

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INSTRUCTIONAL EXCELLENCE

Vice Provost Laurie J. Kirsch, Chair

February 28, 2019

Minutes

Present: L. Kirsch (Chair), N. Benedict, J. Coyle, B. Falcione, P. Gartside, C. Golden, G. Hamad, W. Pamerleau (via call), C. Perfetti, J. Russell, and A. Sved

Welcome and Introductions

Laurie Kirsch called the meeting to order at 12:03 p.m. and welcomed members.

Approval of Minutes

Laurie asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the ACIE meeting held on January 31, 2019 – distributed in advance of the meeting. The motion was offered by Alan Sved, seconded by Bonnie Falcione, and approved by the Council. The minutes will be posted on the ACIE website.

Innovation in Education Awards: Proposal Review Process

Laurie reminded Council members that the Office of the Provost had received 19 proposals for the Innovation in Education Awards. Laurie gave a quick update on the proposal review schedule and extended the individual review deadline to Friday, March 15. Laurie then asked Cynthia Golden to summarize the review process.

Cynthia began by distributing a handout with details for the March 26 Council meeting. She then reminded members to complete reviews on their assigned proposals and return the review forms to Morgan Biaggi-Frische. Morgan will then compile the scores and proposal information into a spreadsheet, which will be uploaded to the Box account.

At the March 26 Council meeting, all proposals will be discussed. The lead reviewer will kick-off the discussion by providing a brief summary of the proposal and his/her recommendation. Council members are encouraged to review all proposals, if possible, to participate in the discussions during the March 26 meeting. During the meeting, the Council will determine the set of proposals to recommend to the Provost for funding. It is anticipated that the award winners will be notified by April 1.

Laurie and Cynthia reminded Council members that the proposal reviews and discussion are to be confidential and review comments will not be shared with faculty. Constructive feedback will be provided to the faculty that submitted proposals upon request. Continuing Council members added that innovation varies by discipline and keeping that in mind while looking at all proposals is very helpful.

Assessment of Teaching

Laurie reminded Council members that Provost Cudd charged the Council with providing recommendations to the Provost about expanding the ways in which teaching is assessed across the University, complementing the use of student opinion of teaching surveys. Laurie noted that the summary of the last discussion can be found in the meeting minutes from January 31.

To continue discussions on this topic, Laurie asked for Council members' reactions to the Assessment of Teaching Benchmarking (attached) provided by Assistant Provost Nancy Tannery and the draft report to the Provost, both distributed in advance of the meeting. Council members agreed that there is a variety of guidance styles provided by institutions within the Assessment of Teaching benchmarking. While the practices of some institutions were vague, others were specific and, some Council members felt, overly prescriptive, Ohio State for example. On the other hand, Council members observed that the prescriptive structure could help remove bias. One area the Council agreed would greatly benefit from more standardized guidance is peer review. It was noted that various units at Pitt currently utilize peer reviews, and in the case of small Departments/Divisions the peer review may not currently be completed by someone within the same discipline.

In the report to the Provost, the Council agreed to reinforce the potential value of student opinion surveys while recognizing that feedback gaps likely exist and need to be addressed. Council members also agree that the potential bias in student opinion of surveys should be noted, along with potential ways of mitigating the bias.

The Council then began reviewing the draft recommendations to the Provost, offering suggestions for revisions. The Council agreed that the following items should be altered in the draft recommendation:

- The recommendation should be made more specific.
- Include that faculty positions are dynamic in nature, therefore there is no end to improvement.
- The Council's recommendation should contain standardized requirements and specific examples of strategies and tools for continued teaching improvement. The recommendation should clarify the responsibilities of the units as well as the Office of the Provost.

Next Steps

As time for discussion drew to a close, Laurie indicated that an additional meeting would be scheduled to continue the conversation. In preparation for that meeting, Laurie will work with Chuck and Cynthia to update draft recommendation to reflect today's discussion.

Next Meetings

An additional meeting to be scheduled will be confirmed via email at a later date.

The last meeting of the academic year will be on Tuesday, May 7, 12:00 – 1:00 p.m., in 815 Alumni Hall.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Assessment of Teaching Benchmarking

This benchmarking study sought to compare assessment of teaching as it relates to annual reviews, promotion and tenure at 18 Association of American Universities (AAU) and Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC) institutions.

The benchmarking institutions include:

Boston University	University of Maryland
Cornell University	University of Miami
Florida State University	University of Michigan
Georgia Tech	University of Minnesota
New York University	University of North Carolina
Ohio State University	University of Oregon
Syracuse University	University of Southern California
University of Illinois	University of Virginia
University of Kansas	Virginia Tech

Key Findings

- ❖ All 18 institutions required some form of student evaluation.
- ❖ Many of the institutions require some type of formal or in-formal peer assessment. The institutions include Cornell University, New York University, Ohio State, University of Illinois, University of Miami, University of Oregon, University of Southern California and Virginia Tech
- ❖ Cornell University, Ohio State, and the University of Illinois describe reviews of course materials.
- ❖ Ohio State, University of Illinois and University of Oregon include a self-evaluation/reflection as part of the teaching assessment.
- ❖ Teaching portfolios were included as part of the teaching assessment at the University of Kansas, University of Maryland, University of Michigan, and University of Oregon
- ❖ Many institutions referred the specific requirements to the school/unit level including New York University, Syracuse University, University of Maryland, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, University of North Carolina.

Information by Institution

Boston University

Requires the inclusion of both original written teaching evaluations by students and statistical summaries.

