

**UNIVERSITY OF DENVER**  
**TEACHING TASK FORCE REPORT, JUNE 2005**

The Teaching Task Force (TTF) was constituted by Provost Robert Coombe in February 2005 to develop and recommend a more comprehensive and coherent system for developing, supporting and evaluating teaching at the University of Denver. As an integral part of its deliberations, the task force addressed issues related to campus culture, faculty development, rewards and support systems, and evaluation. This document summarizes the discussions of the task force and presents recommendations for enhanced teaching excellence that are based on the following principles:

*We are committed to excellent teaching and excellent scholarship, and at DU we recognize that excellent teaching is informed by excellent scholarship. We understand that professors, from year to year and over the course of their careers, will balance their commitments to, and time investments in, these equally important enterprises in different ways.*

*Self-reflection about teaching, coupled with professional development opportunities and institutional supports, improves teaching. This can be documented and evaluated.*

The need for a campus culture and a system of supports for excellent teaching and a consistent and comprehensive evaluation system is discussed in Section I. Section II summarizes issues associated with developing, supporting and rewarding teaching, including examining institutional barriers. Section III revisits the three dimensions of teaching identified by the task force and proposes mechanisms for their evaluation. Section IV summarizes our major findings and indicates areas that require further exploration. Appendices A, B & C provide information noted in the text. Appendix D contains descriptions and observations regarding the varied teaching development, evaluation and reward practice of the academic units.

## **Members of the Task Force**

Task Force members were chosen to represent diversity in a number of areas, including divisional affiliation. Members were chosen by the Faculty Senate and representatives of the Provost, and represent a mix of faculty and administrators. All have a demonstrated interest in developing and supporting teaching excellence.

Don Bacon (Faculty, Daniels School of Business)  
Alan Chen (Faculty, Sturm College of Law)  
Christina Coughlan, (Faculty, Natural Sciences and Mathematics)  
Ron DeLyser (Faculty, School of Engineering and Computer Science)  
Julanna Gilbert (Director, Center for Teaching and Learning)  
Andy Goetz (Faculty, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Social Sciences)  
Jim Hagler (Faculty, Natural Sciences and Mathematics)  
Glyn Hanbery (Interim Dean, Daniels School of Business) Co-Chair  
Jennifer Karas (Associate Dean, Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences)  
Christian Molidor (Associate Dean, Graduate School of Social Work)  
David Montano (Faculty, Arts and Humanities)  
Cathryn Potter (Faculty, Graduate School of Social Work) Co-Chair  
Catherine Reed (Faculty, Social Sciences)  
Dean Saitta (Faculty, Social Sciences)  
Rahmat Shoureshi (Dean, School of Engineering and Computer Science)  
Sheila Summers Thompson (Director, Assessment)  
Jesus Trevino (Associate Provost, Multicultural Excellence)  
Frank Tuitt (Faculty, Education)  
Terri-Jo Woellner (Faculty, Arts and Humanities)

## SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

*The mission of the University of Denver is to promote learning by engaging students, advancing scholarly inquiry, cultivating critical thought, and creating knowledge. We empower the lives and futures of students by fostering productive synergies between intellectual and personal development, research and teaching, disciplinary and interdisciplinary perspectives, classroom and experience-based learning, and theoretical knowledge and professional practice. Our engagement with diverse local and global communities contributes to the common good.*

The importance of the University's instructional aim is prominent in its overall mission. Full realization of this aim relies on a university-wide culture of teaching excellence. This culture must reflect and uphold the principles of academic freedom, civil discourse, and freedom of expression as outlined in the University's Faculty Senate Position Statement on Academic Values, Rights, and Responsibilities.

*Accordingly, teaching at DU supports the faculty's longstanding commitment to defending the principles of academic freedom, open debate, and civil discourse; exposing students to the full range of paradigms, theories, and methods at play in a field of inquiry... promoting critical, creative, and ethical inquiry which is best served when teachers and students are free to express and examine the societal commitments and biases that influence the production, dissemination, and application of knowledge; respecting the ability of students and teachers to jointly contextualize, critique, and compare different approaches and contributions to human knowledge; evaluating students solely on the basis of their academic performance, and our peers solely on the basis of their contributions to scholarly and creative activity, teaching, university service, and the wider public good; and, finally, inspiring and communicating the joy and excitement of intellectual endeavors.*

In addition, it must be understood that the faculty has a responsibility to teach in an ethical and responsible manner using educational pedagogies and activities that respect the dignity, worth, and psychological and physical security of all students. Teaching approaches should be carried out in a manner consistent with university regulations and with ethical guidelines such as those published by the American Psychological Association, (or other discipline-specific guidelines outlining the ethical treatment of students).

Enhancement of the culture of teaching and learning excellence is clearly supported by the Council of Deans in their recent Statement on Teaching.

*Excellent teaching is so much taken for granted that its importance can be diminished by not speaking of it as often or forthrightly as we should.... we want to raise the standards for teaching and reaffirm its importance to our collective mission at the University of Denver.... a broad continuous conversation, both formal and informal, with faculty from across the university is also helpful, not only to the individual, but in creating a culture of*

*teaching excellence that inspires everyone.* (See Appendix A for the full text of the Deans' Statement on Teaching.)

