Faculty Senate Meeting
8 November 1993

The meeting was called to order by President Collier at 3:06 pm.

Senator Luzzo moved to approve the minutes of October 8, 1993; the motion was approved. A list of the membership of all standing Faculty Senate committees, current as of 11/5/93, was distributed.

Guests were introduced: Interim Vice Chancellor William Jenkins, Stephen Moret, Student Senate President, Laura Lindsey, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Laura Hesk representing the Reveille, Sandy Hubbert representing LSU Today, and a number of senators from the LSU Student Senate.

Visitor Presentations

Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost William Jenkins outlined some of the personal goals set for himself during his term as Vice Chancellor, revealing what he perceived as his sense of major commitments and responsibilities to the University. He reiterated that his primary commitment would be to support the Chancellor in all his various endeavors for the well being of this institution and reaffirmed his belief in the inverted organizational pyramid. He shared his thoughts on the direction of higher education and made a commitment to "do the best he can to create a milieu in which the students, staff and faculty will strive to reach their optimum potential." Higher education is entering a "time of profound change" and we should not be frightened, but seek to take advantage of the opportunities that will be emerging. He did not see a significant increase of funding for higher education in the future and we will have to confront the reality that there will be a greater demand of value for money spent. "We will also have to confront the reality of accountability - administrative, faculty and other accountability; and in keeping with our peer institutions, become a student-centered institution recognizing the needs of our students not only academically but also in terms of their well-being in a campus environment." We will also have to deal with the reality of what we are - a research institution? a teaching institution? a service institution? two of the three or all three? Jenkins went on to say that we are dealing with physical facilities that are undergoing deterioration and he believes that no new buildings are going to be built around campusus but rather that classroom will be shrinking in size. We are currently moving into an era of telecommunications, distance learning and multi-media presentations; the University will have to prepare for this.

Vice Chancellor Jenkins announced the undertaking of an Academic Programmatic Planning Process to begin Monday, 11/15/93. He will meet with all Academic deans, department heads, faculty policy committees, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to initiate review of programs, prioritization of programs and establishing direction for these programs, recognizing that budgetary considerations will be a factor.

A second goal set out was creating a student-centered institution. Associate Vice Chancellor Laura Lindsey has already held training sessions for staff in the Academic Services units where they learned to be user/student friendly and better serve our public. The Academic Services staff in turn will train their staff so that all departments under them will become more "user
friendly". This is important because our peer institutions have become very good at it.

Jenkins also explained the delay of the Junior Division merger with the General College. After reviewing the considerations he was not convinced everything was in place for its success. While recognizing that there will eventually be a change, the transition should be worked through very carefully to make it as smooth and comfortable as possible for all.

The third area discussed was the need for revisions to the general education requirements of the University. He believes the number of available courses to be too small and reported that a General Education Commission has been appointed consisting of faculty, deans, and some department heads to study the issue in detail and present a report on May 1, 1994 to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee with their findings and recommendations.

Jenkins discussed the opportunities for telecommunication and remote education or distance learning, stating he feels LSU to be in a position to deliver educational programming to homes as well as other educational institutions. Involvement with this type of learning and demonstrating the intellectual power that exists at LSU, the University can regain some sense of trust among state citizens and legislators. LSU, as the flagship university, should provide educational leadership across the board in Louisiana. This also fits with another long-term goal for the University, an international outreach effort of teaching in Central and South America and the Caribbean via telecommunication systems. The University should not invest in equipment or technology, but rather "the intellectual power which we have to sell and can deliver".

Another area discussed was the University's lack of application in multi-media technology or presentations. He announced he would like to establish a Multi-media Development Center on campus where faculty will have resources available for teaching and training. Utilization of multi-media technology is necessary to remain competitive in the future among peer institutions. Private businesses have begun training their own employees using such multi-media technology, consulting outside authorities and professors to do the job for them.

Lastly, Jenkins discussed his role with respect to the Legislative Committeerecently established to look at Accountability in Higher Education. Several subcommittees have been named to address the final list of questions established to examine faculty workload and accountability; "it gets down to the issue that has been raised in 22 of the 50 legislatures this past year - the question of faculty workload and responsibility", He mentioned that the LSU Board of Supervisors has its own study underway and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is responding separately to this request. It is imperative for us to clearly point out the differences between responsibilities for faculty at a Research I university versus those at a Junior college or smaller comprehensive college. Jenkins promised to represent the University as best he can, adding that he has a great deal of comparative data in which LSU matches well with other peer institutions. He promised to report periodically back to the Senate on how well our University does in this regard.

His principal of day-to-day administration: all administrative decisions will be as "wide as possible and for the benefit of the institution as a whole rather than separate units within the institution". Jenkins expressed his desire and intention to attend all Faculty Senate meetings unless otherwise engaged and said that he looks forward to working with the Senate.

