DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 087 TM 800 084

AUTHOR Wergin, Jon F.: And Others
TITLE Southern Regional Education Board Faculty Evaluation Project: Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [79]
NOTE 36p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Administration: *College Faculty: Evaluation Criteria: Evaluation Methods: Evaluators: Faculty College Relationship: Faculty Development: *Faculty Evaluation: Higher Education: *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Southern Regional Education Board

ABSTRACT

A summary is presented of an intensive assessment of the impact of a two-year effort to assist 30 colleges and universities to improve their faculty evaluation procedures. The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), supported by a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, worked closely with teams of faculty and administrators in workshop and consultation settings to help them design evaluation approaches which were more comprehensive and systematic. The vast majority of the institutions made significant progress toward accomplishing their goals. In general, institutions with the most ambitious goals made the greatest progress. Seven characteristics, most notably support and involvement by top-level administrators, influenced the progress and probability of lasting impact. Full and extensive faculty involvement also proved essential. Certain project activities, in particular the campus visits by project-sponsored consultants, proved significantly helpful. Participants learned several things about the politics of change, as well as about faculty evalution. A regional, interinstitutional approach provided valuable stimulation and access to expert knowledge. (Author/CTM)

Southern Regional Education Board

Faculty Evaluation Project

Final Evaluation Report

Prepared by:

Jon F. Wergin
Virginia Commonwealth University

Al Smith
University of Florida

George E. Rolle
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This report is a summative evaluation of the Faculty Evaluation Project administered by the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) with grant support from the Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). It has been prepared by the project's three-member evaluation team, and is presented in three parts: 1) a description of the overall design and data collection procedures employed; 2) a summary of the evaluation findings; and 3) conclusions reached about the success of faculty evaluation strategies in general, and project impacts in particular.

PART I: EVALUATION DESIGN

Early in the project (August, 1977), the evaluation team completed a comprehensive design for formative and summative evaluation of the project. As a result of lengthy team deliberations, and extensive discussion with SREB staff, a list of ten major criterion areas eventually emerged. Taken together, these evaluation questions provided a focus for the project assessment reported here. The ten criterion areas are couched in terms of the following questions.

1. Has progress been made toward an improved faculty evaluation system? What have been the chief positive and negative influences?
2. To what extent have project goals been achieved? How have expectations changed? What have been the major surprises?
3. Who has been involved in the project? What has been the nature of their involvement?
4. How useful is the "team approach" in this kind of endeavor? How are team members viewed on campus?

5. How has SREB helped or hindered progress? Where would the institution be <u>without</u> participation in the project?
6. Are there any project "spinoffs" on campus (e.g., faculty development activities, contacts with other schools, increased campus visibility)?
7. What is the campus "mood" with regard to faculty evaluation? By what factions are these feelings held? What accounts for them?
8. What is the likelihood of permanent changes in faculty evaluation procedures? What has to happen to insure such changes?
9. What has been learned about faculty evaluation? Its relationship to faculty development? To student learning?
10. Have FIPSE's and SREB's investments been worthwhile overall?

In order to answer these questions, evaluative data were needed from a variety of sources. Specifically, the evaluation design called for the following:

1. Evaluation of each project activity (conferences, consultation visits, etc.) by participants, to determine how well the activity accomplished its objectives;
2. Development of a "portfolio" by team members at each institution, containing all relevant documentation relating to progress toward institutional (and project) goals;
3. Data collected by evaluation team members themselves: conference evaluations, interviews with project team members, SREB staff visits to participating institutions, and evaluation site visit reports; and
4. Interim and final progress reports from each institution in the project.

During the course of the project, the evaluation team has been intricately involved (on a rotating basis) in the evaluation of each project activity, and has provided routine feedback through reports to SREB staff. In addition, members of the evaluation team have maintained an on-going, informal contact with SREB staff and have met with the project Task Force (once each year) to provide formative and summative information on the project.

Data Collection Instruments

Semi-annual workshops. On a rotating basis, two members of the evaluation team attended each of the project-sponsored workshops. Attendance at these meetings allowed the evaluation team to observe the level of interest generated in the project, to report the nature and scope of evaluation activities to project participants, and to assess the relevance of workshop materials and activities. An evaluation form was developed by the evaluation team to assess the effectiveness of these workshops.

Interviews with representatives from participating institutions. In conjunction with the semi-annual workshops, the evaluation team conducted interviews with a representative ("contact person") from each participating institution during the second year of the project. An interview schedule was developed by the evaluation team and interview reports were shared with SREB staff.

Evaluation of consultant visits. Following each visit by an SREB-sponsored consultant to one of the 30 project schools, both the consultant and campus team members completed an evaluation form. The consultant was asked to indicate and rate accomplishment of personal objectives, note critical events, and evaluate

the team's progress. Team members were asked to indicate and rate accomplishment of their objectives, note critical events, and rate the consultant's skills and helpfulness.

