TEACHING

Both the Personnel Committee of the Texas State School of Social Work and the School Director annually evaluate the teaching of every School faculty member, based on work performed from January-December. That evaluation is based on

1) evidence of scholarly preparation,
2) dedication as measured by commitment to class attendance, office hours, and course duties,
3) official peer evaluations by tenured faculty members,
4) official student class evaluations, and
5) the faculty member’s self-evaluation.

Such evaluation may also include

6) evidence of meaningful participation in the BSW, MSW, or Field Oversight Committees,
7) examination of teaching web site materials, and
8) review of handouts, testing activities, course assignments, and other course materials prepared by the faculty member.

Tenure-track faculty should request that tenured faculty conduct a peer evaluation of their classroom teaching every semester (and tenured faculty may also request peer evaluations).

The School defines teaching as including not only classroom performance, but other factors such as:
• preparing courses,
• creating effective testing strategies,
• developing curriculum,
• preparing syllabi and teaching materials,
• conducting assigned field liaison responsibilities,
• maintaining a minimum of five office hours per week for students enrolled in classes and additional hours during registration periods,
• advising students appropriately and timely on academic and career matters,
• maintaining competency in the profession by obtaining instructive CEU'S,
• maintaining licensure,
• sponsoring student organizations/activities outside of the classroom,
• and mentoring students.

Required Teaching Elements: All faculty are expected to show, in their annual reviews, that they:
• Have a majority of student evaluations which reflect acceptable teaching standards (very high quality=4.0+ on 5-point scale; high quality =3.75; adequate quality = 3.5)
• Maintain at least five office hours per week for advising
• Provide additional office hours during registration periods and are accessible to students for advising as needed
• Maintain professional competence by securing appropriate CEU'S
• Maintain licensure

Additional Teaching Elements: Elements which further demonstrate teaching quality are:
• Positive peer evaluations of teaching by tenured faculty members (required for tenure-track faculty)
• University Mentor status
• Sponsorship of student organization
• Sponsorship of outside student activities or student research
• Teaching overloads, large classes, or writing intensive courses
• Teaching courses by distance education strategies
• Overseeing independent studies or student research
• Developing library or other learning resources
• Developing or using challenging instructional methods over and above normal classroom expectation (such as audio production or software development)
• Successfully procuring grants for student stipends or curriculum development (such as leading study tours)
• Conducting guest lectures
• Conducting student BSW or MSW orientation sessions, field instructor workshops, or Bobcat Days
• Winning a teaching award
Demonstrating progress toward a relevant advanced degree

- Providing meaningful input into curriculum development in Oversight Committees
- Other elements as approved

**Teaching Level I**

A Level I rating in Teaching indicates that all of the following elements were above standard.

- A majority of student evaluations reflect a very high quality of teaching (4.0+ on a 5-point scale)
- All other **Required Teaching Elements** (see above list) are strongly evident.

In addition, the faculty person, to achieve Teaching Level I, must demonstrate at least three (3) **Additional Teaching Elements** (see above list) as determined by the Personnel Committee and the Director.

**Teaching Level II**

A Level II rating in Teaching indicates that all of the following elements are evident.

- Presenting a majority of student evaluations that reflect a high quality of teaching (at least 3.75)
- All other **Required Teaching Elements** are clearly evident

In addition, the faculty person, to achieve Teaching Level II, must demonstrate at least two (2) of the **Additional Teaching Elements** as determined by the Personnel Committee and the Director.

**Teaching Level III**

A Level III rating in Teaching indicates that all of the following elements are evident.

- Presenting a majority of student evaluations that reflect quality teaching (at least 3.5)
- All other **Required Teaching Elements** are evident

In addition, the faculty person, to achieve Teaching Level III, must demonstrate at least one (1) of the **Additional Teaching Elements** as determined by the Personnel Committee and the Director.

**Teaching Level IV**

A Level IV rating in Teaching indicates a failure to meet any two (2) of the following criteria:

- Presenting a majority of student evaluations that reflect quality teaching (at least 3.5+)
- Any of the other **Required Teaching Elements**

**Teaching Level V**

A Level V rating in Teaching indicates a failure to meet any three (3) of the following criteria:

- Presenting a majority of student evaluations that reflect quality teaching
Faculty in the Texas State School of Social Work recognize that their commitment to teaching cannot be fulfilled apart from a similar commitment to scholarship. Scholarship is defined as original research (quantitative or qualitative), applied research, and pedagogical research.