**President’s Report**

Feedback on the Faculty Senate Newsletter, which goes out mid-month, was positive; it will be continued. President Collier attended the organizational meeting of the Association of Louisiana Faculty Senates; a second meeting will be held 11/20. All 3 Louisiana systems were represented; private institutions were invited but did not attend. The purpose of ALFS is to advance higher education and faculty interests, increase communication, and provide a concerted voice for all faculty in the state. They will meet twice a year, and currently are discussing low complete programs, role of part-time and adjunct faculty, issues of faculty productivity and workload, and faculty representation on governing boards.

Collier and Senator DeCaro attended the meeting of the Accountability in Higher Education Committee on 10/19. Goal is to get faculty representation on subcommittees; pressure being applied by ALFS, especially on Teaching Research and Service Subcommittees.

The Commission on General Education membership is being appointed presently; will consist of 8 faculty and 5 administrators, and will be chaired by a faculty member.

The Campaign '95 chair (Randy Guile) has been encouraged to include academic issues in the campaign and to make the Strategic Plan their overall guide.

**Other Reports**

Sueann Dorman, chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation (a result of Senate Resolution 90-13) presented the Committee's final report. Copies of the Report, an Executive Summary, and a resultant resolution were distributed. Stated common ground: teaching is fundamental at a land grant university, and we want LSU to be the best it can be. Primary sources: 1987 & 1990 Carnegie Foundation reports and a 1990 Syracuse University report on balance at research universities between research and undergraduate teaching. Recommendations included a multiple-measures teaching evaluation process with proactive enhancement strategies; appropriate administrative support and resources, including appropriate consideration in promotion, tenure, and merit raise actions; development and expansion of a Center for Faculty Development; and working with the Student Senate on voluntary publishing of teaching evaluations. Student Senate President Stephen Moret spoke in support, stating that outstanding teaching is not valued at the same level as outstanding research at LSU, but should be; tenure should be provided for outstanding instruction at the undergraduate level. Dorman discussed the recommendations one-by-one.
Old Business

Senate Resolution 93-01 (Concentrated Study Period [Dead Week] Policy) was discussed, which provides a mechanism for permitting exams during this period based on an exceptions application process. Steve Weintraub presented a petition from 43 Mathematics faculty opposing the Resolution as “misguided and uncalled for” and not sound educational policy. He moved as an amendment (seconded by Senator Daly) a statement that scheduled exams during this period would receive automatic approval when the course has a final exam during final exam week, changing the policy to one of notification rather than seeking approval. The amendment failed. Lab exams and course projects would be allowed under the policy. After extensive discussion the question was called and the resolution passed.

New Business

Senator Kinney moved (as Senate Resolution 93-02) acceptance of the recommendations from the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation; seconded by Vice-President Catano. The resolution reiterated the recommendations in the Executive Summary of the Committee. A substitute motion document from the A & S Faculty Senate was also provided but did not receive a second. It will be distributed before the next Senate meeting. Danny Wallace said the report perpetuates a false dichotomy between good teaching and good research; the two are not mutually exclusive. Also, the report assumes teaching is not being evaluated and rewarded at LSU while other faculty activities are being rewarded adequately, which is false: there is no meaningful evaluation and reward structure for faculty members at LSU. PS-38 is a good philosophical statement of what should happen but does not guide how performance should be assessed. Further discussion was terminated because of loss of a quorum.

On a motion by Senator Kotrlik, the meeting was adjourned.
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INTRODUCTION

The existence of the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation demonstrates Louisiana State University's commitment "to provide the best education possible to the citizens of Louisiana." As Faculty Senate Resolution 90-13 attests, the currents of support for change in how institutions of higher education evaluate and reward teaching are many and strong. (A copy of the resolution is available in Appendix A.) Calls for accountability are perhaps more important than ever in light of the ongoing financial crisis. Given the erosion of state funding and the steady increase of tuition, it is imperative that we demonstrate to students and their parents that LSU, established as a land-grant institution, is as committed to ongoing development of instruction as to ongoing research and publication. Our committee's study convinced us that constructive change in how we evaluate teaching is both desirable and possible. Positive steps the University has already taken encourage us to believe that further progress is probable as well.

This report includes the background for our committee's establishment, a summary of our activities, and a list of 16 central findings gleaned from our research. It concludes with a set of four specific recommendations for adoption by the Faculty Senate, a bibliography, and a list of the extensive set of appendices available in the Reserve Book Room of Middleton Library. (NOTE: The bibliography and appendices will be not available before the final report. If you would like to see any of the documents referred to in the draft, please contact the committee chair.) The recommendations are the heart of the report. Each suggestion rises from several findings, which both underscores the widespread importance of the needs being addressed and indicates potential support for their being met. We believe LSU will do a better job of providing "the best education possible" if these recommendations are implemented, because teaching will be evaluated and rewarded more appropriately.
HISTORY

LSU Faculty Senate Resolution 90-13 was adopted on May 2, 1991. Our committee was appointed by then Faculty Senate President Pat Culbertson the following May and charged to "study how teaching performance is evaluated at other major institutions and whether particular evaluation procedures are better than others, and to report [our] findings to the Faculty Senate with recommendations regarding the teaching evaluation procedures at LSU" (Appendix A). As part of our attempt to include all relevant segments of LSU's university population, we invited a student to join us, the Student Government Association's Academic chair (who was subsequently elected president of the organization). We began our work in the summer of 1992.

Fulfilling our charge "to study how teaching performance is evaluated at other major institutions," we undertook a survey of comparable institutions, results of which are reported in Appendix B. In addition, two seminal works of scholarship provide the larger context for our committee's study: Ernest L. Boyer's Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate (1990), a Carnegie Foundation report which suggests ways to improve how we value and evaluate teaching; and the Syracuse University "National Study of Research Universities: On the Balance Between Research and Undergraduate Teaching" (1992, Appendix C). The Carnegie Foundation report is based on nationwide surveys across the full range of institutions. The Syracuse study not only updates the Carnegie survey, but it does so specifically for research institutions; thus the results are particularly relevant to LSU, which has in recent years added the role of research I university to its land-grant status.

Other important sources we have drawn on for this report include Ernest Boyer's College: The Undergraduate Experience in America (1987), perhaps the most influential among other works calling for more appropriate attention to undergraduate teaching; a collection of reports from other institutions which have been engaged in similar efforts (most especially the report of the University of Nebraska--Lincoln); numerous articles and a book on student evaluations of teaching; and two books on teaching portfolios, which offer a means for implementing key suggestions. (A complete bibliography of works consulted by the committee is available as a separate section of this report. Copies of the teaching evaluation reports from other institutions, some of which were submitted by LSU faculty members, are available in Appendix D.)

Though our committee was not specifically asked to study current teaching evaluation procedures at LSU, we felt it would be impossible to recommend changes without doing so. Therefore we conducted surveys of deans, department chairs, and, through the SGA and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools self-study,
students. In a fortunate coincidence, the SACS self-study surveys conducted in the spring of 1993 added insights about the views of academic administrators and alumni, along with confirmation of our results for faculty. Copies of the questionnaires, summary results, and a narrative report of each survey are available in the appendices.

In addition to determining "whether particular evaluation procedures are better than others," our committee has worked from the outset both to inform the university community and to involve it in our ongoing effort. With the collaboration of Dr. Lynn Evans, Head of the LSU Center for Faculty Development (CFD), our committee co-sponsored three campus-wide Brown Bag Lunch Seminars (one on teaching portfolios, another a panel of students offering their perspectives on evaluation of teaching, and the third an open discussion of the draft report and recommendations released on 24 September 93) and two university-wide workshops on teaching portfolios for enrolled participants. We also published five articles about our activities: three in LSU Today and two in For Faculty, the CFD's newsletter. (Copies of these materials are available in Appendix E.)

Two reports to the Faculty Senate have preceded this one; an initial call for support and participation in October of 1992 and a preliminary report of findings in March of 1993. (A copy of the March 1993 report is available in Appendix F.) Besides being made available to the university community at libraries around campus, copies of the preliminary written draft were circulated among the chancellor, the interim provost, deans and directors, chairs and unit heads, the Faculty Senate Executive and Improvement of Instruction Committees, the Division of Instructional Support and Development, the SACS Self-Study Steering Committee, and college faculty policy committees with a request for responses. We hope that the Faculty Senate will be able to consider and adopt our recommendations before the end of the fall 1993 semester.

FINDINGS

NATIONAL PERSPECTIVES ON TEACHING EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The committee found a call nationwide for balancing instruction and scholarship at research universities, using multiple measures to insure assessment accurate enough to merit increased rewards for teaching.

1. Teaching can be evaluated. The pervasive myth that teaching is too subjective for evaluation has shaped the way teaching is currently rewarded in higher education. This attitude may have been justified at one time, but it is contradicted by a large and growing body of evidence. Peter Seldin (1991) reports
that "more than 10,000 studies have been published on one phase or another of teaching effectiveness" (p. 1). Centra and Bonesteel (1990) report about such studies that "there is strong consensus among and within various groups on the characteristics of effective teaching" (in Theall and Franklin, p. 13).

Acknowledging that teaching evaluation is still a "mara's nest of controversy," Boyer's 1990 Carnegie Foundation report goes on to insist that "Problems notwithstanding, faculty should, we believe, be primarily responsible for evaluating the teaching performance of colleagues, and the process should be as systematic as that used to evaluate research" (pp. 37, 38). The comparison to evaluation of research is apt, as problems with assessing quality versus quantity and relative citedness of publications continue to plague evaluators. But these difficulties are not insurmountable; they have not kept us from evaluating publications for decades, any more than they have kept us from evaluating student performance for far longer.

2. Teaching is not but should be rewarded appropriately.
Early on our committee learned that we could not separate how teaching is evaluated from how it is rewarded. There is widespread agreement that faculty do not focus on current pedagogical theory and practice in part because of the pervasive perception that teaching doesn't count in any meaningful way. According to Boyer (1987), 75% of the college professors responding to a national Carnegie Foundation survey said that it is very difficult today to achieve tenure in their department without publishing" (p. 125). This fact takes on deeper significance when compared to his more recent finding (1990) that "more than 60 percent of today's faculty feel that teaching effectiveness, not publication, should be the primary criterion for promotion" (pp. 29, 31).

The percentages who value teaching effectiveness over publication are predictably highest (92%) at the two-year colleges and lowest (21%) at the research universities, a finding in keeping with the need for different missions across a range of institutions. But Boyer (1987) also unequivocally concludes that "at every research university, teaching should be valued as highly as research, and good teaching should be an equally important criterion for tenure and promotion" (p. 126). The Syracuse "National Study of Research Universities: On the Balance Between Research and Undergraduate Teaching" (1992) both confirms and expands Boyer's assertion. (A copy of the Syracuse Study is available in Appendix C.)

This study is especially useful because it focuses on research institutions (33 public and 14 private) and because it compiles a large amount of data; 23,302 surveys were returned, representing 50% of those distributed among faculty, academic unit heads (such as chairpersons), deans, and central administrators. The results are encouraging for those committed to excellence in fulfilling the
university's instructional mission. Calling it "perhaps one of the best kept secrets in higher education," the Syracuse study concludes that "many faculty, unit heads, deans, and academic administrators at research universities believe that an appropriate balance between research and undergraduate teaching does not now exist at their institutions, but that such a balance should exist" (p. 15, emphasis added.)

3. Rewarding teaching requires appropriate and rigorous evaluation standards. The basic premise of the Carnegie report Scholarship Reconsidered is that "it is unacceptable...to go on using research and publication as the primary criterion for tenure and promotion when other educational obligations are required" (p. 34). The report suggests a variety of ways to expand the current definition of scholarship appropriately to the teaching mission. Professional organizations such as the Association of Departments of English, a subsidiary of the Modern Language Association, and the American Chemical Society's Chemical Education Division, have endorsed and acted on the foundation's advice. Their statements on teaching and scholarship suggest "criteria for assessing the contributions of faculty members whose activities are primarily in the area of teaching rather than research." Among other recommendations, the ADE statement asserts, for example, that "Scholarship should be defined broadly and not limited to the academic book or article." (See Appendix G for copies of these statements.)

Such changes do not in any way indicate a lowering of standards. Boyer (1990) puts it directly: "For teaching to be considered equal to research, it must be vigorously assessed, using criteria that we recognize [sic] within the academy, not just in a single institution" (p. 37). The person who claims to be an effective instructor must show evidence of genuine pedagogical engagement and development, not merely above-average scores on student evaluations of teaching.

To achieve that goal, rigorous evaluation must, as spelled out in the SACS guidelines, "include a statement of the criteria against which the performance of each faculty member will be measured," and "these criteria must be made known to all concerned" (Appendix H, 4.4.10, p. 43). Some institutions make the criteria known with individualized mission statements. At Arizona State University, normative percentages of emphasis for teaching, research, and service were determined by each department in the Engineering School when LSU's former provost Roland C. Haden was dean there. Department chairs include these guidelines in a one-page mission statement, which is sent forward with each personnel action.

Other institutions have further individualized mission statements. The College of Business Administration at Georgia State University has adopted a "multiple-paths faculty evaluation
system" (Brightman et al, 1990). It allows professors to choose, within certain guidelines, between five "alternative profiles," each with an appropriate mix of emphasis on instruction, research, and service. The plan recognizes changes in faculty interest in the course of a career and encourages commensurate change in the profile according to which they will be evaluated. The form used for the University of Oklahoma's "Summary Report of Annual Faculty Evaluation" specifies the relative weights of four criteria, including "composite contributions" in addition to the standard three. (A sample of this form is available in Appendix B.)

4. Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs) should continue to be part of teaching assessment. Despite the stubbornly persistent myth that SETs are merely popularity measures, research has shown conclusively that they are one useful gauge of teaching effectiveness. Cashin (1988) reports that over 1,300 books and articles deal with "research on student ratings of teaching" (p. 1). Summarizing this extensive bibliography, he concludes, "In general, student ratings tend to be statistically reliable, valid, and relatively free from bias, probably more so than any other data used for faculty evaluation" (p. 4). This judgment of course assumes that the instruments used are well constructed. It also perhaps accounts for the widespread acceptance of SETs. All the respondents to our survey of comparable institutions reported using them (Appendix B), and this is the typical pattern nationwide (Theall and Franklin, 1990, p. 63).

5. The effectiveness of SETs is directly related to how they are used. As Theall and Franklin (1990) point out, "Merely having valid and reliable student data in no way ensures that the information will be used appropriately or effectively" (p. 18). They note especially how problems with policy, procedures, and misuse by untrained administrators can undermine even the best instruments for SETs. Array (1990) points out, "For example, among faculty respondents who reported using ratings for personnel decisions involving other faculty, nearly half were unable to identify likely sources of bias in ratings results, recognize standards for proper samples, or interpret commonly used descriptive statistics" (in Theall and Franklin, p. 79). The complexity of using SETs well is graphically illustrated by the number of recommendations Cashin (1990) makes for their effective use: 32.

6. Accurate teaching evaluation depends on using multiple measures. Even if SETs are perfectly designed and administered, they still yield data about only one perspective of effective teaching: the student's. The danger of relying solely on one method is underlined by Cashin's (1990) first recommendation for effective use of student ratings: "Use multiple sources of data about a faculty member's teaching if you are serious about accurately evaluating or improving teaching" (p. 1). Even the most enthusiastic advocates of SETs agree that students are simply not
qualified to evaluate any number of important variables, such as whether the instructor is current in the field. And as Weimer stresses, SETs are not as useful as other measures for formative assessment because student ratings "do not focus on details, and the faculty members with low scores... are not likely to find answers in data that compare them to others at the same institution" (pp. 18-19).

Boyer (1990) does a good job of summarizing the main sources which most researchers agree should be part of a successful evaluation system: "self-assessment, peer assessment, and student assessment" (p. 37). There are of course any number of ways to measure in each of these three categories. Self-assessment usually includes, at minimum, an explanation of teaching philosophy, texts, and basic course materials, but what is evaluated should be tailored to meet specific job assignments. Though we are most accustomed to SETs for documenting the student perspective, exit and alumni interviews can also be used for this purpose. And while most faculty seem to feel "peer review" means classroom observation, the variety of assessment methods available is much broader. Where appropriate, for example, it might well mean external review of syllabus and course materials, using the same process as for evaluating some publications. Our committee found also a positive climate for improvement in this area. In the 1989 Carnegie survey, 69% of the faculty of research universities agreed with the proposition that "At my institution we need better ways, besides publications, to evaluate the scholarly performance of the faculty" (p. 34). A desire for "less dependence upon student evaluations" was one change comparable institutions frequently listed in response to our committee's survey. These schools also ranked peer evaluations second after SETs as means of summative evaluation. (See Appendix B, pp. 2, 1.)

7. Diverse missions necessitate departmental plans for teaching evaluation. As Boyer (1987) continually reminds us, "the time has come to recognize that the American professoriate is a profession with many cultures" (p. 128). There are--and should be--a variety of missions not only between types of institutions, but within colleges and even departments. The compiled departmental plans for teaching evaluation from the University of Lincoln--Nebraska (Appendix I) provide an excellent model for developing appropriately diverse evaluative systems.

8. Teaching evaluations should be used both formatively and summatively. The SACS guidelines for Evaluation of Faculty specify formative use of assessment: "The institution must demonstrate that it uses the results of this evaluation for the improvement of the faculty and the educational program" (Appendix H, 4.4.90, p. 43). Among respondents to our survey of comparable institutions, 100% reported that teaching evaluations are used summatively, and 89.5% reported their use for improvement of instruction (item #7, Appendix B). As Weimer (1990) notes, "Teaching never gets 'fixed'
in any permanent, lasting way" (p. 33). Whereas once teaching was more or less equated with transmitting content through lectures, many factors call such assumptions into serious question. Not only do researchers continue to understand more fully how people learn, but changes in the world and in our student body guarantee that such research will be ongoing. The explosion of knowledge is one important factor here. We've all heard examples like the one Weimer cites, that chemists will acquire 80% of the knowledge they need for a career after they've completed their formal education (p. 8). And even if we could cover all the content, evidence suggests that students couldn't retain it meaningfully. While warning against "easy generalization about the residue of education in college," Bowen (1977) reports for the Carnegie Foundation that "Most studies show that 50 to 80 percent of what is learned in courses is lost within one year" (p. 88).

Another factor necessitating development in teaching methodology is the need in a changing world for students to develop problem-solving, critical thinking skills. Citing companion surveys by Gaff, Weimer notes that while 78% of the faculty surveyed "attached 'great importance' to the teaching of critical thinking'... only 28% [of the students surveyed] said faculty spent time in class developing these skills" (p. 8). She concludes that teaching content is not as effective or efficient as using "content to teach those [critical thinking] skills directly" (p. 8). As Meyers and Jones (1993) point out, lecturing and "covering content" have their place in the university, but so, increasingly, do strategies that engage students more actively in the learning process. Citing research which demonstrates that information is better retained when it's used, the authors assert that active learning techniques "not only foster better retention of subject matter but help expand students' thinking abilities as well" (p. xii). The expansion of knowledge about pedagogy underscores Boyer's (1990) assertion that even "faculty in late career stages still have considerable capacity for growth" (p. 46).

