

NORTHPOINT SITE DIRECTOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Procedure

This evaluation of teachers will take place once each semester at about the eighth week. It will be applied especially to new teachers, to teachers whose student evaluations have been below 4.5 out of 5, and then to all other teachers on a revolving schedule.

Reviewers will meet with the Academic Dean for instruction on how to perform the evaluation, permissions on Populi, and specific course assignments. Reviewers who have expertise in the specific course assigned are preferred. For example, the head of the Worship Minor would be an ideal evaluator for the worship courses and teachers.

The evaluator should review the course syllabus and the set up on Populi prior to the in-person visit. The evaluation can then be accessed through Cognito forms and filled out during the class session. Teachers are scored on a scale of one to five with five as excellent or “strongly agree”. If some element of the course or teacher is not observable, mark N/A.

Evaluators should arrive at class five to ten minutes early to observe the teacher’s interaction with students and should stay for the entire hour.

Course Layout on Populi (Response: “yes” or “no”)

1. Does the course have the syllabus under the “syllabus” tab?
2. Are the assignments clearly laid out under the proper group and assignment designations?
3. Are the assignments weighted properly and corresponding to the syllabus?
4. Is there an appropriate picture or icon uploaded for the course?
5. Is the attendance up to date?
6. Is grading up to date?

Course Syllabus (Response: “yes,” “no,” and room for comment)

1. Does the syllabus adhere to the Northpoint template? That is, does it have the appropriate logo, course title, font (calibri 11 pt), headings, mission statement, policies, and order? (See the sample syllabus provided.)
2. Are the course objectives precise, measurable, and of sufficient number (recommended 4-8)? (Please note that student evaluations inquire about the achievement of stated objectives. Refer to the evaluations. It is important to review the course objectives on the first day of class.)
3. Are the course objectives consistent with the program and institutional objectives and with the mission statement? (The mission statement has been provided on the

template. Institutional objectives and program objectives are available in the College Catalog.)

4. Are the assignments and assessments consistent with the course objectives? For example, do the test questions support the course objectives?
5. Does the amount of homework assigned equal two hours per hour in class? (Homework should not exceed three hours per hour in class.)
6. Are the textbooks of sufficient academic quality, reasonably current, and as representative as possible of diverse perspectives? (Review the evaluations for student comments about textbooks.)
7. Does the amount of reading meet the requirement of 250 pages per credit hour?
8. Do the dates of assignments reflect when they are actually due? Is there a note to that effect? Are the due dates consistent with those shown on Populi?

Staff Observation in Class (rank 1-5)

Health

1. The professor was intentional and evident in his or her attempts to create a classroom environment that is caring and safe.
2. The professor responded to questions, requests for clarification, or challenges in a clear and non-threatening way.
3. The professor appeared confident in leading the class and is believable as an expert.
4. The professor demonstrated an awareness of and comfort with his or her own limitations in terms of knowledge.
5. The professor gave visual and oral cues of care, i.e., smiled, nodded, welcomed specifically, made student specific comments that were kind or personal, affirmed good questions or comments, or expressed personal care or emotion about the students verbally.
6. The professor avoided pejorative or demeaning language regarding any person or group of people. Any criticism of ideas or people was handled with grace, care, and concern.

Academic

1. The professor demonstrated thorough knowledge of the subject area.
2. The professor demonstrated appropriate scholarly reasoning in class instruction.
3. The professor actively involved learners by asking questions, being responsive and welcoming to questions, and encouraging immediate application.
4. The professor utilized appropriate resources, e.g., handouts, multi-media, etc.
5. The professor covered an appropriate amount of material for the time allotted. Pacing did not seem rushed or like it was unnecessarily slow.
6. The professor asked questions to evaluate the students' grasp of information, comprehension, and their ability to make application.
7. The professor's lecture content was organized logically and clearly.

8. The professor demonstrated a clear focus on learning outcomes and course objectives.
9. The professor presented content at an appropriate level of complexity, i.e., it was both accessible and challenging.
10. The professor incorporated contemporary scholarship into the lesson, i.e., the material was not outdated.
11. The professor employed appropriated public speaking skills such as good eye contact, gestures, and the avoidance of distracting habits.

Passion

1. The professor made mention of or spoke in a way that made his or her own vibrant, active personal relationship with Jesus evident.
2. The professor seemed genuinely glad to be there, to see the students, and to be engaged in the subject matter.
3. The professor was clear about why what they were learning mattered to the student personally and to the mission of God.
4. The student's personal spirituality and ability to effectively participate in the mission of God were an evident concern in terms of the course content and lecture outcome. (The goal is to have this happen at least once per hour in a non-directly theological or missional class).
5. Students seemed actively engaged in the content of the lecture.
6. Students seemed genuinely glad to see the professor and to be in the class.