

Adopted: XX/XX/20XX

OCOB FACULTY
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

RESOLUTION ON EVALUATION OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE

WHEREAS,

The University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA) document establishes in Section II.B.1 the ten factors that define effective teaching performance: (1) competence in the discipline, (2) ability to communicate ideas effectively, (3) versatility of teaching techniques, (4) appropriateness of teaching techniques, (5) organization of courses, (6) relevance of instruction to course objectives, (7) methods of evaluating student achievement, (8) relationship with students in class, (9) effectiveness of student advising, and (10) other factors relating to performance as an instructor; and

WHEREAS,

The UFPA establishes in Section II.B.1 that the results of formal student evaluations are to be considered in formulating recommendations based on teaching performance; and

WHEREAS,

Neither the UFPA nor the OCOB RPT document provide explicit guidance for determining whether an instructor has reached sufficiency, proficiency or excellence with respect to the ten factors that define teaching performance, nor does it provide explicit guidance as to how the results of formal student evaluations are to be considered in formulating recommendations based on teaching performance; and

WHEREAS,

Lack of effective guidance as to how to evaluate teaching performance makes these evaluations in practice to be overtly reliant on the student evaluations of teaching; and

WHEREAS,

Student evaluation of teaching have been found in numerous peer reviewed studies to be prone to systematic bias against women and minorities; therefore, be it

RESOLVED:

That the Faculty at OCOB approve the OCOB Evaluation of Teaching Task Force's Report "A System for the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness" that establishes OCOB-wide guidelines for determining, for the purposes of Retention, Promotion and Tenure, the extent to which an instructor is

educationally effective in each of the ten factors identified by the UFPA in Section II.B.1; and be it further

RESOLVED:

That the Faculty at OCOB will implement these guidelines starting in the Fall of 2019 for all Faculty Evaluations of Teaching Performance, Professional Growth, and Service that are routinely documented in form AP-109 as dictated by University policy; and be it further

RESOLVED:

That if any of these guidelines were found to be inconsistent with University or Cal State policies, the rest of the guidelines shall still be in full effect.

OCOB Evaluation of Teaching Task Force's Report

A SYSTEM FOR THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

THIS VERSION: MAY 9TH, 2019

Section I: Rationale

The University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA) document establishes in Section II.B.1 the ten factors that define effective teaching performance: (1) competence in the discipline, (2) ability to communicate ideas effectively, (3) versatility of teaching techniques, (4) appropriateness of teaching techniques, (5) organization of courses, (6) relevance of instruction to course objectives, (7) methods of evaluating student achievement, (8) relationship with students in class, (9) effectiveness of student advising, and (10) other factors relating to performance as an instructor.

While Peer Review Committees (PRCs) are to pay attention to these ten factors, the UFPA is silent as to how to determine the extent to which an instructor is effective according to each factor. In this document we establish clear and comprehensive guidelines that OCOB PRCs can use in establishing, for the purposes of Retention, Promotion and Tenure, the extent to which an instructor is educationally effective in each of the ten factors identified by the UFPA in Section II.B.1.

None of this is to be construed to be the adoption of new policies. Rather, it is the codification and fleshing out of existing policies, and therefore in full compliance with them.

Section II: The Summary Instrument

We summarize performance in each of the factors that contribute to teaching effectiveness using the classification used below:

- Far exceeds the Cal Poly and OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Exceeds the Cal Poly and OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Meets the Cal Poly and OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Does not meet the Cal Poly and OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.

To calibrate this classification with the Summary recommendations from Section V of Form AP-109 we establish that the thresholds for evaluation of teaching that define the “Meets the Cal Poly and OCOB standards of teaching” level are to be high enough so that reaching this level or above is to be interpreted as being sufficient (that is: ‘above the bar’) with respect to that factor for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.

Appendix A contains a full description of the Summary Instrument.

Section III: The Checklist Instrument

PRCs need clear guidance when aiming to determine whether an instructor far exceeds, exceeds, meets or does not meet the Cal Poly and OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and. The Checklist Instrument provides such guidance. It is critical to understand that the

Checklist Instrument is not only “the checklist” but that it also includes the instructions for how to use the checklist.

