Promotion to Teaching Professor

March 27, 2020

Designed primarily for people applying in the 2020-2021 cycle.
Agenda

Welcome: you and your path

Review of criteria for teaching professor

Key building blocks of the teaching professor case
  Teaching philosophy
  Documenting teaching effectiveness/student learning

Evaluations:
  Student and Peer
  Peer-evaluated dissemination

Crafting the dossier
  CV – Candidate Statement – Main Dossier

Navigating the process
  Time in rank
  External evaluators

Questions-Answers
Why you, why now, what now?

Lecturer rank responsibilities:
  Teaching
  Service

Professional development  Becoming better
Documentation          Demonstrating your achievement
Promotion              Being recognized for your achievement

Every day, every way: satisfactory teaching
New progression

All lecturers:
  Satisfactory teaching

Senior lecturers:
  Excellence in own responsibilities
  Local impact / leadership

Teaching professors:
  Excellence
  More-than-local impact

Now that we have three ranks.....
Resources for the new system

New page: Promotion in the Lecturer Ranks

(on the Academic Affairs website, under Promotion and Tenure, on the Guidelines page, scroll down.)

Includes examples of peer-reviewed dissemination

CHECK WITH YOUR SCHOOL

Revised format P&T guidelines:

Includes checklists

Grids incorporate new Teaching Professor
Check with your school!

Schools can have their own criteria, and those criteria can be *more rigorous* than campus criteria.

Currently, there are three possibilities:
- **School has revised both teaching professor and senior lecturer criteria**
  - School criteria trump campus criteria
- **School has no criteria [yet] for teaching professor**
  - Defaults to campus criteria
  - This leaves school criteria for *senior lecturer* in place
- **School has no criteria specific to lecturer categories, i.e. speaking only in terms of “excellence in teaching” regardless of faculty type**
  - In practice, this means defaulting to campus criteria
Criteria for Teaching Professor
New Criteria (2 slides)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard for Excellence</th>
<th>Advancement to Senior Lecturer</th>
<th>Advancement to Teaching Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Documented student learning</td>
<td>• Record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Distinct teaching philosophy</td>
<td>• Documented student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Achievement of excellence in a teaching-related domain</td>
<td>• Distinct teaching philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Achievement of excellence in instruction (see below)</td>
<td>• Achievement of excellence in a teaching-related domain, sustained over time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation of Student Learning</th>
<th>Advancement to Senior Lecturer</th>
<th>Advancement to Teaching Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Student learning outcomes (e.g., at course, program levels)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Teaching philosophy statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student input into teaching (e.g., student evaluations)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reflection on input from student learning outcomes, student evaluations, and peer evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peer evaluations of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation of Distinct Teaching Philosophy</th>
<th>Advancement to Senior Lecturer</th>
<th>Advancement to Teaching Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching philosophy statement</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reflection on input from student learning outcomes, student evaluations, and peer evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Documented student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Distinct teaching philosophy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excellent achievement in Instruction and also in at least one of the other domains (course or curricular development, mentoring/advising, service in support of teaching/learning), depending on responsibilities.¹
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent Achievement in <strong>Instruction</strong> and also in at least one of the other domains (course or curricular development, mentoring/advising, service in support of teaching/learning), depending on responsibilities.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excellent Achievement in Instruction</strong></td>
<td>• Documentation of extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes. The case for teaching excellence is grounded in a sophisticated teaching philosophy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Excellent Achievement in Course or Curricular Development** | • In addition to producing effective course and curricular products, shows evidence of having disseminated ideas *locally or internally* through administration, mentoring, publication, presentation, or other means.  
| | • In addition to producing effective course and curricular products, shows evidence of having disseminated ideas *within the profession or generally* through administration, mentoring, publication, presentation, or other means. |
| **Excellent Achievement in Mentoring and Advising** | • Mentoring and advising (of students) is characterized by a scholarly approach. High accomplishments of students mentored or advised are consistently linked to the influence of mentor, demonstrating impact. Scholarly and reflective approach to mentoring and advising is documented. |
| **Excellent Achievement in Service in Support of Teaching and Learning** | • Course coordination, training of other faculty, support of student learning experiences, support of community in area of expertise, etc. |

Yes: peer reviewed dissemination  
Same/more: student learning documentation  
More flexible: ways in which to impact student learning
Key building blocks of the Teaching Professor case

Brief:
- Teaching philosophy
- Documenting student learning / teaching effectiveness

More:
- Evaluations:
  * Student
  * Peer

Dissemination
Teaching Philosophy:

*Why* you do what you do:

Easier, harder : depends on you

Plausible, weird, weak, strong : depends on your readers and your discipline

CTL materials: [Writing a Teaching Philosophy or a Teaching Statement](#)

*Most of your readers will NOT be “SoTL” experts*

*The majority of school and campus committee members only achieved “satisfactory” in teaching. They will EXPECT something that is more advanced, thoughtful and sophisticated than what they themselves provided!*
Documenting student learning

Consult with the Center for Teaching and Learning

Key points:

• Can be course or program-related (or both)

• Needs to include at least some direct measurement
  • Student evaluations are NOT direct measurement of student learning
  • Method should be appropriate to your program’s design and student goal
  • Can be indirect: e.g. mentoring adjunct faculty so their teaching is more effective
More on documenting student learning

1. Does your program already have a method set up?
   - Accreditation standards
   - Standardized exams
   - DFW rates / retention
   - Tracking success in subsequent classes
   - PRAC report for your department?

2. How do you measure student learning in each course you teach?
   - Aggregated information
   - Analyzed over time, teaching methods, innovations
   - Learning goals → learning assessments

3. Center for Teaching and Learning
   - Resources page

Will and should vary according to your responsibilities, typical students, and disciplinary area
Evaluations: Student

Mounting evidence of inherent systematic bias in student evaluations:

*The same instructor online with a female name*

*is rated lower than with a male name*

People who “look authoritative” [according to historical presence in that field/at that rank] are given higher ratings

Try this at home: google “image professor”
Images for image professor

- cartoon
- university
- anime
- teaching
- character
- college
- lecturing
- happy

People who are white, male, balding, and owlish are more authentic!
Until and unless we revise the guidelines

Stop being complacent about “high” student evaluations
   It is *required* that you provide student eval data
   It is *not required* that you put it into the CV, although many do

Stop comparing yourself to others
   Not everybody can be or will be ‘above average’

**INSTEAD:**
*Within your dossier and candidate statement focus on this:*

What do YOU do with student input?
   Student comments
   Mid-semester “check-ins” ← you don’t have to JUST have end-of-course evals.
      Volume and content of student questions? ← find your own ways to document how you encourage and use student *input*

How do YOU use it to continually improve?
Disasters and innovations

If you try something new and it doesn’t work
If the world goes crazy around you and your students

Use this as an opportunity to **reflect**

Teaching professors are supposed to be:
• Self-conscious professionals
• Intelligent enough to analyze their own teaching
• Creative
• Forward-thinking

Not perfect
Evaluations: Peer

Campus guidelines specify multiple peer evaluations for ANY person with teaching responsibilities; for non-lecturers, this often means “2”

For lecturer track faculty, expectations usually include:

• A continuing series of peer evaluations over time
• Enough time for you to reflect on results and adjust teaching
• Reasonably representative of the types of teaching you usually do

“Peers” are not just CTL staff
For creating a dossier this summer: peer evaluations

What if you haven’t had peer evaluations in a while?

• Make an effort, **this semester for at least some**
  • In Canvas, you can add someone as a co-instructor. That way they can see all of your class materials and grading; they can’t see individual emails.
  • Look at past years’ annual reports: if you and your chair or director discussed your teaching, use those as a proxy for peer evaluation

• In your statement be sure to discuss *how you have gathered information to help you improve over time*.

Prediction as to expectations: *lecturers are experts*

*Whatever you do, will need to look more impressive than what tenure-track faculty normally do for ‘satisfactory.’*
Peer-reviewed Dissemination

Dissemination → Impact

Leadership → Influence
Teacher A has GREAT IDEA

Benefits students
Yay!

Teacher B reads about GREAT IDEA
Implements

Benefits students
Yay!

Teacher A: satisfactory

Teacher B: satisfactory
Teacher X has GREAT IDEA

Benefits students Yay!

Teacher X = EXCELLENCE
IMPACT = much broader

Teacher B Implements

Benefits students Yay!

Teacher C Implements

Teacher D Implements

Disseminates idea through conferences or publications

Teachers B, C, D Satisfactory
Peer-reviewed Dissemination

Peer-reviewed →
Not Cr&P
Not “Famous in your own Head”
To belabor the obvious: mere popularity does not mean useful, accurate or promotion-worthy

Vaccines cause autism

Grapefruit cleanses heal your body’s natural balance

COVID-19 is a Communist Conspiracy

Who has ‘vetted’ your presentation?

(Any conference / event where you have to apply to be a presenter, is ‘peer-reviewed.’)
Wow, who knew? cite

**THE LEICESTER DEMONSTRATION MARCH OF 1885**

Leicester was a popular location for Anti-Vaccination Leagues to meet.

In 1885, between 80,000 - 100,000 demonstrators led an elaborate march that included...

- Anti-vaccination banners
- Children’s coffins
- A burning effigy of Edward Jenner

Due to such demonstrations, a new Vaccination Act in 1898 removed the penalty for vaccine refusal.
More resources

This document came out of a discussion among chairs and P&T committee members about what they considered to be ‘peer’ ‘dissemination.’

Check with your own unit to see if they have examples or common understandings. (This workshop can only tell you what campus review will find appropriate)

Definities and Examples

This document provides examples of peer reviewed dissemination that
Crafting the dossier
Dossier building blocks

The CV is a comprehensive list

The candidate statement is a coherent argument

The rest of the dossier supports and explains
IUPUI has a specific required CV format

Use DMAI to capture information and generate a formatted CV

Virtually all presentations, publications, and grants will be labelled as “teaching”

Whatever disciplinary research you have can be included, but it will be ‘invisible’ for your teaching professor case
Candidate statement
Describe:

Activities: as appropriate
• Curricular design
• Course design
• Course delivery
• Teaching load; responsibilities

Accomplishments:
• Student learning outcomes

Excellence in teaching is expected to be:
• Based on a cohesive, intentional philosophy
• Reflective
• Continually improving

Resources:
Quick Guide to Candidate Statement
Scholarly Teaching Taxonomy
Writing a teaching philosophy

5 page statement +
2 page philosophy
OR 7 page statement
Candidate statement

For lecturer candidates, consists primarily of your teaching statement

Can go like this:

Brief description of your position and responsibilities (department/program, usual course loads, other activities, main changes since last promotion/hire)

Teaching statement:
  Teaching philosophy; goals in teaching
  Examples of development and progress
  Accomplishments showing excellence

Discussion of service:
  University citizenship

Absolutely essential: Get SOMEONE ELSE to read it!
Quick word about dossier style (presenting your case) and introverts vs. extraverts

Faculty are somewhere along a spectrum of ‘introverts’ and ‘extraverts.’

People who are introverts usually have this **challenge for their dossier:**

**SPELLING OUT THE OBVIOUS**

If this is you, you may not include background information that is obvious to you (what kinds of classes you teach), or, the **reasons** why you do what you do. You HAVE reasons, you just don’t spell them out. When you ask someone to look over your candidate statement, have them tell you what they have ‘read’ and understood in it: you will probably find things missing. Add them in!

People who are extraverts usually have this **challenge for their dossier:**

**IDENTIFYING KEY POINTS**

If this is you, you may include in-process (vs. final) thoughts, and you may list lots of things and expect a reader to put them together and pick out the highlights. Many of your readers will **skim** and will want YOU to make sure they can see the essential highlights. When you ask someone to look over your candidate statement, ask them the overall impression/points they can take away. If they struggle, then spell it out for them and re-insert that into the statement.

Much of my advice will sound like it is pointed at introverts...because it is, I am, and this is what I see the most. I hate the most for someone to actually BE GOOD but to lose out because they have NOT PRESENTED IT WELL.
Candidate statement

Your peer-reviewed dissemination is evidence of your excellence and leadership.

It is not a goal in itself. Relate your dissemination to your overall goals and accomplishments as a teacher.
Main dossier

50 pages maximum: you do NOT need to fill it
(50-page-limit includes the candidate statement BUT NOT the CV)

Explanatory details:
Keep the candidate statement coherent: link to details here

Raw data, key data:
Ask your school what raw data they expect:
All student evaluations? Appendix

Key data:
Summarize student evaluations
Summarize student learning outcomes data
At least SOME graphs / visuals will be helpful!
Dossier structure

This version of the P&T Guidelines shows these in detail.

