



COLLEGE OF LETTERS AND SCIENCE
DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC

ONE SHIELDS AVENUE
DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616-8571

26 February 2014

Professor Bruno Nachtergaele
Chair, Academic Senate
University of California, Davis

Dear Bruno,

I hereby submit the report of the Special Work Group on Recognizing Teaching in Merits and Promotions. We met four times between October 2013 and February 2014 to discuss a range of issues relating to the evaluation of teaching and to explore ways in which superior teaching might be made to have a greater weight in the merit and promotion process. At our first meeting we devised a questionnaire that was distributed to all members of the Academic Senate. The unexpectedly large response to this survey is one indication of how important teaching is on this campus.

The members of this Work Group included numerous winners of distinguished teaching awards and the UC Davis Prize for Undergraduate Teaching and Research, and also many former members of CAP. This is to say that the committee was well formed to discuss the place of teaching in merits and promotions. The committee members demonstrated their desire to improve the standing of teaching on our campus in our meetings, in hundreds of emails, and in their contributions in writing the final report.

Our meetings also included visits from others who were in a position to help us formulate our report. These included Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs Maureen Stanton, Marco Molinaro (assistant to Acting Vice-Provost of Undergraduate Education, Carolyn de la Peña), Professor Kenneth Verosub, and Professor Susan Stover, School of Veterinary Medicine. Additionally, Gina Anderson surveyed the Executive Directors at other UC campuses and found that similar initiatives had occurred recently at UC Berkeley and UC San Diego.

Thank you very much for the invitation to be a part of this group.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chris", written in a cursive style.

Christopher Reynolds
Professor of Music

February 26, 2014

Report of the Special Work Group on Recognizing Teaching in Merits and Promotions

OUR CHARGE

In the fall of 2013, Bruno Nachtergaele, the chair of the Academic Senate, established a Faculty Work Group to study the role of teaching in the faculty merit and promotion process. The Work Group was charged with making recommendations aimed at assisting individual faculty members, department chairs, and other participants in the faculty review process to recognize and reward superior teaching. Embedded in his invitation to serve was the hope that the Work Group could play a role in raising the profile of teaching on the campus, in improving current methods used in the evaluation of teaching, and in encouraging the effective documentation of meritorious teaching in any and all of its forms.

This charge arose because Chair Nachtergaele had heard repeatedly from colleagues that accomplishments in teaching are not sufficiently recognized in the merit and promotion process. We take it as a given that this is not due to an inherent shortcoming of our personnel process, which is designed to evaluate achievements in three areas: (i) research, creative work, and scholarship, (ii) service, and (iii) teaching. But there is a consensus that the first area plays a leading role in determining advancement, especially for promotions. This does not mean, however, that the other areas should not be given due attention. In particular, we agree that the importance of superior teaching and mentoring, as well as significant contributions to the development of a curriculum, should be reflected in the final outcomes of the peer review process.

PROCESS

This committee has met several times between October 2013 and January 2014, and in the process we have become aware of two parallel initiatives running simultaneously: Marco Molinaro (assistant to Acting Vice-Provost of Undergraduate Education, Carolyn de la Peña) is working on ways to improve the evaluation of teaching large classes; and a special committee is promoting the recognition of effective teaching in merits and promotions in Veterinary Medicine, chaired by Professor Susan Stover. This simultaneous activity suggests that there is across campus both a need for more serious consideration of teaching and a broad-based desire to achieve some positive change. The desire to make teaching count more significantly in merits and promotions is shared by the leadership of the Academic Senate, by Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs Maureen Stanton, and by all members of this special committee, which includes multiple teaching award winners and several former chairs of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP).

One of our first steps was to devise a survey to measure campus sentiment on this issue. We have considered the 1991 Report of the Universitywide Task Force on Faculty Rewards, chaired by Professor Karl Pister (the “Pister Report”), and also various modes of peer review and teaching

evaluation at some comparable institutions. We also began with a reminder of what the APM directs CAP to consider in merits and promotions:

The review committee shall judge the candidate with respect to the proposed rank and duties, considering the record of the candidate's performance in (1) teaching, (2) research and other creative work, (3) professional activity, and (4) University and public service. In evaluating the candidate's qualifications within these areas, the review committee shall exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing when the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another.

