

Assembly for the opportunity to speak.
--

ACTION APPROVAL OF AGENDA MS. CECILIA STAFFORD

DISCUSSION	
------------	--

As quorum had been achieved, faculty members agreed to approve the agenda with Dr. Mingus's action items added. This was added after the UNM-G Faculty Senator election.

I move to approve the agenda as amended for today's February 15th, 2019 UNMG Faculty Assembly meeting.

Motion: Bruce Gjeltema

Seconded: Yes

Discussion: No further discussion was undertaken.

Voice Vote: Unanimously approved as amended

Motion Carried: Yes

ACTION APPROVAL OF MINUTES MS. CECILIA STAFFORD

DISCUSSION	
------------	--

I move to approve the corrected minutes from the January 18th, 2019 UNMG Faculty Assembly meeting.

Motion: Matt Mingus

Seconded: Yes

Discussion: None

Voice Vote: Unanimously approved

Motion Carried: Yes

INFORMATION FACULTY ASSEMBLY MS. CECILIA STAFFORD
PRESIDENT'S REPORT

--	--

Faculty Assembly President Cecilia Stafford reported on the following:

Ms. Stafford thanked the Nominations Committee for their quick creation of a slate of Senator candidates. The slate included one candidate and would be voted on later.

She also reminded the faculty that this committee will put together the slate for next year's Ops and Nominations Committees, as well as the elected officers. They will assemble the slate by March 22nd, given that we are having electronic elections. Faculty will receive a unique link to vote for candidates of their choice between March 22nd and the April Assembly meeting. Ms. Stafford will speak with an IT specialist in the elections software to make sure that everything can be set up correctly, and the Nominations Committee will create the slate and receive the results. Ms. Stafford asked the faculty to please consider running for one of the elected committees and/or positions.

The Faculty Assembly will have a conversation about division reorganization today, but will not hold the vote until March. There is also a Strategic Planning Working Draft on the website that faculty can consult. Comments on the draft should be sent to the Dean of Instruction and Dr. Malm.

Ms. Stafford has been attending Open Office Hours with the executive team for the last few weeks. Some

issues that have arisen, including traffic safety in parking lots, congestion, and the cold weather driving conditions, will be submitted to the Safety Advisory Group. The Dean will name the members of this group.

Ms. Stafford opened the floor for questions, and received one about the changed date of March's Assembly meeting; she explained that it had been moved to the 22nd to avoid conflict with Spring Break. Ms. Stafford then turned the floor over to the Dean of Instruction, Dr. Daniel Primozic.

INFORMATION	DEAN OF INSTRUCTION'S REPORT	DEAN DR. DANIEL PRIMOZIC
	<p>Dean Primozic spoke about the Safety Advisory Group. There are three members on it: an administrator, a staff senate representative, and a faculty member. These are Mark Remillard, Marilee Petranovich, and Dr. Carmela Lanza. This group will help Robert Griego and the police learn about safety issues on campus. Mark Remillard will probably be the chair.</p> <p>The Dean announced that our numbers in enrollment are slightly up, about 3% or so, but said that Director McMahon of Student Services would give us more detail in her report. The schedule planning will start soon for summer and fall. Dean Primozic will meet with the Dean of Instruction of Navajo Tech University on April 6th to discuss articulation agreements. There may be cooperation in more areas than articulation as well, perhaps in workforce development. For example, Navajo Tech has a nationally accredited engineering program, while UNM-Gallup currently does not.</p> <p>Dean Primozic reminded the faculty that the HLC will visit on March 1st and asked us to prepare for it. The HLC representative will be on campus for five hours, likely between 10:30 and 3:30, and he wants to do a tour of the campus. He also wants to speak to everyone, and if not, he would like to meet with campus representatives.</p> <p>The Dean concluded his report with a mention of possible recognition by the Charlike Morrissey Education Center on the African-American experience in NM. This would be an honor for the campus.</p> <p>The Dean opened the floor for questions, but received none. Ms. Stafford turned the floor over to Dr. James Malm, CEO of UNM-Gallup.</p>	

