U.S.M. COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS FOR TEACHING

During the 1998-99 school year, the Promotion and Tenure committee of the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD) rewrote the scholarship guidelines for promotion and tenure in accordance with the national efforts to redefine scholarship, especially for those engaged in clinical programs. The present document continues this work by proposing criteria for judging excellence in teaching, the second of the three domains of promotion and tenure review. Just as the implementation of the new scholarship guidelines has provided the opportunity for faculty members to present their scholarship in a more authentic and relevant light, we trust that the present document will permit wider recognition of the many facets of teaching in the CEHD and will enable both junior and senior faculty to present a more accurate portrait of their teaching. This draft is intended to stimulate faculty discussion and feedback, promote faculty development, and, upon adoption, serve as the framework for assessing teaching in the promotion and tenure review process.

It is important to distinguish between teaching, as a component of promotion and tenure review, and the scholarship of teaching, as defined in the 1999 scholarship document. That document drew on the work of Ernest Boyer to define the scholarship of teaching as "a dynamic activity which transforms and extends the professor's knowledge as he or she seeks to share it with others." As Lee S. Shulman (1998) wrote, the scholarship of teaching always involves "a public account of some or all of the full act of teaching . . . in a manner susceptible to critical review by the teacher's professional peers" (Hutchings & Shulman, p. 11). Teaching, on the other hand, focuses on what happens in the classroom or other site of learning. When we evaluate a faculty member's teaching (as opposed to scholarship), we are looking primarily at what happens in the interaction between teacher and student for the purpose of academic learning. The College of Education and Human Development expects its faculty members to be “teacher scholars,” demonstrating how their own scholarship and the scholarship about teaching informs their teaching practice.

The dimensions of teaching

Sizer (2001, see website) proposed that “good” teaching was an integration of scholarship, personal integrity, and the ability to communicate. “Scholarship is not only an affair of the classroom, but, at its best, is a way of life, one which is marked by respect for evidence and for logic, by inquisitiveness and the genius to find new meaning in familiar data, and by the ability to see things in context, to relate specificities to generalities, facts to theories, and theories to facts” (p.1).

Sizer offered two separate characteristics or meanings of integrity: probity and completeness. Probity includes the attributes of “honesty, principle, and decent candor”
(p.1), while completeness is described as “unity of character.” Sizer pointed out that “a fine teacher does have confidence, but the honest confidence that flows from a fair recognition of one’s own frailties as well as talents and which accommodate both joyfully.”

Regarding the ability to communicate, Sizer emphasized that in addition to the skills of provoking greater involvement of students and getting them to understand what they need to learn, a good teacher also needs to be a “compulsive listener.” As Richard LeBlanc (1998) reminded us in Good Teaching: The Top Ten Requirements, good teaching is “not only about motivating students to learn, but teaching them how to learn, and doing so in a manner that is relevant, meaningful, and memorable” (p.1).

**The Practice of Teaching**

Before setting forth standards for evaluating teaching in the tenure and promotion review process, it may be useful to list some of the many practices of teaching, a domain which goes far beyond the traditional idea of presenting content in a classroom situation. Teaching may include the following:

**Classroom teaching**
- course preparation
- student assessment
- guest speakers
- individualizing the curriculum to accommodate student needs
- interdisciplinary/team teaching
- guest lecturing
- experiential learning
- learning activities
- use of media
- lectures
- technology-based instruction
- cooperative learning

**Advising**
- Traditional (campus-based) advising
- Using interactive technology
- Dissertation or thesis committee work

**Clinical practice**
- Internship/practicum supervision
- reviewing videotapes, portfolios, and other evidence
- mentoring/advising interns
- setting up placements
- mentoring intern supervisors
- reflective learning opportunities
Curriculum development

Professional development

**Portrait of a Teacher**

The following description is adapted from the "Portrait of a Teacher" of the Extended Teacher Education Program at USM.

The exemplary teacher

- recognizes that teachers are, above all, learners.
- possesses a deep understanding of the concepts, purposes and intellectual processes associated with the discipline he or she will teach.
- understands the effects of human development on the learning of children, adolescents and adults.
- models respect for individual differences and the basic worth of each individual. He or she plans instruction with sensitivity to issues of class, gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and special needs, and works to foster an appreciation of diversity among students and co-workers.
- uses teaching strategies needed to manage instructional nuances and decisions necessary to promote learning of complex concepts and shape positive learning environments.
- understands the principles of democracy and plans instruction to promote critical reflection on the ideals, values and practices of democratic citizenship.
- works cooperatively and collaboratively with colleagues.
- is technologically literate and competent in information gathering, analysis, retrieval and application.
- proactively pursues professional development activities appropriate for the current level of professional experience.
- communicates joy and satisfaction of active inquiry and personal learning.

