Scheme of Award for Excellence in Teaching

Eastern University, Sri Lanka

OVERVIEW OF AWARD

According to the Manual for Review of Undergraduate Study Programmes of Sri Lankan Universities and Higher Education Institutions (2015, Criterion 5 – Teaching and Learning, Standard Number 5.19, p. 63), universities in Sri Lanka should have and practice a well-defined teaching excellence awarding scheme. The manual indicates the necessity of having such a scheme for being stated below.

> "***Faculty/Institute uses a defined set of indicators of excellence in teaching to evaluate performance of teachers, identify champions of teaching excellence, and promote adoption of excellent practices***".

This is an obligatory requirement for having such a scheme by every faculty of Eastern University, Sri Lanka (EUSL). Hence, EUSL plans to introduce a teaching excellence awarding scheme to its all Faculties from 2021 (Academic year 2018/2019). The Teaching Excellence Award recognizes the academic staff who exemplify excellence in teaching at EUSL. This is one of the highest honours for teaching excellence at EUSL.

The main purpose of this award is to honour academic staff who show their exceptional performance in teaching, learning and assessments. One recipient from each faculty shall be selected for the award once a year (academic year) and will be awarded with a certificate, a gold medal and a cash prize of Rs. 25,000 (subject to change with the decision by the Senate of EUSL) at the Annual General Convocation. The portraits of awardees may be displayed within the University premises. This awarding scheme consists of ten (10) main components as laid down.

1. OBJECTIVES OF TEACHING EXCELLENCE AWARD

1.1 Main Objectives

The main objectives of this award are:

1. To identify and award excellent academics in teaching, learning and assessment practices in each Faculty of Eastern University, Sri Lanka, and
2. To promote a culture of outstanding teaching excellence among the academics of Eastern University, Sri Lanka.

1.2 Sub Objectives

The sub-objectives of this award are:

1. To demonstrate the University's commitment to excellence in teaching,
2. To motivate professionalism in teaching, learning and assessment practices,
3. To foster a commitment to teaching, learning and assessment improvement,
4. To enrich and enhance the student learning experience at EUSL, and
5. To produce graduates who are fruitful to the society through the development of the quality of teaching and learning.

2. POLICIES OF TEACHING EXCELLENCE AWARD

2.1 Teaching Excellence Award Eligibility Criteria

The eligibility criteria are:
- Full time permanent academic staff member of EUSL,
- Undergraduate teaching as a primary responsibility,
- Academic staff who has at least **three years** teaching, learning and assessment experience at EUSL,
- Minimum number of courses/modules taught by an academic staff in **an academic year** as being **allocated/permitted by the respective faculty based on 'workload and work norms model'** of University Grant Commission-Sri Lanka (https://www.eugc.ac.lk/qac/ac-accountability.html), and
- Academic staff who has completed the Teaching Methodology Course offered by the Staff Development Centers (SDCs) of Sri Lankan University System. This criterion will not be applicable to the academic staff who are recruited on or before 1997.
- Academic staff who received this award for an academic year **will not be eligible** to apply for next five academic years.

2.2 Application Calling Time and Closing Date

Applications will be called in November every year. This announcement will be made through the EUSL web portal and by written communication to the Deans of all faculties. From the date of calling of applications, the eligible academics should apply within one month. Late applications (after the closing date) **will not** be considered for evaluation.

2.3 Method of Application

An eligible academic should apply On-line/Off-line and should submit two (2) copies of his/her Teaching Portfolio (Hard/Soft Copy) as a key evidence for evaluation to the Office of the Dean. The teaching portfolio of an academic can serve as the data repository for his/her teaching, learning and assessment.

2.4 Main Stakeholders of Evaluation

The main stakeholders are:
1. Undergraduate students – Student Feedback at the end of the semesters,
2. Alumni/immediate passed out graduates – Graduate Survey,
3. The applicant – Self-evaluation and Reflections report (Teaching Portfolio),
4. Peer – Peer Review, and
5. Direct Superior – Head of the Department or if the applicant is a Head of the Department, respective Dean of the faculty will evaluate in place of the HOD.

2.5 Data Collection

The relevant data and information will be collected through the main stakeholders stated above. The process of collecting them is shown in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Data Collection Process and Evaluating Stakeholders

SN	Stakeholders	Format of the Evaluation and Data Source	Responsible Person/Body
1.	Undergraduate students	*Student Feedback* Data from IQA Cell **(Computerized)**	IQA Cell coordinator of each Faculty
2.	Alumni/immediate passed-out graduates	*Graduate Survey* Data from SPSU of EUSL **(Computerized)**	Director SPSU/Responsible Person of SPSU of EUSL
3.	Applicant	*Teaching Portfolio* (Self-evaluation and Reflections Report)	Applicant Two independent evaluators assigned by Faculty Level Awarding Committee
4.	Peer	*Peer Evaluation Report* Data from IQA Cell **(Computerized)**	IQA Cell coordinator of the respective Faculty
5.	Direct Superior	*Report of the Head of the Department or Dean of the Faculty*, whichever appropriate **(Computerized)**	Head of the Department or Dean of the Faculty (whoever appropriate)

