Faculty evaluations will be performed by a committee of six persons. The committee shall consist of the department chair (ex officio - non-voting) and five elected members of the department. DSPC members must have completed at least two years of service at UW-Platteville, and at least three of the elected members must be tenured. Each of the elected members shall serve a two-year term. For ethical reasons, faculty members may neither (a) evaluate the performance of, nor (b) vote on any decision concerning themselves or members of their families, or persons of close relation (i.e. mutual financial dependent, significant other, person in an intimate relationship, etc.). In such situations, faculty members should excuse themselves while the remainder of the assembly conducts its business.

1.1.1.2 Procedure for Election of the DSPC

The department chair, in consultation with the department faculty, will conduct an election in September; all tenured and tenure-track members of the Mathematics Department are eligible to vote. Prior to the election, the department chair will poll all those eligible for election to the DSPC as to their willingness to serve. Unexpected vacancies on the DSPC will be filled as they occur, with the person elected serving out the remainder of that particular term. Normally DSPC members may not serve consecutive terms; however, if a replacement is elected to fill the remainder of a term of one year or less, that person could then be re-elected. The DSPC will elect its own chair from among its continuing tenured members. If no continuing members are tenured, then the chair shall be elected from the tenured members of the DSPC.

1.1.1.3 Definition of Peer Group for Promotion and Salary Review

The Mathematics DSPC has the primary responsibility for peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, the time requirements for an effective peer evaluation process in a department the size of the mathematics department could be beyond the capabilities of a six-member DSPC. Thus the DSPC chair also may assign particular observation/evaluation roles to faculty members in the department who are not on the DSPC. Evaluators should be tenured or be scheduled for a tenure vote prior to that of the individual being evaluated.
1.1.1.4 **Procedure for Conducting Peer Group Evaluation and Voting**

Peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness will be independent of the formal student evaluations. Peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness (as described in section 1.3 below) will be conducted each semester for faculty during their first three years of service. Following this, non-tenured faculty will be peer evaluated once a year. Tenured faculty shall have a peer evaluation at least once every three years. The 3 year cycle of the peer evaluations appears in the Appendix. If the DSPC is concerned about the performance of a faculty member, it may require that he or she have a peer evaluation performed more frequently. If a faculty member does not comply with the required peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness as described in section 1.3 below, then the faculty member’s Peer Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness rating will be determined by taking the faculty member’s Peer Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness rating from the previous year and reducing it by one category. If the faculty member does not comply with the required peer evaluations in any subsequent years, then the faculty member will receive a “no merit” ranking for that academic year evaluation.

Because tenured faculty may go for two years without peer evaluations, the rating they receive during a peer evaluation year will be used for the next two years, unless extra peer evaluations are requested or what is reported on Form 4 provides convincing evidence the rating should be changed for a particular year.

The Mathematics DSPC has the primary responsibility for peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, as outlined in section 1.1.1.3 other faculty may assist with peer evaluations. The completed peer evaluation forms will remain in the department office for use by the DSPC and will not be forwarded. A copy of the completed evaluation form should be given to the instructor by the evaluator within one week of evaluation. Any responses that the instructor may have to points raised in the evaluation process should also be recorded on the appropriate forms and given to the department chair and evaluator. See appendix A for the evaluator and response forms.

The DSPC will vote on which boxes should be checked in Sections I, II and IV of Form 5 and Sections I, II and V of Form 6. Each box for each faculty member shall be addressed separately and voting shall be conducted by a voice vote. Voting procedures will follow the guidelines outlined in section 6.3.4.3 of the Faculty Handbook.

1.1.2 **Renewal and Tenure Review Body (RTRB)**

1.1.2.1 **Composition of the RTRB/RTRBs and Voting Procedure**

The RTRB will consist of all tenured members of the Mathematics Department. These currently include: Barb Barnet, David Boyles, Rob Calceterra, Mu-Ling Chang, Benjamin V. C. Collins, Tim Deis, Kevin Haertzen, Mike Ira, Clem Jeske, Ahyoung Kim, Miyeon Kwon, Julie
McDonald, James Swenson, Jason Thrun, Irfan Ul-Haq, Sheryl Wills and any other faculty receiving tenure prior to January 2016.