INFORMATION	CEO'S REPORT	DR. JAMES MALM
	<p>Dr. Malm reported that since the last Assembly meeting, he had published five weekly briefs, with 24 different stories. The Martin Luther King, Jr. Day brief has had the most hits and broadest reach since Dr. Malm has been at UNM-Gallup. It was widely shared on Facebook and has thousands of hits on the website.</p> <p>He also gave the Assembly a legislative update. The most substantial part is over. At the end of the hearings, the Chair of the House put down the lowest amount of money asked for for higher education. This is 2% in new money, 4% in compensation increase, and 2% in performance increase. This puts our campus about \$25,000 in the black. Dr. Malm plans to ask for 5% new money, 5% compensation, and 2% holdback next week for community colleges. This will affect many more two-year institutions besides UNM-Gallup itself.</p> <p>Dr. Malm also shared the good news that a new nominee for Regent is one of our own, and that she is teaching a Business/Entrepreneurship class. This will help ease our legislative way.</p>	

Gallup-McKinley County Day at the legislature is next week. There will be an information-only meeting held then; this means no votes and no decisions. They will present the draft budget, currently on the website, on that day as well. They have added a recommendation from Mr. Robert Griego, the CFO: Management Discussion and Analysis, which explains what the hundreds of indexes and the budget complexity actually mean. Right now our budget is flat, and there are no new additions or cuts. We will not be raising tuition and fees, and we expect flat enrollments. We will also not ask to raise taxes on mileage. We will not be using reserves for operations and I&G; the current plan is to use them only for five-year building plans. In other words, Dr. Malm concluded, we are much better off than last year.

There is a new shared governance body, the Staff Senate, and he will make the same presentation to them. The by-laws have come through legal in Albuquerque, and the CEO will report to them as well on a regular basis.

Dr. Malm will also present the Strategic Plan Refresh to Student Senate and Staff Senate, as well as the academic administration. This will give us more input from different minds, and different deliberations and viewpoints. This is one of the means of making our mission work.

One faculty member asked whether there is a piece of legislation before the Governor and others now that would establish a line of education faculty through the College of Education for our branch. Dr. Malm replied that there are multiple pieces of legislature that might benefit UNM-Gallup if they pass; we might receive \$250,000 for an African-American art museum, for example. There was an earlier bill in December that Dr. Malm and others argued for when they met with the Provost and Deans to push through Baccalaureate degrees this summer. Main campus faculty will come to Gallup if they can get the state legislature to pay for it, but we don't know the results yet.

A discussion of the budget then began. One member of the Assembly asked how the Assembly can make meaningful and formal recommendations between now and the formal approval of the budget. Dr. Malm said that Dr. Andrew has the materials and information on the process. The Budget Review Committee will be able to talk about it this way. The materials have to be in the finance system to give Dr. Andrew and the administration a chance to discuss it. We have 30 days starting from the 14th of February. To a question as to whether this would allow formal recommendations in the March 22nd meeting of the Assembly, Dr. Malm clarified that the formal budget vote by the advisory board will be the Tuesday after Spring Break, the 19th of March. Dr. Malm will then need to present the approved budget to the Board of Regents. Faculty members who want a concise snapshot of the information can look at one particular page of the budget report out of the 10 presented. The extensive details are in the indexes. Dr. Malm's litmus test for budget items is how the dollar helps us with student success. New initiatives—equipment, buildings, hiring, etc.—are not in the budget.

Faculty members asked for more details of the process, as they would appreciate the chance to more formally and meaningfully advise the executive team in the process. For example, they asked if we could schedule the access to the budget earlier in the future. Dr. Malm said that the schedule for the budget process is late because it has to include the appropriations from Santa Fe and other tax information which does not come out before this. The state's cycle is from January 15th-March 16th. This draft, while out, is still tentative, and many people still need to look at it. The governor, for example, will be the 113th person with decision power to look at the budget. At this point, Dr. Malm said, we don't know if the budget will pass or not, or what it will look like when it does. Among other things, the census date for students has to pass, which is never until February.

Dr. Malm thinks the budget change will be net zero. He also thinks it will be best if it comes through the Budget Review Committee instead of the Assembly. We cannot change the meeting dates of the local advisory board because our local officials are not elected by UNM and the meeting dates are set. The

Faculty Assembly will have to change meeting times if we want more input into the process.