To realize fully a culture of teaching excellence will require attention to the development of integrated practices, teaching support services, and an ethos of excellence in classroom teaching, mentoring, and outreach. The classroom climate for diversity, diversity in the curriculum, teaching about multiple perspectives, and support for professional growth and development in relation to diversity are some of the critical areas that merit attention as DU strives to enhance the culture of teaching excellence.

The University must ensure that faculty members engaged in teaching are making high quality contributions to the teaching mission. Teaching contributions by faculty must be evaluated to inform decisions about such issues as development, recognition, and rewards. Teaching, of course, involves a broad array of activities and efforts. Accordingly, a well-designed teaching evaluation program must include an equally broad spectrum of performance measures that will fairly reflect the individual's contributions and achievements. The sources of evidence used in the teaching evaluation should be reviewed for the possible influence of such factors as race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, disability status and other social dimensions.

Current teaching evaluation practices at the University are subject to at least three major criticisms. First, while teaching is a composite process, much emphasis frequently is placed on only one activity, classroom instruction. Second, often the evaluative evidence on classroom teaching is restricted to one source, student ratings of courses and teaching. Third, a variety of evaluative practices appear to be in force throughout the University, yielding less consistency than may be warranted or desired.

Although the Teaching Task Force was charged with conceptualizing a mechanism for the evaluation of the dimensions of teaching, it was with the realization that teaching and scholarship must not be artificially dichotomized at DU. One of the strengths of this University is the opportunity to marry these two faculty imperatives in creative ways, ways that are not always possible in larger, research-oriented, public institutions. So, while we include a focus here on the development, evaluation and reward of teaching, it is in the context of the expectation that great teaching is a direct result of the University's commitment to and support of development of the "whole" faculty member.

In engaging the current literature and discourse on teaching and learning, the Task Force acknowledges that one can become entangled in discussions that have the potential to simultaneously inform and delay discussion of specifics. We have engaged in some of these discussions, and it may be important to note a few important issues and assumptions that underlie our work.

The first is the debate regarding "teaching" and "learning." Some view the educational enterprise as best described as a "facilitation of learning." This approach has the important advantage of keeping the focus strongly on student learning and on practices that enhance student learning. Others feel that it is important also to stay focused on the enterprise of

teaching, since learning is complex and influenced by many factors beyond teaching. In this document we use language related to both points of view, focusing on our common assumption that enhanced teaching is likely to enhance student learning. We do not focus strongly on the assessment of student learning, though we believe that units should be increasingly focusing their assessment efforts in this arena.

Second is the definition of “excellence in teaching.” We believe that teaching excellence takes many forms; that there are many roads to enhanced teaching effectiveness and student learning. We decline to seek to set a standard for excellent teaching, preferring to focus on exposing faculty to diverse sets of teaching skills and on supporting, evaluating and rewarding their commitment to self-reflective teaching and continuous development. We are committed to a culture that supports continuous innovation in teaching practices and in incorporation of new, important content.

### **Three Dimensions of Teaching**

The task force identified three primary dimensions of teaching: classroom teaching, mentoring, and outreach.

Classroom teaching includes those activities that focus on learning within the classroom as well as others that relate directly thereto. Thus, in addition to classroom instruction this set of activities includes instructional design, student feedback, office hours, etc. Currently, a primary, if not exclusive, source of evaluative evidence for classroom teaching is student ratings. These student ratings do not address the full range of attributes that are important to evaluating classroom teaching. Moreover, student surveys generally fail to address other important faculty-driven, student learning activities or opportunities. Hence, as described in Section III, evidence from other sources is sought to inform the evaluation.

Mentoring includes those activities undertaken by a faculty member to assist a student or colleague in achieving or performing a task, or progressing in his or her career. Mentoring refers to such roles as student advisor, dissertation or thesis advisor, member of master’s or Ph.D. qualifying exam committee, supervisor of independent study or research, supervisor for creative performance or exhibit, etc. Mentoring of colleagues might include activities such as serving as a new-faculty mentor, peer observation of teaching, provision of curriculum development support, etc. Currently, much of this important activity is unreported by faculty, often is not part of the formal evaluation process, and thus is undervalued in teaching evaluations.

Outreach activities are teaching or teaching-related efforts undertaken by faculty beyond the boundaries of their normal assignments. Such activities include teaching non-credit courses to non-traditional students within a DU-based program, teaching in off-campus programs with community members or providing consulting services or technical assistance to external groups devising a curriculum, etc. Much of this activity, too, is unreported by faculty and is not part of the formal evaluation process.

## **SECTION II: DEVELOPMENT, SUPPORT AND REWARD OF TEACHING**

A campus culture that is supportive of teaching is required if teaching is to flourish at any institution of higher education. While the University of Denver has a reputation for high quality teaching, the TTF acknowledges that barriers do exist in our culture, and that opportunities for development and incentives for teaching must be strengthened. In this section we discuss recommendations for strengthening our campus community's commitment to development, support and rewards for teaching.

As we worked with ideas for developing teaching and rewarding teaching, it became clear that the issues of "development," "support," and "reward" should not be separated. Frankly, for most great teachers, the primary reward comes in the act of teaching and the experience of learning. Acknowledgement of these successes cannot be underestimated as well. For many great teachers, opportunities for development of new and creative teaching skills enable the rewards of teaching to be experienced. In many cases, therefore, development opportunities present opportunities for specific rewards, and approaches to reward present opportunities for further development of the teacher and/or the culture.

