Report of the CT Caucus Subcommittee on P&(T) documents
March 17, 2016

This document is a list of suggestions for departments as they revise their P&T documents to accommodate and enable promotion of CT faculty through the professorial ranks. It was authored by Hannah Kim, Beth Morling, and Anu Sivaraman, with feedback from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the professionals at CTAL, and colleagues in the departments of Nursing, MIS, SPPA, English, and the School of Education. Most of the text here applies to CT faculty at the professorial ranks, but a few points are included about faculty at the Instructor rank.

Document revision: Process suggestions

We recommend that departments involve CT faculty in the revision process. As primary stakeholders, they should be part of P&T document revision committees and discussions.

We recommend that the criteria used in all aspects of faculty evaluation be **aligned**, including the annual merit review, the peer-reviews at 2, 4, 6, and 13 years, and the promotion review.

Document suggestions

General Guidelines

According to the recommendations of the CNTT Commission of 2014-15, the Faculty Senate resolution passed in May 2015, and the CBA contract (2013-16), *workload* drives the process of promotion for CT faculty. Although scholarship is often the focus of promotion for TT faculty, CT faculty normally do not have a large percentage of workload assigned to scholarship, so their promotions must be based on excellence in teaching or service, whichever is their primary area of workload. P&T documents should include a statement to this regard.

It is worth reminding all readers that for CT faculty at the professorial ranks (e.g, Assistant Professor), promotion in rank is *independent* of CT contract renewal and raises. CT faculty may be awarded new contracts at the 6th year peer review and 13th year peer reviews while not being promoted in rank.

During the document revision process, departments should consider whether CT faculty who have achieved associate or full professor rank should be allowed to vote on P&T cases for CT and TT faculty. Departments should thoughtfully consider whether it is fair for TT faculty to

evaluate CT faculty without a comparable vote from CT faculty on TT faculty. Some departments allow senior CT faculty to vote on promotions but not tenure. However, this means that departments must separate their votes for TT faculty, separating rank votes from tenure votes.

CT faculty at the **Instructor rank** are promoted based on their successful peer reviews in the 6th and 13th years. One of the May Faculty Senate resolutions states that upon these two peer reviews, Instructors will attain the titles of Associate Instructor and Senior Instructor, respectively. Departments might consider articulating, in the P&T document, what documentation and evidence would be required of Instructors to achieve successful peer reviews. Departments need to provide the criteria that will be used to evaluate Instructors at peer review, keeping in mind that such evidence would be best contextualized within a teaching philosophy statement by the candidate. For example, Instructors might be expected to provide some of the evidence listed in this document under "Documenting Excellence in Teaching"

Documenting Excellence in Teaching

When describing how candidates shall provide evidence for excellence in teaching, Departments might consider providing two categories of evidence: One in **Teaching Effectiveness** (defined as excellence in teaching in the classroom), and the other in **Teaching Leadership** (defined as scholarly or service contributions to the teaching community outside of the classroom). Departments might consider requiring candidates to present portfolio evidence from both of these categories or from only one. For example, for candidates who are being promoted based on their excellence in teaching, departments might consider requiring both teaching excellence and teaching leadership.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness: A menu of options
Departments might consider that some of the following sources of evidence be required, and other elements be optional.

> **A narrative statement** by the candidate that contains a description of his or her teaching philosophy, which will serve to contextualize other evidence. The narrative statement should also list primary teaching activities and primary teaching and learning goals.
>
> **A collection of recent syllabi, examinations, and/or other teaching materials** (e.g., group activities, paper assignments, slide presentations) that demonstrate the rigor and appropriateness of the courses the candidate has designed and taught. The candidate might annotate these materials indicating what learning goals they address, how and why they are used, and what their effectiveness is.
>
> **Data on the achievement of learning outcomes.** A candidate's teaching materials might be annotated with comments about the significance of or success of courses and assignments. (For example, which learning goals were certain assignments targeted for?

What percentage of students achieved these goals? In some cases, there may even be evidence that student learning persisted beyond the semester.)

Candidates might provide documentation of **how they have improved their teaching.** No teacher is ever perfect, but candidates could demonstrate their investment in continuous improvement. Candidates might explain how they have used performance and outcome data to refine course activities over time. Candidates might explain how they have changed their teaching methods in response to student data, and whether such changes have been successful (UD's [Center for Teaching and Assessment of Learning](#) offers consulting on this process) . Similarly, candidates might indicate their participation in faculty development opportunities, such as attendance at conferences or institutes such as the winter or summer faculty institutes, participation in programs offered by Academic Technology Services, or attendance at national or regional teaching conferences.

Quantitative or qualitative evidence that the candidate's courses are designed to meet and assess significant stated learning goals. Such evidence might include evidence of significant student learning, such as completed exams, final projects, or presentations. In addition, tests and rubrics for scoring performance-based assessments of students' achievement of learning goals should be supplied. The candidate might annotate these materials, indicating the learning goals they were designed to develop or assess.

Departments might require candidates to demonstrate **scholarly teaching**; that is, candidates might give examples of how they apply the science of learning in their classrooms (i.e., using evidence-based teaching techniques), or candidates might explain how they use classroom learning outcome data to adapt and refine their teaching methods.

Observations by peers who have visited the candidate's classrooms and prepared letters describing their teaching. This option may require that departments establish a procedure, commonly agreed upon by all faculty who teach, in which candidates may obtain formative or summative peer classroom visits. There are important and useful campus resources (such as CTAL) available, as well as a deep, scholarly literature on the peer review of teaching (see the Resources at the end of this document). Departments may want to consider the number of peer evaluations to require, and from whom. For example, some departments may prefer at least some peer observations come from faculty outside of the department.

Student reactions to the candidate's teaching methods and assignments, obtained from midterm or end of semester course evaluations. Departments should consider a number of details to help interpret and contextualize student evaluation data, including the following:

Candidates could include personally-created course evaluations. Because the standard form does not necessarily capture all an instructor tries to accomplish, some faculty ask students to complete two evaluations.

Departments might require that formal, quantitative student course evaluations be framed in comparison to Departmental norms for courses in that group. They may also require that certain information accompany these values, such as the grade distributions for the course or the percentage of enrolled students responding to the evaluation.

Faculty may wish to explain lower than average course evaluations in terms of course difficulty, teaching style, or other contextual factors.

Qualitative student comments from course evaluations might also be required. When these come from courses of size 50 or less they could be presented in full (unedited) for all courses taught by the candidate in all years leading up to the present review. When these come from courses of larger size, the candidate or the evaluation committee may select a representative sample of the qualitative comments with a statement that describes the method of selection (e.g., systematic random sampling).

Candidates might provide evidence that they have successfully taught **significant, important courses** in the curriculum, including service courses or capstone courses, continuously for a significant number of years.

Candidates might provide evidence of **having participated in the development, design, or revision of courses** or department curricula or programs.

Candidates might provide evidence of **professional development** in the area of teaching, such as attendance at teaching development conferences, teaching workshops, or faculty learning communities relevant to the candidate's assigned or anticipated teaching and training responsibilities.

Candidates might provide solicited or unsolicited letters from former students, providing feedback regarding their experiences with the candidate.

Candidates might provide examples of **successful undergraduate/graduate advisement and mentorship,** such as career or internship placement, placement into graduate programs or jobs. Candidates may describe examples of successful undergraduate research supervision, such as undergraduate thesis supervision, publication with undergraduates, conference presentations with undergraduate co-authors, or supervision of undergraduate independent study. Faculty who train graduate students may present evidence of successful graduate research or clinical

supervision, including dissertation committee chairship or membership, and publications or conference presentations with graduate students.

Receipt of teaching grants, such as course enrichment grants and awards, such as departmental, college, university, or national teaching awards.

Departments whose CT faculty engage in **clinical training or professional practice** roles should consider recognizing and rewarding faculty for fulfilling the unique demands of this kind of teaching, including maintaining their clinical skills, maintaining professional certifications, developing guidelines, policies and programs, supervising students in clinical settings, and practicing as clinicians themselves. Department members are the best sources of information on what constitutes excellence in these professional training roles. Departments might consider using student success in professional or clinical settings, student career placements, or student success in licensure as possible sources of information.