The next question was about faculty positions that might be filled, and if there was going to be any change on that front. The executive team replied that they are not keeping positions vacant to use faculty salaries as budget savings. If these positions are on the books but vacant, this is technically an old position.

Another member of the Assembly asked about creating different titles for administrative assistants to take. Dr. Malm said that that is a technical detail that the CFO and HR will have to talk about.

This ended the Assembly members' questions, so Dr. Malm finished his report. Ms. Stafford turned the floor over to Mr. Robert Griego, CFO for UNM-Gallup.

INFORMATION

CFO'S REPORT

MR. ROBERT GRIEGO

Mr. Griego wished to continue the budget discussion, as it relates to the March HLC visit. These include thinking about the findings of the Legislative Finance Committee. For example, how do our mission and vision influence the budget? The administrative team is trying to be proactive instead of reactive as they have been in the past. They want to add money to innovative programs and growing ones. Mr. Griego also wants to change the budget in the next few budget cycles. They're trying not to just adopt last year's budget, even though it is very similar. Currently, they also have a longer time before they can obtain necessary numbers because this is a 60-day legislative session rather than a 30-day one.

Mr. Griego said that he is hoping for input from faculty and staff on where the campus is going to allocate the money. Faculty can have a lot of input in their own programs, even if some expenses, such as salaries, are fixed. It is possible that we may receive new money from the state and from enrollments. Mr. Griego favors the budget being semester-by-semester or even quarterly. He would like to see more planning in the future as well.

He has given information from the prior two years along with this year's budget to Dr. Andrew, Mr. Griego said. The budget calendar could possibly be adjusted to give more time for input on the budget cycle. He stated that he believed the report already released could give everyone who read it a clear idea of the budget process, but he does want to give more details.

As for the most important information, the CFO said that there is a one-page summary, which is basically a flat budget. Spending on instruction is projected at 51% as compared to 49% in the past year. There are also charts to compare our budget to that of other community colleges.

Finally, Mr. Griego added that the Period 6 budget for December has been completed, but the information for January has been not approved by the board yet. Additional details are available for those who wish to see them.

No faculty members had questions, so Mr. Griego ended his report. Ms. Stafford then turned the floor over to Jayme McMahon, Director of Student Services.

INFORMATION

DIRECTOR OF STUDENT SERVICES' REPORT

DIRECTOR JAYME MCMAHON

Director McMahon began her report with enrollment numbers. The census report numbered our students at 2079. This is up from the census last spring by almost 7%. We have 19,475 credit hours, which is up 4% from last spring. Our numbers are still slightly down from fall of 2018, but this is normal for most colleges.

On the current-day enrollment numbers, the count is slightly different, since 12-week and eight-week courses have their own census dates. We are on day 25 of the semester. So we are now at 2100 for headcount. From day 25 of last spring, this represents an 8% increase in enrollment and a 4.5% increase in credit hours.

Director McMahon moved on to discuss the awards given in the fall, to say that data is still pending. UNM has a new certification system that is making it a little difficult, but she hopes to have the numbers by next Assembly meeting.

Graduation for this semester, Director McMahon announced, will be May 10th at 6 PM in the evening, the Friday of finals week. One faculty member asked if it would be at the same place as last year, and Director McMahon confirmed that it would indeed be the Angelo DePaolo stadium.

The campus will also soon start building the schedule for summer and fall. The common course numbering changes will be implemented, and some of the subject codes have changed. Director McMahon gave an example of one Management course that has changed to the Accounting area instead.

Director McMahon and Student Services are also working on developing an enrollment management plan. This is simply a framework. They will identify markets, territories, and pipelines for recruitment, and will try to chart the whole process, from identifying a prospective student all the way through to matching that same person to their academic advisor. They will also be training admissions staff to go through with recruitment and not just processing, and are performing needs assessments to help students through academic challenges. Student Services wants more yield rates, more communication, fewer incomplete applications, and better alignment of recruitment activities with retention planning.

Student Services also had staff development last week involving prep for the HLC visit. The training will help ensure that everyone on campus understands the fundamentals of higher education. Staying up to date with trends is important to Director McMahon.