Appendix B contains a full description of the Checklist Instrument.

Section IV: Guidelines for Using SETs in an Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

This Section makes specific recommendations as to what parts of the SET are to be used in a process of evaluation of teaching effectiveness, and how this information is to be used.

As part of the evidence of merit for factor ‘8. Relationship with students in class’ we recommend reporting the fraction of students that strongly agree/agree or strongly disagree/disagree with the statements “The instructor was concerned with student’s learning and was helpful” (item 2.13) and “The instructor made me feel comfortable about participating in class” (item 2.14). We recommend against using the arithmetic mean of responses. We also recommend against comparing the reported numbers of an instructor against the averages of the reported numbers of other instructors. This is an insidious practice that makes it impossible for an instructor with ‘very good’ numbers (whatever those numbers may be a measurement of) to be positively recognized in an area composed of instructors with ‘excellent’ numbers. Below is an example of how our recommended method of using SET information could look like, as part of the evidence of merit for the factor ‘Relationship with students in class’:

When we aggregate the responses of the formal student evaluations for all students that took a lower division class with this instructor for this academic year we obtain that **82%** of the respondents agree that instructor “was concerned with student’s learning and was helpful” and, of those, **two thirds** strongly agree with the statement. Further, **85%** of the respondents agree that instructor made the students “feel comfortable about participating in class” and, of those, **four fifths** strongly agree with the statement.

If needed, have a paragraph for “lower division courses” and another paragraph for “upper division and graduate courses.”

Section V: Final Reflections

Even though our recommendations are intended to be comprehensive and immediately actionable, they are incomplete: important issues remain that would require either changes in University policies, Cal State policies, or both. Given that the current system of evaluation of teaching is likely disadvantaging a large segment of our Faculty, especially women, it is important that we work diligently on this. The recommendations in this document are comprised of what we can act on right away at the OCOB level, without needing any other parts of the University or the Cal State system to make changes at this point, and in full exercise of our Faculty rights.

Respectfully submitted,

OCOB Evaluation of Teaching Task Force

Patricia Dahm, Garland Durham, Patricia McQuaid and Eduardo Zambrano (chair)

Appendix A: The Summary Instrument

Teaching Performance Factors: Summary (Cal Poly UPPA Section II.B.1)

1. Competence in the discipline

- Far exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Meets the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Does not meet the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

2. Ability to communicate ideas effectively

- Far exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Meets the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Does not meet the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

3. Versatility of teaching techniques

- Far exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Meets the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Does not meet the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

4. Appropriateness of teaching techniques

- Far exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Meets the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Does not meet the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

5. Organization of courses:

- Far exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Meets the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Does not meet the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

6. Relevance of instruction to course objectives:

- Far exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Meets the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Does not meet the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

7. Methods of evaluating student achievement:

- Far exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Meets the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Does not meet the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

8. Relationship with students in class:

- Far exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Meets the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Does not meet the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

As part of the evidence of merit for factor '8. Relationship with students in class,' report the fraction of students that strongly agree/agree or strongly disagree/disagree with the statements "The instructor was concerned with student's learning and was helpful" and "The instructor made me feel comfortable about participating in class". Do not use the arithmetic mean of responses. In particular, do not compare averages of one professor with averages of other professors. Here is an example of how that could look like:

When we aggregate the responses of the formal student evaluations for all students that took a lower division class with this instructor for this academic year we obtain that **82%** of the respondents agree that instructor "was concerned with student's learning and was helpful" and, of those, **two thirds** strongly agree with the statement. Further, **85%** of the respondents agree that instructor made the students "feel comfortable about participating in class" and, of those, **four fifths** strongly agree with the statement.

If needed, have a paragraph for "lower division courses" and another paragraph for "upper division and graduate courses."

