USING SoTL IN UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

WESTPHAL, JOANNE
Michigan State University, westphal@msu.edu.

1 ABSTRACT

Colleges of Agriculture have become increasingly diverse assemblages of both traditional academic units and less traditional professional programs. As a result, differences in academic training, skills set development, and classroom assignments among faculty in these colleges, have made faculty performance evaluations increasingly difficult. This fact, along with greater expectations relating to external funding and peer-review publications, is creating unbalance in scholarly academic pursuits.

This paper examines the findings of a consultancy project designed to learn how universities currently define teaching as "scholarship". The purpose was two-fold: 1) to bring greater balance in, and inclusiveness to, the standards and criteria used to evaluate teaching, research, and outreach work in faculty performance reviews; and 2) to re-establish the significance of teaching to its central role as a "scholarly activity" in university affairs. To this end, interviews with eleven associate or assistant deans at ten Land Grant Universities, Colleges of Agriculture revealed a broad array of strategies used to improve teaching as a scholarly endeavor. This paper reviews the current teaching evaluation methods in place or being considered at these schools; existing or new standards and criteria being used to define the scholarship of teaching and learning through concepts like SoTL and emerging theories in educational psychology; and teaching enhancement strategies in use or proposed by college administrators to improve individual faculty teaching performance. The paper concludes with suggestions for units of design within academia that would facilitate this rebalancing effort and thereby, improve the outcomes of performance reviews for faculty of design.

1.1 Keywords

Teaching, scholarship, higher education, faculty performance evaluations, design arts

2 INTRODUCTION

Michigan State University was founded in 1855 as the state's land-grant university with the mission to advance knowledge and transform lives through education, research, and community outreach (Board of Trustees 2008). As such, the university charges every faculty member to undertake "scholarly" work that advances the lives of Michiganders (and at a greater scale, global citizens) through the "creation of knowledge". Scholarship, in this sense, is directly tied to the mission statement. How individual faculty members interpret, operationalize, and prioritize their work responsibilities, however, is dependent on two factors: 1) their contractual obligations (in percentages of teaching, research, and outreach); and 2) the effectiveness with which they achieve scholarship in their work. These two factors often serve as the baseline for determining faculty performance for considerations of merit, promotion and tenure.

The current evaluation of faculty performance, therefore, should include consideration of all three major work responsibilities of faculty (i.e., teaching, research, and outreach). Over the years, however, the notion of "scholarship" has become increasingly tied to research activities and increasingly removed from work surrounding teaching and outreach. This is due, in part, to the widespread practice of peer review and the presentation of research ideas among the community of scholars that comprise academe. Teaching and outreach, on the other hand, has increasingly assumed more technical and/or generic roles, independent of the academic community and its peer review processes. Such a separation has reduced the roles of these two activities to something that faculty perform as an obligation of employment (Shulman 1995). This artificial dichotomy of faculty work has led to significant problems in faculty performance review, a process that ultimately affects annual, competitive merit increases (unit level); decisions affecting reappointment, tenure, and promotion (college level); and award/ recognitions (university level).

In the early 1990's, scholars of pedagogy like Boyer (1990) began to challenge inequities in university practices that separated academic responsibilities into "scholarly" and "non-scholarly" pursuits. Increasingly, new discourse within universities has considered teaching (and to a lesser extent, outreach) as one facet of a broadly conceived idea of "scholarship" (Weiser 1996). The caveat is that both teaching and extension-outreach should be subject to a set of rigorous professional standards that are similar in function to research standards—i.e., peer-reviewed articles, grantsmanship, and patents. If these standards can be defined and operationalized within a university for both teaching and outreach, then both should weigh in equally with research in decisions about faculty hiring, tenure, and compensation".

With this information in mind, this project was conceived with the intent to answer several questions relating to university practices surrounding teaching performance evaluation in Land Grant Colleges of Agriculture in the US (Table 1).

Table 1. Questions used to frame the research project.

What do we want to find out?

a. Do they currently have teaching performance standards/criteria for faculty across their college?
    1. How are the standards/criteria set? (Example: by units, by colleges, by the university?)
    2. How is faculty teaching evaluated by these standards/criteria—i.e., the process of evaluation? (example: peer reviewers, unit head annual merit reviews, faculty committee in a unit, college committees)
b. Current satisfaction with teaching performance evaluation (in terms of standards/criteria, process, outcomes, etc.)
    1. Likelihood of change; likely timeframe for change (if appropriate)
    2. Possible strategies for improvement
c. Characteristics of this college that are unique from other land grant colleges?

Why is this information important and how will it be used?

a. Current evaluation of faculty performance includes teaching performance as one of three major work responsibilities of faculty (the other two include research and service)
    1. Used in annual, competitive merit reviews within units
    2. Used in decisions affecting reappointment, tenure, and promotion within colleges
    3. Used in university and other professional award recognitions
b. Social justice demands that transparent and equitable guidelines for faculty in their roles within a multi-disciplinary institution.

c. Nature of a university is to strive to advance sound and reliable measures and means for improving the environmental ambience within which its faculty work.
    1. Improved effectiveness in task performance by faculty
    2. Incubators for improved means and measures that have usefulness to other sectors supported by university research (e.g. teaching performance in secondary and primary school environments; work performance in the private sector; etc.)

Who should we interview and how should we obtain the data?

a. It is proposed that a select number of Colleges of Agriculture and/or Natural Resources within U.S. Land Grant universities serve as the focus of the study.
b. Minimum of ten schools
    1. Similar and dissimilar enrollments
    2. Professional programs and academic programs in same college
    3. Regional considerations (bold are 1st tier recommended)
        a. Big 10 schools: **Wisconsin**, Minnesota, **Purdue**, **Ohio State**, Penn State, **Illinois**
        b. Other Mid-western states: **Iowa State, Kansas State, Colorado State**
        c. West Coast/Southwest: **Oregon State**, **University of Arizona**, **New Mexico State**, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo
        d. South: **Texas A&M**, University of Georgia, **Clemson, U of Florida**
        e. East Coast: **U Mass-Amherst**, Syracuse, U Conn
c. Interview Process
    1. Initial Contact (Telephone) covering: purpose, appropriate contact person, status of current teaching performance standards, criteria & evaluation process, appointment scheduling (telephone or personal interview), existing university documents/policy for college RPT process
    2. Review of Documents/Policy; summary of findings (to be shared prior to interview)
    3. On-site or Skype Interview (Taped? Release form?)
        a. Current understanding of College review process on Teaching Performance
        b. Accuracy of University Policy summary of findings;
        c. Corrections, omissions, & additions to the summary
        d. Anticipated changes in university and college policy and Evaluation practices
            1. Regarding teaching performance standards/criteria
            2. Regarding evaluation process
            3. Post interview summary and review by interviewee, followed by a compilation of all findings on a school by school basis

What will we do with the findings?

a. Products that will be generated
    1. White paper summarizing the findings presented to the CANR Dean, CAC and RPT for review and comment & to the administration after vetting.
    2. Professional, peer-reviewed paper
b. Open a dialogue within the college and the greater university community
    1. Concerning the measures and methods currently used by other universities to evaluate teaching performance
    2. Encouraging the operationalization of those methods most appropriate to the MSU mission of supporting outstanding learning experiences for its students and ultimately in the creation of an informed electorate for Michigan.

These questions helped to frame a study that basically examined three issues: 1) the nature and use of teaching performance standards and criteria; 2) current review processes for evaluating teaching effectiveness; and 3) current satisfaction with review outcomes. In short, it addressed whether teaching currently is considered a “scholarly pursuit” on par with research among faculties in Land Grant universities across the country. To this end, it was intended that the study findings serve as an underpinning in discussions surrounding the “scholarship of teaching” in the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources at Michigan State University and to expand the dialogue on this subject among other Land Grant Universities within NACTA (North American Colleges of Teachers in Agriculture).

3 THE STUDY AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Materials and Procedure

The research project was submitted for review in summer, 2014, and received IRB approval in early fall, 2015.Two survey instruments were developed for the study. The first instrument was designed to gather baseline information on U.S. Land Grant Universities and their Colleges of Agriculture. The second instrument identified seven sets of questions used in the interview of college deans in the land grant universities selected for the study (Westphal 2015).

For the baseline information, data from the Internet, allowed the research team to identify potential schools around the country for possible participation in the study. The baseline survey was designed to provide a standard set of data on individual universities. Two criteria determined whether a university was selected and profiled. First, all institutions involved in this study had to be Land Grant universities in their respective state. Second, only Colleges with the name "Agriculture" in their title were identified as potential study sites. The baseline survey profiled the size of the university, its location, current enrollment, number of colleges, land grant status in the state, and general information on the "agricultural" college on campus (name, address, telephone number, and characteristics of the college, organization of the Dean's office and contact information, and college by-laws).