To the extent possible, faculty members should be able to explain, in their reappointment and tenure and review presentation materials, how they meet the criteria outlined in the "Portrait of a Teacher" description.
Sources of data for evaluating faculty teaching

Faculty seeking to demonstrate their teaching effectiveness for the purposes of promotion and tenure review may present evidence gathered from many different sources. These include the following:

1. Self-assessment and self-report
Studies show little correlation between faculty self-evaluations and ratings from students, with faculty tending to give themselves higher ratings than do students. However, self-reports, which involve narrative descriptions of teaching philosophies, responsibilities, and accomplishments, can be a useful starting point for documenting a faculty member's teaching excellence. Centra (1977) suggested that self-assessments should be used only in conjunction with more objective forms of faculty evaluation. For the purpose of promotion and tenure review, it will be important for faculty to explain the modifications they have made to their teaching as a result of self-assessment and reflection.

2. Student evaluations
Much has been written in recent years about the validity of student evaluations. White (2000) asserted that current teaching evaluation instruments confuse two purposes of teacher assessment: the determination of whether a faculty member is a poor, average or outstanding teacher (a concept he likens to holistic evaluation of student writing), and judgments about whether a teacher has met his or her own objectives in a specific course. Some institutions have recognized this distinction by separating these two kinds of evaluation. For example, at the University of Arizona, faculty members can request a facilitator from the Office of Assessment and Enrollment Research to discuss the instructor's strengths and weaknesses with students and report back confidentially to the teacher (White, 2000).

It is the position of the faculty of the College of Education and Human Development that student evaluation remains an essential component of faculty assessment in the CEHD, yet it is recognized that the traditional “bubble sheet” evaluation form may not be adequate to assess the many varieties of teaching in the College. The use of alternative assessment instruments can authentically and validly assess clinical supervision, partner teaching with school-based faculty, and other forms of teaching unique to the CEHD is encouraged. Faculty, working with their peer committee, may develop and use evaluation protocols that are deemed appropriate for the specific nature of their program. Examples of such protocols are found in the CEHD “Teaching Assessment Samples.”

3. Classroom observations
As L. Dee Fink (1999) pointed out in Improving College Teaching, “valuable information can be obtained from the observations of a third party, someone who brings both an outsider’s perspective and professional expertise to the task” (p.6). Strengthening this process would provide valuable information for faculty members to use teaching for improving their teaching. A recommended set of peer observation guidelines are located in the “Teaching Assessment Samples.”
4. Instructional materials
Curricula, syllabi, classroom activities, assignments, and assessment instruments, especially those developed by the faculty member him/herself, all provide valuable evidence of teaching quality. Exhibits should include commentary and reflection on the role of these materials in the teaching process, and their relationship to the faculty member’s philosophy and goals for the course as a whole.

5. Analysis of videotapes for clinical or classroom practice
The nature of the clinical programs in the College of Education and Human Development requires that faculty members engage in supervisory roles and functions to monitor the progress and competence of their students as they participate in field-based practicum and internship experiences. To demonstrate their effectiveness in this role, faculty members may provide videotapes of their work with students in this supervision capacity, accompanied by a description of their supervision goals and strategies and how their approach to supervision is consistent with their teaching philosophy. To provide further evidence of validity to this process, an objective third-party review of the videotape should address issues of the supervisor’s competence in that role.

6. Feedback from clinical partners
Site-based program models require collaboration with clinical partners. Invited testimony from clinical partners may attest to such things as the faculty member’s ability to link theory to practice, engage students in appropriate and valuable learning experiences, and effectively communicate with students and educational staff, as well the faculty member’s teaching style, accountability, and coordination skills.

7. Evidence of student work
A significant indicator of a teacher’s success is being able to demonstrate that students have gained the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are the focus of a course or lesson. One or two examples of student work may be used to illustrate how the instructor’s philosophy of teaching plays out in course assignments or products that have been inspired by the instructor’s tutelage. The level and calibre of productivity that has been attained through the instructor’s teaching approach should either be evident or explained.

Criteria for Evaluation

Individuals who are preparing documentation of their teaching for the reappointment and tenure and promotion review process in the College of Education and Human Development may include the following information.

1. A Philosophy of Teaching. The philosophy statement should explain the faculty member’s beliefs about how students learn, the role of the instructor in the learning process, and the dynamic that the instructor attempts to create between teaching and learning.
2. A description of how the faculty member’s teaching reflects the ideals of the CEHD Curriculum Framework
3. Examplars of curricula, course blueprints, and/or syllabi that demonstrate the instructor’s ability to develop well-framed instructional learning experiences for students
4. Examples of innovative assignments or teaching strategies that illustrate the instructor’s application of his or her teaching philosophy
5. Examples of the use of technology in course instruction
6. Examples of how issues of diversity are addressed in the faculty member’s courses
7. Artifacts that demonstrate the instructor’s ability to successfully measure student attainment of program and course outcomes, including evidence of the criteria used for measuring outcomes (e.g., student work)
8. Evidence of course evaluations, including formative and summative assessments. Cumulative ratings from the standard USM evaluation form must be verified by the faculty member’s peer committee chair or department chair. Whenever possible, the ratings should be compared to the mean scores for the entire college
9. Feedback from classroom observations by professional colleagues
10. Reflections on feedback from personal experiences, colleague observations, and course evaluations
11. Evidence of how others have sought out the instructor to assist in their instructional practices
12. Documentation of the specific actions the instructor has taken to improve his or her teaching, accompanied by reflections and assessments of the progress made
13. Evidence of how the faculty member’s research and scholarship informs his or her teaching

**Conclusion**

As a college whose primary mission is to prepare educators and human development professionals for responsible service, the CEHD considers teaching a key responsibility in the expectations of its faculty. Teaching is the arena in which we communicate our knowledge to our students, help them learn to think critically about their own professional knowledge and development, and model exemplary practice. Consequently, the evaluation of teaching is an especially important part of the promotion and tenure review for our faculty in the College of Education and Human Development.

Approved by the CEHD faculty on February 6, 2002
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COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

TEACHING ASSESSMENT SAMPLES
Peer Teaching Observation Guidelines

The purpose of peer teaching observations is to provide a reflective learning opportunity for university instructors so they can assess pedagogical strengths and challenges; seek feedback about targeted components of their classroom instruction approaches; and identify insights, techniques, and resources to improve their teaching effectiveness.

To promote consistency, and therefore more reliability, in the teacher observation process, all peer observers are asked to use the following outline to summarize their observations and provide feedback. Additional comments and creative approaches are also encouraged. A summary of the observation should be addressed to the Promotion and Tenure Committee for inclusion at the instructor’s peer observation and reflective learning process.

Sections of Peer Teacher Observation Report

I. Introduction – Include the following:
- Date(s) of observation
- Course title
- Length of class/observation
- Unique consideration for this class
- Context of observations (e.g., peer review requirement, instructor’s request to address particular concern)
- Description of additional or unique features of report

II. Content Knowledge – May include …
- Thoroughness and clarity of course syllabus
- The degree to which it is obvious what students should know or be able to do as a result of the class
- Clarity of content delivery
- Connection of content to course objectives
- Resources used to cover content or develop skills
- Accuracy and legitimacy of content (instructor’s depth of knowledge on the subject)
- Up-to-date information and resources
- Academic rigor

III. Teaching Methods/Strategies – May include …
- How class is structured
- Description(s) of the strategies being employed
- Opportunities for students to apply learning and develop useful skills
- Appropriateness of strategies for meeting objective(s)
- Instructor’s facility in demonstrating, modeling, and/or applying the teaching strategy/strategies
- Variety of teaching strategies
- Effectiveness in the use of technology and media
IV. **Dispositions** – May include …
- Rapport with students
- A “sense of self” in the teaching/learning dynamic
- Ways in which the learning experience models democratic practices
- Ways in which civility and caring are manifested in instructor’s behavior
- Ways in which the instructor demonstrates respect for diversity and individual needs
- Non-verbal behaviors that may communicate intentional or unintentional messages
- Modeling of ethical behavior
- Qualitative aspects of the teaching/learning dynamic that may warrant further observations or consideration

V. **Student Feedback** – Seek student responses to the following questions:
- What do you find most helpful about this instructor’s teaching style?
- What suggestions do you have for improvements in this instructor’s teaching effectiveness?
- Additional questions that target particular concerns for which you are seeking feedback.

