



FACULTY AFFAIRS AND RECORDS

## **Official Department Personnel Standards for the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders**

Approved by Dr. Anil K. Puri, Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, on 12/15/2017 for implementation in the 2018-2019 Academic Year

[Verified and posted online at www.fullerton.edu/far/dps/comd2018.pdf](http://www.fullerton.edu/far/dps/comd2018.pdf)

According to Article 15.3 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement: Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the faculty unit employee no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term. Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the evaluation committee and the academic administrators prior to the commencement of the evaluation process. Once the evaluation process has begun, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the faculty unit employee during the evaluation process.

According to University Policy Statement 210.000 (3/26/18 version), Section V.C.: ▪ Each department shall develop standards for the evaluation of faculty members of that department. These standards... shall indicate the specific range of activities and levels of performance necessary to meet requirements for positive retention, promotion, and tenure decisions.

▪ Approved Departmental Personnel Standards are controlling documents in all personnel decisions. ▪ All Departmental Personnel Standards require the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (Vice President for Student Affairs for counselor faculty). ▪ Approved Departmental Personnel Standards shall be reviewed by the department as part of each program performance review. ▪ Student Opinion Questionnaire forms must be included as an attachment to Departmental Personnel Standards.

The guidelines and procedures contained in this document apply to the faculty of the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders for use in determining recommendations for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) is elected annually by the probationary and tenured faculty and consists of three tenured faculty members within the Department. UPS 210.000 and the collective bargaining agreement both state that only tenured faculty members with a higher rank than those being considered for promotion may review and recommend on a file.

Each faculty member under review is responsible for preparing a Portfolio ensuring that the file is consistent with the most recent UPS 210.000. Supporting materials should be submitted according to Faculty Affairs and Records procedures.

### I. Prospectus for First-Year Probationary Faculty

Consistent with UPS 210.000, first-year probationary faculty shall prepare and submit a Prospectus showing the probationary faculty member's plans for accomplishing the goals necessary to qualify for tenure and promotion in Communication Sciences and Disorders at California State University, Fullerton.

### II. Evaluation Overview

Each faculty member shall be evaluated in each of the three categories prescribed by UPS 210.000 (Teaching; Scholarly and Creative Activities; and Professional, University, and Community Service). All evaluators will use qualitative judgments whenever appropriate in each category. All evaluators will focus on the narratives provided by the faculty member and will evaluate the congruence of claims with the data provided as support.

### III. Teaching

Each faculty member is responsible for including the following materials in the Portfolio: (1) a concise narrative, not to exceed 1,000 words, addressing teaching performance and an explicit articulation of pedagogical approach and methods; (2) evaluators' comments from classroom visitation(s) of teaching; (3) statistical summaries of all responses on Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQ) forms administered to classes taught during the review period; (4) statistical summaries of grade distributions for all classes taught during the review period; and (5) other materials that provide evidence of teaching performance (these materials should be referenced in the narrative but included in an appendix). All materials used as evidence in support of teaching performance should be summarized in the narrative.

Classroom visitations should be completed on a regular basis. This would mean at least two classroom visitations every full performance review period, which occurs every other year for untenured faculty. For tenured faculty applying for full professor, there must be at least two classroom visitations. These classroom visitations will be conducted as prescribed in the "Department Peer Evaluation Guidelines (See Addendum 1)." Evaluators' comments should address issues such as the following: (1) course content, e.g., relationship of class session to course syllabi and assigned readings; the degree to which the content of the presentation is

relevant to the subject, reflects current thinking in the discipline, and includes relevant viewpoints; appropriate level of difficulty of the material presented; (2) organization of the presentation, e.g., logical sequence of topics; pace of presentation, inclusion of summaries and syntheses, effective management of class time; (3) clarity of presentation, clear explanations of ideas and information with relevant examples and illustrations, answering students' questions clearly; (4) style of teaching, e.g., stimulation of students' critical thinking, engagement of students in problem solving, demonstration of professional and ethical behavior; and (5) instructor-student interaction, e.g., engagement of class members in interaction, creation of a healthy and stimulating classroom atmosphere, allowing students to respond to each other, and creation of an atmosphere in which mutual respect is demonstrated.

