

# UT MARTIN ASSESSMENT NEWSLETTER

## MAY 2018

### ***Fall Faculty Workshop—All Faculty Invited***

The 2018 Fall Faculty Teaching Effectiveness Workshop will be held Thursday, August 16, 2018, in the Student Life Center. The Workshop will consist of two sessions: a morning session from 8:30 until 11:30 and an afternoon session from 1:30 until 4:30. Faculty are welcome to attend one or both sessions. Both sessions will be facilitated by Dr. Julie Hill, Dr. Chris Caldwell, and Dr. Stephanie Kolitsch.

The morning session will include an update from Dr. Charley Deal that discusses recent innovations in the Office of Research, Grants, and Contracts; an overview of the new Faculty Evaluation Process; and an overview of recent changes to faculty evaluation expectations and tenure/promotion policies by the Board of Trustees. These new BOT policies have implications for departmental bylaws, so the morning session will include time for faculty to examine their own bylaws and begin identifying necessary revisions. These revisions must be completed by early September. ***Please bring a copy of your departmental bylaws to this session.***

The afternoon session will provide an in-depth look at the new Faculty Evaluation Process. A team of faculty from across campus have worked all year to develop this new process. The new process represents an in-depth look at all of the roles of a faculty member. To implement the process, faculty in each department must articulate their expectations for faculty performance. Guidance on developing and describing these expectations will be provided during a work session. Supporting materials for the new process will also be shared. Several departments have been designated as “beta groups” to test the new process and faculty in these departments will be evaluated for the 2018-19 academic year using the new process. *Faculty in the beta groups are strongly encouraged to attend this session.*

Faculty from departments not designated as a beta group are also welcome to attend. ***Please bring a copy of your department bylaws and any existing departmental faculty evaluation documents, forms, or templates to this session.***

To register for these sessions, please contact Ms. Jennifer Black Rea (phone 7015; email [jblack32@utm.edu](mailto:jblack32@utm.edu)) in the Office of Research, Grants and Contracts.

### ***Update on the Fifth-Year Interim Report***

We have converted our draft Fifth-Year Interim Report to the new template with the newly revised standards. We are now in the process of reviewing the existing draft in light of the new standards to ensure that we are meeting all of the requirements. More details will come soon! Thanks to all who have provided or are planning to provide information for this report!

### ***New Rubric for Evaluating Non-Academic Unit Assessment Reports***

At one of the sessions of the 2018 January Assessment Workshop, we gathered input from non-academic units regarding the use of a more detailed rubric to provide feedback for their annual assessment reports. We asked participants to work in teams to create a rubric that could be used for this purpose. We then examined all of these team-developed rubrics, identified commonalities, and developed a draft rubric that reflected this input. The draft rubric has been shared, and feedback has been used to make slight modifications.

The new rubric is attached to this Newsletter. We will use this new rubric on reports submitted by non-academic units in December 2018-January 2019. Modifications may be made once we identify strengths and weaknesses of the new rubric. Thank you to all who participated in the development and who provided feedback on the draft!

