

TEACHER EVALUATION AND TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS II

A Report by the Committee of Eleven

to the

University of Arizona Faculty Senate

August, 1981

James R. Anthony
Shirley Nickols Fahey, Chairperson*
Rebecca Kellogg
Mary Z. Maher
W. Gerald Matlock
Howard Morrison
Arlene Putt*
Franklin D. Rollins
Oliver Sigworth
Ron St. John
Cornelius Steelink
Marlys H. Witte
David Woloshin*
Charles Zukoski

*Member of the Subcommittee on Teacher Evaluation and Teaching Effectiveness

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
Limitations	1
Background	1
SURVEY OF FACULTY	2
SURVEY OF DEPARTMENT HEADS	7
SURVEY OF DEANS	14
UNIVERSITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROMOTION AND TENURE	19
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	20
Graduate Assistants in Teaching	20
Recommendations	21
Improvement of Instruction	21
Recommendations	22
The Reward System	23
Recommendations	24
Implementation	26
Recommendations	26
APPENDICES	
Appendix A. Memorandum regarding promotion and tenure guidelines	27
Appendix B. Sample listing of methods for documenting teaching quality	35

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1	Summary of Responses to Faculty Survey	4
2	Summary of Responses to Department Head Survey	10
3	Summary of Responses to Dean's Survey	16

INTRODUCTION

In a letter dated December 21, 1978, President John Schaefer requested that "the Committee of Eleven undertake a study of the question of teacher evaluation and teaching effectiveness of our faculty." This request was in response to widespread concern for quality teaching in the University community and appeals to the Faculty Senate by various student organizations including Students Older Than Average (SOTA).

Limitations

While the Committee of Eleven fully recognizes and agrees with the critical importance of research and service as other basic functions of the University, the charge to the Committee from Dr. Schaefer was to study teacher evaluation and teaching effectiveness. Thus, the Committee has limited its study to: (1) the teaching function of the University; (2) undergraduate classes of twenty or more students; and (3) standard classroom teaching situations.

Teaching that occurs in non-standard classroom settings, such as in laboratories or the performing arts and sciences, and teaching that occurs on an individual basis will require different techniques for evaluation of its effectiveness. The Committee encourages teachers and departments involved in such non-typical teaching endeavors to find ways to evaluate the quality of the instruction regularly each semester and to reward excellent teaching in appropriate ways.

Background

A preliminary Teacher Evaluation and Teaching Effectiveness report to the Faculty Senate (see Faculty Senate minutes of September 8, 1980) reviewed a survey of department heads (or deans, in the case of single-department colleges), summarized the Committee of Eleven deliberations to date and provided a set of recommendations. Reactions by members of the Faculty Senate to the report indicated the need for additional systematic information from

college deans and members of the faculty, groups which have a strong interest in the mechanisms for evaluating, improving and rewarding teaching efforts. The Committee of Eleven subsequently met with the President and college deans and following that discussion, two additional questionnaires were prepared to obtain additional information. The three surveys are described below.

SURVEY OF FACULTY

In November, 1980, a questionnaire was prepared and distributed to faculty holding academic rank at the University through a general university mailing. This questionnaire was designed to assess: (1) faculty perception of the effectiveness of the rewards for good teaching at the University; (2) opinions about evaluating teaching effectiveness; and (3) relative weight faculty members believe should be given to teaching versus research and service in the University's reward system. The number of responses to the questionnaire was 1,141. The University determination of the number of faculty with academic rank is 1,864, giving a 61 percent return rate. Responses to the questionnaire are summarized in Table 1.

With respect to the perception of rewards for good teaching at either the departmental level or the University level, "Well rewarded" is the least frequent response selected, although more Professors believe teaching is well rewarded than do those at any other academic rank. Overall, the most frequent response is "Occasionally" for rewards at the departmental level, with "Scarcely rewarded at all" running a close second. Responses to perceptions of the reward system at the University level indicate that 50 percent of those responding believe that teaching is scarcely rewarded at all, with responses of "Occasionally" indicated by 43 percent of the respondents. Overall, only 7 percent of the faculty believe that teaching is well rewarded at the

University level. Again, those faculty with the rank of Professor give more positive responses about the reward system than do faculty at any other rank. More respondents perceive rewards at the department level than at the University level, perhaps because they are more aware of rewards in their department.

The question of whether some form of teacher evaluation should be required each semester is answered affirmatively by almost two-thirds (64%) of the respondents, with "Yes" answers increasing in frequency at each academic rank below Professor. However, even at the Professor rank more than half (55%) believe that teacher evaluation should be required.

From the list of methods for determining who is a good teacher, the most highly ranked method is some combination of the methods named in the questionnaire. This ranking is in accord with the view of the Committee of Eleven that teaching must be evaluated from a number of perspectives, including those of faculty peers and students. The alternative, "Written evaluations by students, other than the CIEQ*," is given the second-highest ranking. The lowest ranked method was "Evaluation by department heads." In contrast to the two preceding questions, all academic ranks rated the methods in about the same order.

More than three-fourths of the faculty responding believe that teaching should be rewarded equally with research and service, with few differences among faculty at different academic ranks.

General comments, requested at the end of the questionnaire, were included by 496 (43%) faculty members. The comments were sorted into 17 categories and

*Course Instruction and Evaluation Questionnaire

are listed under Question 6 (Table 1), followed by the number of comments in each category. An analysis of the views of those commenting on teacher evaluation was made by comparing answers to Question 3 ("Should some form of teacher evaluation be required each semester of all faculty?") with those who did or did not write comments. Of those who wrote comments, 39 percent answered "Yes" and 49 percent answered "No" to Question 3, indicating that a higher proportion of comments were made by those opposing teacher evaluation each semester than by those favoring it.

Table 1

Summary of Responses to Faculty Survey

1. In my perception of the reward system in my department, good teaching is well rewarded, rewarded occasionally, scarcely rewarded at all.

	<u>Well Rewarded (%)</u>		<u>Occasionally (%)</u>		<u>Scarcely (%)</u>	
Professors	144	(31)	202	(43)	122	(26)
Associate Professors	33	(13)	114	(45)	108	(42)
Assistant Professors	33	(16)	79	(39)	92	(45)
Lecturers	9	(9)	47	(48)	41	(42)
Instructors	9	(14)	18	(27)	39	(59)
Total	228	(21)	460	(42)	402	(37)

2. In my perception of the reward system of the University of Arizona, good teaching is well rewarded, rewarded occasionally, scarcely rewarded at all.