The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) can be a major support for these efforts on campus. We recognize also, however, that Deans, Chairs and Faculty members must develop ownership of both mission and programs aimed at enhancing teaching. We therefore support a mix of centralized and decentralized approaches.

Deans play a primary role in developing and supporting culture shifts in academic worlds. We encourage the Provost and Deans to actively engage with our recommendations and with their faculties in support of enhanced commitment and focus on teaching excellence. In that effort, it is important that overall workload issues be considered and fairly addressed.

### **Institutional Support for Teaching**

#### *Valuing Teaching*

At the most basic institutional level, teaching must be valued in the existing review and reward procedures, including promotion and tenure and merit review. The first of our recommendations is for a standard review protocol that can be used in all units. This protocol is outlined in detail in Section III of this document. We believe that it raises the bar with regard to the types of evidence used in evaluation of teaching, promotes a reflective, development oriented approach, and builds on existing annual review processes without creating undue burden on faculty members or their chairs/deans.

We recommend strongly that these review procedures be systematically and consistently applied to decisions regarding merit increases, stipends and bonuses. It is also important that the links between evaluation mechanisms and decisions be transparently fair and reasonably standard.

Some of the primary barriers to valuing teaching are the salary inequities and inadequacies that exist on campus. The lack of basic reward for the whole of the faculty role takes its toll on teaching. We recommend that the University address this issue in a systematic way. This includes a focus on both the current base salary inadequacies and inequities, and the approach to annual salary increases. We are mindful that the University currently approaches compensation using three primary mechanisms: a) base salary, b) stipends to encourage involvement in specific activities, and c) bonuses. In our view, faculty members are best compensated in a competitive and equitable base salary system, with real, tangible and substantial merit increase opportunities. That said, given our current system, we do recommend use of all avenues of support for reward of teaching.

Acknowledgment of faculty has moved from commencement to the internal convocation event. We recommend that teaching awards be acknowledged during commencement as a formal, public statement regarding the University's commitment to teaching and as a means of involving students in that acknowledgment. We are aware of the debate regarding the advisability of teaching awards as a mechanism for reward of teaching, and believe strongly that such awards are only useful in a system in which many tangible rewards exist. We will discuss this in a later recommendation.

#### *Structural Supports: Workload*

We recommend that a small workgroup of Deans and Faculty Members examine logical, coherent and feasible approaches to making teaching load policies transparent and accessible to the University community. Recognizing that the units have differing missions and methods of teaching, we do not recommend a rigid, standard teaching workload. However, we do believe that teaching loads, in the context of other faculty expectations, are relevant to equitable access to time for focus on enhancing teaching, and that some inequities may exist. We are mindful of the many issues involved in this situation and the many implications of changed approaches. We do, however, feel that progress must be made in this area if we are to value both teaching and scholarship across the divisions.

#### *Access and Support for Diverse Pedagogies*

In recent years, much attention has been paid to technologies that support teaching, including systems that support delivery in classroom settings (projection systems, "wired to the seat" technology, etc.), systems that support engagement (asynchronous, internet-based communication, chat rooms, etc.) and systems that support classroom management (grades, participation, etc.). Access to technology that supports teaching is variable across units, as is, more importantly, access to high quality support for its use. We recommend that the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) design a list of technology-related tools that should be available, without charge, to all professors, in all venues, and that Deans commit to access. In addition, we strongly recommend that provision for support be standardized across units and venues, such that teachers may rely upon a specified level of person-support for use of technology.

In addition, it is important that faculty members be exposed to varied pedagogical models that are supportive of teaching. We recommend that DU faculty members have access to information on these developing models. We recommend further that faculty members have the ability to test varying approaches to teaching in a manner that supports creativity and innovation. CTL can be a major resource in this arena.

### *Information and Skill Supports*

We recommend development of a series of workshops for existing faculty (“New Ideas for Experienced Teachers”). Many feel that these workshops will be most useful if they are created by and tailored to units and allow for significant interaction between faculty members regarding the specific needs of their curricula. This requires a high level of cooperation between CTL and individual units. These workshops should expose faculty to both recent theory and research on teaching and learning and specific techniques and approaches, and should include continuation of the cooperative learning effort. Cognizant of the history of non-volunteerism in this area, we further recommend that Deans and Chairs be encouraged to actively support and engage in these efforts (see recommendations below.) In addition, given the wide use of stipends to encourage involvement in many campus activities, we recommend that stipends be used to further this effort as well.

While many are interested in developing stronger peer review systems, the level of knowledge and expertise in this area is scarce. We recommend development of seminars, workshops and one-on-one sessions to facilitate various types of peer review, including

- a. Peer review of course materials,
- b. Observation of in-class teaching,
- c. Mentoring new and existing faculty, and
- d. Facilitation of teaching partners and reciprocal classroom visits.

We do not believe that in-class peer observation systems are best used as evaluation tools, but rather as mechanisms for individual skill and community culture development.

Information on materials that support excellent teaching is not readily available or centralized. We recommend development of a campus website on teaching which contains online resources for both faculty and administrators.

### *Enhancing the Practice of Teaching*

The practice of teaching is supported by careful attention to many basic supports, including the physical spaces, opportunities for fieldwork and access and support for teaching technologies. The Task Force has not identified all areas in which such support can be enhanced. Here we list a few examples.