Samples of evaluation forms used to collect all of the above data are provided in the Appendix.

Site visits. During the final months of the project, the evaluation team conducted site visits at 15 institutions. Each evaluator visited five colleges. Since stratified random sampling procedures were employed, the institutions selected were diverse, not only in size and location, but also in the types of faculty evaluation procedures undergoing development. The table below shows some of this diversity.

Institution	Public	Private	Total
Two-year	4	1	5
Baccalaureate	2	1	3
Masters	2	2	4
Doctoral	3	0	3
TOTAL	11	4	15

The purposes of these site visits were to get a first-hand view of projects on campus and to discuss project activities with administrators, project team members, faculty leaders, and other faculty members.

The campus visits lasted one day each. In preparation for each visit the evaluator read the college's portfolio supplied by SREB. These portfolios contained the following pieces of information: 1) institutional background information, including the nature of the institution's faculty evaluation

policies and procedures prior to the Faculty Evaluation Project, 2) consultant and workshop evaluations by the campus team members and the consultants, 3) progress reports, and 4) information on other critical events and activities that had occurred throughout the project. The evaluator's actual on-site activity consisted of a series of interviews, including in most cases conversations with each of the following:

The SREB campus team
The chief academic officer
The president or chancellor
A group of three or four faculty leaders (e.g., Faculty Senate President, Chairman of Promotion and Tenure Committee, Union President, etc.)
A group of four or five faculty members representing "opinion leaders" among the faculty but unconnected with the project.

In order to permit attention to significant interinstitutional differences, no standard form was developed in advance for use with each interview. Questions relating to each of the ten major criterion areas were asked throughout the day, however, and site visit reports followed a format consistent with these criteria. Site visit reports were shared with the on-campus team leaders for their reaction and correction of factual errors. In the few cases where a dispute over interpretation arose, further discussion occurred between the evaluator and the campus team in an attempt to resolve their differences.

Preparation of Final Evaluation Report

Prior to the evaluation team's final meeting in April, 1979, each evaluation team member reviewed five additional SREB portfolios on colleges that had not been selected for evaluation site visits. This meant that each evaluator had a fairly good grasp of the impact of the project on ten different colleges when the team met to prepare this summative evaluation. (In addition to reviewing

each college's portfolio prior to the April meeting, the evaluation team reviewed summaries of the interviews that were held during the July 1978 and January 1979 workshops.)

By the time of the April 1979 meeting, the evaluation team as a whole was very familiar with the nature and extent of activity on each of the 30 project college campuses. In that April meeting, the evaluation team 1) reviewed its perceptions of the impact of the project at each college with SREB staff, 2) developed a two or three sentence statement describing progress and goal achievement at each college, 3) identified the major positive and negative influences for constructive change on each campus, 4) reviewed SREB's role in the project, and 5) identified colleges that had already achieved some permanence (implemented new policies and/or procedures in 1978-79), colleges where permanent changes in faculty evaluation policies and procedures appeared likely in another year or two, and colleges where change in the foreseeable future seemed unlikely. The evaluation results and conclusions presented in the next two sections are based on these discussions.

PART II

RESULTS

Evaluation findings are reported here in five parts: a) progress and goal achievement; b) prospects for permanent impact of new or revised faculty evaluation procedures on campus; c) major factors responsible for progress (or lack thereof); d) the role and influence of SREB; and e) lessons learned by the 30 colleges as a function of project participation. These five areas represent a distillation of the ten major criterion categories employed in the overall project evaluation plan.

Progress and Goal Achievement

The 30 participating institutions developed a wide variety of goals, dependent in large measure upon the status of their faculty evaluation program at the beginning of the project. In general, institutional goals for faculty evaluation fell into three categories. Fifteen institutions had the ambitious goal of developing a new comprehensive faculty evaluation system from scratch. Nine others, who had already adopted systematic procedures in some form, planned to modify or "fine tune" their current system. Finally, six colleges aimed to review and assess the status quo, increase communication about faculty evaluation within the campus community, and develop more consistent policies and procedures. The larger institutions in the project tended to be among the schools in this final category.

a. Of the fifteen institutions attempting to develop comprehensive systems, progress has been variable. Five have accomplished their goals in full: i.e., a new system has been developed, field tested, approved, and readied for full implementation. Four have developed a new system that is currently being pilot-tested; four have developed parts

of a system (such as a new student rating form); and two have not progressed far beyond preliminary data collection, such as faculty surveys and interviews.