In no case will "equivalent activities" be considered to replace completely traditional refereed scholarly activities. Refereed means blind peer review in the case of a journal article. In the case of a book, chapter in a book, or monograph, it means peer review, but not necessarily blind peer review.

Articles, books, or monographs “in press” can be counted in annual review only once. (For example, a document cannot be counted “in press” during one annual review cycle and counted again in subsequent years when it is actually in print. The faculty member must indicate in which annual review cycle he or she wants the document “in press” to be counted and must document its status.)

In addition to the quantitative requirement, there is an important qualitative requirement. The School Director and Personnel Committee will provide a qualitative assessment of the candidate's scholarship based on such factors as acceptance rates of journals in which articles have appeared, prestige of organizations to which papers were presented, and opinions of experts outside the university. They will also examine whether a presentation or written work is refereed or not, and the source, award amount, and educational or research significance of any grant or contract.

Elements Demonstrating Scholarly and Creative Activity including but are not limited to the following list:

- One (1) approved but not funded grant or contract
- One (1) funded grant or contract
- One (1) publication in a refereed book or an article in a refereed journal
- Serving on one (1) editorial board of a national journal (with documentation to demonstrate substantial activity)
- Two (2) scholarly presentations (international, national, regional, or state)
- Two (2) Discussant or Presenter (panel discussion or workshop leader at the international, national, regional, or state level)
- Four (4) book review and/or newsletter articles
- One (1) international, national, regional, or state-level recognition for scholarly contribution through a variety of media (such as developing software)
- One (1) refereed chapter in a book, textbook, or monograph
- One (1) technical report or monograph based on grant activity
- Editing one (1) book
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- Or any combination of equivalent activities (for example, 1 scholarly presentation and 1 panel discussant meets the criteria)

**Scholarly and Creative Activity Level I**
One (1) publication in a refereed book or a refereed journal, plus any two (2) Elements Demonstrating Scholarly and Creative Activity.

**Scholarly and Creative Activity Level II**
One (1) publication in a refereed book or a refereed journal, or any one (1) funded grant or contract, and any one (1) of the Elements Demonstrating Scholarly and Creative Activity.

**Scholarly and Creative Activity Level III**
Any one of the Elements Demonstrating Scholarly and Creative Activity.

**Scholarly and Creative Activity Level IV**
Some activity listed in Elements Demonstrating Scholarly and Creative Activity, but less than the minimum requirements in Level III, or projects that are underway that will lead to presentation, publication, outside funding or recognition. (However, the same projects will not count from year to year.)

**Scholarly and Creative Activity Level V**
No activity documented in the Scholarly and Creative area.

**Service**

The Texas State School of Social Work defines service and service leadership as professionally related activity, other than teaching or scholarship, which contributes to the School, University, community, or profession. Service activities encompass those performed using competencies relevant to the faculty member’s role as a social work educator. For a faculty member to receive a ranking of adequate or above during the annual review process, he/she must demonstrate service and/or leadership at the School level.

In addition to the requirement that the faculty person must engage in service and/or service leadership at various levels, including the School level, the Personnel Committee and Director also assess the quality of the service or leadership, based on the documentation that the faculty member provides. Examples of service activities include but are not limited to:
1) active membership and participation in professional organizations,
2) active membership on committees,
3) training, volunteering, supervising, and consulting with social service agencies and organizations.
The School Director and the Personnel Committee assess the quality of service leadership based on the faculty member's documentation of same. Examples of service leadership include but are not limited to:

1) holding office in professional organizations,
2) directing University, College, or School committees,
3) organizing a task force,
4) initiating a special project,
5) engaging in legislative or public sector advocacy.

Simply listing membership or the title of an office on a committee is not sufficient documentation to determine the quality of service or leadership. Each faculty member must provide documentation of the following (or its equivalent as determined by the School Director and Personnel Committee):

**SERVICE LEVEL I**
Documented quality contributions on five (5) of the following levels, or documented quality contributions on three (3) of the levels with documented extraordinary service or leadership on at least one (1) additional level

- Leadership and service at the School level
- Leadership and/or service at the College level
- Leadership and/or service at the University level
- Leadership and/or service at the community level
- Leadership or active participation in an international, national, or state professional organization
- Active participation in advisory board meetings and activities

**SERVICE LEVEL II**
Documented quality contributions on four (4) of the following levels, or documented quality contributions on two (2) of the levels with extraordinary service or leadership on at least one (1) additional level