Classrooms with fixed seating units create barriers to cooperative learning approaches. We recommend that, as new classrooms are built and older ones remodeled, the University should build flexible seating. We further recommend that resources be devoted to ensuring that each building with teaching facilities has a balance in types of classrooms. Faculty members

should be able to access teaching spaces that fit the needs of their courses, including those with adequate light and ventilation.

Transportation is not readily available in many units for teaching in the community. Transportation is a necessity if DU is to commit to experiential learning opportunities that support both our educational and public good missions. The lack of access to transportation is a problem in some areas due to budgetary limitations; in others it has to do with simple access to University vehicles. We recommend that the University invest in a system of easy access to University or rented vehicles for use by faculty and students in fieldwork.

### **Support for New Faculty**

The University's support for new faculty members sets the stage for its expectations for teaching excellence. These supports serve to both educate about and develop a campus culture in which teaching is valued and supported.

It is clear that new faculty spend a great deal of time preparing for teaching prior to the start of their contracts on September 1. We recommend that the University invest in an earlier start date for new faculty that would allow for better orientation to the University and to the teaching role.

#### *Center for Teaching and Learning*

We recommend that some of the material now covered in the Fall Quarter CTL New Faculty workshops be moved to a late-August Teaching Orientation in order to allow new faculty an initial focus on teaching and time to develop a clear teaching development agenda.

We recommend that all new faculty members be strongly encouraged, and actively enabled, to attend the CTL New Faculty Workshop series. This series should be delivered in multiple sections at multiple time periods to support easy access from all units. We recommend that this series be continually and rigorously evaluated as it continues to evolve and strengthen its approach to supporting new faculty.

We recommend creation of a second year, new faculty workshop series to facilitate continued professional development of new faculty members. This series should continue to support interaction between new and experienced teachers, with sections tailored to the needs of specific groups of units.

#### *Unit and Department Supports for New Teachers*

We further recommend that units develop a clear, equitable system for allocating course relief from teaching in the first year. At this time, these policies are quite varied across departments and units and not well understood by all faculty members.

We recommend that units establish a clear policy relating to the number of new preparations of courses that are required of new faculty prior to the tenure review. Limiting the number of preps allows new teachers to develop skills in depth, and ultimately supports the quality of the learning experience for students.

We recommend that units consider development of a teaching mentor program for new faculty. Such programs can vary from the informal assignment of teaching mentors within a department or unit, to a more sustained effort to support development of teaching effectiveness, such as the videotaping project currently used in the Sturm College of Law.

### **Support for Administrators**

Development, support and reward of teaching are only possible in the context of a positive campus culture. That culture is developed in partnership between faculty and administrators. For any of the above recommendations to take root and flourish, significant support must be garnered from chairs and deans. We recommend that workshops, discussion groups and on-line resources be developed to support chairs and deans in the following areas:

- To develop norms for and monitor systematic, cross-division approaches to valuing teaching in promotion and tenure, annual review and merit processes,
- To interpret evidence provided through the annual review process
- To integrate student evaluation with other forms of evidence
- To determine teaching expectations for individuals at different levels in their faculty careers and communicate these expectations to faculty
- To base teaching evaluation on demonstrated improvement,
- To identify individuals experiencing problems with teaching, recommend required support and monitor progress,
- To create and support a departmental and unit investment in teaching.

Our recommendations for annual and enhanced reviews, found later in this document, have implications for workload for chairs and deans. We recommend that these implications be accounted for as deans and the Provost consider workload policies for those with administrative assignments.

### **Individual Rewards for Teaching Excellence**

We do not believe that short-term individual awards, without a focus on transmission of expertise, are a powerful agent for cultural change. We do support continuation of some of the individual awards currently in use, though we believe this system should be substantially strengthened. In addition, we believe that valuing and using the talents of exceptional teachers to support others and build the campus culture can be effective. Such an effort will be most effective if it is substantial and sustained.

### *University Teaching Professorships*

We recommend development of a University Teaching Professorship program through which some twelve faculty members would be actively engaged in supporting the teaching mission of the university at any given time. The term of appointment should be 2-3 years. We further recommend that these positions be endowed and named so as to ensure their sustainability and raise their profile both on campus and with external constituents. They should serve as the teaching equivalent to the Evans Professorships, and the group should serve as the teaching advisory group for the Provost. These positions should have visible and tangible rewards, and be highly visible to both internal and external audiences.

University Teaching Professors should be selected through a rigorous, transparent process managed by collaboration between the Deans, Provost and Faculty Senate. This process might be profitably developed for selection of both University Teaching Professors and other faculty awards (see below.)

The University Teaching Professorship program should serve the reward, support and development aims of the University. Structurally, Professors should have access to a specified level of monetary support that could be used in flexible ways as designed by the Professor in consultation with their Dean. For example, some might elect to receive full summer salary and some negotiated, regular workload release to be actively involved in developing both the scholarship of teaching and the practice of teaching at the University of Denver. Others might design creative, innovated and flexible plans. Professors might be actively involved in mentoring other faculty members, in developing teaching symposia and departmental or unit working groups, in supporting team teaching in integrative areas, and in developing innovative new approaches. They could be actively involved in leading curricular innovation and program development. Working together, the University Teaching Professors could be actively involved in supporting cross-department and cross-division initiatives, coordinating their work with that of CTL. In short, Professors should serve as an active resource to their colleagues, departments and divisions, promote creative collaborations and serve to develop the campus teaching culture.

### *Current Teaching Awards*

The faculty awards with teaching components currently in use at the University (Distinguished Scholar, United Methodist Scholar-Teacher Award, and the Adjunct Faculty Teaching Award) should be tied to the broader scope of evidence brought forward in the annual review process. Currently these awards are made through a process in which a committee of the Faculty Senate brings recommendations to the Provost. There is variability among Deans with regard to their comfort level in taking an active role in nomination of potential recipients and in provision of evidence to the process. We are mindful of the need to establish a process that uses available evidence, respects confidentiality and protects against political manipulation. We recommend that the Faculty Senate, the Dean's Council and the Provost's office develop a more structured process for nomination, specification and consideration of evidence and final decision.

In the light of the recommendation for creation of the University Teaching Professors, we recommend discussion between the Provost and the Senate regarding the advisability of elimination of the Distinguished Teacher Award. It may be that reserving the University award process for focus on the integration of teaching and scholarship in innovative and compelling ways is a wise direction.

*Annual Review and Merit Decisions*

We reiterate our belief that individual rewards related to clear, coherent merit salary processes are an important dimension of teaching reward.

## SECTION III: EVALUATING TEACHING

### Introduction

The evaluation mechanism outlined below provides a context within which evidence from a variety of sources is reported, allowing the various pieces to be presented in an integrated fashion. So, for example, student evaluations are integrated with evidence reported by the individual, and in some cases, by peers and chair/supervisors. The evaluation also focuses on development rather than on a defined standard (excellent, good, satisfactory, etc.), reflecting the fact that a culture of teaching requires its members to be engaged in professional development. Hence, development activities are to be reported and reflected upon as a part of the annual evaluation of teaching, the assumption being that professional development focused on teaching will surely enhance teaching and learning.

Figures 1 and 2 present a pictorial summary of the teaching evaluation process that we propose. The process focuses on varying types and sources of evidence for high quality teaching in the three dimensions of teaching. We propose a combination of annual reviews and periodic enhanced reviews, with enhanced reviews incorporating a wider variety of evaluative evidence, and occurring across the career span of faculty members.

We note one issue especially related to our consideration of available, important evidence of teaching excellence. Many universities have moved to complex systems of peer observation of teaching. In order to produce valid and reliable evidence using this method, great investments of time and training must be made. We believe that in-class peer observation of teaching is best used in the context of development rather than evaluation. Accordingly, we do not recommend that units incorporate in-class peer observation into ongoing evaluative systems.

We propose to retain the practice of annual review using the framework presented here and with an emphasis on continuous development of teaching skills. These annual reviews would be supplemented at specific intervals with “enhanced” annual reviews that use a wider variety of evidence. The enhanced review would take place at the:

- Three-year review –review after the third year of teaching at DU
- Tenure review –review submitted with application for tenure
- Three-year post-tenure review –review completed three years after receiving tenure
- Full Professor review –review submitted with application for full professor
- Five-year post-tenure review –review completed every five years following the three-year post-tenure review (These reviews take place every five years after the three year post-tenure review for associate professors and every five years following promotion to Full Professor.)

The “enhanced” reviews of teaching would include **self, peer, and chair/supervisor** evaluations of teaching. All other annual reviews of teaching would consist of self and chair/supervisor evaluations (unless the specific unit requires more). In all annual reviews, the chair/supervisor would provide a summary to include recommendations for improvement and faculty development activities. Student evaluation results would be reported in the context of the

format of the annual review rather than as stand alone evidence. Proposed formats for the annual reviews are provided in this document.

This task force has elected to emphasize development and the pursuit of excellence in teaching as part of all annual reviews, believing that this supports both faculty development and support for a campus culture focused on teaching and learning. Current practices including chair/supervisor review and student ratings of teaching do not capture the scope of the full pursuit of excellent teaching. Before tenure, this pursuit must include evidence showing that the individual has participated in developmental activities such as:

- Attending the first and second year workshops (See Section II)
- Working with a teaching partner (peers)
- Attending seminars and conferences on teaching on or off campus
- Participation in curriculum development

When applying for Full Professorship or when preparing the Five Year reviews, this pursuit must include evidence showing that, in addition to developmental activities, the individual is assuming a leadership role in teaching. For example:

- Evidence of steady development in teaching 
- Teaching projects developed/completed by the individual
- Presentations at teaching seminars, conferences, workshops on or off campus
- Significant involvement in curricular development/evaluation/academic program assessment activities
- Mentoring other faculty and working with teaching assistants

Peer review may be included in both formative and summative evaluations of teaching, and the CTL and/or the Office of Assessment will play key roles in their development and facilitation. Peer review activities to be implemented include:

- Peer review of syllabi, sample exams, assignments and other course materials for content, organization, practice and mechanics in each of the “enhanced” review years,
- In-class observation, which will be available as a *developmental* tool (some units may use this for formal evaluation purposes).