9. Effectiveness of student advising:

- Far exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Meets the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Does not meet the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- N/A

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

10. Other factors relating to performance as an instructor:

- Far exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Meets the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- Does not meet the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.
- N/A

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

This information is to be summarized further by reporting the following two indicators:

- The distribution of scores across all factors with an answer other than N/A.
- In how many, out of the factors with an answer other than N/A, the instructor scores at the level of "Meets the standards" or better.

Appendix B: The Checklist Instrument

Teaching Performance Factors Checklist (Cal Poly UFPA Section II.B.1)

The **Teaching Performance Factors Checklist** provides standards for teaching performance evaluations through class observation and course content review. The first, second, and third tiers include a progression of recommended teaching and course design practices. The substandard tier includes items that are contrary to best practices and/or Cal Poly/OCOB policies. The checklist is to be used for two purposes. First, as a developmental tool to provide faculty formative feedback to enhance their teaching, showing progression over multiple observations. Second, as an evaluative tool to document evidence of teaching performance for retention, promotion or tenure. **It is recommended but not required that one or all of the PRC members meet with the instructor to discuss the final written evaluation of teaching performance.**

To calibrate this classification with the Summary recommendations from Section V of Form AP-109 we establish that the thresholds for evaluation of teaching that define “Meets the Cal Poly and OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure” are to be high enough so that reaching this level or above is to be interpreted as being sufficient (that is: ‘above the bar’) with respect to that factor for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.

Checklist Conditions

- Effective use of the checklist requires that observer and observed have met prior to a class observation and review of course content and discussed class format and purpose and will meet for an informal debrief after the observation and review of course content.

Observer

- Receives training on the best use of this evaluation checklist prior to using it for the first time.
- Observes a minimum of one class session. **If several observers are scheduled to visit an instructor's class, the observers will coordinate among themselves and the instructor so that they visit the classroom at different dates.**
- Is familiar with the course learning objectives listed in the syllabus.
- Understands the content of the course well enough to evaluate effectiveness of instruction in that topic.
- **Uses the summary instrument and the checklist independently of other observers who may be visiting the instructor's class during the same evaluation period.**

Checklist items

- Are observable actions and behaviors of the instructor, not the behaviors of students.
- Require when appropriate a review of the syllabus, lecture notes, websites, textbook, software, videos, assignment descriptions, grading rubrics, exams and other course and program materials.
- Describe practices that can be implemented within a wide variety of teaching models, both traditional and innovative.
- Reflect actions and behaviors that should be observable in nearly all classes, regardless of level, field, or student population.
- Some items in the ‘Far Exceeds’ column may not be applicable/relevant to certain courses, which should be noted in the comments sections.
- Were developed to include best teaching practices relevant to most teaching environments at OCOB.

Teaching Performance Factors Checklist
 (Cal Poly UFPA Section II.B.1)