#### A. Mandatory Indicators for Evaluation of Teaching Performance

##### 1. Course Content

- a. Most current syllabus for each different course taught during the review period, including learning objectives, assignments and requirements, and grading criteria
- b. Selected examples of assignments, handouts, and reading lists
- c. Selected examples of exams and quizzes

##### 2. Classroom Teaching

- a. All Student Opinion Questionnaires, including raw data forms and statistical summaries
- b. Reports of classroom visitations by department colleagues

##### 3. Grading Practices

- a. Statistical summary of grade distributions from all classes taught at C.S.U.F. during the review period
- b. Rationale for grading practices when not in accordance with the department "Grade Distribution Policy" (see Addendum 2)

##### 4. Non-Classroom Teaching - evidence of involvement in student advising and formal or informal mentoring

#### B. Optional Indicators for Measuring Teaching Effectiveness

1. Classroom Teaching: materials such as teaching awards and unsolicited, signed student letters, cards, and emails

##### 2. Teaching Innovations

- a. Information regarding instructional grants
- b. Research conducted that relates to teaching in the discipline

- c. Specific tools, instruments, devices, workbooks, and methods of instruction implemented in the classroom
  - d. New course proposals
3. Non-Classroom Instruction
- a. Information regarding involvement with M.A. theses and/or graduate or undergraduate-level directed research
  - b. Information regarding directed independent studies

C. Criteria for Evaluating Teaching Performance

Evaluation of teaching shall be based upon the total evidence reflected by Student Opinion Questionnaires and other mandatory and optional indicators. Separate ratings of the “qualitative indicators of instruction” and of Student Opinion Questionnaires are determined as described in the next two sections. The overall rating of teaching performance is the lower of the two ratings. For example, a rating of Superior in teaching performance can be assigned only if both the qualitative indicators of instruction and the SOQs are Superior.

1. Qualitative indicators of instruction: All teaching indicators, mandatory and optional, shall be qualitatively assessed, and evaluators shall render a rating of Superior, Excellent, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory using the criteria below:
  - a. Course content is of appropriate depth for the course level, and the content reflects recent trends in the discipline
  - b. Teaching strategies are effective, and there is evidence of significant successful effort to improve teaching effectiveness continuously
  - c. Evaluation of student learning is both rigorous and valid, and in accordance with the department “Grade Distribution Policy” (see Addendum 2)
  - d. Breadth is shown through the ability to teach a variety of courses
2. Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQ). Department-sanctioned student opinion forms utilize a five-point rating scale ranging from “A” (4) to “E” (0). Student Opinion Questionnaires contribute to the evaluation of faculty members’ teaching effectiveness but should not be used as the sole measure. Overall patterns for the duration of the evaluation period shall be considered more informative than isolated course evaluations. The following table will be used to evaluate instructor effectiveness based on the statistical summaries:

Overall Rating	Overall Mean SOQ		Overall Percentages
Superior	3.50 or higher	And	80% A’s or B’s, with at least 50% A’s
Excellent	3.20 - 3.49	And	70% A’s and B’s
Satisfactory	2.90 - 3.19	And	50% A’s and B’s
Unsatisfactory	Below 2.90	And	Fewer than 50% A’s and B’s

**This rating system is used as a guideline:** Written student comments included on the rating forms will be used as an aid to interpret quantitative reports of student opinions. The evaluation

shall take into consideration factors such as the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to the faculty member, and the characteristics of the classes taught (size, level, required or elective, experimental vs. traditional pedagogy, major vs. G.E., etc.). The evaluation shall also take into account the faculty member's overall level of experience and his or her efforts to improve teaching performance.