Teaching is the first criterion mentioned; and while the second sentence allows for those whose strengths are in research to do less teaching, the balance intended refer to "commitments and responsibilities," not to quality (i.e., great research should not balance bad teaching).

HISTORY

We supply the following four quotations from the Pister Report as a way of endorsing them and renewing our commitment to views that are as relevant now as they were in 1991:

(Pg. 4) The "scholarship of teaching" moves well beyond the commonly accepted notion of the teacher as a classroom performer, or as a tutor of a single individual, for the mere transmission of knowledge. Teaching incorporates these activities but is concerned more broadly with the synthesis and extension of knowledge, i.e., the transformation of knowledge. It is self-evident that much of what constitutes the scholarship of teaching goes on outside the classroom or student-faculty conference.

(Pg. 7) The University's ability to encourage and reward effective teaching requires the development of efforts both to assess the strength of each faculty member's teaching and to encourage programs at the departmental level and elsewhere that focus faculty on teaching and underscore its importance in the University. These efforts must be conducted in a supportive, collegial atmosphere where the purposes are (1) to help faculty achieve a high level of accomplishment in their teaching and (2) to ensure that faculty who have demonstrated effective teaching are rewarded.

(Pg. 11) The consequences of narrowing the focus of scholarly activity on the scholarship of discovery at the expense of teaching, integration, and application of knowledge are twofold: The broad mission of the University is unevenly supported by its faculty while, at the same time, the evolution of the career paths of individual faculty is likely to be impaired. The evidence for this is strong, particularly among junior faculty who find insufficient time and little encouragement to engage fully in the scholarship of teaching and in University and public service. Habits gained at the beginning of a faculty career are not easily changed—witness the relatively low level of the senior faculty's participation in shared governance at the level of the college, school, or campus. Finally, if the scholarship of teaching is to be restored to its proper place, it follows directly that

peer evaluation of teaching must be pursued with the same level of enthusiasm and dedication now afforded peer evaluation of research.

(Pgs. 12-13) While teaching has remained prominent in the formal statement of the criteria, the proper evaluation of and reward for superior intellectual attainment in the realm of teaching, as broadly described in the APM, have been slighted. Documentation and evaluation of meritorious achievement in teaching requires a level of faculty effort well beyond current practice. We urge that peer evaluation of teaching be given the same emphasis now given to peer evaluation of research.

SUMMARY OF THE SURVEY

Our survey of faculty views on the place of teaching in merits and promotions is attached as Appendix 1. A tally of the responses to those questions appears as Appendix 2. And a representative sample of written responses follows as Appendix 3.

The responses support both of the following assertions: 1) teaching is not valued enough in merits and promotions; and 2) research should be weighted more than teaching in the faculty review process. We comment on both categories below:

1) Teaching is not valued enough in merits and promotions:

Of respondents in this group, the majority singled out problems with both student and peer evaluations. Many expressed concern about the weight accorded student evaluations, questioning what they can tell us about quality, relevance, currency, and effectiveness of teaching. Some expressed the idea that student evaluations are popularity contests that pressure faculty to simplify the curriculum. Many urged the development of a better system to assess teaching. A small number also mentioned peer review as unreliable because it tends to be perfunctory and positively biased. Suggestions include having the CETL do assessments, measuring learning outcomes, reviewing both curriculum development and the incorporation of innovative teaching methods.

A large number of respondents indicated the need to assess teaching in a wide variety of contexts, pointing to graduate teaching and mentoring as being largely ignored in the current system. A smaller number pointed to the need to evaluate the relationship between teaching and research, suggesting the importance of rewarding hands-on opportunities for research being integrated into teaching.

A significant number voiced concerns that bad teaching rarely has consequences, nor does inaccessibility to students. Some suggested rewarding teaching as a way to get faculty to invest in teaching.

2) Research should be weighted more than teaching:

Most respondents voicing this opinion felt that teaching cannot be accurately assessed. They pointed to quantifiable assessments of research as more certain. Some felt that the

impact of research is far greater than the impact of teaching and that bad teaching did not have as negative an impact as lack of research.

There were a few comments that could not be easily summarized in the above categories, but that raised important concerns. One concern was the lack of attention to diversity issues in the evaluation of teaching. Others commented on increasing teaching workloads and a simultaneous devaluing of teaching.

Excellence in teaching appears to be better appreciated in the review process within the department than it is once a merit/promotion file leaves the department. That is the conclusion suggested by the quite different responses to questions no. 4 and no. 5. Regarding appreciation for teaching within the department, approximately 52% answer positively to the departmental recognition of teaching, with about 37% answering negatively. In contrast the perception is reversed for the appreciation of teaching by non-departmental reviews: about 20% agree and 50% disagree.

The survey was useful in articulating the need for more serious peer review to supplement the student evaluations, and also for there to be greater rewards for teaching. The committee notes the importance of changing evaluation procedures for teaching by establishing guidelines for review, and also the need to change the campus culture, which for too long has treated the perfunctory evaluation of teaching quality as acceptable. The response to question #8 was most indicative of a large majority of faculty favoring such a change:

8. Evidence of exceptional teaching quality should be treated on a par with outstanding research contributions in the consideration of a faculty member's accelerated advancement.

Faculty agreeing or strongly agreeing were approximately 64% of respondents; those opposed or strongly opposed to this statement were approximately 27%.

Regarding the assertion that research should be weighted more than teaching, the committee notes that there is no support for this view in the APM (quoted above on pg. 1), which explicitly notes the separate categories for evaluation without favoring one over the other.

PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

While we recognize the limitations of peer reviews, we believe that they can be a valuable tool in providing a different perspective on teaching than the one offered by students. Peer reviews should serve as a counter-weight to students' evaluations and strive for accuracy and constructive criticism. Detailed description, accurate observations of classroom interactions, a review of course materials, and constructive remarks aimed at improving teaching are all key attributes of a peer review process that will be more persuasive than the familiar rhetoric of collegial praise. In particular, course syllabi and materials should be part of the review to ensure that course contents are up-to-date. A post-observation discussion is encouraged to provide feedback about the dynamics of the observed class, and to allow both the instructor and the reviewers to gain a better understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the course and the

instructor. In this respect, the peer review process should be viewed as a dynamic one aimed at improving student outcomes for departments and programs.

Each college should develop templates and standards for conducting peer reviews of faculty teaching in a variety of educational settings. These should as much as possible be descriptive to allow the reader to make an evaluation. Assistant professors should be evaluated regularly, and the evaluations should involve more than one colleague. A possible template for adaptation by units on campus is included as Appendix 4, the evaluation form from the psychology department of the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Despite their all-too-obvious flaws, student evaluations provide insight into classroom perceptions and can be a useful tool for assessing teaching, especially in extreme cases. Even in average student evaluations, student comments often reveal a patterned response indicative of dynamics in the classroom. In this respect they are important, but require careful interpretation. Student evaluations must provide each student with an opportunity to submit narrative responses. It is in the students' written comments that the true nature of a student's feelings about a course or an instructor reveals itself.

Teaching evaluation forms should include these three questions:

1. What did you like best (or: find most effective) about this course (include both class and labs/sections)?
2. What did you like least (or: find least effective) about this course, and what suggestions do you have for improving it?
3. What did you find most challenging?

Unlike conventional multiple choice evaluation questions, these questions require a written response, and faculty who have used them find the answers they generate to be thoughtful and much more likely to be constructive. These are meant to supplement rather than replace multiple choice questions.

We understand that the idea that student evaluations should be made mandatory of every student in every course is a controversial matter; indeed, while many in our group favor this action, at least one member is strongly opposed. Therefore, while we as a group will not take a stand on the issue, we believe that the campus should consider it. Now that our method of student evaluations will involve online feedback from students, there is a vehicle to make 100% response feasible. It is thus possible to tie a student's submission of a course evaluation and instructor to the release of his/her grade in the course. Without the full response from the students taking a given course, it is not possible to quell the suspicions of bias in one direction or the other. We recommend that the Academic Senate schedule a discussion of this issue, perhaps in the form of a town-hall meeting, and that the Senate follow up on that discussion with a vote of the Representative Assembly on a resolution to require mandatory student evaluations of all courses offered at UC Davis.

We strongly agree that it is wrong to construe scholarship as something that happens only in a lab or in professional publications. Effective teaching is one of the principal means of demonstrating intellectual achievement. The failure to adequately recognize and reward teaching is therefore a product of a view of scholarship that is too narrow.

TARGETED RECOMMENDATIONS

Because of the complexity of the issues involved in evaluating teaching, and because of the enormous effort it takes to shift a campus culture even a little, we offer the following targeted recommendations to specific groups involved in the evaluation of teaching: dean and college executive committees, members of CAP and FPCs, the central administration and departmental chairs, and our faculty colleagues. Improving the consideration of teaching in merits and promotions will not happen without improving the evaluation of teaching; improving the evaluation of teaching will not happen without a concerted effort from everyone involved with teaching: faculty, chairs, and administrators.

For deans and college executive committees:

- Each school and college should establish its own awards for excellence in teaching and mentoring. This has already been done in the College of Biological Sciences, where there is a mentoring and teaching prize:
http://biosci.ucdavis.edu/the_college/awards_and_fellowships.html. Moreover, in the School of Veterinary Medicine there are two new awards, one that will acknowledge innovation in teaching, and another for leadership in teaching and mentoring. In the College of Letters & Science, this could also be done at the divisional level. Establishing such awards will require setting in place a nominations process and a vetting group, whether a new committee or an existing college or divisional committee. An important by-product of expanding the number of teaching awards on campus is to increase the number of people whose teaching has been documented as extraordinarily worthy, a welcome added tool in the campus's effort to recognize outstanding performance in teaching and related activities. This is also a relatively simple way to raise the visibility of superior teaching and teachers in our midst.
- The possibility that these college teaching awards could be modestly endowed, either in the name of a donor or an outstanding teacher, should also be encouraged.

For the administration, officers of the academic senate, and departmental chairs:

- Guidelines and forms for peer reviews (such as that in Appendix 4) should be developed, either at the college level, or by the Provost's Office, and they should be posted on all relevant campus websites.
- Student evaluations should include some form of the three questions suggested above.
- The academic senate should arrange for a senate discussion, perhaps in the form of a town-hall meeting, of whether or not all courses should require student evaluations from all students in all classes.

- Efforts to experiment in teaching should be supported, possibly by providing funding for a post-doc or graduate assistant. Supporting innovative teaching by reducing the course load should be avoided except in rare cases when the degree of time required is extraordinary.
- Assistant Professors should be evaluated regularly, and peer evaluations should involve more than one colleague.
- Buyouts from teaching should be limited.

For faculty members:

- Faculty members should take the time and effort to nominate colleagues for teaching awards. We note that many departments have multiple award winners (Geography, History, and Evolution & Ecology, for example) and others have none. Every award requires both an excellent teacher and an altruistic colleague willing to undertake the nomination.
- For merits and promotions the candidate's statement should spell out all efforts to innovate and experiment in teaching. The candidate's statement has several levels of readers, first of all one's own colleagues who may otherwise be unaware of individual initiatives.
- Faculty need to take peer reviews more seriously than is now the case. Honest and detailed description of methods and materials should be emphasized over predictably enthusiastic praise.

For CAP and FPCs our recommendations are primarily to be aware of the ways in which existing policy supports rewards for teaching:

- Any teaching award constitutes the sort of outstanding achievement that could be used as the principal motivation for an acceleration. This is spelled out in CAP's own committee guidelines: "Accelerated actions are considered exceptional and should be requested only when the evidence shows outstanding accomplishments in one job performance area with good, i.e., expected, achievements in the other required areas." This indicates that a faculty member with outstanding achievements in teaching along with expected achievements in research and service deserves consideration for an accelerated advancement.
- The importance of rewarding efforts to promote diversity is made explicit in APM. 210-1.d-(1), which states: "Teaching, research, professional and public service contributions that promote diversity and equal opportunity are to be encouraged and given recognition in the evaluation of the candidate's qualifications."
- Distinctions between kinds of teaching also matter. APM210-1.d-(1) recognizes that "the committee should pay due attention to the variety of demands placed on instructors by the types of teaching called for in various disciplines and at various levels, and should judge the total performance of the candidate with proper reference to assigned teaching responsibilities."

Additionally, we urge that

- teaching activities be understood to include mentoring and curricular development;
- creativity and innovation in teaching be rewarded.

Finally, we ask that the Chair of the Academic Senate, together with the Provost, accept this report and support its implementation.

David Biale

Chris Calvert

Rick Grosberg

Ines Hernandez-Avila

Ahmet Palazoglu

Christopher Reynolds, chair

Francisco Samaniego

Julia Simon

Abigail Thompson

Appendix 1: Questionnaire on the Evaluation of Teaching and its Role in Faculty Advancement

Please respond to each question below with a numeral in the range 1–5, where 1 represents “strongly disagree,” 3 represents “neither agree nor disagree,” and 5 represents “strongly agree.” You are welcome to add your written comments on any of these questions, or on other issues you wish to bring to the attention of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Recognition of Teaching in Faculty Advancement, after answering the eight questions below.

1. Our present methods of evaluating teaching are effective in capturing faculty effort and performance in the classroom.

1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__

2. Student evaluation of teaching is an essential component in the assessment of teaching quality.

1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__

3. Peer evaluation of teaching is an essential component in the assessment of teaching quality.

1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__

4. In my experience, my department’s faculty merit/promotion process properly assesses the quality of a candidate’s performance in teaching-related activities.

1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__

5. In my experience, the extra-departmental faculty merit/promotion process properly assesses the quality of a candidate’s performance in teaching-related activities.

1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__

6. In the faculty merit and promotion process, student evaluations of teaching are given too much weight in assessing the quality of a candidate’s teaching.

1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__

7. Personnel committees charged with evaluating faculty achievement place too much weight on a faculty member’s research accomplishments and not enough weight on teaching performance.

1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__

8. Evidence of teaching of exceptional quality should be treated on a par with outstanding research contributions in the consideration of a faculty member’s accelerated advancement.

1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__

Comments (Please share your thoughts on any of the questions above or on any other issues related to the assessment of the quality of a faculty member's teaching, including, if you wish, the treatment of contributions to mentoring students and to curricular development):

Appendix 2: Survey Results

Questionnaire on the Evaluation of Teaching and its Role in Faculty Advancement

Please respond to each question below. You are welcome to add your written comments on any of these questions, or on other issues you wish to bring to the attention of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Recognition of Teaching in Faculty Advancement, after answering the eight questions below.

1. Our present methods of evaluating teaching are effective in capturing faculty effort and performance in the classroom.

	Total	Percentage
1. Strongly Agree	20	3.945%
2. Agree	146	28.797%
3. No Opinion	56	11.045%
4. Disagree	200	39.448%
5. Strongly Disagree	85	16.765%
Total	507	100%

2. Student evaluation of teaching is an essential component in the assessment of teaching quality.

1. Strongly Agree	98	19.216%
2. Agree	300	58.824%
3. No Opinion	25	4.902%
4. Disagree	70	13.725%
5. Strongly Disagree	17	3.333%
Total	510	100%

3. Peer evaluation of teaching is an essential component in the assessment of teaching quality.

1. Strongly Agree	128	25.098%
2. Agree	285	55.882%
3. No Opinion	52	10.196%
4. Disagree	37	7.255%
5. Strongly Disagree	8	1.569%
Total	510	100%

4. In my experience, my department's faculty merit/promotion process properly assesses the quality of a candidate's performance in teaching-related activities.

1. Strongly Agree	46	9.037%
2. Agree	219	43.026%
3. No Opinion	53	10.413%
4. Disagree	142	27.898%
5. Strongly Disagree	49	9.627%
Total	509	100%

Questionnaire on the Evaluation of Teaching and its Role in Faculty Advancement (pg. 2)

5. In my experience, the extra-departmental faculty merit/promotion process properly assesses the quality of a candidate's performance in teaching-related activities.

	Total	Percentage
1. Strongly Agree	14	2.783%
2. Agree	88	17.495%
3. No Opinion	149	29.622%
4. Disagree	169	33.598%
5. Strongly Disagree	83	16.501%
Total	503	100%

6. In the faculty merit and promotion process, student evaluations of teaching are given too much weight in assessing the quality of a candidate's teaching.

1. Strongly Agree	99	19.412%
2. Agree	160	31.373%
3. No Opinion	87	17.059%
4. Disagree	142	27.843%
5. Strongly Disagree	22	4.314%
Total	510	100%

7. Personnel committees charged with evaluating faculty achievement place too much weight on a faculty member's research accomplishments and not enough weight on teaching performance.

1. Strongly Agree	101	19.843%
2. Agree	154	30.255%
3. No Opinion	82	16.110%
4. Disagree	127	24.951%
5. Strongly Disagree	45	8.841%
Total	509	100%

8. Evidence of exceptional teaching quality should be treated on a par with outstanding research contributions in the consideration of a faculty member's accelerated advancement.

1. Strongly Agree	143	28.094%
2. Agree	184	36.149%
3. No Opinion	42	8.251%
4. Disagree	108	21.218%
5. Strongly Disagree	32	6.287%
Total	509	100%

Appendix 3: Sample of Responses to the Questionnaire. Here follows a sample of the responses. The committee was struck by the unexpectedly large number of thoughtful responses to the invitation to write comments. The answers fill nearly 40 pages.

Representative sample:

Teaching is essentially a non-issue in my department for merits and promotions unless the student ratings are truly awful. But there is no systemic incentive to improve courses or teaching that is currently “adequate.”

Most of the questions on student evaluations are phrased as consumer satisfaction matters, rather than whether students have acquired the skills/knowledge the course was designed to help them acquire. The false precision of numbers distilled from evaluations encourages committees to make all kinds of comparisons and conclusions that are probably not sound.

Students' evaluations of courses and peer observations of teaching completely neglect the considerable out-of-classroom instruction and mentorship that many faculty engage in. My department may recognize that I spent 10+ hours per week in small group training of undergraduates in advanced research internships, but it is not at all clear that FPC or CAP recognizes such essential contributions to training. For them, all that appear to matter are number of courses taught and classroom evaluations.

Mentoring post-docs is not given enough consideration, nor is curricular development. I think it is also important to have standardized questions for student evaluation of teaching (as the Academic Senate is now requiring). This allows for a fair comparison of instructors across the campus.

We are a top research institution and we have to maintain this status. Excellence in teaching should be encouraged and teaching faculty/lecturers that strive for this should be hired. However, under no circumstances should teaching be given an equal weighting to research, as our status, funding, prestige and power to influence public policy depends on the latter.

I've also ready probably 400 peer teaching letters and have seen only one or two that don't say: “Prof. X is a fine talented teacher.” This subject of teaching quality just begs for statistics. We need document the average performance and then identify truly exceptional efforts. Now we just us anecdotal evidence.

Teaching at UC Davis receives a much higher weight than at most other research universities, something to be proud of.

The part of teaching/education which is not properly weighted in the advancement process is course design, course development and course material (lecture notes, labs, homework assignments) generation. Too much emphasis is placed on in-class performance, not enough on the development of new courses or of material for existing courses. Although I think teaching is an important component of faculty performance, I would be reluctant to place it quite on par with research.

