

Committee on the Evaluation of Teaching Excellence

Final Report

Submitted to:

Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Wendy K. Wilkins

January 2010

Submitted by

Dr. Frances van Tassell, Chair

On behalf of the Committee

Table of Contents

Committee Charge and Purpose	03
Committee and Department Chair Participants	04
Committee Meetings	05
Committee Recommendations	08
Appendix A: Faculty Annual Activity Summary	10
Appendix B: Annual Instructional Profile	13
Appendix C: Classroom Observation Instrument	19
Appendix D: Peer Institutions	27
Appendix E: Notes from Meetings with Representative Department Chairs	28
Appendix F: Presentations to and Responses from Faculty	31
Oct 14, 2009 Presentation to Faculty Senate	32
Oct 16, 2009 Presentation to Chairs' Council	35
Oct 26, 2009 Information to UNT Faculty	38
Dec 09, 2009 Presentation to Faculty Senate	41
Dec 10, 2009 Information to UNT Faculty	43
Responses from Faculty	44
Appendix G: Literature Review	54

Final Report from the Committee on the Evaluation of Teaching Excellence

Charge to the Committee

As given December 2008 by Associate Provost Celia Williamson:

“This *new* committee will be asked to take the evaluation of teaching a step further, recommending a system of evaluation of teaching that will incorporate the student evaluation tool in the context of additional evaluations beyond those that students can provide – including self-evaluation and evaluation by other faculty members. This is a very important step in building the capacity to appropriately value teaching in the merit, promotion and tenure process.”

The Committee then interpreted the charge as follows, to guide us in our work:

- a. To further develop the work of the student evaluation committee
- b. To develop an overall teaching excellence evaluation system
- c. To recommend a high quality peer evaluation system
- d. To develop an assessment rubric that would guide evaluation of the teaching portfolio
- e. To develop a standardized self evaluation instrument

Committee’s Self-Defined Purpose Statement

The Committee then determined that we need to develop the following purpose statement to guide us in our work:

As UNT continues to move from our historical growing regional institution, focused on teaching, to become a nationally recognized research institution, we will be more engaged in research and federal funding. However, our mission clearly states that we are a student-centered research university. That nomenclature asserts that we focus on our students; the implication is that our teaching is of high quality. We believe that faculty have a desire to teach and are interested in providing quality instruction.

We are charged with developing and recommending an overall teaching excellence evaluation system that includes the student evaluation measure that is now being piloted and that will be required of all instructors in the fall 2009 semester. Those data must be part of our overall recommendation for a systematic and systemic evaluation of teaching effectiveness. We are charged with completing our recommendations by the end of December 2009.

Original Membership of the Committee (12 faculty plus graduate assistant)

Chair: Frances van Tassell, Associate Professor, Teacher Education and Administration; Robert Akl, Associate Professor, Computer Science and Engineering; Beverly Bower, Professor and Bill Priest Endowed Chair in Higher Education; Barbara Bush, Assistant Professor, Higher Education; Johnetta Hudson, Associate Professor, Educational Administration; Jean Keller, Professor, Recreation and Leisure Studies; Jim Kennedy, Professor, Biological Sciences; Brenda McCoy, Lecturer, PACS; Jo Monahan, Libraries; Jennifer Roberts, Teacher Education and Administration, Graduate Assistant to the committee (changed to membership in the committee upon graduation); Jesus Rosales, Associate Professor, Behavioral Analysis; Emile Sahliyah, Professor, Political Science; Lew Taylor, Regents Professor, Management

**Committee Members Who Participated in the Work of the Committee throughout the Year
(Identified by academic program)**

Chair: Frances van Tassell, Curriculum and Instruction; Robert Akl, Computer Science and Engineering; Beverly Bower, Bill Priest Endowed Chair; Johnetta Hudson, Educational Administration; Jean Keller, Recreation and Leisure Studies; Brenda McCoy, PACS; Jo Monahan, Libraries; Jennifer Roberts, Teacher Education; Emile Sahliyah, Political Science; Lew Taylor, Business Management

Representative Department Chairs who Participated in Revisions to Self and Peer Instruments

Steven Cobb (economics), Nicole Dash (sociology), Kelly Donahue-Wallace (art education/art history), Susan Eve (Honors College), Lorenzo Garcia (dance and theatre arts), Vicki Goodwin (management), David Holdeman (English), Jan Holden (counseling), Linda Holloway (RSWA), Tammy Kinley (merchandising), Marie-Christine Koop (foreign languages and literatures), Melinda Levin (radio, television, and film), Richard McCaslin (history), Nancy Nelson (teacher education and administration), Debbie Rohwer (music), Peggy Tobolowsky (criminal justice)

Meetings of the Committee from December 2008 to December 2009

Although the full committee (all members available each time) met 10 times in formal meetings, there were additional sub-committee meetings (Frances van Tassell, Brenda McCoy, Jo Monahan, and Jennifer Roberts) held frequently from July – December 2009. Between meetings, numerous email conversations occurred throughout the 13 months of the work of the full committee.

The full committee originally reviewed the charge and discussed the purposes for each instrument that we were to create. We examined instruments used by peer institutions (Appendix D) as well as other research-based instruments we found in an extensive review of the literature. In addition, we consulted UNT's Strategic Plan to ensure that we aligned our work with UNT's Core Values and Strategic Goals. We also considered the early drafts of the student evaluation of teaching excellence (the SETE) in order to align our instruments with that stage of the overall evaluation of teaching excellence assessment system. Overall, we desired to create instruments that would be consistent with UNT's Strategic Plan.

After numerous committee meetings to clarify and revise each instrument, the committee shared with representative chairs and the Faculty Senate both the self instruments and the peer instrument in order to vet those instruments with the UNT community. Comments and suggestions proposed by respondent senators, faculty, and chairs were incorporated into further revisions of the instruments.

There were also meetings or presentations to representative department chairs to share each evaluation of teaching excellence instrument and to request comments/feedback regarding the instruments. Also, the self instruments were presented to the Chairs' Council. Because the Classroom Observation Instrument was completed near the end of the Fall 2009 semester, the representative chairs were asked to share that instrument with their faculty members and other chairs since it was not possible to again meet with the Chairs' Council that late in the semester.

Each evaluation of teaching excellence instrument was presented to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and then to the full Faculty Senate. Revisions were made based on suggestions by these two groups. Subsequently, each instrument was sent electronically to all UNT faculty members, requesting feedback, comments, questions, or concerns.

See Table 1 for a list of the activities of the committee.

Table 1. *Committee Meetings*

Date	Agenda Items	Outcome
December 12, 2008 Initial Committee Meeting Matthews Hall 209, 1:00-3:00	Receive charge Analyze and assign tasks	Review of literature compiled by Jennifer Roberts (Attached)
February 27, 2009	Discussion of previous assigned	Development of a set of clarifying

Committee Meeting Wooten Hall 161, 12:30-3:00	readings Brainstorming of components of a quality teaching portfolio Time line for development of portfolio examples	questions for Associate Provost Williamson
March 27, 2009 Committee Meeting Wooten Hall 262, 1:30-3:30	Proposed self-evaluation instrument Plans for a peer-evaluation instrument Plans for a teaching portfolio Information from Brad Shope Plans for getting input from faculty Celia's responses to our questions	Initial draft of self-evaluation instrument Teaching portfolio rationale Initial draft of peer instrument
April 24, 2009 Committee Meeting Bill Priest Center Board Room Mean Green Village 1:30-3:30	Discussion of purpose document Discussion of revised self-evaluation instrument Discussion of proposed peer-evaluation instrument Discussion of teaching portfolio rationale	Revised self-evaluation instrument
June 4, 2009 Committee Meeting Bill Priest Center Board Room MGV Room 110, 10:00-12:00	Revised self instrument Peer instrument Components of teaching portfolio Components of Final Report	Revised self instrument Revised peer instrument
June 26, 2009 Committee Meeting GAB 472, 10:00-12:00	Final draft of self instrument Peer instrument Summer electronic work	Plans for meeting with department chairs to obtain feedback on self instrument
July 24, 2009 Meeting with Representative Chairs GAB 201, 10:00-11:30	Meeting with Representative Department Chairs to discuss proposed self instrument	Revision of self instrument into two different instruments
September 18, 2009 Committee Meeting Bill Priest Center Board Room MGV Room 110, 10:00-12:00	Report on meeting with department chairs Report on meeting with Allen Clark Dept Chair-edited self instrument Revised peer instrument	Decision about auto-populated elements of annual summary self instrument Revision to self instrument Revision to peer instrument
September 30, 2009 Meeting with Senate Executive Committee Admin Building Board Room 3:00-3:30	Presentation of self-instruments to Faculty Senate Executive Committee	Revisions to self instruments and approval to present to the Senate
October 6, 2009 Meeting with Representative Chairs Matthews Hall 109, 3:00-4:00	Meeting with available Representative Chairs to review revisions to self instruments	Chairs' approval of the two self instruments
October 8, 2009 Meeting with Representative Chairs	Meeting with available Representative Chairs to review revisions to self instruments	Additional changes to self instruments

Matthews Hall 115, 9:00-10:00		
October 14, 2009 Presentation to Faculty Senate Wooten Hall 322, 2:00-4:00	Presentation of self instruments to the Faculty Senate	Additional changes to self instruments Electronic distribution of self instruments to all faculty for feedback by November 6
October 16, 2009 Meeting with Chairs' Council 7:00-8:30 a.m.	Presentation of two self instruments to Chairs' Council	Modest changes based on chairs' feedback
October 23, 2009 Committee Meeting Bill Priest Center Board Room MGV Room 110, 10:00-12:00	Conversation with Allen Clark Report on Senate's response to self instruments Report on meeting with Dept Chairs' Council to share self instrument Final vote on two self instruments Revisions to peer instrument	
October 26, 2009 Electronic message to all faculty	Electronic distribution of two self instruments to all faculty	Feedback provided by a few faculty (Appendix F)
November 2009 Committee Meeting MGV Room 110, 10:00-2:00	Discussion of faculty feedback re two self instruments Final revision of self instruments	Final adoption of the two self instruments (Activity Summary and Self Analysis)
December 2, 2009 Meeting with Senate Executive Committee Admin Bldg Board Room 2:00-4:30	Discussion of Peer Instrument Request to present to Faculty Senate	Approval to present Peer Instrument at December Senate meeting
December 5, 2009 Committee Meeting MGV Room 110, 10:00-12:00	Discussion of peer instrument presentation to Senate EC Plans for peer instrument presentation to Senate on Dec 9 Finalization of peer instrument	Final peer instrument adopted after committee email discussion of faculty feedback re peer instrument Creation of the following library website for faculty resources related to teaching effectiveness: UNT Faculty Teaching Resources http://www.library.unt.edu/research-tools/class-pages/unt-faculty-teaching-resources/ Created by Jo Monahan, Libraries
December 9, 2009 Presentation to Faculty Senate Wooten Hall 322, 2:00-4:00	Presentation of peer instrument to the Faculty Senate	Electronic distribution of peer instrument to all faculty, for feedback by December 18
December 12, 2009	Electronic distribution of peer instrument to all faculty, for feedback by December 18	Twenty-seven faculty members provided feedback (Appendix F)

Recommendations from the Committee

After 13 months of diligent work and numerous meetings, the Committee on the Evaluation of Teaching Excellence makes the following recommendations.