b. Of the nine institutions aiming to "fine tune" their current procedures, significant progress has been made in all but one, although along somewhat different lines. In several of these schools the main focus of attention has been the development of a revised student rating form; others have concentrated on tying their system more closely to faculty development; still others have used the time to study and pilot test their procedures and gain greater faculty acceptance for the system. The one school in this group demonstrating a notable lack of progress has suffered from poor communication between faculty and the administration, resulting in suspicion about how the results are to be used.

c. In the six institutions focusing on review of policy, variable progress has been made. As previously noted, these tended to be the larger schools; only one is a community college, one is a masters-level institution, and all the rest are universities. Thus, the development of more consistent policies and adoption of more standardized campus-wide instruments is a more ambitious task than may at first appear. One of the universities conducted an exhaustive survey of faculty and administrators resulting in major policy changes; at another, a proposed plan for evaluation is currently being considered by the faculty and a new student rating instrument has been adopted by five of its six schools; at another, unionized institution, a new promotion and tenure statement has been proposed; and two schools (including the junior college) have developed new student rating forms. At the sixth institution the project team has played a very low-key role by consulting with individual departments, with little observable impact.

In summary, then, with a few exceptions, the institutional teams have made significant progress toward accomplishing their original goals. This progress has perhaps been

most impressive in those colleges in the first group who started from "ground zero": for five of fifteen schools to have developed and implemented a brand new comprehensive system of faculty evaluation in less than eighteen months' time, and for all but two of the other ten to have made significant inroads during this period is a significant accomplishment by any standard. Further, there are major successes in both of the other two groups as well. Overall, across the 30 project institutions, observable progress toward goal accomplishment is visible and observable in all but four.

Prospects for Permanent Impact

Despite this impressive record of progress, a tougher question must be raised: viz., how likely is it that the project teams' activity will result in permanent changes in faculty evaluation procedures? The correspondence between short- and long-term change is not perfect; particularly in an area as highly-politicized as faculty evaluation, risk is high that, for one reason or another, success may be short-lived. The evaluation team therefore analyzed each of the 30 institutions, searched for evidence of permanence and sorted them into three categories according to their prospects for permanent impact. The categories were defined as follows. High probability institutions were those in which new policies and procedures had been developed, pilot-tested, and implemented with the full (or nearly full) support of both faculty and key administrators. Medium probability institutions displayed significant progress to the pilot-test stage, and were able to provide evidence of administrative followthrough and continued work by the team. Low probability institutions either: a) were not able to put specific proposals together by the Spring of 1979, or b) faced significant administrative or political barriers decreasing the likelihood of successful implementation. According to these criteria, 10 institutions fell into the "high" group, 15 into the "medium" group, and 5 into the "low" group. The table on the following page indicates the statistical relationship between probability of permanent impact and orginal team goals:

Team Goals	Prospects for Permanence: High	Medium	Low	Total
Develop new system	7	5	3	15
"Fine tune" current system	3	5	1	9
Develop consistent policies	0	5	1	6
Total	10	15	5	30

Chi square(X^2) = 5.50; $p < .25$

There appears to be very little relationship between the nature of teams' original expectations (goals) and their long-term prospects: one does not predict the other to a significant degree. Schools intending to develop a completely new system were just as likely to achieve a "permanent impact" status as schools with less-comprehensive goals. Another relationship worth examining is that between assessed permanence and type of institution:

Institution Type	Prospects for Permanence: High	Medium	Low	Total
Two-year	5	3	1	9
Baccalaureate	2	4	0	6
Masters	3	3	4	10
Doctoral	0	5	0	5
Total	10	15	5	30

Chi square (X^2) = 10.04; $p < .15$

Here the relationship appears somewhat stronger, although still not statistically significant. There is some tendency for the 2-year colleges to have better prospects for long-term change than other types of institutions, and for more of the "masters" institutions to be in the "low" group than might be expected. All the same, the type of institution and the nature of goals selected at that institution appear to be only weak explanatory factors, at best. Other characteristics played a much more significant role as predictors of success, as explained in the next section of this report.

Major Factors Responsible for Progress

While sifting through the evidence of progress from the 30 institutions, including reports from team members, consultants, and SREB staff, and data collected from the 15 evaluation site visits, the evaluation team looked for common themes that seemed to discriminate the most-successful from the least-successful projects. When finding a characteristic common to the "high probability" institutions, for example, "medium" or "low" institutions were examined for the lack of that characteristic. Seven such factors emerged from the analysis. Together they go a long way towards defining the elements necessary to insure successful development and implementation of faculty evaluation procedures, at least in these 30 colleges. The seven characteristics are listed and defined below, in roughly descending order of importance.

