MEMORANDUM

October 25, 2002

TO: CAS Faculty

THROUGH: Dr. Wesley Little, Dean, CAS

FROM: Leonard W. ter Haar

Chair, CAS TIP Selection Committee for 2002-2003

The following information outlines the evaluative process (pages 2 & 3) and criteria (pages 4 & 5) for the 2002-2003 TIP award candidates.

TIP REVIEW AND SELECTION PROCESS 2002-2003 FOR CAS FACULTY

As outlined by the Provost's office (uwf.edu/academics/awards/tip.htm) the College Councils were charged with receiving nominations and making recommendations for awards to the appropriate College Dean for review and recommendation and forwarding to the Provost for a final decision. Self-nomination packets are due to CAS Council by 5:00 pm December 9, 2002. Prior to beginning the review process, the CAS Council will submit a list of names of the candidates to the Dean's Office (no later than December 12, 2002). The Dean's Office will verify faculty eligibility by reviewing the names on the list based on the eligibility requirements. The Dean will then notify CAS Council in writing the results of his review (due December 16, 2002). The Dean should forward a copy of such memo to the Provost's Office.

ELIGIBILITY TO BE VERIFIED BY DEAN'S OFFICE

Eligibility requirements set forth in Chancellor's Memorandum CM-C-02.00-07/96 are:

A. Full-time nine and twelve month employees.
C. Tenured or tenure earning assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, or instructor or lecturer, or faculty with equivalent rank.
D. Has not received a TIP award within the past three years. (1999/2000 through 2001/2002 award recipients are ineligible for an award this year).

If a faculty member has questions regarding eligibility, he/she should contact the Dean's Office.

CHEMISTRY

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
11000 University Parkway, Pensacola, FL 32514-5751 850/474-2739
An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution
**AWARD AMOUNT**

In accordance with Chancellor's Memorandum CM-C-02.00-07/96, the award recipient will receive a $5,000 increase in base salary, whether on a nine or twelve-month appointment, retroactive to the beginning of the employment contract.

**TIMELINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 25, 2002</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>CAS Council forwards TIP award process &amp; criteria to CAS Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9, 2002</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Self-nomination packets due to CAS Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 12, 2002</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>CAS Council submits a list of the candidate's names to the Dean's Office for eligibility review and certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 16, 2002</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Dean's Office confirms eligibility and sends a notice to CAS Council and copies the Provost's Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10, 2003</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>CAS Council scoresheets due to chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 17, 2003</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>CAS Council submits final recommendations to Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 24, 2003</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Dean's Office confirms eligibility and sends a notice to CAS Council and copies the Provost's Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 7, 2003</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>TIP award announcements made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14, 2003</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Deadline for appealing TIP award decisions. Appeals submitted to the Provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 28, 2003</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Decisions rendered on TIP award appeals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVALUATION PROCESS**

Individual teaching awards are to be based on creativity, teaching effectiveness, and productivity. Eligible employees must have a continuing commitment to, and emphasis on, classroom instruction, and have demonstrated substantial teaching commitment during the past three academic years (1999-2000 through 2001-2002). The definition of substantial commitment may vary; however, in general it shall be based on an employee's assignment in classroom and/or laboratory instruction. Directed independent studies, supervised research, thesis/dissertation research, summer session courses for nine-month faculty, and overloads are not included.

To be considered for the award, an eligible faculty member must submit a self-nomination packet to the CAS Council by December 9, 2002. The application, limited to a 3-inch 3-ring binder, must include:

1) a summary (maximum of two [2] pages) of his/her teaching philosophy exemplifying his/her most recent significant teaching accomplishments. Significant teaching accomplishments should be documented. The candidate may also include a discussion of scholarly accomplishments and/or service activities that relate to teaching.

2) A list of each section of courses taught for the past three academic years, which should include: semester taught, descriptive title, and the type of course.

3) Measures of instructional quality (9 categories). (Some suggested items for inclusion are described following each of the ten category headings detailed in the section entitled Evaluation Criteria.)
OUTLINE OF STEPS

STEP 1. All candidates will be evaluated independently by each of the committee members. The candidates will be evaluated in each of ten categories itemized below. For each category, a candidate will receive a score that must be an integer value in the inclusive range, 0 to 10. All ten scores will be based on subjective interpretation and appreciation of the documentation presented.

