

Report of the Committee on Excellence in Teaching and Learning

Summary

The report that follows includes many ideas and suggestions for improving teaching and learning. The notion that teaching is undervalued at Baruch is not new; nor is there a dearth of ideas on how to improve pedagogy and reward those who excel.¹ This report draws on previous documents but also reflects fresh thinking about the goal that we identified as essential: building an institutional culture in which teaching is highly valued. The following summarizes the elements that we believe are necessary to achieve that goal.

Personnel Decisions

Teaching must become a significant input into rehiring, promotion, and tenure decisions. From their first day on campus, new faculty must be informed not only of the importance of teaching (which we emphasize in orientations), but should receive a clear articulation of the formal mechanisms by which they will be assessed and the array of support services available to help them succeed. All else flows from that commitment. If it is real, hiring decisions similarly would place significant emphasis on teaching, as would regular department retreats and handbooks for those who teach within the department. Incentives for senior faculty and adjuncts must be tailored to their situation and needs. Senior faculty with weak teaching records may require more “sticks” to encourage participation; rewarding valued adjuncts could be achieved with a judicious use of non-tax levy funds.

Assessment of Teaching

To improve teaching, we must improve the assessment of teaching. Peer observations of tenure-track faculty and adjuncts must be professionally done and should be organized by department faculty responsible for a formal evaluation of the tenure candidate’s teaching capability. We advocate a training process for observers and the creation of teaching portfolios that will play a significant role in the evaluation process. The Annual Evaluation must be constructive but honest. The newly revised student evaluation will provide significant new data upon which to build. Given the important role played by members of the adjunct faculty, they too should be subject to thoughtful observations and constructive interventions.

Team Teaching and Mentoring

We suggest the systematic creation of “teams” organized around those who teach the same sections of multi-section courses. These are discussed in one of our appendices (see below). Here we highlight the mentoring role that team leaders would provide for junior tenure-track faculty and for adjuncts – an institutionalization of pedagogical mentoring that flows naturally from our curriculum.

¹See The Zicklin School of Business Teaching Committee, May 2003 at <http://aux.zicklin.baruch.cuny.edu/index2.htm> See also the Zicklin School of Business Strategic Plan, Section D4: Making teaching a higher priority (p. 18) <http://aux.zicklin.baruch.cuny.edu/documents/aacsb/StrategicPlan.pdf>

Resources

The college must provide support services for faculty development that do not become part of the personnel file. If teaching becomes a meaningful input into tenure decisions, then junior faculty will seek out teaching consultants, video-taping, master-teacher workshops, as well as mentoring, teaching teams, and other initiatives in order to improve. Put simply, if we place a high enough value on quality teaching, we will create an internal market in teaching-improvement strategies. If we do not, the impact will be minimal, regardless of the resources we offer.

Issues that will require additional discussion

Several issues need more work. The teaching load disparity across schools is glaring and must be addressed. We should consider experimental projects such as anonymous electronic answering in classes; this suggestion underscores the need for a much larger conversation about how to improve learning at the college.

Appendices

Our report includes seven appendices, some of which are, in essence, position papers written by individuals. All have been endorsed by the members of the committee.

Appendix A: Faculty Incentives

Appendix B: Teaching Teams

Appendix C: Report on Interview with Stephanie Nickerson, Director of the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning, Stern School of Business, NYU

Appendix D: Report on Survey of Department Chairs

Appendix E: Report on a Survey of Adjunct Faculty

Appendix F: Report on History Department Teaching Workshop

Appendix G: Teaching in Tenure and Promotion

Committee on Excellence in Teaching and Learning

Ken Guest (Soc/Ant)

Curtis Izen (CIS adj)

Ted Joyce (Eco/Fin), co-chair

Umme Hena (undergraduate)

John McGarraghy (SPA)

Diane Morgan (graduate student)

Harold Ramdass (Eng adj)

Dahlia Remler (SPA)

Dennis Slavin (Assoc. Prov.), co-chair

Christine Tan (Acc)

Cynthia Whittaker (His)

Report of the Committee

The broad charge to the Committee is to develop recommendations for promoting a culture at Baruch College in which teaching excellence is valued and supported.

We are to make recommendations in support of:

- institutionalizing support for excellence in teaching and learning at the College;
- promoting and enhancing faculty development efforts in support of teaching excellence, especially within the dynamics and parameters of the large classroom format;
- developing methodologies for evaluating and recognizing teaching excellence;
- identifying institutional roadblocks to teaching excellence and making recommendations for overcoming them.

Since the initial meeting on June 8, the committee has met three times. Each member was assigned tasks that included surveying department chairs, members of the adjunct faculty, and selected students, and interviewing Brauch's academic deans and the director of a teaching and learning center at a neighboring institution. The report that follows reflects a general consensus of the committee about priorities for the college in support of improving teaching and learning at Baruch, with suggestions for both immediate and long term changes. Some of what is advanced is still preliminary and some overlaps with the BCF initiative announced by President Waldron at the Faculty Senate on September 8 – and is thus already in process. A basic conclusion was that meaningful progress would require fundamental cultural change.

Institutionalizing support for excellence in teaching and learning

Without significant administrative support for such excellence, no initiative in this direction will have major impact. The BCF faculty development initiative for 2005-2006 is an important step, but such support will be insufficient to achieve cultural change unless members of the faculty and chairs come to believe that the availability of support will be matched by incentives for success (i.e. as measured by participation in the effort and by improved teaching) and disincentives for failure (i.e. inadequate success in teaching and lack of demonstrated effort to improve). Stated bluntly, unless members of the faculty, including chairs, are convinced that the college's P&Bs will weigh teaching more heavily than has been the case, support for better teaching cannot/will not be institutionalized in any meaningful way.