3.2 Participants

Initially, baseline data on a stratified sample of twenty universities was taken that represented Land Grant schools from six regions in the U.S.: Midwest/Great Lakes, West, Southwest, South, Southeast, and Northeast. Considerations of time and travel expenses eventually narrowed the study population to ten schools in the Midwest/Great Lakes, West, and Southwest (Table 2). These included: University of Wisconsin, Purdue University, Ohio State University, University of Illinois, Iowa State University, Kansas State University, Colorado State University, Oregon State University, University of Arizona, and New Mexico State University.

Once schools were identified, additional information specific to university-wide policies and practices addressing standards of faculty performance, student evaluation practices, and promotion, tenure, reappointment and merit were gathered for each institution being considered for selection in the study. In addition to campus-wide policies and practices, specific information on the agricultural colleges (e.g., administrative hierarchy and organization, bylaws, award/recognition practices, teaching excellence centers, etc.) was gathered using websites at these same universities. This was done for two purposes: 1) to facilitate locating the administrators primarily charged with faculty evaluation within each of respective colleges of agriculture; and 2) to prepare the interviewer for the interview process that would follow.

3.3 Procedure

The interview process consisted of three steps: scheduling, on-campus interview, follow-up. Approximately one month to six weeks before an anticipated visit, the office manager listed in the baseline data for the Dean's Office was contacted by telephone. The ensuing discussion described the purpose of the study and solicited assistance in locating the dean most likely to be responsible for faculty performance evaluation in the college. From the initial telephone call, usually contact with a staff assistant for the appropriate dean followed; review of the dean's calendar took place and a one-hour interview was scheduled. Information on the location of the dean's office on campus, a campus map, and exchange of contact information with the staff person was completed as well.

Questions from the interview survey were reviewed prior to visit & used to guide the on-site interview process. In preparation for the interviews, baseline data on the select Land Grant University and its College of Agriculture also were reviewed the night before an on-campus interview, along with notes taken during the initial telephone conversation when the interview was scheduled. University and college statistics (when available); faculty handbook information; college bylaws; university- and college-wide student evaluation practices/policies; and college administration hierarchy (including assigned roles and responsibilities of faculty titled at some level of dean when available) were reviewed.

Notes were taken during the interview process by the researcher. However, no audio recording of the interviews took place. Eleven college administrators at the level of assistant to associate dean participated in the interviews (one school sent two deans to participate in the interview). Materials provided by the interviewee during the interview session (or emailed following the interview) were filed with the school

profiles. Other materials gathered prior to the interview and used to inform the interviewer also were added to each school's profile.

Table 2. Profile of the selected Land Grant universities for the research project using Internet data

School	Region	Total Enrollment	College Name	#Units	On-campus Teaching Center
Colorado State	West	25,100	College of Agricultural Sciences	5	Y
Iowa State	Midwest	34,700	College of Agriculture & Life Sciences	15	Y
Kansas State	Midwest	24,700	College of Agriculture	9	Y
New Mexico State	Southwest	18,100	College of Agricultural, Consumer, & Environment Sciences	8	Y
Ohio State University	Midwest	57,500	College of Food, Agriculture, & Environmental Sciences	11	Y
Oregon State University	West	26,200	College of Agriculture Sciences	8	Y
Purdue University	Midwest	39,000	College of Agriculture	10	Y
University of Arizona	Southwest	42,000	College of Agriculture & Life Sciences	13	Y
University of Illinois	Midwest	38,900	College of Agricultural, Consumer, & Environment Sciences	7	Y
University of Wisconsin	Midwest	38,800	College of Agriculture & Life Sciences	18	Y

Pool of 20 Land Grant universities originally profiled for the study included: **Wisconsin, Purdue,** Minnesota, **Kansas State, Oregon State, New Mexico State**, Texas A&M, University of Florida-Gainesville, U Mass-Amherst, Syracuse, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, **Ohio State, Iowa State, Colorado State,** Univ. of Connecticut**, Univ. of Arizona,** Univ. of Georgia**,** Clemson**,** Penn State**, Univ. of Illinois.** Those in bold type were selected for further study and had their administrators interviewed.

4 DATA AND ANALYSIS

4.1 School Profiles

Ten Land Grant Universities were represented in the study. In terms of regional representation, the schools were primarily in the Midwest, West and Southwest; this was due to limited travel and time resources. Therefore, some limitations in the study findings may exist in terms of generalizing the data to teaching and performance evaluation across in the U.S.

The universities included: Colorado State University, Iowa State University, Kansas State University, New Mexico State University, Ohio State University, Oregon State University, Purdue University, University of Arizona, University of Illinois, and University of Wisconsin. All of these schools had Colleges of Agriculture. Many of the Agricultural Colleges in the study were not composed of the "traditional" disciplines that marked Land Grant Universities of Agriculture and Engineering in the late 1800's and most of the 20th century. Today, only two maintained a composition that would have been easily recognized as Colleges of Agriculture—Kansas State and Purdue. The other eight colleges were combinations of the traditional disciplines found in earlier Colleges of Agriculture, Natural Resources, Home Economics, and/or Natural Science; this phenomenon reflected the internal pressures that many universities are experiencing from reduced state funding or the diminished relevancy of certain subject areas, disciplines, or societal needs. Within the study group, the colleges were composed of 5 to 17 academic units, often encompassing professional schools or accredited programs within their ranks. Agricultural Extension programs and Experiment Stations were viable entities within all ten colleges, although their research and extension emphasis varied widely. All the universities had Centers for Teaching Excellence, but some of the Centers were housed in the Ag Colleges while others were University-wide in their support base.

The associate and assistant deans in this study represented universities that ranged in size from on-campus student enrollments of 57,500 (Ohio State) to 18,100 (New Mexico State); the average student enrollment in 2014 for all ten schools (graduate and undergraduate) was 34,500. Total student enrollment represented in the study was 345, 000.

4.2 Personal Interviews

Eleven faculty administrators at the level of associate or assistant dean were interviewed on their respective campuses during the study; no full deans participated directly in the study. All of the interviewees were in Colleges of Agriculture at Land Grant Universities in the United States and all had at least one professional program among the academic units in their college. Many interviewees held joint appointments as Directors or had Endowed Chairs, and as a group, they held administrative positions within their respective colleges an average of 12.1 years. Only one administrator was employed in his/her current role for less than one year. All interview sessions lasted at least one hour, and most extended to an hour and a half. All deans were interested in receiving the results of the study; one dean was willing to help expand the study to more Colleges of Agriculture through NACTA. Summaries of each interview were made, based on notes of the interviewer; no audio recordings were taken.

The faculty administrators were interviewed to gain insight on the teaching evaluation processes in place in the Colleges, and the teaching evaluation standards and criteria used to evaluate teaching effectiveness and student learning. However, as a benefit of physically visiting the campuses, and personally interviewing these individuals, the researcher was able to broaden the study to include teaching enhancement strategies used by the colleges. Tables 6-8 summarize the data gathered that related to the scholarship of teaching during the interview sessions.

4.3 Teaching Evaluation Methods

A wide-range of teaching evaluation methods (Table 3) exists among the Colleges. To clarify the differences between some evaluative processes, a lexicon of terminology was developed by the author (Appendix A). Only one tool—the summative (i.e., end of semester) Student Evaluation Review (SER) as opposed to the formative (i.e., throughout the semester) —was universally in place among the ten universities. However, summative SERs varied widely across the universities in both name and content. Some universities require that all colleges use the same battery of questions, while other universities identify a group of 2-5 baseline questions relating to course content and teaching performance, followed by additional questions that are tailored to the subject matter, course setting, teaching style, and/or

Table 3. Teaching evaluation methods actively in place, based on interview data.

	Schools									
	Colo. St.	Iowa St.	Kansas St.	N Mex St.	Ohio St.	Oregon St.	Purdue	Arizona	Illinois	Wisconsin
Teaching Evaluation Methods										
Student Evaluations										
Direct 1:1 feedback	x				x	x				
Summative (SER) surveys	s	t	t	s	s	s	s	s	s/t	s
Alumni Feedback (non-anecdotal)	x	x	x		x					
Peer Evaluations of Teaching (PETs)										
Team membership affiliation:										
Unit Senior Faculty	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
CollegeSr Faculty (n/d)										
Univ.mentor committee										x
External Sr Faculty (n/d)										
Classroom visits (frequency):										
One per year	x									
Two or more per year		x	x		x					
One before PT										
Two or more before PT									x	
Unit dependent				x		x				x
Review Team composition:								n/d		
One senior faculty in unit				x			x		x	
Two senior faculty in unit					x					
Three senior faculty in unit										
Department Head	x			x			x			
Unit dependent						x				
Teaching Portfolios	n/d	x	x		x			n/d		
Teaching philosophy statement	n/d	x	x		x			n/d	x	
Other In-class observations	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

Abbreviations:

s-standardized university SER

t-tailored SER

x-present or declared

n/d-no data or
data not verified or clear

student learning style of the college, unit, and/or subject matter. One would assume (incorrectly) that any specially-tailored questions were tested for validity and reliability by the on-site testing agency charged with the task of summarizing evaluations at the university before administering modified SERs. However, this did not appear to be a universal practice among all the schools in the study. The Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning (CITL) at the University of Illinois, was the most conscientious in this regard. This was due to its decades' long commitment to proficiency testing, course development, and expanding teaching resources across campus (http://citl.illinois.edu/teaching-resources). Such validity and reliability testing was not practiced consistently among universities in the study.