The department chair will call a meeting of the tenured faculty in the department in January. A meeting may need to be called during the fall as well, if there are any second year faculty. If the department chair is untenured, the department chair will appoint a tenured member to chair the meeting. All renewal votes will be conducted by a voice vote and recorded on Form 1 in section III. The formal tenure vote shall be conducted by a signed, closed ballot. The tenured members of the DSPC shall count the ballots. The mathematics department will function as a single discipline when conducting tenure votes. For ethical reasons, faculty members may neither (a) evaluate the performance of, nor (b) vote on any decision concerning themselves or members of their families, or persons of close relation (i.e. mutual financial dependent, significant other, person in an intimate relationship, etc.). In such situations, faculty members should excuse themselves while the remainder of the assembly conducts its business.

To be considered a positive recommendation, a simple majority must vote in favor of the recommendation as outlined in section 6.3.4.3 of the Faculty Handbook.

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

Not Applicable

1.2 Procedure for Approving the Departmental RST Plan/Sub-Plans by the Departmental Faculty

To be approved, the RST plan will be presented for discussion at one meeting of the faculty and voted on in a future faculty meeting. Significant changes in the RST plan may be discussed at a special departmental faculty meeting.

1.3 Procedures for Evaluation of Departmental Faculty
1.3.1 Peer Evaluations

Peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness will be based on the most recent information obtained from the following sources:

1. Observation of classroom performance.
In each semester that an evaluation is required, an instructor's classroom performance in two separate courses (if possible) will be evaluated by three separate faculty members. For each course, the evaluation will be conducted by at least one faculty member of the department. Whenever possible, the faculty member evaluating an instructor's classroom performance in a course should have experience teaching the course. The evaluating faculty should consult with the instructor in advance of the expected day and time of the classroom visit and give the instructor the opportunity to discuss the goals of the class and the methods to be used in the class. In addition, the evaluating faculty should meet with the instructor within one week of the classroom visit in order to discuss the observation. The form, Observation of Classroom Presentation, will be used for this evaluation. If the instructor being evaluated does not agree with the evaluator’s assessment, they may fill out the Response to Observation of Classroom Presentation form, which will be filed with the Department Chair.

2. File of course portfolios.

In each semester that an evaluation is required, the instructor will compile one course portfolio. This course portfolio should be in hard copy, so that the portfolio is easily accessible to all DSPC members. A course portfolio is a complete collection of all materials used in a given course (syllabus, assignments, quizzes, examinations, projects, etc.), along with a complete record of grades for the course (with the students’ names deleted). A one page teaching reflection statement must be included within each course portfolio. This statement will provide a context for evaluation of classroom performance and course portfolios. The teaching reflection statement should describe how the course was run and what methods of instruction were used, as well as a reflection of what worked and what could be changed in the future. The evaluation will be conducted by three faculty members of the department. Whenever possible the evaluating faculty should have experience teaching the course. When a faculty member submits more than one portfolio in a calendar year, at least one should be for a course numbered below 3000. The Portfolio Evaluation Form will be used for this evaluation. If the instructor being evaluated does not agree with the evaluator’s assessment, they may fill out the Response to Portfolio Evaluation Form, which will be filed with the Department Chair.

3. Form 4 Section I on Teaching Effectiveness

The DSPC members will also consider what the faculty member has self-reported on Form 4 for Teaching Effectiveness for the year. This will be evaluated each year, regardless of whether the faculty member is undergoing 1 and 2 above. During non-peer evaluation years, this information will be evaluated by the DSPC members to determine whether it provides convincing evidence the rating should be changed from the prior year.

4. (Optional) Supporting letter(s) from colleague(s) or student(s).

Letters should provide information relevant to 1 and 2 above. Faculty should provide no more than five such letters each calendar year.
1.3.2 Student Evaluations

Student evaluations must be conducted each fall and spring semester for all faculty. Faculty members must conduct these evaluations in every class they teach in the fall and spring semesters. Any faculty member is free to add additional evaluations to his or her file. If a faculty member only conducts the required student evaluations in one semester, then the faculty member’s Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness rating can be no higher than “Meets expectations.” If a faculty member does not conduct the required student evaluations in both semesters, then the faculty member’s Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness rating will be “Does not meet expectations.” If the faculty member does not comply with the required student evaluations the next year, then the faculty member will receive a “no merit” rating for that academic year evaluation.

Student evaluations will be obtained from the form Student Evaluation of Mathematics Instructor. The faculty member being evaluated will not be present when these forms are completed and collected. If the faculty member is teaching a streaming video section for a course, then the Department Chair will send the Student Evaluation of Mathematics Instructor for PSV courses form to the students, which will be returned to Math@uwplatt.edu. The faculty member will not have access to the evaluations until after the deadline to submit final grades to the Registrar's Office.