1. Implement the attached Annual Faculty Activity Summary.

This instrument includes a number of elements that will be automatically populated from EIS data, based on the design of the instrument as prepared by Allen Clark and his assistants.

This instrument may be used as a faculty annual update document. It also provides faculty additional ways to verify their teaching load and provides a context for the Faculty Annual Instructional Profile.

2. Implement the attached Faculty Annual Instructional Profile

This profile consists of three separate sections which serve to guide reflection about the faculty member's teaching skills and abilities:

Part A: Self assessment of overall teaching effectiveness

Part B: Use of Instructional Strategies (*Teaching Methods and Assessment Techniques*)

Part C: Statement of teaching philosophy

Options stated in Part A are suggested for how the faculty member chooses to respond (once for each course, once for all courses combined, or once for each of any cluster of courses).

Department chairs should determine the extent to which the Faculty Annual Instructional Profile is used. For example, a department might choose to require all faculty members to respond annually, or only tenure-seeking faculty and lecturers might be required to complete the instrument each year. Optimally, this instrument should be used as a self-reflection guide for faculty who wish to improve and will serve as an instrument that will provide chairs information about teaching rather than just about numbers. Such information will serve to provide departmental recommendations for the improvement of teaching across the department and/or for promotion, merit, or retention.

3. Implement the Classroom Observation Instrument

As noted on the first page of the Classroom Observation instrument, department chairs, in partnership with faculty in the department, should determine the extent to which this instrument is used. The department should decide how data acquired from use of peer observation might impact annual tenure (both at the three-year reappointment and the final tenure determination stages), promotion, and merit decisions. The Classroom Observation Instrument is intended to be used only with face-to-face classroom settings. The committee recognized the need for a parallel instrument developed for use with fully online classroom settings; however, we simply did not have sufficient time to develop such a detailed instrument. It is part of our recommendations that such an online instrument be developed because we do highly value distance/electronic education as part of the UNT mission.

It is recommended that each department submit to the Dean the unit's faculty-agreed-upon peer observation plan, which includes the following elements:

- A. A rationale for the unit's selected plan,
- B. An identification of which faculty members are to be observed,
- C. How often faculty members are to be observed, and
- D. A plan for how the observation data will be considered as part of the annual PAC review.

If departments choose to do so, faculty may be asked to collect the recommended documents into a teaching portfolio. Additional materials for such a portfolio would include course syllabi, assessments of student learning, technology documents or tools used for instruction, student written comments from the SETE, an analysis of three years of SETE data, and a reflection on growth as an effective teacher over the evaluation period.

Ultimately, the purpose of the three levels of evaluation of teaching excellence (student, self, and peer) is to provide UNT an assessment system that moves us forward toward true excellence in teaching across all academic areas. Through such venues as the newly revised University Forum on Teaching and Learning, all UNT faculty members must be encouraged to take advantage of professional development that responds to areas of need identified by the four instruments proposed for the overall evaluation of teaching excellence (SETE, Annual Instructional Profile, Annual Faculty Activity Summary, and Classroom Observation Instrument). We recommend a more responsive and individually based system of professional development that department chairs and faculty may turn to for improvement of teaching and learning.

The committee had numerous conversations with Dr. Brad Schope, Professional Development Specialist in the office of CLEAR, regarding how his office might facilitate faculty professional development related to teaching and might provide persons to conduct classroom observations of faculty teaching. This is another venue where departments and faculty may go to seek assistance for the improvement of teaching. This is also the office where faculty might go for quality training related to effective practices inherent in peer observation.

Appendix A

Recommended Faculty Annual Activities Summary

Total # of special topics/readings courses: Total number of individual special topics/readings courses
Total # Tchg Asst or Grader Asst supervised: Faculty member actively uses a teaching assistant or a grading assistant
Total # Interns Supervised Faculty member is responsible for supervision of student internships
Other (please describe) This may include items such as special problems courses, team teaching, co-teaching, etc.

Instructions

Explanation for each of the columns on page one is listed below. Columns J through Q may be answered by indicating a "Y" for yes or a "N" for no.

A	Course Prefix & Number	The course taught in a given semester
B	Course Title	The title of each course
C	Number Enrolled	The number of students enrolled in each class
D	Percent of SETE Responses	The percentage of students who completed the SETE
E	SETE Rating	The mean rating received on the Student Evaluation of Teacher Effectiveness (SETE) questionnaire
F	Course Grade Average	The average of all final grades in a course (A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, F=0)
G	Failure Rate	The percentage of students who failed the course with a grade of D or F
H	Drop/Fail/WD/Incomplete	The combined percentage of students in a course who dropped, failed (grade of D or F), withdrew, or received an incomplete
I	Required for Majors	A course which is required for all majors in the instructor's department
J	New Preparation	A course that is already a part of a department's curriculum that the instructor taught for the very first time
K	New Course	A course which is newly developed and has not previously been offered by the department
L	New Delivery Method	A significant change in course delivery (i.e., alteration of a course from face-to-face to full online instruction)
M	Major Content Revision	A significant revision in course content (i.e., new text(s). New editions of the same text do not qualify as revision.
N	Offered Totally Online	A course that is offered completely online
O	Offered Partially Online	A course which utilizes Blackboard or another tool to supplement instruction or is considered blended instruction
P	Uses Grading Assistant	A course in which the instructor actively uses a grading assistant
Q	Uses Teaching Assistant	A course in which the instructor actively uses a teaching assistant

Note: Red bolded text indicates fields which will be auto-populated by EIS data.

Please refer to <http://www.library.unt.edu/research-tools/class-pages/unt-faculty-teaching-resources/> for linking to sources related to teaching effectiveness.



Appendix B

Recommended Annual Faculty Instructional Profile

ANNUAL INSTRUCTIONAL PROFILE

This annual instructional profile consists of three separate sections which serve to guide reflection about your teaching skills and abilities, as follow:

- A. Part A: Self assessment of overall teaching effectiveness
- B. Part B: Use of Instructional Strategies (Teaching Methods and Assessment Techniques)
- C. Part C: Statement of teaching philosophy

Note the options stated in Part A for how you chose to respond for Parts A and B (either once for each course, once for all courses together, or once for each of any type of clustering of courses).

Please refer to <http://www.library.unt.edu/research-tools/class-pages/unt-faculty-teaching-resources/> for linking to sources related to teaching effectiveness.

Name:

Faculty Rank:

Department:

Evaluation Year:

PART A: SELF-ASSESSMENT

I am responding for **each course that I taught (one response per course)**.

Course prefix, number and title: _____

I am responding for **all courses taught** in one group (**one response total**).

List of courses in group by prefix and number: _____

I have clustered my responses by **type of course** (e.g., all online together, all graduate together, all undergraduate together)

Type of courses in cluster: _____

Please use the following table as a tool to personally evaluate and rate your teaching effectiveness during the evaluation period by marking your response to each item with an X.

<h1>Part A</h1>	Strong	Proficient	Making Progress	Needs Development	Not Applicable
Area of Professional Responsibility Related to Teaching					
Course Content					
I possess a firm command of course content.					
I keep current in course topics.					
I provide clearly stated content learning objectives.					
I set high expectations for student learning.					
I maintain an appropriate level of rigor for content and reading materials.					
I explain how each topic is relevant to the course as a whole.					
Teaching Methods and Delivery					
I present material in an organized manner and clearly explain material to students.					
I utilize various instructional methods to support diverse styles of thinking and learning.					
I point out to students any practical application of course concepts.					
I clearly communicate assessment criteria and assignment deadlines.					
I assess students related to course objectives using varied assessment methods.					
I answer students' questions thoroughly.					
I support student learning by linking course material to students' prior knowledge and experiences.					
I demonstrate enthusiasm for course material and its delivery.					
I stimulate students' intellectual interests in the course content.					
Student Interaction					
I start and end classes on time, if applicable.					
I make an effort to get to know students in the course.					
I am available to assist students during regularly scheduled office hours.					

I respond within 48 hours to students' emails or phone calls (if appropriate).					
I advise and mentor students appropriately.					
I provide continuous and timely feedback related to student achievement.					
Assessment of Instruction					
I invite peers and/or supervisors to observe and evaluate my teaching.					
I use student feedback to improve my instruction. (Student evaluations or other)					
Learning Materials and Resources					
I set forth grading procedures and other class policies in each syllabus.					
I keep current all required texts, readings, and assignments.					

PART B: USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

The table below includes possible teaching methods and assessment techniques. Best practices indicate that a variety of methods should be used to engage students and to evaluate learning outcomes. Please indicate how often you used each of the following items during the current evaluation period by marking the desired response to each item with an **X**.

Part B Type of Method	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Not Applicable
Teaching Methods and Strategies					
Lecture					
Small-group discussion					
Whole-group discussion					
Instructor-led questioning of whole class (Socratic method)					
Students working in cooperative learning teams					
Students engaging in discussion in an online forum					
Other (Please describe)					
Use of Materials and Methods During Class					
I provide students with a visual representation of the material to be covered during or prior to class activities.					
Students complete in-class activities related to application of knowledge and skills to real-world problems (problem-based learning).					
I encourage students to develop and use critical-thinking skills during class discussion and assignments.					
Other (Please describe)					
Assessment Methods and Strategies					
Teacher-constructed exams					
Textbook-published exams/quizzes					
Standardized exams (required by department as common to all sections)					
Student self-evaluations (using a rubric, questionnaire, narrative, etc.)					
Student evaluations of their peers (using a rubric, questionnaire, narrative etc.)					
Assignments that examine application of course content in field experience or other real-world application					
Application of concepts in written response form (narratives, reading responses, etc.)					
Assessment of behavioral observations through rubrics/scoring guides					
Assessment of performances or products through verbal feedback or rubrics (scoring guides)					
Course portfolio					
Other (Please describe)					

PART C: TEACHING PHILOSOPHY

Please write a one-paragraph statement below that describes your teaching philosophy. Each faculty member is expected to write a philosophy statement the first year that this instrument is used (either in the initial year of implementation or upon joining the UNT instructional pool). Thereafter, the file should be annually reviewed and any appropriate changes should be made to the statement of philosophy.

Appendix C

Recommended Classroom Observation Instrument

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION OF
TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

RATIONALE

The attached Classroom Observation Guide (pages 4-7) is based on 12 months of intensive work on the part of the Committee on the Evaluation of Teaching Excellence and is considered to be a tool based on researched best practices. It is recommended for use in the peer classroom observation process.

The process of peer observation of classroom instruction supports a positive climate for a department. As faculty peers engage in a shared learning experience, the process guards against assumptions, as faculty instruction is actually observed rather than perceived.

While the university requires a three-part evaluation of teaching effectiveness (student/SETE, activities summary, and peer), each department must be accountable for establishing a mechanism for peer observation appropriate for its teaching context. Maximum flexibility should be given to departments in determining how peer observation should be used in the department.

Departments have the best knowledge about when the observation process should be evaluative and when it should be developmental for enrichment purposes.

It is recommended that each department submit to the Dean the unit's faculty-agreed-upon peer observation plan, which includes the following elements:

- E. A rationale for the unit's selected plan,
- F. An identification of which faculty members are to be observed,
- G. How often faculty members are to be observed, and
- H. A plan for how the observation data will be considered as part of the annual PAC review.