Some Colleges of Agriculture encouraged formative SERs of student learning and faculty teaching at midpoints during the semester; these primarily were used to test new subject matter or teaching delivery mechanisms in an effort to improve overall teaching effectiveness. All Colleges in the study used "end of the semester", summative surveys of course content, student learning, and faculty teaching performance; these were used for comparative purposes in the evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness to achieve learning outcomes within a unit. In nearly every interview, summative student evaluations alone were considered insufficient indicators of effective teaching by the deans interviewed; and many deans had either encouraged adoption of other teaching evaluation tools or were in the process of testing additional tools that would provide a more holistic view of a individual faculty member's performance and the student learning achieved in the classroom. In nearly every interview, the deans cited the literature on the pedagogy of learning.

Many colleges were grappling with either putting a peer evaluation of teaching (PET) tool into place or trying to improve the effectiveness of existing PET review systems. Great variability exists in PETs across this sample of universities in terms of guidelines for reviewers, number of reviewers, review practices (including number and scheduling of classroom evaluations), and review standards/criteria. Among the most nettlesome issues with PETs have been the faculty time commitments that an effective PET system demands, or the lack of tradition within a university to use PETs (http://www.celt.iastate.edu/teacjomg-resources/document -your-teaching/peer-evaluation/ last accessed on December 1, 2014). In this study, the most active institution in the study that was utilizing PETs and refining its procedures, and disseminating its findings, was Iowa State University and its Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT). This Center was originally created to improve teaching in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, but it has extended its influence beyond college boundaries through workshops, power-point presentations, and other mechanisms to widely affect student learning through improved teaching performance across campus. To bring standardization to PETs, CELT recommends the inclusion of certain materials in the review process to improve inter-rater reliability of teams. These materials include a faculty Teaching Portfolio (Centra 2000), which should contain a teaching philosophy statement, syllabi, exams, assignments, student products and other indicators of student performance that can be independently reviewed by a PET. Some PET review teams seek out non-anecdotal alumni feedback and/or external reviewer input of teaching materials from professional groups/individuals affiliated with a particular discipline. Almost all promotion and tenure review processes of tenure track faculty will seek outside evaluations of a candidate's work; however, these external reviewers often are directed to the more easily evaluated standards/criteria that mark research scholarly activities. Seldom are external reviewers asked to review teaching portfolios associated with a candidate, even when a candidate's academic responsibilities to teaching are above 50% time; this practice could be easily changed with PET team input.

During the interviews with the deans, some difficulty with terminology entered the discussion. For example, many individuals interchanged "general peer review" of academic responsibilities (i.e., the standard external review of teaching, research, and service that commonly accompanies a promotion or tenure case) with "peer evaluation of teaching (PET)" reviews. A second area came from deans who considered individuals outside of a department as "external reviewers" even though the faculty member under question was either in the same college or another college on-campus. The changing lexicon that has accompanied changing theories of effective teaching and learning in universities also can create confusion when discussing faculty evaluation processes with colleagues who were trained during different eras. Therefore, it is important that everyone affected by, and involved in, faculty evaluation review processes across colleges are updated as to lexicon changes occur in higher education. This insures good communication among reviewers in an institution. Centers for Teaching and Learning Excellence will be among the timeliest sources of information on changes in terminology and theories of learning on-campus.

4.4 Teaching Evaluation Standards and Criteria

A broad set of teaching evaluation standards and criteria were employed (Table 4) among the ten schools. Standards that served as "Evidence of Student Learning" and/or effective teaching (beyond normal institutional quantitative profiles involving teaching loads, undergraduate/graduate advising levels, graduation rates, etc.) included: SER qualitative comments, SER quantitative summative scores, SER formative scores (when tied to summative scores), exceptional (i.e., state or national) student awards, exceptional (i.e., state or national) student recognitions, student preparedness (for subsequent coursework in curriculum or upon entering the workplace [based on employer standardized assessments]), student products (e.g., exam performance, papers, awards, artwork, performances), graduate student placement upon graduation, graduate student career attainment levels, university teacher ranking systems (see CILT, University of Illinois), candidate's self-evaluation of teaching, and faculty teaching perspectives inventory (TPI).

