

Appendix D

Development, Evaluation and Reward Mechanisms Unit Descriptions

Members of the Teaching Task Force described the evaluations processes in their units so as to facilitate the group's ability to assess variation and consider ideas. In some cases, TTF members comment informally on their mechanism. In other cases more systematic interviews were used to assess departmental variations. Here we summarize those documents, realizing that they are not exhaustive and mindful that they present important variations in both practice and in opportunities for change.

Art, Humanities and Social Sciences

Development

Faculty members are encouraged to apply for available grants that are designed to be of assistance with teaching development.

Evaluation

The University's Course and Teacher Evaluation Forms, distributed by the Office of Assessment and completed by students, are used for all courses each quarter.

After August 31 every year, each faculty member completes the Annual Faculty Report form used by the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences Divisions, and submits his/her completed form to the Chair, who then forwards it to the Dean. Under Part A, the form solicits information on courses taught, student advising, and course and curriculum development activities.

Department chairs meet with each faculty member every fall. During this conference, information from the faculty member's student-completed course and teacher evaluations, and from his/her annual faculty report, are discussed. The Chair writes an evaluation that is forwarded to the Dean along with the annual faculty report.

Rewards

Information from annual faculty reports, student-completed course and teacher evaluations, and the Director's evaluations is considered in the process for determining merit salary raises. Chairs are encouraged to nominate faculty members for teaching awards given by the University.

Variations by Department

Some departments use only student evaluations as evidence. Others also use peer evaluations of syllabi and peer observation.

ARTS, HUMANITIES & SOCIAL SCIENCES

ANNUAL FACULTY REPORT

NAME: DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL:

PERIOD COVERED: September 1, 2003 – August 31, 2004

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

Courses taught – include supervision of independent study and research, theses, (undergraduate and masters) dissertations, etc. Please include guest participation in CORE courses.

FALL QUARTER 2003:

WINTER QUARTER 2004:

SPRING QUARTER 2004:

SUMMER QUARTER 2004:

Student advising: (number of advisees):

Course and curriculum development activities:

RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Books, monographs, articles, book reviews and chapters:

Published:

Accepted for Publication:

In Preparation:

Papers or lectures presented to professional groups and/or artistic performances and creative activities:

Research or instructional/training grants/contracts (indicate source of funding, annual amount, duration):

Newly awarded:

Continuing:

Proposals submitted:

Other new or continuing important professional contributions (i.e., major technical reports, editorial work, major reviews, panels, etc.):

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Department/Divisional/University Committee/Service (indicate quarters):

Professional Societies

Public Service

Other Significant Activity

OTHER PERTINENT INFORMATION (new degrees, certificates, promotions; honors and awards; etc.):

STATEMENT OF PLANS FOR CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNIVERSITY'S PROGRAMS AND MISSION DURING THE NEW YEAR (instructional activities, research, service, etc.):

Department of Marketing, Daniels College of Business

Development

Faculty teacher mentors are available upon request, but are rarely requested. Once or twice a year, seminars are offered on issues related to teaching techniques. These sessions are attended by approximately 10 to 15% of the faculty. About the same percentage of Daniels faculty also attend teaching-related conferences on campus, such as the CTL collaborative learning conference last year. Most development probably happens informally, through “hall conversations” about teaching issues, and team teaching experiences. Faculty also learn from the written comments from students on student evaluations of teaching.

Evaluation

Once a year, faculty self-report on teaching performance, as part of a longer report on overall performance (three to five pages, including research and service). The teaching subsection of this report emphasizes student evaluations of teaching, but faculty often mention other teaching-related activities. For example, faculty often mention new course preparations or enhancements, but these descriptions seldom exceed a sentence or two.

All full-time faculty read and evaluate the merit reports created by the other full-time faculty members and submit evaluations to the department chair. Faculty never see evaluations directly from their peers. In my subjective perception, evaluations from faculty and the chair are based heavily on student evaluations of teaching because these numbers facilitate comparisons.

Rewards

The chair’s recommendation for merit pay increases are based on his evaluation of each faculty member, also considering the evaluations submitted by other faculty. Due to the large number of factors that can affect merit pay, the low variance in teaching evaluations, and the small total amounts of merit pay, the difference between being the worst teacher or the best teacher in the department seldom amounts to a pay raise difference of more than \$300.