Please refer to <http://www.library.unt.edu/research-tools/class-pages/unt-faculty-teaching-resources/> for linking to sources related to teaching effectiveness.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

This instrument is intended to provide best practices for how the process of peer observation occurs. The roles and responsibilities of each party in the peer observation process, prior to, during, and after a classroom observation, are described below. It is important that both the instructor and the peer observer be committed to the purpose of instructional improvement. Please note that the process included in this instrument is not intended for use in all instructional formats, for example, one-on-one or online instruction; however, a department may find the instrument useful in those instances.

Classroom observations should not be conducted during the first or last week of a semester or during any examinations. The scheduling of observations should be done to provide a typical class period observation.

Pre-Observation Conference

The pre-observation conference should take place prior to the observation, preferably within 48 hours prior to the observation. It is recommended that the conference take place in person; however, in some cases it may be necessary to conduct the conference over the phone or electronically.

Instructor

- Indicate when and where the class meets.
- Indicate to the observer(s) any preference regarding seating location.
- Provide the observer with a copy of the syllabus or other pertinent material.
- Indicate your instructional goals (learning outcomes) for the class to be observed.
- Describe what is planned for the observed class, including any teaching strategies or issues you consider important and the assessments planned.
- Indicate anything to which you would like the observer to pay special attention.
- Discuss expectations regarding student interaction during the observed class. For example, are there particular students that present a challenge or are you interacting with a certain group of students more than others.
- Recommend the time needed for a meaningful observation.

Observer

- Review the observational instrument with the instructor.
- Ask the instructor if there is anything to which you should pay special attention, if not already identified by the instructor.
- Schedule a post-observation meeting while the observation is still fresh.

During the Classroom Observation

Instructor	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introduce the observer(s) to students and explain the purpose of the visit.• Make notes or record any reflections or impressions of your teaching as soon after class as possible.
Observer	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Observe the class for a minimum of 50 minutes using the attached form.• Record any impressions, questions, or other thoughts and ideas you would like to discuss with the instructor.• Refrain from any participation with the class.

Post Observation Conference

It is recommended that the post observation conference occur within a week of the observation.

Instructor	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Describe what went well with the class and what you might change or believe needs to be improved.• Indicate anything that was unusual about the class.• Ask for constructive feedback and suggestions for teaching resources.• Submit the Observation Record (last page of this Observation Guide) to the Chair of your department to document that an observation was conducted.
Observer	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discuss with the instructor what she or he thought went well and what, if anything, could have been improved.• Describe (not evaluate) what you observed during class.• Provide feedback to the instructor, including concrete suggestions for improvement.• Give the instructor and the department chair the completed and signed classroom Observation Guide, with your notes.

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION GUIDE

The purpose of this form is to assist peer observation of classroom teaching by providing a checklist of indicators. Please check the appropriate column for each item in a section, where:

1. **Y** = The indicator was observed.
2. **N** = The indicator was not observed.
3. **NA** = The indicator was not applicable for this class or in this setting.

As appropriate, please make notes in the column provided, to guide your general comments on page six.

Y	N	NA	ORGANIZATION	
			Is prepared for class	
			Reviews material from previous class with students	
			States class goals or objectives	
			Uses class time efficiently	
			Organizes learning materials or activities effectively	
			Summarizes material and/or provides closure	

Y	N	NA	INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS	
			Uses teaching technique(s) appropriate to the instructional goals for this class	Notes
			Invites class discussion	
			Proceeds at an effective pace	
			Uses multi-media effectively	
			Provides clear directions for group work/labs/exercises	
			Assesses student learning	

Y	N	NA	CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	
			Monitors behavior of students during class	Notes
			Stops inappropriate behavior promptly with respect (tardiness, sleeping, cell phone use, talking, etc.)	
			Encourages positive student behavior in the classroom	
			Establishes and maintains a respectful atmosphere for all students	
			Other, please specify	

Y	N	NA	CONTENT OR SUBJECT KNOWLEDGE	
			Appears knowledgeable about subject matter	Notes
			Points out any potential bias	
			Uses examples and/or illustrations to explain content	
			Emphasizes major points during delivery of course content	
			Addresses diversity or ethics when relevant to content	

Y	N	NA	COMMUNICATION SKILLS	
			Is enthusiastic about the subject matter	Notes
			Makes material interesting to students	
			Responds to questions clearly and promptly	
			Uses speech that is audible, distinct, and appropriately paced	
			Demonstrates adequate command of English or the language of the course	
			Uses classroom space well	

Y	N	NA	STUDENT INTERACTION	
			Encourages student participation	Notes
			Manages student interactions effectively	
			Welcomes and respects diverse viewpoints	
			Treats students equitably	
			Motivates students	

GENERAL COMMENTS:

OBSERVATION RECORD

This page serves as a record of the observation which took place on the date and time listed below. It should be completed by the Observer and signed by both the Observer and the Instructor at the conclusion of the post-observation conference. Please return only the completed Classroom Observation Guide to the faculty member observed and the department chair.

Course Number: _____ Course Title: _____

Course Meeting Day(s): _____ Course Meeting Time(s): _____

Observation Date: _____ Approximate Number of Students Present: _____

Time Observation Started: _____ Time Observation Ended: _____

Instructor's Name: _____ Date: _____
(Please print)

Instructor's Signature: _____

Observer's Name: _____ Date: _____
(Please print)

Observer's Signature: _____

Appendix D

Peer Institutions Reviewed for Evaluation of Teaching

In benchmarking, it is a common practice to utilize a list of institutions of similar background, population and makeup. This list is helpful to UNT for over-arching comparisons. For specific units within the Division of Student Development, additional institutions sharing closer comparable data may be included. It is up to the Director of each unit to accurately determine specific instances when additional peer institutions should be considered.

UNT Peer Institutions

[PDF version](#)

- [Bowling Green State University](#)
- [Florida Atlantic University-Boca Raton](#)
- [Florida International University](#)
- [Kent State University](#)
- [George Mason University](#)
- [Georgia State University](#)
- [New Mexico State University-Main Campus](#)
- [Northern Arizona University](#)
- [Northern Illinois University](#)
- [University of Alabama](#)
- [University of Central Florida](#)
- [University of Memphis](#)
- [University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee](#)
- [Western Michigan University](#)

Texas Comparison Universities

- [Texas Tech](#)
- [University of Houston](#)
- [UT-Arlington](#)
- [UT-Dallas](#)
- [UT-El Paso](#)
- [UT-San Antonio](#)

For information on how UNT compares to its peer institutions, [click here](#). Also, you may view *US News & World Report's* comparison of UNT to its selected national peers by clicking [here](#) [pdf].

<http://pasd.unt.edu/resources/index.html> Last updated -04/09/2009 16:56:46.

Appendix E

Notes from Meetings with Representative Department Chairs

Dept. chairs attending October 6, 2009 meeting to discuss Self Instrument: Peggy Tobolowsky, Lorenzo Garcia, Marie-Christine Coop, Steve Cobb, Richard McCaslin, Nancy Nelson

Committee members attending: Brenda McCoy, Frances van Tassell, Jennifer Roberts, Johnetta Hudson

Guest: Brad Schope, CLEAR

Points Discussed and Comments Made

Separate the failure rate from the DFWI rate. Allen Clark states that it can be done (later, he strongly recommends to not separate this from the set). The university collects data in a set that includes "drop, withdrawn, failure, and incomplete." The rationale of the Senate Executive Committee for requesting this separation is that students are in control of whether or not they fail, but the others items in this set they may not be in control of.

Some chairs stated that the D stands for a grade of D. (Allen Clark later clarified that the D is for Drop and that the F includes grades of D or F.)

To be responsive- we can pull D out with F and include those together if this indeed represents below acceptable performance

Policies regarding withdraws v. failures make it hard for students to choose to fail or withdraw.

We will send this version electronically so that chairs can begin sharing this with their departments to get feedback before the final revisions.

Administration will take our recommendations regarding this instrument establish the policies that they deem appropriate.

Chairs were asked to identify summary reports they would like to receive from this Activity Summary report.

SETE is still changing but will be universally used this semester; however, Brad reminded us that the data collected the first two or three semesters will not be valid. Faculty would like to see the SETE in advance of its required usage at the end of the semester. Departments may continue to use their own instruments, in addition to SETE.

Discussion of the item related to departmental exams- does not necessarily equate to less work load- does it need to be there? Who is this information supposed to be for? For self, chair, and university- REMOVE IT!

There are multiple ways of examining teaching performance; we are just trying to give faculty an ability to accurately report what they are doing related to teaching.

Discussion of TA and TGA- What is a TGA? Others have different acronyms for equivalent work- can be viewed positively, negatively, or just as descriptive data- might want to separate TA from others, as they represent different impacts on work load. These can simply be ways to prompt faculty to think of their work load when putting together their self-reflection and philosophy statement.

For parts A and B, there should be an option to fill out one per course instead of one for all classes combined or possibly one per category of course.

Dept. chairs attending October 8, 2009 meeting to discuss Self Instrument: Debbie Rohwer (music), Susan Eves (honors), Vicki Goodwin (Management), Jan Holden (counseling), Linda Holloway (RSWA), Tammy Kinley (SMHM)

Committee members attending: Frances van Tassell, Brenda McCoy, Emile Sahliyah, Jo Monahan

Guest: Brad Schope, CLEAR

Frances reviewed the Instructional Activities Summary (1st self instrument). Chairs had the following suggestions:

- Items E & F: SETE suggestions: use clickers to have students complete, use some type of student incentive to make students do it online. Rollout of SETE is a policy issue.
- Items G & H: Grades of F and D – do they mean the same? Who has declared that D=F? Committee may need to clarify with A. Clark. Does D= drop?
- Standardized exam has been dropped from earlier versions of the summary.
- Items C & D need to be switched.
- Question: how would an instructor get credit for doing an online course but the content was created by someone else?
- Added intern supervision.

Frances then reviewed the Annual Assessment of Teaching (2nd self instrument). Chairs had the following suggestions:

- Evaluation period is the time frame under review.
- Part B each instructor can decide what is best for determining how to use this form.

Appendix F

Presentations to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

and

The Faculty Senate

with

Responses from Faculty to both the

Self and Peer Instruments

Collected Electronic Faculty Responses to Self-Assessment Instruments

Pasted in below are responses received from UNT faculty members, following the self-assessment instruments that were sent to all faculty on October 26, 2009. In most cases, the name is not included, to protect the sender.

Sent November 5, 2009

1. I am continuing to look at the proposed new forms for teacher evaluations, and I do not see how some of these questions relate AT ALL to what we do in applied music. We don't have "syllabi", we don't "revise the course" - etc - we deal with individuals on an individual basis, and the standardized forms don't allow for that kind of information to be imparted. It's just like the infamous Delaware Study - no application whatsoever to music performance. Can this be addressed? Is Music represented on the committee? By a performer?
Regents Professor in Music

Sent November 4, 2009

2. I'm following up with the brief conversation we had in the Avesta last week and want to provide feedback to the COETE committee. My feedback is based on the information that was sent out on October 26. I commend the committee on their work and want you to know that I understand the efforts to create a university-wide teacher evaluation system.

It is extremely difficult to find an evaluation rubric that meets the needs of all units on campus, much less the various areas within those units. The College of Music poses some unique challenges, largely because students are taught through multiple instructional approaches. The inherent problem with the current SETE is that the measurement tool will not be applicable to all classes in the COM, resulting in an evaluation system that applies to certain faculty. For example, we have organized classes that are lecture-based (music history, music theory, music education, etc.). We also have multiple classes that are, by nature, small in size – which eliminates them from the SETE measure. Further, we have music ensembles (in varying sizes), music laboratories (band, choir, orchestra) and private studio instruction (one-on-one instruction). Some of our classes are a combination of both lecture and performance. We have some faculty who teach only applied lessons while others teach a combination of applied lessons and organized classes. My understanding is that only students in organized classes will complete the SETE. This means that many of our faculty will not receive SETE evaluations. In these days of accountability and rankings, I do not see how it will be possible for our various committees (RPTCs) to write informed assessments

when everyone is measured against a different scale. I realize that the SETE is in the care of a separate committee, but I think this information is relevant for the COETE.

In response to the documents sent out by the COETE:

- What is the purpose of collecting the inordinate amount of data requested on the Instructional Activities Summary? Some of our faculty will report an enrollment of 1; many will not have any information to report from the SETE; and many teach courses that require different instructional delivery methods. I do not understand how this kind of information will improve instruction or help determine merit, tenure or promotion. How will it provide any information about teaching effectiveness? If this goes into effect, how will I convince the COM faculty that the information is valuable and meaningful to them or others?
 - A one-page narrative has been a part of the COM merit process in the form of a 1-page statement. I have found the narrative statements to be useful and illuminating. While these statements have not address teaching specifically, they provide some insight on what the faculty members feel is their most significant contribution. Perhaps something similar would be more valuable for a teaching self-assessment. The rubric that was presented by the COETE is organized well, but I simply cannot see a faculty member rating themselves as “making progress” or “needing development” in any of the instructional fields on the self-assessment measure. How would the data collected be used, disseminated and for what purpose? Would this kind of measure actually be used to determine merit, tenure and promotion? Additionally, the section in Part B (Use of Instructional Strategies) would not apply to most of our faculty in the College of Music. Again, I would ask how this information would be used, disseminated and for what purpose?
 - I appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback to your committee and am doing so with the highest respect for what you are trying to accomplish. I understand the pressures from the State and the goal to find fair and equitable measurement tools. However, some aspects of effective teaching are invisible and do not reveal themselves in a rubric, and we have to be sure that appropriate methods of assessment are used for the appropriate instructional setting. The arts, in general, have struggled with assessment. Ironically, it is the ineffable nature of the arts that makes them so wonderful!
3. Frances, looks like the materials sent from the Faculty Senate for review are very thorough.
 4. I have perused the UNT Faculty Evaluation materials that were sent and have a few observations. Let me preface my comments by the following: My PhD is in “Research and Evaluation Methodology”. I have taught research, measurement, and evaluation courses for 34 years. I have written in the area (including peer reviewed papers and a measurement and evaluation textbook that is going into its 4th edition). I have an interest in these processes.

- More than 30 years of experience tells me that some faculty/administrators will complain about the system – no matter what it is.
- Oftentimes many, many questions are asked on these systems and then they are not used for anything. What is the student GPA? Is this course part of the major? Is the course required? These are asked and not used to “adjust” ratings in any way.
- Will student rating depend on course difficulty, rigor, grading practices, etc.? Will the results be statistically adjusted for important factors?
- Results are often boiled down (not statistically, just look at a single variable) to make decisions.
- About 50% of people will complain about the system no matter what – that is because they do poorly on it and want a system that is “more appropriate” for them. That is a generalization on my part but nevertheless I often see people who complain about these systems as those who might best need help with teaching strategies.
- Peer evaluation is a good idea but who can judge the quality of the content when there is only one expert teaching a course.
- Do any of these systems get at “teaching effectiveness:”? I think not and I doubt that there are any that really can.
- They often get a “personality” or classroom environment.
- Part B of the self-evaluation page is you shared are troubling/concern/questionable to me. Is there any evidence that differences in these variables are more or less effective?
 - Who says my tests or textbook items are better?
 - I use Item Analysis EVERY time to evaluate my tests – does that make mine better?
 - Do small groups work for some and not others because of content, class size, etc.?
- Will there be any variability in the results of the self- evaluation? I suspect that there will be little.

Please do not get me wrong – I believe that effective teaching is important and that ineffective teachers should not be employed. Identification of an instrument or strategy that discriminates among these groups is very difficult. I applaud the intent but I really don’t know if it will work. Self-reflection is important to enhanced teaching (or research or service, too) but we often “think more highly of ourselves than we ought.”

The piece about the state mandating publication of CV, syllabi, and student ratings is interesting. I understand that legislators have to appear to be doing something important to protect the citizens of the state but this is a great deal of busy work. Will faculty take steps that result in higher student ratings (yet not be any more effective)? Will student ratings be VALID? Will student ratings reflect effectiveness or personality or course content? I personally will be happy to have my CV, my syllabi , and student evaluations posted. I will do as directed. However, it seems that faculty should also be required to also post their

three most recent (or important or all within last 5 years) publications/scholarly works as they part of our faculty responsibilities.

Sent October 28, 2009

5. I would love to serve on this committee.
6. Regarding the 48-hour response to student emails question: Sometimes it is not appropriate to do so within that time frame due to the nature of the assignment in question or the fact that the student is not following guidelines stated in syllabus for such communications. Therefore, I recommend that some qualifying language be added to that item – something like “unless not appropriate to do so” would suffice.

Sent October 27, 2009

7. Hi – yes, I will share the info with our Music folks.
8. Thanks for the info concerning the Annual Assessment of Teaching. We still haven't seen a draft of the peer assessment form and the deadline for your receiving feedback is November 6, 2009. Is a peer observation plan being proposed? Will peer observations be mandatory? Thanks very much.

How will the Annual Assessment of Teaching be scored? Will faculty submit these documents when they submit their profiles?

Will the Annual Assessment of Teaching form(s) be in hard copy or online? I have 22 faculty members. Will there be some way I can monitor who has completed which form? It would be nice if there were a database and I could check whether Dr. X has completed the Self-Survey or not. Otherwise, it's a lot of paperwork to process. Thanks very much. I appreciate your work!

9. Nice work.
10. Unfortunately, the "one size fits all" approach does not fit those relatively few of us who teach one on one, performance majors in the College of Music. Every single student is an individual, and within the confines of broad repertoire requirements, the repertoire for each student is individually tailored to suit their level, their particular "gaps" in the repertoire, their possible attempts to enter major competitions, the size of their hands, etc etc etc. Most of the questions in the form do not apply, and thus are merely another in an increasingly long string of ridiculous bean-counting exercises to which the faculty are being subjected. Quite frankly there are very many of us who would be much happier if we could use our leftover energies for looking forward instead of constantly counting up what we did in the past!!
11. Dear Professor Van Tassell,

Someone in my department asked me if I could ask the Faculty Senate for details about the statistical methodology used during the field testing of the Student Evaluation of Teacher Effectiveness (SETE) instrument that I believe will be put into effect this semester.

In particular, I believe someone told this particular faculty member that there would be some statistical procedure used to control for potential racial and gender bias. I think he was particularly interested in the exact form of statistical methods and controls that would be used for this purpose. Do you think it might be possible to get a detailed report on the field testing methodology at some future Senate meeting? I am also copying this e-mail to Professor Perez, who is our representative on the Senate Executive Committee.

Collected Electronic Faculty Responses to Peer/Classroom Observation Instrument

1. I appreciate your effort to incorporate language giving departments freedom to adapt this process to their specific circumstances. I think your committee has created a very useful tool that will help us to improve teaching at UNT. Best regards,
2. As a general comment, I think your committee has done exceptionally well at a difficult task. I suppose it is human nature for faculty members to worry about being evaluated, but if we are to improve the overall quality of instruction at UNT we must have a thorough system. My only broad concern is one that I'm sure most of us share – a peer evaluation process that is done properly will require quite a bit of time spent by at least several people. Systems, no matter how well designed, can always be flawed in their implementation, and sometimes people will approach the exercise with less-than-selfless motivation. None of these concerns should mean that we don't adopt the system your committee has designed. The status quo has at least occasionally allowed poor teaching to go largely unnoticed.

More generally, while I understand some of the worries folks are now expressing regarding the SETE, it is obvious to me that we need such a system. The peer evaluation process that you propose should help alleviate some of the concerns folks have about over-reliance on student opinion.

As an aside, I don't entirely understand the senate's opposition to the SETE. I'm not connected to the senate any longer (a happy state of affairs!), but it seems to me that this opposition was rather sudden. UNT has been developing this system for a couple of years now, and I believe there was a great deal of faculty involvement all along the way. Of course, it may be that the senate has been barking about this from the beginning.

In any case, lest you perceive this as an important but thankless task: thank you. I support this program, even if it creates more work for me. I can't know how many hours you and your committee have spent at this task, but I'd bet it's a large number. It's a good instrument, and it's a system that can work well for us all.

3. Looks fine for face-to-face classes. All of our classes are online or blended. Will online courses be "observed"?
4. Frances (and others on the committee), I participated in one of the faculty focus groups on the development of SETE, but didn't see the final document until recently. The SETE questionnaire has some real strengths but also some flaws. I have two major problems.

1) The tone of the questionnaire ("My instructor cares about ME") is more suitable to a JC Penney customer satisfaction survey than an instrument designed to assess the educational enterprise. The effect, I think, is to trivialize the whole exercise. At a minimum, I would suggest replacing "my instructor" with "the instructor."

2) The instrument does not seem to be interested in how intellectually challenging the course was. There doesn't even seem to be an "overall evaluation of the instructor" question. Since evaluations tend to be reduced to the score on one question, it is important to have such a catch-all.

What is the rationale for the Dec 18 deadline? Now that evaluations are done for Fall, there seems to be no need to get this done so quickly, since this has been sprung on the faculty at the busiest time of the semester.

I also have a question. Excuse my ignorance, but are departments now going to be required to do in-class observations of all instructors?

5. Thank you for sharing the peer observation instrument. As a longtime user of such instruments, I welcome the emphasis given to formative assessment by peer observation. I have benefited personally from observation by my peers and have helped my colleagues as well. The instrument will be a valuable tool in making improvements in instructional practice. I particularly liked the flexibility that it seems to afford for comments in addition to guidance to the observer to note research-based characteristics of best practice.

I welcome the use of this instrument and look forward to using it in the future. I hope that as we implement both SETE and Peer Observation we can build a culture of excellence based on a community of practice where trust is given and deserved by all those involved: instructor, observer and administrator.

6. Attached is the SMHM Peer Observation Instrument. I *strongly* suggest that you incorporate classroom management in the instrument. This is how we have addressed it:

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT:

Monitors behavior of students during class

Stops inappropriate behavior promptly with respect (tardiness, sleeping, cell phone use, talking, etc.)

Encourages positive student behavior in the classroom

Establishes and maintains a respectful classroom atmosphere for all students

Other (specify) _____

Please let me know if you have questions!

7. I wanted to take a second to pass along my comments on the information regarding peer assessment that was distributed on Friday. Let me say at the outset that I am very happy to see UNT developing a standardized teaching evaluation system. That said, I have a few concerns about the peer evaluation process as described in your email.