If improved teaching requires administrative support, support for learning also must come from faculty. Improving learning cannot take place without assessing results and making change based on those results. That process will fail without faculty support, support that cannot be taken for granted. The Joint Committee on Curriculum and Articulation is charged with reporting to the Strategic Planning Council on assessment; however, a few additional points are worth making here.

First is the somewhat obvious but necessary concept that good teaching should be defined by good learning. Another is that a primary goal of secondary education should be that students learn how to learn – so that they become lifelong learners and informed citizens. That skill, along with the abilities to think critically and communicate clearly, transcends disciplines and should be understood to underlie the college’s curricula. Freshman seminars and the learning communities should strongly emphasize the acquisition of basic learning/note-taking skills. Faculty development efforts aimed at emphasizing learning with attention to different student learning styles, assessing student learning throughout a course, exploring service learning, and encouraging greater student involvement/ engagement through collaborative and cooperative learning should be hard wired into the approaches suggested below. In the end, we want to make our courses as easy as possible for students to learn from – and not simply as easy as possible. Consequently, we want to be careful to reward faculty members who maintain high standards. Finally, we (and members of our faculty) should keep in mind the thought articulated by one of our chairs: “We do not teach political science [or accounting, or public affairs etc.]; we teach students.”

Incentives/Disincentives by faculty rank and status

Appendix A discusses a number of specific incentives for engaging members of the faculty in a college-wide effort to improve teaching and learning. Here we simply would like to emphasize that incentives and disincentives must vary to some degree depending on faculty rank/status:

Tenured Faculty

Tenured faculty, especially tenured full professors, have little incentive to participate in initiatives to improve teaching other than a desire to improve. Indeed, those tenured faculty who would volunteer to be video-taped, to confer with a consultant, to accept peer review, etc., are likely to be the faculty members who least need such support. And yet, it is the more disengaged senior faculty who should be the target of many of these initiatives. The challenge for the committee is to find both carrots and sticks that might be brought to bear on these faculty members so as to increase their likelihood of participation. One caution: financial and release time incentives risk communicating the idea that being a good teacher is an “extra” for which members of the faculty deserve special compensation – and is not part of their jobs.

Tenure-Track Faculty

Initiatives to improve teaching may bring the most value-added among the tenure-track faculty. However, this depends critically on the weight given to teaching in tenure and promotion decisions. The general perception is that good scholars but poor teachers have a much stronger chance of tenure than fair scholars but excellent teachers. If the college is serious about rewarding teaching, then we have to develop more concrete ways to evaluate teaching and to make that evaluation part of the personnel decision (see **Appendix G**).

Adjunct Faculty

Given the relatively low pay received by adjuncts, insisting that they participate in initiatives to improve teaching is difficult. They must be paid for their time; yet the temporary nature of their employment might argue for limited investment in their development. However, two groups of adjuncts merit special attention. First, there are the long-time, highly professional adjuncts who are invaluable teachers. Every Chair and program head has several and most go out of their way to reward these adjuncts with the courses and schedules they want. This is a group for whom initiatives coupled with financial rewards might have big payoff. The other major group is graduate students. They might be more willing to participate in initiatives as part of their professional development. Again, their tenure is relatively short, and so more attention to orientation, focused supervision, and feedback might be the most cost-effective approach.

Two promising strategies for institutionalizing support*Teaching Teams and Team Leaders*

Organizing members of the faculty who teach multi-section courses into teams that meet regularly to discuss teaching strategies and learning outcomes could lead to benefits almost immediately. This strategy is discussed more fully in **Appendix B**. Members of the team (which would often include both full- and part-time members of the faculty) would have the opportunity to observe each other teach and to learn and develop best practices. The team leader would serve as a de facto mentor for newer members of the faculty, thus institutionalizing pedagogical mentoring.

Mentoring

A model such as that employed by Baruch's History Department might successfully be adapted/adopted by other departments. New members of the faculty (this could be broadened to include adjuncts) are assigned mentors, and are required to meet before the semester begins. Topics for discussion include the diverse nature/background of the student body, on-site explanation of technology, a review of sample syllabi, and the proposed syllabi for the first semester.

Promoting and enhancing faculty development efforts in support of teaching excellence²

- Use of video-taped classes; tapes/DVDs may be used by the faculty member him/herself, with or without consultants;

² This section shares a number of ideas with those discussed in **Appendix C**, the report of Christine Tan's interview with Stephanie Nickerson, Director at the Center for Director at the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning, at the Stern School of Business (NYU). Two key points of the Stern program (Stern Teaching Effectiveness Program – STEP) are: 1) that it was started by the members of the faculty; and 2) that it is a mandatory program. Faculty can choose from among a smorgasbord of options, most of which focus on observation in some form and work with consultants. If the instructor has been through all of those options s/he can choose to attend workshops instead.