The dean also rewards faculty for teaching performance by a process that is not well understood by faculty. It is believed that the dean gives out additional merit increases (\$100 to \$200) for the faculty with the highest student evaluations.

In the past, the dean has ranked departments within Daniels by the average student evaluations of all the courses with the department prefix. Chairs of departments with below average teaching evaluations have experienced pressure to find ways to raise their department averages.

The Daniels College of Business also offers a teaching award each year. Nominations are submitted to a college-level committee, and the committee’s

recommendations are submitted to the dean. The criteria used by this committee are not well understood by faculty, but are believed to rely heavily on student evaluations of teaching

Graduate School of International Studies

Faculty Development

- If a faculty member meets with the Dean to discuss low course evaluations, the Dean offers suggestions about what has worked for other colleagues and offers the person the opportunity for classroom observation by his or her peers
- The faculty has discussed the idea of more regular classroom observation, but there is not a groundswell of support at this time
- The Dean is inviting Carl Pletsch, faculty member and experienced faculty developer at the University of Colorado at Denver, to consult with at least one faculty member
- The School held a half-day retreat a few years ago to discuss teaching issues, in particular those related to objectivity and bias in the classroom given that policy issues are a regular part of course content, discussion emphasized the importance of providing access to the full range of policies and ideas in any particular content area; in addition, the topic of some faculty meetings has been the use of technology in the classroom course development opportunities, including additional funds for future research and travel or additional points toward the 5-course equivalent load, are provided to faculty interested in teaching a new course that is an important part of the curriculum

Evaluation of Teaching

- Primarily based on course evaluations, both quantitative results and comments
- Low performance considered below 4 on 5-point scale and below 5 on 6-point scale
- If a new faculty member has low performance or a continuing faculty member exhibits a trend of low performance, that person is invited to the Dean's office for a conversation about teaching
- Faculty reputation for teaching is also taken into consideration; this develops over time and is primarily provided by students, both formally and informally; the courts accept this type of evidence as valid, according to the Dean
- Occasionally poll graduates regarding the courses that had the greatest and least value in terms of their employment

Rewards

- Merit pay is significantly tied to classroom performance
- GSIS takes literally the language of the faculty handbook that says faculty should be distinguished in both teaching and scholarship
- The Dean provides the Provost an independent judgment about faculty who are recommended for tenure or promotion there is a fairly universal view in the School that anyone who does not teach well should not be tenured or promoted

Graduate School of Social Work

Development of Teaching

Upon reflection, it appears we make minimal efforts to develop stronger teaching. For the last two years, we have required all new instructors to attend the faculty development seminar that is hosted by the Center for Teaching and Learning. To my knowledge, GSSW is the only program on campus to require this of all new faculty. We give all new faculty a two-course reduction upon coming into our program. This allows them to have a lighter load, though that time is probably used more to develop their research and scholarship. We also allow them to teach the same courses for the first six years so that they do not have to continuously prep for new courses. Again though, that reduced time doesn't necessarily make them better instructors. We give all faculty members \$1,000 development funds per year. These funds may be used to attend conferences, increase teaching skills, or used for research and scholarship. We do less with those other than new faculty in terms of developing teaching skills though we do encourage using the Center for Teaching and Learning to increase skills for incorporating technology into the classroom or developing any creating teaching environment.

Evaluation

We are much stronger in terms of evaluation. The MSW curriculum committee, assessment committee, and Sturm Electronic Portfolio committee (funded by the Center for Teaching and Learning) are constantly working to improve evaluation and consistency within our curriculum. Many projects have been developed to make program and course evaluation more meaningful. These projects have forced our program to go back and integrate our mission statement, program goals and objectives, foundation year educational objectives for each course, and concentration year educational objectives for each course. Evaluation tools are used to evaluate each individual course in terms of the University mission, program mission and individual course educational objectives.

Students and then the associate dean of the program evaluate each adjunct instructor.

Reward

The reward system is the responsibility of the Dean. Each year the Dean meets individually with each faculty member in regards to the entire deployment: teaching, research and scholarship, and community service. From the whole picture, the Dean allocates merit raises.