1. Active support and involvement of top-level administrators. The influence of this factor is remarkably pervasive, and in fact far outdistances all others in importance. Project institutions at which the president or academic vice-president early voiced their support, strongly communicated a sense of need for change, and actively participated in the development of the new system were, without exception, the institutions in the "high probability" group. Likewise, institutions characterized by a seemingly apathetic administration fell, again

without exception, into the "low probability" group. So pronounced was the apparent influence of this factor that even the amount of administrative support correlated almost perfectly with the degree of project success. Such support took many forms, ranging from strong presidential directives backed up by Board or Trustee resolutions, to the presence of "line" administrators as active and working members of the team. At one college, for example, the president took every opportunity at college-wide faculty meetings to indicate his full support of a new faculty evaluation system. At another institution the academic dean worked behind the scenes obtaining three years of grant support so that his administrative staff and faculty could fully explore new procedures. The devastating consequences produced by the lack of top administrative involvement is exemplified by examining one of the "low probability" schools. Here, team members conscientiously carried out their plan with remarkable enthusiasm: they drew upon SREB resources, enlisted the aid of consultants, and kept the college faculty well informed of, and involved in, their activities. Their project has suffered, however, from only half-hearted administrative support, and thus the team has faced an almost insurmountable barrier. The importance of both strong and visible administrative support cannot be overstressed.

2. Faculty involvement throughout the project. This was another characteristic of all the "high probability" institutions; at each, the team was expanded, at least temporarily, to include wider representation of the faculty; open meetings or workshops were held periodically to keep faculty informed, and team members themselves undertook a major responsibility to keep their own constituents up to date. Finally, in all the "high probability" schools, feedback from faculty members was solicited and responded to, both on a formal and informal basis. While, as noted above (point 1), faculty involvement is no guarantee of success, it clearly appears to be a necessary condition.

Indeed, several institutions were included in the "medium probability" group by the evaluators even with solid-looking plans, primarily because the level of faculty involvement had been insufficient to generate confidence that such plans would last.

3. Faculty trust in administration. This factor is, of course, suggested by a combination of factors one and two. Changes in faculty evaluation procedures were much more likely to be positively received by faculty when the administration was viewed as responsive to their interests. Such an attitude was enhanced when: a) administrators took an active listening role, and b) faculty input was incorporated into evolving plans.

4. Faculty dissatisfaction with status quo. This factor, and the one following, may not be critical to project success on campus; but they certainly give institutions having such characteristics a useful push forward. Faculty dissatisfaction with previous evaluation procedures - due primarily to perceived invalidity or unfairness - helped ward off apathy and the usual organizational resistance to change. This factor proved most important in those institutions attempting to "fine-tune" an intact system; in contrast, the lack of this characteristic was often a barrier in those colleges attempting to develop something new.

5. Historical acceptance of faculty evaluation. One reason, perhaps, why the community colleges generally had an easier time establishing comprehensive evaluation procedures was that they usually did not have to deal with the "why evaluate?" question. Such expectations are clearly understood at the time of a faculty member's appointment. In a similar vein, community colleges also tend to be the newest institutions, and thus have not built up academic and faculty traditions to the extent of other institutions. An atmosphere of openness and trust in organizational change is easier to cultivate.

6. Presence of an institutional statement covering the philosophy and uses of evaluation. Many of the projects having serious problems were not operating under a clear sense of purpose for an evaluation system. At other places, the formulation of such a policy statement appeared to be an event critical to significant progress. At one institution, for example, clear progress was possible only when procedures for evaluation for improvement purposes ("formative") were sharply separated from procedures covering promotion and tenure ("summative"). At another, the implementation of a proposed new "formative" system was delayed by pressures to use the system for "summative" purposes.

7. Degree of centralized institutional decision making. This point is fairly self-explanatory. Consistent policies and procedures were considerably harder to develop in colleges characterized by decentralized decision making authority (i.e., a concentration of power at the dean and department chairman level).

For the purpose of this project, the above may be considered to be a list of "readiness factors." Colleges fortunate enough to have most or all of these factors stood to gain the most from SREB project involvement, and were able to use project resources to their best advantage. SREB's role in facilitating development of systematic faculty evaluation procedures is assessed in the following secton.

Role of SREB

There is little doubt that SREB played a pivotal role in facilitating accomplishment of institutional objectives. The vast majority of individual project teams pointed to SREB as a helpful and critical agent; the most often-mentioned comment was, "We couldn't have come as far as we have without SREB involvement." There were scattered dissenting voices, one for example from a college with an already-developed system, where the team leader complained about the inappropriateness of conference topics; but such comments were few and far between.

In a sense, the most important SREB role was also the least substantive. That is, the mere fact of participation in a multi-institution project of this sort seemed to "spotlight" the importance of faculty evaluation on campus, publicize it as an issue, and elevate it to a top-priority status. The existence of a two-year project punctuated by periodic conferences helped provide a structure, with goals, activities, and milestones. Resultant deadlines helped keep project teams on track. Perhaps most important, project participation allowed institutions to take the time to develop a rational structure for development and implementation; in several cases, in fact, participation forestalled hasty responses to external pressure from Boards of Trustees or system administrations.