The classroom teaching evaluation process should be applied to all teaching faculty members, regardless of status: tenure-line, non-tenure line lecturers, and serial adjuncts. For non-tenure line faculty, the enhanced reviews would occur every five years if applicable. These teaching practices may be expected of tenure-line faculty, but not of other faculty, depending on the unit. For faculty whose single role on campus is to teach a specific class (adjunct) or for a limited time (1 year lecturer) it may not be appropriate to “raise the bar” in terms of expectations of teaching performance outside the classroom.

**Figure 1: Annual review process for tenure track faculty**

**Annual reviews**

**3<sup>rd</sup>-year, Tenure, 3<sup>rd</sup>-year Post-Tenure, Application for Full Professor, Every Five Years Post 3<sup>rd</sup>-year Post-Tenure**

<b>I. Classroom</b>	<b>Sources</b>
<i>A. What, how, &amp; why I teach</i>	
<u>Teaching Philosophy</u>	Self
<u>Content</u>	Self
<u>Organization</u>	Self Students
<u>Practice</u>	Self Students
<u>Mechanics</u>	Self Students
<i>B. Evidence of development</i>	
	Self
<i>C. Plans for development</i>	
	Self
<i>D. Recommendations for development</i>	
	Chair/supervisor

<b>I. Classroom</b>	<b>Sources</b>
<i>A. What, how, &amp; why I teach</i>	
<u>Teaching Philosophy</u>	Self
<u>Content</u>	Self Peers
<u>Organization</u>	Self Students Peers
<u>Practice</u>	Self Students Peers
<u>Mechanics</u>	Self Students Chair/supervisor
<i>B. Evidence of development</i>	
	Self Chair/supervisor
<i>C. Plans for development</i>	
	Self
<i>D. Recommendations for development</i>	
	Chair/supervisor

<b>II. Mentoring</b>	<b>Sources</b>
<i>A. Mentoring activities</i>	
<i>B Evaluation, development plans</i>	Self

<b>II. Mentoring</b>	<b>Sources</b>
<i>A. Mentoring activities</i>	
<i>B. Evaluation, development plans</i>	Self Chair/supervisor

<b>III. Outreach</b>	<b>Sources</b>
<i>A. Outreach activities</i>	
<i>B. Evaluation, development plans</i>	Self

<b>III. Outreach</b>	<b>Sources</b>
<i>A. Outreach activities</i>	
<i>B. Evaluation, development plans</i>	Self Chair/supervisor

**Figure 2: Annual Review Process for Lecturers and Adjunct Faculty**

**Annual reviews**

<b>I. Classroom</b>	<b>Sources</b>
<i>A. What, how, &amp; why I teach</i>	
Teaching Philosophy	Self
<u>Content</u>	Self
<u>Organization</u>	Self Students
<u>Practice</u>	Self Students
<u>Mechanics</u>	Self Students
<i>B. Evidence of development</i>	
	Self
<i>C. Plans for development</i>	
	Self
<i>D. Recommendations for development</i>	
	Chair/supervisor

<b>II. Mentoring</b>	<b>Sources</b>
<i>A. Mentoring activities</i>	
<i>B Evaluation, development plans</i>	Self

<b>III. Outreach</b>	<b>Sources</b>
<i>A. Outreach activities</i>	
<i>B. Evaluation, development plans</i>	Self

**3rd-year, Every Five Years (where appropriate)**

<b>I. Classroom</b>	<b>Sources</b>
<i>A. What, how, &amp; why I teach</i>	
Teaching Philosophy	Self
<u>Content</u>	Self Peers
<u>Organization</u>	Self Students Peers
<u>Practice</u>	Self Students Peers
<u>Mechanics</u>	Self Students Chair/supervisor
<i>B. Evidence of development</i>	
	Self Chair/supervisor
<i>C. Plans for development</i>	
	Self
<i>D. Recommendations for development</i>	
	Chair/supervisor

<b>II. Mentoring</b>	<b>Sources</b>
<i>A. Mentoring activities</i>	
<i>B. Evaluation, development plans</i>	Self Chair/supervisor

<b>III. Outreach</b>	<b>Sources</b>
<i>A. Outreach activities</i>	
<i>B. Evaluation, development plans</i>	Self Chair/supervisor

## **Dimension 1: Evaluating Classroom Teaching**

In the normal review year, the document will include self-report and student evaluations of teaching. The self-report will be submitted every year; however, we anticipate that in some years it will be more extensive than others. For example, the teaching philosophy should be reexamined on a yearly basis, but it may be refined minimally in some years, not at all in others, and dramatically in others. The purpose of these reports is to help the faculty member focus and reflect on the development of her/his teaching in a serious way and to document changes when they have occurred. Four elements of the teaching experience are included: content, organization, practice, and mechanics. Individuals will comment on their performance in each area; student evaluations will speak to issues of organization, practice, and mechanics. Each individual would include evidence of teaching development over the past year and plans for development. Deans/chairs/supervisors may also include specific recommendations for development, and may incorporate evidence of a positive or negative nature that has come to their attention during the year.