Cornell University

To evaluate the candidate's success in teaching, the department compiles documentation such as course evaluations, letters from both suggested and randomly chosen graduate and undergraduate students, peer assessments of teaching, and course materials. It is helpful to include: any comments on the candidate's efforts to improve instruction; how student evaluators were selected, the rate of response, and the usual rate of response in the department; and data on how candidate's teaching evaluations compare to those of other faculty teaching the same or similar courses.

theuniversityfaculty.cornell.edu/the-new-faculty-handbook/4-tenure-track-promotions/4-1-the-tenure-process/4-1-5-the-department-review/

Information about teaching to include in dossier:

- List of courses taught, with enrollments
- Summary of teaching evaluations, prepared by someone other than the candidate.
- Letters from students and advisees
- Copy of letter(s) requesting student evaluations
- Assessments by colleagues of teaching and course materials (e.g. syllabi, project assignments, homework sets, field studies, lab experiments)

<http://theuniversityfaculty.cornell.edu/tenure/>

Florida State University

The University evaluates teaching using the Student Perception of Courses and Instructors (SPCI) instrument. Departments may also use additional methods of teaching evaluation, including peer evaluations and additional instruments. All instructors are required to have these evaluations administered during the last two weeks of each fall and spring semester for all classes in which at least 5 students are enrolled.

<https://facultyhandbook.fsu.edu/sites/g/files/upcbnu471/files/FacHandbookDec2018.pdf>

Dossier includes:

- Candidates discussion of teaching, research and service
- SPCI reports (student evaluation surveys)
- Sample Syllabi

Successful Faculty Performance in Teaching, Research and Original Creative Work, and Service

fda.fsu.edu/sites/g/files/upcbnu636/files/Media/Files/Promotion%20%26%20Tenure/Successful-Faculty-Performance7-2016.pdf

Georgia Tech University

Evaluation of Faculty Members as Teachers and Educators-Faculty Handbook

Criteria for effective teaching are difficult to define. As a minimum an effective teacher should continue to become more proficient in the subject matter and more efficient in achieving the objective of the courses being taught. An effective teacher should be able, especially, to motivate Students to do their best and to respond favorably to the teacher's enthusiasm for the subject.

The concept of educator implies a broad perspective toward higher education that encompasses more than effective teaching. It involves such things as leadership in

developing new educational programs, including postgraduate educational programs, attracting graduate Students, developing new laboratory experiments, etc.

Listed below (with no attempt to suggest any rank order) are some types of evidence that may be used to evaluate the performance of a Faculty member as teacher and educator:

Course and Curriculum Development

- Development of new courses and laboratory experiences or new approaches to teaching.
- Extensive work in curriculum revision or teaching methods for the school or department.

Teaching Skills and Methods

- Relative performances of students in the candidate sections of multi-section courses.
- Participation in programs, conferences, or workshops designed to improve teaching skills.
- Awards or other forms of recognition for outstanding teaching.
- Systematic Student evaluations, such as exit interviews or other standardized questionnaires. Information such as percentage of Students providing data and a copy of evaluation instructions must be provided. (See Student Opinion of Courses and Instructors below).
- Demonstrated ability to teach basic courses effectively at the undergraduate and at the graduate level (when appropriate) where such courses are offered in the disciplines.
- Demonstrated ability to communicate effectively in the classroom environment.

Generation of Textbooks, Instruction Materials, and Publications on Teaching

- Publication of books or articles on teaching methods.
- Publication of new instructional techniques or descriptions of laboratory materials (if not listed under Creative Activities).
- Publication of textbooks (if not listed under Creative Activities).
- Effective utilization of audio-visual aids and multi-media where appropriate.
- Expository articles of broad interest exemplifying command of subject, breadth of perspective, etc.

Education Activities

- Supervision of independent study courses, honors theses, graduate theses and dissertations, field trips, internships, and practice.
- Supervision of Students who are working in instructional activities, such as lectures, laboratories, recitations, self-paced instruction, or tutoring.
- Specialized teaching for honors Students or for other types of special programs.

<http://www.policylibrary.gatech.edu/faculty-handbook/3.3.7-promotion-and-tenure-evaluation>

Dossier information-

The teaching and training assessment section of the file should contain both peer review or other qualitative evaluation of these roles by peers within Georgia Tech and a summary table on Course/Instructor Opinion Survey (CIOS) scores. Candidates should prepare or supervise the preparation of their own tables of student evaluation scores from CIOS, limited to the last five years for promotion from associate to full professor. A format is available on the Faculty Affairs website. For the standard documentation, only the scores on the question “Is the instructor an effective teacher?” are required, but a separate table with others is encouraged. At the top of the table, a section for normative data on the “effective teacher” question for the candidate’s college and school (i.e., subject abbreviation such as MATH or ISYE) should appear, to provide the appropriate context for the numbers in the table.

http://faculty.gatech.edu/sites/default/files/documents/rpt_guidance_5-18-2018.pdf

NYU

The candidate's teaching performance and teaching potential within the context of a research university, together with supporting evidence and documentation, in the form of a teaching portfolio, which may include:

- Candidate's statement of his/her teaching philosophy
- Course syllabi
- Student evaluations
- Reports of peer observations, including formal assessments of teaching effectiveness
- List of advisees (graduate and undergraduate)
- List of PhD dissertation direction
- List of MS, MA, MFA thesis direction
- List of PhD committees

<https://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/compliance/documents/promotion-tenure-guidelines.pdf>

OHIO STATE

Without systematic forms of teaching assessment, there is little basis on which to evaluate either the quality of instruction or the performance of individual faculty members. Tenure Initiating Units (TIU)s should establish measurable criteria for evaluation of teaching. Criteria that are research-based and specific to the unit's teaching mission are most useful in faculty evaluation of teaching. The TIU's documentation and procedures for peer evaluation and for student evaluation must be included in its Appointments, promotion, and tenure (APT) document.

See ucat.osu.edu/professional-development/teaching-portfolio/feedback/ for links to on-line resources at Ohio State and at other institutions, as well as published sources, that offer principles and methods for the formative and summative evaluation of teaching. The material provided is intended to be helpful both to individual faculty planning to evaluate their teaching and to academic units developing statements on policy and procedures.

