



The Annual Evaluation Process (AEP), otherwise known as merit review, measures the performance of individual faculty members according to the expectations of their appointed position. All positions include teaching as a core expectation, thus all faculty members are evaluated on their teaching effectiveness, among other responsibilities. To ensure equity, consistency, and transparency in this process, the College uses the following framework for the annual assessment of teaching. The central component of the framework is a common evaluative tool: the [Standard Teaching Assessment Rubric \(STAR\)](#). This document outlines the procedure for using the STAR to complete the assessment of teaching as required by the AEP.

USE OF THE STAR

- The STAR represents the minimum teaching expectations for Wake Forest faculty in the College and must be used by all departments and programs to assess teaching for the AEP. The AEP directions determine the frequency with which the STAR must be completed.
- The STAR must be completed for each faculty member with teaching responsibilities participating in the AEP in a given year.
- The Department Chair is responsible for ensuring that the STAR is completed and appropriately included in the AEP report.

COMPONENTS OF THE STAR

- The STAR consists of three main parts:
 - A section assessing six [benchmarks of effective teaching](#)
 - A section documenting significant teaching [contributions beyond the classroom](#)
 - A section providing written formative feedback for the instructor
- Benchmarks may not be added, substituted, or removed. However, departments may contextualize and elaborate on the benchmarks by providing discipline-specific examples, guidelines, and interpretations that align with their unique teaching methodologies, goals, and subject matter.
- Departmental elaboration should be included in departmental guidelines distributed to all faculty at the beginning of each year.

COLLECTING EVIDENCE FOR THE STAR

- The STAR ensures evidence-based assessment by identifying common sources of [evidence for each benchmark](#) and asking reviewers to indicate which were consulted for each judgment.

- Three categories of evidence are required for each completed STAR:
 - reflective narrative
 - course materials
 - student feedback
- Departments may require two further categories of evidence that appear on the STAR:
 - evidence of student learning
 - peer review
- Instructors are responsible for submitting the reflective narrative and course materials.
 - The reflective narrative should describe how the six benchmarks were met and note any additional teaching contributions made that academic year. Instructors may submit a single, integrated narrative or answer seven short-answer questions using the [ODOC reflective narrative template](#). Instructors should also use the narrative responses to direct reviewers to specific supporting documentation in submitted materials. Narratives should not exceed 1,500 words.
 - The course materials appendix serves as a supplement to the reflective narrative and provides further evidence of meeting the six benchmarks. A sample syllabus may be all that is needed, but those with shorter syllabi may wish to submit a range of alternative materials (e.g., reading schedules, assignment prompts, rubrics, lesson plans, in-class activities, or examples of feedback and communication with students). If instructors wish to demonstrate pedagogical development, they should also submit relevant material from previous years. These appendices should not exceed 10 pages.
- Departments are responsible for collecting student feedback in every course the instructor teaches using the [ODOC student feedback template](#) and the Watermark Course Evaluation Survey software.
 - This survey requires instructors to submit their course learning outcomes so that students can rate their progress on each. If instructors do not submit these outcomes, program-level outcomes will be included as the default.
 - Departments and individual instructors may add their own questions to this survey.
 - Results should not be used as evidence if fewer than 5 students or fewer than 35% of the class respond to the feedback survey.
 - The window for sharing the feedback should be as close to the end of the semester as possible, and as narrow as feasible.
 - Instructors should not be sent results until after grades have been submitted.
- If departments choose to require peer review, we encourage them to use the [ODOC peer review template](#) that is aligned with the STAR benchmarks.
- Departments have established processes for collecting the information necessary to complete AEPs. These processes may need to be amended to accommodate the collection of evidence required by the STAR. If so, this new process must be made clear to all department faculty members at the beginning of each evaluation period (in practice, at the beginning of the academic year covered by the AEP).

- Departments are encouraged to make use of CAT-developed guidelines and workshops on collecting and interpreting evidence of teaching effectiveness.

COMPLETING THE STAR

- The Chair (or the Chair's designee) reviews the submitted materials for evidence of the faculty member's achievement of the six benchmarks.
 - The Department Chair is responsible for overseeing the process of completing the STAR for each eligible member of the respective department. The department may elect to establish a process for sharing the work of completing the STAR. For example,
 - The Chair may be solely responsible for completing the STAR
 - The Chair may share the duty with the Associate Chair
 - The Chair may share the work with the Executive Committee
 - The Chair may share the work with a subcommittee elected or appointed by the department faculty for the purpose of evaluation
- The Chair (or designee) scores each benchmark, using the following scale:
 - Developing = 1
 - Effective = 2
 - Expert = 3
- If an instructor receives a 1 on any benchmark, an explanation must be provided in the notes for that benchmark.
- The Chair (or designee) must also make note of **at least two sources of supporting evidence** for each benchmark score. That is, evidence from one source must be verified by another.
 - If student feedback is used as one source of evidence, reviewers should use ODOC standards rather than comparing scores to a departmental average. ODOC considers scores of 3 or above to be imperfect, partial evidence that the instructor has effectively met the benchmark.
 - Student feedback is rarely precise enough to distinguish effective and expert practice. These judgments should rely more heavily on the second (or third) source of evidence.
- The Chair (or designee) indicates if the instructor has reported at least two significant contributions beyond the classroom, and documents them in the notes section of the STAR.
- The STAR automatically calculates an overall score. The Chair (or designee) may determine that the calculation inaccurately reflects the faculty member's teaching effectiveness and therefore override the score by explaining, on the basis of available evidence, the reason for the discrepancy. Such explanations should be included in the comment section of the AEP.
- The Chair (or designee) includes relevant feedback to support the faculty member's ongoing growth and success in the notes section of the STAR.
- The Chair records the final score on the AEP spreadsheet.

- AEP Scores of 1 must be accompanied by an explanation, typically consisting of the notes from the STAR itself.
- The submitted score is then calculated as part of the AEP in keeping with the appropriate percentage of the faculty member's teaching responsibility.
- The Chair shares the completed STAR with the faculty member, making note of any concerns and/or successes.
 - The Chair should also arrange for a copy of the completed STAR to be included in the faculty member's departmental file.
 - The Chair and instructor should work together, drawing on the available resources to support growth, to develop a formative plan to address concerns and determine professional goals for the following evaluation period. The conversation about the STAR should be part of a broader discussion of the faculty member's professional development.

SCORING SYSTEM OF THE STAR

- Instructors will receive numeric scores from 1-3 for each benchmark, which are then averaged.
- Within this average, each of the six benchmarks is equally weighted, which means:
 - 66% of the evaluation assesses pedagogical practice/approach
 - 33% of the evaluation assesses pedagogical outcomes/impact.
- If the faculty member has submitted evidence of contributions beyond the classroom, that is also noted. These activities are not individually scored, as they are not required. They cannot detract from the overall calculation, though they may add to it. Two or more additional contributions will be credited and counted within calculations for the overall score.
- The overall score is based on the average of the six benchmark scores, the number of 1s received, and whether or not the instructor has made two or more significant contributions beyond the classroom.
 - Benchmark average of 1 - 1.67 = Does Not Meet Expectations (AEP of 1)
 - Benchmark average of 1.68 - 2.67 = Meets Most or All Expectations (AEP of 2)
 - Benchmark averages of 2.0 - 2.33, no 1s, & sig. contributions = Exceeds Expectations (AEP of 3)
 - Benchmark average of 2.34 - 3.0 & no 1s = Exceeds Expectations (AEP of 3)
 - Benchmark average of 3.0 & sig. contributions = Exceptional Performer (AEP of 4)