Table 4. Teaching evaluation standards and criteria in place, based on interview data.

	School									
	Colo. St.	Iowa St.	Kansas St.	New Mex St.	Ohio St.	Oregon St.	Purdue	Arizona	Illinois	Wis.
Teaching Evaluation Standards & Criteria										
Evidence of Student Learning										
SERs Forms										
Qualitative Comments	x									
Quantitative Scores	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Exceptional Student Awards				x	x					
Except. Student Recognition	x	x	x	x	x					
Student Preparedness										
Subsequent Coursework	x									
Entry level post-graduation	x	x		x	x				x	
Student Products										
Exam Performance		?	x							
Papers		?	x		x				x	
Nat'l, State, Local Awards	x	?	x	x	x				x	
Artwork		x								
Performances		x								
Teaching Ranking System										
Candidate's Self-Review		x	x		x				x	
Teaching Perspectives Inventory		x							x	
Abbreviations:										
x-present or declared ?-likely, but needs further verification/clarification										

Four deans specifically reported that units within their Colleges set their own teaching standards and criteria: Illinois, New Mexico State, Kansas, and Purdue. A fifth university, Wisconsin, stated that a faculty member's university-wide mentoring committee which is established at matriculation, sets the

guidelines for teaching performance. (This is due to the strong faculty governance system at this institution). An examination of the other five schools' faculty handbooks imply that most standards/criteria of performance are set at the unit level, since it is there that decisions affecting curriculum are made.

4.5 Teaching Enhancement Strategies

Finally, it was refreshing to witness the broad complement of "Teaching Enhancement Strategies" that are used to improve the effectiveness of faculty teaching (Table 5). These included: senior faculty

Table 5. Teaching enhancement strategies used to improve teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes based on interview data.

	Schools									
	Colo. St.	Iowa St.	Kansas St.	N Mex St.	Ohio St.	Oregon St.	Purdue	Arizona	Illinois	Wisconsin
Teaching Enhancement Strategies										
Collegial Interactions										
Senior Faculty Mentorships	X		X							X
Teaching Partnerships			X							
Student Evaluation Review (SERs)										
Modified Summative SERs		X		X	X				X	
Matches College Learning Outcomes		X			X				X	
Matches Unit Learning Outcomes		X		X	X				X	
Matches faculty member's LOs		X		X	X				X	
Formative SERs		X							X	
Grants										
Small College Pedagogy Grants		?	X		X				X	
USDA Instructional Grants			X	X	X				X	
Workshops										
Teaching ImprovementWorkshops	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Peer Reviewer Training Workshop	X	X		X						
Mandated 1st yr. Fac. Teaching Workshops					X				X	
Graduate TA Teaching Workshops			X		X				X	
Awards/Recognitions										
Alumni Faculty Recognition Banquet					X					
External Faculty Recognitions		X	X		X					
Internal Univ. & College Awards	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Other										
Monthly Book Clubs	X				X				X	
Teaching Menus		X								
Teaching Academy				X	?				X	X
Required Teaching Portfolio		X			?				?	
Required Teaching Philosophy Statement		X			X				X	
Abbreviations:										
x-present or declared										

mentorships, teaching partnerships, formative SER's, small college pedagogy research grants, USDA instructional improvement grants, teaching improvement workshops, "Teaching Menus", and Book Clubs that reviewed the latest thoughts on university teaching. Peer Evaluation Team (PET) workshops were offered in several universities, and encouraged in a number of Colleges, for the purpose of enhancing the Scholarship of Learning and Teaching (SoTL) among faculties. In all cases, for faculty rated as "below average" on the standards used to measure teaching effectiveness (within a unit or College), these individuals were encouraged to pursue teaching improvement options available to them. These options were universally mentioned by the deans: 1) seeking out and securing **input from the Teaching Center** on-campus; 2) working with the deans to identify **mentors** from the ranks of senior faculty who are known for teaching excellence in the College or unit; and 3) participating is **teaching enhancement programs**. Close personal monitoring of improvements in teaching by the deans as a follow-up, reinforced the importance of teaching excellence to others in the college.

5 CONCLUSIONS

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) is not a new concept, but its use is being redefined in higher education today. University administrators interested in restoring balance among the three competing interests for faculty time (i.e., teaching, research, and extension) in higher education today, are broadening the scope of SoTL to include more viable teaching standards and criteria, improved evaluation processes, and significant enhancement opportunities to promote teaching as an endeavor worthy of scholarly recognition among peers. These efforts are slowing gaining traction as pivotal points in discussions affecting faculty merit, promotion, and/or tenure. To prepare for this study, the author examined a variety of publications, including seminal works on the scholarship of teaching and evaluation, including Boyer (1990); Centra (2000); Cohen and McKeachie (2008); Johnson and Ryan (2000); Kremer (1990); Lattuca and Domagal-Goldman (2007); and Root (1987). Personnel at university "Centers of Teaching Excellence" when visiting the University of Illinois and Iowa State University campuses suggested other works, and citations for these works are provided in the Bibliography section to promote further insight into the scholarship of teaching.

From the consultancy experience and past assignments involving faculty performance evaluations, it is the author's contention that SoTL has high potential to be a viable concept within the merit and tenure system at most institutions. The key is how it will be operationalized within existing review systems by the administration. Central to any integration will be the issue of credibility, particularly as it applies to the standards and criteria used to judge the scholarship of teaching and learning. It is here that external professional groups and individuals (e.g., Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture (CELA), Fellows in ASLA or CELA, retired professor emeriti, etc.) can play a role. Clearly, they could facilitate some of groundwork that evaluation methods, like Peer Evaluation of Teaching (PET), would require. Identifying and validating standards and criteria used to measure the "effectiveness" of teaching is another area where external professional input from professional groups like the Landscape Architecture Accreditation Board [LAAB] might enhance the scholarship of teaching. Finally, having external design professionals helping in various aspects of the faculty review process, would insure that the unique teaching demands of design studios, become a contextual part of an evaluation process.

Our online examination of university-wide policies from a variety of sources (including faculty handbooks) revealed almost no information on specific standards or criteria used for evaluating faculty performance. Websites of Colleges of Agriculture fared slightly better, with about half of the 21 Colleges actually outlining "general expectations" for faculty in teaching, research, & outreach, respectively. Interviews of the associate or assistant deans were the most informative. Almost all discussions focused on strategies used to change internal work conditions that would "level the playing field" among researchers, extension personnel, and teachers. In some cases, this involved modifications in: 1) teaching assignments; 2) contact hours related to subject matter; 3) student evaluation reviews (SERs); and/or 4) the use of SoTL in course output. The practical aspects of incorporating SoTL into existing evaluation systems often followed. Pro arguments included perceptions of social justice, administrative aspirations, and needs to "re-balance" evaluation systems that overemphasize research outputs and SERs. Barriers included institutional inertia, faculty workloads, and lack of "on-site evaluative expertise".

Each interviewee showed remarkable consistency in supporting his/her faculty in terms of improving all aspects of faculty performance, but especially, in improving teaching performance. It was clear that each of them used discretionary tools to encourage innovation in the classroom—small grants, awards/recognitions, mentors, workshops and other vehicles to celebrate and share innovative teaching

with high learning outcomes. This was perhaps the most inspirational part of the consultancy project. In a sense, it showed that the Land Grant philosophy continues to serve all segments of the public—including the ranks of academe (i.e., the faculty), who ultimately serve as the vehicle for "advancing knowledge" outward to the general public.