VI. **Other**
- In this section, add any other information or feedback that reflects your unique approach to the observation process.

VII. **Post-Observation Dialogue and Exploration**
- Summarize the *major* highlights of the observation, including both positive and negative features.
- Draw conclusions about the instructor’s overall abilities to convey content knowledge, develop skills, and promote dispositions that will help students develop competence.
- Target any specific areas that require remediation, mentoring, or further professional development.

VIII. **Recommendations**
- Recommendations for how the college or specific programs might use this instructor’s techniques as models of “best practices” should be highlighted.
- Any noted deficiencies or “trouble spots” should be aligned with specific, helpful suggestions for improvements or professional growth opportunities.

*Be sure to include your name and title somewhere on the observation, whether submitted in memo or letter format.*

IX. **Faculty Member’s Reflections and Response**
The Faculty member being observed should record written comments in response to the observation within one week of receiving the feedback. Comments might include reactions, insights, commentary, elaboration or clarification or issues needing attention, possible actions to be taken, further work to be done, etc.
Considerations for Evaluating Teaching in Clinical Placements

While the criteria for good teaching are universal, faculty teaching in school-university partnerships, professional development schools (PDSs), and clinical internship sites face a unique set of circumstances that must be taken into account when their teaching is evaluated for promotion and tenure.

Since some of their teaching time is released for site coordination, teachers at clinical sites often teach fewer students than those in traditional programs. In addition, faculty who coordinate clinical sites often see the same students in more than one class, making the total number of students who evaluate them even smaller. Faculty who teach or supervise in partnership with site-based faculty or clinicians work within contexts where the teaching environment, assessment, and other factors are not completely within their control, even though they may be the instructor of record in a class. For faculty engaged in clinical supervision of student teachers or counselor education students, curricula, course syllabi, "classroom meetings," and assessments may look very different than they do in the traditional classroom.

Single evaluation instruments make it difficult to isolate the instructional components of collaborative teaching models. For example, instructors in the teacher education programs who supervise PDS sites with a school-based instructor have repeatedly found that no matter how carefully they instruct their students to evaluate only the university faculty member, students tend to see their site coordinators as a matched pair and to think of both instructors when filling out evaluations. Similarly, counselor education students may assess the quality of their internship in relation to the quality of supervision received at their internship site in addition to the course instructor’s teaching and supervision.

Finally, it is important to be mindful of the multiple roles played by faculty members teaching in rigorous clinical programs. Students in intensive clinical programs provide feedback in the context of program coordination, multiple-course workload pressures, the culture and climate of the field site, sociological factors in the field site community, and peer group dynamics. Even though “teacher” is the role that is being evaluated, it may be very difficult for students to separate that role from those of coordinator, liaison, manager, collaborator, clarifier, leader, and negotiator – to name a few of the multiple roles played by clinical faculty members.
Clinical Course Evaluation

(An adaptation of the standard USM course evaluation instrument)

1. How prepared was the instructor for class?
2. How clearly were the clinical objectives/outcomes articulated?
3. How clearly were the assignments and expectations articulated?
4. How much were the students encouraged to think for themselves?
5. How well did the instructor model the qualities of a good teacher?
6. How open was the instructor to feedback and other viewpoints?
7. Did the instructor show respect for the questions, concerns, and opinions of students?
8. How clearly were the roles of supervisors and supervisees articulated?
9. How well did the instructor provide for reflective learning opportunities in the clinical experience?
10. Did the instructor inspire confidence in his/her knowledge and expertise related to the clinical experience?
11. How genuinely concerned was the instructor with the students’ progress?
12. What was the quality of the feedback given for professional improvement?
13. Was adequate time provided for supervision?
14. Did the instructor model best professional practices?
15. Overall, how would you rate the instructor?
16. How would you rate the way content knowledge, professional skills, and dispositions have been integrated into the clinical experience?
17. Did the clinical experience provide a safe environment in which professional risk-taking was possible?
18. Did you develop significant skills in the field as a result of this course?
19. What is your overall rating of the primary textbooks used in this clinical experience?
20. How did the workload for this course compare to others of equal credit?
21. How fair were the grading procedures?
22. What is your overall rating of this course?