Evidence of teaching leadership: Menu of options
(Departments might consider requiring evidence from the Teaching Leadership category for candidates who are being promoted based on teaching). Teaching leadership might take the form of a local, regional, or national reputation as a teacher in their discipline.

Designing or revising courses that are central to the department's or university's strategic teaching and learning goals (such as developing or improving general education courses).

Teaching courses that involve additional effort, such as writing-intensive courses, or that try innovative techniques or technologies. Designing courses that reflect the scholarship of teaching and learning or evidence-based teaching practices.

Preparing and delivering conference presentations that are teaching-related, or publishing scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL) in teaching-oriented journals (Please also see our note on SOTL research under the Scholarship section of this document).

Taking a leadership role in teaching- or training-related organizations on or beyond campus, such as programming workshops or teaching conferences.

Publication of original pedagogical materials such as study guides, problem sets, textbooks, online teaching resources, training manuals or other creative endeavors.

Engagement in mentoring relationships with other faculty or graduate students for the improvement of teaching, including mentoring of undergraduate, 'near-peer' mentors.

Participation in program/curriculum review outside the department.

Improvement activities, study abroad, outcomes assessment, or instructional grants.

Publication of, or contribution to, a textbook.

Presenting teaching methods or other forms of instruction to members of the department, graduate students, or other units in the university, for example in Summer or Winter Faculty Institutes or other workshops.

Receiving teaching grants and conducting research studies on teaching effectiveness specific to the field of study.

Creating an influential social media presence, such as a blog, Facebook page, or Twitter feed that promotes scholarly teaching or teaching innovations.

Participation on assessment teams evaluating programs in other institutions.

Note: CT faculty, because they often specialize in teaching, might also show teaching leadership through their participation in curriculum revision and assessment committees at the department, college, or university level. However, such committee work is often more formally counted as "Service" in the faculty member's workload. Departments might consider whether they would allow a candidate to include such activities under Teaching Leadership instead of Service.

Documenting Excellence in Service

Below we present some text that is present in some departmental P&T documents under the Service umbrella. In general, Service characteristics are described in general for all faculty (TT and CT), but specific notes for CT faculty are added to the document, as you can see below:

Below, edited from one department's P&T document, is one possible description of service and how it is evaluated; it is intended to apply to both CT and TT faculty.

Service includes service to the Department and to the programs within it, service to the University, service to the academic and professional community. Service could also include the community in general: The land grant nature of the institution and the University's most recent Community Engagement classification from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching suggests that community service be included in the definition of service.

Service to the academic and professional community reflects on an individual's professional reputation and scholarship. Examples of this would include journal and grant reviews and

committee assignments associated with membership in professional societies. In the case of CT faculty, these service assignments might be associated with service responsibilities, curriculum, or other important campus functions.

Leadership in service might take the form of presentations, publications, elected positions, or other accomplishments that reflect that the candidate has made significant contributions and earned a regional, national, or international reputation in his or her area of workload.

Similarly, **extraordinary service of a demanding nature** to the Department, College, or University will enter into the evaluation of faculty. Examples of this are election as College or University Faculty Senate president, chairing important Department, College, or University committees, directing programs and concentrations, etc.

Candidates might provide letters attesting to service, and might provide a narrative indicating the impact their service responsibilities have had on the campus or academic community.

Below, edited from a different draft P&T document, is a list of elements of service, organized by category of the service.