- Availability of outside consultants to work with video and/or discuss various aspects of teaching;
- Availability of video creation specifically for placement on Blackboard (brief lessons on specific topics);
- Master-teacher workshops (attendance will be very sparse – and will involve preaching to the converted – without the strong support of deans and chairs and remuneration for adjunct attendance);
- Summer/January “institutes” for adjuncts (with remuneration for attendance);
- Discipline-based consultation by groups of faculty teaching specific courses with SACC and/or Writing Center tutors;
- Forums for section/team leaders to meet with leaders from other departments to discuss best practices for leaders;
- Accent reduction program and workshops for international faculty (currently in place) have been effective; deans and chairs need to convince more faculty to participate;
- Departmental orientations, retreats, and handbooks – administration can make consultants available and provide food. (See **Appendix F** for a report on the September 23, 2005 retreat of the History Department.)
- Support attendance at teaching-related conferences;
- Hiring practices: at least one department (Political Science) requires that a job candidate teach a class under its observation. “This not only provides them information about us and us about them; it also demonstrates in a tangible way the depth of our commitment to excellence in teaching and learning.” (Tom Halper) An alternative could be a presentation to advanced students on a topic of the candidate’s choosing. The point being that without an opportunity to teach or otherwise present to students, job candidates receive the message that research is the only thing that counts. See **Appendix D** for John McGarraghy’s report on his survey of department chairs.

Developing methodologies for evaluating and recognizing teaching excellence

Personnel decisions will be hampered without significantly enhanced effort to assess teaching (and support for improving it) via peer observations and student evaluation.

Evaluation

Peer Observations

- Follow the first-ten-semester rule (mandated by the PSC contract) in all departments;
- Observe regularly thereafter (perhaps one out of four semesters); more if problems seem to arise;
- Train the chairs to help faculty observe each other;
- Train the members of the faculty to observe each other;
- Be clear and consistent about to look for;
- Clarify the role of syllabi, learning goals, use of technology etc.

Student Evaluations

- Require them and post results; perhaps include departmental or course averages on the web;
- Encourage faculty to employ their own mid-semester evaluations for self-assessment;
- Hold regular workshops to discuss how to assess the results of student evaluations and make use of the information they provide;
- Appropriate committees should regularly assess the instrument.

Other methodologies

Encourage members of the faculty to use online teaching portfolios. This would require substantial yearly fees to a vendor and regular professional development in the use of portfolios. Faculty members could post their teaching materials online for view by other instructors and students. They could post videos of themselves teaching to provide samples for students to view when choosing classes. A portion of the portfolio could contain representative samples of the instructor's scholarship.

Recognizing Excellence

- Include teaching as a category in the annual Faculty Recognition Ceremony;
- Allow "best" teachers more leeway in choosing their programs;
- Present awards, primarily financial, to outstanding adjuncts.

Identifying institutional roadblocks to teaching excellence and making recommendations for overcoming them

Some of these are endemic in higher education; some more specific to Baruch.

Roadblocks

- Culture that devalues teaching versus research;³
- Tenure process and short clock;
- Lack of funding to support and reward excellent teaching (the BCF initiative suggests change);
- The radically different levels of need and attention in the classroom: ever larger pools of good students, yet significant number of others, including ESL, those barely past remediation, and those woefully under-prepared;
- Many of our students chafe at core requirements, especially those (many) who are career- versus learning-oriented;
- The large number of students who work part- and full-time: they often come to class unprepared and tired – particularly obvious in early mornings or evenings;

³ Indicative of the gap between those who value teaching and many others at the college is the response of one of the chairs to the survey reported on in **Appendix D**. He wrote that new faculty coming from research universities would not have difficulty transitioning into Baruch because "we at Baruch are also a doctoral research university."

- Many students are working parents or otherwise responsible for support of families – many succeed, but making learning their priority often is difficult;
- Large percentage of courses taught by adjuncts.

Recommendations

- The “cultural” issue was addressed under institutionalizing support (pp. 3-5): key is need for administration to reinforce change through personnel actions;
- Maintain support for lengthening the tenure clock; if necessary, support a proposal to distinguish the CUNY senior colleges from the others in this regard;
- Continue to fight for a fair allocation model in which full time lines taken from the college in the 1990s are returned, thus lessening reliance on part-time faculty;
- Make faculty development efforts (discussed above) attractive for adjuncts to participate in.

Responses from members of the adjunct faculty

These are discussed in more detail in **Appendix E** and summarized here. One comment worth singling out: since adjuncts receive the least favored classes, the lowest pay, the least training, and a lack of esteem, how can the institution expect this to translate positively in the classroom?

Adjuncts saw as positive values:

- Availability of smart classrooms
- Availability of Blackboard and other teaching technologies
- Support from the Schwartz Institute and SACC

Adjuncts saw as negatives with regard to teaching at Baruch:

- Large size of classes size and limited course selection
- Inadequate compensation
- Inadequate observation and training of observers
- Lack of community

Two related points regarding to adjunct faculty, especially in WSAS:

1. Adjuncts teach a disproportionate number of the first courses that students take. Many of these are large classes.
2. The large number of students – and, because of the courses’ introductory nature, the larger population of “challenged” students – means that a significant amount of teaching and learning takes place outside of the classroom. Adjuncts are not compensated for these “extra” office hours.

Some longer term goals

Community building

- Enhance efforts to welcome adjuncts to the community.
- Reach out to other members of the staff (including clerical, custodial, security et alia) and invite them to attend classes of their choosing.

Center for Teaching and Learning

Benefits include the symbolic and practical: positive symbol to the campuscommunity of administrative investment and coordination of the many programs and initiatives outlined above.

APPENDIX A
Faculty Incentives
(Ted Joyce)

A major concern with all efforts to improve teaching is a lack of incentive to participate. Junior faculty members have the most incentive especially if teaching is emphasized in promotion and tenure decisions. Adjuncts may have some incentive especially if they are interested in a long-term relationship. Tenured senior faculty members have the least incentive to participate and yet, they may benefit the most from the proposed initiatives. The following discusses possible incentives that might be offered to encourage faculty whose teaching evaluations are low to participate in some of the initiatives suggested by the committee.