9. Improved assessment of teaching calls for commitment of resources to support for faculty development. For evaluation to lead to improvement of instruction, faculty need a support system. As our survey of comparable institutions indicates, among schools where evaluations are used to improve teaching, "the most frequent approach was referral to a teaching assistance center for individual consultation" (Appendix B, p. 2). Such units are typically involved in individual consultations, workshops and seminars, orientation programs, teaching awards, mini-grants, newsletters, TA training/support services, handbooks or other publications, and discussion groups. (See Appendix J for more information about the activities of faculty development centers at LSU's regional peer institutions which are part of the Professional and Organizational Development Network.) According to the Association for Educational Communications and Technology's Ad Hoc Committee on Standards for College and University Learning
10. The teaching portfolio (TP) concept is an effective means for documenting multiple sources of teaching evaluation data. The emergence of the TP concept is a key means to implementing more appropriate evaluation and rewards for teaching. The TP, according to Seldin (1991), "is a factual description of a professor's major strengths and teaching achievements.... It is to teaching what lists of publications, grants and honors are to research and scholarship" (p. 3). This instrument is flexible enough to account for diversity among departments (which may choose to specify core elements that all candidates must provide) and individual faculty members (who may choose to include some items which highlight their strengths and achievements relative to their particular job assignments). It is also of reasonable length--usually the TP consists of 10-12 pages of substantive description, accompanied by an appendix with selected documentation (e.g., awards, materials developed, letters of support), which is updated regularly.

The TP offers other benefits as well, especially the potential for using evaluation formatively, i.e., to improve instruction. As Seldin (1993) reports, the very "process of portfolio development, itself, acts as a stimulant to self-improvement." Likewise, the TP is a valuable tool we can offer our GTA's entering the academic job market, as Harvard discovered some time ago. These and similar benefits allow Seldin to conclude persuasively that "many colleges and universities find that portfolios are a useful means to underscore teaching as an institutional priority" (p. 13). Such advantages may explain the rapid growth of this evaluative tool; Seldin estimates that 400 American colleges and universities are "now using or experimenting with" the TP, as compared to about "75 institutions using it just two years ago." Users include "institutions of every size, shape, and mission" (p. xi).

Summary. The committee found that teaching can be evaluated, and that it is not but should be rewarded appropriately. Doing so requires appropriately defined and rigorous evaluation measures, which should continue to include SETs, though these need to be designed and used properly. However well used, SETs alone are not sufficient; accurate teaching evaluation depends on using multiple measures. Assessment should also be used formatively, and a faculty development center is important for that purpose. The teaching portfolio concept is a promising one, as it offers a means for organizing documentation of teaching effectiveness that is flexible enough to account for diverse missions of departments and individual faculty as well as for both formative and summative uses.
FINDINGS

TEACHING EVALUATION AT LSU

The committee found that LSU is in a transition period in how it evaluates and rewards instruction. We found solid evidence of a strong value for teaching, but this was countered by a clear need for improvement in several areas.

11. LSU faculty and administrators value teaching highly. In response to our committee’s survey, 94% of the faculty respondents agreed or agreed strongly that teaching was important to them (item #6, Appendix L). In addition, 55% of the faculty respondents strongly agreed or agreed that it is appropriate to grant tenure to persons who are exclusively teachers (item #14). One called for a system such as that in operation at the University of Kentucky, with "research & teaching faculty lines that are tenure-tracked & clearly differentiated" (Appendix L, p. 19). (To some degree this system is already operative at LSU; according to the draft report of the SACS Self-Study Faculty Committee, 34 faculty members currently have full-time appointments in research. See Appendix K, p. 33.)

Another measure of the university’s value for teaching is recognition for instructional excellence. According to the list compiled by the Office of Academic Affairs (Appendix M), we now have at least 37 awards annually for teaching excellence. (This does not include awards made each year by the Student Government.) Cash amounts range from $250 to $1,500. Given that LSU employs nearly 1300 faculty members and 400 GTA’s, there is room for improvement in the number of awards. And in how they compare to rewards for research also; as one respondent to our faculty survey noted, “a teaching award might be $500. One research grant is 3 years at 2 or 3 months/year salary. The research grant is worth more to the scientist than any teaching award” (Appendix L, p. 16).

12. LSU’s Policy Statement 36 mandates that notable teaching is equal in importance to notable research, but neither faculty nor administrators perceive this value to be operative at present. Section II of PS-36 specifies that “in evaluating the qualifications of faculty within these areas [teaching, research, and service], judgments will be made as to whether the individual is engaging in a program of work that is notable in at least two of the areas and satisfactory in the third” (Appendix N, p. 3). Despite this unequivocal statement, we found little evidence that faculty are being promoted on the basis of notable teaching. As former Graduate Dean McCook noted on behalf of the Graduate Council promotion and tenure subcommittee, “Remarks on teaching tend to 'drop out' of the Dean’s final evaluation. In this era of new attention to instruction this is a grievous [o]mission. In several cases teaching was barely mentioned....” (See memo from Graduate
Dean Fogel, Appendix O.) This concern is echoed in the draft report of the SACS Self-Study Faculty Committee, which notes an inconsistency between the equal weight assigned teaching, research, and service in PS-36 and the heavier weight given to research on the LSU Systems Instruction for Promotion/Tenure Review Request" (Appendix K, p. 32; see Appendix P for a copy of the systems form).

