, college, and department faculty committees).

c. Community service will be rated according to the faculty member's active participation in his/her field which benefits the non-university community.
2.2 Ancillary Materials Required by the Department for Inclusion in the RST File (if applicable)
N/A

2. Granting of Tenure

3.1 Departmental Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Professional/Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service

3.1.1 Teaching Effectiveness
a. Weighted at 65%

b. Teaching includes an array of activities that provide students opportunities for learning in and beyond the classroom (e.g., syllabi, samples of tests or assignments, use of new technology, academic and career advising, supervision of independent work, student organizations, internships, student-faculty projects, field trips, and laboratory work, availability to students and colleagues, and individual tutoring).

c. Teaching effectiveness shall receive top priority. Consistent deficiencies in teaching effectiveness cannot be offset by superior achievements in scholarship and service.

d. This evaluation will consider the cumulative record of peer and student evaluations.

3.1.2 Professional, Scholarly, and Creative Activity
a. Weighted at 20%

b. The evaluation of scholarly and professional activities will be based on the quality and quantity of scholarly and professional activities submitted as part of the RST file.

i. Examples of such scholarly and professional activities include published research, presentation of research (including research co-authored by students), participation in professional meetings, unpublished materials, holding office in professional organizations, service as a consultant, clinician or professional teacher (outside of usual UW-P responsibilities), continued formal and informal study, etc.

ii. Copies of publications and descriptions of presentations and summaries of other work will assist in the qualitative part of this review.
c. This evaluation will consider the cumulative record of university and community service.

3.1.3 Service to the University and to the Community
a. Weighted at 15%

b. University service will be rated in accordance with the responsibilities assumed outside of teaching and research (e.g., system, university, college, and department faculty committees).

c. Community service will be rated according to the faculty member’s active participation in his/her field which benefits the non-university community.

d. This evaluation will consider the cumulative record of university and community service.

3.2 Ancillary Materials Required by the Department for Inclusion in the RST File (if applicable)
N/A

3. Promotion to Full Professor
4.1 Departmental Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Professional/Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service
4.1.1 Teaching Effectiveness
a. Weighted at 60%

b. Teaching includes an array of activities that provide students opportunities for learning in and beyond the classroom (e.g., syllabi, samples of tests or assignments, use of new technology, academic and career advising, supervision of independent work, student organizations, internships, student-faculty projects, field trips, and laboratory work, availability to students and colleagues, and individual tutoring).

c. This evaluation will consider the cumulative record of peer and student evaluations since the date of promotion to associate professor.

4.1.2 Professional, Scholarly, and Creative Activity
a. Weighted at 20%, equal to the weight for Service to University and Community.
b. The evaluation of scholarly and professional activities will be based on the quality and quantity of scholarly and professional activities submitted to the DSPC in the faculty member's vita.
   i. Examples of such scholarly and professional activities include published research, presentation of research (including research co-authored by students), participation in professional meetings, unpublished materials, holding office in professional organizations, service as a consultant, clinician or professional teacher (outside of usual UW-P responsibilities), continued formal and informal study, etc.
   ii. Copies of publications and descriptions of presentations and summaries of other work will assist in the qualitative part of this review.

c. This evaluation will consider the faculty member's record of professional and scholarly activity since the date of promotion to associate professor.

d. A rating of excellent in either Professional/Scholarly Activity or University/Community service is expected, with a rating of at least satisfactory in the second area, for promotion to professor.

4.1.3 Service to the University and to the Community
a. Weighted at 20%, equal to the weight for Professional, Scholarly, and Creative Activity.

b. University service will be rated in accordance with the responsibilities assumed outside of teaching and research (e.g., system, university, college, and department faculty committees).

c. Community service will be rated according to the faculty member's active participation in his/her field which benefits the non-university community.

d. This evaluation will consider the cumulative record of university and community service.

e. A rating of excellent in either Professional/Scholarly Activity or University/Community service is expected, with a rating of at least satisfactory in the second area, for promotion to professor.

4.2 Ancillary Materials Required by the Department for Inclusion in the RST File (if applicable)
N/A
4. **Salary and Inequity**

5.1 **Departmental Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Professional/Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service**

5.1.1 **Teaching Effectiveness**
   a. Weighted at 65%
   
b. Teaching includes an array of activities that provide students opportunities for learning in and beyond the classroom (e.g., syllabi, samples of tests or assignments, use of new technology, academic and career advising, supervision of independent work, student organizations, internships, student-faculty projects, field trips, and laboratory work, availability to students and colleagues, and individual tutoring).

5.1.2 **Professional, Scholarly, and Creative Activity**

   a. Weighted at 20%

   b. The evaluation of scholarly and professional activities will be based on the quality and quantity of scholarly and professional activities submitted as part of the RST file.

      i. Examples of such scholarly and professional activities include published research, presentation of research (including research co-authored by students), participation in professional meetings, unpublished materials, holding office in professional organizations, service as a consultant, clinician or professional teacher (outside of usual UW-P responsibilities), continued formal and informal study, etc.

      ii. Copies of publications and descriptions of presentations and summaries of other work will assist in the qualitative part of this review.

