INSTITUTIONAL CULTURES THAT SUPPORT NEW AND PROSPECTIVE FACULTY IN SCHOLARLY TEACHING: AN ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH

by

Mary C. Hoover

B.S. The Pennsylvania State University, 1992

M.Ed. The University of Pittsburgh, 1994

MPM Carnegie Mellon University, 1998

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

The School of Education in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

University of Pittsburgh

2006

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

This dissertation was presented

by

Mary C. Hoover

It was defended on

March 21, 2006

and approved by

Dr. Glenn Nelson, Professor, Administrative and Policy Studies, Higher Education Management

Dr. Diane Davis, Director, Center for Instructional Design and Distance Education

Dr. Susan Goodwin, Clinical Professor, Administrative and Policy Studies, School Leadership

Dr. Charlene Trovato, Clinical Associate Professor, Administrative and Policy Studies, School Leadership

INSTITUTIONAL CULTURES THAT SUPPORT NEW AND PROSPECTIVE FACULTY IN SCHOLARLY TEACHING: AN ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH

Mary Hoover, M.Ed./MPM/EdD.

University of Pittsburgh, 2006

Abstract: New and prospective faculty often enter the professoriate with less than adequate preparation for the many roles and expectations of the position, particularly in regard to teaching requirements. In spite of the fact that teaching responsibilities consume large amounts of new faculty time, they frequently are not emphasized in the doctoral preparation experience, nor in the new-faculty orientation process. Most prospective and new faculty do not understand the importance of the teaching culture of an institution, nor how to go about assessing that culture to determine the level and nature of support offered for teaching. New faculty need to evaluate the institutional fit between their own teaching and research priorities and those of the institution. In addition, those who enter graduate school with the ambition of one day entering the professoriate would be wise to understand the nature of their institution's teaching culture, as it directly affects the level and amount of training that graduate students receive as future instructors. This study reviewed the literature related to programs and practices that research universities have in place that help to form the culture of support for scholarly teaching on campus. The product of this review is a set of guidelines and related criteria intended to help new and prospective faculty

assess the teaching culture of a research institution based on specific guidelines, as well as related criteria for each guideline. After compiling and defining the guidelines and related criteria for this study, feedback was gathered from individuals who are involved in related research and/or work in the field. The purpose of this effort was for these professionals to gauge whether the findings were relevant, viable, or lacking in any way. Based on the feedback and information that was received, changes were made to the proposed guidelines and related criteria. The resulting document should be helpful for new and prospective faculty to review prior to attending graduate school or accepting a professional position in academe.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

This dissertation is dedicated to my family, especially my husband and mother, who not only provided me with the opportunities to dedicate time to the project, but also gave me the encouragement, support and confidence that I needed to be a scholar.

1. INTRODUCTION

"We assume that faculty motivation to teach, the maintenance of instructional excellence, and the effectiveness of strategies to improve instruction all clearly benefit by the presence of a culture that is supportive of teaching" (Feldman & Paulson, 1999, p.71).

1.1 BACKGROUND

Institutions of higher learning have a long standing history of existing to serve the public good. One of the primary functions, obviously, is to educate students to become productive and contributing members of society (Baxter and Terenzini, 1992). In order to do so, campus constituents turn to the faculty with high expectations for exceptional instruction, innovation and creativity in teaching. In addition, "faculty members must have some appreciation and preparation for working with students of diverse ages, genders, ethnicities, capabilities, levels of interest and commitment, life circumstances, and prior educational preparation" (Austin, 2002, p.98). These skills require preparation, education, continuous feedback and support.

In addition to teaching responsibilities, faculty are expected to participate in community service and produce exemplary research: "legislators and community leaders call for greater attention by faculty members to apply knowledge to solve societal problems. These same constituencies expect university research to aid local and regional economic development" (Austin, 2002, p. 94). Though it is not necessarily the ideal, research often takes precedence over teaching obligations due to its strong association with institutional success. Quality research efforts bring prestige and recognition not just to the researcher, but also to the institution. In addition, research grants are a significant source of revenue for many universities. This is especially important because due to government cutbacks, research universities rely on external funding more than ever (Serow, 2000, p. 449).

Communities also turn to universities for insight related to world issues, and expect that institutions will provide knowledge through their research efforts. Finally, research is invaluable in measuring faculty success; it is easily evaluated through numbers of publications and award winning findings. Teaching is more subjective and challenging to quantify. Consequently, research is typically a lead factor in tenure decisions, which is the ultimate symbol of faculty success. Therefore, new faculty tend to spend the majority of their time on research efforts. As a result, "much of the day to day work of instruction has fallen to graduate assistants and other temporary appointees and those regular faculty members who are willing to invest long hours in student advising and curriculum development" (Serow, et al., 2002, p. 26).

As vital as research is to the institution, outstanding scholars in the field of higher education research such Peter Seldin, Carolyn Kreber, and Jerry Gaff have dedicated much of their careers to learning more about how universities can show greater dedication and support for teaching effectiveness. Ernest Boyer (1990) and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching initiated significant efforts to suggest to the academic community that teaching is also an activity that is worthy of being considered a form of scholarship. In the landmark work "Scholarship Reconsidered", Boyer addressed the wisdom and rationale for considering and promoting teaching as a legitimate form of scholarship. In addition, he "reframed the issue, so that we could get beyond the old teaching versus research debate, rise above the theory/practice hierarchy plaguing higher education, and begin to think in new ways about the alignment of faculty priorities and institutional mission" (Rice, 2002, p. 8).