SREB impact was not entirely symbolic, however. Two important components of the project - conferences and campus consultants - each had substantial effects. The primary value of the three project workshops was the opportunity they afforded campus teams to work intensively together with a minimum of distraction, drawing upon SREB resources as needed. Interestingly, the actual content of the workshops as provided in the formal sessions seemed most valuable to the teams as a means of identifying possible consultants for later use. One other important effect of the woskshops should be noted. Many times team members expressed a feeling of relief and greater self-confidence as a result of interacting with people from other institutions, finding that others shared their problems. An implicit goal of the workshops was to allow project institutions to share ideas and strategies with one another, and this did not happen to a great extent; most teams preferred to work individually, with occasional interaction with workshop staff and commiseration with colleagues in other institutions.

The effect of consultant visits to project campuses was much more tangible. In a remarkable number of cases, consultant visits proved to be critical, even watershed, events, and were almost universally praised by campus teams. Consultants played a

variety of roles, all significant. Sometimes they addressed the faculty as disinterested outsiders, softening opposition and resistance to change; sometimes they worked with department heads and other administrators, training them to use new procedures; but most often they concentrated their efforts on work sessions with the team itself, helping to define options and focus attention on fundamental issues, such as distinctions between "formative" and "summative" evaluation and the importance of system flexibility. In many cases consultants also helped the teams anticipate problems they were likely to encounter - such as logistical arrangements for a standardized student rating form - before such problems created delays and frustration.

In looking at the overall impact of SREB across the 30 institutions, the evaluation team concluded that at least some of the ten "high probability" schools would probably have made significant progress anyway, without SREB involvement: their strengths in the seven major "readiness" factors alone would likely have carried them through. (Even in these institutions, critical events orchestrated by SREB consultants helped make their work more efficient and productive, however). SREB probably had the greatest impact in those schools building new comprehensive systems. As suggested earlier, these institutions tended to make the most progress, and the evidence indicates that the most successful of these utilized SREB resources to the fullest.

Lessons Learned

Statements made by campus team members in various self reports during the project and during interviews with evaluators revealed that project participants have learned a great deal in the past two years of work, not only about the mechanics of faculty evaluation systems but also about the process of institutional change. Their comments have been clustered into six general them areas.

1. By far the most frequent comment made by team members was how <u>time consuming</u> the whole process turned out to be. The implication is that participants discovered how major projects such as these require not only a great deal of effort, but also considerable patience. Other related comments were learnings about the importance of timing (i.e., fitting the strategy to the institutional climate), and the value of "caution." These statements all reinforce the emphasis SREB has given to rational planning, although perhaps more attention could have been paid in the workshops to the value of small but steady incremental progress.

2. Another class of team comments revolved around what team members had learned about their own faculties. In many cases these dealt with certain myths about faculty attitudes that were later proven false. All of the following implicit hypotheses about faculty attitudes were later <u>disproved</u> on at least two campuses: a) faculty members prefer to evaluate one another (versus having the chairman evaluate them); b) faculty members are basically antagonistic to any form of evaluation; and c) faculty members are generally well aware of the system currently used at their institution. At the same time, other implicit hypotheses were later supported, such as the need for perceived personal impact as a prerequisite for faculty support, and a generally high faculty interest in (if not support of) student ratings of instruction.

3. Another whole class of learnings dealt with the politics of organizational change. Taken as a group, these statements help reinforce the need for working within the institution's political system. a) "One to one" communication with influential faculty members is critical to generating widespread support. b) Faculty evaluation is easier with a genuine administrative commitment. c) Faculty members must share a sense of need for change. d) Seemingly simple alterations in instruments or documents may make a significant psychological difference to the individual being evaluated. e) While faculty tend to be more interested and acceptant of faculty evaluation after some experience with it, they are often reluctant to consider

other viewpoints once they've invested their time. f) The status (both formal and informal) of team members is just as important as their representatives of the campus community. g) Faculty evaluation won't work if it is simply imposed from the "top down"; faculty involvement is critical.

4. Several statements referred to connection between faculty evaluation and development, and connections to student learning. Most common was a comment recognizing the importance of tying these concepts together, but expressing frustration that: a) faculty development programs are difficult to implement without outside funds; and b) relationships to student learning are extremely difficult to document and measure.

5. A fifth cluster of comments contained observations relating to problems of instrumentation, primarily that team members realized the limitations of quantitative measurement in some areas, and the difficulty of achieving a consensus on proper weights assigned to evaluative criteria.