Natural Sciences and Mathematics

Decanal Evaluation

NSM's Dean acknowledges some concerns about the exclusive use of student evaluations in evaluation of teaching. He is aware of the dangers of credibility of the assessment, and wonders if we can rely on the measures. He believes that the teaching evaluation system may miss some excellent teachers, but that bad instructors usually get noted. Dean Fogleman is also concerned about development of more elaborate systems that may be subject to the same concerns regarding reliability and credibility.

The Dean's evaluation of faculty members starts with the evaluations but takes into account a number of other factors, including

- 1) Personal narratives – these are unsolicited visits by students or letters from students, either positive or negative.
- 2) Themes in comments – for example, if many comments say an instructor is great, or (on the other hand) unavailable and insulting, he takes this as evidence.
- 3) He is sensitive to the difficulty of the course and how it factors into the evaluations
- 4) He looks for trends. For a constantly superior record, he rewards the faculty with a higher merit raise. With respect to negative indications, he stated that one course with a low evaluation may be due to external factors, such as (3) above or may just be an anomaly. But if there are many such courses, he is more likely to intervene.

This intervention generally takes the form of a conversation with the chair, who will then continue the discussion with the faculty member. His general philosophy is that remediation, standards for teaching, etc. are departmental matters best handled within individual departments. Also, he believes that the balance between teaching and research should be addressed each year by the chair. For a faculty member whose teaching needs improvement, all of this is predicated on his or her willingness to seek that improvement.

Chair Thoughts on Teaching

Evaluation

Some departments focus on grade trends in major classes, for use in course redesign. These evaluations have been used to effect some changes. For example, one department has noted, but cannot explain, why students in the sophomore year are considered to perform lower than in the other 3 years.

Some departments have assessment plans that include portfolios.

One department has a peer teaching committee of 2 (senior) members. These faculty visit each class of a faculty member (at the assistant or associate level) once per quarter and

file a letter with the chair. Additionally, the chair asks for comments that specifically address teaching on each faculty's annual report.

With respect to teaching, teaching evaluations are important and it is part of both department culture and NSM requirement that teaching is important. Much of this is conveyed informally. For example, in the student evaluations, the chair finds that the comments are much more useful than the numbers. But he appreciates the additional distribution data now provided by the Office of Assessment.

Development

The way to improve teaching is that it be made a different kind of institutional priority. (Good teaching is already often stated to be an expectation of faculty.) He thinks not much additional resources (such as many workshops, questionnaires, surveys, etc.) are needed to do this, but rather a culture change enunciated and implemented beginning at the level of chairs and deans, but not by the Provost, Chancellor, and Office of Assessment, from whom it might appear punitive.

The current evaluations are not always objective, particularly in the lower division courses. They contain components that are prone to being "emotional." Part of the chair's job is to protect his faculty from punitive aspects of the current evaluations, without alternate/complimentary methods of assessment. Other issues include,

- 1) Comparing numbers from the current evaluations for new vs. seasoned faculty; a faculty member should be allowed up to 2-3 years to refine a new course before being 'prejudged.'
- 2) Exactly what the numbers returned from the current evaluations actually represent; and,
- 3) How the current evaluation numbers distinguish between the faculty member and the course.

Reward

Since the annual merit raise pool is so small, it is difficult to try to reward good teaching by raises. Anything we do must be careful to look out for the needs of individuals: during a faculty member's career, relative emphases on different professional activities may change. However, departmental needs as to teaching, scholarship, and service must be respected. He states that Physics and Astronomy has enough physical (i.e. lab equipment) resources to teach satisfactorily.

With respect to new resources, this is a great idea for new faculty, but programs may be viewed as punitive by associate and full professors. The first encounter between the chair/department and a teacher "in trouble" is very delicate, whether the deficiencies came for individual student complaints or the current evaluations. He suggests a communal lunch (once a week) among faculty with common interests. He thinks that a

central resource would benefit faculty and the university in two ways, first because it might exhibit less bias, and second, as a matter of economics and efficiency.