Note: IQA = Internal Quality Assurance, SPSU = Strategic Planning and Statistical Unit

2.6 The Final Evaluation of the Application

- **Faculty Level Awarding Committee:** This faculty level committee consists of five members (Dean of the Faculty, Director/Staff Development Centre (SDC), Director/Centre for Quality Assurance (CQA), One Professor – outside the faculty, One Head of the Department – Outside the faculty). These five members will be recommended by the faculty board and approved by the Senate. Dean will serve as the Chair of this awarding committee. Deans of the Faculties, Directors-SDC and CQA cannot apply for this award during their Deanships/Directorships.

- The committee will select two independent evaluators (outside the committee) to evaluate the applicant's portfolio by using a rating scale method, which is defined in the awarding scheme.

- The committee will get input data from the other four sources (as in **Table 2.1**) and determine the final marks for the applicants by using the defined criteria in the awarding scheme.

- The committee will determine the potential awardee and inform to the Faculty Board and the Faculty Board shall recommend the potential awardee to the Senate of EUSL for final approval.

3. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS OF TEACHING EXCELLENCE AWARD

This section consists of five (5) sub-sections that belongs to the evaluations of the stakeholders. This section devises the criteria and standards of teaching excellence award for evaluating a lecturer by:

3.1 Undergraduate Students
3.2 Alumni/immediate passed-out Graduates
3.3 Two (2) independent Evaluators
3.4 Peer
3.5 Direct Superior

3.1 Criteria and Standards for Evaluating a Lecturer by Undergraduate Students

The criteria and statements for undergraduate students to evaluate a lecturer performance in teaching learning and assessment consists of Six (6) aspects, namely they are:

a) Course management
b) Effective communication with students
c) Delivery of Lectures
d) Knowledge and applications
e) Assessment
f) Support for students and motivation

All these aspects (see Appendix 1 for details) are evaluated with 7, 5, 10, 3, 5 and 4 statements, respectively, by using a rating scale 1-5 from a student's perspective (see ***Appendix 1*** for details). Overall average value in terms of the rating scale (1-5) will be considered for computation of final marks for awarding the teaching excellence.

3.2 Criteria and Standards for Evaluating a Lecturer by Alumni/Immediate Passed-out Graduates

The alumni members/immediate passed out graduates who participate in this evaluation process must select the **top three (3) university lecturers** from their **faculty** in their preferential order. The graduate must evaluate those preferred top three lecturers for their excellence in teaching by using the same rating scale above for evaluating the six (6) aspects/criteria (see ***Appendix 2*** for details).

Overall average value in terms of the rating scale (1-5) will be considered for computation of final marks for awarding the teaching excellence.

3.3 Criteria and Standards to assess Teaching Portfolio submitted by the Applicant

This section consists of two sub-sections - ***Outline of the components in the teaching portfolio*** and ***evaluation criteria*** to assess the submitted portfolio by the applicant (university teacher). The applicant should submit only one Teaching Portfolio by incorporating all aspects of courses/modules taught.

3.3.1 The Outline of the Teaching Portfolio

3.3.1A   PERSONAL AND COURSE DETAILS

3.3.1A 1   **Personal Information of the Applicant**: Full name, Field, Department etc.

3.3.1A 2   **Courses/Modules Taught:**

Provide a table with all courses taught in the ***past three years of teaching***. Column headings are to include course code and title, number of credits, academic year and Semester taught, class size (including **gender** and **ethnic diversity**), and passing rate (only for past three years). Include a statement of the normal teaching load in the Applicant's department/faculty. If there was a breaks in teaching, it is acceptable to include teaching activities beyond this 3-year history (for example, a 6-month study leave or personal leave means that teaching history should be included for a 3-year 6-month period. In this context, the applicant should provide the following as the minimum information.

Details of Course/Modules taught in the past three years of teaching

Course Code and Title (with number of credits)	Academic Year & Semester	Class Size	Passing Rate (past 3 years)

3.3.1B   **TEACHING PRACTICES**

3.3.1B 1   **Statement of Teaching Philosophy and the Role of the Teacher**

The Statement of Teaching Philosophy is prepared by the Applicant and must be current (***within the last two years***). An effective philosophy statement should be personal and genuine. It should uniquely distinguish the Applicant's approaches to learning and teaching. It provides a conceptual framework that explains the values, principles and goals that underpin the Applicant's teaching decisions, methods and actions.

3.3.1B 2   **Course Specifications**

A concise description of a course relatively to its aims(s), objectives, intended learning outcomes, the volume of learning in terms of credits, course contents/synopsis, teaching and learning methods, assessment procedures, learner support available, recommended reading material, including the information on the programme for which the course is prescribed, the department responsible for offering it, and prior-learning requirements (***Programme Review Manual of UGC, 2015, p. 111***).