Director McMahon also named several initiatives that she is working with university counsel on, such as grievances and appeals for students. She has met with Dr. Gjeltrema as Chair of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs. She is interested in making the process more transparent, since some titles are different from the ones in the Handbook.

There is also a concern that the student governance staff has not been vetted by the legal team or recognized by the Board of Regents. Currently, student fees have been allocated to Student Senate, but Director McMahon is reviewing those allocation processes. Those fees might also be used for projects like New Student Orientation.

Director McMahon also reported that she is working on Title IX processes and reporting options.

Faculty then began to ask questions. One asked about whether the enrollment numbers are or would be published on the website. Director McMahon replied that the Office of Institutional Analytics has its own webpage and contains enrollment numbers. These are broken down by categories such as gender and ethnicity. To a question about whether the numbers included McKinley Academy and CTE students, Director McMahon explained that they are included in the headcount but are not separated into groups of their own.

No faculty had more questions, so Director McMahon ended her presentation. Ms. Stafford turned the floor over to Dr. Bruce Gjeltrema and Dr. Tracy Lassiter.

DISCUSSION ITEM**ARTS & SCIENCES
REORGANIZATION****DR. BRUCE GJELTEMA &
DR. TRACY LASSITER**

Mr. Kee, current interim chair of the Arts & Sciences Division, asked Dr. Gjeltema and Dr. Lassiter to be on an Arts & Sciences ad hoc committee set up to look into reorganization. The committee also included Dr. John Burke and Dr. Kamala Sharma. Part of the impetus behind reorganization is to create a more equitable workload for the division chair, who currently has the largest workload among the divisions; they have to supervise more than half the full-time faculty at UNM-Gallup as well as many visiting faculty and adjunct members. The reorganization would be more equitable both with the other divisions' sizes and with the workload of division chairs at other branch campuses.

As for the process of reorganization itself, Dr. Gjeltema and Dr. Lassiter explained that the Social Sciences faculty have chosen to stay with Humanities rather than with Math and Science. As a branch campus, we also need to follow the UNM Faculty Handbook: two of the Assembly's main duties, according to the handbook, are curriculum approval and division organization. We started working on the reorganization last spring because the administration had already done it in the past without faculty input. We had separate Applied Technology and Workforce Development divisions before the administration organized it so that these two groups were combined. Following the Faculty Handbook will allow us to organize the Arts & Sciences division more effectively—it is not effective currently—and to realign the duties of the chairs with main campus and the Taos, Los Alamos, and Valencia branches.

Dr. Gjeltema and Dr. Lassiter then listed the original organization recommendations, which had input from Business & Applied Technology faculty. These recommendations are to divide the Arts and Sciences into two divisions, roughly focused on the two subject areas, and to change the meaning of the chair position so that we are more in sync with the other branch campuses.

As well as the other advantages, this may let us save some money from the compensations for chairs. The separate divisions would also offer more opportunities for faculty leadership, as there can now be new chairs and possibly assistant chairs. The vote, held among the Arts & Sciences faculty in September, was unanimous, and the recommendation was submitted to the Dean of Instruction. However, the Dean recently approached the Ops Committee and asked the Faculty Assembly to decide on a recommendation instead. Therefore, Arts & Sciences is asking for the support of the other divisions. While the vote to divide has been held, this does not preclude the other groups from offering input. The Assembly will hold their own vote on this next month.

Dr. Gjeltema and Dr. Lassiter then asked for comments from the faculty. One comment concerned the structure of Arts & Sciences, and how, since the recommendation affects the structure, that falls into the purview of the Assembly.

Another faculty member asked whether the present compensation for the chairs would stay the same or would be downgraded for the current chairs? However, as the ensuing discussion said, the Handbook says that this is an opportunity to redefine and reorganize and it is hard to do things outside that process. We can make recommendations but they may not affect the ultimate outcome for the chair paygrades.

One member stated that the past reorganization Dr. Gjeltema and Dr. Lassiter had alluded to was hard on Workforce Development. They did not receive support from the Assembly or other divisions, and the reorganization happened outside the say-so of Business & Applied Technology faculty. Partially as a result of this, as well as a perceived lack of say by the Business & Applied Technology faculty in campus-wide offices or becoming Senate representatives to Albuquerque, the faculty member felt that the Arts & Sciences division should have raised their desire to reorganize with other divisions. He also felt that Business & Applied Technology has not received support from other divisions in the matter of salary

raises and promotion, despite having the most graduating students each year.