Mathematics: Development of a Group Culture on Teaching

The members of the Mathematics Department have always regarded effective teaching as an essential part of our contribution to the university. This attitude is conveyed right from the very first interview with a prospective candidate and is part of our departmental culture. Each of us has a different teaching style and each of us respects our colleagues' approaches to student learning. We do lots of talking, sharing of ideas and material, and this is the most effective feedback on teaching that we could have.

I feel that the members of the department understand that tenure decisions, yearly evaluations, recommendations for merit raises, etc. are in some kind of not explicitly defined but balanced emphasis on teaching and research (with a look at service, as well). But we understand this because of how we operate and not because of a grander, more formal system.

I look at the student evaluations as indicators. I always look at "my" numbers and read the comments and I always learn something. But mostly I know if I've had a good or a bad quarter and my students mostly seem to confirm my suspicions. Professor Rick Ball, who has been chair of Mathematics for several years and who has had to reflect on these evaluations as part of his yearly evaluation of each faculty, is on sabbatical and unavailable as of this writing (March 7, 2005). I know also that Dean Fogleman looks at these evaluations, and he and the chair, and then the chair and the instructor have a conversation at the first sign of an ongoing problem.

We have learned some things from the assessment data we have kept over the years and have found the most informative piece to be the exit interviews. At that moment, our students have considerable perspective and are willing and able to share their thoughts. Many of their suggestions (which are mostly about course offerings and not about people) have found their way into our yearly schedule.

It is clear to me that our model is most workable in a small, harmonious department and that more formal measures may be needed in other situations. But the key is to provide a setting where faculty members want to teach well for the right reasons.

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

ANNUAL FACULTY REPORT

Name: _____ Dept. _____

Period Covered:

A. Instructional Activities

1. Courses taught (include supervision of independent study and research, special topics/seminar; indicate enrollment in parentheses after each course; where course was team taught indicate percentage taught)

2. Student advising (number of advisees)

3. Course and curriculum development activities (indicate in a brief narrative any important initiatives in the area of curriculum and new course development that you have participated in during the past year; also outline work you have done to revise and improve existing courses you have taught during the past year.)

B. Research and Scholarly Activity

1. Books, monographs or articles published, or accepted for publication.

2. Papers or lectures presented to professional groups

3. Research grants/contracts (indicate source of funding, annual amount, duration)
 - a. Newly awarded:

 - b. Continuing

 - c. Proposals submitted:

1. Other new or continuing important professional contributions (i.e. major technical reports, editorial work, major review panels, etc.)

C. Other Activities

1. Department/Divisional/University Committees/Service
(Indicate quarters and year)

2. Professional societies

3. Public service

4. Other significant activity

D. Other Pertinent Information (new degrees, certificates, promotions; honors and awards; etc.)

E. Statement of Plans for Contribution to the University's Programs and Mission During the Next Year (instructional activities, research, service, etc.)

School of Engineering and Computer Science

Evaluation of teaching:

The following was requested of faculty members for the Fall 2004 review for merit raises. This form is under review for Fall 2005.

A. Instructional Activities

1. **Courses taught** (include supervision of independent study and research; indicate enrollment in parentheses after each course; indicate if undergraduate and/or graduate; where course was team taught indicate percentage taught and if you had GTA(s) also indicate the number of GTA(s); include tuition hours (No. of students * Number of quarter hrs * Fraction of course you taught) generated for each course-adjusted by percentage taught; include course evaluation numbers [no. of students, no. of evaluations, average instructor rating, and average course rating])
2. **Student advising** (number of advisees; separate by undergraduates, MS, and PhD students, with the students names listed. In the case of graduate students, indicate if thesis or non-thesis, indicate how many years you have been their adviser)
3. **Course and curriculum development activities** (indicate in a brief narrative any important initiatives in the area of curriculum and new course development that you have participated in during the past year; also outline any significant work you have done to revise and improve existing courses you have taught during the past year.)
4. **Initiatives and Activities for Improvement of Teaching Quality and Effectiveness** (for example: attended CTL courses/sessions, implemented special student feedback, etc.)

The following is the information requested for pre-tenure review, and tenure and promotion review.

- I. Complete list of courses taught each year, with course numbers, titles, and quarter in which taught. Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor need only list courses taught since attaining the rank of associate professor.
- II. Graduate and undergraduate theses, projects, etc., supervised.
- III. Course and curriculum development.