5.1.3 **Service to the University and to the Community**

   a. Weighted at 15%

   b. University service will be rated in accordance with the responsibilities assumed outside of teaching and research (e.g., system, university, college, and department faculty committees).

   c. Community service will be rated according to the faculty member’s active participation in his/her field which benefits the non-university community.
5.1.4 Departmental Guidelines for Determining Merit or High Merit

a. Four criteria will be considered, including three peer ratings (teaching effectiveness, scholarly/professional development, and service) and student evaluations of teaching effectiveness.

b. Faculty who, in a given year, receive either four ratings of “Exceeds expectations” or three ratings of “Exceeds expectations” and one rating of “Meets expectations” will be recommended for high merit.

c. Faculty who do not qualify for high merit but who, in a given year, receive peer ratings of at least “Meets expectations” in the areas of teaching effectiveness, scholarly and professional development, and service, as well as student evaluations of at least “Meets expectations” will be recommended for merit.

d. Faculty who, in a given year, receive three of the four ratings of at least “Meets expectations” and a fourth of “Below expectations” will be recommended for merit. However, if they again receive a rating of “Below expectations” in the following year, they will be recommended for no merit.

e. Faculty who receive more than one rating of “Below expectations” in a given year will be recommended for no merit.

f. See section 4.1.c.vii for information regarding merit recommendations for the Coordinator/Advisor of MSE Adult Education Program.

5.2 Ancillary Materials Required by the Department for Inclusion in the RST File (if applicable)

N/A
5. Post-tenure Review

6.1 Departmental Criteria for Evaluation

a. The faculty member being reviewed prepares a summary of major activities since the time of tenure or the last post-tenure review and a personal plan for continuing professional development until the date of next review, as required on Form 7: Post-Tenure Review.

b. The Department Chair reviews the faculty member’s summary of major activities and personal plan for continuing professional development with the faculty member, with the exception that the Department Chair will be reviewed by the Chair of the RTRB.

c. The Department Chair summarizes the faculty member’s peer ratings and student evaluations since the time of tenure or the last post-tenure review.

d. If either (1) the peer ratings and student evaluations from the current year are not all “Meets expectations” or “Exceeds expectations” or (2) the peer ratings and/or student evaluations reveal a marked, declining trend, then evidence of need for improvement exists.

6.2 Departmental Policy on Professional Development Tied to Post-tenure Review

a. If need for improvement is documented during the post-tenure review, the Department Chair will assist the faculty member in devising a development plan.

b. The Department Chair and college dean will assist the faculty member in finding resources to fund reasonable development activities.

c. The schedule for post-tenure review is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Last Review</th>
<th>Next Review</th>
<th>Following Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narayan, Chetna</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wruble, Marc</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons, Theron</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates, Elizabeth</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enright, Corinne</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riedle, Joan</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

PEER ASSESSMENT FOR ________________________________

TO BE USED AS INPUT TO THE DRB
January, 2013

Please read the following and base your evaluation on the criteria listed. Using the following scale, provide a rating between 1 and 5 in the blank beside each category. Use the blank space to provide an optional justification for your rating.

Low   Below Normal   Normal   Above Normal   Outstanding

1.........2..............3..............4..............5

Teaching Effectiveness -- weighs 65%
Teaching includes an array of activities that provide students opportunities for learning beyond the classroom (e.g., academic and career advising, supervision of independent work, student organizations, internships, student-faculty projects, field trips, laboratory work, availability to students and colleagues, and individual tutoring).

Justification:

Based on direct knowledge/observation.

Scholarly and Professional Activities -- weighs 20%

i. The evaluation of scholarly and professional activities will be based on the quality and quantity of scholarly and professional activities submitted to the DRB in the faculty member's vita.

ii. Examples of such scholarly and professional activities include published research, presentation of research (including research co-authored by students), participation in professional meetings, unpublished materials, holding office in professional organizations, service as a consultant, clinician or professional teacher (outside of usual UW-P responsibilities), continued formal and informal study, etc.

iii. Copies of publications and descriptions of presentations and summaries of other work will assist in the qualitative part of this review.

Justification:

University Service -- weighs 10%
University service will be rated in accordance with the responsibilities assumed outside of teaching and research (e.g., system, university, college, and department faculty committees).

Justification:

Community Service -- weighs 5%
Community service will be rated according to the faculty member's active participation in his/her field which benefits the non-university community.

Justification:

__________________________
Signature (optional)
Instructor and Course Evaluation - Department of Psychology

Fill in the 5-digit code in the AIdentification Number@ section of the green scantron sheet for the course you are evaluating.

_____________________________________________________________________________________________

Blacken the circle on the green scantron sheet that corresponds to your rating of your instructor for each of these questions.

Use the following scale:

A - Outstanding           B - Above Normal              C - Normal               D - Below Normal               E - Low

Rate your instructor(s):

1. Preparation and organization: ........................................................................................................

2. Interest in the subject: .....................................................................................................................

3. Respect, tolerance, and fairness: ....................................................................................................

4. Availability to help students during office hours, if needed: ..............................................................

5. Use of examples and illustrations to clarify material: ...........................................................

6. Knowledge of the course material: ....................................................................................................

7. Openness to students’ questions and comments: ............................................................................

8. Overall, how do you rate this instructor’s teaching ability: .................................................................

_____________________________________________________________________________________________

Now, rate the course: .............................................................................................................................

9. How much you learned: ......................................................................................................................

10. Appropriateness and relevance of assignments: .............................................................................

11. Fairness of evaluation procedures: ................................................................................................

12. Involvement of students: ..................................................................................................................

13. Meaningful content: ..........................................................................................................................

14. Overall, how worthwhile has this course been? ..............................................................................

_____________________________________________________________________________________________

15. Blacken the circle on the green scantron sheet that corresponds to the letter grade you expect to receive in this course:

16. Blacken the circle on the green scantron sheet that corresponds to your attendance in this class based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always Attended</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Never Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Optional Qualitative Evaluation Form – Department of Psychology

Course number and section______________

Written Comments for Instructor=s Use Only
They may be shared with other faculty only at the instructor=s discretion.

List two changes that would make this a better course/class:

List the two things that you like best about this class/course (for example, content, assignments, videos, evaluation procedures, and so on):

List any additional comments you would like to make: