GUIDELINES FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY STUDENTS

Professor Ann Cudd, Department of Philosophy

So you think you want to do an independent study with me as guide, eh? Well, here are some thoughts I have put together to help us decide how we want to proceed and to avoid floundering in the beginning phases for half the term. But the first thing to note is that this is YOUR project and YOU will have to do the lion’s share of the work here, both in designing how you want it to go and in motivating yourself to do the work. I am here to help you decide on the scope of your project, give tips on how to find appropriate readings, guide you through the readings that we decide on, and respond to the written work that you do. If these guidelines don’t seem to fit what you have in mind, let’s discuss it. Nothing is ruled out a priori (except immoral acts, of course).

Course numbers and levels
A. Undergraduate students:
   - PHIL 340 Tutorial in Philosophy—This is the thing that students wanting to do an independent study with me during the school year enroll in, provided that I agree.
   - PHIL 600 Readings in Philosophy (summer only)—Ditto above, except that this is done in the summer. Some summers I will not be available.

B. Philosophy majors (in addition to above):
   - PHIL 460 Senior Essay—This is for senior majors who wish to work for departmental honors.

C. Graduate students:
   - PHIL 899 Master’s Thesis—Just what it says. Note that this is not required to get an M.A. at KU.
   - PHIL 900 Research in Philosophy—Independent study for graduate students, any semester.
   - PHIL 901 Tutorial II—This is an official requirement for Ph.D students; it requires the preparation of a paper on which the student will be examined by three members of the department.
   - PHIL 999 Dissertation—Final product of the Ph.D. You’ll work with a director at least a year on this. Choosing a dissertation director is perhaps the most important choice you make in graduate school; make it carefully, thinking about professional, intellectual and personal issues.

Themes and topics
A. General topics that I am competent to discuss:
   - Decision theory, game theory—Various topics
   - Philosophy of economics, philosophy of social science, philosophy of science—Any topic
   - Political or social philosophy—Various topics
   - Epistemic logic
   - 20th century epistemology—Especially foundationalism and its demise
   - Feminism—Various topics
   - Philosophy of law: sexual harassment, abortion, date rape, consent theory
   - Work of particular philosophers: Hobbes, Rousseau, Mill, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, David Gauthier, Charles Taylor, Wilfrid Sellars, and others not regularly taught by the department

B. Research specialties
   - Foundations of game theory, especially role of common knowledge, theories of convention and norms, theories of oppression, feminist ethics, applications of game theory and decision theory to social/political problems, abortion, rape, sexual harassment, theories of resistance, theories of social groups, methodological individualism vs. holism, theories of rationality
Meeting arrangements
A. PHIL 340 and PHIL 600 should be weekly meetings that cover the readings for most of the term. We may decide at some points, when the student is writing up the final paper for instance, not to meet for a week or so. This should be clearly agreed upon by both of us, however. And whenever you are going to have to miss a meeting be sure to let me know as far in advance as possible, even if that means calling me 10 minutes before our meeting to tell me that your car broke down!
B. PHIL 460—Usually weekly meetings until the topic is established and narrowed down, then whenever you have a portion or draft to run by me for comments.
C. PHIL 900—Weekly meetings are presumed.
D. PHIL 901—Usually weekly meetings until the topic is established and narrowed down, then whenever you have a portion or draft to run by me for comments
E. PHIL 999—Weekly meetings, perhaps for an entire term, until there is a clear sense of direction, then whenever you have a draft of the prospectus for me to comment on. After the prospectus has been approved, you may want to meet more or less frequently, but at least whenever you have a draft of a chapter to show me.

Readings and assignments
A. PHIL 340, PHIL 600, PHIL 900
   - Syllabus: You will select the reading with more or less assistance from me, though I will maintain veto power over any reading that you will want to discuss with me (expect me to read).
   - Annotated Bibliography: At the end of the term you will prepare a list of the readings we have done with a brief annotation concerning the topic and points of interest of the reading.
   - Paper: Normally you will be expected to write a term paper on a subject of interest to you from the readings we have done. We can also consider other final products, however.
B. PHIL 460, PHIL 901
   - Paper: The final product for each of these is set by departmental practice.
   - Bibliography: You will select all references and we will discuss some of them together. I will provide suggestions, but the final choices are yours to make.
   - Exam: Each of these requires an oral exam by three members of the department, including myself as director.
C. PHIL 899, PHIL 999 (see Department Guidelines for Graduate Students for specifics)
   - Thesis: The final product for each of these is set by department practice.
   - Bibliography: You will select all references and we will discuss some of them together. I will provide suggestions, but the final choices are yours to make.
   - Exam: Each of these requires an oral exam. The M.A. oral exam is by three members of the department, including myself as director. The Ph.D. oral exam is by four members of the Philosophy department, including myself as director, and one member of the KU Graduate Faculty from a department other than Philosophy.

Grades
A. PHIL 340, 600, 900, 901: I will assign A, B, C, D, F as merited. In exceptional cases I may consider giving the student an ‘I’ for a specific, short period of time.
B. PHIL 899, 999: I will assign P/F for every semester until the last one, then A, B or C as merited.
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STUDENT CONSENT FORM—SHARING COURSE WORK

I will randomly select several students whose work will be copied and included in an archive of student work that I keep for this course. That archive is important to my continued reflection on how well students are learning in my courses. There are also two additional ways that I sometimes use a small portion of the archive of student work. First, I often use prior students’ work as a point of comment for later students who are preparing for examinations. I post various questions and answers on a Web site and invite students to comment on how well the answers address the questions. Second, I maintain a course portfolio in which I write about the quality of student performance that is generated in the course. These examples are a very important piece of my work that I show to other professors to indicate how much and how deeply students are learning. Once the course portfolio is completed, it will also be made available to a wider audience of professors on a public Web site on teaching and learning in higher education (http://www.cte.ku.edu/gallery/).