### **WHAT, HOW, AND WHY I TEACH**

#### **Teaching Philosophy**

- *A statement discussing philosophical orientation to teaching, approaches used, etc.*

#### **Content**

- *Self-report of subjects taught, how & why various course materials are selected, how level of courses is determined, how one keeps current in the subject, how one's courses fit into the departmental curriculum.*

#### **Organization**

- *Self-report of instructional design of courses with supporting examples of syllabi, exams, assignments, student work, comments on pertinent student evaluation results.*
- *Student evaluations of teaching*

#### **Practice**

- *Self-report of how to engage students, enthusiasm, support of students, teaching techniques, classroom climate, comments on pertinent student evaluation results.*
- *Student evaluations of teaching*

#### **Mechanics**

- *Self-report of preparedness, timely return of papers, feedback to students, office hours, and comments on pertinent student evaluation results.*
- *Student evaluations of teaching*
- *Information from chair or supervisor if pertinent*

### **B. EVIDENCE OF DEVELOPMENT**

- *Self-report of implementation of various teaching methodologies in the classroom, trends in student evaluation results, teaching workshops attended, collaboration with a teaching partner, how these have influenced one's teaching*
- *For the five-year reviews of tenured faculty members, teaching leadership activities should be described in this section. These include such things as curriculum development, mentoring new faculty, giving presentations on teaching, organizing teaching workshops, etc.*

### **C. PLANS FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT**

- *Self-report based on evidence described above*

### **D. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT**

- *Prepared by the chair/supervisor and communicated to the faculty member*

### **Supplemental information for Enhanced Annual Reviews:**

#### **Peer Evaluation of Classroom Teaching**

#### **Chair/Supervisor comments on Classroom Teaching**

This segment of the evaluation is added in the pre-tenure, tenure, post-tenure, full professor and 5 year post tenure reviews. The review will *include all of the points from the section above*, but is “enhanced” with the inclusion of information from peers and chairs/supervisors, in the following ways.

### **A. EVALUATION RESULTS**

#### Content

- *Report from peers – review of content as evidenced by syllabi, course materials, and assignments with evaluation of*
  - *Up to date nature of content, examples, or applications used in class*
  - *The level of the course (appropriate or not)*

#### Organization

- *Report from peers – review of organization as evidenced by syllabi*

#### Practice

- *Report from peers –evaluation of*
  - *Effective use of teaching methodologies to engage students*
- *Report from chair/supervisor – evaluation of*
  - *Enthusiasm for teaching*
  - *Student responses about classroom climate, faculty support & interest in students*
  - *Trends in pertinent student evaluation results*

#### Mechanics

- *Report from chair/supervisor – evaluation of such things as submitting grades on time, meeting class regularly, adequate office hours, posting office hours, trends in pertinent student evaluation results*

## **B. EVIDENCE OF DEVELOPMENT**

- *Report from chair/supervisor – includes such things as evaluation of how the faculty member’s teaching has developed based on implementation of new teaching methodologies in the classroom, trends in student evaluation results, teaching workshops attended, collaboration with a teaching partner, teaching leadership roles assumed in the department for senior faculty members, etc.*

### **Dimension 2: Evaluating Mentoring/Advising**

In an effort to expand the concept of teaching, we would like to specifically and consistently evaluate, recognize, and reward mentoring activities as an element of teaching. Mentoring activities are often cited by students as one of the most powerful and memorable experiences of an academic program. It is in these experiences that students are given the opportunity to integrate classroom learning from diverse courses in the context of a supportive, intense teaching relationship. These mentoring relationships may be one-on-one as academic and/or career advisor, thesis and dissertation supervision or the PINS and Honors programs. They may also be established in small groups in the context of creative activities, such as performance groups, art exhibits or dramatic performances. Thus, we define the term mentoring broadly to include those opportunities for faculty members to engage in working relationships with individual students or small groups. We view these opportunities as an important element contributing to long-term student success, and a critical element of a strong teaching program.

### **Evaluation**

For the annual review, each faculty member should include mentoring/advising activities for the year. This will be a self-report, but may also include information that comes to the department chair/supervisor in routine discussion with students. The student ratings of teaching should also be included for faculty members who participate in the UDCC 1000/1050 seminars. The self-report of mentoring may include a general log of activities (See Appendix B for a potential template) and a narrative section discussing activities and plans for development. The presentation of evidence regarding mentoring should include

- A. Number of advisees/students in a mentoring relationship with the faculty member
- B. Nature of the interaction with the advisees
  - i. Range
  - ii. Depth
  - iii. Outcome
- C. Summary and Plans for Development

The following list of mentoring activities may be helpful for new faculty in accurately reporting their work in this area. It is not, however, considered to be an exhaustive list of possible mentoring activities.

## **List of Mentoring Teaching Activities**

### **Credit and Noncredit Course Related Activities**

- Principal Dissertation/Thesis Advisor for Graduate Student
  - Faculty member who is primary advisor for Ph.D. student or Master's Student
- Principal Thesis/Honors Thesis Advisor for Undergraduate Student
  - Faculty member who is primary advisor for an undergraduate honors student
- Member/Outside Chair of Dissertation/Thesis Committee (not Principal Advisor)
  - Faculty member who was part of a Ph.D. thesis evaluation either within or outside of the graduate student's department
- Member of Master's/Ph.D. Qualifying Exam Committee
  - Faculty member who was part of a Ph.D. thesis evaluation or Qualifying examine evaluation either within or outside of the graduate student's department
- Independent Study/Research Group Supervised
  - Faculty member who sponsors either an undergraduate or graduate student in a listed, for credit Independent Study course
  - Faculty member who supervised a research group of undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or faculty
- Undergraduate Research advisor (list by individual)
  - Faculty member who advises individual undergraduate students in a scholarly project that is not part of a listed, for credit course
- Partners-in-Scholarship (PINS) (list by individual)
  - Faculty member who advises individual undergraduate students in a research project supported by PINS
- Student Advising (total number of undergraduates/graduates supervised)
  - Formal and/or informal advising of undergraduate students or graduate students regarding course scheduling, career opportunities, etc.
- Professional Career Development
  - Faculty mentorship activities outside of MA/MS and Ph.D. responsibilities that include counseling students regarding career development and opportunities and/or who review and provide suggestions for students who are publishing articles (e.g., in the law review).
- Other Teaching Activities