Peer evaluation

Successful peer review entails a commitment of time and resources as units educate faculty on best practices and develop and implement specific policies and procedures. Although Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) does not require any particular form of peer evaluation, units are required to develop a detailed plan that is appropriate for their instructional situations, taking into account what assessments will be done, for what purpose, by whom, and when. See <https://uitl.osu.edu/news/2017/09/12/innovative-approaches-documenting-teaching-peer-evaluationteaching-and-teaching> for link to on-line resources for peer evaluation.

Required:

Periodic peer evaluation is required for all tenure-track, clinical faculty, and associated faculty with multiple-year appointments who deliver formal course instruction. In addition, if teaching is a component of a faculty member's assignments, peer evaluation for promotion is required and must include at least two new evaluations occurring at each promotion (assistant to associate and associate to professor) and reappointment, with the exact number to be determined by the TIU in line with college guidelines. OAA recommends a greater number of peer evaluations for

faculty members with high teaching loads. If faculty members teach in multiple modes, for example, on-line and in-classroom, all methods should be evaluated.

Peer evaluation is the responsibility of the chair and faculty of the TIU, not the individual faculty member being reviewed. The faculty must determine the methods of peer review that work best for the particular unit and apply them consistently.

Recommended:

Peer evaluation should focus on those aspects of teaching that students cannot validly assess, such as appropriateness of curricular choices, implicit and explicit goals of instruction, choice of examination/evaluation materials by the faculty member, and consistency with highest standards of disciplinary knowledge. Peer evaluation should have clear goals, be informed by student opinion, and be grounded in a unit culture that values quality teaching. Classroom observations should not serve as the sole method for peer assessment of teaching effectiveness.

Instruction:

The focus of peer evaluation of teaching should be on how the faculty member engages the students in learning in a manner appropriate to the situation. Peer evaluation of teaching should include an assessment of the substance of the class including the appropriateness of topics, given the goals of the course (survey, major required course), and the methods used to communicate them.

Course materials:

Peer reviewers should examine syllabi, assignments, projects, and examinations to determine the extent to which:

- course objectives are appropriate;
- course materials and assignments are up-to-date and consistent with course objectives;
- syllabi are informative;
- feedback on assignments is appropriately detailed and contributes to learning; and
- graded examinations and projects demonstrate the engagement of the faculty member and student learning.

Assessment of course materials may be made by peers within the unit or external reviewers as determined by procedures established by the TIU. Peer review conducted for the purpose of informing reviews for promotion and tenure or promotion should be done often enough, and across a sufficient range of instructional situations, to provide a meaningful body of evidence and early enough to allow for the use of feedback for improvement. Such reviews should, in general, be completed by senior faculty for probationary faculty and by professors for associate professors.

The following brief guidelines, taken in part from Nancy Van Note Chism's *Peer Review of Teaching: A Sourcebook*, 2nd ed. (Bolton, MA: Anker, 2007), will greatly benefit units that wish to initiate substantive and effective change in current practices of peer review of teaching at the most local levels (units or schools).

When evaluating peer review of teaching, the first step is to review current practices and seek effective change. Faculty must come together to address several philosophical and pedagogical issues before revising existing practice or implementing new practices. The kinds of issues

addressed during local discussions (which will take place over several meetings and/or during retreats to address teaching) might include the following:

- Define good teaching within the unit, its qualities and goals (a "what" of peer review). For what purpose is teaching reviewed (the "why")?
- Define "peer" (a "who" of peer review). Who is eligible to conduct reviews of teaching?
- Define who will be reviewed (a second "who").

According to OAA guidelines, all faculty teaching must be reviewed periodically.

- Enumerate the range of practices defined as teaching (a "what" and "where" of peer review). These practices might include classroom teaching, scholarship on teaching, advising, web-based instruction, distance learning, dissertation and thesis advising, independent study, curriculum development.
- Articulate the areas of focus for review of classroom teaching (articulation of course goals, mastery of course content, effective use of instructional methods and materials, appropriate evaluation of student work).
- Establish the process by which peer review of teaching will take place (the "how" of peer review). What tools and methods will be used? What kinds of documentation will be required of faculty, peer reviewers, unit heads?
- Define a schedule by which all faculty members will be reviewed (the "when").
- Articulate the relationship between and provide opportunities for both formative and summative evaluation of teaching.

Articulate the relationship among types of evaluation of teaching (student, peer, administrative, self).

Once a unit has discussed and reached consensus on issues addressing peer review evaluation, it can then begin to implement the new processes. To do so effectively, the unit must:

- prepare faculty to participate effectively in the new review processes;
- monitor, review, and evaluate the new processes; and
- commit to further change and adjust the system if data suggests that is necessary.

Finally, units must "close the loop" by using the data gathered in peer review to improve the quality of teaching within the unit. Teachers (and peers) use what they learn from both formative and summative evaluation to become better teachers. Units must also seek to use the data collected to make informed and equitable judgments about teaching while undertaking summative evaluation of teaching. Peer review of teaching, as well, must be situated in terms of the other data available (self-evaluation, student evaluation, administrative review). Similarly, all data should be interpreted in terms of both the unit's and candidate's goals, philosophies of teaching, and mission.

Student evaluation:

Faculty Rule 3335-3-35(A)(14) requires units to assure that students are given the opportunity to evaluate every course every time it is taught. The university recognizes the value of soliciting commentary from students on their experiences in the classroom. Student assessment of teaching, however, may be influenced by the student's performance in the course, personal response to a particular instructor, and other aspects of the course or situation that do not necessarily reflect on the quality of instruction; nevertheless, student opinions about instructors and classes are important. TIU faculty must develop and implement policies for collecting student input, including qualitative as well as quantitative data as appropriate as well as procedures for interpreting data collected from students. However, TIUs should not rely solely

on student responses to courses and instruction such as the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) in their assessment of the quality of a faculty member's teaching.