The Graduate School subcommittee specifically recommended that the University have "standardized summary sheets for chairs and deans" to ensure that teaching be included in personnel decisions (Appendix O). The draft of the SACS Self-Study Faculty Committee report current to our committee's report recommends likewise that LSU design a standardized cover sheet including the percentages of teaching, research, service, and other expectations of each faculty member (Appendix K, p. 34). Though subject to revision in the final Self-Study document, this recommendation is offered as one important means of implementing PS-36's specific instructions that evaluation of academic performance must be "consistent with job assignments" (Appendix M, p. 3). (For an example of an evaluation form using percentages, see the sample from the University of Oklahoma, Appendix B.)

Our committee also found a striking discrepancy between how faculty and administrators perceive that teaching is actually rewarded at LSU. In response to the survey question "How is teaching excellence rewarded in your department?" (item #13 on chair survey, Appendix Q, and #23 on the faculty survey, Appendix K), the two groups answered "yes" to the choices provided as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merit Raises</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award/Recognition Programs</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Rewarded</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using a different framework, the SACS self-study surveys revealed a different split: between the way faculty perceive that teaching should be valued as opposed to the way they perceive that it is actually rewarded. As might be expected at a land-grant university, 88% of the faculty respondents agreed (57% strongly) that "the University should pursue the long-term goal of being recognized for high quality teaching and undergraduate education." But only 29% perceived undergraduate teaching as currently important for awarding raises, while another 41% saw it as being considered unimportant or very unimportant. (See items #12 and #146, Appendix R.) The percentage of faculty respondents who see teaching treated as important for promotion and tenure decisions is slightly higher (31%), while those who see it as unimportant in those matters is slightly lower (38%). (See item #150, Appendix R.)
Academic administrators responded to the SACS self-study survey similarly. Whereas about 90% of them think teaching should be important in decisions of salary, promotion, and tenure, only 43% believe that it actually is. An additional 29% felt that undergraduate instruction is at present relatively unimportant in making those decisions. (See items #132, #136, #140, and #144, Appendix R.)

Overall we found that the situation at LSU parallels the results of the Syracuse study: we do not reward teaching as much as we value it. As one respondent to our survey of department chairs noted, "The 'publish or perish' requirements of Graduate School set the agenda for the University" (Appendix Q, p. 2). The importance of this finding was repeated throughout the 93 pages of written responses generated by our committee's survey of the faculty. It is well summarized by the comment that "teaching evaluation is worth the effort only if teaching figures in the reward structure. Currently it doesn't...in which case, what's the point?" (Appendix L, p. 16).

13. Student evaluations of teaching (SETs) are the main method of assessment used at LSU. Our committee received responses to its survey of deans from all four schools and nine colleges, though not all departments were represented. (For a comprehensive view of the responses and sample evaluative instruments, see the report and Table 1 in Appendix S.) Every respondent reported using some form of student evaluation.

While it is encouraging that teaching is being evaluated, the committee noted also that of the 16 items specified on PS-36's non-inclusive list of evidence of teaching effectiveness, SETs are the only one currently widespread at LSU.

Among the other forms of teaching assessment reported were mentoring and self, peer, and administrative evaluation. More light was shed on this subject by our committee's chairperson and faculty surveys (comparing items #8 on the chair survey, Appendix Q, and #19 on the faculty survey, Appendix L). The comparison reveals some differences in percentages between faculty and administrative perceptions of methods used to evaluate teaching, but the ranking is similar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Chairpersons</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluation</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator Evaluation</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Evaluation</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicited/Unsolicited Comments</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Portfolios</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interviews</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. The primary use of teaching evaluations currently is
summative (i.e., in decisions of promotion, tenure, and raises) rather than formative. While 86% of the chairpersons and 72% of the faculty responding to our committee surveys reported that teaching evaluations are used to determine rank and reward, there is a discrepancy in these groups' perceptions of whether SETs are used formatively; that is, for the improvement of instruction. In comparison to the 62% of the faculty who reported that they are not used formatively, 81% of the chairpersons indicated they are so used. (See items #18 on the faculty survey, Appendix L, and #11 on the chair survey in Appendix Q.)

As LSU moves toward more formative use of teaching evaluation, following national and SACS guidelines, we must provide assistance for faculty identified as needing to improve their instructional skills. The Center for Faculty Development exists to do just that. In fact the CPD is itself more evidence of the commitment to ongoing improvement of the quality of instruction at LSU; several of the reports from committees similar to ours at other institutions recommended the creation of such a unit. But the center's very success and potential are already straining its resources. Consisting essentially of one person, its head, the CPD offers a wide range of services, from providing consultation with individual departments and faculty members (including GTA's) to, among other activities, offering orientations and monthly workshops and brown bag lunch seminars on topics of current importance to faculty development. (For a complete report on the CPD, see Appendix T.)

Currently the director is hard pressed to meet the demand for her services, and it is not unusual for faculty to be turned away from workshops for enrolled participants. Put simply, one full-time faculty development specialist among 1300 faculty and 77 departments is bound to be spread thinly--and increasingly so as we improve our system of teaching assessment.