First, I think that it is really unfortunate that information regarding this important process was not sent to the faculty until the very end of the semester and the deadline for comments is Friday of exam week. This is easily the busiest time of the semester for most faculty members so soliciting input at this point in time would seem likely to severely undercut the amount of feedback the committee can expect to receive.

Without a compelling reason for this deadline, my suggestion is that the committee consider extending the deadline for comments. Second, it would be very helpful to have some more

specifics on the peer review process. From the information provided, the aims of the peer review process are not clear nor is it clear who is to be evaluated. For faculty that underperform during the peer evaluation, what consequences follow? Will there be resources available to poorly evaluated faculty to help improve teaching? Will there be punitive consequences for poor peer evaluations? Will these consequences be different for tenured and tenure-track faculty? What happens to faculty members with a sustained pattern of low evaluations? It is difficult to evaluate the specifics of a peer review process without more information about the goals of the process and how it would be carried out. Perhaps the committee could consider providing more detail to faculty regarding these issues. Thanks for the opportunity to comment upon your committee's work.

8. The psci dept. *most* definitely would like to weigh in on some concerns that we have regarding the instruments you have put forward.

Unfortunately, giving us one week at the beginning of finals to review something this important seems a bit imprudent. I would like to request an extension until Dec. 23 & that will give me time to collect feedback from colleagues. Can I ask, why the rush?

9. I have one suggestion for you and the Committee on the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness, which is that a Bibliography or Reference List be provided since the sources are deemed "best practices, and some of us on the faculty do educational research or would like to study the deeper educational philosophy that underpins the Peer Eval. forms.
10. First of all, please let me say that I think you did a great job presenting the material at the Senate meeting last week. Some questions were raised during your presentation. I think it is not about the work you presented. It is due to the misperception of the purpose of the evaluation process. Professors often believe that the purpose is to offer student a good education. This purpose cannot be measured by student evaluation, or peer evaluation. It has to be measured by the long term growth of the students. Evaluation you discussed, the purpose is to improve the process, using quality assurance lingo, - a good process will produce good product. However, the theoretical foundation of quality assurance program is base on machines not human interactions, therefore, the misperception is very hard be explained to the point of satisfactory. I hope this makes sense. If we just examine the instrument for peer evaluation, I think you and your team did a great job.
11. I have a comment with respect to the classroom observation instrument. In our department we conduct classroom observations among tenured and tenure-track faculty. When I was a junior faculty member, I found that providing all but the most basic details on the observer's presence undermined my authority within the classroom. While introductions may be okay, I do not agree with allowing students to ask the observer questions. The observer in my view should say nothing. Too often as a junior faculty member being observed by a full professor, I was asked by my students during the next class period why my superior was evaluating me. There was no convincing the students that this was a typical department activity. Also in a few instances with one particular professor (who no longer out-ranks me but is older and male) this semester I had the same difficulty. This particular professor felt at great liberty to speak while in my class, and I

found it difficult to respectfully maintain control of my class and not allow them to be side-tracked by another professor whom they all know. Inviting such a person to speak only increases the possibility of this type of trouble. In short, I think there is a danger in undermining younger faculty and in undermining women faculty (if older males are the observers). Perceptions are important, and regardless of what is true, perceptions students have affect our ability to teach effectively. My suggestion is to amend the instrument to advise no participation whatsoever by the observer. Thank you for your consideration.

12. Looks fine for face-to-face classes. All of our classes are online or blended. Will online courses be "observed"?
13. Has your committee considered how this instrument would be applicable to an online course. Some of the instructions seem to assume a real time evaluation.
14. You asked for comments. Here is one. The form focus on LEARNING, and from the question on whether a complete syllabus is given, LEARNING A PRESCRIBED SET OF MATERIAL. What about courses which focus on discussion, discovery, or creating one's own knowledge (by the students)? We are not teaching high school (and even high school should not be just about LEARNING material on a SYLLABUS). And is the committee endorsing (by the nature of the question asked) that a professor ALWAYS review the last class? Doesn't this contradict efficient use of time? Yours, in disappointment,
15. The senate meeting was the first I have heard of this. It's just not possible for me to work through this material with so many other matters pending, I'm sorry, but maybe during the break (I'll be working then, too.)
16. My initial response to this is that it is unreasonable to drop this on us for comments by December 18. This is the first I have heard of this dimension of the new "evaluation" mandate. It is exam week. We are busy. Unless those who set this deadline can explain why they chose exam week to spring this on us, I think the deadline for comment should be delayed.
17. Thanks for the material on Class Observation tools. From my experience of an observer and a teacher who had been observed, I would suggest that an observer comes to class at any moment of the course (after agreement on the date with the instructor) EXCEPT the very beginning when rapport with the students is in the process of establishing and the very end, when professor may be in a hurry to cover all necessary topics. I think that the last class in the course is not typical and fully representative. I wish you success in your work!
18. Thanks for your hard work on this process. My only suggestion is to change the Y/N format of the observation record to a scale (1-3 or 1-5). I think there are cases when some of these items will be observed 'to a degree' and it would be more appropriate to scale that response rather than be forced into a binary y/n rating.
19. This instrument (the one attached) is excellent! I just had a quick question. Will this be modified for online courses or should we use the one that was previously used? Many thanks.
20. I would extend a thank you to you and your colleagues for all of the time you have expended on the ETE document. I have no doubt that this project has taken an inordinate amount of time from everyone's schedule, time otherwise spend on teaching and research endeavors. I have some concern over the document and how the data might be used against the faculty,

particularly untenured faculty, but I'm more concerned over the absence of a similar publically disseminated evaluation vehicle of the UNT administrative hierarchy. Surely, our administrators need to be evaluated in an analogous and transparent process, with the data available to our students, faculty, and interested elected officials.

21. Is this a request for a vote on whether this should be implemented? If so I vote no.
22. I have just one question which I hope is straightforward. Is SETE a Faculty Senate document or is it being imposed by another level at UNT? Gus Seligman's memo implied that it is from the administration and not the Senate. Your memo is less clear. Thanks for any clarification.
23. It seems to me that student evaluation of teaching is the major contributor to the rampant grade inflation we have had in the past few years. If peer evaluation can substitute for student evaluation, that would be welcome. However, given that peer evaluation will be added to student evaluation, I predict that the introduction of peer evaluation will detract from our effectiveness as faculty members, because of the time it will consume to evaluate and to prepare to be evaluated. Not only do evaluation mechanisms fail to measure most of what really matters in teaching and learning, but instructor efforts to "teach to the evaluation instrument" further decrease teaching effectiveness. Moreover, how can a candid peer evaluation be expected, when the evaluator will be handing over his/her assessment to the instructor?? Well, I guess you wanted constructive suggestions, but I don't have the heart to tweak the plan when it seems that the plan represents a counterproductive burden for faculty. The blessing is that individual departments have some freedom in how to do this -- we can only hope that departments have the wisdom to lighten the burden.
24. A couple of comments. The first entry, "Provided students with a complete course syllabus" seems inappropriate. It's not something that's done in every class, just in the first class. It would be more appropriate to look this kind of thing up on the web. Also, "Assesses student learning" is not something that can be measured from a single class observation.
25. There seems to be no single instrument with which to evaluate all faculty and all courses. Some are exempted. How should we proceed with in house comparisons?
26. For what it is worth I think that overall the Peer Evaluation instrument is very good. I understand that at least one member of the Hist fac used it as a sort of model for a peer evaluation (we require them for all non-tenured faculty) and found it helpful. My thoughts on the self-evaluation have not changed.
27. This looks great, Frances! Thanks to you and your committee for all of your hard work!

Appendix G

Literature Review on Teaching Portfolios in Higher Education

Prepared for the Committee on the Evaluation of Teaching Excellence
By Jennifer Roberts, Graduate Assistant and Member of the Committee
University of North Texas, Denton, TX
January 2009

"It is proper to the role of the scientist that he not merely find new truth.... but that he teaches, that he try to bring the most honest and intelligible account of new knowledge to all who will try to learn." – Robert Oppenheimer

Section/Question One

- 1.) How are teaching portfolios currently used by IHE to evaluate teaching for the purposes of promotion and tenure? What standards are currently being used to formulate criteria for teaching portfolios?

It is accepted that teaching portfolios provide a larger examination of teaching effectiveness than the sole use of standard student evaluation forms. Teaching, like many other "arts," can be good in many different ways, and the portfolio offers opportunities for educators to highlight their knowledge and skills in ways that survey data alone cannot. Portfolios therefore provide a medium for educators to share a variety of responses and evaluation modes that illustrate their capacity to enhance student learning ("Promoting a culture of teaching: The teaching portfolio," 1996). J. P. Murray's (1997) review of the use of teaching portfolios for faculty evaluation states that portfolios can be defined in one of four ways, based on purpose. These are:

- 1.) Teaching portfolios are vehicles for documenting teaching, with an emphasis on demonstrating excellence.
- 2.) Teaching portfolios are vehicles to empower professors to gain dominion over their professional lives.
- 3.) Teacher portfolios are vehicles to provide institutions of higher learning with the means to demonstrate that teaching is an institutional priority.
- 4.) Teaching portfolios are vehicles for individualizing faculty development. (p. 2)

Many IHEs, both within our own peer group and beyond, currently use portfolios in some way to evaluate faculty teaching. See the UMDNJ site for a current list of links to such endeavors

("Career development: Teaching portfolios," 2008). These uses range in complexity and purpose, but all portfolios are **ultimately tied to the goals of the institutions** and center on criteria that can be found in the institution's mission and/or strategic plan.

The Carnegie Foundation's report, *Scholarship Assessed* (1997), however, has provided the following list of qualitative standards as common to nearly all evaluation programs across the country:

- 1.) Clear goals
- 2.) Adequate preparation
- 3.) Appropriate methods
- 4.) Significant results
- 5.) Effective presentation
- 6.) Reflective critique

While these criteria could certainly be applied solely to the examination of research activities, they are also appropriate for the examination of teaching, as well. These criteria have been adopted and used by the Research University Consortium for the Advancement of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL). This leadership cluster is comprised of 15 tier one institutions, is housed at Indiana University, and provides many resources related to SOTL to the public via their website ("Research university consortium," 2008). Below is a brief description of how these criteria could be applied to standards for teaching excellence, as outlined in the Carnegie report (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997).

Clear Goals. Clarity of goals precedes action in teaching. A professor must know and understand the important questions to be asked related to teaching in order to effectively carry them out. An effective educator must set forth goals for each course taught, effectively communicate those goals to students, and match instructional choices to a plan for meeting the stated course goals. In addition to this type of goal setting, the use of reflective self-evaluation methods provides an opportunity for professors to state their philosophy and objectives as instructors as well as set goals for their own professional growth and development.

Adequate Preparation. Preparation in teaching includes having a clear understanding of all course topics and being well prepared for each class. Standards for excellence in teaching must then include an examination of evidence that shows the professor's understanding of the existing scholarship in the field related to their teaching assignments, both in depth and breadth; mastery of the necessary skills, or the practice of the craft, to teach successfully; and the skillful use of materials and resources in teaching. In addition, preparation can include the

acquisition of new knowledge and skills through professional development to increase content knowledge and pedagogical skills.