6. The final cluster of statements - second in frequency only to those dealing with time demands - dealt with learnings about implementation and management of evaluation systems. Several teams noted some surprise that implementation of procedures proved to be a more difficult task than the design of such procedures. Others noted the importance of the chairman's role in evaluation and the need for chairman training in this area, the need for continued attention to the distinction between "formative" and "summative" purposes for collecting evaluation data, and the need for frequent reassessment and evaluation of the new procedures.

Summary

The vast majority of project schools (26 out of 30) have made significant progress toward accomplishment of their original goals. In general, institutions with the most ambitious objectives (such as building an entirely new evaluation system) displayed the greatest progress. Ten of the 30 individual projects were judged to have a "high probability" of long range impact, fifteen others fell into a "moderate probability" category, and five were judged to have only a "low probability" of long term success. Prospects for impact appeared only slightly related to the type of institution and the nature of team goals; seven other characteristics, headed by the level of support and involvement by top-level administrators, displayed much stronger relationships. The role of SREB as a facilitator of institutional team goals was highly significant. While much of SREB's impact was symbolic (i.e., "spotlighting" faculty evaluation on campus and creating a structure for team members), specific project activities - especially campus visits by SREB-sponsored consultants - provided needed input. Finally, project participants appeared to learn a great deal, not only about faculty evaluation, but also about the politics of change in higher education.

PART III - GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Data gathered by the evaluation team have suggested a number of conclusions, related not only to the success of the SREB Faculty Evaluation Project, but also to the probable success of similar efforts in other settings. Five such conclusions have emerged from the analysis.

1. In order for <u>any</u> faculty evaluation scheme to work, four major conditions must be present. These conditions were found in all ten of the institutions having the highest probability of permanent project impact, and were generally lacking in the less-successful institutions:

a. Strong administrative support either from the institution's president or chief academic officer is absolutely necessary if a college faculty, administrative staff, or board hopes to make changes in this area. Where top-level administrative support exists, faculty evaluation enjoys a high priority, time is freed up to deal with it, and there appears to be a greater congruence between actual and perceived faculty reward structures. In contrast, lack of administrative support is related to complaints about "lack of time" and faculty grumblings about "academic bureaucracies" and "administrators' hidden motives." This is probably the single most important factor in the entire development and implementation process.

b. Full and extensive faculty involvement is essential. Faculty members must feel that the system is theirs and that they have had some part in its design. Such involvement may be achieved in a variety of ways: expansion of on-campus teams, frequent discussion in division or department meetings, open forums, and pilot tests of new systems with the total faculty participating.

c. There must be a base of expertise that the faculty and administration can draw upon in developing or revising their system. This expertise can come from a variety of sources, both internal and external to the institution. External resources in the form of consultants play a key role; the most successful institutions were those at which team members were able to specify how a consultant could best complement their own strengths.

d. Finally, a generally recognized need for change in the faculty evaluation system must exist on campus. In general, this meant the presence of an unpopular system at the beginning of the project. Faculty members must feel they have something to gain by change; at institutions where faculty members seemed apathetic or complacent, project teams generally had trouble getting started.

2. The kind of regional, interinstitutional approach used by SREB in this project warrants consideration as a model for dealing with other major issues in higher education. Twenty-six of 30 project teams demonstrated significant progress in eighteen month's time, and 25 of these showed at least a moderate prognosis for permanent impact. A regionally-coordinated effort, with its conferences, deadlines, and reports, provides invaluable outside stimuli to the institution, and helps to elevate the status of project activities on campus. This appeared to be true even of the participating institutions who would likely have made significant progress without SREB's help.

SREB staff members made important contributions, and were critical to the success of the project as a whole. They communicated frequently with participating colleges and their campus team leaders. They planned and implemented workshops for team members from all 30 schools, and gave them an opportunity to

work together and get to know one another. They helped colleges select consultants, while serving as informal consultants and catalysts themselves. In short, they kept things moving.

3. Another important conclusion inferred from the evaluation data is that no one faculty evaluation system is necessarily better than any other. There was a tremendous diversity of culture, tradition, and norms among the 30 project schools, and clearly, what worked at one institution (faculty growth contracts, for example), would not have worked at another. Campus team members seemed sensitive to this fact, and there were few, if any, attempts to borrow whole systems from other institutions. Rather, the sharing which took place during the regional conferences tended to be a sharing of common problems and occasionally, specific instruments. Successful systems were developed from within, not imported from somewhere else.

4. Most of the participating colleges appear to have made a direct and visible tie between faculty evaluation and faculty development. The ties took many forms: career development plans, new grant proposals for faculty development funds, plans for new or upgraded faculty development offices, and so forth. Many professionals in the field of faculty development and evaluation have taken the position that development and evaluation programs ought to be kept separate. Observations derived from the project schools, however, suggest that such a separation may not be necessary and may even hinder the successful revision of an institution's faculty evaluation program. Often the successful acceptance of a new or revised faculty evaluation system appeared to be enhanced by an administrative commitment to do more in faculty development.