	<u>Well Rewarded (%)</u>		<u>Occasionally (%)</u>		<u>Scarcely (%)</u>	
Professors	50	(11)	224	(50)	177	(39)
Associate Professors	11	(4)	100	(39)	144	(56)
Assistant Professors	13	(6)	75	(36)	118	(57)
Lecturers	4	(4)	33	(34)	59	(61)
Instructors	2	(3)	28	(44)	33	(52)
Total	80	(7)	460	(43)	531	(50)

Table 1 (continued)

3. Should some form of teacher evaluation be required each semester of all faculty?

	<u>Yes (%)</u>	<u>No (%)</u>
Professors	254 (55)	210 (45)
Associate Professors	154 (64)	87 (36)
Assistant Professors	158 (74)	56 (26)
Lecturers	81 (75)	27 (25)
Instructors	53 (87)	8 (13)
Total	700 (64)	388 (36)

4. Ranking of methods to determine who is a good teacher from One (best) to Six.

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Methods</u>	<u>Rank Order Mean</u>	<u>Number of Faculty Ranking</u>
1	Combination of methods	2.23	663
2	Written evaluations by students other than CIEQ	2.31	812
3	CIEQ	2.64	751
4	Peer review of course description, exams, syllabi, etc.	2.81	771
5	Class visitation by faculty peers	2.87	767
6	Evaluation by department heads	3.43	717

5. I think teaching in the University of Arizona as a whole should be rewarded more than research or service, equally with research and service, less than research or service.

	<u>More than (%)</u>	<u>Equally (%)</u>	<u>Less than (%)</u>
Professors	48 (10)	366 (80)	45 (10)
Associate Professors	37 (15)	192 (75)	26 (10)
Assistant Professors	32 (15)	160 (76)	20 (9)
Lecturers	24 (24)	71 (72)	4 (4)
Instructors	14 (20)	56 (80)	- (0)
Total	155 (14)	845 (77)	95 (9)

Table 1 (continued)

-
6. General comments. Number of faculty commenting is given in parentheses.
1. Question 3 is poor, since it includes the qualification of evaluation "every semester." (58)
 2. Good teaching cannot be evaluated, because it cannot be defined or it is too complex or there is too much red tape involved or the time spent on the evaluation is not worth the questionable results. (57)
 3. CIEQ is not a good instrument. (56)
 4. Poor administrative practice or leadership is responsible for the sorry state of teaching. (47)
 5. Good teaching and good research go together. (38)
 6. Research too narrowly defined. A lot of scholarly work is unrecognized; a lot of published triviality is rewarded. (25)
 7. Teaching is the most important function of a university and should be rewarded accordingly. (23)
 8. Committee of Eleven should be applauded for its work. (21)
 9. Committee of Eleven questionnaire is too biased or too broad or too unscientific to be good. (18)
 10. Evaluation of teaching should be tailored to level of course, type of course, size of class. (15)
 11. Student evaluations are a highly effective means of identifying good teachers. (13)
 12. Research is more important than teaching or service and should be better rewarded. (10)
 13. Undergraduates cannot judge good teaching. Only after 10 - 20 years will they know. (7)
 14. Workshops, training sessions or experimental evaluation systems should be tried to improve teaching effectiveness. (5)
 15. Reward ONLY outstanding teachers. Punish ONLY horrible teachers. Same for researchers. (5)
 16. Poor researchers cover up their deficiencies by claiming that their teaching is not rewarded. (3)
 17. "Rewards" not spelled out. Promotion, tenure, merit money, travel, sabbaticals should be separated. (3)
-

SURVEY OF DEPARTMENT HEADS

A questionnaire was prepared and sent to all department heads in mid-June, 1979. The questionnaire was designed to determine how teaching was evaluated and rewarded in academic units throughout the University. The initial return rate of completed questionnaires was excellent and with a single follow-up to less than a dozen departments, 100 percent were returned. The questionnaire and combined responses for all departments are summarized in Table 2.

Some type of student evaluation form is used in 91 of the 92 departments (Question 1). The Course Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire (CIEQ) is used by 66 departments (72 percent), although many departments also use a departmental form, or forms constructed by individual faculty members. Two colleges do not use the CIEQ at all. In both cases, these are professional schools where the teaching format may be quite different from the teaching format assumed for the CIEQ. In 38 departments (41 percent), use of student evaluations is mandatory (Question 2) although some department heads are not sure that the forms are always used. In four of the 23 colleges, the use of student evaluation forms in all courses is mandatory. Additionally, 45 departments (49 percent) encourage the use of student evaluations.

In 88 departments (96 percent), the results of the student evaluations (Question 3) go to the individual instructor and in 79 departments (86 percent) the department head also sees the results at least some of the time. It is much less common for the results to be sent to departmental promotion and tenure committees and even more rare for the results to be sent elsewhere.

The department heads were asked to indicate the percentage of their faculty members who use some type of student evaluation form (Question 4).

The average for all departments is 77 percent of the faculty, with estimates from individual department heads ranging from 0 to 100 percent.

On the basis of comments made by a number of department heads to Question 5, "Do individual faculty make self-evaluations?" it is clear that there was often a misunderstanding of the term "self-evaluation" and therefore the responses given to this question are not interpretable.

Other types of evaluation, as indicated by responses to Question 6 and 7, are less frequently used than student evaluations and tend to be non-systematic or informal. Appraisal of the course syllabus, text or catalogue description by the department head and by the faculty occurs at least some of the time in about half of the departments. The item concerning classroom visits by either the department head or other faculty was checked by 30 department heads (33 percent) but comments indicated that such visits may occur only occasionally.

Responses to Question 8 about support services for teaching indicate that 54 (59 percent) department heads encourage their faculty to attend the workshops offered periodically by the Office of Instructional Research and Development (IRAD) and 26 (28%) have invited Dr. Aleamoni, the director, to meet with their department faculty. However, 31 (34 percent) have apparently had no contact with this office. Special equipment or services provided for instructional support are indicated by responses to Question 9. Responses to Question 10, "How frequently are the following used to reward effective teaching?" indicate that merit increases are used to reward teaching in about half of the departments, but several comments indicate that available merit money is really not sufficient to serve as a reward. Similar comments apply to travel funds. With respect to reduced teaching loads, one perceptive

individual questioned, "i.e., the best teachers would never teach?" Others indicated that occasionally a teaching load was reduced in order for a faculty member to develop a new course. With respect to special consideration in promotion and tenure, several department heads indicated that their departments gave special consideration to teaching effectiveness but that teaching effectiveness was "not recognized by the University-wide committee."

Responses to questions about Graduate Assistants in Teaching are given in Questions 11, 12, and 13. Responses to Question 11 describe the work responsibilities performed by Graduate Assistants in Teaching. "Almost always" responses indicate that Graduate Assistants in Teaching assist classroom instructors (29 percent) and conduct laboratory sessions (31 percent) in their departments. In 25 percent of the departments Graduate Assistants in Teaching are themselves teaching courses. With respect to supervision and evaluation of Graduate Assistants in Teaching, there is faculty observation of graduate student teaching in 66 departments (72 percent) and the use of student evaluations of graduate student teaching in 55 departments (60 percent). The most frequently cited special award for Graduate Assistants in Teaching (Question 13) is nomination for the University of Arizona Foundation award. Other rewards frequently mentioned were letters of recommendation, renewal of the assistantship, and preferred teaching assignments.

Question 14, relating to departmental teaching responsibilities, attempted to assess the department heads' positions on a number of specified issues. The last statement, "Teaching is expected of all faculty but promotion and tenure are based on other considerations," was criticized as being ambiguous by some department heads, and we believe the criticism is valid. Thus, the responses for this statement are not meaningful since it is often unclear

whether the first part or the last part of the question determined the responses given. The several written comments for this item, however, again pick up the theme indicated for Question 10. Two responses illustrate the thoughts of several respondents:

I think that fair consideration is given to teaching accomplishments as regards promotion/tenure at the Department and College level (at least in _____) but that fair consideration is not given at the University level. This is disturbing.

In Question 14, you should have asked if teaching is very important to the Administration for tenure and promotion, etc. The faculty of this department believes it is not, regardless of the lip service which the Administration extends to it.

Table 2

Summary of Responses to Department Head Survey*

1. What student evaluation forms are used in your department? (Check all that apply.)		
	Number	(%)
(a) Course Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire (CIEQ)	66	(72)
(b) Departmental form	42	(46)
(c) Other	20	(22)
2. Is the use of student evaluation forms in your department		
(a) Mandatory	38	(41)
(b) Encouraged	45	(49)
(c) Discouraged	--	(0)
(d) Optional	9	(10)
3. Who receives the tabulated information from the student evaluation forms? (Check all that apply.)		
(a) Individual faculty member	88	(96)
(b) Department Head	79	(86)
(c) Department tenure and promotion committee	36	(39)
(d) Dean of College	10	(11)

*We are indebted to the Division of Computer Systems and Biostatistics, Arizona Health Sciences Center, for tabulation and analysis of the questionnaire responses.

Table 2 (continued)

	Number	(%)
(e) Associated students (ASUA)	8	(9)
(f) All department faculty	8	(9)
(g) Other	10	(11)
4. What percentage of your faculty uses some type of student evaluation form?		77%
5. Do individual faculty make self-evaluations?		
Yes	34	(37)
No	45	(48)
No Answer	13	(14)
6. What type of peer evaluation is used in the department? (Check all that apply.)		
(a) Classroom visits by department head	30	(33)
(b) Classroom visits by other faculty	30	(33)
(c) Appraisal by department head of syllabi, text or course descriptions	52	(56)
(d) Appraisal by other faculty of syllabi, text or course descriptions	46	(50)
(e) None	16	(17)
7. Indicate any other ways in which teaching is evaluated in your department.		
8. Periodically, the Instructional Research and Development (IRAD, Dr. Lawrence Aleamoni, Director) offers workshops related to teaching. As Department Head, do you:		
(a) Require faculty to attend	--	(0)
(b) Encourage faculty to attend	54	(59)
(c) Invite Dr. Aleamoni to meet with your department	26	(28)
(d) None of the above	31	(34)
9. What special equipment or services are provided by the department for instructional purposes?		
(a) Audiovisual equipment	87	(95)
(b) Television equipment	40	(44)
(c) Clerical help	82	(89)
(d) Student assistants	69	(75)
(e) Demonstration equipment/models, etc., for use in lectures	53	(58)
(f) Other	24	(26)

Table 2 (continued)

10. How frequently are the following used to reward effective teaching?

	<u>Almost always</u>	<u>Occasionally</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>N/A</u>
(a) Merit Increases	45 (49)	36 (39)	4 (4)	7 (8)
(b) Reduced teaching load	— (0)	13 (14)	54 (59)	25 (27)
(c) Travel funds	7 (8)	25 (27)	37 (40)	23 (25)
(d) Special consideration for office/laboratory space	7 (8)	27 (29)	31 (34)	27 (29)
(e) Special consideration in promotion/tenure considerations	53 (58)	24 (26)	5 (5)	10 (11)
(f) Other	2 (2)	3 (3)	— (0)	87 (95)

11. How are graduate teaching assistants (housestaff in the College of Medicine) used?

	<u>Almost always</u>	<u>Occasionally</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>N/A</u>
(a) To teach courses	23 (25)	24 (26)	33 (36)	12 (13)
(b) To assist classroom instructors	29 (32)	35 (38)	10 (11)	18 (20)
(c) To conduct laboratory sessions	31 (34)	29 (32)	10 (11)	22 (24)
(d) To conduct seminars	7 (8)	20 (22)	32 (35)	33 (36)
(e) To present lectures	4 (4)	43 (47)	18 (20)	27 (29)
(f) To grade papers	23 (25)	41 (45)	11 (12)	17 (18)
(g) Other	8 (9)	3 (3)	1 (1)	80 (87)

12. How are graduate teaching assistants supervised/evaluated? Number (%)

(a) By student evaluations of teaching	55	(60)
(b) By faculty observation of teaching	66	(72)
(c) Prior approval by supervisor of all tests	26	(28)
(d) Prior approval by supervisor of course grades	24	(26)
(e) Written TA handbook	7	(8)
(f) Other	15	(16)

13. How are graduate teaching assistants rewarded for effective teaching?

(a) No particular reward	32	(35)
(b) Merit increase	9	(10)
(c) Rank increase	12	(13)
(d) Special award	22	(24)
(e) Othe	23	(25)

Table 2 (continued)

14. For the statements (a) through (f), please select the alternative that most closely agrees with your own position (1=Strongly Agree, 3=Neutral, 5=Strongly Disagree).

							<u>Mean</u>	<u>Number</u>	
(a) Teaching is a very important activity in the Department.	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1.07	89	
	90%	7%	-	-	-	3%			
(b) Teaching provides funding to support other activities.	1	2	3	4	5	NA	3.52	83	
	10%	14%	17%	17%	32%	10%			
(c) Teaching is primarily a service function for other departments	1	2	3	4	5	NA	4.20	86	
	1%	5%	10%	35%	42%	6%			
(d) Teaching is directed primarily toward departmental majors	1	2	3	4	5	NA	3.13	85	
	13%	18%	18%	28%	14%	8%			
(e) Teaching loads are reduced for those doing research.	1	2	3	4	5	NA	2.84	87	
	14%	36%	11%	18%	15%	5%			
(f) Teaching is expected of all faculty but promotion and tenure are based on other considerations.	1	2	3	4	5	NA	3.21	85	
	11%	23%	15%	23%	21%	8%			
							<u>Yes (%)</u>	<u>No (%)</u>	<u>NA (%)</u>
15. Are you familiar with the services available from the IRAD office?							77 (84)	11 (12)	4 (4)
16. Have you used the IRAD office?							65 (71)	23 (25)	4 (4)
17. Are there services that IRAD should provide that are not now available? If YES, please describe.							11 (12)	32 (35)	49 (53)

SURVEY OF DEANS

In October, 1980, a questionnaire was sent to all college deans requesting information about the composition and functioning of college promotion and tenure committees (or departmental committees if there was no college committee) and the evidence of teaching quality submitted to the promotion and tenure committees. Responses were received from all college deans. Since one college does not have a college-level promotion and tenure committee and functions with departmental committees only, information is reported only for the other 12 colleges. Responses to the dean's questionnaire are summarized in Table 3.

Responses indicate that two-thirds of the college promotion and tenure committee members are elected and one-third are appointed by the dean. Committee members are primarily Professors, although some colleges include Associate Professors as well. Half of the college committees have five members; in other colleges there are as few as three and as many as 12 members. In eight colleges, all committee members are male, including one minority male. Two colleges have one female committee member, one college has two females (including one minority female) and in one college all five committee members are female. The total number of committee members for all colleges is 72, which includes 63 males (87.5%) and 9 females (12.5%). Minorities represent less than three percent of the total.

Several deans found Question 3 (how committee members divide their time between teaching, research and service) difficult to answer and commented that there is often an overlap between the three types of activities. Responses are given for the ten deans who answered the question. Other comments indicated that the amount of time one spends on a given activity is not

necessarily a measure of the importance of that activity in decisions about promotion and tenure. Given these caveats, responses indicate that teaching activities occupy the largest percent of time for 36 (61 percent) committee members.

Length of term on the committee is three years for 6 of the 12 colleges, with terms running from one year to an indefinite period for the other colleges. Uniformly, names of the committee members are available to the faculty in each college.

The deans' estimates of the weights that promotion and tenure committees give to teaching, research and service activities in the consideration of promotion/tenure vary greatly, depending on the unique characteristics of the faculty member being considered and the particular department involved, among other factors. Ten deans indicated that documentation of teaching effectiveness is always included in materials submitted to the college promotion and tenure committees. Two deans said it is included "sometimes." With respect to the kinds of evidence of teaching quality submitted, only four colleges always include a summary of student evaluations. Other types of evidence of teaching quality and the frequency of their inclusion are given in the responses to Question 8.

Eight colleges have some way of evaluating the teaching ability of potential new faculty members. The mechanisms used for this evaluation are given in Question 9.

The deans indicated a number of ways that teaching is encouraged or rewarded in their colleges. Responses to this question were categorized and are listed in Question 10.

Table 3

Summary of Responses to Dean's Survey

1. Selection of college promotion and tenure committee.		<u>Number</u>			
Appointed by Dean		8			
Elected by faculty		4			
2. What is the composition of the present committee?					
	<u>No.</u>		<u>No.</u>		
Assistant Professor	0	Male	63		
Associate Professor	10	Female	9		
Professor	60	Minority	2		
Department Head	0				
Other	2				
Total	72				
3. How many of the committee members spend the largest percentage of their time in:					
Teaching activities			36		
Research activities			15		
Service activities			7		
Administrative activities			1		
No answer			13		
4. What is the length of term for promotion and tenure committee members?					
Three-year terms			6		
Two-year terms			1		
One-year terms			2		
Indefinite period of time			3		
5. Are names of committee members made available to:					
College faculty			12		
Department Heads only			0		
Only on request			0		
Not at all			0		
6. Estimate of percentage weight given by college promotion and tenure committees to teaching, research and service activities of teaching faculty being considered for promotion.					
<u>Teaching</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Research</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>No.</u>
33%	4	20-30%	1	10-30%	3
35-50%	4	33%	3	33%	4
Unsure	1	35-50%	3	Up to 50%	1
No fixed ratio	3	55%	1	Unsure	5
		Unsure	1	No fixed ratio	3
		No fixed ratio	3		

Table 3 (continued)

7. Do departments include documentation of teaching effectiveness in materials submitted to your college promotion and tenure committee?			
	<u>Number</u>		
Always	10		
Sometimes	2		
Rarely or never	0		
8. Evidence of teaching quality submitted by departments as part of the promotion and tenure documentation.			
	<u>Always include</u>	<u>Sometimes include</u>	<u>Rarely or never include</u>
<u>Student Evaluation</u>			
Summary of student evaluations	4	7	-
Unsolicited student comments	-	9	2
Solicited letters from students	-	3	8
<u>Peer Review</u>			
Summary of evaluations of course materials, objectives, syllabi, reading lists, etc.	2	5	1
Summary of evaluations of quizzes, exams, etc.	1	4	4
Review of student achievement	-	5	2
Summary of "drop-rates" over several years	1	1	7
Summary of "continuation rate" in higher level courses	1	2	6
Evidence of student success after graduation	-	7	4
Evidence of successful and innovative teaching methods and/or materials	4	6	-
Letters from colleagues reporting on classroom visitation	1	9	1
Evidence of incorporation of new developments into teaching	5	5	1
Summary of classes taught over two or more years	9	1	1
Summary of independent studies directed	5	4	2
Summary of theses and/or dissertations directed	7	4	-
Contributions to Honors Programs	3	4	4
Other	2	1	-

Table 3 (continued)

9. Does your college have a mechanism for evaluating the teaching ability of candidates being considered for a faculty position?	<u>Number</u>
Yes	8
No	3
No response	1
 (Mechanisms utilized are summarized according to the total number of responses.)	
Present seminar or lecture to demonstrate teaching skills.	8
Letters of recommendation.	6
Telephone calls.	3
No set mechanism.	3
Recommendation of peers.	2
Personal interviews.	2
Examination of teaching record.	1
Present seminar or lecture to demonstrate research skills.	1
Review of syllabi of courses taught previously.	1
Review of vitae.	1
Request evaluation from students present at demonstrative seminar.	1
 10. Summarized responses to the question of what mechanisms exist to encourage/reward teaching effectiveness in the various colleges.	
Merit increase.	8
Meeting with Dr. Aleamoni.	3
Naming Professor of the Year.	3
National recognition through professional organization.	2
Recommend faculty for awards.	2
Teaching seminars.	1
Appointment to head teaching teams.	1
Individual conferences.	1
Mention at faculty meetings.	1
Letter of congratulations from the Dean.	1
Discussion of goals and achievements with a committee of peers.	1

UNIVERSITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROMOTION AND TENURE

Dr. Albert B. Weaver, Executive Vice-President, was interviewed to clarify the composition and procedures of the University Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure. The Advisory Committee consists of eight tenured faculty members appointed by the President for staggered three-year terms. Presently there are seven men and one woman serving on the Committee.

Dr. Weaver made available his memorandum to department heads (see Appendix A) regarding the necessary documentation of teaching, research and service activities for promotion and tenure consideration. When Dr. Weaver receives the faculty member's file from the dean it is checked for completeness and forwarded to the Advisory Committee for their consideration. The Advisory Committee's recommendation and rationale for their decision are added to the file, which is then returned to Dr. Weaver. After review by Dean Jones for the Graduate College, Dr. Weaver reviews the file and adds his own recommendation. The file is then forwarded to the President for decision. Once a decision is made, Dr. Weaver notifies the dean and the involved faculty member of a positive decision (promotion/tenure approved). If the decision is negative, the dean may appeal the decision to the President before any formal notification to the faculty member.

Dr. Weaver emphasized that "teaching is our prime function," and noted that faculty at the University of Arizona are expected to be superior in teaching, research and service in order to merit promotion/tenure.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the results of the three questionnaires and on information developed through interviews, the Committee of Eleven has prepared recommendations in four areas: Graduate Assistants in Teaching, Improvement of Instruction, the Reward System, and Implementation of the Recommendations.

Graduate Assistants in Teaching

The survey of department heads (Table 1) yielded some rather distressing data with regard to Graduate Assistants in Teaching. Fewer than 30 percent of the department heads indicated that supervisors approve the tests given or grading by Graduate Assistants in Teaching. Only 8 percent of the respondents indicated that a written handbook for Graduate Assistants in Teaching is used in their department. The record is somewhat better in the realm of evaluation. As noted earlier, 60 percent of the respondents indicated that Graduate Assistants in Teaching are regularly evaluated by their students and 72 percent indicated that graduate student teaching is regularly observed by faculty members. According to the Office of the Vice-President for Planning and Budgeting, Graduate Assistants in Teaching are responsible for teaching 21 percent of the undergraduate courses on campus. Since the majority of courses taught by Graduate Assistants in Teaching are on the lower division level, it seems obvious that large numbers of freshmen are being taught by instructors whose preparation and appreciation for teaching may be non-existent. This situation may be at least partly responsible for the 20 percent attrition rate in the freshmen year. Improvements in this area could be effected without great expense and would be of vast benefit to the entire University community.

Recommendations

1. All new Graduate Assistants in Teaching should receive an intensive orientation in basic teaching skills before they begin their teaching duties. Orientation sessions should be held twice a year, prior to the beginning of each semester. The first part of the orientation program should be coordinated by the Office of Instructional Research and Development and involve general teaching techniques and professional responsibilities. Individual departments would use the remainder of the orientation period to discuss teaching in the specific subject matter.
2. Department Heads should provide close, in-service supervision of all Graduate Assistants in Teaching and should assure that all courses taught by Graduate Assistants in Teaching are evaluated each semester by the students.
3. Graduate Assistants in Teaching should be compensated at a level which reflects their professional preparation and responsibility within the constraints established by the Board of Regents.
4. The Office of Instructional Research and Development should assist departments in administering the conditions established by Recommendations 1 and 2 and should present a report to the President for inclusion in the President's report to the Faculty Senate, as described in Recommendation 16.

Improvement of Instruction

An important step in increasing support for the improvement of instruction was initiated six years ago with the establishment of the Office of Instructional Research and Development and the hiring of Dr. Lawrence Aleamoni as its director. Since its inception, this office has provided the campus

community with a standardized form (CIEQ) for gathering student evaluation of courses and instruction. The forms are completed anonymously by students and are sent directly to the Instructional Research and Development office where the results are tabulated. The tabulations and student comments are returned to the instructor during the following semester. The faculty have the option of reviewing the results with Dr. Aleamoni.

The Office of Instructional Research and Development also conducts workshops and seminars, consults with faculty and administration on a wide variety of teaching problems and reviews educational project proposals, among other services.

With increasing emphasis upon the documentation of the quality of teaching, the Office of Instructional Research and Development has received increasing numbers of requests for documentation of teaching effectiveness from departmental promotion and tenure committees. Recently, that office has also been asked to consult with such committees about the interpretation of the results of student evaluations.

The Committee of Eleven believes that there is increasing awareness by faculty and administration of the importance of excellence in teaching and this awareness should receive support and encouragement in the following ways.

Recommendations

5. Faculty should be encouraged to participate in workshops and seminars designed to improve the quality of instruction.
6. Activities concerned with the improvement of teaching should be considered appropriate for a sabbatical leave from the University. The applicant seeking a sabbatical leave for this purpose shall outline goals and submit a plan for reaching those goals.

7. The professional staff in the Office of Instructional Research and Development should be expanded in order to provide:
 - a) Research designed to enhance the quality of instruction at the University of Arizona.
 - b) Additional assistance for individuals and groups of faculty for the purpose of improving instruction.
 - c) Additional consultation services to deans, department heads, and promotion and tenure committees (at all levels) so as to develop consistent policies across campus on how teaching will be evaluated and considered in promotion and tenure decisions.
 - d) Additional instruments for evaluating instruction and for diagnosing instructional weaknesses which take into account the unique needs of individual faculty and departments.
 - e) More information to the faculty about the instructional support services available on campus. This information should be distributed to all faculty annually at the beginning of the new academic year.
8. A standing committee of the Faculty Senate should be established for the purpose of overseeing the instructional services at the University of Arizona. This committee should be charged with providing direction for instructional development on the campus, and should periodically report its activities to the Faculty Senate. The committee should be composed of faculty members who are recognized for their excellence in teaching and who have a demonstrated interest in the improvement of instruction. As specified by the Faculty Constitution, a majority of the members must be members of the Faculty Senate.

The Reward System

Results from the survey of department heads indicate that there is a wide range of approaches to the evaluation of teaching, but for the most part there

is an attitude of informality about the evaluation of faculty teaching. There exists on this campus little consistency in the evaluation of teacher effectiveness and little evidence of a viable continuing system for rewarding superior teaching efforts at any level.

Since one of the obvious and crucial means of rewarding performance in any area is through promotion and tenure, the survey of college deans (Table 3) dealt principally with the structure and functioning of college promotion and tenure committees. The results are illuminating. For example, 8 out of 12 deans responded that committees in their colleges place one-third of the weight on teaching when considering promotion and tenure cases for faculty whose major responsibility is teaching. However, answers to Question 8 indicate that only four deans include a summary of student evaluations of teaching in promotion/tenure packages in their colleges. With respect to peer evaluation, only two colleges always consider summaries of course materials, and only four promotion/tenure committees are always provided with evidence of successful and innovative teaching methods and/or materials. Only one dean responded that his college committee always receives letters from colleagues reporting on classroom visitation. Nine deans responded that such letters were sometimes included in promotion/tenure packages.

The faculty survey (Table 1) provided a fairly clear picture of how the faculty perceives the University's reward system. Twenty-one percent of the faculty responding think that good teaching is well-rewarded at the departmental level, but only 8 percent believe that is the case at the University level. This figure drops to 6 percent for Assistant Professors. It seems obvious from these data that faculty members perceive teaching as having little real value within the reward system of the University and, in

fact, the methods of evaluating teaching quality are often so weak and uneven as to justify that perception.

Recommendations

9. For those faculty members for whom teaching is a continuing responsibility, excellence in teaching should be more vigorously and consistently rewarded through the promotion and tenure system.
 10. Departments and colleges should be required to include the criteria for teaching excellence in their guidelines for promotion and tenure and these guidelines should be adhered to by the promotion and tenure committees at both college and University levels.
 11. The Executive Vice-President should require that evaluations of teaching (except where clearly irrelevant) be a mandatory part of promotion and tenure documentation before submission to the University Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure. This documentation should include:
 - a) A summary of student evaluations from all courses taught during the previous two years.
 - b) One or more additional methods of evaluating teaching, such as peer review of course descriptions, objectives, examinations and syllabi; letters reporting on classroom visitations; unsolicited letters from students; evidence of student success in subsequent courses as well as after graduation; evidence of innovative or imaginative teaching methods and materials; development of new courses.
- A sample listing for documenting teaching quality is provided in Appendix B.
12. Documented teaching effectiveness should be one of the criteria for awarding merit raises.

13. Department heads should review the teaching of all instructional staff on an annual basis. Such reviews should be based on a variety of measures, such as classroom visitations, student evaluations and discussion of course materials, and should consist of personal conferences with each faculty member. The reviews should result in a written record, a copy of which is given to the faculty member concerned. Heads of large departments may delegate the task of teaching review to a departmental committee on instruction.
14. Effective teaching should receive more campus-wide visibility. The following activities are suggested to increase the recognition of excellence in teaching:
 - a) Selection by each college of a "teacher of the year" who would be invited to speak at the college Honors Convocation or a comparable event.
 - b) Faculty participation in the selection of recipients of the Creative Teaching Awards offered by the University of Arizona Foundation.

Implementation

In order that a coordinated, campus-wide effort is made and is visible to the faculty, the Committee of Eleven proposes the following recommendations.

Recommendations

15. The President shall appoint an officer on his staff who is charged with facilitating the recommendations included in this report.
16. The President shall report to the Faculty Senate annually on the implementation of the recommendations.



THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85721

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

October 23, 1980

MEMORANDUM TO: Academic Deans, Directors, and Department Heads

REGARDING: Promotion and Tenure

The Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure is called on each year to consider about 200 recommendations. To provide adequate time for the Committee to conduct its review and to ensure that timely notice of the action taken in approving or denying recommendations can be given to your offices and to the candidates, it is requested that departments consider candidates for promotion or tenure before the end of the fall semester, if possible. It should be borne in mind that it takes time to obtain and assemble the letters from outside referees and other supporting material the department may wish to present. The Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure has requested that all recommendations for promotion or tenure be submitted to it by my office before January 15, 1981, if possible.

A copy of the guidelines drawn up by the Committee concerning the evidence it would find most helpful for its deliberations is appended.

It is the Committee's suggestion that the department head should be responsible for preparing all the material submitted with the exception of the resume and the list of publications.

Departments are reminded that the Committee would welcome an outline of the criteria used by each department in making its recommendations, if this has not already been supplied. In general, the functions of a University faculty member include teaching, research, and service. In most cases, therefore, the criteria of the department should include suitable evidence of excellence in each category, and in particular, in teaching and research as judged by professional peers.

There are, of course, some exceptions in which the overall teaching load of a department limits research or in which service commitments do not allow for teaching. In these cases, recommendations should include a general statement indicating appropriate criteria for judging excellence in the activity to which the faculty member has been assigned.

If a College Committee has reviewed the recommendations submitted by the College, information concerning its membership and the criteria guiding its recommendations would aid the University Advisory Committee in its deliberations.

Recommendations which are approved by the Advisory Committee will be reviewed by Dr. Jones and myself and forwarded with the Committee's written comments to President Schaefer for approval or disapproval.

Those recommendations received from the colleges which the Advisory Committee recommends denying will be reviewed by Dr. Jones and by me and returned to the dean of the college with my written statement of the reason for denial.

It is the responsibility of the dean to review such cases and to inform my office whether or not he wishes to appeal the denial. The final decision will be made by President Schaefer and my office will inform the candidate concerning this decision.

Your attention is called to Chapter VIII of the Faculty Manual which you are urged to review. In particular, sections 8.00, 8.05, 8.08, 8.10, 8.12, 8.13, 8.14, 8.14.5, and 8.15 are pertinent to promotion and tenure considerations. If I can be of help in interpreting Chapter VIII or in furnishing further information about the procedure please let me know.



A. B. Weaver

cm

Enclosure

FOR PREPARING PROMOTION AND TENURE CASES

- I. SUMMARY DATA SHEET
 - A. Furnished by Dr. Weaver's Office (xl856)
 - 1. See Attachment A

- II. PROMOTION AND TENURE CHECKLIST
 - A. Furnished by Dr. Weaver's Office (xl856)
 - 1. See Attachment B

- III. DEAN'S RECOMMENDATION
 - A. Addressed to Dr. Weaver
 - B. Own Opinion, Views and Comments

- IV. COLLEGE COMMITTEE'S REPORT
 - A. Addressed to Dean
 - B. Include committee's vote (in figures)
 - C. Evaluate candidate
 - 1. Teaching
 - a. See attached addendum
 - 2. Scholarship
 - 3. Service
 - a. Intramural
 - b. Extramural

- V. DEPARTMENT HEAD'S RECOMMENDATION
 - A. Addressed to Dean
 - B. Own opinion, views and comments

- VI. DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE'S REPORT
 - A. Addressed to Department Head
 - B. Include committee's vote (in figures)
 - C. Evaluate candidate
 - 1. Teaching
 - a. See attached addendum
 - 2. Scholarship
 - 3. Service
 - a. Intramural
 - b. Extramural

VII. CURRICULUM VITA

- A. Prepared by candidate
- B. Personal Information
 - 1. Date and place of birth only
- C. Education
 - 1. All colleges and universities attended
 - 2. Institutions, degrees and dates
 - 3. Title of doctoral dissertation and name of director
- D. Statement of major field or fields
- E. Employment
- F. Honors and Awards
- G. Courses taught in last 5 years
 - 1. Give enrollments for each
- H. University and professional committees
 - 1. Give degree of responsibility (i.e., chairman)
 - 2. Indicate reliability of performance and initiative
- I. List of Publications (published or accepted)
 - 1. Chronological order within:
 - a. Scholarly books and monographs
 - 1. distinguish scholarly from text books
 - b. Chapters in scholarly books and monographs
 - 1. distinguish scholarly from text books
 - c. Refereed journal articles
 - d. Abstracts
 - e. Research reports
 - f. Other
 - 2. List number of pages in each publication
 - 3. List per cent of responsibility for each
- J. Unpublished Work (optional)
 - 1. Work in progress
 - 2. Scholarly presentations (i.e., colloquia, seminars, symposia, conferences, etc.)

VIII. LETTERS OF EVALUATION

- A. Minimum of 3 letters
- B. Solicited by department head or head of review committee (not by candidate)
 - 1. Include copy of this letter from department head or head of review committee
 - 2. Outside referees should be provided samples of candidate's research to examine
- C. Outside Referees
 - 1. From individuals from similar academic departments at universities other than the U of A. Letters from individuals at research institutes, national laboratories, etc., are appropriate.
 - 2. Candidate may suggest names, but the department head or review committee should select the individuals to be contacted
 - 3. Letters should not be requested from persons such as the candidate's major professor, co-author, dissertation advisor or people with whom the candidate has closely collaborated
- D. Brief statement attached to each evaluation stating the writer's national or international standing
- E. All letters received from outside reviewers must be included in candidate's package

IX. DO NOT INCLUDE

- A. Individual teacher evaluations by students (summarize results instead)
- B. Reprints or manuscripts
- C. Other matters of detail that can be summarized by department head or review committee

ADDENDUM TO GUIDELINES

As you are aware, the Committee of Eleven has been concerned about the evidence for teaching excellence presented in connection with considerations on promotion and tenure. In view of this concern I have reviewed the evidence that has been given in the past by different departments and include a summary here. Some other concerns raised by particular colleges or departments are also briefly discussed below.

1. Summaries of student judgment derived from questionnaires answered by students or written comments of students in the candidate's classes. A number of departments use such questionnaires in a systematic way.
2. Senior professors in some departments sit in on a sample of the candidate's classes and submit formal reports to the Department Head on the candidate's teaching ability.
3. Many departments tend to rely on less formal evaluations by the senior professors in the department. Usually these departments will transmit the consensus view of the senior faculty. This consensus is based on a variety of sources of information. For instance, the candidate's colleagues know how well prepared the candidate's students are to enter some other professor's class. They know how good a background the students appear to have. They know how enthusiastic the students appear to be and how confident they are. They know how successful the candidate is in placing his or her students after graduation and how well the students do after placement.

Other evidence which influences the senior faculty is the performance of the candidate in delivering seminars to the department as a whole or to national meetings. These talks demonstrate how well organized and effective the candidate is in presenting his or her ideas; how well he or she can field difficult questions; how well and how deeply the candidate appears to understand the subject; and how clear and penetrating his or her explanations are.

Other criteria used by senior faculty in evaluating teaching ability include the cogency of the advice or comments the candidate gives when discussing problems or ideas with his or her colleagues and with students; the candidate's accessibility to students; whether or not students bring problems to him or her; how the candidate grades and evaluates students.

4. Other evidence departments tend to cite as evidence of teaching ability include such things as textbooks or teaching manuals the candidate has written; unusual use of audio-visual aids or of the computer; awards won for teaching; new courses designed and taught; new laboratories established, etc.

Assistant professors are reviewed and their performance evaluated in writing at two year intervals even though they are not necessarily recommended for promotion. It is suggested that such evaluations be made well before June 30, which is the deadline for such reviews. Each letter of transmittal should be concerned with one candidate only.

SUMMARY DATA SHEET FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE RECOMMENDATION
 (to be prepared by Department Head)

Candidate: _____ Date: _____
 Present rank: _____ College: _____
 Age (as of preparation date): _____ Department: _____
 Type of terminal degree: _____ Year of terminal degree: _____
 Candidate now (please circle): Has tenure. Does not have tenure.

Candidate is now being recommended for (please circle):

- Tenure
- Prom. to Assoc. Prof.
- Prom. to Lecturer
- Prom. to Professor
- Prom. to Asst. Prof.
- Reappointment in rank

Faculty Service	Rank	Dates*	No. of yrs.*
Faculty service elsewhere after terminal degree			
Faculty service at the University of Arizona			

* To include present academic year.

Department Head please initial: _____

Checklist (for use of Executive Vice President's Office only):			
Years of service _____		Dept. Head _____	
Academic vita _____		Dean _____	
Support letters _____		Univ. P&T Com. _____	

PROMOTION AND TENURE CHECKLIST

(To Be Completed By Candidate's Department Head)

- | | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|--|------------|-----------|
| 1. Does the P & T package include: | | |
| a. department head's recommendation? | _____ | _____ |
| b. department committee's recommendation? | _____ | _____ |
| c. candidate's curriculum vita? | _____ | _____ |
| d. minimum of 3 outside letters? | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Does candidate's curriculum vita show: | | |
| a. a complete chronology of candidates education and professional career to date? | _____ | _____ |
| b. all degrees received by candidate (with institutions identified)? | _____ | _____ |
| c. title of dissertation and name of director? | _____ | _____ |
| d. courses taught over last 5 years (with enrollments)? | _____ | _____ |
| e. publications segregated into books and monographs, chapters, refereed journal articles, abstracts, research reports, other? | _____ | _____ |
| f. page lengths for publications? | _____ | _____ |
| g. per cent of responsibility for each co-authored publication? | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Letters of evaluation: | | |
| a. did someone other than the candidate solicit the outside letters? | _____ | _____ |
| b. is this letter included in candidate's package? | _____ | _____ |
| c. were outside reviewers sent samples of candidate's published work to review? | _____ | _____ |
| d. is there a brief description of the academic stature of outside reviewers? | _____ | _____ |
| e. have <u>all</u> letters received from outside reviewers been included in candidate's package? | _____ | _____ |

4. Identify below those outside reviewers who can be judged as independent of the candidate. That is, identify those who have not been the candidate's dissertation director, co-author or close colleague.

APPENDIX B

Sample Listing for Documenting Teaching Quality

The various items in the listing are rated by the Committee of Eleven as follows:

Essential--Should always be included in promotion/tenure files.

Highly Recommended--these items may not always be available but should be included if possible.

Desirable--these items are sometimes difficult to obtain or summarize but could serve to solidify a promotion/tenure package.

Student EvaluationsEssential

Summary of student evaluations.

Highly Recommended

Unsolicited student comments.

Desirable

Solicited letters from students.

Peer ReviewEssential

Summary of evaluations of course materials, objectives, syllabi, reading lists, etc.

Summary of classes taught over 2 or more years.

Evidence of successful and innovative teaching methods and/or materials.

Evidence of incorporation of new developments into teaching.

Summary of independent studies directed.

Summary of theses and/or dissertations directed.

Highly Recommended

Summary of evaluations of quizzes, exams, etc.

Letters from colleagues reporting on classroom visitation.

Contributions to Honors Program.

Desirable

Review of student achievement on standardized exams, etc.

Summary of "continuation-rate" in higher level courses.

Evidence of student success after graduation.

Not Approved
(See Faculty
Senate
1/18/82)

Committee of Eleven

TEACHER EVALUATION AND TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS II

for
16
new
that was
approved)

Recommendations

1. All new Graduate Assistants in Teaching should receive an intensive orientation in basic teaching skills before they begin their teaching duties. Orientation sessions should be held twice a year, prior to the beginning of each semester. The first part of the orientation program should be coordinated by the Office of Instructional Research and Development and involve general teaching techniques and professional responsibilities. Individual departments would use the remainder of the orientation period to discuss teaching in the specific subject matter.
2. Department Heads should provide close, in-service supervision of all Graduate Assistants in Teaching and should assure that all courses taught by Graduate Assistants in Teaching are evaluated each semester by the students.
3. Graduate Assistants in Teaching should be compensated at a level which reflects their professional preparation and responsibility within the constraints established by the Board of Regents.
4. The Office of Instructional Research and Development should assist departments in administering the conditions established by Recommendations 1 and 2 and should present a report to the President for inclusion in the President's report to the Faculty Senate, as described in Recommendation 16.
5. Faculty should be encouraged to participate in workshops and seminars designed to improve the quality of instruction.
6. Activities concerned with the improvement of teaching should be considered appropriate for a sabbatical leave from the University. The applicant seeking a sabbatical leave for this purpose shall outline goals and submit a plan for reaching those goals.

7. The professional staff in the Office of Instructional Research and Development should be expanded in order to provide:
 - a) Research designed to enhance the quality of instruction at the University of Arizona.
 - b) Additional assistance for individuals and groups of faculty for the purpose of improving instruction.
 - c) Additional consultation services to deans, department heads, and promotion and tenure committees (at all levels) so as to develop consistent policies across campus on how teaching will be evaluated and considered in promotion and tenure decisions.
 - d) Additional instruments for evaluating instruction and for diagnosing instructional weaknesses which take into account the unique needs of individual faculty and departments.
 - e) More information to the faculty about the instructional support services available on campus. This information should be distributed to all faculty annually at the beginning of the new academic year.

8. A standing committee of the Faculty Senate should be established for the purpose of overseeing the instructional services at the University of Arizona. This committee should be charged with providing direction for instructional development on the campus, and should periodically report its activities to the Faculty Senate. The committee should be composed of faculty members who are recognized for their excellence in teaching and who have a demonstrated interest in the improvement of instruction. As specified by the Faculty Constitution, a majority of the members must be members of the Faculty Senate.

9. For those faculty members for whom teaching is a continuing responsibility, excellence in teaching should be more vigorously and consistently rewarded through the promotion and tenure system.

10. Departments and colleges should be required to include the criteria for teaching excellence in their guidelines for promotion and tenure and these guidelines should be adhered to by the promotion and tenure committees at both college and University levels.

11. The Executive Vice-President should require that evaluations of teaching (except where clearly irrelevant) be a mandatory part of promotion and tenure documentation before submission to the University Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure. This documentation should include:
 - a) A summary of student evaluations from all courses taught during the previous two years.
 - b) One or more additional methods of evaluating teaching, such as peer review of course descriptions, objectives, examinations and syllabi; letters reporting on classroom visitations; unsolicited letters from students; evidence of student success in subsequent courses as well as after graduation; evidence of innovative or imaginative teaching methods and materials; development of new courses.

12. Documented teaching effectiveness should be one of the criteria for awarding merit raises.
13. Department heads should review the teaching of all instructional staff on an annual basis. Such reviews should be based on a variety of measures, such as classroom visitations, student evaluations and discussion of course materials, and should consist of personal conferences with each faculty member. The reviews should result in a written record, a copy of which is given to the faculty member concerned. Heads of large departments may delegate the task of teaching review to a departmental committee on instruction.
14. Effective teaching should receive more campus-wide visibility. The following activities are suggested to increase the recognition of excellence in teaching:
 - a) Selection by each college of a "teacher of the year" who would be invited to speak at the college Honors Convocation or a comparable event.
 - b) Faculty participation in the selection of recipients of the Creative Teaching Awards offered by the University of Arizona Foundation.
15. The President shall appoint an officer on his staff who is charged with facilitating the recommendations included in this report.
16. The President shall report to the Faculty Senate annually on the implementation of the recommendations.

10/81