One possibility is to offer release time in lieu of a seventh course for faculty who participate in a specific initiative. For instance, faculty at Zicklin who have stopped doing research have been asked to teach a seventh course. Prior to last year, all faculty were given three credits of release time for doing research, regardless of whether they had published any scholarly work in the previous five years. Dean Elliott has stopped this automatic release and many faculty have viewed the additional teaching as punishment. One suggestion is to offer these research-inactive faculty the opportunity to participate in a teaching initiative in place of a seventh course. A set of programs could be constructed. If the faculty agreed to participate in them, release time would be granted. These might include an observation by a consultant, a video-taping of class, followed by meetings to evaluate the tape. This could be done at the beginning of the semester and then repeated at the end. This same faculty would be asked to observe other faculty with excellent teaching reputations. The faculty might then be asked to write up a set of teaching changes that s/he would implement in the following semester.

Adjunct faculty might have similar needs for instruction and support but asking them to give more time seems unfair in light of their limited compensation. Thus, inducements for adjunct faculty could be financial. We could start with only adjuncts that have a history of commitment to Baruch and if successful, include adjuncts with less tenure. It is important to emphasize the contribution made by adjuncts to the day-to-day instruction at Baruch. Programs designed to improve their teaching could have significant payoff to both Baruch and the adjuncts.

Creating new incentives for non-tenured faculty would appear unnecessary. The desire to gain tenure should provide the necessary encouragement. However, one way to demonstrate the importance of teaching to the tenure decision would be to give junior faculty release time to participate in teaching initiatives. For most junior faculty release time is almost always for research. However, there may be third- or fourth-year faculty whose research agendas are well-established and for whom tenure looks probable. Offering these faculty release time to develop their teaching skills might be an important way to improve their pedagogy, but also signal Baruch's commitment to their professional development. (Also see **Appendix G: Teaching in Tenure and Promotion**)

In sum, programs without the proper incentives will generate little value added. It is also apparent the incentives vary by rank and tenure. Often those who volunteer to be videotaped or to be observed by a consultant are the most dedicated and successful teachers. If such faculty self-select into these voluntary initiatives, the impact of the proposed initiatives on the overall quality of instruction may be minimal. Thus, it is essential that we think hard about how to attract, persuade, and push less accomplished teachers into these programs.

APPENDIX B
Teaching Teams
(Ted Joyce)

The idea behind teaching teams is straight forward. Appoint a senior faculty with a strong teaching record to serve as the academic leader or supervisor of the other faculty and/or teaching assistants (TAs) who are also teaching sections of the same course. The teaching leader would be responsible for the quality of teaching and learning in the course. With this responsibility, the leader would be involved in the recruitment and supervision of the other faculty and TAs who were also teaching sections of the course. With clear lines of accountability, the teaching leader would have strong incentives to build a team of faculty and graduate students who share similar goals and philosophy. Members of the team would be asked to meet once a month to discuss best practices in the recitations, testing, student feedback, and helpful hints about successful lectures. The leader would be expected to visit the classes of the other sections and each team would be expected to observe the TAs in recitations. All would be invited to observe the teaching leader's class. All observations would be in an unofficial capacity, meaning that no written assessment would be added to anyone's personnel file. The goal would be to create a collegial but professional atmosphere in which the shared goal was the delivery of a high-quality academic experience for the students, the TAs, and the other faculty involved.

To make the discussion more concrete, consider economics. We teach approximately 1400 students in ECO 1001 in the Fall and approximately 1000 students in the Spring. If we taught ECO 1001 in classes of 40 students it would require 60 sections, 35 in the Fall and 25 in the Spring. Even in classes of 80 we'd still need 17.5 faculty for the Fall from a department that has only 13-full-time faculty. In other words, large sections are essential and they "subsidize" small classes at higher levels. Thus, as it currently exists, assume that there are four large lectures and four recitations per lecture. The teaching leader would need three additional faculty/adjuncts for the lectures and at least four TAs for the recitations.

One advantage of team teaching is that it provides a support structure for junior faculty. As part of recruitment, junior faculty are often promised jumbo teaching sections in order to lessen their teaching loads. However, this can be a daunting experience for both faculty and students. A poorly managed lecture affects 350 students; a poorly taught class affects only 40. *The support and supervision associated with team teaching would be a useful way to institutionalize a form of pedagogical mentoring.* The same would be true of TAs. We might even consider letting talented Ph.D. candidates teach a large lecture. It would be a useful form of financial aid and it would provide a tremendous experience in terms of professional development.

Teaching teams would require little if any extra funding to initiate. They require only commitment on the part Deans and Department Chairs. The key to the idea's success is accountability. The jumbo sections are coveted because they confer 6 or 9 teaching

credits. They should be distributed on merit among senior faculty and on need/merit among junior faculty. The goal would be to create an internal market in teaching quality. Supervising teachers who were responsible for the quality of the all sections would pick their teams carefully. Supervising faculty would be evaluated by the Chair and the Dean.

I would propose that the first team or teams be overseen by the Dean of each school. The Provost's office could be engaged to develop an instrument by which to evaluate the overall quality of the course. Initial meetings with the teams and the Dean and relevant Chair would underscore the importance of the experiment. After a semester, formal presentations as to the building of similar teams in other departments could be made by the supervising teacher.

The other advantage of teaching leaders is that it could be done as a small pilot study, beginning as early as Spring or Fall 2006. It would represent a concrete outcome from the committee that would have immediate visibility.