5. Most project participants voiced an appreciation of the logical connection between faculty evaluation and student learning. But in only one

institution was an attempt made (even on a small scale) to study the relationship empirically. The 30 participating colleges recieved very little assistance from SREB in attempting to make this connection. Not many colleges had reached the point of even considering student learning seriously as a means of measuring teaching effectiveness. Those few that had were unable to move further.

In summary, the Faculty Evaluation Project has demonstrated that significant results are achievable with a regional, multi-institutional approach at a reasonably low cost, if four characteristics (administrative support, faculty involvement, base of expertise, and recognized need for change) are present in the individual institutions. Without these characteristics, prospects for success are low, no matter what SREB does; but if these characteristics are sufficiently strong, participation in a multi-institutional project like this one has a great deal to offer.

Southern Regional Education Board
Faculty Evaluation Project

TEAM'S EVALUATION OF CONSULTING VISIT

The purpose of this form is to give your team an opportunity to convey to the SREB staff and your consultant your reactions to and constructive criticism of the consultant's work with you. It is intended that the completed form represent the concensus of the team. Please complete and mail this form in to William O'Connell, Director, Faculty Evaluation Project, Southern Regional Education Board, 130 Sixth Street, N.W., Atlanta, GA 30313, no later than two weeks after your consultant's visit.

Part I - General Background Information

1. Name of your College _____

2. Name of your Consultant _____

3. Dates of the Consultant's Visit _____

Part II - Your Objectives

Directions: Please list the objectives you had for inviting a consultant to your campus and then indicate the extent to which these objectives were met.

Response Key: (Circle appropriate response for each objective.)

1 = Not Met 2 = Partially Met 3 = Largely Met 4 = Fully Met

Statement of Your Objective(s)

1. _____	1	2	3	4
2. _____	1	2	3	4
3. _____	1	2	3	4
4. _____	1	2	3	4

Comments or Additional Objectives:

(Continued on Back)

Part III - Critical Events during Consultant's Visit

Directions: Please describe any critical events that occurred during the consultant's visit and indicate whether they helped or hindered the accomplishment of the above objectives.

Part IV - Anticipated Outcomes

Directions: List below the outcomes you think can be expected as a result of this consultation visit.

Part V - Overall Evaluation of Consultant

Directions: Please evaluate the following characteristics of your consultant.

Response Key: x = Unable to Judge; 1 = Very Poor; 2 = Poor; 3 = Average or Fair; 4 = Very Good; 5 = Excellent

1. Effective interpersonal skills	x	1	2	3	4	5
2. Knowledge of the field of Faculty Evaluation	x	1	2	3	4	5
3. Knowledge of the field of Faculty Development	x	1	2	3	4	5
4. Knowledge of the field of Higher Education	x	1	2	3	4	5
5. Problem solving skills	x	1	2	3	4	5
6. Helpfulness to our team	x	1	2	3	4	5
7. Knowledge of our institution	x	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:

Part VI - General Comments

Directions: Please use this section to give us any additional comments, suggestions, or observations about your consultant's visit or how this Faculty Evaluation Project could be more successful.

SIGNATURES OF TEAM MEMBERS: _____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for your assistance in completing this evaluation form. Your assistance is deeply appreciated. Please make a copy of this completed form for your files (evaluation portfolio) and then return the form within two weeks after your consultant's visit to: William O'Connell, Director, Faculty Evaluation Project, Southern Regional Education Board, 130 Sixth Street, N.W., Atlanta, GA 30313.

Southern Regional Education Board
Faculty Evaluation Project

CONSULTANT'S EVALUATION OF CONSULTATION AND TEAM PROGRESS

The purpose of this form is to give you an opportunity to convey to the SREB staff and to the project team your reactions to and constructive criticism of the team's work with you. Please complete and mail this form to William O'Connell, Director, Faculty Evaluation Project, Southern Regional Education Board, 130 Sixth Street, N.W., Atlanta, Georgia, 30313, no later than two weeks after your consulting visit.

Part I - General Background Information

1. Your Name _____

2. Name of College Visited _____

3. Dates of Consultation Visit _____

Part II - Your Objectives

Directions: Please list the objectives you had for your consultation visit and then indicate the extent to which these objectives were met.

Response Key: (Circle appropriate response for each objective.)

1 = Not Met 2 = Partially Met 3 = Largely Met 4 = Fully Met

Statement of Your Objective(s)

1. _____
_____ 1 2 3 4

2. _____
_____ 1 2 3 4

3. _____
_____ 1 2 3 4

Comments or Additional Objectives:

(Continued on Back)

Part III - Critical Events

Directions: Please list below any critical events that occurred either prior to or during your visit and indicate whether they helped or hindered the accomplishment of the above objectives.