Dr. Lassiter detailed some of the support she had given to Business & Applied Technology faculty in the matter of program reviews and promotions, and objected to the contention of no support from Arts & Sciences. Asked whether they would have wanted to be on the ad hoc committee that decided on the division split, the Business & Applied Technology faculty member agreed that they would. Dr. Gjeltrema then discussed his perception that the process is not ideal. While the divisions can initiate reorganization and the Assembly can make recommendations, the Dean of Instruction is the one who has to make some of the final decisions. The division reorganization that happened to Business & Applied Technology was decided on without faculty input.

The Business & Applied Technology member said that the Dean should have asked the faculty affected by the past reorganization what they wanted. The discussion moved on to a process of how to handle such issues in the future. One Assembly member suggested that other divisions could give their input to the Operations Committee to handle.

Discussion then ensued of how divisions should speak to each other when making decisions and where the boundaries lie of what is appropriate feedback. Some were disappointed that other divisions, in their view, had not been more supportive of the new workforce chair.

The next topic to arise was how the reorganization would leave us comparing to other branch institutions. The answer was that we would have a more even distribution of faculty, which is something that other branch campuses already have. As to whether other campuses would have the same Arts & Letters vs. Math & Science division, Dr. Gjeltrema and Dr. Lassiter replied that this was not so much a trend as a conversation that had occurred before. The changes would also more closely align our chairs with other branch campus chairs as far as teaching load and compensation. Our chairs currently have more work and being a division chair is considered administrative work instead of service, which is the opposite of how our fellow branches have tended to think of it. Chairs on main campus and in Los Alamos, Taos, and Valencia have a specific rotation period between different faculty and have SAC's rather than an addition to the salary. They are also firmly faculty, not administration, which avoids the ambiguous position that division chairs at Gallup have been historically placed in.

This ambiguous position was the next topic of discussion concerning how chairs are faculty if they are not teaching, and whether they are. More arguments in favor of the new reorganization were presented, including that rotating on a regular, clear schedule will ensure chairs' loyalty to faculty and their representation of faculty interests. It would also give more individuals work and leadership opportunities and give others a voice in choosing them. Others were more in favor of chairs remaining as a balance between administration and faculty.

DISCUSSION ITEM

TASK FORCE UPDATES

VARIOUS

Ms. Cecilia Stafford asked for Task Force updates:

Adjunct Faculty Task Force: Professors Kristi Wilson and Tara DeYoung gave the report. They reported that they are looking into finding additional workspace for adjuncts; with 11 new hires, there is not sufficient room. They also want to inquire about laptops and PC policies for the adjuncts; they need to find out if adjuncts can check out laptops or not.

Another concern of the task force is what resources are available for adjuncts who are teaching on Saturdays. Since IT and CAL are closed then, Saturday instructors cannot easily call on others for help.

DISCUSSION	
<p>The Curricula Committee put forward several forms requiring the approval of the Faculty Assembly.</p> <p>I move that we approve the deletion of the Anthropology, History, Psychology, English, and Arts Studio Concentrations.</p> <p>Motion: Matt Mingus Seconded: Yes Discussion: None Voice Vote: Unanimous Motion Carried: Yes</p> <p>I move that we pass form C's to delete the concentrations in the A.S. in Science.</p> <p>Motion: Matt Mingus Seconded: Yes Discussion: None Voice Vote: Unanimous Motion Carried: Yes</p> <p>I move that we approve the Form C to revise the A.S. to add core plus general electives in Math and Science.</p> <p>Motion: Matt Mingus Seconded: Yes Discussion: None Voice Vote: Unanimous Motion Carried: Yes</p> <p>I move that we create a certificate in General Studies.</p> <p>Motion Carried: Matt Mingus Seconded: Yes Discussion: None Voice Vote: Unanimous Motion Carried: Yes</p>	

