

Addran College of Liberal Arts
Professional Development Review Best Practices & Supplemental Materials

I. Professional Development Review Best Practices

Performance expectations for tenured faculty are not appreciably different from those for tenure-track faculty; performance expectations for instructors must be consistent with that particular instructor's hiring criteria. The standards of evaluation and the evidence that are appropriate to determine performance will be consistent with departmental, university, and college criteria for promotion (tenure or not).

Those involved in the PDRs might keep in mind that this process is intended to encourage faculty members to establish goals and to develop specific plans to increase their professional development no matter what their level of achievement: it is intended to be formative. The spirit of these reviews is *development*, meaning everyone can set goals to improve in each of the five areas relevant to their rank, or as required: teaching, scholarship, service, advising/mentorship, and professional development.

When possible, departments may consider how the PDR review cycle can be streamlined and/or aligned with planned review activities for each individual faculty and/or instructor in need of review. For example, using the PDR to prepare for promotion, or resetting the PDR matrix schedule after a review for promotion, may maximize the benefits of PDRs in a department's calendar (each department is ultimately responsible for making sure their PDR matrix is updated in the Dean's office, as necessary). In addition, each department's own PDR policy provides guidelines particular to any given discipline and/or sub-discipline with each department, allowing for special circumstances as appropriate.

Finally, each PDR provides an opportunity for requests in additional training and/or professional development from the college. The final Review Committee recommendation and the comments made about each review by the Chair may include specific ways the Dean's office may help any applicable instructor or tenure-track faculty member opportunities to further their own development in any of the five areas mentioned above.

II. Possible Guidelines for PDR Submission Materials

Though each department will likely differ, the materials each review requests are to allow for a formative, rather than summative, snapshot of a faculty member's development. The file may include the following sections with additional material pulled from the "Evidence of Development" section):

Development Plan: A written statement of about 750 –1000 words reflecting on this review period, including:

- Overview;
- Description of noteworthy activities and accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, service, advising, and professional development.
- Description of current projects underway; and
- Description of future goals and areas of improvement.

Second Method for Evaluating Teaching: Peer Teaching Observation Reports

- Reflection of teaching practice over the entire review period, including specific areas for improvement;
- Peer Teaching Observation Report #1 (lower-division focus);
- Peer Teaching Observation Report #2 (upper-division and/or graduate course emphasis).

Supplemental Materials

- Prior PDR letter(s), if any.
- Each Faculty Annual Report (FAR) since the last PDR

Note that this is only one possible set of submission materials. Each department may develop their own, as long as the method is systematic and equitable among all PDRs (tenure-track faculty and instructors, as appropriate).

III. Evidence of Development

Teaching Performance

- Adherence to any of the 8 principles on faculty performance listed in the document, “On the Evaluation of Teaching” (Faculty Senate Report, 2011);
- Teaching portfolios (possibly including a statement of teaching responsibilities, a teaching philosophy/objectives/methodologies, description of curricular revisions, selected course syllabi and other material, teaching improvement activities, student evaluation data, peer evaluation data, administrative evaluation data (see *The Academic Portfolio: A Practical Guide to Documenting Teaching, Research, and Service* by Peter Seldin and J. Elizabeth Miller).
- Class observations and evaluations (conducted by supervisors, peers, non-departmental colleagues, etc.);
- Self-assessment (reflections, journals, summative statements, etc.);
- Curricular development (new courses, revised courses, core vetting, etc.);
- Students perception of teaching, both formative and summative;
- Evidence of teaching innovation, pedagogical methods, and use of technology;
- Significant modifying and/or updating of course materials;
- Service-learning and community engagement;
- Local, national, and global outreach in course content (guest speakers, work with organizations, etc.);
- Examples of active learning & problem-based methods of instruction;
- Interdisciplinary work in teaching with faculty in other areas and/or disciplines;
- Interdisciplinary connections of subject with departments and/or colleges;
- Dissertation and/or Thesis work done with graduate students;
- Evidence of student interaction beyond the classroom (independent studies, honors theses, advising, mentoring, etc.);
- Outstanding student research and student achievement completed collaboratively or under the instructor’s supervision;
- Teaching Awards (nominated or received).

Scholarship & Creative Activity

- Publication of scholarship and creative activity since last review (peer-reviewed work distinguished from other publications);
- In-progress and/or sustained scholarship and creative activity not yet published;
- Selected samples of formal productivity, as published in refereed publications;
- Grant, grant development, or the active pursuit/collaboration in grant preparation;
- Conferences, public performances/presentations, and all invitations to present scholarship and/or creative activity;
- Editing and collaborative work that contributes to a body of knowledge;

- Research/Creativity Awards, nominated or received.

Service & University Citizenship

- All work done as a citizen for the university, including committee work (making note of any administrative role), work with students and staff, and contributions to the planning and/or promotion of special events;
- All work done as a citizen for the college (as above);
- All work done for the department (as above);
- All work done for the community (as above);
- Service and/or community awards of distinction, nominated or received.

Advising & Mentorship

- Quantitative and qualitative data on advising, both graduate and undergraduate;
- Efforts made to improve advising, both graduate and undergraduate;
- Other mentorship work done to guide and/or facilitate students and/or colleagues;
- Letters of recommendation written on behalf of students and/or colleagues, local, national, or international.
- Honors program theses and special projects.

Professional Development

- Specific workshops and/or training specific to the profession, use of technology, and/or improved performance in higher education;
- Professional fellowships, awards, and/or distinctions received;
- Any evidence that supports efforts made to improve the efficiency of processes, visibility of the profession, visibility of the department/college/university, and efforts towards fiscal development on behalf of the university.

IV. Evidence of Development

Several resources exist already regarding the evaluation of teaching, faculty development, and conducting reviews (and observations). Here is a small selection that you may find helpful:

- “Post-Tenure Review: An AAUP Response”, n.d. <http://www.aaup.org/report/post-tenure-review-aaup-response>.
- Bartlett, Kellie. “It’s Time to Review Post-tenure Review.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 19, 2003, sec. Archives. <http://chronicle.com/article/Its-time-to-review/111183/>.
- Basken, Paul. “Cost Savings Appear Elusive in Push for Faculty Productivity.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 8, 2012, sec. Research. <http://chronicle.com/article/Is-Pushing-Faculty/134892/>.
- Chism, Nancy Van Note, and Grady W Chism. *Peer review of teaching: a sourcebook*. Bolton, MA: Anker Pub. Co., 2007.
- Hebel, Sara. “U. of Texas Regents Adopt Plan to Strengthen Post-Tenure Reviews.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 9, 2012, sec. Faculty. <http://chronicle.com/article/U-of-Texas-Regents-Adopt-Plan/130721/>.
- Hoyt, Donald P. and William H. Pallett. “Appraising Teaching Effectiveness: Beyond Student Ratings.” “IDEA Paper No. 36 | The IDEA Center”, n.d. <http://theideacenter.org/research-and-papers/idea-papers/idea-paper-no-36>.

- June, Audrey Williams. "Faculty-Review Proposal at Saint Louis U. Would 'Eviscerate Tenure,' AAUP Says." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 30, 2012, sec. Faculty. <http://chronicle.com/article/Faculty-Review-Proposal-at/134022/>.
- Mangan, Katherine. "U. of Texas Adopts Plan to Publish Performance Data on Professors and Campuses." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 25, 2011, sec. Faculty. <http://chronicle.com/article/U-of-Texas-Adopts-Plan-to/128800/>.
- Otieno, Tom. "Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness". unpublished, 2011.
- Ryan, Katherine E., ed. *Evaluating Teaching in Higher Education: A Vision for the Future: New Directions for Teaching and Learning, Number 83*. 1st ed. Jossey-Bass, 2000.
- Seldin, Peter, and J. Elizabeth Miller. *The academic portfolio: a practical guide to documenting teaching, research, and service*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2009.
- [University of Minnesota Classroom Observation Instruments](#). A link from Tom Otieno.
- [University of New Mexico Resources for Effective Teaching](#). You'll find peer-review and observation forms and links to additional resources.