- IV. Teaching evaluations: summaries of student evaluations for each class should be presented in tabular form (based on current evaluation forms). Department division and/or core averages should be provided for comparison.
- v. Other evaluations of teaching are also appropriate (for example, reports of class visits by other department faculty).

Graduate School of Professional Psychology

At GSPP, we use student evaluations. For promotion and tenure, we have senior faculty observe junior faculty in class. We also tend to hear informally from students and we discuss student impressions with faculty in order to be helpful. Of course annual merit raises include success of teaching.

Social Sciences

One Model

Department Evaluation: We use the student course evaluations almost exclusively. The Chair looks at all the numbers and narrative comments for use in annual faculty reviews, paying attention to how these numbers compare with Divisional and University averages. Having credibility in the eyes of the Dean was important to me, so I offered up both good and bad news. If the numbers were relatively low, I would make note of it in the faculty member's annual evaluation. By "numbers", I mean the values for INSTRUCTOR and COURSE, since these seem to be the categories that folks seem to care most about and that we pay most attention to (something that I think needs to change, as argued below). There would be no subsequent follow-up to a sub-par teaching evaluation, however, mostly because I never encountered a problem so serious that it warranted follow-up. Plus, I was never sure about what "follow-up" would look like.

New hires are asked to teach a class when they interview for the position, but after that we never peer review their teaching. We don't peer review each other, and we don't look at syllabi or course assignments.

For candidates up for tenure or promotion, we simply summarize the student numbers for all courses taught over their career and provide department averages as a comparison. The chair and department committee will speak to the candidates teaching in their respective dossier letters. These assessments are based on the student numbers and also on anecdotal and/or impressionistic information accumulated over the period of time that they've been at DU. We also ask for the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy, but this is the only time we really see a colleague's philosophy committed to paper.

Divisional Evaluation: The evaluations I've seen in my experience as a SOCS P&T Committee member pretty much parallel what we do in anthropology. We see the accumulated numbers for a candidate's career, department evaluations, and maybe a few testimonials from students (which we committee members always take with a grain of salt). This is an opportunity, however, to take an especially close look at the numbers and how they interrelate with each other. These experiences have come to *radically* sour me on the utility of the student evaluation instrument in making personnel decisions. Really high and really low numbers certainly tell you something, but the concern is for that broad band of sometimes great variability and ambiguity in-between. There are also the telling (and, in my experience, too-frequent-to-ignore) correlations between, for example, high INST and low CHALL numbers, or low INST and low GRAD numbers.

The evaluation of candidates can also vary depending on how much you break out numbers from the summary aggregate that a department usually provides. I did this once for an unsuccessful candidate for tenure in SOCS, a person who was not recommended at the department level. The candidate had erratic teaching numbers over the course of their career, and this was part of the justification for denial. However, if you broke out the numbers for only those courses that the candidate was most responsible for as their

central contribution to department mission, it was clear that they had been making improvement over time—maybe not dramatic improvement, but improvement nonetheless. They also had routinely high numbers in the CHALL category for all courses, even though INST was generally lower than that for colleagues. This wasn't enough to save the case at the Divisional level, but it pointed out the difficulties of using the instrument—at least as currently configured—in making personnel decisions.

Lessons Learned/Suggestions: I think the student evaluation instrument needs to be fundamentally changed. We need to move away from what, in my experience, is a more-or-less single-minded focus on INST. Not unlike IQ, these numbers reify that which is almost certainly too complex to satisfactorily measure with a single number, and lead to spurious rankings and invidious comparisons. They might also encourage a greater obsession with self instead of program—a worry raised by the results of student exit interviews during my time as chair.

I'm thinking we could stand to eliminate INST (as well as CRS) altogether. I think that Stanley Fish has some useful suggestions (made in the 2/4/05 *Chronicle of Higher Education*) about the kinds of things we should ask students to comment on that fall within their ability to usefully judge. Combining Fish with some of the things we already do on our student evaluation instrument produces the following:

1. Course was well organized.
2. Course readings were up-to-date.
3. Instructor was well prepared for class.
4. Student responsibilities and requirements were clear.
5. Assignments were graded in a timely fashion.
6. Students were tested on topics and materials covered in the course.
7. Feedback on assignments was sufficient.
8. Feedback on assignments was constructive.
9. Instructor was available during office hours.
10. Course met my curricular expectations.