INFORMATION	COMMITTEE REPORTS	COMMITTEE CHAIRS
DISCUSSION		
<p>President Stafford asked for committee reports:</p> <p>Senator to Albuquerque, John Burke/Tracy Lassiter: The Senate representatives announced that the main campus and the benefits office are proposing changes to our health insurance. This would change the UNM-Lobo coverage and place it under Blue Cross/Blue Shield to expand the provider network. Our monthly premiums would increase, but co-pays and out-of-pocket expenses would go down. There are PowerPoint charts available on the website that would summarize the changes. It may affect providers in our area.</p> <p>There is the possibility that someone from main campus could come to UNM-G to do a presentation on how the changes to health insurance would affect Gallup. The Senate representatives urged the Assembly</p>		

members to look over the PowerPoint charts and see if they would be interested in attending such a presentation. We can discuss this further at our March meeting.

Budget Review Committee: The committee had found it hard to make significant recommendations for the budget. They would like to tie the process in to Strategic Planning. The Budget Review Committee can either hold an emergency meeting, the Assembly members can send information to the BRC and have them put recommendation to the administration, or faculty can approach the CFO individually.

The information had not been given to the Budget Review Committee before this week despite the BRC asking for such since October. The administration had said there might be confidential information that would be difficult for the committee to review. The BRC wanted to know about the administration's choices and priorities to ask where they are putting the funding and offer pertinent input.

One faculty member asked about positions that our campus lacked, such as a grant-writer, and the committee agreed that this was one of the concerns they had wanted to have input on. To ideas about conducting thought experiments early to work on the budget left after some money has been set aside, the committee said they had tried this, but no data was available in October..

Discussion then shifted to asking about the budget early and creating a list of priorities whether we have the information or not. Presenting this information in January is a possibility. Others indicated that they believed the administration should solicit information from the Faculty Assembly, and that the Assembly and Budget Review Committee should act early and formally. The Budget Review Committee might also create its own calendar and work through this to offer input to the budget, and submit that calendar or their concerns to the advisory board and/or the division chairs. The committee also discussed having an emergency meeting.

Teaching Excellence Committee: This committee has been asked by the chair of the Online Assessment Task Force to set up training for faculty who are teaching their first online classes. The workshop will take place during development week.

Constitution and By-Laws Committee: This committee had nothing to report.

CARC Committee: Upload of assessment reports for our campus to the digital repository has just finished.

Faculty Committee on Student Affairs: This committee had no new cases, but has talked with Student Services about the grievance process, as Director McMahon had reported.

Curricula Committee: The chair reported on new certificates and program reviews being due. They will need to deal with topics courses. Only one chair has changed their programs to meet the new state requirements, so compliance with these is also an issue.

Finally, the chair announced that there will be a few gaps in the Curricula Committee and that new members would be able to join.

Library Committee: This committee plans to meet in March.

Long-Range Planning and Resource Committee: The committee has offered their working drafts of the new strategic plan and their concerns to the administration. Their committee can deal with faculty issues, but the administration needs to also take over some of the concerns. The committee does support hiring a grant-writer, and some of their initiatives overlap CAL's and Director McMahon's concerns.

DISCUSSION	OTHER BUSINESS	VARIOUS
DISCUSSION		
<p>Ms. Stafford opened the floor for comment on other business:</p> <p>A faculty member announced that Mr. Bolts, a long-time former professor at UNM-Gallup, has died. He went on to teach as an adjunct after being at UNM-G.</p> <p>The second piece of news was that UNM-Gallup has been awarded a substantial grant to generate paid research opportunities for students.</p> <p>There are also two graduates who went through the now defunct Tribal Advocacy program who have achieved success. One graduate is practicing in the Navajo Nation. Another Navajo graduate got a bachelor's degree and a Master's at the University of Tulsa.</p>		

ACTION ITEM	ADJOURNMENT
DISCUSSION	
<p>Motion to adjourn: Matt Mingus Seconded: Yes Voice vote: Unanimously approved Motion carried: Yes</p>	
<p>Meeting adjourned at 2:48 PM, by Faculty Assembly President Cecilia Stafford.</p>	
<p>Recorded by: Keri Stevenson, Faculty Assembly Secretary on February 15th, 2019.</p>	

University of New Mexico-Gallup
Online Teaching Evaluation Form

Date:

Instructor's name:

Observer's name:

Check one: Peer evaluation Administrative evaluation

Course:

Module/Lesson:

Number of students enrolled:

Part 1: Lesson description and formative feedback

1. Which Student Learning Objectives for the course were addressed in this module/lesson?
2. How did the instructor attempt to achieve them? (Video, PPT slides, Mini-lecture as a Word document, reading assignments, discussions, etc..)
3. List positive or effective aspects of the lesson.
4. List any areas in need of improvement or things the instructor should consider incorporating into future lessons.