The DSPC will vote on which boxes should be checked on Form 3 and section II of Form 5. Each box for each faculty member shall be addressed separately and voting shall be conducted by a voice vote. Voting procedures will follow the guidelines outlined in section 6.3.4.3 of the Faculty Handbook. Faculty members have the right to respond to student evaluations prepared for RST purposes, by placing a counterstatement in Section I of their Renewal/Tenure File.

1.3.3 Additional Types of Evaluation (if applicable)

Not Applicable.

1.4 Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty with Non-Teaching Assignments

Salary recommendations for percentage of the chair’s and assistant chair’s appointments assigned to administrative responsibilities will be made by the dean of the college. Salary recommendations for the percentage of the chair’s and assistant chair’s appointment assigned to teaching will be made by the Mathematics DSPC. The Mathematics DSPC is responsible for promotion recommendations for the chair and the assistant chair. When the DSPC evaluates the
chair and assistant chair for university and community service, it should not consider serving on the college Executive Council and other activities that are typical responsibilities of the chair and assistant chair. Each year, the chair and assistant chair evaluation summary compiled by the Dean’s office will be added to each of their files.

If the Mathematics Department has an assistant chair with at least 0.25 FTE release time, then the chair must teach a minimum of three credits in both the spring and fall semesters of one calendar year. Otherwise, the chair must teach a minimum of three credits in either the spring or fall semester of one calendar year.

2. Renewal of Probationary Faculty
   2.1 Departmental Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Professional/Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service
      2.1.1 Teaching Effectiveness

      a. Weights: Peer Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness: 55%
                     Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness: 15%
      b. Teaching includes an array of activities that provide students opportunities for learning in and beyond the classroom. These activities may include:
         • classroom teaching and its ancillary activities,
         • supervision of independent work,
         • advising or being a reader for senior seminar students
         • individual tutoring,
         • class preparation and syllabus writing, and
         • using innovative teaching methods.
      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. Weight: Scholarly/Professional Activity: 15%
      b. These activities shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
         • progress toward an advanced degree when applicable,
         • post-doctoral or other study not leading to a degree but beneficial to professional development,
         • attendance at workshops, symposia, and conferences beneficial to professional development,
• publication of articles, books, or other professional writings,
• progress in research intended for publications,
• presentation of a paper or direct, formal participation in a conference, convention, or workshop designed to benefit other members of the profession,
• participation in professional organizations,
• writing of proposals for grants and receipt of grants.

2.1.3 Service to the University and to the Community

a. Weight: University/Community Service: 15%
b. These activities shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
   • participation on university, college, and department committees, councils, commissions, senates, and boards,
   • service as an advisor to student organizations and activities,
   • regular participation in a state-wide or system-wide committee or organization whose specific purpose is to benefit academic programs or personnel,
   • activities outside the university in which an individual participates in a professional capacity or as a representative of the university.

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

Not Applicable

3. Granting of Tenure

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

3.1.1 Teaching Effectiveness

a. Weights: Peer Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness: 55%
   Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness: 15%
b. Teaching includes an array of activities that provide students opportunities for learning in and beyond the classroom. These activities may include:
   • classroom teaching and its ancillary activities,
   • supervision of independent work,
   • advising or being a reader for senior seminar students
   • individual tutoring,
• class preparation and syllabus writing, and
• using innovative teaching methods.
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. Weight: Scholarly/Professional Activity: 15%
b. These activities shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
   • progress toward an advanced degree when applicable,
   • post-doctoral or other study not leading to a degree but beneficial to professional development,
   • attendance at workshops, symposia, and conferences beneficial to professional development,
   • publication of articles, books, or other professional writings,
   • progress in research intended for publications,
   • presentation of a paper or direct, formal participation in a conference, convention, or workshop designed to benefit other members of the profession,
   • participation in professional organizations,
   • writing of proposals for grants and receipt of grants.
c. This evaluation will consider the cumulative record of scholarly and professional development.

3.1.3 Service to the University and to the Community

a. Weight: University/Community Service: 15%
b. These activities shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
   • participation on university, college, and department committees, councils, commissions, senates, and boards,
   • service as an advisor to student organizations and activities,
   • regular participation in a state-wide or system-wide committee or organization whose specific purpose is to benefit academic programs or personnel,
   • activities outside the university in which an individual participates in a professional capacity or as a representative of the university.
c. This evaluation will consider the cumulative record of scholarly and professional development.