3.3.1B 3   **Lesson Plans**

3.3.1B 4   **Course Materials**

Materials in print or electronic format which are provided to the learner to support the achievement of the intended learning outcomes (***Programme Review Manual of UGC, 2015, p. 111***).

3.3.1B 5   **Statement of Effective Teaching/Learning Strategies**

The Applicant also writes this section (updated in the last two years). It is often

presented as a narrative and it should illustrate how the Applicant's philosophy is informed by the teaching decisions and actions enacted in the teaching process. The Applicant needs to provide the rationale behind the strategies and evidence of his/her effectiveness (e.g., what worked, what did not work). It is advisable to link these teaching strategies to student learning and learning outcomes. This statement is typically *three to five pages*.

3.3.1B 6   **Evidence for Integrating research and scholarly works in Teaching and Learning**

Applicant integrates into his/her teaching with appropriate research and scholarly activities of his/her own/others' and current knowledge in the public domain (***PR Manual of UGC, 2015, Standard 5.6, p. 61***).

3.3.1B 7   **Evidence for Group/Team based Teaching and Learning**

Teaching and Learning strategies of the applicant should provide opportunities for students to work in study groups to promote collaborative learning ***(PR Manual of UGC, 2015, Standard 5.9, p. 62)***.

3.3.1B 8   **Evidence of Teaching Excellence (Innovative and Healthy Practices)**

This is the ideal opportunity for the Applicant to illustrate the link between teaching philosophy, strategy and application. The Applicant should choose two to three unique examples (e.g., innovative learning strategies a novel assignment, a series of lab experiments, exceptional fieldwork, innovative teaching) that support these links. A copy of a course-outline or major assignment, by itself, is insufficient. The Applicant must explain explicitly how each example links philosophy and strategy or how it enhances teaching excellence (***Note: Applicant should refer to the Programme Review Manual of UGC, 2015, pp. 75-78***).

3.3.1B 9   **LMS usage and its Application in Teaching, Learning and Assessment**

3.3.1B 10   **Handling Critical Incident related to Teaching, Learning and Assessment**

During the evaluation period, if any incident happened and those incidents seriously affected university operation/function, in that context, the applicant should explain how he/she has handled teaching, learning and assessment activities without delays and interruptions during the said period.

3.3.1C   **STUDENT ASSESSMENT**

Applicant should write about his/her involvement in the assessment and provide evidence for practising the standards of student assessment. Following standards should be taken into consideration while preparing this section.

3.3.1C 11   **Assessments align with course ILOs**

3.3.1C 12   **Appropriate assessment strategy for a particular course**

3.3.1C 13   **Ensure the weightage relating to different components of assessments in the programme handbook/course specifications** (***PR Manual of UGC, 2015, Standard 7.5, p. 72***)

3.3.1C 14   **Paper moderation feedback from moderators or second/external**

examiners (*PR Manual of UGC, 2015, Standard 7.6, p. 72*)

3.3.1C 15 **Evidences for students are assessed using published criteria, regulations, and procedures that are adhered to by the staff (applicant) and communicated to students at the time of enrollment/beginning of the course** (*PR Manual of UGC, 2015, Standard 7.8, p. 72*)

3.3.1C 16 **Evidence for giving CA/Formative Assessment Feedback to the student on time** (*PR Manual of UGC, 2015, Standard 7.11, p. 73*)

3.3.1C 17 **Continuous Assessment Question Papers, Marking Scheme and Mark Sheets** (*PR Manual of UGC, 2015, Standard 7.12, p. 73*)

3.3.1C 18 **End Semester Examination Papers and Marking Scheme** (*PR Manual of UGC, 2015, Standard 7.12, p. 73*)

3.3.1C 19 **Evidence for submitting Continuous Assessment (CA) Marks to Head of the Department**

3.3.1C 20 **Evidence for giving Final Mark sheet to the HOD/Examination Branch on time** (*PR Manual of UGC, 2015, Standard 7.15, p. 74*)

3.3.1C 21 **Applicant's perspective of the Summary of Student Feedback received from IQAC Coordinator of the Faculty**

3.3.1C 22 **Applicant's perspective of the Summary of Peer Feedback received from IQAC Coordinator of the Faculty**

3.3.1C 23 **Rules for Classroom Management**

3.3.1C 24 **Reflections and Remarks on Teaching, Learning and Assessment (at least two pages)**

Name　　　:

Signature　:　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Date:

3.3.2 Evaluation Criteria to Assess the Portfolio submitted by the Applicant

This is to evaluate the portfolio submitted by the applicant. The evaluation does take place with the two (2) independent evaluators assigned by the Faculty Level Awarding Committee on the approval of the Senate of EUSL. Relatively, the criteria and the statements have been set out appropriately to evaluate the portfolio submitted by the Applicant. The aspects for evaluation include: (b) **Teaching practices** with ten (10) criteria and (c) **Student Assessment** with sixteen (14) criteria (see *Appendix 3* for details).