APPENDIX C
**Report on Interview with Stephanie Nickerson, Director of the Center for
Innovation in Teaching and Learning, Stern School of Business, NYU**
(Christine Tan)

Background of CITL

The Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning (CITL) advances the instructional support initiatives at Stern and performs strategic thinking and planning in educational technology. It is committed to promoting interdisciplinary and interdepartmental collaboration in order to provide the best possible learning experiences for NYU students. The CITL supports the exploration and adoption of new methods in the service of teaching and learning.

STEPS Program

The **Stern Teaching Effectiveness Program (STEP)** started several years ago, when full-time faculty decided they wanted a school-wide program in which all full-time faculty members could work on improving their teaching. After a two-year pilot program to assess STEP, faculty voted overwhelmingly to make it a mandatory program, in which each of the full-time faculty members would have at least one confidential class observation every four semesters they teach.

Since that time the program has expanded to offer more options for faculty members ('instructors'), and class observations and consultations have also been made available to adjunct faculty members and to Ph.D.-student instructors.

STEP observations and consultations are *confidential*. They are not used in promotion and tenure decisions. Rather they are designed simply to be helpful to faculty members. The only thing reported to the departments and to the deans is when faculty members have their STEP consultations.

To fulfill their STEP obligation, *faculty members may choose one of the STEP options below*. The first five options generally consist of three parts: First, a brief pre-observation meeting, in which faculty member and consultant discuss the class the faculty member has invited the consultant to—the faculty member's goals for students, any concerns he or she has about the class, areas the faculty member would like feedback on, etc.; second, the class visit itself; last, a post-observation meeting in which consultant and faculty member reflect on the class—based primarily on the faculty member's goals for students and what type of feedback the faculty member requested from the consultant.

1. Videotaping and Observation

The **Videotaping and Observation** option involves the faculty member inviting a faculty development consultant to a specific class, and the consultant observes the class while it is being videotaped. (This is a different kind of video than the remote

streaming video that is done in many Stern classrooms. It is much better quality. They have a camera and skilled videographer in the classroom,). The video, which is usually on a DVD, becomes the property of the faculty member, and they may watch it on their own, or watch it with the consultant. Obviously, they are getting two forms of feedback when they ask for this option—the actual video of your class and the observations and inferences of a trained consultant.

2. Observation and feedback

The **Observation** option involves the faculty member inviting a faculty development consultant to a specific class, and the consultant observes the class with the instructor's goals for students in mind. Since the teaching process is so complex, the consultant can act as a third eye for the faculty and can focus on dynamics and other things that the instructor cannot because of other content-related tasks requiring his or her attention.

3. Student small group analysis

The **Student Small Group Analysis (SGA)** option is most useful if it is done during the early weeks of the course, by midterm at the latest, since it provides early feedback from students, and it enables you to catch small problems early, when there is time to make changes.

It involves the faculty member inviting a faculty development consultant to a specific class, and the consultant observes the class with his/her goals for students in mind. Toward the end of class, the instructor leaves the room while the consultant asks students for feedback about what is most useful to their learning in the course and for suggestions for what might improve their learning in the course.

After the class, the consultant prepares a report and meets with the instructor to review the information gathered from students. He/she then complete the process by discussing the results with the class and telling them what changes (if any) he/she will make based on the students' and consultant's feedback.

The in-class process takes the 20 to 30 minutes of class time (for 50+ students, 40 - 45 minutes).

4. Peer review

In the **Peer Review** option, the instructor invites a fellow faculty member to attend a class of his/her choosing, and, based on the instructor's request of colleague, he/she gives the instructor feedback on their experience in the class.

5. Observation and Blackboard site review

The **Observation and Blackboard Site Review** option is a good choice if the instructor has been working on integrating the Blackboard site with classroom activities. For example, the instructor might be using the testing function in

Blackboard to assess how well students understand a key concept *after* they have read the text about that concept but *before* the class in which the concept will be discussed. Another example, the instructor may be using the Discussion Board in Blackboard to extend discussions beyond the classroom and he/she want some feedback from an outside expert about how to do it more effectively.

If the instructor chooses this option, both a STEP consultant and an Educational Technologist from the CITL will visit the classroom and review your Blackboard site.

6. Performance coach consultation

If the instructor has already been through one of the first five STEP options described above, he/she may choose to have **Performance Coach Consultation** to fulfill his/her STEP obligation.

Performance coaching is a special kind of consultation using acting techniques to increase connection with the audience or class, personal power and confidence.

7. If the instructor has already been through one of the first five STEP options listed above, he/she may choose to attend a **Teaching Workshop** to fulfill his/her STEP obligation. With this option, the instructor may attend a teaching workshop, such as Harvard Business School's Case Teaching workshop or Case Writing workshop (in conjunction with viewing the Harvard Business School's CD ROMs on 'Teaching Using Case Studies').

Cost

Ranges from \$400-\$700 for each faculty observation. This includes a 3-hour class observation and meeting with the faculty member both before and after the class observation.

Background of Consultants

Consultants usually have a Ph.D., experience with teaching at the college level and have been recognized for being good teachers.

We discussed that the implementation of a program very similar to STEPs at Baruch would be constrained by the costs and resources available at Baruch. The following were some suggestions made:

1. Solicit interest from tenured-faculty members who would be interested in being trained as in-house teaching consultants. These faculty members could either be formally affiliated with the Teaching Center at Baruch and their respective departments, or they could be affiliated with the Center on a full-time basis. We discussed the limitations of having faculty spend their sabbatical year or teaching-

- relief time at the Center. Given the potential investment of resources and money in the training of the in-house consultants, we thought that this approach might not reap the full benefits of the limited resources.
2. An outside consultant would be brought in to train the in-house teaching consultants which would be for 3-3.5 days. Stephanie was confident that the in-house teaching consultants would be well equipped to conduct classroom observations after such an intensive training.
 3. Stephanie emphasized that it was important to reassure the faculty members that these classroom observations are confidential and that the in-house consultants are not accountable to, and independent from, any Deans of schools or promotions/tenure committees.
 4. Stern received some funding from Citibank to launch the STEPs program – could we do something similar?