Period. Student narratives are useful (despite the occasional axe-grinding) and should be retained so that they can elaborate on the above if necessary. I like the narrative questions we use in anthropology:

1. Please comment on what you see as the *strengths* of the course and the instructor.
2. What did you especially like about the course (e.g., specific topics, readings, learning activities and assignments, instructor's approach, etc.).
3. Please comment on what you see as the *weaknesses* of the course and instructor.
4. What changes for improving the course can you suggest?

Maybe add a question or two that solicit the sorts of warm-and-fuzzy information that we currently ask students to quantify, like instructor "enthusiasm", whether something was "learned", whether "critical thinking" skills were "enhanced", etc.

I also think that supplementing the student numbers and narratives with copies of course syllabi, assignments, exams, and other materials—including a rationale for why a course looks the way it does, given that there are multiple ways to disseminate knowledge—is crucial and long-overdue as a standard practice (at least in our department and maybe within the division). Finally, I think the kind of “autocritique” of courses I described above should be a standard expectation on the occasion of annual reviews.

Another Model:

Summary:

- The Psychology Department uses both quantitative and qualitative data to evaluate teaching for merit/tenure review. 5 faculty members plus the chair review the data. From the data, notes, and discussion a synthesis is formulated and written up.
- What gets forwarded to the Dean of SOCS is a description of attributes in which numbers are only part of the story. They are put in the context of what the faculty member is doing and how well that faculty member is doing it.
- The Psychology Department emphasizes that the Teaching Evaluation must be flexible to emphasize different types of faculty members in the department and what they are trying to accomplish. The process needs to be general enough and abstract enough to get consensus information in which the important information is in information that is often not quantifiable. An abstract criterion is necessary so that the information is constrained to a point where the department cannot demonstrate a faculty member’s strengths where they have them.
- A general procedure at the department level (i.e., without extra special committees between departments and deans or higher) permits variability among faculty member’s roles, across departments, etc. to be accounted for.

Procedure:

- The Psychology Department elects a Personnel Committee (5 members + the chair= ~20% of the dept) on an annual basis. All faculty members take part in the vote. This committee is selected from and represents all different areas in our department: experimental, clinical & developmental. The voting process makes sure that any decisions of the Personnel Committee can adequately represent each member of the department and that the decisions made by the Personnel Committee are valid.
- “Teaching” for the purpose of Advancement/Tenure Review is defined in the larger sense. The following information, some quantitative & some qualitative, is all discussed by the Personnel Committee.
 - Teaching Ratings
 - Means for the overall course & overall instructor
 - Each class is evaluated over the period of time that is relevant to the review
 - Percentiles are NOT looked at
 - The numbers themselves are not taken seriously in that they are not given total weight

- Instead, the committee looks at trends in the numbers, the type of course being taught, the number of people in the course, whether the course is a graduate or undergraduate course, etc.
 - Information from the Chair
 - For each course evaluation, the Chair reads all the comments from the students
 - In cases in which there are issues or problems, the Chair copies the comments
 - The Chair uses the comments to help provide feedback to the faculty member in their annual reports
 - Over ~6 years of comments and feedback, the Chair has a good sense of what students like and what they don't like
 - Course Syllabi
 - At least one member of the Personnel Committee is qualified to evaluate the content of a course
 - Course syllabi are submitted as part of the evaluation process so that content and readings can be evaluated
 - Information from Undergraduate Advisors/Research Group Meetings/Research Supervision comments/PINS/Honors Students
 - Because Psychology has a graduate program, there are a number of points of information that are available to provide an overall profile of pedagogical activities of the faculty member
 - The lack of hard numbers here does NOT diminish the importance of this data!
 - Teaching Statement by Faculty Member being evaluated
 - In this statement, the faculty member describes what he/she is trying to do, what they have done, and what efforts they have taken to address any issues or concerns.
- From the above information, notes are taken, each piece of information is discussed, and the Personnel Committee synthesizes the total profile in a document that gets forwarded to the Dean. This synthesis includes a description of the attributions in which numbers are only part of the story and the teaching ratings are put into a larger context of what the faculty member is trying to do and how well that person is accomplishing those goals.