DIMENSION				
	Below the Cal Poly and OCOB Teaching Policy Standard	Meets the Cal Poly and OCOB Teaching Policy Standard	Exceeds the Cal Poly and OCOB Teaching Policy Standard	Far Exceeds the Cal Poly and OCOB Teaching Policy Standard
1	Competence in the discipline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of subject • Discipline specific language 	<p>Instructor does not appear to understand course content.</p> <p>Instructor does not use, or incorrectly uses, discipline-specific and/or academic language.</p>	<p>Instructor's factual statements are consistent with current knowledge in the field.</p> <p>Instructor correctly answers questions about course-level content.</p> <p>Instructor uses discipline-specific and academic language.</p>	<p>Instructor answers questions confidently, clearly, and simply.</p> <p>Instructor explains use of discipline-specific terms.</p> <p>Instructor facilitates the use of discipline-specific language by students.</p>
2	Ability to communicate ideas effectively <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation form 	<p>Instructor uses inappropriate or offensive gestures and/or speech.</p>	<p>Instructor volume, pace, and diction allow observer to follow the class session.</p> <p>Instructor faces students when speaking.</p>	<p>Instructor incorporates appropriate eye contact and effective non-verbal communication (e.g., hand gestures).</p> <p>Instructor is engaging, responsive, and constructive in both tone and content of their speech.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation substance 	<p>Instructor displays a negative attitude in tone and/or content.</p> <p>Instructor does not use, or uses inappropriate, visual support for presentation and/or examples/illustrations.</p>	<p>Instructor provides visual support for verbal presentation and uses concrete examples/illustrations to clarify content.</p>	<p>Instructor avoids distracting mannerisms or speech patterns, such as filler words and nervous habits.</p> <p>Instructor cites sources for content discussed.</p>	<p>Visual support is outstanding and facilitates understanding well beyond what can be obtained with a verbal presentation alone.</p>
3	<p>Versatility of teaching techniques</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of active learning 	<p>Instructor uses no active-learning¹ exercises.</p> <p>Instructor has unrealistic expectations for active-learning exercises.</p> <p>Instructor uses inappropriate or offensive active-learning exercises.</p> <p>Instructor uses active-learning exercises that are not accessible to everyone in the class.</p>	<p>Class session contains at least one active-learning exercise to apply course content.</p> <p>Instructor monitors and manages active-learning exercises.</p>	<p>Instructor appropriately debriefs the active-learning exercise.</p> <p>Instructor ensures that all students are on-task.</p> <p>Instructor is responsive to student engagement² and adjusts strategy accordingly.</p> <p>Instructor facilitates student-led explanations and/or discussions.</p>	<p>Instructor appropriately debriefs the active-learning exercise and connects the lessons from the exercise to the learning goals for the class session</p> <p>Instructor requires students to submit or present in-class work by end of class.</p> <p>Where appropriate, instructor leverages student use of electronic technology to facilitate active learning.</p>
4	<p>Appropriateness of teaching techniques</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate content or level 	<p>Class content and course materials are too</p>	<p>Class content and course materials appropriately</p>		

¹ Activities in which students practice course concepts during class.

² Active participation in an activity in which students are practicing course concepts.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time management 	<p>easy or difficult for student knowledge level.</p> <p>Instructor does not encourage higher-order thinking³.</p> <p>Room and/or technology issues occur during class that could have been addressed before the start of class.</p>	<p>challenges students.</p> <p>Class content promotes mastery of course learning objectives.</p> <p>The class session starts and ends on time.</p> <p>Planned sections of the class session are well-timed.</p> <p>Little or no time spent on non-instructional activities.</p> <p>Instructor prepares the room and relevant technology before the start of class.</p>	<p>Instructor engages students in higher-order thinking skills during class.</p> <p>Instructor utilizes and references educational technology for passive learning activities⁴ outside of class to support effective use of in-class time.</p>	<p>The instructor spends the majority of class time leading students in higher-order thinking activities.</p> <p>Instructor maximizes in-class time, using active learning or applications⁵ rather than passive learning.</p>
5	Organization of courses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course objectives 	<p>Aspirational statements⁶ are listed as learning objectives.</p>	<p>Learning objectives are listed in the syllabus and identify specific, measurable skills.</p> <p>Every learning objective is measured by at least one graded assignment.</p>	<p>The learning objective being measured is noted in the assignment.</p>	<p>Learning objectives are explicitly cited in the syllabus as related to standards/goals set by program, university, profession, and/or accrediting body.</p>

³ Analysis, critical thinking, evaluation, problem solving, etc.

⁴ When students receive information from the instructor or another source.

⁵ Activities in which students practice course concepts during class.