The average of both evaluators in terms of the rating scale (1-5) can be used for final computation of marks to determine the Teaching Excellence. If there is a rating scale difference with greater than or equal to 1.5 (30 marks or above) (refer to page no. 11) between the two evaluators, the respective faculty board can appoint the third evaluator to finalise the Applicant's portfolio assessment as approved by the Senate of EUSL. Overall average value in

terms of the rating scale (1-5) will be considered for computation of final marks for awarding the teaching excellence.

3.4 Criteria and Standards for Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Each faculty can decide the appointment/nomination of peer for the 'peer evaluation' based on their existing practices. There must be at least one peer evaluation for a course. In this context, the second examiner (within EUSL) for a course can be considered as a suitable academic for the peer evaluation. In case, the second examiner is outside academic (outside the EUSL or difficult to access or reach the peer evaluation place/location), applicant's Department/Faculty can assign a suitable and relevant internal senior academic as a peer to perform peer evaluation.

The appointment of peer evaluator should be recommended by the Department and approved by the Faculty Board. Peer evaluation of teaching is integral to demonstrate the teaching excellence. Peer evaluation must be based on observation of teaching (physical and/or virtual classroom*) and meet the standards for peer evaluation of teaching.

Note: *Virtual classroom refers to teaching online using educational technologies. Observation can be done through reviewing Course Spaces sites, LMS, postings, discussions, commentary, etc.

The criteria and statements for the evaluation of the Applicant by his/her peer have been laid down with six (6) aspects with the statements as being evaluated with 1-5 rating scale (see ***Appendix 4*** for details).

Criteria	No. of Statements
a) Effective Time Management: Based on Classroom Observation	6
b) Effective communication with students: Based on Classroom Observation	8
c) Delivery of lectures: Based on Classroom Observation	10
d) Use of effective teaching strategies: Based on Classroom Observation	7
e) Knowledge and Applications: Based on Classroom Observation	3
f) Facilitation and Students Motivation for Enhancement of Learning: Based on Classroom Observation	4

Overall average value in terms of the rating scale (1-5) can be used for final computation of marks to determine the Teaching Excellence.

3.5 Criteria and Standards for the Evaluation of Lecturer by the Direct Superior

The Applicant's direct superior (this refers to usually Head of the Department; however, in case of the applicant as a Head, the Dean of the faculty is the superior to the Head) must evaluate the Applicant's performance for the award of teaching excellence.

The criteria and statements for the evaluation of the Applicant by his/her direct superior have been laid down with eight (8) aspects with the statements as being evaluated with 1-5 rating scale (see ***Appendix 5*** for details).

Criteria	No. of Statements
a) Punctuality	9
b) Quality of work	3
c) Preparation of Teaching, Learning and Assessment Materials	7
d) Assessment	5
e) Continuous Professional Development	4
f) Workload (one academic year)	6
g) Research and Publication	3
h) Personal Conduct	12

Overall average value in terms of the rating scale (1-5) will be considered for computation of final marks to award the teaching excellence.

4. METHOD(S) OF TEACHING EXCELLENCE AWARD

This awarding system mainly uses a rating scale method to assess the performance of the applicant. The standard forms will be designed by using rating scale method and peer evaluation will be conducted by visiting the classroom (**without prior notifications**) of the lecturers as a normal practice, which comes under quality assurance cell of the faculty.

5. EVALUATION FORMS OF TEACHING EXCELLENCE AWARD

This scheme mainly comprises five (5) evaluation forms. The blueprints of these forms are given in Appendices 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. These tables will be converted as computerized/google forms with appropriate instructions and guidance. Hence, the components of the scheme did not provide details information about every evaluation form of the scheme.

6. TRAINING

6.1 Training to the Evaluators
To implement this system effectively, Staff Development Center (SDC) should provide training to evaluators as well as examiners and other key stakeholders of this system.

6.2 Training to the Academic Staff
 SDC of EUSL will conduct a series of workshops to introduce, promote, encourage, and support academic staff in their application for the teaching excellence award. These workshops not only showcase the works of previous winners, but also provide individual consultations to academic staff to help them develop their teaching portfolio for faculty level teaching awards.

Frequency of Workshops per year: once a year specifically at the beginning of the year.

Duration: one day programme

Resource persons: Senior Academic staff members from different faculties selected by SDC programme committee will serve as resource persons for this workshop.

Role of Director/SDC and Management Committee: Director and management committee of SDC will be responsible for the continuation of this workshop. They should take adequate measures to allocate funds and identify suitable resource persons for this workshop with the approval of the Senate of EUSL.

Inclusion with Staff Induction Training Programme: It could be decided by SDC management committee and approved by the Senate of EUSL.

Responsibility of the Faculties
Each faculty should provide the necessary information and guidance to the students about this awarding scheme and their key role in implementing the scheme efficiently and effectively.

7. APPRAISING

This is about implementing the scheme practically.