- Leadership and service at the School level
- Leadership and/or service at the College level
- Leadership and/or service at the University level
- Leadership and/or service at the community level
- Leadership or active participation in an international, national, or state professional organization
- Active participation in advisory board meetings and activities

**SERVICE LEVEL III**
Documented quality contributions on three (3) of the following levels or documented quality contributions on one (1) of the levels with extraordinary service or leadership on at least one (1) additional level

- Leadership and service at the School level
- Leadership and/or service at the College level
- Leadership and/or service at the University level
- Leadership and/or service at the community level
- Leadership or active participation in an international, national, or state professional organization
- Active participation in advisory board meetings and activities

**SERVICE LEVEL IV**
Documented quality contributions on two (2) of the following levels or documented quality contributions on only one (1) level

- Service at the School level
- Service at the College level
- Service at the University level
- Service at the community level
- Participation in an international, national, or state professional organization
- Active participation in advisory board meetings and activities

**SERVICE LEVEL V**
Documented quality contributions at only one (1) level or no documented service contributions at any level

- Service at the School level
- Service at the College level
- Service at the University level
- Service at the community level
- Participation in an international, national, or state professional organization
- Participation in advisory board meetings and activities
LEVELS OF EXPECTATION FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PERFORMANCE, AND Merit

The Texas State School of Social Work has defined in the document “Annual Review Procedures, Performance Expectations, and Forms” the definition of Teaching Levels I, II, III, IV, and V; Scholarly and Creative Activity Levels I-V; and Service Levels I-V. These definitions were approved by the faculty on 10/11/97 and have been updated in 2001, 2002, 2005, and 2006 to conform to language used in current University policy statements and the 2006 faculty handbook*.

Reappointment. Non-tenured faculty may be appointed either as continuing faculty or temporary faculty. According to the 2006 Faculty Handbook*, continuing faculty include those who are hired in a traditional academic rank with the clear understanding that they may be rehired for one or more additional years. Eligibility for reappointment is contingent upon a continuing faculty member achieving satisfactory annual evaluations (Faculty Handbook, pg. 36; PPS 8.09**).

Annual Review. The purposes of annual review include providing an opportunity for self-development; identifying, reinforcing, and sharing the strength of faculty; extending opportunities for continuous development; and identifying and strengthening the role of the faculty members in the unit (Faculty Handbook, page 39).

Faculty annual reviews are separate from but related to the tenure and promotion reviews. Cumulative annual reviews inform the Personnel Committee and Director about the body of work that the faculty person is developing over time. Annual evaluations form part of a faculty member’s file in tenure and promotion decisions (Faculty Handbook, pg. 39). Specific guidelines for evaluating tenure-track faculty members are found in PPS 8.01***.

Performance. Performance is a term used at this university to indicate that an employee meets the demands of the job appropriately. Achieving an acceptable performance rating means that a faculty person is eligible to be considered for a performance raise (if performance raise money is available). It does not guarantee or imply that a performance raise will be awarded.

Merit. Merit is a category which is used when the President deems it appropriate. Under the current university administration, a faculty member is eligible for merit only when his/her activities can be demonstrated as truly meritorious or outstanding as defined by School policy. Achieving a meritorious rating means that a faculty person is eligible to be considered for a merit raise (if merit raise money is available). It does not guarantee or imply that a merit raise will be awarded.

According to our School policy, in general:

Level I equates excellent activity and progress toward meeting School and personal professional goals
Levels of Expectation for Faculty. Faculty who are tenured or tenure track, as well as faculty who are continuing non-tenure-track (such as Clinical Faculty) are evaluated yearly. To be deemed eligible for reappointment, performance, or merit, a faculty person’s activities should meet the following minimum levels of expectations of Teaching Levels, Scholarly and Creative Activity Levels, and Service Levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenured/Tenure-Track Expectations</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Scholarly and Creative Activity</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment and Performance</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Merit (*Must have a I in at least one area)</td>
<td>I or II</td>
<td>I, II, or III</td>
<td>I or II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Tenure-Track Continuing Faculty Expectations</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Scholarly and Creative Activity</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment and Performance</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Merit (*Must have a I in at least one area)</td>
<td>I or II</td>
<td>III or IV</td>
<td>I or II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The faculty handbook is available at [http://www.txstate.edu/academicaffairs/](http://www.txstate.edu/academicaffairs/) (click on Faculty Handbook).