3.2 Ancillary Materials Required by the Department for Inclusion in the
4. Promotion to Full Professor

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

In order for a faculty member to be considered for promotion, the member must request consideration in a memo to the chair of the DSPC by October 31. Student evaluations, classroom observations and course portfolio evaluations must take place during the year promotion is requested. In addition, the faculty member must compile all evaluations that have taken place during the last three years.

4.1.1 Teaching Effectiveness

a. Weights: Peer Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness: 55%
   Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness: 15%

b. Teaching includes an array of activities that provide students opportunities for learning in and beyond the classroom. These activities may include:
   - classroom teaching and its ancillary activities,
   - supervision of independent work,
   - advising or being a reader for senior seminar students
   - individual tutoring,
   - class preparation and syllabus writing, and
   - using innovative teaching methods.

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 since the date of promotion to Associate Professor.

4.1.2 Professional, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

a. Weight: Scholarly/Professional Activity: 15%
b. These activities shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
   - progress toward an advanced degree when applicable,
   - post-doctoral or other study not leading to a degree but beneficial to professional development,
• attendance at workshops, symposia, and conferences beneficial to professional development,
• publication of articles, books, or other professional writings,
• progress in research intended for publications,
• presentation of a paper or direct, formal participation in a conference, convention, or workshop designed to benefit other members of the profession,
• participation in professional organizations,
• writing of proposals for grants and receipt of grants.
c. This evaluation will consider the cumulative record of scholarly and professional development since the date of promotion to Associate Professor.

4.1.3 Service to the University and to the Community

a. Weight: University/Community Service: 15%
b. These activities shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
   • participation on university, college, and department committees, councils, commissions, senates, and boards,
   • service as an advisor to student organizations and activities,
   • regular participation in a state-wide or system-wide committee or organization whose specific purpose is to benefit academic programs or personnel,
   • activities outside the university in which an individual participates in a professional capacity or as a representative of the university.
c. This evaluation will consider the cumulative record of scholarly and professional development since the date of promotion to Associate Professor.

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

Not Applicable.

5. Salary and Inequity

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

5.1.1 Teaching Effectiveness

a. Weights:  Peer Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness: 55%

Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness: 15%
b. Teaching includes an array of activities that provide students opportunities for learning in and beyond the classroom. These activities may include:
   - classroom teaching and its ancillary activities,
   - supervision of independent work,
   - advising or being a reader for senior seminar students
   - individual tutoring,
   - class preparation and syllabus writing, and
   - using innovative teaching methods.

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

5.1.2 Professional, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

a. Weight: Scholarly/Professional Activity: 15%

b. These activities shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
   - progress toward an advanced degree when applicable,
   - post-doctoral or other study not leading to a degree but beneficial to professional development,
   - attendance at workshops, symposia, and conferences beneficial to professional development,
   - publication of articles, books, or other professional writings,
   - progress in research intended for publications,
   - presentation of a paper or direct, formal participation in a conference, convention, or workshop designed to benefit other members of the profession,
   - participation in professional organizations,
   - writing of proposals for grants and receipt of grants.

5.1.3 Service to the University and to the Community

a. Weight: University/Community Service: 15%

b. These activities shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
   - participation on university, college, and department committees, councils, commissions, senates, and boards,
   - service as an advisor to student organizations and activities,
   - regular participation in a state-wide or system-wide committee or organization whose specific purpose is to benefit academic programs or personnel,
   - activities outside the university in which an individual participates in a professional capacity or as a representative of the university.
5.1.4 Departmental Guidelines for Determining Merit or High Merit

The weighted average for each faculty member will be calculated, using the weights stated above and assigning 0 points to the category “Does not meet expectations,” 1 point to the category “Meets Expectations” and 2 points to the category “Exceeds expectations.” Faculty members with a weighted average of 0.60 or below will be assigned No Merit. Faculty members with a weighted average of 1.45 or higher, with no “Does not meet expectations” boxes checked will receive High Merit. The remainder will receive Merit.

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

Not Applicable.

6. Post-tenure Review

6.1 Departmental Criteria for Evaluation

Tenured faculty will be reviewed at five year intervals beginning with the fifth anniversary of tenure. Any faculty member wishing a PTR sooner may petition the department chair, who will then act on that request.

On the year of PTR, the faculty member must submit Form 7 of the URSTPC Policies to the department chair. This form summarizes the faculty member’s major activities and DSPC evaluations since tenure or the previous PTR and outlines a personal plan for continued growth and development until the next PTR. (See the guidelines in chapter 6 of the Faculty Handbook.) The department chair will forward Form 7 to the DSPC for review.