Required:

Every TIU's APT document must specify a single required method of soliciting student opinion in each distinct type of course (large lecture course, small seminar, online instruction). Faculty members may supplement this with other methods if they wish.

Student opinion must be solicited in every course on those issues that students are best able to assess:

- instructor's preparedness for class;
- clarity of communication;
- ability to generate interest in the material;
- accessibility;
- ability to establish a conducive learning environment; and
- timeliness of and quality of responses to student work.

When the results of soliciting student opinion are to be a component of performance review, the process cannot be under the control of the faculty member. TIUs must have a mechanism for assuring that faculty members do not collect student opinion surveys themselves.

If instruments are used in the P&T process that are not machine-gradable, the TIU must identify an individual other than the faculty member to summarize the results for inclusion in the dossier. Units may determine whether comments received on the electronic SEI should be collected and summarized for the purposes of P&T review. Such comments are not retained by the Registrar's Office and will be available directly to instructors unless otherwise requested by the TIU.

Recommended:

Open-ended or semi-structured essays may be used; however an aggregate summary must be compiled by an individual other than the faculty member. Comments may be useful in allowing respondents to expand on those questions to which student opinion is desired. but when few such comments are available, they offer minimal basis for generalization. Student comments that aid specifically in the interpretation of the statistical data are useful.

Efforts should be made to maximize response rates. Students generally respond well to being told that instructors value the feedback. Decreased response rates resulting from the transition to on-line SEIs should not be cited as negative indicators.

If the TIU wishes to draw comparisons among instructors, then performance in comparable types of courses should provide the basis for comparison.

Numerical assessments that determine solely whether a faculty member does or does not meet or exceed the college or university mean in the cumulative average on the SEI are not useful. Trivial differences in mean values do not constitute a viable basis for comparing one instructor with another. The focus should be on patterns of responses and on general comparisons rather than on small differences in mean values.

Exit interviews of graduating majors, though not generating large amounts of data about specific instructors, are often helpful in revealing how students view their overall experience in the unit's courses.

Administrator evaluation:

TIU heads play a particularly important role in the definition, development, and implementation of appropriate practices of peer review of teaching. Administrator evaluation of classroom teaching should focus on:

- evaluating drop rates, failure rates, and other data associated with the course;
- judging whether a pattern of negative data is a direct consequence of the quality of instruction or is possibly related to other factors;
- providing important corroborating evidence related to the quality of teaching by faculty in a particular unit;
- identifying particular teaching contributions of the faculty member to the teaching mission and mandates of the unit;
- evaluating the effectiveness of extra-classroom teaching of faculty; and
- reviewing and documenting significant course redesign and completed by faculty member.

Self evaluation:

Reflective practice and self-assessment by faculty members are necessary components of the systematic evaluation of instruction. Individual faculty members should be given every opportunity to:

- explain the goals and intentions of their courses and assignment designs;
- describe the philosophy of teaching and learning that informs their practice;
- interpret the relationship between student ratings and classroom events; and
- reflect on evaluation information to improve their teaching.

Although self-assessment cannot be the only source of data for making credible personnel decisions, the personal narrative that provides an explanation of a faculty member's teaching goals is a valuable source for P&T decisions.

Interpretation and integration:

Units must develop procedures for interpreting evaluation of teaching in a fair and responsible way and must develop a system to integrate the data from all relevant sources within the context of the discipline using the TIU's criteria for judging teaching effectiveness and excellence.

Systems of evaluation must make both summative judgments about the quality of teaching and provide timely and formative feedback with the opportunity for faculty to use this feedback to improve their instruction of Ohio State students.

https://oaa.osu.edu/sites/default/files/links_files/HB1-2.pdf

Syracuse University

As a research university, Syracuse University expects that faculty members will be actively engaged in an intellectual and creative life that enhances the knowledge base and/or otherwise extends the boundaries in their chosen areas of concentration. The University also has a tradition of permitting various allocations of effort across research and teaching. Schools and Colleges are expected to provide guidance to all faculty regarding allocations of effort. In particular, Schools and Colleges must provide guidelines for those individuals whose teaching, research, and service do not sharply divide into distinct categories so that they can present integrated dossiers and accounts of activities.

Teaching

Syracuse University recognizes success in teaching among its tenured faculty to be of vital importance and values innovation and intellectual pursuit embedded within teaching. Teaching

involves the art and skill required for the diffusion of knowledge and guidance toward its effective and independent use. The successful teacher, among other things, instructs in consonance with the School/College mission, has knowledge of subject matter, skillfully communicates and contributes to student learning and development, acts professionally and ethically, and strives continuously to improve. Quality teaching includes providing substantive feedback to students, revising curriculum to reflect developments in the field, and mastering appropriate pedagogical approaches. In addition to the instruction of individual courses, activities under the heading of teaching may include supervising independent study projects; advising; arranging and supervising internships, clinical placements or student research; serving on graduate examination committees and thesis, dissertation, dossier, and portfolio review committees; providing professional development for teaching assistants; involving students in community engagement projects; and instructing non-SU students or community members in a variety of venues. provost.syr.edu/faculty-manual/

University Of Illinois · Urbana-Champaign.

CRITERIA AND GENERAL GUIDELINES

Evaluation of Teaching - All promotion and tenure recommendations must include a thorough evaluation of the candidate's teaching. While departments may use different methods to evaluate teaching quality, strong performance in teaching cannot be simply presumed; it must be demonstrated as convincingly as measures allow. The specific evaluative practices recommended, and in some cases required, appear in the attached Instructions for Preparing Promotion Papers. Faculty members who teach credit-bearing continuing education courses or professional development courses should use these same evaluative practices.