⁶ Examples of aspirational statements are “Students will appreciate X,” or “value X,” or “develop creativity,” etc.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course outline • Lesson plan 	<p>A weekly plan for the semester is not provided.</p> <p>Instructor changes the established class session plan without prior notification to students.</p>	<p>A weekly plan for the semester is provided and includes class topics, readings, and assignment due dates.</p> <p>The class session demonstrates clear signs of planning and organization and follows a logical flow.</p>	<p>The weekly plan for the semester includes description of in-class work and active learning.</p> <p>Assignment due dates have not been scheduled on religious days of obligation.</p> <p>The class session includes instruction and formative assessment⁷ to assess student learning for that class session.</p>	<p>Learning objectives include development of skills relevant to living and working in a diverse world.</p> <p>The weekly plan for the semester includes specific instructional plans for each class meeting with a lesson objective tied to the course learning objectives.</p> <p>The class session includes instruction, formative assessment, and reflection components.</p>
6	<p>Relevance of instruction to course objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication of clear learning goals for the class session 	<p>Instructor communicates no learning goals for the class session and/or each lesson activity.</p> <p>Instructor communicates inappropriate or unrealistic learning goals for the class session and/or each lesson activity.</p>	<p>Instructor clearly identifies realistic learning goals for the class session.</p>	<p>Instructor clearly connects the learning goals for the class session to the course objectives.</p>	<p>Instructor clearly identifies the learning goals for each instructional activity and connects them to the course learning objectives.</p>

⁷ Assignments intended to help students evaluate their mastery of a skill or learning objective and provide information to the instructor on student progress.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contextual relevance and transferability 	<p>Instructor teaches content devoid of real-world applicability.⁸</p> <p>Instructor assumes unrealistic skill level of students in the class.</p>	<p>Instructor provides real-world applications of class session content.</p> <p>Instructor explicitly builds on prior student knowledge.</p>	<p>Instructor has students provide real-world examples of class content or apply content to real-world scenarios.</p>	Where appropriate, instructor uses examples where their discipline converges with other disciplines in addressing challenges.
7	<p>Methods of evaluating student achievement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignments and assessments Formative assessment/feedback 	<p>The method of grading/scoring for assignments and assessments is unclear, inappropriate, or unfair.</p> <p>Instructor violates FERPA by publicly sharing student grades.</p> <p>Instructor provides non-constructive and/or discouraging feedback.</p> <p>Instructor compares student work to an ambiguous or unrealistic standard.</p>	<p>The method of grading/scoring for each assignment or assessment is specified in the syllabus.</p> <p>Due dates for all assignments are specified.</p> <p>Instructor provides students constructive and encouraging feedback on how to improve their comprehension or performance in class.</p>	<p>Assessment is done using a variety of methods (e.g., exams, projects, presentations, etc.)</p> <p>Each assessment or assignment has its own specific description.</p> <p>Instructor provides information to students about their performance on class activities compared to a pre-established standard.</p>	<p>Course includes multiple low-stakes assignments distributed across the course to prepare for larger assignments.</p> <p>Grading rubrics are provided for all major assignments along with the assignment description.</p> <p>Grading rubric requirements align to the assignment description.</p> <p>Instructor leads students in structured reflection on class learning activities.</p>

⁸ Applicability outside of the specific context of the class.

8	Relationship with students in class <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom climate 	<p>Instructor raises students' stress or anxiety by using discriminatory, dismissive, or other abusive language.</p> <p>Instructor minimizes students' struggle with material.</p> <p>Instructor discourages student input.</p> <p>Instructor violates confidentiality by publicly revealing students with accommodations.</p> <p>Instructor ignores disruptive student behaviors.</p>	<p>Instructor consistently uses verbal and body language that is responsive to students' stress or anxiety.</p> <p>Instructor encourages student participation.</p> <p>Instructor treats all students equitably.</p> <p>Instructor is responsive to students' different educational backgrounds and learning needs.</p>	<p>Instructor has established classroom norms that foster a positive and inclusive environment.</p> <p>Instructor encourages interaction between students.</p>	<p>Instructor uses practices that increase students' motivation and foster a growth mindset.</p>
9	Effectiveness of student advising, if appropriate	<p>Instructor ignores clear signs that the student may need extra support.</p> <p>Instructor fails to refer the student to pertinent University or community resources.</p>	<p>Instructor is a good source person who listens to problems.</p> <p>Instructor is able to give accurate information and referrals.</p>	<p>Instructor facilitates professional growth and maturity.</p> <p>Instructor effectively discusses the student's long-range goals.</p>	<p>Instructor anticipates student needs.</p> <p>Instructor is genuinely concerned with the student's welfare.</p>
10	Other factors relating to performance as an instructor, if appropriate	<u>Comments:</u>			