#### IV. Scholarly and Creative Activities

The department expects that faculty members will show on-going development in scholarly and creative activities as demonstrated in two ways: (1) evidence of a systematic research program, and (2) progression from third-level and second-level activities to first-level scholarly and creative activities as described below. Scholarly and creative efforts may be published in traditional print form or equivalent electronic publication format. Faculty members shall provide evidence of the value or importance of their scholarly and creative contributions to the field by including the following indicators as available and appropriate: (1) relative prestige of journals in which one's work appears (i.e., a brief description of the journal, and impact factor if available); (2) acceptance/rejection rates of journals, paper panels, or interest groups at conferences; (3) honors or awards bestowed on one's work; (4) frequency with which one's work is cited by other scholars; (5) book reviews of one's work; and (6) letters from journal editors or associate editors acknowledging the value of one's work. These indicators should be used by the faculty member to support the case for work assigned to the three different levels below.

The members of the departmental personnel committee will consider indicators to assess the prestige of a given journal: affiliation with a national scholarly or professional organization, large circulation relative to other journals in the field, impact factor, rigorous acceptance standards and wide citation.

Each faculty member shall include a concise narrative of scholarly and creative activity and how the work contributes to a systematic program of research. The narrative, which shall not exceed 1,000 words, should include: (1) a list of works that have been published, presented, or accepted during the review period; (2) a written evaluation of each work; and (3) a description of work in progress. In the case of multiple authors, the faculty member's evaluation of the work shall include an assessment of her or his contribution and/or the faculty member shall submit a multiple author form. It is expected that the faculty member's narrative will summarize her or his research and creative activities agenda(s). The common theme(s) running through the faculty member's work shall be identified in the narrative.

##### A. First-Level Activities

1. Refereed scholarly journal articles (including in press, or accepted for publication, excluding articles in predatory journals)
2. Author of a scholarly book; "in press" books require galley proofs
3. Refereed articles in nationally/internationally distributed conference proceedings
4. Edited scholarly book or special issue of a journal
5. Major external grant proposals funded (e.g., Principal Investigator (PI) or co-PI on National Institutes of Health (NIH) R03, 15, 21, 01, Department Of Education (DOE))

- grants, Health Resources & Services Administration (HRSA), American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) Foundation grants, etc.)
6. Standardized instruments published and commercially available (e.g., Fullerton Language Test for Adolescents, Stuttering Severity Instrument)

#### B. Second-Level Activities

1. Non-refereed journal articles
2. Non-refereed articles in nationally/internationally distributed conference proceedings or in published working papers [working papers are scholarly volumes published by universities and research institutes to disseminate current research on an annual or more frequent basis. Examples include: Haskins Laboratories Status Report on Research, UCLA Working Papers in Phonetics, NCVS Status and Progress Report (National Institute of Deafness and Other Communication Disorders (NIDCD) of NIH), and Quarterly Status and Progress Report]
3. Chapters in scholarly books
4. Invited publications
5. Peer-reviewed presentations at national/international conventions/conferences
6. Invited presentations at national/international conventions/conferences
7. Internal or minor external grant proposals funded or major external grant proposals unfunded
8. National distribution of educational and/or professional materials (e.g., workbooks or digital media series)
9. Major external grant proposals resubmitted but unfunded (e.g., PI or co-PI on NIH R03, 15, 21, 01, DOE grants, etc.)

#### C. Third-Level Activities

1. Published book reviews that make a scholarly contribution
2. Presentations at state or local conferences
3. Development of experimental forms for a research or clinical instrument
4. Accepted contributions to forums or newsletters (e.g., California Speech-Language-Hearing Association (CSHA) Magazine)
5. Internal/minor external grant proposals submitted but not funded
6. Material completed but not submitted and/or material submitted for publication but not accepted

#### D. Criteria for Evaluating Scholarly and Creative Activities

Using the scale of ratings Superior, Excellent, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory, scholarly and creative activities shall be evaluated using the three criteria listed below. Overall performance in scholarly and creative activities shall be based on a composite of the individual ratings.