## RUBRIC FOR EVALUATING NON-ACADEMIC UNIT ASSESSMENT REPORTS

CRITERIA	Level 1: UNACCEPTABLE	Level 2: ACCEPTABLE	Level 3: EXCEPTIONAL	SCORE
Goals/Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not measurable or difficult to measure</li> <li>• Vague; lacks specificity or focus</li> <li>• Inappropriate or irrelevant for unit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measurable</li> <li>• Clearly defined</li> <li>• Appropriate for unit</li> <li>• Aligned to the unit's mission</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measurable using multiple strategies</li> <li>• Clearly defined and specific</li> <li>• Reflect high expectations</li> <li>• Future-oriented</li> <li>• Clearly aligned to the strategic plan</li> <li>• Where applicable, reflect peer, industry, and/or national standards</li> </ul>	
Assessment Tool(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not identified or not relevant</li> <li>• Does not measure effectively the goal or outcome</li> <li>• Not related to the mission/purpose of the unit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly described</li> <li>• Appropriate measure of the goal or outcome</li> <li>• Produces meaningful data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment tool is evidence-based, valid, and reliable</li> <li>• Provide(s) long-term comparable data</li> <li>• Where appropriate, industry/national assessment tool is used</li> <li>• Where appropriate, multiple assessments including both direct and indirect measures</li> </ul>	
Benchmarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not stated or not clearly defined</li> <li>• Not aligned to assessment tool</li> <li>• Unrealistic or trivial</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly stated</li> <li>• Aligned to assessment tool</li> <li>• Appropriate for unit's mission/purpose</li> <li>• Where appropriate, reflect some knowledge of peer, industry, and/or national standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reflect high expectations</li> <li>• Clearly advance the mission of the unit and/or institution</li> <li>• Where appropriate, aligned to peer, industry, national, or other external benchmarks</li> <li>• Where appropriate, reflect long-term aspirations</li> </ul>	

CRITERIA	Level 1: UNACCEPTABLE	Level 2: ACCEPTABLE	Level 3: EXCEPTIONAL	SCORE
Processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No responsible person identified</li> <li>• No timeline identified</li> <li>• Standard operating procedure (workbook) for collecting/analyzing data is not described or poorly defined</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsible person identified</li> <li>• Appropriate timeline clearly stated</li> <li>• Standard operating procedure (workbook) for assessment is clearly described</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Back-up assessment personnel identified</li> <li>• Sustainable process for collecting/storing data is in place</li> <li>• Results are shared with stakeholders both within and outside the unit as appropriate</li> </ul>	
Analysis of Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data summary is missing or incomplete</li> <li>• Basic data analysis missing or incomplete</li> <li>• Questionable methodology for analyzing data</li> <li>• Results are unclear, disorganized, or not supported by data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data summary is clear, concise, and informative</li> <li>• Basic data analysis is complete</li> <li>• Acceptable methodology used for analyzing data</li> <li>• Results are clear, organized, and supported by data</li> <li>• Data analysis identifies strengths and/or weaknesses related to the attainment of the goal/outcome</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data analysis is sophisticated and reflects implications for the unit's stated goals/ outcomes</li> <li>• Where appropriate, analysis includes comparisons to external benchmarks</li> <li>• Where appropriate, longitudinal analysis of data is included</li> <li>• Where appropriate, data from multiple measures are analyzed and compared to identify trends</li> </ul>	
Use of Data to Inform Decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decisions based on data are missing or incomplete</li> <li>• Decisions provided but not relevant to the goal or outcome</li> <li>• Description of decisions is confusing, vague, or trivial</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decisions are clearly stated and appropriate</li> <li>• Decisions reflect results of data analysis and address identified strengths and/or weaknesses as appropriate</li> <li>• Decisions support attainment of goal/outcome</li> <li>• Decisions are clearly communicated to all stakeholders</li> <li>• When appropriate, "closing the loop" is clearly described through examples or actions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decisions are future-oriented and focused on improvement(s)</li> <li>• Decisions describe innovations informed by unit data and (where appropriate) peer, national, industry, and/or research-based data, programs, or trends</li> <li>• When appropriate, "closing the loop" is clearly described through examples/actions and demonstrated through before/after comparison data</li> </ul>	

CRITERIA	Level 1: UNACCEPTABLE	Level 2: ACCEPTABLE	Level 3: EXCEPTIONAL	SCORE
Overall Quality of Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report is confusing, vague, or nonsensical</li> <li>• Report is incomplete</li> <li>• Report is late</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report is clearly understandable to the layperson</li> <li>• Report is grammatically correct with no spelling errors</li> <li>• All required components are included</li> <li>• Report is submitted on or before the due date</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report is well-written</li> <li>• Report clearly reflects the mission and/or purpose of the unit</li> <li>• Report clearly supports the strategic plan of the institution</li> <li>• Where appropriate, report clearly reflects input from multiple stakeholders</li> </ul>	
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>				
<b>COMMENTS:</b>				