As the chair or member of several committees to examine innovative teaching approaches in the CA&ES, at UC Davis campus-wide, and at UC systemwide, I repeatedly encounter the observation from faculty and administrators that teaching plays too small a role in advancement. One provost declared that in the UC system, teaching is a spiritual exercise. Consequently, very few faculty are willing to devote the time and resources (the university does NOT provide most of the hardware or software required) to adopt innovative teaching approaches.

I happen to love research, and I focus most of my efforts upon it, but given that this is a public university with an obligation to prepare students for work and citizenship, I think that at minimum faculty should be allowed to request (perhaps when they first start at the university) that their teaching assessment be more heavily weighted than usual—and that assessment should be based less on student evaluations (though that should be one component) than on peer evaluation and/or outcome-based assessments.

Additional criteria for teaching should be used: a) lab courses, if there is direct involvement of the faculty instructor, should be weighed more heavily; b) lectures with extra features, like term paper, should also be weighed more. An additional item to check is whether the faculty has engaged in activities to improve his/her teaching, like participating in CETL activities or has introduced new teaching tools or approaches. Usually college and campus personnel committee only parrot the departmental letter. So pressure to increase attention to teaching should be directed at the departments. My chair does not pay much attention to teaching quality beyond the student evaluations.

Our heavy emphasis on student evaluation at UCD allows us to identify negligence (e.g. professor isn't showing up etc.) and popularity (e.g. is the professor friendly and approachable?). It does not capture the thoughtfulness or rigor associated with a dedication to learning. For example, I could ask my students to go through numerous drafts of a given writing assignment. My evaluations would likely suffer—they'd hate it—but they would also hopefully improve their ability to reflect and revise their own writing in the process. I've had similar experiences with the peer-review of my teaching. Other faculty are easily able to gauge that I give clear, organized lectures and that the students like me. They can also evaluate if the material is pitched at the right level and if students are engaged during lecture. However, they often don't assess my exams, how discussion sections are structured, or even the approaches I'm using to generate discussion during lecture. I easily spend as much time thinking and working on the latter as I do on the initial lecture. When I reflect on my own abilities as an instructor, I give weight to all of these components, yet my merit and promotion packages rarely reflect the depth of my commitment to this or my skill in executing it. I think instead of student or faculty evaluation, assessment by an outside party, similar to those that the Teaching and Resource Center offers, would be extremely valuable. I think it would serve two purposes. Firstly, it would mean that folks with dedicated training would evaluate the entire offering and secondly, would benefit the instructors.

Peer evaluation and student evaluation of teaching are both important, but student evaluation, if done properly, is more important. We should nonetheless strive to do both well. Our campus, appropriately, has recently devoted considerable energy toward figuring out effective and meaningful ways of administering and interpreting student evaluations, and that process should continue. But a similar process should be developed for modeling peer evaluations. One or two visits to one or two classes by one or two departmental colleagues, who are no more knowledgeable about effective methods of teaching than the candidate is, does not constitute meaningful peer evaluation.

Question #8 asks if exceptional teaching should be taken into account with excellent research for accelerated advancement. I think that exceptional teaching should also be taken into account for ordinary advancement, provided that evidence of continued research is also available. Too often, ordinary merits are denied solely because of “insufficient” research productivity, regardless of whether a candidate's teaching is outstanding or not. There really isn't an attempt to balance research teaching, and service in the merit and promotion process, despite the lip service given to it by Deans.

Our culture is that research has primacy, and this will be difficult to overcome even in cases in which someone benefits the University and students via curricular development or heroic classroom teaching. In part this is because good teaching is expected. However, exceptional teaching should be rewarded in cases where the effort goes beyond the ‘normal’ teaching load. Perhaps members of the faculty could identify ‘Exceptional Teaching Effort’ in the dossier, articulating why the effort was an overload and how

it benefited students and programs. This kind of effort could be counted on the same level as a publication. There will always be some individuals who refuse to honor teaching, but perhaps a higher committee could check more closely for these exceptional efforts and discount reviews that do not seem to take them into account.

Along with usual seminars, etc., I teach two large enrollment classes (>200 students each), both of which I created from scratch, are interdisciplinary, and use no textbooks. I bring cutting edge information to the classroom from my discipline via meetings, journals, etc., and am creative and progressive with respect to use of new digital technology in the classroom and online. Although my teaching evals are respectable, students do not seem to differentiate the challenges of teaching these sort of courses relative to say gateway courses with mature pedagogies, textbooks, workbooks, and material that is used in every similar course across the country. Yet when my teaching is evaluated relative to any number of colleagues who often teach standard courses with 25 to 40 students, it seems to make zero difference in either the scale of course or the type in the merit evaluation—the only thing that shows up is the average course eval for the course. Whereas the average faculty in my dept teaches around 450 credit hrs/year, I teach over 1,500 credit hours I have one colleague who teaches a small field course involving 8-10 students. He receives fantastic evaluations as might be expected. I teach 1,500 credit hours and am criticized since students are not raving about some of my teaching. I am a step IX professor (due to my research program primarily) so my teaching has not hindered my merits including many accelerations. But the ridiculous system of evaluating teaching here at UCD has bothered me a great deal at every step. I applaud the committee's efforts to try to improve the evaluation system for teaching. With all this said, I DO NOT support the idea that superior teaching at a research university should be used to offset a weak research program.

The weakest aspect of evaluating teaching and curriculum development is the almost absence of honest peer review.

UC Davis is a leading Research University and not a Liberal Arts College. The balancing of teaching and research achievements in the personnel process needs to properly reflect this.

We are a public university. We exist to serve the students. Research is critical to good teaching. But good teaching is critical to the public mission. We need far more value placed on teaching in merits and promotions than currently is the case.

This is a very important topic and worthy of time spent on it by an Ad Hoc committee. In my opinion teaching has never been on a par with research in the evaluation for merit and promotion and in our school and therefore many faculty make choices to put their efforts into those things that bring rewards. This is something that we are wrestling with as a school as are bringing in a new curriculum where some faculty are putting many hours both in design and implementation to get this correct with little rewards from all their time and effort. To this end our Executive Committee established an ad hoc committee which is titled “SVM Teaching Effort and Recognition Task Force.” The EC said “The implementation of the School’s new curriculum has resulted in a significant change in the traditional instructional roles and responsibilities of faculty in the School.” Specifically, significant changes include the assignment of some faculty as leaders overseeing team-taught curricular blocks, and the utilization of other faculty as “facilitators” in small group learning sessions with students. As a result, there has been concern expressed over how teaching can be best evaluated and recorded so that faculty merit and promotions packets properly reflect teaching effort and performance.

Appendix 4: Peer review questions of the Department of Psychology, University of Wisconsin, Madison (<https://tle.wisc.edu/teaching-academy/peer/psychology>)

Evaluation of Teaching

Name of Instructor

Date

Course number and name

Name of evaluator

1. Please write a brief non-evaluative description of the class you visited. Was it a large lecture, a small class, or a discussion? What material was covered? What methods were used to present the material (e.g., lecture? slides? dialogue between instructor and students?) How was the time apportioned?

2. Please write an evaluation of this class session. Your evaluation should include responses to the following questions:

a) How well was the material organized?

b) How clearly was it presented?

c) Did the instructor have a thorough knowledge of the material?

d) Was the material presented up-to-date?

e) Did the instructor encourage critical thinking?

f) Was time well utilized?

g) Did the instructor communicate enthusiasm and interest in the subject?

h) If discussion took place, how well did the instructor moderate it?

i) How did the instructor respond to students' questions and comments?

j) Were faculty-student interactions lively and interesting?

3. Please write an evaluation of the syllabus and any other written materials (e.g., exams) that you considered. Your evaluation should include responses to the following questions:

a) Does the syllabus set out clear learning objectives for the course?

b) Is the syllabus well-organized and well-conceptualized?

c) Is the instructor covering the major areas that should be covered in this course?

d) Does the syllabus make clear the basis for grading?