Based on the information contained in Form 7, the DSPC will prepare a written preliminary evaluation. The faculty member will meet with the department chair to review this evaluation. At this meeting, the department chair will address the developmental needs of the faculty member to make progress toward achieving the plan’s goals and will recommend ways of helping the faculty member to meet those goals. The faculty member will have an opportunity to meet with the DSPC to discuss the preliminary PTR evaluation. The DSPC will then finalize the PTR evaluation, and the department chair will forward it to the dean, with a copy given to the faculty member.

The schedule for Post tenure reviews:

2015-16    David Boyles
            Robert Calcaterra
6.2 Departmental Policy on Professional Development Tied to Post-tenure Review

If the faculty member’s review reveals a need for significant improvement in performance, the department chair will report such to the academic dean. The dean and the chair, in consultation with the faculty member, will suggest a plan to aid the faculty in improving performance and will assist the faculty member in finding resources to fund the plan.
Appendix

Schedule of Peer Evaluation (3 year cycle)

2015-16
Mu-Ling Chang
Ahyoung Kim
Miyeon Kwon
Tim Deis

2016-17
Barb Barnet
Dave Boyles
Rob Calcaterra
James Swenson
Jason Thrun
Irfan Ul-Haq

2017-18
Ben Collins
Kevin Haertzen
Mike Ira
Clem Jeske
Julie McDonald
Sheryl Wills

Other faculty will be added to the schedule as they receive tenure.
OBSERVATION OF CLASSROOM PRESENTATION

Instructor: ___________________________  Course number: ______  Semester/Year: ____________
Topic covered: ___________________________  Date observed: ______________

Meeting date of classroom observer and faculty member: ______________
(This meeting should take place within one week of the observation).

A. Educational Climate for Learning:
Classroom observer will look for the following instructor qualities:

- Speaks to the class with appropriate volume
- Demonstrates interest in and enthusiasm for the material presented
- Creates an atmosphere of classroom participation
- Writes clearly and in an organized manner
- Encourages student learning
- Encourages student involvement
- Creates a comfortable learning environment

Considering the above bullet points as a guide, provide examples where the instructor created a positive (or negative) learning environment.

B. Instructional Methods:
Classroom observer will look for the following instructional traits:

- Material is appropriate for the course
- Material is from a section appropriate for the time in the semester
- Key points of the content for the lecture are covered
- Level of difficulty is appropriate for students
- Explanations are clear to the students
- Examples are appropriate for the course
- Material is presented in a manner which shows forethought and preparation

Considering the above bullet points as a guide, provide examples where the instructor created a positive (or negative) instructional environment.
C. Classroom Interaction
Classroom observer will look for the following areas of communication between the instructor and students:

- Encourages (or discourages) student questions
- Responds appropriately to questions
- Gives clear responses to questions
- Engages students with questions
- Engages students in the classroom discussion
- Attempts to assess student learning and understanding of the material
- Willing to help students
- Interacts with the class in a respectful and courteous manner

Considering the above bullet points as a guide, provide examples where the instructor created a classroom environment where discourse is encouraged (or discouraged):

D. Suggestions:
- Provide the instructor with statement(s) on positive observations that occurred in the classroom visit.

- Provide the instructor with AT LEAST one constructive suggestion that will help enhance future classroom presentations.

Classroom Observer _________________________ Date_________________
RESPONSE TO OBSERVATION OF CLASSROOM PRESENTATION

Instructor __________________________ Course number _______ Semester/Year ________

Classroom Observer __________________________

Instructions: Circle the letter of each section to which you are responding. Respond in as brief and concise a manner as possible. Please list your responses in the same order that the sections are listed.

A. Educational Climate for Learning.
B. Instructional Methods.
C. Classroom Interaction.
D. Suggestions.
CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF COURSE PORTFOLIO

Instructor______________________ Course number ______ Semester/Year____________

Course portfolio was submitted by deadline:  Yes_____ No______

Instructions to evaluator: Mark each category with a "✓" to denote agreement with a statement, a "−" to indicate that suggestions for improvement are included in Section H below; use "NA" to denote that the statement does not apply.

A. Teaching Reflection Statement: included__________ missing__________
   1. What aspect(s) of the teaching statement show instructor thoughtfulness?
      _____________________________

   2. What area(s) of the statement could be improved upon?
      _____________________________

B. Syllabus or course outline:
   1. ______ contains information about the teacher (name, office, office hours, office phone, e-mail).
   2. ______ outlines the sequence of topics to be covered.
   3. ______ describes the grading system (including attendance policy).
   4. ______ is structured so that the information is clear and understandable.
   5. ______ identifies instructional resources such as books, films, recordings, guest speakers, etc. (if applicable).