8. DISCUSSING TEACHING EXCELLENCE AWARD RESULTS WITH APPLICANT

After collating all the information and data about the applicant's performance, the faculty level awarding committee should invite the applicant and can discuss with him/her about his/her performances, strengths and weaknesses. The main objective of this discussion is to clarify or ensure certain doubts, ambiguities and any other matters related to performance evaluation.

9. MAKING DECISION, RECORDING AND COMMUNICATING TO FACULTY BOARD & SENATE

This component consists of two sub-components such as final marks calculation process and final awarding decision. In view of final marks calculation, overall average of every stakeholder assessment in terms of the rating scale (1-5) will be considered for final computation of marks to determine the Teaching Excellence. Therefore, the following 4-step processes are in consideration.

Step 1: Converting the rating scale averages of every stakeholder value into percentage marks.

Evaluators	Overall average in the rating scale 1-5 (**e.g.**)	Actual marks gained in %
1. Undergraduate Students	3.8300	76.60
2. Alumni/Immediate Passed-out Graduates	4.5200	90.40
3. Teaching Portfolio Evaluators	3.2200	64.40
4. Peer	4.0000	80.00
5. Direct Superior	3.5000	70.00

Step 2: Setting the percentage criteria for the accountability (weightage) of each assessment into the final marks-calculation.

Evaluators	Actual marks gained in %	Weightage to marks gained (sum = 100%)
Undergraduate Students	76.60	**25%**
Alumni/Immediate Passed-out Graduates	90.40	**15%**
Teaching Portfolio Evaluators	64.40	**25%**
Peer	80.00	**20%**
Direct Superior	70.00	**15%**

Step 3: Final marks-calculation

Evaluators	Actual marks gained	Weightage %	Final Marks
Undergraduate Students	76.60	25%	19.15
Alumni/Immediate Passed-out Graduates	90.40	15%	13.56
Teaching Portfolio Evaluators	64.40	25%	16.10
Peer	80.00	20%	16.00
Direct Superior	70.00	15%	10.50
Total marks to be considered for award			**75.31**

Step 4: Final Awarding Decision

The Applicants who receive or gain 75 or above will be eligible/qualify to get the award. At the same time, if more than one staff qualifies for the awards in a faculty, all will be selected to get this award. Moreover, applicants who receive or gain 50 or less than 74.99 marks will be selected to get following types of certificates at the Annual General Convocation.

Marks Range	Type
50 or less than 64.99	Bronze Certificate
65 or less than 74.99	Silver Certificate

10. REVIEW AND RENEWAL OF TEACHING EXCELLENCE AWARDING SCHEME

This is the last components of this scheme. This is about the review and renewal of teaching excellence awarding scheme. Faculties have the rights to review and renew this awarding scheme based on their unique requirements with appropriate justifications. However, a change in this awarding scheme should be recommended by the Faculty Board of respective faculty and approved by the Senate of EUSL.

Bibliography

Arnautu, E., & Panc, I. (2015), Evaluation Criteria for Performance Appraisal of faculty Members, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 203, 386 – 392.

Baker, W., Franz, G. Glenn, A., Herron, N., Pauley, L., Pierce, G., Snavely, L., Von Dorpowski, H., (2005), Definition of Teaching Excellence. Teaching Excellence Committee, Teaching and Learning Consortium, Penn. Retrieved: 2020-04-05, 9.30 pm, Sri Lanka (source: http://www.schreyerinstitute.psu.edu/Definition).

Berk, R.A.(2005), Survey of 12 Strategies to Measure Teaching Effectiveness, *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education,* 2005, 17(1), 48-62.

Broughan, C., Steventon, G., & Clouder, L. (Eds.), (2018), *Global Perspectives on Teaching Excellence: A new era for higher education* (1 Ed.). London: Routledge.

Chalmers, D. (2015), National Teaching Quality Indicators Project Final Report – Rewarding and recognising quality teaching in higher education through systematic implementation of indicators and metrics, University of Western Australia.

Courcy, E.D. (2015), Defining and Measuring Teaching Excellence in Higher Education in the 21st Century, *College Quarterly*, 18(1), 1-6.

Dublin City University. (2020), What is Teaching Excellence? Retrieved: 2020-04-06, 10.30 am, Sri Lanka. (source: https://www.dcu.ie/teu/presidents_awards_what_is_teaching_excellence.shtml).

Gillard, J. W. (2018), An initial analysis and reflection of the metrics used in the Teaching Excellence Framework in the UK, *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 22(2), 49-57, DOI: 10.1080/13603108.2017.1409669

Gunn, A. (2015), The UK Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF): The Development of a New Transparency Tool, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326400766

Jeff Gelfer, Katie 'O' Hara, Delilah Krasch & Neal Nguyen (2015), Teacher portfolios: an effective way to assess teacher performance and enhance learning, *Early Child Development and Care*, DOI: 10.1080/03004430.2015.1005614

Khuanwang,W., Lawthong, N.,& Suwanmonkha, S. (2016), Development of evaluation standards for professional experiential training of student teachers, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 217, 878 – 886.