APPENDIX D
Report on Survey of Department Chairs
(John McGarraghy)

On August 8th I sent out an e-mail to all department chairpersons at the College on behalf of the Committee. I asked them to send me information as soon as possible about what their departments do to orient newly-hired faculty members to their teaching responsibilities at Baruch. I also asked them to tell me what their departments do to orient adjuncts, especially newly-hired ones. In each case I gave some examples of what they might be doing. The e-mail went to 18 departments and to the School of Public Affairs, which does not have a departmental structure. In this initial survey I did not ask them what they did to assist senior faculty in maintaining or recreating a productive learning and teaching environment in their classrooms.

I received seven replies. Two of those replies were pretty much pro forma and for the most part did not provide thoughtful insights into the practices in their departments in regard to acculturating newly-hired faculty. In one of those two replies, however, the chairperson said that new faculty coming from research universities would not have difficulty transitioning into Baruch because “we at Baruch are also a doctoral research university.” That observation was troubling to me because it reflects a basic misunderstanding of the mission of Baruch.

Three of the five substantive replies came from departments in Weissman, one from Zicklin and the other from SPA. All of these departments, and the other two as well, have orientations of new full-time and adjunct faculty of one kind or another. The types of orientations depend on the size of the departments and the number of new hires in any given year. In the cases of relatively small departments, they are very personal and often are led by the chairperson, with the assistance of colleagues when needed. They cover a wide range of practical topics. They also complement the Provost’s Orientation.

The Department of Political Science stressed that its orientation starts in the hiring process when prospective candidates are given information about the demographics of the student body and the culture of the College. The response noted that in the hiring process the department requires that candidates teach a class under its observation. “This not only provides them information about us and us about them; it also demonstrates in a tangible way the depth of our commitment to excellence in teaching and learning.”

It seems to me that, from the viewpoint of beginning to foster a culture that values learning and teaching, this is a more valuable approach than the “job talks” that SPA candidates, and perhaps candidates in other departments, give. These job talks emphasize the research the candidates are pursuing and often end up in discussions with faculty members present about the value and process of the research being presented. Frequently the candidates are not given the chance to complete their presentation and, so, it is difficult to judge their ability to teach. I know that job talks are valuable to help determine a candidate’s research potential, but if that is all then the message is that research is what really counts. No other chairperson commented on the hiring process and

I did not ask them to. I missed a bet by not pursuing that line of questioning. I think that somehow we should include that aspect in our reports along the way. We may want to recommend that departments consider including in the hiring process some type of teaching experience for candidates, perhaps a presentation to an advanced group of students on a topic of the candidate's choosing.

The Department of Law has very thorough and practical guidelines for its adjunct faculty that are tailored to the specific needs of the department. SPA administrative staff has developed useful guidelines to follow in introducing both new full-time faculty and new adjuncts to many of the practical aspects of working and teaching at Baruch. And the History Department is in the process of updating its Adjunct Handbook. New faculty members especially adjuncts, need very practical information about the resources of the College and their departments to help them manage their classes effectively and to feel comfortable at Baruch. Clear and comprehensive handbooks can be helpful in achieving this goal.

All of the reports included the aspect of mentoring as an important part of the on-going orientation process for new full-time and adjunct faculty. In smaller departments the chairperson is often the mentor. In other cases different members of a department take on the task. In some departments, there is an informal linking up of experienced and new faculty. In others, it is more formally structured.

For example, the Department of History assigns a mentor to each newly-hired faculty member "who is expected to actively engage the person on all matters of teaching before the start of the school year. Our checklist includes: a discussion of the student body; on-site explanation of technology; a review of sample syllabi; and a discussion of the proposed syllabi for the first semester."

Many of the reports emphasized that mentoring must go on during the academic year, and especially the first semester, and that this is equally important, if not more important, than the initial orientation. The response from the chairperson of the Department of Political Science noted that "once the candidates have been hired, I meet with them regularly to discuss their teaching. We focus on various pedagogical techniques and approaches in a problem solving dialogue. We also try to target the bigger issues (for example, they have all heard me remind them that we do not teach political science; we teach students.)"

The chairperson of the Department of History stated that if, during the first year, "the new faculty members indicate problems or if the student evaluations and/or the peer reviews indicate deficiencies, a whole set of recommendations go into play: having the professor giving informal evaluations in the course of the semester and discuss them with his/her mentor; discussing the problems with the mentor and at least one other member of the Executive Committee; sitting in on classes of our best teachers; closely evaluating the syllabi." We have also received the agenda for that department's daylong workshop/retreat on teaching. There were no comments about similar events in other replies. We may want to put that workshop forward as a model for other departments to

benchmark. I cite these examples just to give a flavor of the comments in the e-mails I received. They also talked about the need for continued work with new adjuncts to ensure productive teaching.

The clear lesson here is that the acculturation of new faculty –whether full time of adjunct – into an environment that values and supports learning and teaching is not a one-shot affair. It requires constant follow up guidance and monitoring, especially in the first year. One chairperson noted that the first semester is often a difficult one for new faculty members as they adjust to the College. So it is all the more important that they get help during this period. Since I did not receive responses from the chairpersons of most of the largest departments at the College, I wonder how challenging this task is for those departments. I think that unless this process is very well organized in those departments, it will not be carried out effectively.

