CRC RESOLUTION: REVISION OF HANDBOOK 4.04 C. 1; 4.05 B. 1, B.2: UNIVERSITY STANDARDS FOR TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Whereas, Western Carolina University’s evaluation of teaching has operated under guidelines called the ‘seven dimensions of teaching’ for several years, and

Whereas, these ‘seven dimensions’ required revision due to a number of WCU initiatives, especially the QEP, as well as changing pedagogical approaches and philosophies,

Be it resolved that, the Collegial Review Council recommends that the following changes be made to the Faculty Handbook 4.04 C. 1; 4.05 B. 1, B.2 to reflect an update approach to the evaluation of teaching (NB: items in italics are already found within the handbook; they are included for contextual purposes only).

*4.04 WESTERN CAROLINA UNIVERSITY COLLEGIAL REVIEW*

*C. University Standards for Collegial Review*

*1. Teaching*

Faculty members at Western Carolina University are scholarly teachers who provide evidence that their teaching is effective. Effective teaching will be documented through the use of student and peer evaluations as well as a self-report. Students will evaluate teachers on the professional aspects of teaching and on their response to instruction. Peers evaluate pedagogical content knowledge as well as the professional aspects of teaching. Faculty members will provide a self-evaluation on the link between their instruction and disciplinary currency.

## 

## *4.05 ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION*

*B. Evaluation of teaching*

1. The faculty at Western Carolina University is committed to the idea that effective teaching maximizes student learning. As such we define teaching excellence as the facilitation of engaged and ambitious learning. Even among diverse instructional settings, we recognize that effective teaching incorporates some common aspects that can be evaluated.In accordance with UNC Policy Manual Chapter 400.3.1.1[G], WCU’spolicies for the evaluation of teaching include ongoing student and peer evaluations of teaching. WCU’s evaluation of teaching centers on three areas:pedagogical content knowledge, the professional administration of the class (including supervision of students), and student response to instruction. **See Office of the Provost website [url here / hyperlink] for further resources and research on the evaluation of teaching.**

**Overview: WCU Evaluation of Teaching—3 Criteria with Evidence**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| EVALUATIVE  MEASURES | PEDAGOGICAL CONTENT  KNOWLEDGE | PROFESSIONAL ASPECTS  OF TEACHING | STUDENT PERCEPTIONS  OF LEARNING |
| EVIDENCE / ARTIFACT | Peer Review of Teaching Materials and Direct Observation | Peer Review of Teaching Materials and Direct Observation | Peer Review of Teaching Materials and Direct Observation |
| EVIDENCE / ARTIFACT | Statement on  Teaching Currency | SAIs | SAIs |

A. Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Effective teachers remain current in their fields, know how students learn, and recognize what prior information, including misconceptions, students bring to their courses.Most important, they know how to combine these three kinds of knowledge to create teaching acts that lead to student learning.Shulman (1987) has called this combination “pedagogical content knowledge” to distinguish it from content knowledge alone or pedagogy alone.Using their pedagogical content knowledge, scholars restructure their expertise in forms that are understandable and useable by their students.

An instructor’s pedagogical content knowledge is reflected in the teaching acts that represent a discipline’s central concepts, skills and recent advances through a variety of means, including classroom explanations, assignments, and other course requirements. Teachers become more effective as they repeatedly engage in these teaching acts and find out what is easiest and most difficult for their students and modify their teaching accordingly.

Evaluation of Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Faculty members should be able to evaluate the current state of their pedagogical content knowledge for a particular course by responding to the questions:“What am I doing to help my students understand the most important material in my field?”; and “How have I changed my teaching practices to help students understand the central concepts, skills and advancements for the courses I teach?”.

Peer evaluators should be able to see evidence of pedagogical content knowledge in the portfolios of materials faculty members submit, including their syllabi, assignments, exams, classroom exercises, and self evaluations. Peer observation reports may include categories that reflect how instructors have used pedagogical content knowledge in the design of their instruction.

* Statement (by faculty member) discussing how instruction has changed or developed in relation to his/her discipline.
* Peer evaluation of the extent to which a faculty member’s assignment is appropriate to the discipline

B. Professional Aspects of Teaching

Effective teaching relies upon the ability to perform well the required administrative and professional functions associated with instruction. While good teaching relies upon disciplinary expertise – and different disciplines often approach teaching differently – teaching is also a profession that requires common duties regardless of area. Such functions include, for example, providing appropriate and timely feedback to students, providing clear instructions, providing regular information regarding progress, responding appropriately and in a timely manner to students, making materials available, holding classes and making suitable use of class time. Highly effective teaching is more than class management; it is class management that relies upon an instructor’s ability to perform the duties associated with the job.

Evaluation of Professional Aspects of Teaching

These workaday aspects of teaching are separate from, but related to, both academic expertise and student perception of learning, and they may be assessed by peers and students.Direct observation by peers of instruction, as well as peer review and evaluation of materials, can provide evaluation of a faculty member’s organizational and administrative performance in their classes.Student feedback (on SAIs for example) may reflect performance in this area.

* Feedback from direct observation of teaching
* Peers review of teaching materials
* SAI responses on relevant items, such as:
  + My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.
  + Feedback from the instructor clearly indicates my standing in this course.

C. Student Response to Instruction

Students have a unique and important perspective on certain components of teaching effectiveness. They value intellectual engagement, enthusiasm, and passion for course content. Course organization and clarity, two aspects that relate to student success, are validly rated by students. Effective teachers are available to the students. The extent to which the student feels respected and shares a sense of rapport with the instructor correlates with teaching effectiveness.

Evaluation of Student Response to Instruction

* Feedback from direct observation of teaching. Evaluation by peers of teaching materials
* SAI responses.

*Departmental AFE plans should include means for evaluating each of these areas in the ways outlined below.*

2. Sources of data for evaluating teaching

*When evaluating an instructor's teaching for tenure, promotion, and reappointment, all departments must include data from at least the following three sources:*

* *Student assessment of instruction (SAI)*
* *Colleagues’ reviews of teaching*
* *Instructor's self-report and evaluation*

*A. Student assessment of instruction (SAI)*

*Tenured faculty members are required to report SAIs during at least one semester each academic year. Those standing for promotion or reappointment may be required to provide more frequent evaluations as prescribed by the Provost. SAIs will be conducted using forms and procedures that have been departmentally approved and include one of the university-wide assessment forms approved by the Faculty Senate.*

*B. Colleagues’ review of teaching*

*Teaching Materials. Each department should designate a committee of at least two faculty colleagues, exclusive of the department head, to review and evaluate teaching materials prepared by the instructor being evaluated. Materials may include course syllabi, examinations, quizzes, reading lists, assignments, study guides, handouts, slides and media, computer programs, etc. In small departments, reviewers may be selected from outside the department. Each department should develop a protocol to guide the review of materials.*

*Direct Observation of Classroom Teaching. All tenure-track faculty members must be evaluated by direct observation of classroom teaching as required by the University of North Carolina General Administration (see UNC Policy Manual 400.3.1.1(G). Classroom observation should never be used as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. Each department should develop protocols to guide classroom observation. Other faculty members may also include direct observations in support of their AFE.*

C. Instructor's self-report and evaluation

Faculty members should be able to address the currency of their pedagogical content knowledge by responding to the questions:“What am I doing to help my students understand the most important material in my field?”; and “How have I changed my teaching practices to help students understand the central concepts, skills and advancements for the courses I teach?”.

*D. Other information as determined by the College and/or Department Collegial Review Documents.*
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For university websites that address the evaluation of teaching, see:

* Cornell University, Center for Teaching Excellence: <http://www.cte.cornell.edu/resources/teh/ch4.html>
* Lewis and Clark, Faculty Handbook:

<http://legacy.lclark.edu/faculty/faculty/cotrptsection3.html>

* NC State, Policies, Regulations and Rules:

<http://policies.ncsu.edu/regulation/reg-05-20-10>

* NYU Center for Teaching Excellence:

<http://www.nyu.edu/cte/centerhistory.html>