This form requests your consent to have your work possibly included in discussions of understanding for future students and in any versions of my writing about teaching in a portfolio. There is only a small chance your work would be randomly included in my private archive for any assignment, but I ask all students for their permission should that be the case. Note that you have the choice to have your work be anonymous or have your name be part of the work.

Please check the following designated purposes (if any) to which you give your consent:

_____ I am willing to have copies of my coursework available so later students can use it for preparation.

_____ I am willing to have copies of my coursework included in my professor’s course portfolio.

_____ I am willing to have copies of my coursework included in the public Web site.

Please check one of the following:

_____ I wish to have my name remain on any work that is used.

_____ I wish to have my name removed on any work that is used.

Additional restrictions on the use of my texts (please specify):

Print name__________________________________________ Date______________________________

Phone number (        )________________________________     Email____________________________

Course title__________________________________________ Professor_________________________

By signing below you give your permission that work you produce for this course may be used with the restrictions and for the purposes you indicated above. You understand that your grade is NOT connected in any way to your participation in this project, and I will not receive the list of students who have given permission to have their work shared until after I have turned in the grades for the course. Your anonymity will be maintained unless you designate otherwise. Finally, you understand that you are free to withdraw consent at any time, now or in the future, without being penalized.

Signature________________________________________

Please address questions to: (name of faculty member, department, phone number, email.)
APPENDIX B

TEACHING-RELATED WORKSHEETS FOR PROMOTION & TENURE
As you prepare to represent your teaching for professional review, each offering of a course is an occasion for learning and development. Consider using these prompts at the end of each semester to remember what you thought about a course and what you learned about teaching it. The accumulation of several of these sheets for a course will provide an excellent core of a narrative on teaching that could be reviewed by a colleague. The archive of student examples (and the distribution of grades for each) will provide a rich picture of your accomplishments.

1. Of all the material you taught, what were the three or four most important goals you had for student understanding and performance?

2. Where in the students’ work for the semester did they have the best opportunity to show you their understanding and their skills? Be sure to retain copies of a small representative sample of that work (two As, two Bs, two Cs of each).

3. What made you most pleased about students’ work on those central intellectual topics? What features of their work indicated real success in students’ performance? How broad was that success? Did it reach beyond a few top students?

4. What class activities, lectures, assignments or materials worked extremely well this semester? Can you replicate them, continue them, or expand them in useful ways? Do you have an idea about why they worked well or how you made them successful?

5. What left you most disappointed about students’ work on those central intellectual topics? What features of their work would you hope to see improve the next time you teach the class? How many students succeeded in this challenging area? Are these goals worth keeping or should you put your energy elsewhere?

6. What class activities, lectures, assignments or materials did not go well this semester? How might you replace them or modify them to achieve your goals better? Are there new ways you could achieve the same goals?

7. What ideas have you had for something new you want to add to this course the next time you teach it? Will the topics or goals evolve in some way? Are there particular forms of measuring learning you want to add? Are there additional ways of engaging students you want to try?

8. Overall, what have you learned about teaching in general from this course? Are there lessons you would carry forward to teaching any class at this general level and size? What ideas, reactions or feelings do you have about teaching right now, about this course or in general?
**PREPARING FOR REVIEW**

**TEACHING NARRATIVE**

Your Teaching Narrative is a one-page statement that provides a brief overview of your teaching. To help you develop it, answer the following questions:

What topics do you teach?

What are one or two examples of intellectual goals you have for students?

How do you help students achieve course goals?

How do you know that students are achieving these goals?

How have your teaching experiences shaped your ongoing goals and practices as a teacher?
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SAMPLE COURSE NARRATIVE

Andrea Greenhoot, Psychology

When I initially developed my Cognitive Development (PSYC 430) course at KU 12 years ago, I found myself facing a challenge that is familiar to many new faculty: how to teach students at diverse skills levels without lowering the bar. My goals for student learning were much the same as they are now: to understand and critically evaluate research on cognitive development, synthesize and connect across multiple empirical findings in the field, apply research findings and major course themes to real world situations, and develop clear and cohesive written arguments. I developed a capstone assignment for the course that integrated a number of these skills that I want students to take away from the course: to write a paper framed as an advice column, providing practical recommendations to parents, based on their critical reading of empirical articles from the psychological literature. But in my earliest offerings of the course, I found that students seemed to lack the skills required for this assignment, and their performance did not reflect the type of scholarly work that I expected at their level. Because the writing task is “real-world,” student interest in the assignment was high. The challenge I faced was how to help students read, understand, and use psychological research. Thus, across several offerings of the course, I made several changes to the term project assignment to better support students’ attainment of the necessary skills.

My earliest modifications involved simplifying the project, breaking it into multiple subcomponents to be completed throughout the semester, providing support and feedback at each step. For instance, I invited a librarian to conduct an in-class tour of the psychological literature search database, and required students to turn in their articles for feedback on appropriateness. I also incorporated an in-class, guided analysis of an empirical article. Finally, I developed a detailed grading rubric for the paper and distributed it to students before they wrote their papers. I observed clear upgrades in student work during this period; most students selected appropriate sources, and produced solid summaries and analyses of their empirical articles. Yet 15-20% of the students still needed individual assistance to find appropriate and relevant articles. Moreover, students seemed to devote almost all of their efforts to the summaries of individual articles, and had difficulty integrating the research findings and writing coherent arguments about the applications. I targeted these skills in several additional course enhancements by partnering with the KU Libraries and Writing Center (Spring 2007 to present). For instance, Erin Ellis from the KU Libraries provided hands-on literature search instruction in a computer lab, and students wrote summaries of their articles early in the process to free up their resources for the difficult task of article synthesis. They then participated in a Peer Workshop in which they reviewed each others’ summaries and discussed and debated the implications of the research. We also encouraged students to consult with staff from the Libraries and Writing Center throughout the semester. At the same time, I increased the number of articles students were required to synthesize.