The chairperson of the History Department made the only comment about senior faculty who seem to be slipping in student evaluations. In these cases she speaks with them individually. Of course, the daylong workshop that department will hold is another way to assist and reinvigorate senior faculty members.

I am sure that there are good reasons why the other chairpersons in the College did not respond to my request. At the same time, the lack of replies is troubling in terms of the goals of the Committee because of the central role that academic departments play in Baruch. They are the chief academic organizational unit here, as in most colleges and universities. They should be expected to play a key role in the continual improvement of the teaching and learning environment in the College in a whole variety of ways. Perhaps the Committee should consider having a session with the department chairpersons to explore with them ways they can assist in achieving the goals of the Committee.

At the same time, a good deal of the literature that I have read on the topic of the Committee's work suggests that the department is not the place to foster the continual improvement of teaching and learning for a whole list of reasons. One article in Change noted that "faculty find their own departments inhospitable places to talk about teaching." That is why I think the idea of some type of center for teaching and learning to support the efforts of individual faculty members is so important beyond what the departments do in this regard.

APPENDIX E
Report on a Survey of Adjunct Faculty
(Harold Ramdass and Curtis Izen)

The success of any effort to encourage a culture of excellence in teaching must involve a careful consideration of Baruch's substantial adjunct faculty. A questionnaire aimed at identifying incentives and disincentives to excellent adjunct teaching revealed the positive value of "smart classrooms," teaching technologies such as Blackboard, and learning support centers such as The Schwartz Communications Institute and SACC.

Four areas of concern to adjuncts surfaced:

- **Class Size and Course Selection.**
 - Large class sizes impact negatively on student learning and increase the need for remedial attention during office hours.
 - Generally assigned to introductory and pre-requisite courses, adjuncts teach students who naturally require more attention than those in advanced courses.
 - Class size and course selection combine to make paper and exam grading particularly time consuming, especially to adjuncts in the humanities.
- **Compensation.** Apart from a low pay rate, much adjunct labor goes unrecognized and uncompensated.
 - Current policy pays one office hour for a minimum of six teaching hours per week, yet adjuncts report spending over one hour of office time weekly per section taught.
 - Grading and preparation represents significant unpaid work, particularly in the core distribution courses with heavier writing requirements.
 - Blackboard, generally favored as an aid to effective teaching, also translates into extra unpaid adjunct work.
- **Training and Peer Observation.** Many departments lack adequate mentoring and training programs, especially needed by adjuncts new to teaching. Moreover, many adjuncts find the mandatory observations and subsequent review sessions largely unproductive of effective classroom strategies, and generally biased toward the particular reviewer's pedagogical idiosyncrasies.
- **Lack of Community.** Adjuncts report the impression of being second-class citizens within the teaching population. Apart from the concrete factors indicated above, a lack of job security, a lack of representative voice, the inadequacy of cubicles serving as offices, perceived relegation to the 23rd Street building, and unreliable access to paper and photocopying, also contribute to this impression.

APPENDIX F
Report on History Department Teaching Workshop
September 23, 2005
(Cynthia Whittaker)

General Description

All fourteen of the fulltime history department faculty members who are on campus this year attended the September 23rd workshop; Friday was chosen as no one has classes on that day. This is a tribute to our faculty's commitment to our students and dedication to good teaching, especially since at the same time each of them is an active, productive scholar. The workshop began with doughnuts and coffee at 9:30 and continued through lunch, ending at 4 in the afternoon.

Session I

The first session was dedicated to a discussion of teaching base curriculum (Tier II) courses, which include

- HIS 1000 (Themes in American History), with 244 students enrolled this semester
- HIS 1001 (Themes in World History to 1500), 441 students
- HIS 1003 (Themes in World History Since 1500), 283 students
- HIS 1005 (The United States Since the Civil War), 440 students
- HIS 2050 (The U.S. from 1880 to 1945), 65 students
- HIS 2053 (The U.S. Since 1945), 121 students

In this open discussion, chaired by Bert Hansen, each professor explained which courses s/he taught, the type of coverage given to the material, and the concerns encountered while attempting to meet the goals of the course. A number of common themes emerged.

Topic I, coverage. Many of those who taught world history stressed the difficulties of covering all the material the professors thought essential in a base curriculum course. Two of the Americanists stressed the necessity of covering the *basics* in American history, given the composition of our student body.

Recommendation: We have agreed that each group teaching a particular Tier II will meet separately this semester, along with the adjuncts, to discuss ways of handling the curriculum and learning goals, either at brown bag luncheons or afternoon sherry, depending on everyone's teaching schedules.

Topic II, student preparedness. Everyone agreed that the reading/writing skills of our students vary a great deal, but most students seem unable to understand the concept of a thesis in writing a paper in a history course. Even worse, many students cannot handle the reading and writing demanded of them in a history course, which is heart breaking. However, the students in the American history 2000-level base curriculum courses, through self-selection, are better prepared.

Recommendations

- Make a change in the requirements for 1000-level courses so that student must have already taken ENG 2100 and have as a co-requisite 2150.
- Work closely with the Schwartz Institute and the Writing Center, but also have each professor allot one session in the beginning of the semester to teaching guidelines on writing a paper or book review in a history class. Some members of the department already do this, and we will combine their expertise to provide a general outline of the topics that should be covered.
- Devise a 2000-level course in world history, so that better students (for instance those who have taken AP history in high school) might take a more challenging course.