6 REFERENCES

1. Arreola, R. A. (2000). *Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system*. (2nd Ed) Bolton MA: Anker.
2. Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
3. Barr, R. B. & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change* 27, 6, 13-25.
4. Bernstein, D., et al. (2000). An examination of the implementation of peer review of teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* 83: 73-86.
5. Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate* (pp.1-147). A special report. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
6. Bruning, R. H. (1994). The college classroom from the perspective of cognitive psychology. In K. W. Prichard & R. M. Sawyer (Eds.), *Handbook of college teaching: Theory and applications* (pp. 3-22). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
7. Cabrera, A. F., et al. (2001). Developing Performance Indicators for Assessing Classroom Teaching Practices and Student Learning: The Case of Engineering. *Research in Higher Education* 42, 3, 327-352.
8. Cavanagh, R.R. 1996. "Formative and summative evaluation in the faculty peer review of teaching." *Innovative Higher Education* 20, 4, 235-240.
9. Centra, J. A. (1993). *Reflective faculty evaluation: Enhancing teaching and determining Faculty effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
10. _____. (2000). Evaluating the teaching portfolio: a role for colleagues. *New Directions for Teaching and Learnin*g, 83, 87-93.
11. _____, et al. (1975). Instructional effectiveness of college teachers as judged by teachers, themselves, current and former students, colleagues, administrators, and external (neutral) observers. *Research in Higher Education* 30, 2, 137-194.
12. _____, et al. (1996). The peer review of teaching: progress, issues and prospects. *Innovative Higher Education* 20, 4, 221-234
13. Chism, N. (Van Note). (2007). *Peer review of teaching: A sourcebook*. (2nd Ed.) Bolton, MA: Anker.
14. _____, et al. (2000). A comprehensive approach to the evaluation of college teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* 83, 109-123.
15. Cohen, P. A. and W. McKeachie. (1980). The role of colleagues in the evaluation of college teaching. *Improving College and University Teaching,* 28, 147-154.
16. Courtneya, C. (2008). Through what perspective do we judge the teaching of peers. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 24, 69.
17. Dineke, E. H., et al. (2004). The development and validation of a framework for teaching competencies in Higher Education. *Higher Education 48, 2,* 253-268.
18. Fosnot, C. T. (1996). Constructivism: A psychological theory of learning. In C.T. Fosnot (Ed.), *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice* (pp. 8-33). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
19. Kremer, J. F. (1990). Construct validity of multiple measures in teaching, research, and service and reliability of peer ratings." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 2, 213-218.
20. Mayer, R.E. (1992). Cognition and instruction: Their historic meeting within educational psychology. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 84, 405-412.
21. Pratt, D. D. (1992). Conceptions of teaching. *Adult Education Quarterly* 42, 4, 203-220.
22. Quinlan, K. M. (2002). Inside the peer review process: how academics review a colleague's teaching portfolio. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 18, 1035-1049.
23. Root, R.S. (1987). "Faculty evaluation: reliability of peer assessments of research, teaching, and service." *Research in Higher Education,* 26, 1.

24. Scriven, M. (1967). The methodology of evaluation. IN Stake, R. E. [Ed.], *Curriculum evaluation*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
25. Seldin, P. (2004). *The teaching portfolio: A practical guide to improved performance and promotion/tenure decisions*. (3rd Ed.) Bolton, MA: Anker.
26. Shulman, L. (1995). Teaching as Community Property. In Hutchings, P [Ed.]. *From idea to prototype: The peer review of teaching, a project workbook.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
27. Svinicki, M. D. (1999). New directions in learning and motivation. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* 80, 5-27.
28. Weiser, C. J. (1996). The value system of a university—rethinking scholarship. (http://www.adec.edu/clemson/papers/weiser.html, last accessed May 28, 2016).
29. Westphal, J. M. (2015). Evaluating current standards, criteria, and evaluation practices surrounding teaching performance in U.S. Colleges of Agriculture and/or Natural Resources. Consultancy Report, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
30. Wilson, S. M. & Peterson, P. L. (1997). Theories of learning and teaching: what do they mean for educators? (Working paper, Benchmarks for Schools). Wash DC: Office of Educa Res & Improvement.

7 APPENDIX

7.1 Lexicon of Terminology

In this study, several new concepts were introduced during the interviews. The following set of terms are provided so that the text and tables can be understood more clearly.

Alumni Feedback—formal data collection methods, tested for validity/reliability, and used to survey the learning/teaching impact of a faculty member on students; non-anecdotal.
Candidate's Self Review—refers to a faculty member's "Philosophy of Teaching" statement which is normally a part of a teaching portfolio, but not always.
Internal versus External Peer Reviewers—this refers to the composition of the peer review teams with internal suggesting all reviewers are from within a unit, and external reviewers come from outside the unit but within the college.
Performances--may include judging teams, national or state competitions, or other venues where an independent group of jurors evaluates student skills.
Peer Evaluation Workshops—programs designed to train peer reviewers in teaching scholarship and thereby, increase inter-rater reliability when peer review occurs in a unit.
Positive External Review—refers to the normal P&T process of seeking outside "authorities" in a discipline to comment on the "institutional contributions of a candidate to his/her profession/discipline.
Senior Faculty Mentorship—Senior faculty at the Associate or Full Professor rank within a unit selected to advise a junior faculty member within the same unit.
Single Reviewer versus Multi-reviewers—this refers to the number of peer reviewers on a team when evaluating teaching in the classroom.
Student Preparedness—refers to the status of a student to take on the next level of challenge based on his/her knowledge and skills acquisition in a course or curriculum.
Teaching Evaluation Methods—teaching review practices actually in use presently.
Teaching Menu—the product of an individual faculty member who details his/her teaching plan throughout the year, including evaluative comments about success and/or failure.
Teaching Partners—senior faculty at the Associate or Full Professor rank from one unit cross over unit boundaries to mentor or teach collaboratively with a members of the faculty from a different unit.
Total Enrollment—includes graduate and undergraduate students, 2014.