Teaching evaluation must include a summary of ICES data (or, in the alternative, a summary developed through use of a departmental instrument), the candidate's self-review, and document evaluation. (Please note the requirements in the Instructions for Preparing Promotion Papers if the standard report form from the Center for Teaching Excellence is not used.) Units are encouraged to augment these required elements with results from additional methods of evaluation. Each unit shall have a clearly understood procedure for such additional evaluation. The following have proven effective when developed with care:

Peer observation. Visits to the candidate's classroom can be valuable, but they should be made by at least two faculty observers for each of several courses. Visits should be made on more than one occasion in each course. This method is valuable for it entails considerable communication among faculty being evaluated and their colleagues involved in the evaluation. The campus is encouraging more extensive use of this approach, including the involvement of peers from other institutions, not only in the period when a promotion is being considered, but over the entire period of a faculty member's career at Illinois. When a candidate's teaching or curricular contributions have achieved recognition by peers beyond the campus, the ability to comment on the instructional contributions as well as the candidate's other scholarship should be considered in the selection of external evaluators.

Information from students not currently enrolled, alumni, and others. Surveys or interviews with former students, alumni, and others can provide a different perspective from that of students currently enrolled, and this can be a valuable part of an evaluation. However, anecdotal comments from one or two people are generally not perceived as useful by review committees,

because there is no basis for gauging the quality of the views. If information in this category is to be developed, it should be based on a method that can give a legitimate sample of views.

Evidence of student learning. Provision of measures of student learning is encouraged. They might include measures included in the unit's outcomes assessment program that can be linked clearly to the work of the candidate, exceptional awards or recognition earned by the candidate's students, evidence of student success in later coursework in a sequence, evaluation of student work products such as exams, papers, artwork, performances, and so on.

Generally, it has not proven useful to provide selected students comments from ICES forms, for essentially the same reason that anecdotal comments from other quarters are of limited value. Review committees have no ability to judge either the relative frequency of favorable comments or the degree to which they might be offset by unfavorable commentary.

The candidate must provide (in three pages or less) a personal statement of teaching philosophy, methods, strengths, problems, goals, and other material in a manner that will present colleagues with a context for interpreting other evaluative information. However, candidates may be poorly served by self-reviews drawing attention to their own weaknesses. It is not ethical to ask them to go so far in the statement. Units are encouraged to ask the candidate to prepare this statement early in the process of review, so that it can be made available to persons who are asked to take a particular role in the evaluation of the candidate's teaching, e.g. as peer observers.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARING PROMOTION PAPERS

A. Summary of Instruction

1. Descriptive Data

Provide information for undergraduate courses, both on and off campus, since the last promotion. For each semester under review, provide a list of courses taught and the number of students enrolled in the course, as in the following sample table (The Division of Management Information posts a complete history of faculty teaching by the end of October each year on its web site at: www-s.dmi.illinois.edu/course. You may use the data from that site for this section). There is no need to change the format of the DMI report; it can be inserted as it appears on the web and in the example immediate following this page.

2. Supervision of Graduate Students

- Please list doctoral and master's students separately.
- For each graduate student supervised, provide the student's name and level, dates work was supervised, current status, thesis title if completed, and the student's placement (example: Jones, Timothy, Ph.D., 1985, "Analysis of Correlation between CEO Compensation and Return on Investment at Ten Fortune 500 Companies", now at Arthur Andersen).
- List participation on examining committees separately from supervision of a thesis.

3. Supervision of Undergraduate Students

- Please list all undergraduates that have been supervised in research, honors activities, service learning, or public engagement activities.
- For each student, provide the student's name, term during which the activity was supervised, and nature of the activity (e.g., Brown, Keisha, Fall 2012, supervised her senior honor's thesis).

4. Other Contributions to Instructional Programs

Faculty members often make significant instructional contributions of other sorts, (e.g., through development of course materials used by other instructors, through training and supervising teaching assistants, through extensive independent study or informal interactions with students). Instructional improvement projects or activities, such as leadership in a significant curricular change, or new courses developed also fall into this category. Please describe noteworthy contributions made by the candidate.

B. Evaluation of Instruction

1. Student ICES Course Evaluation Questionnaires

This information is available from the Center for Teaching Excellence. It is most convenient to use the summary table of ICES data available from the Center for Teaching Excellence (an ICES "Longitudinal Profile"). Unit executive officers, or the instructor, must request this summary from the Center for Teaching Excellence (cte.illinois.edu/teacheval/ices/long_prof.html). For those being promoted from associate to full professor, ICES scores from the last promotion to the present are all that are needed. If the request is from the unit executive officer, only data previously released to the department will be included. If the request comes directly from the instructor, all ICES results will be included on the Longitudinal Profile.

Generally, it has not proven useful to provide selected student comments from ICES forms, for essentially the same reason that anecdotal comments from other quarters are of limited value. Review committees have no ability to judge either the relative frequency of favorable comments or the degree to which they might be offset by unfavorable commentary.

2. Candidate's Teaching Activities Report and Self-Review

The candidate must provide a personal statement of teaching philosophy, methods, strengths, problems, goals and other material in a manner that will represent colleagues with a context for interpreting other evaluative information.

This statement should not exceed three pages.

3. Departmental Evaluation of Teaching and Course Documentation

- The departmental evaluation must include a review of course documents, including instructional materials such as syllabi, bibliographies, textbooks, test questions, grading policies and procedures. Please provide the name of the person who developed the evaluation.

- Information on the number of students dropping each course and the reasons for doing so (if known), is often useful. Identification of withdrawals, for example, can be helpful in pointing out unusually large decreases in the number of students throughout the semester (perhaps compared to others teaching the same course). This information can serve as a flag interpreting the end-of-course student ratings as well as serve as a topic of discussion with the instructor regarding the reasons for dramatic enrollment shifts. Interpretation should be made cautiously,

however, since students drop courses for several reasons and some may have little relevance to the instructor or course.

- Departments are encouraged to report results of other effective means, such as observation by peers, for evaluating instructional performance. Where the candidate's teaching contributions have achieved significant recognition outside the campus, the department may wish to invite letters from external evaluators who are knowledgeable of those contributions as well as of the candidate's other scholarly work.