** Policy and Procedure Statement 8.09 “Performance Evaluation of Faculty and Post-Tenure” is found at [http://www.txstate.edu/academicaffairs/pps/pps8/8-09.htm](http://www.txstate.edu/academicaffairs/pps/pps8/8-09.htm).

***Policy and Procedure Statement 8.01 “Development/Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty” is found at [http://www.txstate.edu/academicaffairs/pps/pps8/8-01.html](http://www.txstate.edu/academicaffairs/pps/pps8/8-01.html)
All faculty members are required to include a current Texas State vita, highlighting the items relevant to this calendar year (January-December). They are also required to document those items marked with *. They may provide additional documentation as well.

1. Teaching Area

A. **Student Evaluation of Teaching**

   B. **Peer Evaluation of Teaching** (mandatory for tenure-track faculty)
C. Director Evaluation of Teaching

D. Innovative Teaching Strategies or Advising Responsibilities

E. Professional Development (Licensure, continuing education, pursuit of advanced degree)

F. Other activities (Student research or theses, writing-intensive courses, large classes, overload)

2. Scholarly and Creative Activities
a. External Grants*
b. Internal Grants*
c. Publications (refereed articles, books, book chapters, book reviews)*
d. Editorial Board activity
e. Presentations*
f. Discussant or Presenter at panel or workshop

3. Service (indicate and document participation)
A. Service to professional organizations
B. Community service
C. University service
D. College service
E. School of Social Work service

4. Other areas (Use this area to provide additional information not addressed in the above categories, and document at your discretion.)
Self-Evaluation and Goals
Annual Review Process
School of Social Work
Texas State University-San Marcos

Faculty Member’s Name: ____________________________  Date: ___________
Tenure-Track _______  Tenured _________  Non-tenure-track ______

Self-Evaluation for Calendar Year of January ______ through December ______.
Please carefully consider your performance as a faculty member over the last calendar year, and assess both your strengths and areas you wish to enhance.

× Teaching

× **Research and Scholarship

× Service

× Overall Performance

Goals for Calendar Year of January ______ through December ______.
Please carefully consider your goals as a faculty member for the coming calendar year, assessing what are your aspirations, what you can realistically accomplish, and how you plan to accomplish the goals you set.

× Teaching

× Research and Scholarship

× Service

× Overall Performance
Texas State School of Social Work
Performance Evaluation of Percent Time Lecturers and Per Course Adjunct Lecturers

a policy promulgated by the School of Social Work Personnel Committee,
November 2007; updated December 2008

This policy pertains to Percent Time Lecturers (defined as usually paid 50% or more time) and Per Course Adjunct Lecturers (defined as usually paid a flat amount for one course or two courses).

The Personnel Committee and/or the School Director review the teaching performance of Percent Time Lecturers and Per Course Adjunct Lecturers each semester.

- The School Director will ask all full-time faculty for any constructive, pertinent feedback on adjuncts and lecturers; resulting data will become part of the assessment.
- Both Percent Time Lecturers and Per Course Adjunct Lecturers must submit documentation of their teaching performance each semester to the School Director at the end of the semester. This documentation consists of student evaluations for each course taught during that semester.
- Percent Time Lecturers and Per Course Adjunct Lecturers are expected to include documentation of a peer evaluation of teaching, completed around midterm by a full-time member of the faculty using the attached Peer Evaluation of Teaching Form.
- For Percent Time Lecturers, the performance evaluation might also incorporate non-teaching responsibilities, such as student advising, committee work, administrative tasks, or other service activities. In this case, the required documentation should also include a summary of these additional assigned duties.
- In addition to the documentation specified above, The Personnel Committee and School Director may also rely upon other performance data in making their evaluation of both Percent Time Lecturers and Per Course Adjunct Lecturers. Discussions about the performance of adjunct and percent time lecturers will take place in Personnel Committee meetings on an as-needed basis.
- The Director will report the evaluation results to the adjuncts and lecturers in writing.
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
PEER EVALUATION OF CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE FORM

FACULTY       Amy Benton_________  COURSE    SOWK 5315—Child Welfare _______  LOCATION    _HPB 214_______
EVALUATOR    Dorinda Noble_________  DATE      02-21-2011_____________  TIME    6:30-9 M__________
# OF STUDENTS ____12___________

Evaluators: Schedule a time to observe the faculty member with a class. After the observation, share your appraisal with the faculty member. If the faculty member disagrees with your ratings, ask the faculty member to put his/her dissenting view in writing, to be included in the evaluation report if the faculty member so desires. Either the faculty member or evaluator may initiate a second review (by the same evaluator or a different evaluator).