1. Continuous and systematic progression of activity from one level to the next (e.g., conference papers to publications, grant proposals to funded grants, intramural grant to extramural grant)
2. Achievement that includes high quality, peer-reviewed scholarly publications (e.g., Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research (JSHLR), American Journal of Speech-Language-Pathology (AJSLP), Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools (LSHSS), Journal of Child Language (JCL), Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders (JADD), Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) journal, Aphasiology, Journal of Fluency Disorders (JFD), Journal of Voice (JV), The Journal of Acoustical Society of America (JASA), International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology (IJSLP), Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics (CLP), Dysphagia, etc.)
3. Evidence that scholarly and creative activities contribute to the discipline

A rating of Superior shall be given for ten or more (10+) second-level and/or first-level activities during the RTP review period. The activities must include at least four peer-reviewed journal articles (online publication with doi or published), of which first authorship must be counted on two publications.

A rating of Excellent shall be given for seven-to-nine (7-9) second-level and/or first-level activities during the RTP review period. These activities must include at least three peer-reviewed journal articles (online publication with doi or published), of which first authorship is accorded on two publications.

A rating of Satisfactory shall be given for five-to-six (5-6) second-level and/or first-level activities. These activities must include first authorship on at least two peer-reviewed journal articles (online publication with doi or published).

A rating of Unsatisfactory shall be given for scholarly activity judged to be of insufficient quality and/or quantity.

#### V. Professional, University, and Community Service

It is expected that faculty members will demonstrate continuous service. Some of the indicators of the level of involvement include: (1) the amount of time devoted to professional organizations and committee assignments; (2) the amount of responsibility or degree of prestige associated with service; and (3) the degree of visibility afforded the individual, the department, the college, and the university through the faculty member's service.

The faculty member under review shall prepare a concise narrative, not to exceed 1,000 words, that evaluates and summarizes service, including a complete listing of service activities and the level at which each belongs. The narrative should include a careful presentation of evidence for assigning activities to the first-level and the second-level.

The narrative should summarize how the professional activities completed contribute to the faculty member's professional growth and to the professional organization(s). As part of the

narrative, a complete list of activities with accompanying dates and places should be provided. Data supporting the quality should be included wherever possible.

Service activity falls into one of three levels depending on the amount of time and effort, the level of skill or leadership, and the degree of benefit to the department, school, university, profession, or community.

A. First-Level Activities. An activity at the first level generally requires more time, responsibility, or leadership than does an activity at the second level. Such activities bring exceptional benefits to the department, college, university, profession, or community. Community service that brings more recognition or other benefits to the department, college, or university than to the faculty member, e.g., organizing conferences, is at the first level. Listed below are selected examples of first-level service:

1. Serving as an association office holder (e.g., CSHA/ASHA president, etc.)
2. Serving as an editor of a regional or national journal, or professional newsletter
3. Professional convention program chair
4. Receiving honors and awards from CSHA, ASHA, or any professional association
5. Serving in the Academic Senate
6. Providing leadership on university committee as a chair (e.g., Faculty Personnel Committee, Faculty Research Committee, Planning, Resource & Budget Committee, etc.)
7. Developing, administrating, and/or contributing to outreach efforts that serve the community through application of knowledge of the discipline
8. Submitting any non-research grant
9. Organizing conferences
10. Participating in internal or external program reviews (e.g., Council on Academic Accreditation (CAA) site visitor, etc.)

B. Second-Level Activities

An activity at the second level generally requires less time than does an activity at the third level, or it involves significantly less responsibility and leadership. Typical examples are chairing an active departmental committee or college-level committee. Community service that brings more recognition to the individual faculty member than to the department, college, or university, e.g., public lecture or public office, is at the second level. Listed below are selected examples of second-level service:

1. Chairing a department or college committee
2. Serving as department chair, graduate adviser, undergraduate adviser, clinic director, or credential coordinator
3. Serving on university committees
4. Reviewing program performance of other departments or programs at other university
5. Planning programs or conferences including peer reviewed paper selection
6. Professionally related consulting