Lesley Gourlay & Jacqueline Stevenson (2017), Teaching excellence in higher education: critical perspectives, *Teaching in Higher Education*, 22(4), 391-395, DOI:10.1080/13562517.2017.1304632

Manual for Review of Undergraduate Study Programmes of Sri Lankan Universities and Higher Education Institutions (2015), Higher Education for the Twenty First Century (HETC)

Project Ministry of Higher Education, Sri Lanka & University Grants Commission, Sri Lanka.

Neghavati, A. (2016), Core Skills Training in a Teacher Training Programme, International Conference on Teaching and Learning English as an Additional Language, GlobELT, Antalya, Turkey.*Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 232, 617 – 622.

Opatha, H H D N P. (2013), Towards a Sound Performance Appraisal System: An Agenda for Action, *Sri Lankan Journal of Human Resource Management*, 4(1), 62-77.

Quality Assurance Council-University Grant Commission-Sri Lanka (2018), Academic Accountability, Work Load and Work Norms Model Retrieved: 2020-05-06, 11.30 am, Sri Lanka. (source: https://www.eugc.ac.lk/qac/ac-accountability.html)

Sri Lanka Qualification Framework (2015), University Grants Commission, Sri Lanka. https://www.ugc.ac.lk/attachments/1156_SLQF_2016_en.pdf

University of OREGON. (2020), What is Teaching Excellence? Retrieved: 2020-04-06, 10.45 am, Sri Lanka. (source: https://tep.uoregon.edu/teaching-excellence).

Committee to Prepare Evaluation Criteria for Award for Teaching Excellence (List of Team Members)

1. Dr A. Anton Arulrajah, Head/Department of Management – Chair
2. Dr Roshini Murugupillai, Head/Medical Education & Research
3. Rev. Fr. A. Augustine Navaretnam, Senior Lecturer in Christianity, **(SCL trained)**
4. Mr. K. A. N. K. Karunarathna, Senior Lecturer in Statistics, **(SCL trained)**
5. Mr. S. Srikrishnah, Senior Lecturer in Crop Science

Appendix 1: Evaluation Criteria and Statements for Undergraduate Students

Use 1-5 rating scale as:

1 = Strongly Disagree   2 = Disagree   3. Neutral/Marginal   4 = Agree   5 = Strongly Agree

Criteria and Statements	Rating Scale				
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Course Management					
1.1 Lectures were conducted according to the session timetable.					
1.2 All chapters/modules/topics were completed within the given duration.					
1.3 Lectures were conducted according to given course plan/course outline.					
1.4 Tutorials, practical, discussion class, etc. were done in well informed manner.					
1.5 Lecturer was punctual.					
1.6 The learning materials were modern and updated.					
1.7 Overall contact hours made the students motivated to attend the classes.					
2. Effective Communication with students					
2.1 Course objectives and intended learning outcomes were clearly outlined/defined.					
2.2 Course/Lesson plan was given at the beginning of the course.					
2.3 Methods of assessments were clearly communicated.					
2.4 Lecturer listened to students' needs and remedial measures were taken.					
2.5 Lecturer's language was clear.					
3. Delivery of Lectures					
3.1 Lecturer was well confident and committed in teaching.					
3.2 Lectures/practical were conducted in a well-organized manner.					
3.3 Subject matters were clearly communicated.					
3.4 Lecturer was friendly and treating the students with due respect.					

3.5	Interaction with students during the lecture was high.					
3.6	Voice of the lecturer was in an acceptable level.					
3.7	Students were promoted for discussion and asking question/doubt.					
3.8	Lecturer could maintain students' attention during lectures					
3.9	Self-learning was promoted.					
3.10	Lecturer provided motivation for development of new ideas/concepts/models.					
4.	**Knowledge and Applications**					
4.1	Lecturer demonstrated a sound knowledge in the field.					
4.2	The Lecturer integrated theoretical course concepts with real-world applications.					
4.3	The Lecturer integrated current research findings in teaching.					
5.	**Assessment**					
5.1	Lecturer used appropriate assessment methods/strategies to promote learning.					
5.2	Transparency in continuous assessment was maintained by providing marking schemes.					
5.3	Continuous assessments were conducted as in course plan.					
5.4	Results of continuous assessments were released on time.					
5.5	Results of continuous assessments were discussed with the students.					
6.	**Support for Students and Motivation**					
6.1	The lecturer was available during the office hours and for after class consultations.					
6.2	Proper appreciation was given to students.					
6.3	Lecturer was compassionate and caring.					
6.4	Lecturer provided support, directions and guidance.					
	Overall Average Value					

Appendix 2: Evaluation Statements for Alumni/Immediate Passed-out Graduates

Use 1-5 rating scale as:

1 = Strongly Disagree   2 = Disagree   3. Neutral/Marginal   4 = Agree   5 = Strongly Agree