15. Students feel present evaluation methods could be improved. In response to our committee's SGA-sponsored student survey, 67% felt that the current system of teaching evaluation was ineffective (item #18, Appendix U). Perhaps the most typical complaint is summed up in one student's comment that "I haven't seen any changes in teachers after evaluations." Others noted that "No student knows the outcomes of these evaluations." These perceptions may well explain a more damaging acknowledgement by student respondents: that "Most students don't take evaluations seriously and just write down anything" (Appendix U, p. 4).

These responses run counter to research which supports the validity of SETs, and to other data collected by our committee as well. Responses to the more representative sample of the student body polled in the SACS self-study survey, for example, were more favorable, with 47% indicating satisfaction with the "methods by which students evaluate faculty" and 23% expressing
dissatisfaction. (See item #98, Appendix R.) Still, at the very least the information our committee gathered indicates a need for better explanation of the evaluation process to students, whose perceptions of the University's seriousness about its undergraduate teaching mission are critical to our future as the state's premier institution of higher education.

16. Faculty and administrators suggest improvement in the current teaching evaluation procedures. Though 77% of the faculty respondents to our committee's survey agreed or agreed strongly that they changed their teaching in response to SETs (item #9), 54% said that student evaluations can sometimes be counter-productive (item #8, Appendix L). In rating the current evaluation process, faculty respondents to the SACS self-study survey split almost in thirds, with 34% reporting that they are satisfied or very satisfied, 30% neutral, and a final 34% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. (See item #129, Appendix R.) Among administrative responses to the SACS survey the perception was more positive: somewhat less than half (43%) expressed satisfaction with the process, while 21% rated it as poor. (See item #117, Appendix R.)

As to means for improvement, 76% of the faculty respondents to our committee survey strongly agreed or agreed that they were willing to be evaluated by a variety of methods. (See item #10, Appendix L.) When they rated various methods of evaluation, the TP was ranked first most often (37%), followed by SETs (26%) and peer evaluation (17%). (See item #20, Appendix L.) Our committee's survey question "What changes would you like to see in how teaching is evaluated in your department?" generated 34 typed pages of comments from the faculty. Of these about 93% suggested changes, with peer review and teaching portfolios the most frequently mentioned.

Campus support for the TP concept is evident in other ways as well. In the spring of 1993, response to a CFD-sponsored workshop on TPs was so enthusiastic that enrollment had to be closed for lack of room space. A repeat campus-wide session is scheduled for the fall, along with another workshop specifically tailored to the needs of our GTA's. LSU's College of Agriculture has taken the lead here, introducing the concept formally during a one-day retreat for its department chairs prior to the beginning of the fall 1993 semester. At least one faculty member has been granted tenure on the strength of her teaching portfolio since our committee was appointed.

Summary. We found evidence of a strong value for teaching at LSU, but, paralleling the results of the Syracuse study of research institutions nationwide, we believe that the University needs—to build on the foundation of PS-36 in order to make our practice more consistent with our values. Toward that end the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation proposes the specific recommendations which follow.
RECOMMENDATIONS TO FACULTY SENATE

Based on our study of "how teaching performance is evaluated at other major institutions and whether particular evaluation procedures are better than others," the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation makes the recommendations below, as mandated by FS Resolution 90-13. Upon the adoption of these recommendations by the Faculty Senate, we urge faculty, department chairs, deans, and administrators to commit the financial resources and support necessary for implementation. Some of the recommendations can and should be put into action immediately (e.g., #4); we recommend aiming for final implementation of the entire package by the beginning of the fall semester in 1995.

1. Require each academic department to design and implement a comprehensive teaching evaluation system that is
   a. appropriate to its mission,
   b. consistent with college/school policy,
   c. based on multiple measures (self, peer, and student),
   d. includes proactive strategies to enhance teaching effectiveness

2. Demonstrate in these concrete ways that the university values teaching:
   a. provide appropriate compensation and tenure for outstanding teaching;
   b. reiterate the positive relationship between teaching and research by including scholarly activities directly related to teaching and curriculum development among items pertaining to "Research and Other Creative Activity" in FS-36;
   c. examine current practice to determine whether it is consistent with FS-36;
   d. adjust the promotion and tenure biographical data sheet and the annual report form to reflect target percentages for teaching, research, and service consistent with each faculty member’s current job assignment;
   e. establish a system of merit raises for exceptional teaching;
   f. expand regular awards for teaching excellence at both the college and university level to more proportionately reflect the size of our faculty.
3. Dedicate financial resources to develop and expand the Center for Faculty Development, by providing for
   a. additional staff to meet increasing need for consultation and programs for instructional enhancement,
   b. released time for faculty from academic units to work on specific projects with the CFD,
   c. a sourcebook that provides guidelines for departments to develop an effective teaching evaluation system,
   d. competitive faculty grants for pedagogical research.

4. Charge the Faculty Senate Committee on Improvement of Instruction to work with Student Government on a system for voluntarily publishing student evaluations of teaching.