- For each peer reviewer whose evaluation is included, please provide a brief statement (one to two sentences) about the reasons for selecting the reviewer for this service.

provost.illinois.edu/files/2016/08/Communication_9.pdf

University of Kansas

All numeric student evaluation summary forms for courses listed on the P&T CV. The absence of student numeric evaluations for specific courses must be justified. Under Regents' and university policy, quantitative student evaluations are required. All original student evaluation forms with comments IF student comments are part of the review in the department or school/college.

Optional- Additional documentation of teaching effectiveness. Examples include a comprehensive teaching portfolio, course syllabi, reflective journals, sample assignments, efforts to improve teaching through reflective journals, course design changes to enhance student learning, descriptions of how publications or research activities relate to teaching, unsolicited letters from students, etc.

http://facultydevelopment.ku.edu/sites/facultydevelopment.ku.edu/files/docs/PT_Docs_Updated_2018/1%20Candidate%20Verification%20Form%20and%20List%20of%20Supporting%20Materials.docx

University of Maryland

Superior teaching and academic advisement at all instructional levels (or reasonable promise thereof in the case of initial appointments) are essential criteria in appointment and promotion. Every effort shall be made to recognize and emphasize excellence in teaching and advisement. The general test to be applied is that the faculty member be engaged regularly and effectively in teaching and advisement activities of high quality and significance.

The responsibility for the evaluation of teaching performance rests on the academic unit of the faculty member. Each academic unit shall develop and disseminate the criteria to be used in the evaluation of the teaching performance of its members. The evaluation must include opinions of students, colleagues, and the materials contained in the teaching portfolio.

<https://president.umd.edu/sites/president.umd.edu/files/documents/policies/II-100A.pdf>

Teaching portfolios

<https://tltc.umd.edu/portfolios>

University of Miami

The educational function of a university requires the appointment of faculty who are effective teachers. The means of evaluating teaching effectiveness include: (1) the informed judgment of colleagues; (2) the performance of students; and (3) student opinion of teaching effectiveness. Promotion, tenure, and merit salary increases should recognize outstanding achievements in teaching.

<https://fs.miami.edu/assets/pdf/facultysenate/Documents/FacultyManual.pdf>

University of Michigan

Teaching evaluations can help faculty improve their classroom performance and provide important information for decisions about re-appointment, promotion, tenure, salary, and awards. (They also provide information to students to assist them in course selection.) All of the schools and colleges have teaching evaluation tools to meet these objectives. For information about the systems in place for a particular academic unit, faculty should check with the department chair or other administrator.

Many schools and colleges use the Office of the Registrar system of student course evaluations called Teaching Evaluations. This system permits instructors to select questions to administer to the students in a given class from a large catalogue of choices. Some schools, colleges, and other academic units design common core questions for use in these or other questionnaires. Reports with statistical results of the responses and all individual student comments are provided to the instructors. In some academic units, the statistical reports are also sent to the dean or chair. For more information, see <http://www.ro.umich.edu/evals/>.

The Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) can provide information about multiple methods of evaluating teaching, including teaching portfolios and peer review. CRLT's instructional consultants also help individual faculty interpret their student ratings reports.

<https://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/handbook/>

The Teaching Portfolio

https://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/promotion_guidelines/AttachmentE.pdf

University of Minnesota

Documenting and Conducting Peer Review of Teaching

<https://faculty.umn.edu/faculty-support-and-resources/peer-review-teaching>

T&P criteria and policies are decided by unit with approval of the Provost. Below is an example from the Department of Anthropology-

Candidates for indefinite tenure must be effective teachers

“Effective” means that a candidate enables or produces the intended result of student learning. Specifically, candidates should demonstrate course-appropriate content expertise and an ability to transmit such knowledge to students through effective instructional design, delivery, and assessment. Instructional design includes the ability to create, sequence, and present experiences that lead to learning. Instructional delivery refers to the skills that facilitate learning

in a respectful environment. Assessment refers to the use of tools and procedures for evaluating student learning, including appropriate grading practices.

“Teaching” is not limited to classroom instruction. It includes other forms of communicating knowledge (to both registered University students and persons in the extramural community) as well as supervising, mentoring, or advising graduate or undergraduate students whether individually or in groups.

Relevant Forms of Evidence:

- Faculty peer review: Methods of evaluation include direct classroom observation of at least two courses, review of syllabi, statements of goals and objectives, methods employed, assignments, exercises, and examinations prepared for courses.
- Review of contributions made to the curriculum of the unit, such as development of courses, course sequences, new areas of instruction, major/minor sequences, substantive refinements of courses, and uses of new technology. Such contributions may be made individually by the candidate or result from participation in committees or workshops devoted to curriculum development and assessment.
- Development of instructional material, including but not limited to computer software, compilations of readings, course guides for Independent Study courses, and publication of textbooks. Student Ratings of Teaching: The primary method of student rating of teaching is through course rating forms. Additionally, evaluations may be obtained from students once they have graduated.
- Evidence of effective advising and mentoring degree candidates at the undergraduate level; for example, evidence concerning Honors theses, Directed Study, Independent Study, The Bachelor of Individualized Study (BIS), Individually Designed Interdepartmental Major (IDIM) mentorship, and Senior Projects.
- Evidence of effective advising and mentoring degree candidates at the graduate level; for example, evidence concerning advising at the Master's and Ph.D. level, thesis and dissertation supervision, Ph.D. oral and written preliminary exam participation, and professional development and job placement activities.
- Teaching awards and other formal recognitions of teaching excellence.
- Grants for curricular development or for the preparation of instructional materials.
- Noteworthy contributions to the teaching and advising mission of the unit, such as service as Director of Undergraduate Studies or Director of Graduate Studies.