Sturm College of Law

I. Development

Unlike those in most other disciplines, members of law school faculties do not often emerge from programs that provide experience or development in classroom or clinical teaching. Many law faculty members come directly from practice and have only a J.D.; though an increasing number have other advanced degrees (PhDs or post J.D. law degrees) or have completed clinical teaching fellowships. Thus, development of teaching should be a high priority.

A. Formal Mentor

As part of its formal tenure and promotion rules, the College of Law (COL) requires the Dean to appoint a tenured faculty member as a formal mentor to each untenured faculty member. The faculty mentor is supposed to provide support to new faculty in all facets of the job, including scholarship, teaching, and service. In order to encourage candor, the rules suggest that the mentor should not take part in the formal evaluation of the faculty member during any formal reviews.

B. Faculty Mentoring Committee

In addition, during the 2004-05 academic year, the Dean approved a faculty proposal to appoint an ad hoc faculty mentoring committee. This was in part a response to the unusual circumstance that the COL hired seven new, untenured faculty members who began teaching in Fall 2004.

1. Teaching Workshops

The mentoring committee put on several workshops related to teaching, including an introductory teaching workshop, a workshop on assessment of students in clinical settings, and a workshop on assessment of students in classroom settings. The programs were coordinated so that they did not overlap with any of the CTL's new faculty programs.

2. Videotape Reviews of Newer Faculty

In addition, the faculty mentoring committee provided an opportunity for any newer faculty member (anyone hired in the last four years) to conduct a session to review and discuss a videotape of one of that faculty member's classes. The sessions included one or two law faculty members and either Julanna Gilbert from CTL or Sheila Summers Thompson from the Office of Assessment. The purpose of these sessions was purely developmental and they were not allowed to be used as part of the evaluation process. At each session, we discussed teaching goals, methods, and styles with the observed faculty member.

C. Teaching and Administrative Loads

An ordinary teaching load is approximately four classes per year, or 11-12 semester hours. New faculty members are given a half teaching load during their first semester in order to accommodate the time demands on new teachers. Furthermore, the tenure and promotion rules suggest that new teachers should be given no more than average teaching loads and no greater than average administrative responsibilities during their pre-tenure years.

II. Evaluation

A. Student Evaluations

As with other units, the COL relies on anonymous student evaluations, which include numerical scores and an opportunity for narrative comments, in the evaluation of faculty. I have posted a blank copy of our course evaluation form as a separate document on the Teaching Task Force portfolio site. All course evaluations are filled out and posted on line, including both numerical scores and narrative comments. It should be noted that prior to posting these on line, the COL has always made hard copies of the hand written evaluations, including narrative comments, available to the students.

B. Classroom Observations by Peers

The tenure and promotion rules also require faculty members to observe classes of those being reviewed. The COL's tenure and promotion rules require a review in the second year of an appointment, the fourth year of an appointment, and in the tenure year (usually the 6th year). I have posted a copy of the relevant portion of our tenure and promotion rules as a separate document on the Teaching Task Force portfolio site.

At each review, the COL process first employs a three-person faculty advisory committee to perform an initial review of teaching (and other criteria). The rules require all three advisory committee members to observe a faculty member's classes. In addition, the rules require that two advisory committee members rotate off and be replaced by two new tenured faculty members for each subsequent review, so that multiple members of the faculty have observed a professor teach before he or she is reviewed for tenure.

The advisory committee's assessment is documented in a report, which is submitted to and reviewed by the Policy Committee (with a copy to the entire tenured and tenure-track faculty), a five-member faculty body elected by the faculty as a whole. The Policy Committee makes a recommendation in each review year that is passed on to the Dean. Some or all of the five Policy Committee members also observe the teaching of the faculty member being reviewed.

III. Rewards

Rewards for good teaching are entirely under the Dean's control. The Dean may reward good teaching as part of the salary review process, or possibly through occasional salary bonuses (though we have no way of knowing whether the latter occurs). For years, the COL did have a student-selected annual teaching award for law faculty. That no longer occurs, though the Student Bar Association now gives out an annual "Best Faculty" award, which presumably takes teaching into account.