Criteria	Teacher/Lecturer														
	Name-1: _____					Name-2: _____					Name-3: _____				
	Rating Scale 1 to 5					Rating Scale 1 to 5					Rating Scale 1 to 5				
1. Helped in my Overall Academic Development.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2. Helped in my Overall Professional/Career Preparation.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
3. Helped in my Overall Personality/ Leadership Development.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
4. The lecturer had good image and reputation in the Faculty/University.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
5. Lecturer was Genuine and treated the students fairly.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
6. The lecturer was a role model for students.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Overall Average Value															

Appendix 3: Evaluation Statements for Evaluators on the Applicant's Teaching Portfolio

Use 1-5 rating scale as:

1 = Basic/below Expectation	2 = Closer to the Expectation	3. Meets Expectation
4 = Approaching the Excellence	5 = Excellence and for	**Not Applicable** = N/A

SN	Evaluation Content/Criteria	Rating Scale					
		N/A	1	2	3	4	5
B	**Teaching Practices**						
B.1	Statement of Teaching Philosophy and the role of the teacher						
B.2	Course Specifications						
B.3	Lesson Plans						
B.4	Course Materials						
B.5	Statement of Effective Teaching/Learning Strategies						
B.6	Evidence for Integrating research and scholarly works in Teaching and Learning (PR Manual of UGC, 2015, Standard 5.6, p. 61)						
B.7	Evidence for Group/Team based Teaching and Learning: (PR Manual of UGC, 2015, Standard 5.9, p. 62): Programme Review Manual of UGC, 2015, pp. 60-63)						
B.8	Evidence of Teaching Excellence (Innovative and Healthy Practices): Programme Review Manual of UGC, 2015, pp. 75-78)						
B.9	LMS usage and its Application in Teaching, Learning and Assessment						
B.10	Handling Critical Incident related to Teaching, Learning and Assessment						

C	Student Assessment						
C.11	Assessments align with course ILOs						
C.12	Appropriate Assessment strategy for the course						
C.13	Ensure that the weightage relating to different components of assessments in the programme handbook/course specifications (PR Manual of UGC, 2015, Standard 7.5, p. 72)						
C.14	Paper moderation feedback from moderators or second/external examiners (PR Manual of UGC, 2015, Standard 7.6, p. 72)						
C.15	Evidences for students are assessed using published criteria, regulations, and procedures that are adhered to by the staff (applicant) and communicated to students at the time of enrollment/beginning of the course (PR Manual of UGC, 2015, Standard 7.8, p. 72)						
C.16	Evidence for giving CA/Formative Assessment Feedback to the student on time (PR Manual of UGC, 2015, Standard 7.11, p. 73)						
C.17	Continuous Assessment Question Papers, Marking Scheme and Mark Sheets (PR Manual of UGC, 2015, Standard 7.12, p. 73)						
C.18	End Semester Examination Papers and Marking Scheme (PR Manual of UGC, 2015, Standard 7.12, p. 73)						
C.19	Evidence for submitting CA Marks to Head of the Department						
C.20	Evidence for giving Final Mark sheet to the HOD/Examination Branch on time (PR Manual of UGC, 2015, Standard 7.15, p. 74)						
C.21	Applicant's perspective of the summary of Student Feedback received from IQAC Coordinator of the Faculty						
C.22	Applicant's perspective of the summary of Peer Feedback received from IQAC Coordinator of the Faculty						
C.23	Rules for Classroom Management						
C.24	Reflections and Remarks on Teaching, Learning and Assessment (at least two pages)						
	Overall Average Value						

Appendix 4: Evaluation Statements for the Evaluation of Lecturer by Peer

Use 1-5 rating scale as:

1 = Strongly Disagree   2 = Disagree   3. Neutral/Marginal   4 = Agree   5 = Strongly Agree

Criteria and Statement	Rating Scale				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1. Effective Time Management: Based on Classroom Observation					
1.1 Session was started on time.					
1.2 Session was stopped on time.					
1.3 Session was taken according to session timetable.					
1.4 Lesson was aligned with the course plan (the lesson in the course plan for that specific day and time was taught).					
1.5 All the topics outlined in the lesson plan were completed within the session.					
1.6 Time allocations for each component (introduction, objectives, outcomes, etc.) of lesson, calculation, doubt clearance, students' discussion, etc. were appropriate.					
2. Effective communication with students: Based on Classroom Observation					
2.1 Importance of the lesson was explained.					
2.2 Expected learning outcome of lesson was explained.					
2.3 Lesson content was explained.					
2.4 Subject matters were communicated clearly.					
2.5 Voice was audible at the back.					
2.6 Acceptable Language command.					
2.7 Handwriting was clear and visible for all.					
2.8 Lecturer listened to the students.					
3. Delivery of lectures: Based on Classroom Observation					
3.1 Lecturer was well confident in subject matter.					
3.2 Lesson was well organized.					
3.3 Accuracy and clarity of theory/concept were observed					

	3.4	Lesson was delivered interestingly.					
	3.5	Lesson was an interactive session.					
	3.6	Students in the class were well managed.					
	3.7	Lecturer was enthusiastic in teaching.					
	3.8	An adequate time was allocated for students' doubts.					
	3.9	Self-learning of students was promoted.					
	3.10	Lecturer encouraged students' critical thinking.					
4.	**Use of effective teaching strategies: Based on Classroom Observation**						
	4.1	Linked the teaching session to the previous session/s					
	4.2	Used one of these approaches-Outcome Based Education, Problem Based Education, Students-Centered Learning, Research-Led Approaches.					
	4.3	Necessary guidance and direction were provided to adopt one of the above approaches.					
	4.4	Teaching aids were effectively used.					
	4.5	Used appropriate teaching methodology (small/large/peer group discussion, demonstration, simulation etc.)					
	4.6	Summarized major points/ concluded the session					
	4.7	Related the session to future sessions					
5.	**Knowledge and Applications: Based on Classroom Observation**						
	5.1	Lecturer demonstrated sound knowledge in the field.					
	5.2	Real-world problems were discussed as examples.					
	5.3	The Lecturer integrates current research findings in teaching.					
6.	**Facilitation and Students Motivation for Enhancement of Learning: Based on Classroom Observation**						
	6.1	Necessary learning materials had been provided.					
	6.2	Learning resources had been made available to access from outside the classroom.					
	6.3	Lecturer used own motivational methods in teaching.					
	6.4	Used appropriate method to appreciate students.					
		Overall Average Value					

Appendix 5: Evaluation Statements for the Evaluation of Lecturer by the Direct Superior

Use 1-5 rating scale as:

1 = Strongly Disagree (Very Low)	2 = Disagree (Low)	3. Neutral/Moderate/Marginal
4 = Agree (High)	5 = Strongly Agree (Very High) and	Not Applicable = N/A

#		Criteria and Statements		Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High
				Rating Scale				
1.		**Punctuality**		1	2	3	4	5
	1.1	Staff was available or reachable during the working hours.						
	1.2	Obtains prior approval for leave and prompt notice of absence due to illness.						
	1.3	Delivery of lectures completed within the stipulated period.						
	1.4	Session timetable was followed.						
	1.5	Continuous assessments were conducted on time.						
	1.6	Results of continuous assessments were released on time.						
	1.7	Setting of question papers were done on time.						
	1.8	Moderation of question papers, when assigned were done on time.						
	1.9	Submission of results as the first/second examiner was done on time.						
2.		**Quality of Work**		1	2	3	4	5
	2.1	Quality of the examination papers (based on moderators' reports).						
	2.2	Accuracy of the submitted marks sheet and evaluation sheet.						
	2.3	Overall Quality of the work was acceptable.						
3.		**Preparation of Teaching, Learning and Assessment Materials**	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
	3.1	Course plans						
	3.2	Lesson plans						
	3.3	Learning material						

			1	2	3	4	5
	3.4	Tutorial*					
	3.5	Assignments*					
	3.6	Presentations*					
	3.7	LMS					
4.	**Assessment**		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	4.1	Examination questions were aligned with the learning outcomes of the course.					
	4.2	Effective usage of different evaluation strategies.					
	4.3	Fairness was maintained in the evaluation.					
	4.4	Consistency was maintained in the evaluation process.					
	4.5	Transparency was maintained in evaluations.					
5.	**Continuous Professional Development**		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	5.1	Participating Training Programmes/Workshops /Courses					
	5.2	Serving as a consultant					
	5.3	Completion of higher degree					
	5.4	Awards and Appreciations received during the evaluation period					
6.	**Workload (one academic year)**		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	6.1	Number of courses (give one score for one course, max = 5)					
	6.2	Number of credits (give one score for two credits, max = 5)					
	6.3	Number of students (≤ 5:1, 6-25: 2, 26-50:3, 51-100:4, > 100: 5)					
	6.4	Inter-faculty teaching					
	6.5	Inter-University teaching					
	6.6	Disseminating knowledge through seminars, workshop, training programs, awareness programs and public talks.					
7.	**Research and Publication**		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	7.1	Research Papers					
	7.2	Textbook Publications					
	7.3	Other publications					
8.	**Personal Conduct**		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	8.1	Responsible					

	8.2	Cooperative/collaborative/team orientation.					
	8.3	Respectful.					
	8.4	Loyal.					
	8.5	Attentive					
	8.6	Participative.					
	8.7	Society-orientation/Volunteerism					
	8.8	Enthusiastic and Self-motivated					
	8.9	Duty-orientation/task orientation/result orientation					
	8.10	Accountability					
	8.11	Leadership qualities					
	8.12	Relationships with students, peers and others					
		Overall Average Value					
	Note:	*When assessing the applicant if you feel some statements/items are not applicable (N/A) in section 3, please mark them with (x) in given N/A column.*					