

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY 2001-2002 FACULTY SENATE

The third regular meeting of the 2001-2002 Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, November 13, 2001, at 2:10 in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

FULL AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes
October 9, 2001
- III. Special Order of the Day
 - A. Roll Call
 - B. Announcements
 - C. William Muse, Chancellor
 - D. Vice Chancellor's Report
 - E. Bob Morrison, Chair of the Faculty
 - F. Brenda Killingsworth, SACS Self Study Director
 - G. Approval of Fall 2001 Graduation Roster, including honors program graduates.
 - H. James LeRoy Smith, Executive Assistant to the Chancellor
NCAA Self-Study Report (distributed via campus mail to all Senators/Alternates)
 - I. Paul Cunningham, Director
Administrative University and Medical Center Institutional Review Board
 - J. Question Period
- IV. Unfinished Business
- V. Report of Committees
 - A. Academic Awards Committee, Karl Wuensch
Selection Procedures for the Chancellor's Award for Outstanding Teaching and Robert L. Jones Award for Outstanding Teaching (attachment).
 - B. University Budget Committee, Rick Niswander
Update on University Budget.
 - C. University Curriculum Committee, Dale Knickerbocker
Curriculum matters contained in the minutes of the September 27, 2001, Committee Meeting. (Copies of these minutes may be viewed at <http://www.ecu.edu/fsonline/AcademicCommittees/cu/cum.htm>.)
- VI. New Business

Academic Awards Committee
Selection Procedures for the
Chancellor Award for Outstanding Teaching and
Robert L. Jones Award for Outstanding Teaching

DRAFT – PENDING FINAL APPROVAL

1. Each faculty unit is invited to nominate candidates for the annual Awards for Outstanding Teaching. Each unit is to determine its own method for selecting nominees based on Faculty Senate Resolution #91-29, "Seven Characteristics of Effective Teaching" (attached), and should allow consideration of any eligible faculty member who requests consideration for nomination. No more than one nominee for each ten faculty members in the academic unit can be nominated for the award.
2. Faculty members are eligible to be nominated for one of the three Outstanding Teaching awards, as well as for one of the six Board of Governors Distinguished Professor for Teaching Awards and the one Board of Governors Award for Excellence in Teaching. Information on the selection procedures for the Board of Governors' awards may be obtained from the Faculty Development Center.
3. Any full-time faculty member who has taught at ECU for 3 or more years is eligible to be considered for a teaching award. Four years must have elapsed before a faculty member who has won can be considered again. Award recipients will be invited to place their portfolios and videotapes in the Faculty Development Center.
4. An announcement on the upcoming call for nominees will be distributed to all faculty and unit code administrators each year by the end of Spring semester. Deadlines for the submission of these materials will be specified in the call letter for nominees each year. An official call for nominees will be distributed to unit code administrators at the beginning of the Fall semester. This call will include a brief statement that each unit is to determine their own method for selecting nominees. Nomination letters from the unit code administrators must be received in the Faculty Senate office no later than September 15 of each year. The nomination letter should include a listing of the names and departments of all nominees to the Ad Hoc Teaching Awards Committee via the Faculty Senate office. Nominated faculty who wish to pursue the award should submit the portfolio of all evaluative materials to the Faculty Senate office no later than December 1 of each year. The Ad Hoc committee chair will forward format guidelines to each candidate.
5. The candidate, once nominated by the unit, should provide the following portfolio of evaluative materials to the Ad Hoc Teaching Awards Committee:
 - A. 2-page cover letter describing his/her teaching philosophy, including efforts for effective teaching and learning,
 - B. current nomination letter from the unit code administrator,
 - C. list of all courses taught over the past 3 years, average credit/contact hours per semester, and representative samples of course outlines, tests, and teaching materials. Samples do not have to include all courses taught,
 - D. student evaluations for the past 3 years, and the corresponding grade distributions for each course,
 - E. peer evaluations, if available, or other approved evaluation methods as listed in Faculty Senate Resolution #91-28, "Methods for Assessing Teaching Effectiveness" (attached), and
 - F. 3 letters of support from former students (not to exceed 2 double-spaced pages each). Include names, addresses, phone numbers of students, and the title and date of course attended.

Please note that finalists for the award will also be asked to provide a video tape showing them teaching a portion of a class. The Chair of the Ad Hoc Teaching Awards Committee will contact the finalists at a later date concerning arrangements for making videotapes.

The total packet of materials submitted to the Ad-Hoc Teaching Awards Committee is not to exceed 50 single-sided pages. All materials must be up-to-date, using at least a size 12-font and be double-spaced. The course materials, counted in the 50 single-sided page limit, does not have to be in a size 12-font or be double-spaced. Packets that do not follow all specified guidelines will be eliminated from consideration.

6. The Ad Hoc Teaching Awards Committee will consist of 2 members elected from the Academic Awards Committee, 1 faculty member appointed by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, 1 faculty member appointed by the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences, and 1 member appointed by the Alumni office. It will be chaired by a member of the Academic Awards Committee and have at least one member who is experienced in classroom observation and evaluation. The Committee will receive the materials, which will be read by at least 3 committee members, and evaluated using the criteria in Faculty Senate Resolution #91-29 (attached). The seven characteristics of effective teaching will all have equal weight.
7. The final pool of at most twelve applicants will be contacted by the chair of the Ad Hoc Teaching Awards Committee. A copy of this correspondence will also be sent to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences for their information. Finalists must provide a videotape showing them teaching a portion of a class. The video segment submitted to the committee must be fifteen to twenty consecutive minutes in length, must include at least one pan of the students, and must have been recorded within the past 3 semesters. The date, time, and class must be indicated on the video tape. The finalists will be given 3 to 4 weeks to provide the video tape.
8. The Ad Hoc Teaching Awards Committee will evaluate the materials, including the video tapes, and by scoring determine the 3 winning candidates. Once determined, the Committee will randomly choose one recipient to receive the Robert L. Jones Award, with the other two receiving the Chancellor's Award.
9. The names of the winning candidates will be announced during the annual teaching awards ceremony that is held at the end of the Spring semester. The finalists will be publicly recognized at that time.

Academic Awards Committee

Selection Procedures for the Chancellor's Award for Outstanding Teaching and the Robert L. Jones Award for Outstanding Teaching (attachment)

SEVEN CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING

Faculty Senate Resolution #91-29

Good Organization of Subject Matter and Course: Reflected in the objectives, course materials, assignments, examinations, instructor preparation for class, and effective use of class time.

Effective Communication: Reflected in lecturing ability including use of motivational techniques such as audiovisual aids, clarity of presentation, verbal fluency, interpretation of abstract ideas, good speaking ability, good listening skills, and the ability to communicate the organization and sequence of a course.

Knowledge of and Enthusiasm for the Subject Matter and Teaching: Reflected in the choice of textbook, readings and reference lists, lecture content, course syllabus, and personal interest displayed in the subject and in teaching.

Positive Attitudes Toward Students: Reflected by helping students master subject matter, encouraging students to ask questions and express opinions, being accessible to students outside the classroom, and expressing a general concern for student learning.

Fairness in Examinations and Grading: Reflected in clarity of student assessment procedures including papers, assignments, exams, classroom discussion, and other activities, including relative weight toward grade, consistency among objectives, course content, and assessment procedures, and timely, useful feedback on student progress.

Flexibility in Approaches to Teaching: Reflected in the use of alternative teaching strategies such as small group discussion, simulations, use of audiovisual materials, and varying the approach and pace of instruction to meet different learning styles among students.

Appropriate Student Learning Outcomes: Reflected in student performance on various assessment measures and positive changes in student attitudes and values.

METHODS FOR ASSESSING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Faculty Senate Resolution #91-28

Academic Unit Implementation Plans endorse The University's Strategic Plan Goal that Academic Units employ more than one approach when assessing the teaching effectiveness of faculty members. Appendix C of the *Faculty Manual* requires that a survey of student opinion of instruction be used in evaluating teaching effectiveness. Appendix C permits the use of other methods and procedures when initiated by the Unit and recommended by the Faculty Senate and approved by the Chancellor. The methods outlined below are examples of additional approaches for assessing teaching effectiveness which units may adopt. These assessment methods are adapted from the manual, *A Guide to Evaluation of Teaching for Promotion and Tenure* published by Syracuse University's Center for Instructional Development.

ADDITIONAL METHODS OF EVALUATING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Annual Goals Assessment: An annual agreement with the unit administrator where specific goals are set that contribute to effective classroom teaching. Such goals might include, but are not limited to, updating syllabus and reading lists, developing study guides, implementing new instructional procedures, and incorporating components of writing/critical thinking into course. The unit administrator will evaluate progress related to the agreed-upon goals at the end of the academic year.

Faculty Report: A description of teaching activities including, but not limited to, the names and numbers of courses taught, number of students taught and advised, services on thesis/dissertation committees, involvement with instructional development activities, descriptions of teaching methods, and other activities that bear on the effectiveness of the unit's educational program. (Much of this information is currently part of the annual report.)

Analysis of Instructional and Other Materials: Review by the unit administrator and/or peers of course materials including syllabi, reading lists, outlines, examinations, audiovisual materials, student manuals, samples of student's work on assignments, projects, and papers. Other materials prepared for or relevant to instruction.

Instructor-Generated Evaluations: Instructor-generated evaluation procedures, such as checklists, survey-type instruments, videotapes of class sessions, and written entries reflecting on teaching techniques and philosophy.

Classroom Observations: Direct observation of classroom teaching or observation of videotaped class sessions by peers or experts. Several techniques help to make observations objective: use of an observation guide or structured process determined by the unit for observations; a number of observations before final report is prepared; observations and reports by at least two observers; observation by those outside the faculty member's immediate unit.

Structured Interviews with Former Students: Face-to-face, telephone, group interviews, or surveys asking for comments on current or former professors. Broad questions, such as the following, are asked to solicit overall evaluation statements: Describe why you would recommend (or not recommend) Professor X's class to a friend? How did Professor X's class prepare you for advanced work in the subject? What is your overall assessment for Professor X?

Measures of Student Achievement: In the case of multi-section courses with a diagnostic pretest and a final examination that both measure abilities in a similar way, student improvement may be used as a measure of teaching effectiveness. In addition, multi-section courses that use an identical final examination for all sections make possible a comparison of relative teaching effectiveness of individual faculty where observed patterns hold over five or more semesters.