The Women's College

The Women's College does not have regular appointed faculty. We have several people who teach regularly as a part of a broader administrative assignment in program direction/coordination and numerous adjuncts/overload faculty who teach quite consistently. We evaluate their administrative performance through the usual DU performance review process in the fall, and award merit increases that are based on performance.

We evaluate teaching through the course evaluations, reviewing the numeric ratings as well as the comments. DU appointed faculty who teach for us on-load also are evaluated annually by their departments in the usual ways—i.e., their TWC teaching is part of their review. We discuss outstanding and problematic course evaluations with chairs and directors in the academic units with whom we partner.

We provide any new adjunct or overload faculty with one-one orientations to our teaching and learning environment and to characteristics and needs of our students. Also, we offer one-one consultation and support for instructors who are experiencing a problem with classroom dynamics or specific teaching-learning issues. (Margo Espenlaub typically calls and makes herself available in those situations.) Persistent problems with a specific instructor usually would mean that we would not have that person back, unless the circumstances were very unusual.

We provide quarterly faculty meetings for faculty networking and for such topics as honor code/plagiarism issues, academic policies and support resources, sharing of instructional techniques, introduction of new ideas or programs, support around technology use in teaching and learning, and other faculty development issues. We also offer one-one coaching re use of technology.

We have participated enthusiastically in the university's faculty award programs and have nominated several people. We have had three adjunct instructors honored in the fall faculty awards program in recent years.

University College

University College hires only adjunct faculty. Appointed DU faculty who also teach at University College are considered adjunct and go through these same processes.

Evaluation

- The appointment process includes a review of credentials by the Program Director and approval by the Council on Academic Standards. They value diversity and hire minority faculty when possible and have two physically handicapped faculty.
- The first course is “probationary” though it is not actually called that. Faculty are expected to work with Paul Novak, Instructional Designer, on defining course outcomes and developing a syllabus.
- Course and Teacher evaluations used as primary source of evidence in evaluating faculty, particularly focusing on student comments.

Development

- There is a required new faculty orientation that includes information on policies, procedures as they relate to students, an introduction to teaching strategies, description of online learning, course development processes and available resources, and use of Blackboard, among other topics.
- Low evaluations lead to the Program Director working with the faculty member on specific areas of weakness, with a clear message that the second time needs to improve.
- Program Director can also recommend a classroom observation of an experienced instructor for faculty who need additional support.
- Faculty who need additional support are encouraged to restructure and redesign the course, with assistance from Program Director and Instructional Designer.
- There is a Master teacher program where a certificate and the opportunity to apply for up to \$200 in course development, books or travel are awarded. Faculty must attend 8 separate workshop sessions, the topics of which include teaching strategies, online learning, language specialization, course design, and diversity in the classroom. Two sessions are offered each quarter. They also must have successful teaching over 4 to 6 courses with good evaluations.
- Faculty who teach an online course must complete an online tutorial about teaching online courses prior to teaching that online course.
- There is a full faculty meeting each fall, the last portion of which is devoted to faculty development. Past topics have included teaching strategies, managing classroom behavior, and writing across the curriculum.
- An online capstone advisor course must be taken in order to be a capstone advisor.

Rewards

- Pay is determined by enrollment (\$1500 per 3 credit course if 10 students enrolled, sliding scale below that and above that, \$100 per student)

- Excellent faculty are invited to participate in student information sessions for students.
- A holiday party for students, faculty and staff is hosted at the Newman Center.

Enrichment program

- There is no master teacher program for these instructors.
- Teachers receive packet regarding teaching adults, course outcomes, outline of direction, and the importance of varying teaching strategies.
- A separate evaluation form is used for these courses.
- Courses are not offered again if evaluations are not good.
- Will intervene (and have done so) immediately if students complain.

Items under discussion

- They are launching a quarterly electronic faculty newsletter that will include teaching tips from Jim Davis.
- They are considering classroom observations by Program Directors, academic dean, or dean but have not decided whether or not to do this and how it might be structured.
- There is a task force on faculty that is exploring different levels of “permanence” and different types of contracts.