Part IV - Anticipated Outcomes as a Result of Your Visit

Directions: List below the anticipated outcomes you think can be expected as a result of your work with this college and its project team.

Part V - Perceived Resources and Strengths/Barriers and Weaknesses

Directions: Please describe briefly any resources or strengths you perceive to be helpful in this team's progress to date. Also, similarly describe any perceived barriers or weaknesses that may be hindering progress.

(Continued on Back)

Part VI - Your Evaluation of Team

Directions: Please evaluate the team you worked with on the following items:

Response Key: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Average or Fair; 2 = Poor; 1 = Very Poor; x = Unable to Judge

1.	Team's progress to date	x	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Cohesiveness of the team	x	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Level of communication among team members	x	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Quality of interpersonal relationships on the team	x	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Team's skill in knowing how to use a consultant	x	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Quality of planning for consultant's visit	x	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Use of consultant's time while on campus	x	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Team's ability to set objectives	x	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Chances that this team will effect significant changes in the faculty evaluation system at their college	x	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Team's ability to assess its own progress	x	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:

Part VII - General Comments

Directions: Please use this section to give us any other additional comments, suggestions or observations about your consulting visit or about how we could make this Faculty Evaluation Project more successful.

_____ Date _____
Consultant's signature

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE IN COMPLETING THIS EVALUATION FORM. YOUR ASSISTANCE IS DEEPLY APPRECIATED. Please return this completed form within two weeks after your visit to: William O'Connell, Director, Faculty Evaluation Project, Southern Regional Education Board, 130 Sixth St., NW, Atlanta, GA 30313.

(sample form from one of three workshops)

WORKSHOP FORM A

Name of Institution

_____

SREB FACULTY EVALUATION PROJECT WORKSHOP --- JANUARY 22-24, 1979

EVALUATION FORM

The purpose of this form is to give each participant an opportunity to convey to the workshop staff and project evaluators his or her reactions to the final project workshop. Please leave your completed form with an SREB staff member before leaving the meeting.

Part I - Your Objectives
(To be Partially Completed During the First Workshop Session)

Directions: We are interested in knowing of your specific objectives for this workshop. Please list your objectives at the beginning of the workshop, and then at the end of the workshop rate how well these objectives were met.

Response Key: (Circle appropriate response for each objective)

1 = Not Met 2 = Partially Met 3 = Largely Met 4 = Fully Met

Statement of your Objective(s)

1. _____

_____ 1 2 3 4

2. _____

_____ 1 2 3 4

3. _____

_____ 1 2 3 4

Comments or Additional Objectives:

(continued on back)

Part II - Workshop Objectives

Directions: Please indicate how well you think the following workshop objectives were met, using the same response categories as above (1=Not met; 4=Fully met).

1.	Team assessed its progress to date	1	2	3	4
2.	Team identified problems/barriers and solutions to same	1	2	3	4
3.	Team refined its plans for improving faculty evaluation	1	2	3	4
4.	Team made effective use of resource consultant(s) at the workshop	1	2	3	4
5.	Team defined procedures for gaining final acceptance of new or revised evaluation system, and for implementing new/revised system	1	2	3	4
6.	Team gave attention to maintaining momentum and continuing progress beyond June 30, 1979	1	2	3	4
7.	Team/individuals had helpful interaction with workshop participants from other institutions	1	2	3	4

If so, from which institutions?

_____

Comments:

Part III - Evaluation of Resources

Directions: Please indicate your overall rating of each of the following items:

Response Key: 1 = Of No Help; 2 = Of Little Help; 3 = Helpful; 4 = Very Helpful

1.	Resource consultants	1	2	3	4
2.	Workshop resource center (display materials, message center, contact point)	1	2	3	4
3.	SREB staff (as conference facilitators)	1	2	3	4

Comments:

Part IV - Conference Sessions

1. Which workshop session(s) or activity(ies) did you find the most useful? Why?

2. Which session(s) or activity(ies) did you find to be least useful? Why?

Comments:

Part V - Evaluation of Workshop Format and Arrangements

Directions: In order to help us in the planning of future workshops like this one, please indicate your evaluation of the following aspects of the workshop.

Response Key:

X = Unable to judge 1 = Poor 2 = Fair 3 = Very Good 4 = Excellent

1. Workshop location	X	1	2	3	4
2. Food services	X	1	2	3	4
3. Workshop physical facilities	X	1	2	3	4
4. Workshop schedule/agenda	X	1	2	3	4

Comments:

Please use the back of this page for additional comments on any aspect of the workshop and/or project format and approach. Thank you.