STEP 2. Each committee member will sum the ten scores of STEP 1 for each candidate so as to yield a total score from 0 to 100 for each candidate. Each committee member will record for each candidate the total sum score and the ten individual sub-scores in a scoresheet to be provided. The scoresheets will be turned in to the Chair of the Committee no later than January 10, 2003.

STEP 3. Since different committee members - or, for purpose of discussion, “judges” - may assign scores with different ranges of values, a candidate’s total score as assigned by a given judge will be transformed to yield a Z-score by that judge, as follows:

\[ Z = \frac{T - M}{S} \]

where

- \( T \) = a candidate’s total-score as assigned by judge
- \( M \) = the mean of all candidates’ total-scores as assigned by judge
- \( S \) = the standard deviation of all candidates’ total-scores assigned by judge

STEP 4. The lowest and highest Z-score for each candidate will be dropped. The remaining Z-scores assigned to a candidate will be summed to yield his/her ranking-score to four significant digits.

STEP 5. The final ranking-scores of all candidates will be sorted from largest to smallest.

STEP 6. The Selection committee will recommend the top four highest ranking (largest scores) to the Dean as TIP award recipients. If there is a tie between one or more of the four top-ranking candidates and the fifth or lower-ranking candidates, the committee may make recommendations to the Dean for additional awards, or, reserves the right to review the necessary files before making a final recommendation.
EVALUATION CRITERIA

_____(10)  TEACHING PRODUCTIVITY
Candidates for awards must demonstrate teaching productivity over the last six academic semesters (fall and spring for nine-month employees) or last nine semesters (fall, spring, and summer) for twelve month employees.

Teaching productivity includes meeting department and/or college means and/or medians in one or more of the following measures: the number of instructional contact hours, number of courses, and number of student credit hours generated. The application of these criteria must take into consideration differences in course delivery and preparation, and make provision for a balance between larger and smaller classes.

Individuals who were officially on sabbatical leave, faculty development leaves, or on special assignment during the three-year period may substitute data from a semester or term prior to the three-year period in consideration of the lack of data for the semester(s) or term(s) when the individual was on sabbatical or professional development leave, or special assignment.

_____(10)  TEACHING RESPONSIBILITY
• For each course taught during the evaluation period, identification of its function in the curriculum of the department/college/university.
• Statement of special circumstances which might influence content, teaching style, nature of assignments (for example, whether a course is a required service course, required major course, or major elective).

_____(10)  TEACHING PHILOSOPHY
• Statement of teaching philosophy, both in general and as it pertains to the discipline (might include a section on grading philosophy).
• Statement of the individual's contribution to the department's curriculum and/or mission (might include involvement in departmental curriculum design, course development, or implementation of new tracks or programs).

_____(10)  COURSE DESIGN/CONTENT/METHODOLOGY
• For each course, a syllabus with detailed information about content and objectives, primary readings, homework assignments, and testing procedures.
• Statement of teaching methods.
• Examples of tests, quizzes, exercises, and handouts.

_____(10)  EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING
• Sample test results from the best and poorest students with comments.
• Term papers, projects, or laboratory assignments. Student scores on standardized tests taken before and after the course (where applicable).
FACULTY ANNUAL EVALUATIONS
- Copies of the faculty annual evaluations for the past three years.

STUDENT EVALUATIONS
- Course/instructor evaluations.

ALUMNI PEER EVALUATIONS
- Statements from alumni about teaching effectiveness.
- Faculty evaluations by peers who can provide some evidence of an instructor's teaching effectiveness other than direct classroom observation (for example: statements from colleagues about how well students have been prepared for graduate studies or subsequent coursework).
- Classroom observation by chairman, invited colleagues both in and out of department.

SCHOLARSHIP
- Statement of teaching-related research and special projects/activities designed to improve classroom teaching.
- Evidence of classroom research on student learning styles.
- Evidence of participation in professional conferences and workshops/seminars devoted to improvement of teaching.
- Evidence of attempts at instructional innovations and evaluations of their effectiveness.

OTHER
- Contributions toward acquiring and maintaining national accreditation of programs.
- Contributions toward delivering quality programs.
- Any additional documentation the candidate feels is reflective of their teaching.