E-dossier folders:

Teaching Statement (if applicable) \( \rightarrow \) only if using a 5-page candidate statement
Teaching load and goals
Peer review of teaching (aggregated)
Student evaluation of teaching (aggregate)
Disseminated scholarship on teaching and learning
Impact of instruction on student learning outcomes
Course, curricular, and professional development
Teaching recognition – grants, awards, honors, fellowships

Appendix: Teaching publications
Appendix: Sample of course materials
Appendix: Student course evaluations
Appendix: Peer evaluations
Appendix: Unsolicited letters from former students
Appendix: Additional Evidence
Appendix: Candidate Solicited Letters
Navigating the process
External review

Organized by chair

For teaching professor candidates 2020 cycle:

• Not co-authors, co-workers, co-PI
• Clinical full or tenured full rank
• Titles may vary by institution

At least 2 must be external to IU
Comparable institutions unless the chair makes a specific case for inclusion. Must be academic faculty, at full rank.

Materials for the reviewers:

Candidate statement
CV

Materials illustrating teaching accomplishments:
• Sample syllabi
• Teaching materials
• Publications/dissemination

Sufficient
Relevant
Not too much
Time in rank

Faculty at any ‘full’ level (teaching professor, clinical full, tenured full, research full) are expected to have **sustained** accomplishment.

There is no hard timeline; typically one is at the middle/associate rank at least 5 years.

During 2020-2023 (3 cycles), your **exact title** will not matter, because criteria were different.

People already met many of the criteria for teaching professor when applying for senior lecturer.

Instead, demonstrate that you meet teaching professor criteria and that you have had sustained accomplishments.

Spell it out please!
More on time in rank during the transition period (2020-2023)

Suppose this:

Hired in 2009 as lecturer
2010 attends EC Moore
2011 attends CTL workshops, joins Gateway faculty group
2012 is part of a panel discussion at EC Moore
2013 gives a presentation at EC Moore
2014 receives Curriculum Enhancement Grant to use clickers
2015 gives a quick-presentation at the Assessment Institute
2016 publishes a brief article in *Midwest Ethics* journal
2017 publishes an article on “Can Clickers Help Students Discuss Hard Topics” in *Journal of Teaching Ethics*

*Promoted to senior lecturer-old format*
2018 two more presentations at one state and one national conference;
four items accepted for the teaching repository at IUPUI
2019 one more article in *Science of Learning*
2020 Consultant on NEH grant on ethics teaching

Work in-rank *if the new had existed*
For your own timeline

1. Figure out when you **would have** qualified for senior lecturer rank under the **new** rules

2. Accomplishments after that date you will characterize as **time in rank**

3. Present approximately **five years of** senior-lecturer-level work

4. Do not attempt to present only one year worth of presentations/publications: people want your **leadership** and **dissemination** to be **sustained**

Consider having a special section in your dossier where you give the details, so you don’t need to cram the explanation into your candidate statement
Timelines: Normal P&T cycle

Normal promotion-and-tenure cycle timeline: (“cycle year” the academic year in which a dossier is reviewed)

- Fall before the cycle year: candidates notify chairs of intention. Chairs start arranging for external letters.

- Spring before cycle year: candidates prepare materials for external reviewers: at least: CV, candidate statement, materials demonstrating teaching (e.g. syllabi). Some schools require more.

- June-July: candidates gain access to eDossier and submit their materials. Chair checks for completeness.

- August-Sept: Department and then School committees meet.

- Sept-Oct.: Dean finalizes the case. Last Friday in October: complete case due to campus. Candidate is notified at each level of results.

- Jan.-March: Campus committee meets

- April-May: Campus administrators, President, Trustee finalize

- June/July: Promotion takes effect

COVID change? Nothing so far for campus deadline. Check with your school
Timelines: Teaching Professors 2020

1. Tell your chair!

2. Tell your chair!

3. Key dates for you to find out:
   - When does the chair need to have your materials to send to external reviewers?
   - Summer, sometime: you will have access to edossier

4. Once things are submitted in e-dossier, YOU get to relax! You’re done.

FYI: If you receive a negative vote, you MAY submit additional material. For promotion cases, there is no requirement that any reviewer revisit the vote, but they may choose to do so.
Questions and answers???
Thank you!