C. Assignments and quizzes:
   1. ______ encourage students to learn course material.
   2. ______ are appropriate to course objectives and content level.
   3. ______ are uniformly spread throughout the semester.
   4. ______ prepare students for more complex courses in the subject area.
   5. ______ make appropriate use of technology (when applicable).

D. Ancillary Materials (handouts, supplementary reading lists, multimedia materials, etc.):
   1. ______ are relevant additions which elaborate upon course content.
   2. ______ are structured so that the content is clearly communicated.
   3. ______ enhance understanding and/or appreciation of course content.
E. Examinations:

1. ______ are consistent with the course content.
2. ______ are written so that the intent of the questions are clear and explicit.
3. ______ are not too long for the time allotted.
4. ______ are at a level of difficulty appropriate for the course.
5. ______ test an appropriate mixture of computational skills and higher level thinking (such as reasoning, problem solving, synthesis, proof, etc.).
6. ______ require written solutions as well as answers to objective questions, when appropriate.

F. Portfolio indicates all sections in the department syllabus were covered: Yes____ No____

G. Copy of grades for all graded work: included__________ missing__________

H. Provide the instructor with positive statement(s) on areas that were done particularly well.

I. Provide the instructor with AT LEAST one constructive suggestion on an area to improve upon.

Portfolio evaluator ______________________ Date________________
RESPONSE TO EVALUATION OF COURSE PORTFOLIO

Instructor______________________  Course number_______  Semester/Year_______

Portfolio Evaluator __________________________

Instructions:
- Circle the letter of each section to which you are responding.
- Respond in as brief and concise a manner as possible.
- Please list your responses in the same order that the sections are listed.

A.  Teaching Reflection Statement
B.  Syllabus or course outline
C.  Assignments and quizzes
D.  Ancillary Materials (handouts, supplementary reading lists, multimedia materials, etc.)
E.  Examinations
F.  Portfolio indicates all sections in the department syllabus were covered
G.  Copy of Classroom Grades
H.  Provide the instructor with positive statement(s) on areas that were done particularly well.
I.  Provide the instructor with at least one constructive suggestion on an area to improve upon.
Student Evaluation of Mathematics Instructor

Course: __________________________   Instructor: _________________________   Date: _________

Directions: Thoughtfully respond to each of the following in regard to this course and this instructor.

1. In this course I anticipate a grade of (Circle one):
   A   B   C   D   F

2. Estimate how many times you sought help, outside of class, from the instructor.

3. How clearly did the instructor state assignments, course objectives and course structure to the class?

4. How clearly does the instructor explain topics?

5. How organized was the instructor?

6. Was the instructor available outside of class for individual help?

7. Were questions and comments encouraged in class?

8. Did the instructor return exams/quizzes/homework in a reasonable amount of time?
9. Would you recommend this instructor to another student? Explain your answer.

10. What did you like about how the instructor taught the course?

11. What could have been done to improve the way the instructor taught the course?

12. Did the instructor challenge you in this course?

13. Do you feel you learned a lot in this class?

14. Additional comments:
Student Evaluation of Mathematics Instructor for PSV courses:

Course: __________________________   Instructor: ___________________________   Date: __________

Directions: Thoughtfully respond to each of the following in regard to this course and this instructor. When complete, please save the file and e-mail as an attachment to Math@uwplatt.edu. These evaluations are anonymous and will not be provided to the instructor until after final grades are posted.

1. In this course I anticipate a grade of (place an X to the right):
   A ___ B ___ C ___ D ___ F ___

2. Estimate how many times you sought help from the instructor:

3. How clearly did the instructor state assignments, course objectives and course structure to the class?

4. How clearly does the instructor explain topics?

5. How organized was the instructor?

6. Was the instructor available for assistance?

7. Was the format of the lecture presentation effective for a streaming video class?

8. Did the instructor return exams/quizzes/homework in a reasonable amount of time?

9. Was the format for homework assignments and/or quizzes appropriate for a streaming video class?

10. Would you recommend this instructor to another student? Explain your answer.

11. What did you like about how the instructor taught the course?

12. What could have been done to improve the way the instructor taught the course?
13. Did you find this course challenging?

14. Do you feel you learned a lot in this class?

15. Additional comments: