

**CTL Campus Leader Annual Reports  
Rubrics for Assessment and Feedback  
2007-2008**

**Campus Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

The purpose of this rubric is to provide CTL staff with some direction as we read your final reports. Ultimately, they help CTL staff provide you with helpful feedback about faculty development on your campus and about your role as Campus Leader. The letters we write to you each year are an opportunity to acknowledge your strengths and give you ideas about ways in which you may want to improve. Assessment and evaluation of the past year's activities are important, but it is also useful to reflect on how you can further improve your overall program. The CTL staff offer continual assistance in that process. Final reports are due on June 1, 2008. You should email your report to [ctl@so.mnscu.edu](mailto:ctl@so.mnscu.edu). Once electronic copies have been submitted and reviewed, they will be posted to our new "Faculty Development on Our Campuses" Web site at <http://campusfacdev.project.mnscu.edu>.

**Essentials for a sustainable and functional campus CTL (not scorable):**

- Support of campus administration (financial support/budget)
- Advisory committee
- Programming
- Services
- Space
- Regular staffing (someone available at Center on a regular and consistent basis)

<b>Completeness</b>	<b>Complete</b>	<b>Incomplete</b>	<b>Missing</b>	<b>Completeness</b>	<b>Complete</b>	<b>Incomplete</b>	<b>Missing</b>
Cover Sheet	2	1	0	Budget Statement	2	1	0
Executive Summary (or equivalent)	2	1	0	Plan for Activities (or equivalent)	2	1	0
Summary of Faculty Development Leadership (or equivalent)	2	1	0	Conclusion or Reflection (or equivalent)	2	1	0
List of Activities and Programming (or equivalent)	2	1	0				

<b>Fac Dev Leadership</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Weak</b>	<b>None</b>
Collaboration	3 -Identified three or more ways in which you facilitated individuals or groups to collaborate with each other, e.g. faculty leaders, administrators, librarians, IT staff, counselors, student services staff, discipline leads.	2 -Identified 2 ways in which you facilitated individuals or groups to collaborate with each other.	1 -Identified one way in which you facilitated individuals or groups to collaborate with each other.	0 -Identified no ways in which you facilitated individuals or groups to collaborate with each other.
Providing support and resources to campus	3 -Identified three or more resources for faculty to learn about faculty development, e.g. POD Network, local expertise, listservs, CTL Web site, books, journals, peer observation, mentoring, brown bag.	2 -Identified 2 resources for faculty to learn about faculty development.	1 -Identified one resource for faculty to learn about faculty development	0 -Identified no resources for faculty to learn about faculty development.
Promoting campus and statewide activities to faculty	3 -Advertised or otherwise promoted three or more faculty development activities or programs to faculty, e.g. sent regular email updates regarding campus and statewide faculty development activities, forwarded all or parts of system CTL Updates, notified faculty of travel cost reimbursement provision for system CTL events.	2 -Advertised or otherwise promoted 2 faculty development activities or programs to faculty.	1 -Advertised or otherwise promoted one faculty development activity or program to faculty.	0 -Promoted no faculty development activities or programs to faculty.
CTL workshops and conferences attended	3 -Attended 3 or more.	2 -Attended 2.	1 -Attended 1.	0 -Attended or listed none.

<b>Programming</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Weak</b>	<b>None</b>
Programming offered	<p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p>-Planned and organized 4 or more faculty development programs, e.g. campus workshops or conferences, department workshops, book talk series, campus newsletters, flyers, new faculty sessions, mentoring activities, service-learning workshops, faculty orientation days, grant-writing assistance.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p>-Planned and organized 2-3 faculty development programs.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p>-Planned and organized 1 faculty development program.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>-Planned and organized zero faculty development programs.</p>
Needs assessment	<p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p>-Conducted 3 or more needs assessments throughout the year. Reached most faculty and administrators.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p>- Conducted 2 needs assessments throughout the year. Reached several faculty and administrators.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p>- Conducted 1 needs assessment. Reached a limited number of faculty and administrators.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>-Did not solicit input from faculty or administrators.</p>
Alignment with campus teaching and learning priorities	<p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p>-Provided programming and services based upon the results of 3 or more campus needs assessments.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p>-Provided programming and services based upon the results of 2 campus needs assessments.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p>-Provided programming and services based in part upon the results of one campus needs assessment.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>-Programming and services were not based on needs assessments or campus priorities.</p>

<b>Evaluation of the year by CTL Leader</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Weak</b>	<b>None</b>
Multiple types of data	3 -Used qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods on programs and services.	2 - Used either qualitative or quantitative evaluation methods on programs and services.	1 -Did not use qualitative or quantitative data to evaluate programs and services, but did include a personal evaluation.	0 -Did not evaluate the programs.
Reflection	3 -Indicates how your perceptions and assumptions have changed. -Indicates how this might affect your future faculty leadership.	2 -Few direct references to how your perceptions and assumptions have changed. -Few direct references to leadership implications.	1 -Lack of previous assumption discussion prevents comparison. -No direct references to leadership implications.	0 -No reflection.
Outcomes assessment	3 - Includes an analysis of all program and service data collected and recommendations of changes for next year.	2 - Includes an analysis of some program and service data collected and recommendations of changes for next year.	1 - Includes an analysis of some program and service data collected, but no recommendations of changes for next year (or vice-versa).	0 -No final analysis or recommendations for change.