7. Consulting with community or private groups
8. Presenting speeches, lectures, and presentations
9. Statewide/national task force or selected boards
10. Conducting workshops
11. Advising student groups (e.g., National Student Speech Language Hearing Association (NSSLHA)/Student Speech Therapists and Audiologists Nurturing Cultural Enrichment (STANCE) adviser, etc.)
12. Producing publications relevant to university goals that are not traditional academic publications
13. Developing web pages designed to increase university contact with the community
14. Reviewing books or manuscripts for publication or reviewing extramural grants
15. Providing testimony to governmental or regulatory bodies

C. Third-Level Activities. Listed below are selected examples of third-level service:

1. Participating on departmental and college committees
2. Attending professional meetings, workshops, or other professional development
3. Association committee member
4. Association member
5. Being the subject of a mass media interview regarding the field and its applications
6. Advising students
7. Serving on graduate committees
8. Working with independent studies

D. Criteria for Evaluating Service

A rating of Superior shall be given for exemplary performance in depth and/or breadth of service. In general, two first-level activities during the review period, and multiple examples of high-quality second-level and/or third-level activities are expected for a rating of Superior. For associate professors, superior service should include participation in university-wide service.

A rating of Excellent shall be given for a sufficient amount of service judged to be of high quality. Generally, one first-level activity during the review period, and several second-level and/or third-level activities are expected for a rating of Excellent.

A rating of Satisfactory shall be given for a sufficient amount of service judged to be of satisfactory quality. In general, three examples of second-level activities are expected for a rating of Satisfactory and several examples of third-level activities.

A rating of Unsatisfactory shall be given for service activity judged to be of insufficient quality and/or quantity.

## VI. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

For promotion and/or the granting of tenure, a faculty member must be evaluated as at least Satisfactory in each of the three categories and Excellent or Superior either in Teaching or Scholarly and Creative Activities.

## VII. Criteria for Decisions on Early Tenure or Early Promotion

Early tenure refers to a decision on tenure that is made prior to the faculty member's sixth year of service at the university. Early promotion refers to a decision on promotion that is prior to the completion of time normally spent in one's current rank. In accordance with university policies, promotion to full professor requires that a faculty member be tenured. Early tenure and promotion are separate decisions and the DPC will vote on each action separately.

1. The following criteria are established for early tenure or early promotion to associate professor:

A faculty member must be rated Superior in Scholarly and Creative Activities or Teaching performance and at least Excellent in all other categories of evaluation. Performance in all categories shall have ample evidence to suggest that the ratings are reliable.

2. The following criteria are established for early tenure for untenured associate professors or professors:

A faculty member must be rated Superior in Scholarly and creative Activities or teaching performance and at least Excellent in all other categories. Performance in all categories shall have ample evidence to suggest that the ratings are reliable.

3. The following criteria are established for untenured associate professors requesting early tenure and early promotion to professor. The following criteria also apply to tenured associate professors requesting early promotion to professor:

A faculty member must be rated Superior in Scholarly and Creative Activities and Teaching performance and at least Excellent in Professional, University, and Community Service. Performance in all categories shall have ample evidence to suggest that the ratings are reliable.

**Addendum 1**  
**DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION SCIENCES AND DISORDERS**  
**PEER EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

The process for the peer review of teaching performance is to be initiated by the faculty member who is under review. The frequency and scheduling of peer reviews is prescribed in the Department Personnel Standards (III. Teaching on page 2). Peer evaluations of teaching performance should conform to the requirements specified below; however, a faculty member may submit a request to the Department Personnel Committee to utilize an alternative procedure. Such a request must be made in writing prior to conducting any peer evaluations for the review cycle in question, must detail the specific alternative procedure to be employed, and must be approved by the Department Personnel Committee in advance of the peer evaluations.