Topic III, jumbos (sections with over 100 students). This part of the morning session was chaired by Thomas Heinrich. Since nearly everyone either is teaching or has taught a jumbo, this discussion was lively and, as it turned out, very practical. To handle the numbers, a variety of techniques were suggested and shared and will be elaborated in the brown bag/sherry get-togethers mentioned above:

- Seating charts to ease the burden of attendance, break up the chatty (or card playing) cliques caused by block programming, and prevent late comers or chronic absenteeism
- Xeroxing student I.D.s to learn names
- Constant quizzes to make sure students are keeping up with the reading
- Guiding students by having inclusive syllabi that indicate the important names, terms, and concepts they must learn, along with questions to ponder
- Discussion techniques useful in large classrooms
- The need for rules to enforce discipline and a professional environment
- Walking around and use of visuals as methods for keeping all students involved

Graders, a major problem, since the essay form is so important in history exams/papers. Everyone complained about the difficulty of finding graders and training them to rate exams and papers properly. A related problem is that we receive so little money for graders in a labor-intensive job that the amount rarely can cover anything more than a mid-term. This, of course, runs contrary to the College's stated goal of writing across the curriculum. Another related problem is that non-tenured faculty are spending an inordinate amount of time on grading.

Recommendations

- Get more money for grading
- Randy Trumbach will talk to people at the Graduate Center to see if there can be some system for recruitment of graders.

Session II

This session was devoted to adjuncts and centered about ways the fulltime faculty could help adjuncts. These included:

- Creating a committee consisting of two fulltime and two part-time faculty to redo the adjunct handbook for the history department
- Inviting them to all our future teaching workshops
- Expanding the mentoring program for adjuncts
- In the beginning of the semester, making sure that their faces/names/fields become known to the fulltime faculty.

Session III

The group adjourned to Room 5/175, a “smart” classroom, where lunch was served. The three presentations were greeted with a combination of skepticism and enthusiasm and provoked spirited discussion and questions.

- Bert Hansen provided a demonstration of how BOSS would be useful in managing classes, especially the ability to find information on students about whom the faculty member might have a concern. In smaller electives, one might also be able to ascertain the level of student preparedness.
- Tansen Sen instructed the faculty on the use of Blackboard for classes, committees, discussion boards and external links, with his own site an extraordinary example. He made a pitch for Blackboard’s usefulness both for students and professors.
- Thomas Heinrich informed the faculty of the efficacy of Turnitin.com for combating plagiarism in history papers.

Session IV

This session, appropriately chaired by the chair of Weissman’s curriculum committee, Tansen Sen, focused on our teaching of upper division courses.

On the capstone course, HIS 4900, and on 3000-level courses. This provoked an intense discussion of the various approaches to teaching history minors and what they should learn. The topics covered a wide range: book reviews; research papers; primary sources; how to read a book; how to isolate an argument; using the CUNY catalog; accessing history data bases; compiling bibliographies. This discussion will clearly be ongoing.

Recommendations

- Appoint a special advisor for minors in the department
- Encourage the library to buy the top fifteen books in the topics at hand
- Advertise our electives to generate more minors

On history majors. The clock had struck four; the wine and cheese no longer held appeal; the congregated were tired, although no one had run out of ideas.

Recommendation: the department’s curriculum committee will convene and draw up learning goals for our majors, and they will be presented at the next department meeting.

APPENDIX G
Teaching in Tenure and Promotion
(Ted Joyce)

The three legs of tenure and promotion are nominally research, teaching, and service. However, not all legs carry equal weight. The general perception among faculty and my own personal experience in over 13 years of tenure and promotion meetings is that research is often the only criterion by which a candidate is evaluated. Excellent teaching may play a roll when the faculty member's research is marginal but there should be little doubt that teaching is under-valued in tenure and promotion decisions.

I would like to propose that Chairs be required to create teaching committees for each candidate up for promotion or tenure. The committee's role is to evaluate the candidate's teaching based on interviews, observation, student evaluation, and the candidate's teaching portfolio. The report of the teaching committee would become a standard input into every promotion and tenure decision. These committees should be formed at least a year or two prior to tenure or promotion to allow for peer evaluations.

The idea of a teaching committee is to parallel what should also happen with the evaluation of research. At top schools, a committee is assigned the responsibility of evaluating a candidate's scholarly work. This goes beyond reading the vitae and external letters and is best viewed as an internal version of what the external evaluators do: read the candidate's work, evaluate its importance to the discipline, and comment on the candidate's long-term potential.

The teaching committee would proceed in an analogous way, with serious evaluation of the candidate's teaching. The committee members should be assigned to provide peer observations of the candidate consistent with the union contract, but more informal discussions about teaching should also occur. The committee should have access to a candidate's blackboard site, student evaluations, and teaching portfolio.

From their first day on campus all candidates should be told about the teaching committee and strongly encouraged to create a teaching portfolios that consist of syllabi, assignments, exams and other material developed by the faculty. This would provide a clear signal to candidates that teaching mattered and would be an important input into the tenure and promotion process.

I recommend that we begin teaching committees only for tenure track faculty. This small scale will make it doable. In addition, members of teaching committees would receive training in peer observations and evaluation. Moreover, there could be support for junior faculty unconnected to the teaching committee. For instance, junior faculty could have access to teaching consultants and video taping. These interactions would not be accessible to the teaching committee unless the candidate wanted this information included. If the teaching component in tenure decisions became important, faculty would have a stronger incentive to seek such support.