Service to the university:
- Active engagement as a faculty advisor for a student organization or club
- Seminar presentations or lectures to members of the university community
- Administrative assignments within the university
- Directing a program
- Extraordinary service of a demanding nature to the Department, College, or University will enter into the evaluation of faculty/ Examples of this include election as College or University Faculty Senate president, chairing important Department, College, or University committees, etc.
- Participating actively on multiple committees
- Taking responsibility for a major function, such as running graduate examinations or serving as a faculty sponsor for a student organization or publication
- Work on department, college, and university committees

Service to the Profession:
- Descriptive book reviews published
- Organizing professional meetings or conferences
- Reviewing candidates for promotion at other institutions
- Service as a journal or book editor, membership on editorial boards, or work as a referee for professional journals Reviewer of grant proposals, scholarly research monographs, or textbooks
- Serving as a chairperson or discussant at sessions of professional meetings or
- conferences
- Substantive contributions to colleagues' research efforts

Service to the General Community:
- Community service that reflects on an individual's professional competence or is a significant part of the negotiated workload, including outreach and recruitment efforts, might also be considered by departments as evidence of service.

On Evaluating Scholarship for CT faculty

Criteria for evaluating a CT member's research must accommodate the workload percent for that faculty member. Most of the time, CT faculty members have a much smaller proportion of their workload assigned to research (often 15% or less). Therefore, department expectations for scholarship excellence should be reduced. Departments may expect, for example, fewer scholarly products, or products produced for a more diverse range of audiences, such as the general public or practitioners, in addition to (or in place of) academic scholars. Appropriate expectations for number and quality should of course be decided by the departments.

Whereas *scholarly teaching* (defined above, under teaching excellence) may be a reasonable expectation for teaching excellence, *scholarship of teaching and learning* (SOTL) requires developing and testing theories of teaching in learning in one's discipline. Because such scholarship is as time intensive and resource-dependent as any other kind of scholarship, we do not recommend that original SOTL research be required for promotion of CT faculty (unless workload is adjusted accordingly). However, CT faculty may elect to conduct SOTL. We recommend that it should be up to the faculty member if they would like to include SOTL work under Scholarship, Service, or Teaching Leadership portion of a promotion dossier. However, departments might wish to restrict the faculty member to list such scholarship under only one of the three areas.

Full Professor Promotions of CT faculty

For promotion to full professor as a CT faculty member, departments might consider requiring the candidate to demonstrate a substantial difference (in terms of focal area, number, scope of reputation, and so on) from that required to attain promotion to Associate Professor.

Another option is to require external recognition or exposure (in contrast to only internal, on-campus) recognition, for the Teaching Leadership or Service Leadership contributions of faculty who are candidates for full professor. CT Candidates might be expected to win national awards or have a regional, national, or international reputation as a teacher or in their area of service.

CT Candidates might be expected to make significant contributions in the form of pedagogical

materials, regional or national presentations or workshops, or contribute to original products related to curriculum or other areas relevant to their workload.

Resources

Elements of this document were based on scholarly work in faculty development and the science of teaching and learning. This list includes sources that we have consulted as well as suggestions for further reading.

Introductions to the science of learning to foster scholarly teaching:
Ambrose, S.A., Bridges, M.W., DiPietro, M., Lovett, M.C., & Norman, M.K. (2010). *How learning works: Seven research-based principles for smart teaching.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Buskist, W., & Benassi, V.A. (Eds.) (2012). *Effective college and university teaching: Strategies and tactics for the new professoriate*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning:
[Borgen? on SOTL]

Thompson, S.B., Nelson, C.E., & Naremore, R.C. (2001) *Tutorial on the scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL)*. Powerpoint presentation. Downloaded from http://slideplayer.com/slide/1414354/

Boyer, E.L. (1990) *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities for the professoriate*. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Documenting teaching effectiveness/teaching portfolios:
Seldin, P. (1999). *Changing practices in evaluating teaching: A practical guide to improved faculty performance and promotion/tenure decisions*. Jossey-Bass.

Peer observation of teaching:
Buskist, W., Ismail, E.A., & Groccia, J.E. (2014). A practical model for conducting helpful peer review of teaching. In J. Sachs, M. Parsell (Eds.), *Peer Review of Learning and Teaching in Higher Education, pp 1-20.* Springer Science. DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-7639-5_3,

Cavanaugh, R.R. (1996). Formative and summative evaluation in the faculty peer review of teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, *20*, 235-240.

Chism, N. V. (1998). *Peer review of teaching: A sourcebook*. Bolton, MA: Anker.