A list of all the units with links to their policies <https://faculty.umn.edu/promotion-tenure/approved-712-statements>

University of North Carolina

T&P criteria and policies are decided by unit. Some describe teaching assessment in detail and some do not. Below is an example from the School of Global Public Health

At the Gillings School of Global Public Health, we value teaching and evaluate it as part of promotion. Teaching occurs in a variety of settings and ways, including traditional classrooms and an increasing variety of online educational formats. It also occurs in other, less traditional and potentially less obvious settings. Teaching also occurs in research laboratories, in the

context of research projects, in practice settings and when faculty supervise master's theses, doctoral dissertations, other forms of student-directed research, and field training activities. Teaching also occurs in the faculty-student academic advising process. Faculty members in the School may provide considerable continuing education in the form of workshops, short courses and webinars. For purposes of promotion and tenure, continuing education is considered within teaching category.

Teaching has three components: process, content and impact. Process is how one teaches, e.g. use of a variety of appropriate and up-to-date teaching methods; content is what one teaches; and outcomes are results or impact of teaching on students (what the student learns or can do as a result of teaching).

It is the responsibility of each tenure-track faculty (and appropriate fixed-term faculty) to develop and maintain a teaching portfolio. This portfolio should be updated annually and presented at the time of promotion and tenure. For promotion and tenure in the Gillings School of Global Public Health, all three components of teaching (process, content and impact) are documented and evaluated.

Evidence of high quality teaching can be demonstrated by including the following types of materials and information in the teaching portfolio.

1. Process a. Documentation of courses taught, including continuing education courses for preceding four years, with numbers of students involved. Evidence of innovative approaches to teaching should be included b. Numbers of undergraduate, master's and doctoral students advised or supervised c. Evidence that student advising is effective, including, but not limited to, academic advising and supervision of student research and field training experiences d. Evidence of successfully mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students through honors papers, theses and dissertation process e. Scope of teaching activities, such as size and level of teaching load and any exceptional responsibilities undertaken, e.g., teaching more than the "usual" or standard load for the department or f. Evaluation by students of courses taught, including summary statements, tables, or charts, indicating how the numerical evaluations have progressed over time and how they compare to other faculty in the department

2. Content a. New developments in disciplines should be reflected in course content b. Development of content or synthesis of content that influences pedagogy of discipline or c. Evidence that teaching methods and course content are peer-reviewed periodically. Peer review includes (done by senior faculty members or other external experts): classroom visitations, review of course syllabi and other related materials, and review of student evaluations of teaching.

3. Impact a. Evidence of impact of all forms of teaching and mentoring (e.g. classroom and distance education teaching, supervising students in research and field experiences, academic advising, and continuing education) on professional careers of former students, colleagues, and junior faculty or b. Evidence of annual self-evaluation of teaching

4. In addition to above High quality teaching can be demonstrated by presenting the following types of materials and information. a. Documentation of activities in curriculum and program development b. Evidence of innovation in teaching methods, course content, other learning

experiences, curriculum development or revision, and use of appropriate technology c. Evidence that contributions to teaching are being adopted or influencing teaching programs at other institutions d. Evidence that teaching has a significant impact on students beyond what is expected e. Awards for outstanding teaching f. Publication and adoption of textbooks, case studies, software, webpages, and other media venues g. Invitations from other institutions to serve as lecturer, trainer, or visiting professor h. Invitations to serve as consultant for educational programs and methods i. Grants to support instructional activities (where these can be construed as an individual faculty member's accomplishments) and j. Grants to support research activities which also have some impact on teaching, e.g., research grants which involve students, or where new laboratory equipment is also used for teaching purposes k. Responsiveness and collaboration, as demonstrated by: i. Evidence of capacity to sustain and build relationships and teams for teaching ii. Engagement in collaborative interdisciplinary teaching or iii. Contributions to department and School teaching missions l. Support Structure, as demonstrated by: i. Contributions to teaching support structures of the department and School ii. Mentoring junior faculty and students . m. Participation in programs (certificate programs, executive education, workshops) directed to enhancing skills of practitioners or n. Evidence of leadership in design, delivery and evaluation of teaching programs that catalyze others to achieve their maximum potential.

Policies by School

<https://academicpersonnel.unc.edu/faculty-policies-by-school/>

University of Oregon

The University of Oregon, Provost's Office and University Senate, is currently working to critique and revise their entire teaching evaluation system to include

- Student feedback-end of term student experience survey
- Self-reflection -10-minute instructor reflection tool
- Peer review –peer review framework

<https://provost.uoregon.edu/revising-uos-teaching-evaluations>

Mid-Term Review

Teaching portfolio: Representative examples of course syllabi or equivalent descriptions of course content and instructional expectations for courses taught by the faculty member, examples of student work and exams, and similar material.

<https://provost.uoregon.edu/midterm-review>

University of Southern California

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness in Tenure and Promotion Dossier

(a) University Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure (UCAPT) finds that the most useful evidence in evaluating teaching effectiveness is the following:

- Classroom observations by faculty colleagues close to the time of the candidate's consideration for promotion. These observations should comment on strengths and weaknesses in the candidate's presentation of course material and in classroom interactions with students. These reviews are even more valuable if they include classroom visitations over a period of time. (Some schools have each member of a

committee visit at least two classes taught by the candidate; these individuals then submit written evaluations for inclusion in the promotion dossier or mid-year review.)

- Demonstration that the candidate has applied teaching strategies whose effectiveness has been validated through research. The research may refer to the candidate's own teaching or be drawn from publications about teaching effectiveness. The research may rely on quantitative, ethnographic, or other methodologies that the candidate's field of scholarship values.
- Other evidence that the candidate's teaching is effective such as protocols through which students demonstrate their mastery in a public forum or data on student learning outcomes compared to students of similarly situated teachers.
- Course syllabi or instructor's teaching materials provided to students for a few courses that the candidate considers most indicative of his or her approach to teaching.