RATE THE FACULTY MEMBER’S EXPERTISE ON EACH ITEM,
WITH 5 AS HIGH SCORE AND 1 AS LOW.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objectives</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Objectives are clear; faculty member follows the objectives X</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Objectives are fairly clear and followed in the main</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Objectives could be deduced</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Objectives were muddled and the faculty member did not seem to adhere to them</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Objectives were not apparent and did not guide the instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Benton made her objectives clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>The class presentation was very well-organized X</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>The class was fairly well-organized X</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Organization was acceptable</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Class presentation was somewhat disorganized</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Presentation was disorganized and disjointed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Benton was clearly well-prepared and had the information in mind that she wanted to convey. Students often make more sense out of statistics and factual material if it is related to case studies, so Dr. Benton may want to use case examples as “anchors” for her lecture. I recommend she avoid pronouns; Dr. Benton often referred to “she”, which I took to mean the text author, but I wasn’t sure. Or at times she pointed to something on the white board and said “that’s what that meant”, and I was unclear about meaning there as well. Making sure that everything is named and clear is helpful. Dr. Benton might want to think about repeating the full name of the concept to help students capture it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of Ideas and Material</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ideas and material were very clearly explained</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Ideas and material were fairly clear</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ideas and material could be deduced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ideas and material were fairly unclear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ideas and material were fuzzy and blurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Benton is new to teaching and certainly new to this course, so my comments are offered strictly as ideas for her to consider as she continues to develop her prowess as a teacher. 1) Benton started by giving statistics, which is a good way to have students glaze over. I suggest stories to link to statistics. 2) Benton wrote on the white board, but because the pens were used up, it was almost impossible to see the writing. A strategy that I use is to project a blank Word document on the screen and type my notes (using at least 18 point font so that people in the back can see). Or one can do the notes during prep time (again in big font) and project the actual notes, which helps students read and understand. Or prepare a handout or a power point. 3) Dr. Benton, since this course is new to her, focused on the notes in her hand, writing certain elements on the white board. Unfortunately, this focusing on words inhibits eye contact with students, and they can easily fade in attention. Try to look at students, not at paper or at the board. This also helps people hear better. Talking to the white board means your voice does not carry to the back of the room, where you want it to project. These are teaching skills that take time and experience to learn, so I offer these suggestions as ideas for future growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The faculty member was very informed and very knowledgeable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The faculty member was informed and knowledgeable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The faculty member was somewhat knowledgeable and informed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The faculty member had limited knowledge of material</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The faculty member had obvious knowledge and information gaps and made mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Benton seemed to have a good handle on the material, particularly for a first run in the course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Faculty used class time very effectively</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Class time was used rather effectively</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Faculty member used the time adequately</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Faculty member did not effectively use class time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Class time was mostly wasted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>I suggest that Dr. Benton make sure she repeats students’ questions, so that she is clear about the question, and also so that all students can hear the question or comment. Aim you voice to the back of the room, and look, look at your audience. Try to think like a student. Would you understand the material as presented; if not, go over it in a different way. Dr. Benton used a power point on some of her material, which is a suitable strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Involvement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Faculty member encouraged students to be involved in learning and discussion, and found ways to make this happen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Faculty member got students involved in learning and discussion a lot of the time</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Faculty member sometimes got students involved</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Faculty member rarely involved students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Faculty member discouraged students from being involved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Benton has a charming smile and when she flashes it on students, I think she draws them in. She listened to all questions respectfully and addressed them as she could. Obviously students felt comfortable talking. Students asked a few challenging questions, and Dr. Benton did a nice job of answering. Again, looking at students as much as possible, repeating their questions or comments for clarity and for accurate hearing, and answering loudly enough to be clearly heard will help students feel engaged in the learning process. Remember: aim your voice to the back wall. It gives you authority, and it helps people hear.

Dr. Benton is new to teaching and is doing fine. She can and will improve in her delivery strategies. It helps me to think like a member of the audience, so I adjust to the style and strategy that I think best meets the audience’s needs. And don’t forget: everyone loves a story!

Dr. Benton is very pleasant and approachable, and students seemed easy with her. I encourage her to face students full-on and use her physical presence through visual contact and body centeredness.

The syllabus was appropriate.

I enjoyed visiting her class.

Evaluator’s Signature: Dorinda Noble

Date: 02-28-2011