**1. SELECTION OF PEER EVALUATORS**

A peer evaluation of teaching performance comprises an independent evaluation by at least two reviewers; additional reviewers may be employed if desired. Each reviewer must conduct a minimum of one class visitation. A faculty member need not be evaluated in all the classes she/he teaches during a given review cycle. Peer reviewers may evaluate the faculty member on the same or different classes, as the faculty member chooses. The faculty member should identify tenure-track faculty within the department who have expertise in the applicable teaching area(s) to serve as peer evaluators. The faculty member will submit these names to the department chairperson. The department chairperson is responsible for contacting the peer evaluators. Once the evaluator has accepted responsibility for peer evaluation, the faculty member and peer reviewer will arrange the time, date, and locations for the evaluations to take place.

**2. CONDUCT OF THE PEER EVALUATIONS**

The faculty member and peer reviewer must schedule a pre-evaluation conference to clarify the nature of the course material to be covered during each peer evaluation as well as the instructional strategy. The peer evaluators will take written notes during the evaluations, which shall remain completely confidential.

Peer evaluators should address the faculty member's performance in areas such as (a) course content—for example, the relationship of the class session to course syllabi and assigned readings; the degree to which the content of the presentation is worth knowing, reflects current thinking in the discipline, includes divergent viewpoints; the level of difficulty of the material presented; (b) organization of the presentation—for example, logical sequence of topics and ideas; pace of presentation; inclusion of summaries and syntheses; appropriate use of class time; (c) clarity of presentation—for example, whether definitions of new terms, concepts, principles are presented; (d) classroom interaction—for example, questions used; allowing students to respond to each other; directing discussion so that it is centered on the lecture topic; (e) style of teaching—for example, choice of instructional strategy; stimulating students' critical thinking; engaging students in problem solving; exercising professional and ethical behavior; and (f)

instructor-student interaction—for example, reinforcing and encouraging student participation; promoting a positive classroom atmosphere; and demonstrating mutual respect.

Following the class visitation, each peer evaluator will then complete a formal written evaluation of the faculty member's teaching performance for inclusion in the Portfolio. Each peer evaluator will also conduct an informal conference with the faculty member. Both the written and oral evaluations should be completed in a timely manner, but no later than two weeks prior to the date on which the faculty member's Portfolio is due. Only the formal written evaluations produced by the peer evaluators will be considered by the Personnel Committee in the Portfolio review process.

### **3. DISPOSITION OF THE PEER EVALUATIONS**

The formal written evaluations may be completed either before or after the informal conference between the faculty member and the peer evaluators. Formal written evaluations should be distributed to the faculty member being evaluated, the chair of the Department Personnel Committee, and the chair of the department. It is the faculty member's responsibility to include a copy of the formal written evaluations in the Portfolio. Once a peer evaluator has submitted a formal written evaluation, that evaluation may not be changed, altered, amended, or rescinded. The formal written evaluation becomes a permanent part of the faculty member's file. A faculty member may, however, write a written response to a peer evaluation and include it in the Portfolio. The response must be completed by the date for submitting the Portfolio.





Mark as shown:      Please use a ball-point pen or a thin felt tip. This form will be processed automatically.

Correction:      Please follow the examples shown on the left hand side to help optimize the reading results.

## 1. Student Opinion Questionnaire

	<i>strongly agree</i>	<i>moderately agree</i>	<i>neutral</i>	<i>moderately disagree</i>	<i>strongly disagree</i>
1.1 The instructor stimulated my learning in this course.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2 The instructor made the course intellectually challenging.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3 The instructor demonstrated an understanding of broader areas of knowledge relevant to the subject matter.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4 The instructor is knowledgeable in the subject area of this course.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.5 The instructor demonstrated respect for students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.6 The instructor encouraged students to think for themselves.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.7 The instructor fostered a favorable learning climate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.8 The instructor evaluated student work fairly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.9 The instructor evaluated my work objectively.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.10 The instructor presented the subject matter effectively.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.11 The instructor presented course content clearly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.12 The instructor attempted to promote interest in the content of this course.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.13 The instructor made assignments and requirements explicit.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.14 Overall, the instructor provided a valuable learning experience.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**PLEASE CONTINUE ON PAGE 2 - DO NOT WRITE IN THE SPACE BELOW**

## 2. Comments

2.1 Please write any comments in the box below.