Appropriate Methods. “Methods and procedures make a great difference in teaching. This is true from the logic of the syllabus to pedagogical procedures and student assessment” (p. 28). Teaching methods must be responsive to the needs and learning styles of students and include a variety of approaches to instruction that allow for student mastery of knowledge and skills within a given course. Methods should match instructional goals, be applied effectively, and be modified as appropriate in response to changing circumstances.

Significant Results. In judging the significance of the results of teaching, evaluation procedures should include not only questions related to the meeting of course goals but also the extent to which the professor was able to stimulate student interest in the content of each course and to improve student competency within a given discipline. Evidence should be provided to demonstrate that students have learned something valuable from the instructor. Professors, who utilize innovation or original teaching methods, and those who then share these methods with colleagues, can also add to the significance of the results of their teaching to their disciplinary field.

Effective Presentation. Presentation of ideas, or effective communication, is the cornerstone of effective teaching. The evaluation of the scholarship of teaching should include evidence of the professor’s ability to communicate effectively with students, both in and out of class, to mentor others, and to work cooperatively with colleagues to refine instructional practices. “We agree with those colleges and universities that take as an indicator of excellence in teaching the sharing of innovative instructional materials and concepts through formal publications, conferences, and seminars, as well as through more informal means” (p. 31). Effective presentation involves the careful attention to the audience and the selection of the best ways of reaching each of its members.

Reflective Critique. The ability to critically examine one’s own practice, and to accept the reflective critique of others, is important to the evaluation of teaching excellence. Professors should engage in reflective practice in which they evaluate their own work, use appropriate evidence in this critique, seek out evaluation by others, and use reflective practices to improve the quality of future work. Evaluation should be formative as well as summative, as “effective professionals think about what they are doing while they are carrying out their work,” (p. 35) not just after it is finished. Insightful reflection, the soliciting of others’ opinions, and professional response to any criticisms, can lead to innovative change to improve practice.

Table 1 provides a list of questions relevant to each of these standards related to the evaluation of teaching.

Table 1. *Summary of Teaching Standards and Important Questions to Consider*

Standard	Summary of Important Questions to be Considered
Clear Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the scholar state the basic purposes for his or her work clearly? • Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable? • Does the scholar identify important questions in the field, worthy of exploration in the classroom?
Adequate Preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the scholar show an understanding of existing knowledge in the field? • Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to his or her work? • Does the scholar bring together the necessary resources to teach effectively?
Appropriate Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the scholar use methods appropriate for the goals? • Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected? • Does the scholar modify methods in response to changing circumstances?
Significant Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the scholar achieve the goals set forth related to instruction? • Does the scholar's work add consequentially to the field, as evidenced by student knowledge and understanding?
Effective Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present his or her work? • Does the scholar use appropriate communication methods to reach the intended audience? • Does the scholar present his or her message with clarity and integrity?
Reflective Critique	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the scholar critically evaluate his or her own teaching in both formative and summative ways? • Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his or her critique, including evidence from students, self, and peers? • Does the scholar use evaluation to improve the quality of future work?

Source: Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

The use of teaching portfolios requires institutions to critically examine what they value as effective teaching, and this examination should then become the basis for the criteria used when formulating portfolio guidelines. While the above sources provide general guidelines for standards, these should ultimately be determined locally by the institution, so as to ensure alignment between institutional goals and evaluation procedures (Glassick et al., 1997; J. P. Murray, 1997). See Section 3 of this document for more information on standards for teaching excellence.

The organization of the teaching portfolio is another decision to be made by each campus. J. P. Murray's (1997) review suggests the following themes by which to center the organization of a teaching portfolio:

- 1.) What you teach
- 2.) How you teach
- 3.) Changes in your teaching
- 4.) Rigor in your academic standards
- 5.) Students' impressions of your teaching and their learning
- 6.) Your efforts to develop your teaching skills
- 7.) Assessments of your teaching by colleagues

Braskamp and Ory (1994) suggest an alternative to this system with the following:

- 1.) Roles, responsibilities, and goals
- 2.) Annotated course materials
- 3.) Documentation of students' learning
- 4.) Evaluations of teaching
- 5.) Contributions to the institution or the profession
- 6.) Activities to improve instruction
- 7.) Honors or recognition

The following presents a comprehensive list of items that *could* be included in a teaching portfolio, as compiled from the reviewed sources. Additional lists of items to be included will be sent with this document, as well.

- 1) A statement of personal teaching philosophy
- 2) A list of courses taught (including the primary knowledge and/or skills of each)
- 3) A statement of teaching responsibilities (including brief description of the way each course is taught and why)

- 4) Descriptions of assessment procedures
- 5) Descriptions of students' characteristics and learning styles
- 6) Institutional and departmental missions related to course goals
- 7) Examples of assignments or exams
- 8) Techniques used to assess students' learning styles
- 9) Examples of syllabi and other course materials
- 10) Brief descriptions of teaching strategies used
- 11) Evidence of student growth and learning, e.g., student evaluations, notes or other testimonials from students, review of video/audio recording of instruction, students' scores on standardized or departmental exams or other assessment measures, annotated copies of student work, publications authored by students, transcripts or other evidence of student exit interviews, letters from students (preferably unsolicited)
- 12) Evidence of teaching awards received
- 13) Statements from colleagues who have reviewed your course materials, a peer evaluation of teaching, administrator review of teaching
- 14) Self- evaluation based on formative student evaluations or other measures.
- 15) A teaching improvement plan
- 16) Evidence of professional development related to teaching that resulted from self-evaluation
- 17) Contributions to the professional development of others (through professional journals that deal with teaching improvement, formal or informal peer interactions related to teaching effectiveness)
- 18) Reflections on the use of new teaching strategies
- 19) Descriptions of curricular revisions (including new course materials, projects, and assignments)
- 20) Discussion of teaching goals for the next five years
- 21) A record of students who succeed in advanced study

22) Evidence of mentorship or assistance to students outside of the classroom

23) Work on curriculum revision or development

24) Evidence of obtained funds or equipment for teaching labs, programs, etc

25) Research on teaching, learning, or assessment

26) Requests for advice on teaching by committees or other organized groups

(Braskamp, Brandenburg, & Ory, 1984; Braskamp & Ory, 1994; Edgerton, Hutchings, & Quinlan, 1991; Knapper & Wright, 2001; J. P. Murray, 1997)

Section/Question Two

2.) How is critical reflection used in evaluating teaching excellence? What are the accepted procedures for reporting self and peer evaluations in a portfolio process?

By 1994, the use of self-evaluations (82%), peer review of teaching materials (62%), and classroom teaching (58%) were prominent across the country (*National survey on the reexamination of faculty roles and rewards*, 1994). The continued use of these practices has only grown during the past 15 years. The use of a portfolio system provides documentary evidence of the professor's work as it relates to the agreed-upon standards, highlighting accomplishments as well as areas for growth. "Good documentation is dynamic, producing not merely a snapshot but a moving picture of the why as well as the what, the process as well as the products of scholarly work" (Glassick et al., 1997, p. 49). This type of documentation can open pathways for dialogue within programs and departments as colleagues learn more about the ways others have shared their own best work.

Most often, self and peer evaluations are primarily formative in nature and used for the purposes of improving instruction. Self evaluations are one way for instructors to identify their own strengths and weaknesses, and as Brinko (1993) points out, "feedback is more effective when information is gathered from oneself as well as from others" (p. 577). Self-evaluation can take the form of the same survey or procedure as students use to evaluate teaching effectiveness. H. G. Murray's (1987) diagnostic instrument is one that could be used not only by students but by instructors as well to focus attention on specific classroom behaviors (see Addendum A for a copy of this instrument). The use of video or audio tapes to record class sessions, coupled with an analytic review of these recordings, form the foundation of most self-evaluation techniques. J. P. Murray's (1997) review of the use of self-evaluation strongly recommends the use of some type of observational checklist to focus the analysis process.

Peer review can take two forms: 1) the review and critique of course materials and artifacts and 2) the observation and critique of classroom practices. The use of classroom observation alone has been shown to produce only slight inter-rater agreement (Centra, 1993), but when faculty are given proper training and experience, the reliability of such evaluations increases (Braskamp & Ory, 1994). Careful organization of peer evaluation procedures is recommended and the use of an observational checklist is also highly recommended. See J. P. Murray, pages 57-60, for a complete discussion of the models recommended for peer evaluation (PDF attached). Attached also are Centra's (1993) samples for classroom observation and colleague evaluation as a starting point for this process.

Certainly, the use of the standards to define and measure excellence in teaching (see Section 3 below) would be the focus for any peer or self evaluation systems. The focus of these procedures, though, is on the act of teaching, or the observable teaching behaviors. Donald (2000) lists the following categories of teaching responsibilities that might be useful in creating our own forms:

Provision of Intellectual Context

- Explaining education goals
- Understanding the institutional context
- Understanding the students
- Providing the disciplinary context
- Providing a learning community
- Establishing student responsibility for learning

Instructional Planning and Evaluation

- Designing
- Representing knowledge
- Selecting teaching strategies
- Adapting to student characteristics
- Aligning instruction
- Aligning through monitoring and evaluation

Chism (2007) offers many helpful materials and resources to use when creating a system for peer review, and these will be provided at our next meeting.

All sources indicate that post-observation interviews should also be utilized to further increase understanding of course context and instructional activities by the observer in a peer-

evaluation system. The example document, from the University of British Columbia, contains both observational and post-interview criteria and could be used as an example when creating our own instruments. The additional document from Howard University serves as an example checklist to focus peer observations of teaching.

Section/Question Three

3.) How are teaching portfolios evaluated when used by IHEs to evaluate teaching?

The use of agreed-upon standards is critical for the successful use of any university-wide system of evaluation. These standards must be aligned with university policies and goals as well as the goals of those agencies responsible for monitoring the work done at our university. To review, the following are the UNT values and goals as outlined in the Five-Year Strategic Plan 2008-2013 (located at <http://www.unt.edu/president/plansreports.htm>).

UNT's Core Values:

- Discovery and learning
- Opportunity and Diversity
- Scholarship and Research
- Community and Connectivity
- Partnership and Outreach
- Integrity and Stewardship

UNT's Strategic Goals:

Strategic Goal 1—Excellence in Student-Centered Education

UNT will provide a stimulating, supportive, and rigorous educational experience to a diverse student body, preparing students for leadership in a changing world.

Strategic Goal 2—Increased Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

UNT will significantly increase its levels of funded research, scholarly productivity, and artistic expression in order to enhance undergraduate and graduate education, contribute to economic growth, and improve UNT's standing among peer institutions.

Strategic Goal 3—Enhancing Institutional Reputation, Community Engagement, and Advancement

UNT will enhance an institutional image that reflects the University's character, relevance, accomplishments, and value; strengthen the reputation of its academic, research, creative, and athletic components; and promote supportive and collaborative relationships with external constituents.

In examining the literature, there are many sets of standards for teaching and higher education instruction that could also be considered when formulating standards for excellence in teaching. These are included in Addendum B of this document and include the work of the American Association for Higher Education, the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, as well as other researchers and institutions.

The formation of standards is necessary when considering how to evaluate teaching portfolios. These standards would then form the basis for set criteria by which each teaching portfolio is to be evaluated. Addendum C contains a few examples of ways other universities have formulated evaluation rubrics for the purposes of evaluating teaching. These examples were less frequently located in the literature but nonetheless share similar characteristics.

A continued search for other examples of rubrics is continuing, and results of this search will be shared with the group at a later time.