There are several indications that the latest course modifications were successful. Not one student required individual assistance locating and selecting his or her empirical resources this past semester, and no one submitted articles from inappropriate sources (e.g., popular media). Furthermore, I was very impressed with the insightful and constructive feedback students gave each other during the peer review process. Overall grades on the term project have changed very little from year to year, in part because my expectations for what constitutes “outstanding” or “adequate” work have increased with the level of support I am providing to students. But comparisons of actual student products from year to year show that on the whole the papers were clearer and more sophisticated.
during the most recent offering than they were during previous semesters. In particular, I observed a much improved ability to synthesize diverse research findings and draw appropriate conclusions, and this change is especially noteworthy given that students were required to synthesize more research findings during the most recent offerings. Formal and informal student evaluations of the course were also quite positive—most liked being held accountable for assignment stages across the semester, and they believed that it improved their final products. I am very happy with students’ improved information literacy skills and the increased level of synthesis after the most recent course modifications and instructional partnership. Student work is more closely approximating the types of upper-level work that I think should be exhibited. Therefore, this is an approach that I will continue to use.

Sample Narrative Description of Student Learning Data: PSYC 430, Andrea Greenhoot

For many years I have used a capstone assignment in my undergraduate course on Cognitive Development (PSYC 430) that integrates many of the skills I want students to take away from the course. The assignment asks students to write a mock advice column, providing practical recommendations to parents based on their critical reading of empirical articles from the psychological literature. One dimension of the assignment that has been particularly difficult for students is the synthesis of multiple research findings, especially when those findings lead to divergent conclusions. This weakness clearly stands out in Panel A of Figure 1, which summarizes the percent of students in the Fall semester of 2005 who received high, intermediate, and low scores on four major dimensions of the assignment. In the Spring of 2007, I partnered with colleagues from the KU Libraries and Writing Center to redesign the course to better support students’ attainment of the skills required for this assignment, with particular emphasis on improving their synthesis skills. The first set of changes involved breaking the assignment into more stages and providing increased support and feedback at each step. These changes yielded small upgrades in students’ use of research, synthesis of research, and application to real world conclusions (see panel B). To promote further improvement in synthesis in later semesters, we added several learning activities (e.g., students evaluated and discussed sample papers with the rubric) that specifically targeted this skill area (Fall 2009), and then required students to write a traditional literature review paper before producing the advice column (Fall 2010). After making these changes, I saw particularly strong increases in students’ abilities to synthesize multiple findings and apply them in real world conclusions. The shift in synthesis scores is especially noteworthy because at the same time that I increased support and feedback to the students, I also increased the number of articles students were required to synthesize. Thus, my students are performing better on an even more sophisticated learning task. Nonetheless, there may still be room for improvement, the changes I made to support synthesis may have also led to the small drop in high-level performance on the “use of research” category. In the next offering, we will work with students on how to maintain a clear research emphasis while writing for the “real world.”
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FOUR FACETS OF TEACHING FOR PEER REVIEWERS

Under the Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Recommendations, KU faculty members who are completing peer reviews are encouraged to address the following four areas:

Quality of intellectual content
- Is the material in this course appropriate for the topic, appropriate for the curriculum and institution?
- Is the content related to current issues and developments in the field?
- Is there intellectual coherence to the course content?
- Are the intellectual goals for students well articulated and congruent with the course content and mission?

Quality of teaching practices
- Is the contact time with students well organized and planned, and if so, are the plans carried out?
- How much of the time are students actively engaged in the material?
- Are there opportunities (in or out of class) for students to practice the skills embedded in course goals?
- Are there particularly creative or effective uses of contact time that could improve student understanding?
- Are there any course structures or procedures that contribute especially to the likely achievement of understanding by students?

Quality of student understanding
- Is the performance asked of students appropriate for course goals, level of course, and for the institution?
- Does the performance requested include challenging levels of conceptual understanding and critical evaluation of the material appropriate to the level of the course and of the students?
- Are students being asked to demonstrate competence in the stated course goals? If not, is it possible to identify why?
- Are there obvious changes in the course that could improve performance?
- Are the forms of evaluation and assessment appropriate to the stated goals of the course?
- Are they particularly creative or do they provide students with opportunities to demonstrate their understanding using intellectual skills typical of the field?
- Is the weighting of course assignments in grade calculation coordinated with the relative importance of the course goals?

Summarizing the evidence of reflective consideration and development
- Has the faculty member made a sincere effort to insure that students achieve the course goals?
- Has the faculty member identified any meaningful relationship between what (s)he teaches and how students perform?
- Is there evidence the faculty member has changed teaching practices based on past teaching experiences?
- Is there evidence of insightful analysis of teaching practice that resulted from consideration of student performance?

As reported in the November 2005 issue of Teaching Matters, published by the KU Center for Teaching Excellence.
GUIDELINES FOR PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING: FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The University Task Force Report on the Assessment of Teaching and Learning has constructed these guidelines to assist departments in conducting peer reviews of teaching. The guidelines are intended to orient faculty members to new expectations for peer reviews of teaching and to help expedite the review process.

Q: What should a peer review reflect?

Peer review of teaching should reflect multiple sources of information, including course materials and student work as well as observations of contact time with students. Reviews of materials and in-class practices should include a variety of class sizes and instructional levels (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, survey, upper division course, etc.) as appropriate to the faculty member’s instructional responsibilities. The resulting evaluations should address both strengths and areas to target for improvement.

Q: Who should conduct peer reviews of teaching?

Peer reviews of teaching are most effective when they are conducted by more than one individual over multiple periods. Because best teaching practices differ across disciplines, it is strongly recommended that peer reviews are conducted by faculty members from the same department, preferably by different reviewers each year. Peer reviewers need not be at an equivalent or higher rank to the person being reviewed. At the request of a faculty member, a reviewer external to the department or the University could be solicited to provide a reference on the quality of the content, instructional design, or student work evident in the faculty member’s course or teaching portfolio.

Q: How often should we conduct peer reviews of teaching?

There are no definitive rules regarding how often peer reviews are conducted, other than prior to third-year reviews and tenure decisions for tenure-track faculty and prior to decisions for associate professors being considered for promotion to full professor. Peer review in any given year may focus on class materials, class observations, or other documentation. The review prior to the third-year review, the pre-tenure review, and review for promotion to full professor should consider the entire portfolio.

Q: What materials should be provided by the faculty member under review?

1. Teaching materials to demonstrate the intellectual content of teaching:
   - Syllabi, preferably annotated to highlight decisions made in including material and choosing aspects of the field to include, exclude, or emphasize in the course.
   - Selected course materials (readings, demonstrations, grading standards/rubrics).
   - Evidence of innovative techniques or materials used in teaching.
   - Student voice and evidence of student learning:
     - Midterm and end-of-the-semester student feedback forms, both quantitative and optional qualitative comments.
     - Samples of assignments students use to demonstrate their understanding of key course goals. For each assignment chosen for review, reviewees should provide two A papers.
(or equivalent category of judgment), two B papers, and two C papers, along with the
distribution of performance for the entire class.

2. Teaching narrative:
   - This is a short statement (one to two pages) that is the faculty member’s own account of
     how his or her teaching has developed over time. The teacher should pay particular atten-
     tion to articulating how he or she defines course goals and assesses student learning. The
     statement should also include reflection on how the faculty member’s teaching experiences
     have shaped his or her goals and practices as a teacher.

Q: What are the responsibilities of peer reviewers?

1. Interaction: After reviewing the materials provided by the reviewee, the peer reviewer and the
   reviewee should engage in a conversation about the faculty member’s teaching practices. The
   four-point, KU guideline to peer reviews of teaching can serve as a useful framework for this
   conversation (see page 84).

2. Documentation: The peer reviewer prepares comments regarding the faculty member’s teach-
   ing practices, including preparation for courses, conduct in and outside of class, and methods of
   assessing teaching effectiveness and student learning. The recommended organization of these
   comments would reflect the four key facets of teaching described in KU’s guideline to peer re-
   views of teaching: quality of intellectual content, quality of teaching practices, quality of student
   understanding, and evidence of reflective consideration and development.

3. Classroom observations: The peer reviewer may find it useful to visit the faculty member’s class
   to see how ideas and objectives are put into practice, how the faculty member engages with stu-
   dents, and how students respond and engage with the instructor and with class material. Peer
   reviewers may also observe contact time with students outside of the classroom. Please note
   that, contrary to prior norms, these observations should NOT be the sole or even primary
   focus of peer evaluations.

Q: Where can I find additional resources on teaching and peer evaluations?

1. Task Force Report on the Assessment of Teaching and Learning (http://www2.ku.edu/~unigov/TFATL08FR.shtml)
2. University of Kansas Documents for Promotion and Tenure (facultydevelopment.ku.edu/promotion-tenure)
3. Samples of Documentation:
   a. Peer review letters (http://www.cte.ku.edu/documenting/observations/samples.shtml)
   b. Teaching Reflection Statements (http://www.cte.ku.edu/documenting/statements/)
   c. Course Portfolios (http://www.cte.ku.edu/gallery/)
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Below is the standard survey students may be given at the end of each semester's course. Check with your department to see which form it uses.

STUDENT SURVEY OF TEACHING: THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

Student evaluations of teaching play an important role in enhancing the quality of instruction at the University of Kansas. The evaluations are made available to the faculty member (after grades are turned in) and to the chairperson/Dean of the School. These evaluations are considered in the processes for merit salary, promotion and tenure, and sabbatical leave decisions. Please give your responses careful attention.

Please mark only one response per item.

1. This instructor provided content and materials that were useful and organized.
2. This instructor set and met clear goals and objectives for the course.
3. This instructor expected of me was well defined and fair.
4. Overall, this instructor's teaching was clear, understandable, and engaging.
5. The instructor was encouraging, supportive, and involved in my learning the course material.
6. This instructor was available, responsive, and helpful.
7. This instructor demonstrated respect for students and their points of view.
8. Compared with courses at a similar level, I would rate how much I learned.

Responses:
1. Not at all important, 2= somewhat important, 3= important, 4= very important.

How important were the following reasons for taking this course?

1. Course was a requirement.
2. Course was not (a repeat).
3. Course was at a convenient time.
4. Course topic interested me.

Did you complete readings/coursework?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Most of the time
- Always

How many times per week did this class meet?

- One
- Two
- Three
- Four
- Five

My student status is:

- Undergraduate
- Graduate
- Other (junior college, army etc.)

What year of study are you in?

- 1st
- 2nd
- 3rd
- 4th
- 5th
- 6th or more

Over the course of the semester, how many class meetings did you miss?

What grade do you expect in the class?

- A
- B
- C
- D
- F
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This report shows how the results of the student survey of teaching are recorded.
PREPARING FOR REVIEW

This report shows how a faculty member might graph a trajectory of teaching progress in one or more courses over a period of time.
Recommendation 3: Faculty members should collect open-ended student comments to guide improvement of teaching. Reporting these comments should remain optional, and if they are used in evaluations they should be reported systematically.

Many faculty members agree that a great deal can be learned from the observations offered by students in response to questions inviting commentary on features of instruction, and faculty members should be encouraged to seek open-ended commentary. It is especially valuable for faculty members to invite these comments during the semester at a time when they can still respond to the comments with adjustments in the course. Those adjustments are valuable to students, and faculty members can also include those changes as part of their teaching record.

We recommend continuing the policy jointly articulated by the Provost and by Faculty Governance that makes the use of such comments in personnel decisions optional, at the discretion of the faculty member or unit. Accordingly, any open-ended questions used by a faculty member or requested by an individual department should be on a separate sheet from the numerical rating items, so that they may be collected and distributed independently of each other. Open-ended questions should be framed in ways that maximize the likelihood of constructive comments and specifically discourage irrelevant or disparaging comments about faculty members.