(b) UCAPT also expects to see this traditional evidence, though it is cognizant of the research questioning its usefulness:

- Summaries of student evaluations for all of the candidate's courses, as well as complete student evaluations for the candidate's most recent courses (approximately the last two years). All individual student evaluations should be readily available upon request. If summaries of evaluations are presented based on USC's standard questionnaire, UCAPT suggests that the candidate's average scores on questions rating the course and instructor should be compared to the distribution of departmental scores for comparable courses or faculty.

(c) The following evidence may also be used if the department finds it helpful:

- Information on the candidate's (1) use and assessment of information technology or multi-media that promote student engagement and learning or that adapt course materials to students' needs; (2) the accommodation of different learning styles among students; (3) innovations to customary practices (dependence on lectures, standard semester length, constraints of disciplinary boundaries, etc.) aimed at increasing a course's benefits to students; and (4) the use and assessment of work produced by students in service-oriented or experiential settings outside classroom walls.
- Letters from a sample of former students who have been asked to evaluate the candidate's teaching and how it affected them. These students may not be suggested nor solicited by the candidate. The department or committee chair or dean organizes the contacting of students whose opinions are solicited. Please explain the selection method and enclose the solicitation letter. A candidate's teaching assignments will suggest the distribution between undergraduates and graduate students contributing to this section.

policy.usc.edu/faculty/appointments-promotions-tenure-ucapt-manual/part-8-the-dossier-ucapt/
(see 8.8.2)

University of Virginia

An award of tenure will not normally be made unless there is evidence of both the candidate's sustained commitment to classroom instruction and the candidate's sustained effectiveness as a contributor to the intellectual development of students through devices such as course design, course material, interaction with students outside of formal instructional periods, and other

mechanisms of enhancing student learning. The means of assessment of that contribution will vary with the field, with the level at which the teaching is concentrated, and with the degree of objectivity with which outcomes can be measured during the probationary period.

In schools that serve undergraduate students, separate attention should be focused on commitment to and effectiveness of undergraduate instruction. Student evaluations must be a part of the evidence in all cases, but by themselves they are not enough. Students are important judges of a teacher's fairness, organization, and personal qualities in the classroom, laboratory, seminar, or office; but the candidate's faculty peers are normally the better judge of the content of her or his pedagogy. Popular teaching and good teaching are not necessarily the same thing. Advising, availability to students, and other forms of beneficial interactions between the candidate and students may be given appropriate weight as a part of the "student instruction" criterion, but are not, by themselves, a substitute for accomplished classroom instruction or for other elements of the tenure standards.

<https://uvapolicy.virginia.edu/policy/PROV-017>

Virginia Tech

Teaching and Advising Effectiveness:

Teaching and advising are multifaceted activities. In any assessment of a candidate for promotion and tenure, both the quality and the quantity of the individual's achievements in teaching and advising should be presented in the dossier. A number of measures to demonstrate the quality of teaching and advising are available: development of instructional material and of courses and curricula; student, peer, and alumni evaluations; contributions as an academic advisor; recognition and awards for teaching or advising effectiveness; the long-term effect of a faculty member on the personal and professional success of students; student achievements; and incorporating inclusive pedagogy in teaching.

Those evaluating candidates for promotion or tenure should give special consideration to teaching effectiveness. The assessment of teaching and advising effectiveness rests on a comprehensive review of both qualitative and quantitative measures. To be evaluated favorably, an individual should contribute to the accomplishment of the mission of the university in several aspects of teaching.

Candidates for promotion to professor may choose to provide a listing of teaching accomplishments since the last promotion, or they may choose to provide a selected list of teaching accomplishments if they have been in rank for many years and can demonstrate their effectiveness with a selected list.

The promotion and tenure dossier should provide the following information about teaching and advising:

- A. Recognition and awards for teaching or advising effectiveness
- B. A chronological list and/or table of courses taught since the date of appointment to Virginia Tech (or since last promotion). Candidates who held a position at the same rank at another institution may include courses taught at that rank prior to their appointment to Virginia Tech. The chronological list and/or table should include courses by term and year, credit hours, course enrollments, and the faculty member's role (if not solely responsible for the course) with the percent of effort or assignment.
- C. A chronological list of non-credit courses, workshops, and other related outreach and/or extension teaching since the date of appointment to Virginia Tech (or since last promotion).

- D. Completed theses, dissertations, other graduate degree projects, major undergraduate research projects, and honors theses directed
- E. Postdoctoral Fellow training and research
- F. Current positions held by the candidate's masters and doctoral recipients
- G. Special achievements of current/former undergraduate and graduate students
- H. Current academic advising responsibilities—graduate and undergraduate
- I. Course, curriculum, and program development

The dossier must provide a persuasive evaluation of the faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher and an advisor. It should explain the point or meaning of any data, information, or examples included as evidence. Data from student evaluations, for example, are not necessarily self-explanatory; the numbers usually require interpretation and comparison. Where comparisons are warranted and would be helpful, they should be included. The quality of a candidate's achievements and ability as a teacher should be clearly demonstrated. Evidence such as the following should be included:

Student evaluations of instruction

Include the rating scale and college and/or department averages. Include data on all courses evaluated, enrollment in each course, number of students turning in evaluations, and numerical averages. Do not include student comments from teaching evaluations. Include evaluations of non-credit courses or other outreach or extension-related teaching, which should include participant data as defined above and evidence of the impact of programs on participants.

Peer evaluations of instruction

Provide at least two letters or reports from departmental or college peer reviewers regarding the candidate's teaching and advising effectiveness.

Alumni evaluations of instruction

Inclusion of alumni evaluations of instruction is optional. If included, describe how the letters/evaluations were solicited.

Demonstrated efforts to improve one's teaching effectiveness, including, but not limited to, pursuing training in inclusive pedagogy and incorporating the Principles of Community into course development.

<https://bit.ly/2RLFpOJ>