Section/Question Four

4.) What are some additional resources related to the use of teaching portfolios in higher education?

In addition to the resources found in the reference list, the following sources were consulted and could prove beneficial to the continued work of the committee. This list will be updated throughout the work process as needed.

The AHA-AAHE-CF teaching portfolio project. (2008). Retrieved December 26, 2008, from www.historians.org/teaching/AAHE/aahecover.html

Anderson, E. (Ed.). (1993). *Campus use of the teaching portfolio: Twenty-five portfolio profiles*. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Andrews, H. (1985). *Evaluating for excellence*. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press, Inc.

Astin, A. (1991). *Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Bibliography of SOTL. (2008). Retrieved December 26, 2008, from <http://www.indiana.edu/~sotl/bib.html>

Brown, S., & Glasner, A. (Eds.). (1999). *Assessment matters in higher education: Choosing and using diverse approaches*. Buckingham, UK: The Society for Research into Higher Education.

Hutchings, P., Babb, M., & Bjork, C. (2002). *The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education: An annotated bibliography*. Washington, D. C.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Kaplan, M. *The teaching portfolio*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Keig, L., & Waggoner, M. D. (1994). *Collaborative peer review: The role of faculty in improving college teaching*. Washington, D. C.: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report.

Kells, H. R. (1995). *Self-study processes: A guide to self-evaluation in higher education* (4th ed.). Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education, Oryx Press.

Macdonald, R., & Wisdom, J. (2002). *Academic and educational development: Research, evaluation, and changing practice in higher education*. London: Kogan Page.

Teaching portfolio resources. (2008). Retrieved December 22, 2008, from <http://depts.washington.edu/cidrweb/resources/portfoliotools.html>

The scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL). (2008). Retrieved December 26, 2008, from http://www.vanderbilt.edu/cft/resources/teaching_resources/reflecting/sotl.htm

Addendum A

SEATTLE UNIVERSITY
Founded 1891

Center for Excellence in
Teaching and Learning

Student Course Evaluation:
Teacher Behaviors Inventory
Developed by Harry G Murray*

Course: Class time:

Instructor: Date:

Instructions to Student:

In this inventory you are asked to assess your instructor's specific classroom behaviors. Your instructor has requested this information for purposes of instructional analysis and improvement. Please try to be both thoughtful and candid in your responses so as to maximize the value of the feedback.

Your judgments should reflect that type of teaching you think is best for this particular course and your particular learning style. Try to assess each behavior independently rather than letting your overall impression of the instructor determine each individual rating.

Each section of the inventory begins with a definition of the category of teaching to be assessed in that section. For each specific teaching behavior, please indicate the frequency with which he/she exhibits the behavior in question. Please use the following rating scale in making your judgments:

- | | |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| 1 = almost never | + = should do more |
| 2 = rarely | - = should do less |
| 3 = sometimes | |
| 4 = often | |
| 5 = almost always | |

CLARITY: methods used to explain or clarify concepts and principles

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Gives several examples of each concept | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 2. Uses concrete everyday examples to explain concepts and principles | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 3. Fails to define new or unfamiliar terms | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Repeats difficult ideas several times..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 5. Stresses most important points by pausing, speaking slowly, raising voice, and so on..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 6. Uses graphs or diagrams to facilitate explanation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 7. Points out practical applications of concepts | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 8. Answers students' questions thoroughly..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 9. Suggests ways of memorizing complicated ideas..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 10. Writes key terms on blackboard or overhead screen..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 11. Explains subject matter in familiar colloquial language | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |

ENTHUSIASM: use of non-verbal behavior to solicit student attention and interest

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12. Speaks in a dramatic or expressive way..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 13. Moves about while lecturing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 14. Gestures with hands or arms | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 15. Exhibits facial gestures or expressions..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 16. Avoids eye contact with students..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 17. Walks up aisles beside students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 18. Gestures with head or body..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 19. Tells jokes or humorous anecdotes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 20. Reads lecture verbatim from prepared notes or text..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 21. Smiles or laughs while teaching..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 22. Shows distracting mannerisms | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |

INTERACTION: techniques used to foster students' participation in class

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 23. Encourages students to ask questions or make comments during lectures | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 24. Criticizes students when they make errors..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 25. Praises students for good ideas | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 26. Asks questions of individual students..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 27. Asks questions of class as a whole..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 28. Incorporates students' ideas into lecture | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 29. Presents challenging, thought-provoking ideas..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 30. Uses a variety of media and activities in class | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 31. Asks rhetorical questions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |

ORGANIZATION: ways of organizing or structuring subject matter of the course

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 32. Uses headings and subheadings to organize lectures | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 33. Puts outline of lecture on blackboard or overhead screen | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 34. Clearly indicates transition from one topic to the next..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 35. Gives preliminary overview of lecture at beginning of class | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 36. Explains how each topic fits into the course as a whole | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 37. Reviews topics covered in previous lectures at beginning of
each class | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 38. Periodically summarizes points previously made..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |

PACING: rate of presentation of information, efficient use of class time

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 39. Dwells excessively on obvious points | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 40. Digresses from major theme of lecture | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 41. Covers very little material in class sessions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 42. Asks if students understand before proceeding to next topic ... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 43. Sticks to the point in answering students' questions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |

DISCLOSURE: explicitness concerning course requirements and grading criteria

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 44. Advises students as to how to prepare for tests or exams..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 45. Provides sample exam questions..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 46. Tells students exactly what is expected of them on tests,
essays or
Assignments | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 47. States objectives of each lecture | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 48. Reminds students of test dates or assignment deadlines | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 49. States objectives of course as a whole | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |

SPEECH: characteristics of voice relevant to classroom teaching

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 50. Stutters, mumbles or slurs words | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 51. Speaks at appropriate volume | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 52. Speaks clearly | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 53. Speaks at appropriate pace..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 54. Says "um" or "ah"..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 55. Voice lacks proper modulation (speaks in monotone)..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |

RAPPORT: quality of interpersonal relations between teacher and students

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 56. Addresses individual students by name | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 57. Announces availability for consultation outside of class..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 58. Offers to help students with problems..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 59. Shows tolerance of other points of view | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |
| 60. Talks with students before or after class..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | + | - |

*MURRAY, Harry G (1983) "Low-inference Classroom Teaching Behaviors and Student Ratings of College Teaching Effectiveness." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 75. 138-49.

Addendum B

Standards

Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education American Association for Higher Education

1. Encourages Contact between Students and Faculty

Frequent student-faculty contact in and out of classes is the most important factor in student motivation and involvement. Faculty concern helps students get through rough times and keep on working. Knowing a few faculty members well enhances students' intellectual commitment and encourages them to think about their own values and future plans.

2. Develops Reciprocity and Cooperation among Students

Learning is enhanced when it is more like a team effort than a solo race. Good learning, like good work, is collaborative and social, not competitive and isolated. Working with others often increases involvement in learning. Sharing one's own ideas and responding to others' reactions sharpens thinking and deepens understanding.

3. Encourages Active Learning

Learning is not a spectator sport. Students do not learn much just by sitting in classes listening to teachers, memorizing pre-packaged assignments, and spitting out answers. They must talk about what they are learning, write about it, relate it to past experiences and apply it to their daily lives. They must make what they learn part of themselves.

4. Gives Prompt Feedback

Knowing what you know and don't know focuses learning. Students need appropriate feedback on performance to benefit from courses. When getting started, students need help in assessing existing knowledge and competence. In classes, students need frequent opportunities to perform and receive suggestions for improvement. At various points during college, and at the end, students need chances to reflect on what they have learned, what they still need to know, and how to assess themselves.

5. Emphasizes Time on Task

Time plus energy equals learning. There is no substitute for time on task. Learning to use one's time well is critical for students and professionals alike. Students need help in learning effective time management. Allocating realistic amounts of time means effective learning for students and effective teaching for faculty. How an institution defines time expectations for students, faculty, administrators, and other professional staff can establish the basis of high performance for all.

6. Communicates High Expectations

Expect more and you will get more. High expectations are important for everyone -- for the poorly prepared, for those unwilling to exert themselves, and for the bright and well motivated. Expecting students to perform well becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy when teachers and institutions hold high expectations for themselves and make extra efforts.

7. Respects Diverse Talents and Ways of Learning

There are many roads to learning. People bring different talents and styles of learning to college. Brilliant students in the seminar room may be all thumbs in the lab or art studio. Students rich in hands-on experience may not do so well with theory. Students need the opportunity to show their talents and learn in ways that work for them. Then they can be pushed to learn in new ways that do not come so easily.

Source: Chickering & Gamson. (1987). *Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education*. Washington, D. C. AAHE Bulletin, March.

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education

CAS General Standards (selected standards that apply to the evaluation of teaching)

Part 2. PROGRAM

The formal education of students, consisting of the curriculum and the co-curriculum, must promote student learning and development outcomes that are purposeful and holistic and that prepare students for satisfying and productive lifestyles, work, and civic participation. The student learning and development outcome domains and their related dimensions are:

- Knowledge acquisition, integration, construction, and application
 - o Dimensions: understanding knowledge from a range of disciplines; connecting knowledge to other knowledge, ideas, and experiences; constructing knowledge; and relating knowledge to daily life
- Cognitive complexity
 - o Dimensions: critical thinking; reflective thinking; effective reasoning; and creativity
- Intrapersonal development
 - o Dimensions: realistic self-appraisal, self-understanding, and self-respect; identity development; commitment to ethics and integrity; and spiritual awareness
- Interpersonal competence
 - o Dimensions: meaningful relationships; interdependence; collaboration; and effective leadership
- Humanitarianism and civic engagement
 - o Dimensions: understanding and appreciation of cultural and human differences; social responsibility; global perspective; and sense of civic responsibility
- Practical competence
 - o Dimensions: pursuing goals; communicating effectively; technical competence; managing personal affairs; managing career development; demonstrating professionalism; maintaining health and wellness; and living a purposeful and satisfying life

[See The Council for the Advancement of Standards Learning and Developmental Outcomes statement for examples of outcomes related to these domains and dimensions.]

Source: *CAS general standards (2008)*. Retrieved December 08, 2008, from <http://www.cas.edu/>

Nation Board for Professional Teaching Standards: The Five Core Principles

Proposition 1: Teachers are Committed to Students and Their Learning

- NBCTs are dedicated to making knowledge accessible to all students. They believe all students can learn.
- They treat students equitably. They recognize the individual differences that distinguish their students from one another and they take account for these differences in their practice.
- NBCTs understand how students develop and learn.
- They respect the cultural and family differences students bring to their classroom.
- They are concerned with their students' self-concept, their motivation and the effects of learning on peer relationships.
- NBCTs are also concerned with the development of character and civic responsibility.

Proposition 2: Teachers Know the Subjects They Teach and How to Teach Those Subjects to Students.

- NBCTs have mastery over the subject(s) they teach. They have a deep understanding of the history, structure and real-world applications of the subject.
- They have skill and experience in teaching it, and they are very familiar with the skills gaps and preconceptions students may bring to the subject.
- They are able to use diverse instructional strategies to teach for understanding.

Proposition 3: Teachers are Responsible for Managing and Monitoring Student Learning.