As a general rule, we recommend that these comments be used for the benefit of teachers working to improve their instruction. There may be times in the evaluation of an instructor when it would be useful to have such comments for the interpretation of ambiguous numerical information. In such cases, the faculty member should bring forward the entire sample of such comments to aid in interpretation. Additionally, an individual faculty member should always be free to bring the comments forward, as long as they are reported in a professional manner (see below).

Within KU there are distinct communities of evidence, in which knowledge is constructed in different ways and conclusions are evaluated based on varying criteria. For many in the humanities, as well as from other areas of campus, there is great value in close reading of text, done by an individual, using a combination of personal experience and professional conventions of reading. For people in the social and natural sciences, and many in professional areas, open-ended verbal statements are data like any other, and the protocols and conventions of data analysis would be the preferred method of reading. The practices around using open-ended student comments should be flexible enough that different local communities (such as departments) can adopt consensual practices that reflect their shared understanding of reading and evidence. This is especially true for the use of these comments as guides for continuous development of teaching.

When samples of comments are used in formal evaluation, the resulting judgment represents an estimate of the professional quality of a faculty member’s teaching. In that context, people presume that the conclusions drawn are an accurate representation of the teaching in question and not an artifact of either the reading or the gathering of comments. For that reason, we recommend that professional standards of treating comments as data be followed whenever comments are included in an evaluative professional context beyond a department level. This practice would assure all faculty members that the information will inform the process in the fairest way possible.
The Task Force consulted with KU faculty members whose research includes the analysis of the content of comments. That group noted a series of careful, empirically justified steps that are required for such evidence to meet professional standards of validity. It would be impossible as a practical matter for review of teaching comments to meet the publication standards of the research community, but several general guidelines emerged from the conversation that we recommend be included in the handling of all open-ended comments.

- The sample of comments should be as large as possible; small samples can be very misleading.
- Analysis should always include a record of non-responders. Summary descriptions place the responses in a context of the total possible population.
- The analysis begins with the framing of a specific question or questions to be answered by the comments.
- Analysis includes identification of categories of responses, as appropriate to the question being answered. Where possible these categories should be distinct from each other and include a full range of possible answers.
- Individual comments should be put into a single category when possible; if a comment is long or complex, it can be broken into components and counted as separate comments.
- The final product would report a frequency of comments in each category, always including the number of people who did not respond to the question.

The analysis produced will be only as good as the questions asked and the categories of responses that are identified. If those are well constructed and aligned with each other, the analysis can help answer the question posed.
UNIVERSITY REVIEWS

COURSES TAUGHT

To complete this part of your review, you need to record the following information about every course you have taught:
- Course number and title
- Course code (required for major, survey course, clinical/supervision, service course, elective, instructional television, and/or team taught)
- Semester and year taught
- Number of students enrolled
- All original student rating sheets and summary forms for your courses. Under Regent’s and University policy, faculty members may choose to include student comments in dossiers, but they are not required to do so.

In the following table, list all courses taught.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number and Title</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th># Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course codes:
R = required for major     Svy = survey course     E = elective     T = team taught
Ser = service course       C = clinical/supervision  ITV = instructional television
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ACTIVITIES THAT MAY BE CONSIDERED IN THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING AT KU

INTRODUCTION

High quality teaching and scholarship have long been recognized as the two hallmarks of a productive faculty member. Teaching is serious intellectual work that is grounded in deep knowledge and understanding of a field, and it includes the ability to convey that understanding in clear and engaging ways. The conduct of courses is the central feature of our teaching responsibilities at KU, and it has priority among the many kinds of teaching activities that take place. Our identification of teaching should not be limited to formal class performance, however, and a broader menu of teaching activities provides additional ways to demonstrate quality in teaching.

There is more to quality instruction than making one’s knowledge and understanding accessible to students; effective education successfully generates understanding, knowledge, and skills among students. People acquire more skill in teaching over time, and as in research, that success comes from thinking about the results of prior efforts and identifying ways to improve future results. Quality in teaching will include self-evaluation of how well students are learning and inquiry into how to improve learning in each class.

The measurement of any human activity is never perfect, whether it is teaching or research. The proposed guidelines offer a framework from which faculty can choose elements that may improve the measurement of teaching beyond current practices. It is intended to increase flexibility by offering many different ways that teachers can show their work and demonstrate what they are learning from its results.

It is not expected that any single faculty member would engage in all or even most of the activities listed below, but they should be recognized as part of teaching when they occur across the full duration of a teaching career.

ACTIVITIES

How does this teacher conduct courses?

Evaluation in this area should focus on some or all of the following factors:
- Clarity of course goals
- Relevance and appropriateness of course content
- Effectiveness of instruction in lecture, labs, discussion, studios, and other activities
- Appropriate relationship with students in which the instructor is available, challenges students, and supports their learning
- Measures of student learning
- Presentation of courses serving the mission of the unit or University

A faculty member could provide various forms of evidence to indicate success in achieving these aims, such as:
- Annotated syllabus
- Selection of course materials (readings, resources, demonstrations, grading standards, etc.)
- Ratings and/or written comments from students
- Peer evaluation of classroom performance, interaction with students, and/or course materials
- Samples of student work demonstrating student learning
- Trend data showing the impact of the teacher on measures of learning
- List of courses taught and explanation of their importance
- Explanation of special service in particular courses, such as large lecture courses
- Teaching awards or nominations for teaching awards
- Other materials that the faculty member believes indicate excellence in teaching

Faculty colleagues and or the department chair would evaluate the evidence provided by the faculty member to judge the degree to which he/she was attaining the aims cited above. Student perspectives of those properties of teaching they are in a good position to evaluate are reflected in “Ratings and/or written comments from students” shown above.

How does this teacher prepare for courses?

Evaluation in this area should focus on the following factors:
- Appropriate preparation of new courses or efforts to improve instruction
- Continuing efforts to improve teaching

A faculty member could provide various forms of evidence to indicate success in achieving these aims, such as:
- Sample of course materials: learning activities, assignments, etc. for new or existing courses
- Plans for future course development; may include a journal or other reflections on teaching
- Examples of innovation in teaching including teaching practices, technology, etc.
- Seminars attended or conducted on teaching; include description of new approaches learned from workshops or description of how ideas have been incorporated into teaching (annotated syllabus or other notes)
- Student comments indicating changes in teaching, faculty observation supporting innovation based on workshops
- Examples of collaboration with faculty at KU or elsewhere to support teaching
- Examples of work with KU offices (KU Libraries, Writing Center, Learning Communities, etc.) to support teaching
- Publication(s) or other research on teaching
- Awards or nominations for research, teaching, or service related to improving teaching
- Other materials that the faculty member believes indicate excellence in teaching

Faculty colleagues and or the department chair would evaluate the evidence provided by the faculty member to judge the degree to which he/she was attaining the aims cited above.

What teaching work has the faculty member done in addition to teaching courses?

Evaluation in this area should focus on some or all of the following factors:
- Coordinating courses within a program, or developing a new course
- Supporting teaching at the unit level by developing new materials for general use; creating infrastructure for labs, studios, or field work; seeking grant support for teaching; recruiting students
- Mentoring and supervising GTAs/GRAs
- Mentoring and supervising students in clinical settings or internships
- Working with student groups
- Mentoring new faculty members in their role as teachers
- Mentoring students or directing research projects

A faculty member could provide various forms of evidence to indicate success in achieving these aims, such as:
- List of administrative or coordination activities, along with new materials developed and commentary from colleagues and students involved
- Observations and comments on unit level contributions by students, colleagues, chair, dean
- External funding of proposals/awards related to teaching, reviews of proposals
- Lists of those mentored and supervised in various roles (undergraduate, graduate, post-docs; research, teaching, clinical work)
- Unit records of GTAs/GRAs’ performance, comments from other students learning from graduate students, comments from community partners or clients
- Examples of student work completed under teacher’s supervision, along with descriptions of venues for presentation and any recognition
- Letters from students reflecting on mentoring activities and effectiveness and indicating how the mentoring has influenced student work and success
- Faculty colleagues’ comments on mentoring activities, e.g., service on MA or MS/PhD committees
- Examples of any regional or national critical review or recognition of student work
- Time to degree, success in obtaining employment or other placement
- Lists of student groups supported, identifying unit or university level, along with student comments, awards or achievement by the group
- Lists of faculty colleagues mentored on teaching, with examples of feedback given or comments from colleagues about the impact of the shared work

Faculty colleagues and/or the department chair would evaluate the evidence provided by the faculty member to judge the degree to which he/she was attaining the aims cited above.

Has this faculty member made contributions related to scholarship of teaching?

Evaluation in this area should focus on some or all of the following factors:
- Teaching related presentations at KU or elsewhere
- Attending or organizing teaching institutes
- Serving as a guest teacher at other institutions, for outside associations, or in the community
- Developing course materials, such as textbooks or websites
- Applying for and receiving grants in support of teaching or publishing articles related to teaching
- Participating in outreach to local schools (K-12) or other forums

A faculty member could provide various forms of evidence to indicate success in achieving these aims, such as:
- Conference programs from presentations, letters, or other evaluations of quality of presentations; samples of presentation notes or published proceedings; programs from institutes or letters evaluating participation or impact
- List of service on department or University teaching committees or presentations at KU Summit or the Center for Teaching Excellence
- Letters attesting to impact of guest presentations in classes; formal evaluations if available
- Books, web addresses, or other materials generated, along with any letters attesting to the impact or quality of the materials
- Products developed for schools, feedback from organizers of presentations, statements from professional society or honors or awards for contributions
- Grant proposals, reviewer feedback on proposals, copies of articles submitted and published

Faculty colleagues and/or the department chair would evaluate the evidence provided by the faculty member to judge the degree to which he/she was attaining the aims cited above.
GUIDELINES FOR DEPARTMENT IMPLEMENTATION

High quality teaching and scholarship have long been recognized as the hallmarks of a productive faculty member. Teaching is complex intellectual work that is grounded in deep knowledge and understanding of a field, and it includes the ability to convey that understanding in clear and engaging ways. The conduct of courses is the central feature of our teaching responsibilities at KU. Our identification of teaching should not be limited to formal class performance, however, and a broader menu of teaching activities provides additional ways to demonstrate quality in teaching.

These proposed guidelines offer a framework from which faculty members can choose elements appropriate for their department, their discipline, the stage of their career, and the type of review. It is intended to increase flexibility by offering many different ways that teachers can show their work and demonstrate what they are learning from its results.

It is not expected that any individual faculty member would engage in all or even most of the activities outlined below, but they should be recognized as part of teaching when they occur across the full duration of a teaching career.

How should departments evaluate teaching?
The record of teaching should begin with a collection of materials provided by the faculty member, addressing these questions:

- How does this teacher conduct courses?
- How does this teacher prepare for courses?
- What teaching work has the faculty member done in addition to teaching courses?
- Has the faculty member made progress over time in development of teaching and/or shared teaching work with colleagues?

The previous document, Activities That May Be Considered in the Evaluation of Teaching at KU, includes factors for evaluating each question and examples of various forms of evidence for answering each question.

It would be helpful for members of an individual unit to discuss which of these areas would be most important for that unit’s mission, so that faculty members would know the kinds of contributions that are most valued by their department colleagues.

In addition to collecting materials, the faculty member should assess her/his progress in generating effective instruction. The faculty member may highlight specific goals in teaching and comment on how the materials collected demonstrate the degree to which they have been achieved.

What about student ratings?
Students’ perceptions of teaching can identify key features of the conduct of courses, and the items used should focus on characteristics of teaching that students clearly can recognize. Students can tell accurately whether faculty members are accessible, respectful, available, clear, and timely.

Whether the unit uses the new student evaluation of teaching form or its own, it is important to recognize that no single number from students is an adequate substitute for professional judgment. Students provide a valuable perspective that can be used to inform or confirm or possibly challenge the perspective of the faculty member or peers. Ratings should be taken seriously as complemen-
tary indicators of key components in the conduct of classes, but they should not be a substitute for
direct peer evaluation of the quality or success of instruction.

Open-ended student comments are most valuable as guides to instructors for their own improve-
ment. It is University policy, however, that the use of these comments in evaluation is optional.
Accordingly, they should be collected on separate pieces of paper (or online) so they can be treated
independently of the required numerical ratings. When open-ended comments are used in a per-
sonnel file, they should be treated in a professional way, as described by the Task Force.

How can departments sustain the process?
A department plan should include decisions about how often each part of the process would be
used. Student feedback and faculty-generated updates on innovations, development, or public
presentation of teaching could easily be part of annual review, but more labor intensive processes
could be intermittent at different stages of a career. For example, it is reasonable for pre-tenure fac-
culty members to reflect annually on how effective their teaching is and on how and why their teach-
ing practices are evolving. Between promotion to associate and promotion to full professor, that
might be useful every two or three years, and perhaps for full professors or other very experienced
teachers, reflection would be most useful every three to five years. Similarly, there is real benefit to
having peers look closely at course materials and student learning of pre-tenure faculty members,
but a more intermittent schedule of deep review would be implemented after tenure. To sustain a
rich peer review of teaching, each unit will need to think through how it can allocate faculty re-
sources wisely.
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SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION—MULTIPLE SOURCES

To document your teaching, you’ll need to use multiple sources of information and blend them into a teaching portfolio. In addition to student evaluations and comments, documentation may include any of the following:
- Course syllabi
- Sample assignments that demonstrate innovations
- Student work on assignments, exams or projects
- Peer evaluations
- Description of how you’ve improved your teaching through reflective journals or course design changes that enhanced student learning
- Descriptions of how your publications or research activities relate to teaching
- List of grants related to personnel preparation

You can conveniently store many of these items using an electronic portfolio program called the KEEP Toolkit. To set up an account, check the KEEP Toolkit site at http://portfolio.ku.edu; you can login with your Exchange account information.

SUMMARY OF WEB RESOURCES RELATED TO THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The following links to the Center for Teaching Excellence web site will provide additional information regarding the evaluation of teaching. They are found in the “Documenting Teaching” section of the site:
- Teaching statements: http://www.cte.ku.edu/documenting/statements
- Developing peer observations: http://www.cte.ku.edu/documenting/observations
- Creating teaching portfolios: http://www.cte.ku.edu/documenting/portfolios
- Student survey of teaching: http://www.cte.ku.edu/documenting/survey
APPENDIX D

EXAMPLES OF RUBRICS
The ultimate goal of Assignment 2 is to evaluate the accuracy of information provided in a website about parenting issues using psychological research. You are to write a letter to a hypothetical friend who has been relying on the website for parenting advice, telling him or her whether or not to believe the information provided on the site. Justify your comments about the accuracy of the site by describing the research presented in your selected article. You should feel free to be creative in your approach to this assignment, but it is critical that you discuss the accuracy of some of the information provided on the site (you do not have to evaluate every piece of information on the site) and that you use the research presented in your article to explain your position. Specifically, your “letter” should:

- **Make the “problem” clear.** In other words, introduce the issue at hand (the issue for which the friend is seeking parenting advice) and the information provided on the website.

- **Describe the relevant research (your article).** Discuss whether you think the advice presented in the website should be followed, using the research presented in your article as support for your comments. Thus, your letter should include the kind of the information you were asked to provide about your article in assignment 2b. Be sure to mention reasons why this study is persuasive (e.g., it controlled for lots of possible confounds), or whether there are any important caveats (e.g., even though this study showed this… there are limitations to their method that we should keep in mind…).

- **Apply the research to the problem.** Discuss the implications of this research for the particular real-world parenting issue that is the focus of the website, and based on this research application offer some advice to your friend. Note that it is ok to conclude that experts disagree, or that more research needs to be done, if you have good reasons to make that argument and you make those reasons clear (e.g., if there are conflicting findings or if you have good reasons to question the conclusions of the study you reviewed).

Your letter should be approximately two pages typed and double-spaced. In addition, be sure to include:

- Your name, ID, and **color** group
- Your topic
- The reference for your article (this should indicate the authors’ names, year of publication, name of article, name of journal, journal volume number and page numbers)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Clarity and Organization</th>
<th>Description of Research</th>
<th>Application of Research</th>
<th>Writing Mechanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 points</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 points</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 points</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of “Letter” is clear at outset; Message is communicated clearly; Well-organized and persuasive</td>
<td>Accurate, clear, and appropriate level of detail</td>
<td>Accurate and insightful application to material presented in website</td>
<td>Well-written. Grammatical errors and errors in sentence structure (fragments, run-ons) are minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 point</strong></td>
<td><strong>6 points</strong></td>
<td><strong>6 points</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 point</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message is reasonably clear, but some difficulty following arguments</td>
<td>Partly inaccurate, incomplete or unclear</td>
<td>Some inaccuracy in application to site; or does not offer much insight</td>
<td>A few grammatical errors or errors in sentence structure, or repetitious sentence structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0 points</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 points</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 points</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message is not communicated clearly</td>
<td>Inaccurate, very limited or missing</td>
<td>Substantial inaccuracy, very limited or missing</td>
<td>Frequent grammatical or sentence structure errors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RUBRICS

SAMPLE WRITING ASSIGNMENT AND CORRESPONDING RUBRIC

PSYC 333: Child Psychology
Andrea Greenhoot

Read Chapter 2 on Prenatal Development. Write a 1-2 page response (typed and double-spaced) to the following vignette, applying the material on low birth weight and multiple risks. Turn in a hard copy of your response during class the day it is due (or in the event of last-minute printer or transportation failures, leave in Dr. Greenhoot’s mailbox in 425 Fraser by 4 pm)—please do not email your paper to us.

You return after class one day to find a message in your voice mail from your cousin’s husband, who is obviously upset. He has called to tell you that your cousin Karen has just given birth more than two months early to a little boy who weighs slightly less than four pounds. Karen’s pregnancy had been planned and completely normal and she had followed her doctor’s advice to the letter, so this outcome comes as a complete shock. The baby has been moved to the neonatal intensive care unit. You’re very close to Karen and know that she will want to see you as soon as possible. When you visit her in the hospital, Karen tells you that the baby is in stable condition but that she’s deeply worried about what the future holds for him and for the family. She shares her fear that he will never have a normal life. From what you’ve learned in your child development class, what can you honestly tell Karen about her new son’s chances for normal development? If she asks for your advice, what would you tell her?

The grading rubric for this assignment is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment Dimension</th>
<th>Clarity and Organization</th>
<th>Writing Mechanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>15 points</strong></td>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response indicates comprehension of assignment and course material; Insightful application</td>
<td>Message is communicated clearly; Well-organized and persuasive</td>
<td>Well-written. Grammatical errors and errors in sentence structure (fragments, run-ons) are minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 points</strong></td>
<td>2 points</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response indicates some inaccuracy in applying course material or does not offer much insight into major issues</td>
<td>Message is reasonably clear, but some difficulty following arguments</td>
<td>A few grammatical errors or errors in sentence structure, or repetitious sentence structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 points</strong></td>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response indicates substantial inaccuracy in applying course material or is incomplete</td>
<td>Message is not communicated clearly</td>
<td>Frequent grammatical or sentence structure errors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RUBRIC FOR FILM PRESENTATION

Instructor circles the applicable portion of the description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Presentation Skills 20%</strong></td>
<td>The presenter spoke clearly and intelligibly, modulating voice tone and quality, maintaining eye contact, and using appropriate body language. The use of humor and competent handling of technology also contributed to the excellence of the presentation. The presenter used all the time available but did not go over the time limit.</td>
<td>The presenter mumbled or droned, spoke too fast or too slow, whispered or shouted, used inappropriate body language, or failed to maintain eye contact to the point where intelligibility was compromised. Too much or too little humor or technological problems detracted from the presentation. The presentation ran over or under the time limit but not dramatically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Presentation Skills 20%</strong></td>
<td>The presentations followed a logical progression and allowed each member an equal opportunity to shine. Group members treated each other with courtesy and respect and assisted each other as needed.</td>
<td>The presentations followed a logical progression but were unbalanced in the way time or content was assigned to members, or the division of labor was fair but impeded the logical progression of the argument. Group members were mostly respectful and helpful toward one another, but there were lapses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Organization 20%</strong></td>
<td>The group thesis, topics to be covered and the direction of the individual presentations were clearly stated at the beginning and carried through in the rest of the presentation.</td>
<td>The thesis, topics and direction were unclear, unstated or not evident in the body of the presentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cont. on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Organization 20%</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The individual presentation was well organized in itself with an introduction, body and conclusion. That organization was emphasized and made clear to the audience through the use of appropriately captioned PowerPoints, overheads or handouts.</td>
<td>The individual presentation was mostly well organized but there were problems with the introduction, body or conclusion. The presenter used PowerPoints, or handouts, but these were too wordy or too vague to help the audience follow the organization.</td>
<td>The presentation rambled with little evidence or an introduction, body or conclusion. PowerPoints, overheads or handouts were either not used or did not assist the audience in following the organization in any significant way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Individual Content 20% | Facts and examples were detailed, accurate, and appropriate. Theories referenced were accurately described and appropriately used. Analyses, discussions, and conclusions were explicitly linked to examples, facts, and theories. | Facts and examples were mostly detailed, accurate and appropriate, but there were lapses. Theories were referenced, but they were either not accurately described or not appropriately used. The connection between analyses, discussions and conclusions was evident or implied, but not explicitly linked to examples, facts and theories. | Facts and examples were seriously lacking in detail, inaccurate, or inappropriate. Theories referenced were inaccurately described and inappropriately used or not referenced or used at all. There was no clear connection between analyses, discussion, and examples, facts and theories. |

## RUBRICS

### RUBRIC FOR CREATIVE RESPONSE PROJECT

Instructor checks each applicable box, makes comments and assigns points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Topic and Outline 3 pts.** | o Paragraph description of project turned in on time.  
o Details of project, type of project  
o Link to class topic clear | | |
| **Content 8 pts.** | o Clear focus of project—what lecture, reading, movie inspired the idea  
o Grabs attention right from the beginning  
o Identifies a significant cultural difference  
o Describes values of that difference to the culture  
o Describes how you viewed previous assumptions of the culture  
o Includes brief summary of the movie, book  
o Describes clear purpose behind this choice  
o Clear connection to adding/affirming diversity | | |
| **Organization 5 pts.** | o Clear beginning, middle, end  
o Understandable to others, not confusing  
o Clear directions and wrap up  
o Easy to see connections to adding/affirming diversity  
o Clear link to class topics | | |
| **Creativity 11 pts.** | o Puts together a presentation that is “out of your comfort zone”  
o Expresses emotional response  
o Open/honest  
o Attractive  
o Visually pleasing  
o Creates at least half of the images  
o Obvious extra effort (not copied pages)  
o Authenticity and uniqueness of effort  
o Though provoking  
o Original  
o Strong expressions of “otherness” | | |

*(Cont. on next page)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reflection 2 pts. | o Indicates how your perceptions and assumptions have changed  
|                 | o Indicates how this might affect your future teaching and adding/affirming diversity in your life |         |        |
| Conventions 3 pts. | o All grammar, spelling, punctuation correct  
|                 | o Neatly presented  
|                 | o If typed, double-spaced and pages numbered |         |        |