

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 abil

ARTS, HUMANITIES & SOCIAL SCIENCES

ANNUAL FACULTY REPORT

NAME: DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL:

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 work, m

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

f

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

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

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.

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

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

- 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 pr

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 teach

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 offe

I also think that supplementing the student numbers and narrativ

- § 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 course evaluation process so that content and readings can be evaluated
- Information from Undergraduate Advisors/Research Group Meetings/Research Supervision comments/PINS/Honors Students

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. T

C. Teaching and Administrative Loads

An ordinary teaching load is approximately four classes per year, or 11-12 semester hours. New faculty members are g

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

University College

University College hires only adjunct faculty. Appointed DU faculty

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 on events, fTw dvi(o)1 o 1.ETEMC/P MCID 7 B