- NBCTs deliver effective instruction. They move fluently through a range of instructional techniques, keeping students motivated, engaged and focused.
- They know how to engage students to ensure a disciplined learning environment, and how to organize instruction to meet instructional goals.
- NBCTs know how to assess the progress of individual students as well as the class as a whole.
- They use multiple methods for measuring student growth and understanding, and they can clearly explain student performance to parents.

Proposition 4: Teachers Think Systematically about Their Practice and Learn from Experience.

- NBCTs model what it means to be an educated person – they read, they question, they create and they are willing to try new things.
- They are familiar with learning theories and instructional strategies and stay abreast of current issues in American education.
- They critically examine their practice on a regular basis to deepen knowledge, expand their repertoire of skills, and incorporate new findings into their practice.

Proposition 5: Teachers are Members of Learning Communities.

- NBCTs collaborate with others to improve student learning.

- They are leaders and actively know how to seek and build partnerships with community groups and businesses.
- They work with other professionals on instructional policy, curriculum development and staff development.
- They can evaluate school progress and the allocation of resources in order to meet state and local education objectives.
- They know how to work collaboratively with parents to engage them productively in the work of the school.

Source: *The five core propositions. (2008)*. Retrieved December 26, 2008, from http://www.nbpts.org/the_standards/the_five_core_propositions

Addendum C

Examples of University Use of Teaching Portfolios

University of Texas El Paso

Evaluating Teaching through Portfolios- Prospective Rubric

PROFESSIONAL REFLECTION

Statement of Teaching Philosophy

- Are teaching goals well developed and well articulated?
- Are teaching goals consistent with the aims of the profession and the institution?
- Are teaching goals communicated to students and reflected in course materials and practice?

substandard || satisfactory (good) || strong || exceptional

Comments for further development:

Roles, Responsibilities, Methods

- Do the teachers' responsibilities reflect teaching goals?
- What is the scale or magnitude of responsibilities adopted and met?
- Do teaching methods and practice reflect goals?
- Does the teacher have and use a large repertoire of teaching skills?

substandard || satisfactory (good) || strong || exceptional

Comments for further development:

EVIDENCE

Evidence from Students

- How do the students rate this teacher as a classroom instructor, mentor and advisor (based on the spectrum of available evidence and given qualifications on each type of data)?

substandard || satisfactory (good) || strong || exceptional

Comments for further development:

Evidence from Peers

- How do peers rate this teacher?
- Does the evidence reflect a robust cross-section of elements of teaching?

substandard || satisfactory (good) || strong || exceptional

Comments for further development:

Other Evidence/Products of Teaching

- What do students achieve, as documented by objective measures?
- How do others outside the university rate this teacher (where applicable)?

substandard || satisfactory (good) || strong || exceptional

Comments for further development:

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Professional Development

- Is there evidence of improvement in evaluation by students or peers since the last evaluation?
- Is there evidence of effort to develop professionally (learning new teaching methods; innovative trials; teaching circles; etc)?
- Has the teacher identified short-term and long-term goals for continued development (and/or service)?

substandard || satisfactory (good) || strong || exceptional

Comments for further development:

Source: *Teaching portfolios. (2008)*. Retrieved December 26, 2008, from <http://sunconference.utep.edu/CETaL/resources/portfolios/>

University of North Carolina- Chapel Hill

Use of Portfolios in the Promotion Process

Faculty members' portfolios will be formally evaluated by the School only at the time of promotion/tenure decisions and the renewal of probationary contracts. For this purpose, the faculty member and his/her chair will select the most important elements of the portfolio for submission to these committees, creating a "reduced portfolio." Departmental and school promotion committees will use the reduced portfolio as the primary basis for their decisions about the excellence of a faculty member's teaching. They may, of course, consult the full portfolio and request additional materials as necessary.

There are six broad areas in which a faculty member's teaching may be judged to be excellent, satisfactory, or less than satisfactory.

1. Leadership of educational programs (broadly interpreted to include programs in medical/graduate/allied health/undergraduate/dental/pharmacy/nursing/public health, initiation of new course or seminars, course/clerkship/residency/graduate program directorship, directorship of continuing education programs, etc.).
2. Quality of teaching as judged by peers, including peers who have directly observed the faculty member.
3. Quality of teaching as judged by learners and as collected by routine departmental procedures which respect the confidentiality of the learners.
4. Innovation/scholarship in education (introduction of innovative ideas and techniques, creation of instructional materials, initiation of/participation in funded projects relating to education, publications and presentations about teaching).
5. National reputation as a *teacher*.
6. Extent of participation in teaching, mentoring, and/or advising.

The final judgments, in each case, about overall excellence in teaching will be made by the relevant promotion committees in the department and the school. We would offer as a general guideline that faculty members judged to be excellent, overall, in the area of teaching will have been rated as "excellent" in at least two of the above areas and at least satisfactory in the other areas, on the basis of the evidence furnished in the teaching portfolio.

March 3, 1994
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
School of Medicine

Source: *School of medicine policy on teaching portfolios. (2008)*. Retrieved December 22, 2008, from <http://www.med.unc.edu/wrkunits/1dean/oed/teachingportfolio/portfolio.htm>

Addendum C

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

SUMMARY OF PEER EVALUATION

This form is to be completed by Review Committee to summarize results of evaluation, review/discuss with instructors and submit signed copy to Department Head

IF MORE THAN ONE COURSE IS EVALUATED, THE NUMERICAL RATING FOR EACH ITEM IS THE AVERAGE OF SCORES FOR THE DIFFERENT COURSES.

NUMERICAL RATING SCALE:

- 7 - Outstanding
- 6 - Superior
- 5 - Very good
- 4 - Good
- 3 - Adequate
- 2 - Poor
- 1 - Inadequate

NAME OF INSTRUCTOR BEING EVALUATED: _____

COURSE EVALUATED: _____

TERM: ___ SUMMER ___ FALL ___ WINTER ___ YEAR ___

SECTIONS NUMERICAL RATING _____

DATE OF EVALUATION: _____

MEMBERS OF THE PEER EVALUATION COMMITTEE Initials

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

MEETING OF INSTRUCTOR WITH REVIEWERS:

DATE: _____

SIGNATURE OF REVIEWER(S) _____

INVITATION TO RESPOND TO DEPARTMENT HEAD: ___ YES ___ NO

PART A: COURSE EVALUATION (based on interview)

1. Intellectual integrity of course content:

Numerical rating: _____

Comments: _____

2. Preparation and organization of the course:

Numerical rating: _____

Comments: _____

3. Course evaluation procedures:

Numerical rating: _____

Comments: _____

4. Feedback to students:

Numerical rating:

Comments:

5. Course assignments:

Numerical rating:

Comments:

6. General evaluation of course quality:

Numerical rating:

Comments:

Additional comments on items the instructor wishes the Committee to consider, or items the Committee would like to further discuss:

PART B: TEACHING EVALUATION (Based on classroom observation)

1. Relationship between course content and course objectives:

Numerical rating:

Comments:

2. Rate at which new ideas were presented in relationship to student understanding:

Numerical rating:

Comments:

3. Clarity of presentation, including clarification and elaboration where necessary:

Numerical rating:

Comments:

4. Use of appropriate examples, illustrations or visual aids (especially for important concepts):

Numerical rating:

Comments:

5. Opportunity for students to ask questions (students encouraged to ask questions and get involved):

Numerical rating:

Comments:

6. Response to students' questions: accurate, clear, enthusiastic response:

Numerical rating:

Comments:

7. Humane and respectful treatment of students:

Numerical rating:

Comments:

8. General classroom atmosphere. Rapport with students. Attitude of students.

Numerical rating:

Comments:

9. Other:

Numerical rating:

Comments:

10. Other:

Numerical rating:

Comments:

Source: *Independent peer evaluation form. (2003)*. Retrieved December 26, 2008, from <http://ecps.educ.ubc.ca/forms/Peer%20Evaluation%20Form.pdf>

Addendum D

Howard University's Teaching Responsibilities Checklist

Teaching Responsibilities

Faculty Responsibilities	SA	A	SD	D	NA
Has a firm command of the subject.					
Keeps abreast of new developments.					
Selects teaching strategies that facilitate the learning process.					
Communicates the subject effectively.					
Instructs classes at the scheduled time and place.					
Instructs in a manner consistent with the course content and course credit approved by the appropriate faculty body.					
Notifies the department office, if unable to meet a class, and makes arrangements for substitute instruction or for the class to be notified concerning cancellation.					
Reschedules make-up classes, if needed, at a time reasonably convenient for students.					
Designs and evaluates conscientiously all student work with impartiality.					
Completes grading in a timely fashion according to the schedule of due dates announced by the Office of the Registrar.					
Gives students an opportunity to receive an explanation of the grade assigned.					
Provides each student with a written syllabus or course guide summarizing the objectives and requirements of their courses, the textbooks or other sources to be used, and the applicable attendance and grading rules.					
Avoids unacceptable discriminatory conduct based on such factors as race, color, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, disability or handicap, age, or political beliefs.					

Is sensitive to the harmful consequences of professorial or student conduct or comments in classroom discussions or elsewhere that perpetuate stereotypes or prejudices involving such factors.					
Is available to counsel students about academic matters throughout the academic year by means of regularly scheduled office hours or appointments.					
Transmits timely and accurate information during conference hours.					
Is available to colleagues for purposes of discussing teaching methods, content of courses, and related matters.					

Source: *Teaching resources: Administrative review. (2008)*. Retrieved December 26, 2008, from http://www.cetla.howard.edu/teaching_resources/AdminReview.html

References

- Braskamp, L. A., Brandenburg, D. C., & Ory, J. C. (1984). *Evaluating teaching effectiveness*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Braskamp, L. A., & Ory, J. C. (1994). *Assessing faculty work: Enhancing individual and institutional performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brinko, K. T. (1993). The practice of giving feedback to improve teaching. *Journal of Higher Education, 64*, 19.
- Career development: Teaching portfolios. (2008). Retrieved December 26, 2008, from http://cte.umdj.edu/career_development/career_portfolios.cfm
- Centra, J. A. (1993). *Reflective faculty evaluation: Enhancing teaching and determining faculty effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chism, N. v. N. (2007). *Peer review of teaching: A sourcebook* (2nd Ed.). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.
- Donald, J. G. (2000). The pedagogue: Creating designs for teaching. In J. L. Bess & Associates (Eds.), *Teaching alone, teaching together: Transforming the structure of teams for teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Edgerton, R., Hutchings, P., & Quinlan, K. (1991). *Teaching portfolio: Capturing the scholarship of teaching*. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education.
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Knapper, C., & Wright, W. A. (2001). Using portfolios to document good teaching: Premises, purposes, practices. In C. Knapper & P. Cranton (Eds.), *Fresh approaches to the evaluation of teaching* (pp. 19-30). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Murray, H. G. (1987). Acquiring student feedback that improves instructions. In M. G. Weimer (Ed.), *New directions for teaching and learning* (Vol. 32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Murray, J. P. (1997). *Successful faculty development and evaluation: The complete teaching portfolio*. Washington, D. C.: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

National survey on the reexamination of faculty roles and rewards. (1994.). Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Promoting a culture of teaching: The teaching portfolio. (1996, December 22, 2008). *Speaking of Teaching: Stanford University Newsletter on Teaching*, 7, 4.

Research university consortium. (2008). Retrieved December 26, 2008, from <http://www.cfkeep.org/html/snapshot.php?id=72191394>