Part 2: Summative evaluation

The categories of effective teaching listed below are integrated, utilizing the seven standards of effective teaching from the UNM Faculty Handbook, B1: Professional Activities of Faculty and Criteria for Evaluation, Section 1.2.1 Teaching.

(1) *Demonstrate effective communication skills.* (2) *Show evidence of strong preparation,* (3) *Present material that reflects the current state of knowledge in the field.* (4) *Demonstrate effective management skills.* (5) *Organize individual topics into meaningful sequence.* (6) *Demonstrate an ability to interact with students in an encouraging and simulating manner.* (7) *Demonstrate a commitment to the discipline.*

In each category below, please select **one numerical value** that best represents the degree to which the instructor *exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or does not meet expectations*. General definitions of each numerical value appear in the Legend on the following page. Please provide explanatory comments for **at least 4** of your ratings.

	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectations	Non- applicable	Comments
Pedagogical skills and strategies					
Presenting content in a logical and	8 - 7 - 6	5 - 4 - 3	2 - 1 - 0	N/A	

understandable sequence (5)					
Encouraging student participation (6)	8 - 7 - 6	5 - 4 - 3	2 - 1 - 0	N/A	
Providing feedback to students (6)	8 - 7 - 6	5 - 4 - 3	2 - 1 - 0	N/A	
Professionalism					
Knowledge of subject matter and strong commitment to the discipline (3) (7)	8 - 7 - 6	5 - 4 - 3	2 - 1 - 0	N/A	
Preparation and organization (2) (4)	8 - 7 - 6	5 - 4 - 3	2 - 1 - 0	N/A	
Classroom management (1) (4)	8 - 7 - 6	5 - 4 - 3	2 - 1 - 0	N/A	
Selection and use of up-to-date educational materials, including technology as appropriate (3)	8 - 7 - 6	5 - 4 - 3	2 - 1 - 0	N/A	
Teacher-student interaction					
Effective communication with students (1) (6)	8 - 7 - 6	5 - 4 - 3	2 - 1 - 0	N/A	
Enthusiasm and concern for student learning (5,6)	8 - 7 - 6	5 - 4 - 3	2 - 1 - 0	N/A	

Legend
Exceeds Expectations

8: This aspect of the lesson was **superior** and completely successful; there are no conceivable

Does Not Meet Expectations

2: This aspect of the lesson was **largely unacceptable** and met with very limited success;

<p>improvements to be made</p> <p>7: This aspect of the lesson was excellent and almost completely successful; only exceedingly minor modifications are necessary</p> <p>6: This aspect of the lesson was above average and very successful; the instructor can consider how to fine-tune her/his approach</p> <p><u>Meets Expectations</u></p> <p>5: This aspect of the lesson was effective and successful; the instructor can still consider possible modifications</p> <p>4: This aspect of the lesson was average and achieved a baseline level of success; the instructor should explore potentially more effective alternatives</p> <p>3: This aspect of the lesson was low average, and met with somewhat limited success; some improvement is needed</p>	<p>significant improvement is needed</p> <p>1: This aspect of the lesson was wholly unacceptable due to incoherence, inaccuracy, irrelevance, etc. and totally unsuccessful; an entirely different approach is necessary</p> <p>0: This score should be assigned only in the event that the instructor does not appear for the scheduled observation</p>
--	--

Part 3: Post-observation reflections, discussion and conclusions. After communicating with the instructor you observed in person or by email and sharing your comments on this form, please write a short summary of your conversation. Describe any strong points or concrete goals for improvement that you identified, clarify any differing interpretations of classroom events, and so on.

Observer signature _____ Date: _____

Instructor signature _____ Date: _____