

Information for Faculty

This book contains information for faculty, including college PRT criteria, course evaluations, and the funding request form.

- [Neil Griffin College of Business 2026-2027 PRT Criteria](#)
- [Funding Request Form](#)
- [Course Evaluations](#)

Neil Griffin College of Business 2026-2027 PRT Criteria

Please see the attached file for the [2026-2027 Neil Griffin College of Business PRT Criteria](#).

Funding Request Form

Attached is the updated [Revised_NGCOB_Faculty_Funding_Request_Form_6_9_26.pdf](#). Please note that the form has been revised to include information regarding conference location, date, and name.

When completing the form:

- Save it to your computer once filled out
- Email the completed form directly to me at sleslie@astate.edu, and be sure to **copy your Department Chair**. Requests that have not been submitted to department chairs before being submitted to the associate dean for faculty affairs will not be reviewed.

A reminder for those presenting research at conferences: please **check both the “Research” and “Conference/Travel” categories** on the form. This ensures that your request is assessed and allocated appropriately.

We appreciate your attention to these updates and your continued engagement in advancing the Neil Griffin College of Business's mission.

Course Evaluations

Part 1

Administrative/Peer Review Rubric (Asynchronous/Online Modality - Part of Term (POT) 5/7 Weeks Semester)

To be completed by a Department Chair, Program Director, Peer Reviewer, or other NGCoB Leadership via LMS access.

Evaluation Category	Exemplary (5)	Proficient (3)	Needs Improvement (1)
Instructional Presence	Weekly video/module overview intros; Weekly course update communication provided.	Bi-weekly updates; presence is consistent but reactive.	Minimal presence: "Set it and forget it" approach.
Feedback Timeliness	All grades/feedback returned within 3 business days	Grades returned within 3-4 days per syllabus.	Frequent delays: feedback is sparse or late.
Course Navigation	Zero "dead ends"; logical flow; clear "Start Here" module.	Logical flow, but some minor link/file confusion.	Disorganized; students must email to find materials.

Engagement Strategy	Uses case studies, simulations, provide opportunities for student-to-student, student-to-instructor engagement. At least one (1) weekly recorded virtual meeting of minimum 30 minutes provided for students to participate. Recorded virtual meeting posted to course LMS (Canvas, etc.) for all students to access.	Standard discussion boards and quizzes. Faculty is engaged with students through Q&A discussion board. Students are evaluated using multiple assessment types (DB, Case Analysis, Essays, Etc.)	Passive reading and multiple-choice only. Course content is outdated (dates not current on course material.) Course does not consist of any recorded lectures &/or walk-throughs.
----------------------------	--	--	--

***Developed for alignment with the 2026 AACSB Accreditation standards 4 & 7**

Administrative/Peer Review Rubric (Face to Face/Traditional Teaching Modality- Full 16 Weeks Semester)

To be completed by a Department Chair, Program Director, Peer Reviewer or other NGCoB Leadership via classroom visits.

Evaluation Category	Exemplary (5)	Proficient (3)	Needs Improvement (1)
Instructional Presence & Facilitation	Demonstrates strong command of the subject; uses active learning – students are actively involved in the learning process; facilitates high-level classroom dialogue and inquiry.	Effective delivery of lecture material; maintains student attention; handles questions competently.	Passive delivery; reliant solely on reading slides; minimal interaction with students during class.

Feedback Timeliness & Depth	Grades/feedback returned within 3 business days; provides qualitative comments that guide student improvement.	Grades/feedback returned within 7-10 days per syllabus; feedback clarifies the earned grade.	Frequent delays beyond syllabus policy; feedback is minimal or non-existent.
Course Organization & Resource Access	LMS is used effectively to supplement F2F meetings (syllabi, slides, and rubrics are easily accessible).	LMS contains essential documents and a clear schedule that aligns with in-person meetings.	LMS is empty or disorganized; students must ask the instructor to locate basic course materials.
Engagement & Interaction Strategy	Incorporates experiential learning, small group breakout sessions, case studies, incorporation of real-world, current scenarios in lesson delivery or live simulations during class. Includes guest speakers from industry to add real-world perspectives to classroom teaching and learning.	Uses standard classroom interaction such as Q&A sessions and guided group discussions. Opportunities provided for student-to-student or student-to-instructor engagement.	Instruction is strictly one-way (lecture only) with no opportunities for student-to-student or student-to-instructor engagement.

***Developed for alignment with the 2026 AACSB Accreditation standards 4 & 7**

Part 2

Neil Griffin College of Business Asynchronous Teaching Effectiveness/Student Course Experience Survey - Online/Asynchronous Course Only

Instructions: Please rate your experience with this course and instructor by selecting the response that best represents your view.

Section 1: Instructor Presence & Communication

1. The instructor provided clear weekly overviews or "roadmaps" that helped me navigate the course requirements independently.

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly Disagree

2. When I reached out via email or the "Ask the Professor" forum, I received a helpful response within the timeframe stated in the syllabus (e.g., 24-48 hours).

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly Disagree

3. The instructor was actively engaged and accessible in the class, through various communication channels (e.g., Discussion boards, General Q&A, Emails, Canvas Messaging).

(5) Strongly Agree

- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly Disagree

Section 2: Course Design & Content

4. The course modules were organized logically, allowing me to progress through the material without confusion.

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly Disagree

5. The asynchronous materials (recorded lectures, selected videos, or readings) were effective in helping me learn the concepts.

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly Disagree

6. The technology and tools (links, media, quizzes) functioned correctly and were easy to access.

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly Disagree

Section 3: Feedback & Assessment

7. The assignments and assessments directly reflected the learning objectives stated in the syllabus.

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly Disagree

8. The feedback provided on my work was specific, constructive, and helped me understand how to improve.

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly Disagree

9. Grades for major assignments were returned within the promised timeframe, allowing me to apply feedback to future work.

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly Disagree

Section 4: Overall Impact

10. Despite the lack of live sessions, I felt supported by the instructor and achieved the learning outcomes of the course.

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral

- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly Disagree

11. In terms of "overall teaching effectiveness," how would you rank this instructor? Provide your level of agreement using the following responses.

- (5) Much above average
- (4) Above average
- (3) Average
- (2) Below average
- (1) Much below average

Section 5: Qualitative Feedback

12. Please describe one specific action, resource, or feedback practice the instructor used that most effectively supported your learning in this class.

[Text Box for Response]

13. Did the instructor offer optional live virtual meetings? If so, were they recorded and posted for those who could not attend, and how did this impact your learning?

[Text Box for Response]

14. Did the instructor provide self-produced videos or other digital content (e.g., YouTube/publisher textbook content and assessments)? How did this mix of video and other digital sources help or hinder your understanding of the material?

[Text Box for Response]

15. Please comment on the text and/or materials and the course itself.

[Text Box for Response]

16. Please comment on the overall quality of instruction in this course.

[Text Box for Response]

17. What is one specific change that would have improved your experience?

[Text Box for Response]

Part 3: Faculty Self-Reflection (Both Traditional and Online)

To satisfy the 2026 **AACSB Standard 4 & 7 (Teaching Effectiveness and Impact)**, it is not enough to simply collect student surveys. We must demonstrate that faculty **reflect** on that data and "**close the loop**" by making specific improvements.

This form will be completed by the faculty member at the conclusion of each semester.

Faculty Self-Reflection: Asynchronous/Face to Face Teaching & Continuous Improvement

Faculty Name: _____

Course & Section: _____

Term/Year: _____

Section 1: Data Reflection

1. Reviewing your Student Evaluation results (the 11-question Likert survey), which category received the highest rating, and why do you believe students responded positively to this area?

[Text Box]

2. Identify the category or specific question where the mean score was lowest. What specific student feedback (from the open-ended question) helps explain this result?

[Text Box]

Section 2: Instructional Presence & Innovation

3. AACSB emphasizes "engagement." Describe one specific method you used this semester to maintain a visible presence in the asynchronous environment (e.g., personalized video feedback, midweek "check-in" announcements, or course Q&A).

[Text Box]

4. How did you ensure that "Regular and Substantive Interaction" (RSI) occurred?

- ☐ Weekly instructor-initiated discussion summaries
- ☐ Personalized feedback on all *formative assessments during the course
- ☐ Scheduled virtual office hours/synchronous "drop-ins" (optional)
- ☐ Other: _____

Section 3: Closing the Loop (Continuous Improvement)

5. Based on this term's student feedback and your own observations, what is one specific change you will make to the course design or your facilitation style the next time this course is offered?

[Example: "I will redesign the Module 4 rubric to be more granular because students expressed confusion over grading criteria."]

6. What resources or professional development (e.g., instructional design support, new software, or AACSB seminars) would help you improve the quality of this asynchronous course?

[Text Box]

***Formative Assessment:** Ongoing checks used during instruction to monitor student learning and provide immediate feedback.

Goal: To improve learning while it is still happening.

Stakes: Low (usually worth few or no points).

***Summative Assessment:** Evaluations used at the end of an instructional unit to measure what students have learned.

Goal: To provide a final grade or certify proficiency.

Stakes: High (exams, final projects, or certifications).

Resources

Johns Hopkins University Whiting School of Engineering: Discussions in Online Courses: Best Practices and Expectations

<https://ep.jhu.edu/faculty-staff/teaching-technology-resources/discussions-in-online-courses-best-practices-and-expectations/>

Faculty Focus: The Discussion Board: How Faculty Can Make Discussions Authentic and Not Transactional

<https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/online-education/online-student-engagement/the-discussion-board-how-faculty-can-make-discussions-authentic-and-not-transactional/>

Harvard Graduate School of Education: Enhancing Online Discussions

<https://www.gse.harvard.edu/ideas/usable-knowledge/20/08/enhancing-online-discussions>