### **Creative Work**

- Directing a play involving student actors,
- Directing a musical ensemble involving student musicians,
- Individual mentoring regarding creative expression in art, theatre or music,
- Directing a student exhibit
- Other creative work involving the coordination of students

### **Instructional Development Related to Mentoring**

- Development of new mentoring opportunities

- Major revision of existing mentoring or advising programs
- Development of assessment procedures for mentoring/advising programs.

### **Dimension 3: Evaluating Outreach Teaching**

Outreach teaching is defined as pedagogical activity in support of the University's mission to serve the public good. It serves the community beyond campus as well as programs that bring non-traditional students/adult learners to campus. These activities are often grouped with a miscellany of other curricular activities under the "service" category. We distinguish them from service that is characterized by committee membership (internal or external to the university) or provision of specific services. When activities use the pedagogical skills of faculty members in these non-traditional arenas, they should be explicitly recognized and rewarded as Teaching Activities.

Some of these outreach teaching activities take place in the community, where DU faculty members offer training to community groups, give lectures in local schools, or introduce youth to performance or creative activities. Some of them take place here at DU when external audiences are brought into the University for non-degree programs. We also support expansion of and recognition for outreach programs at different levels to encourage underrepresented groups to come to DU to learn about specific types of careers a college education can provide. This would be much in the line of the Making of an Engineer program in place at DU, a successful program for almost two decades.

#### **Evaluation**

For the annual review, each faculty member should include teaching outreach activities for the year. This will be a self-report, but may also include relevant outside feedback. As with mentoring, the self-report of outreach teaching may include a general log of activities (See Appendix C for a potential template) and a narrative section discussing activities and plans for development. The presentation of evidence regarding mentoring should include

- A. Number of events
- B. Nature of the interaction
  - i. Range
  - ii. Depth
  - iii. Outcome
- C. Summary and Plans for Development.

The following list of outreach teaching activities may be helpful for new faculty in accurately reporting their work in this area. It is not, however, considered to be an exhaustive list of activities.

#### **List of Outreach Teaching Activities**

- Noncredit seminar or workshop: Faculty member who teaches seminars or workshops to provide either professional development or other educational opportunities to traditional or non-traditional students either on or off campus.
- Creative works published or exhibited and made available to an external audience: Faculty member who publishes or exhibits a musical composition, script, play, poem,

short story or other creative work and makes it available to an external audience for the purpose of teaching.

- Teaching on-site at local industry
- AHSS “Reach out DU” program
- Humanities Institute Salons
- Bridges to the Future Community Classes
- University College Short Courses
- Making of an Engineer, Making of a Scientist
- Bringing groups of secondary school students to campus for special programs, such as special programs created by the Center for Multicultural Excellence
- Faculty development programs for under-represented groups

## SECTION IV: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Enhancing the quality of teaching at the University requires a structured system of developmental opportunities, supports, evaluation processes and value/reward mechanisms. The recommendations of the Teaching Task Force focus on each of these areas.

Evaluation processes are essential to decision making in each area. Accordingly, we provide detailed recommendations for an evaluation system that

- a. Are tied to primary decision points, at both annual and multi-year time points,
- b. Provide for enhanced attention to evidence at critical time points,
- c. Focus on three dimensions of teaching,
- d. Use self-report, student, peer and chair/supervisor sources of evidence.

Believing that development, support and valuing/rewarding are inextricably bound together we offer recommendations that strengthen these systems for new and continuing faculty. These include focus on structural issues such as salary and merit mechanisms, workload, tangible teaching needs and mentoring support. They also include focus on development of individual and group expertise in diverse pedagogies, curriculum development skills, administrative use of evaluation results and mentoring. We propose mechanisms to strengthen the individual awards given for teaching and propose the development of a University Teaching Professors program whose primary goal is the support of campus teaching culture.

We acknowledge that many issues remain unaddressed, and many of our recommendations require operational specification. Some primary outstanding issues include the need to address teaching workload concerns and salary/merit issues in a structured way, development of a plan to enhance CTL capabilities, and development of the University Teaching Professorship Program. We propose two approaches to implementation:

We suggest formation of an Implementation Group to be named during the summer of 2005. This group should be charged with working closely with the Interim Provost to implement those recommendations chosen for immediate implementation. This group should include both administrators and faculty members, be small enough to work efficiently, and be clear about the charge to work closely with units to develop policy and program elements in support of these recommendations.

Following the completion of the work of the Research Task Force in AY 2005-2006, we suggest a small operational group including the Provost, Deans and Faculty representatives be convened to consider the major structural shifts needed to respond to workload and salary/merit recommendations.

We believe that both of these initiatives must move forward if we are to enhance and sustain a growing, vibrant culture of teaching excellence.