More recent research reflects agreement with Boyer, and suggests that, "teaching is not simply the mastery of tricks and techniques; it is intellectual work…the scholarship of teaching and learning is a rigorous investigation into classroom practice, how a teacher teaches, and how

(and what) a student learns" (Gale and Golde, 2004, p. 9). While these ideas may seem self-evident, they lend credence to the idea that teaching is scholarly, not just a routine function of the institution.

Lee Shulman's appointment as the president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching was another landmark occurrence in the quest for the scholarship of teaching. Schulman developed the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL). "CASTL is a national network of institutions with teaching academies. This program now has over two hundred colleges and universities wrestling with what the scholarship of teaching and learning means for their campuses" (Rice, 2002, p. 13).

The duty to promote a supportive teaching culture and the scholarship of teaching is so important that the obligation cannot be held by faculty alone. Rather, the caliber of teaching excellence in higher education is influenced by an institution's values and culture, at both the department and institutional levels. "A university that wants its faculty to be motivated to teach well must hold as central to the institution's mission the commitment to high quality teaching" (Rice & Austin, 1990, p. 35). At the grassroots level, a shift in the commitment shown by top college administrators may be one of the first steps toward enhancing the quality of teaching. Seldin (1995) wrote, "The commitment of senior institutional leaders who wish to encourage professors' motivation to teach well should frequently articulate the institution's valuing of teaching effort and excellence and find opportunities to recognize such efforts in formal and informal ways. For example, the attendance of provosts and deans at events that celebrate teaching or at seminars concerning teaching issues conveys a strong message about what the institution values" (pg. 43).

Lieberman's (2004) work emphasizes the idea that in order for scholarly teaching to be effectively implemented throughout the institution, collaboration with campus constituents is a vital initiative. Through this collaboration, members of the campus community are given the opportunity not only to provide their input, but also to gain a sense of ownership over the importance of finding ways to enhance scholarly teaching and the academic culture on campus. Lieberman reports a number of ways that various campuses have worked to foster collaboration on campus, and recommends that other institutions consider adopting similar strategies:

- Hold open campus discussions;

- Involve deans, provost, president;

- Involve students;

- Communicate results through specific examples and evidence of success;

- Involve Teaching and Learning Centers;

- Relate funding and support;

- Include diversity of participants (e.g. faculty senate and other forms of faculty leadership);

- Impact promotion and tenure; and

- Identify future challenges of sustaining this in the campus culture

- Embedding scholarship of teaching and learning into the promotion and tenure system;

- Transitioning to second-generation collaborations; and

- Providing on-going funding (p. 60-61).

Some of the most prominent research in the area of institutional support for teaching has been done by Feldman and Paulson (1999), who conducted extensive studies regarding the importance of a "supportive" institutional teaching culture in order to foster excellence in

teaching. Overall, the nature of the institution's teaching culture affects various campus

constituents, but most specifically, new faculty and graduate students. These two groups hope to

enter the professoriate, where they will be expected to uphold teaching responsibilities as well as

research, sometimes receiving conflicting messages and confusion over priorities:

> …there have been two competing pressures felt by faculty at research universities over the last decade or so. The first has been a perception by faculty (if not a reality in practice) that post-secondary institutions are moving toward an emphasis on research over teaching. The second major press in the last decade has been increasing pressure from legislators and the public at large to improve the quality of undergraduate education specifically, and teaching in general (Amey, 1999, p. 60).

Boyer's (1990) work called for teaching and research to be viewed as comparable and

complimentary forms of scholarship, both worthy of significant prestige, recognition and

advancement. Some scholars in the field indicate that "using a term such as scholarship, which is

well understood and conceptualized by academics, in conjunction with teaching gives symbolic

capital to teaching, thus raising its status and social capital for those promoting the scholarship

of/in teaching as a core professional value" (Nicholls, 2004, p. 41). This aspiration cannot take

place without institutional commitment. Rice (2002) noted that the university does benefit from

scholarly teaching because of the support and structure that it lends to evaluating teaching work:

> …No longer does the peer review of teaching depend chiefly on the impression of the department chair, the anecdotes of a member of the tenure committee, or one report of a classroom observation. Teaching as scholarly inquiry becomes subject to empirical evidence and the focus of collaborative intellectual inquiry. The peer review of teaching projects generated a wide range of challenging strategies that soon began to be identified as elements of the scholarship of teaching (p. 12).

However, the literature indicates that for many new and prospective faculty, university cultures

are not always conducive to the scholarship of teaching. The following section will review the

current state of affairs for new faculty.

1.2   STATE OF AFFAIRS: EXPECTATIONS OF NEW FACULTY

Faculty are pulled in a variety of directions by university stakeholders. Students and parents are consumers who expect a service in exchange for their tuition dollars, and have particular concerns about the quality of teaching (Camblin and Steger, 2000, p.2). University administrators and faculty department heads anticipate and depend on the prestige and revenue that accompany grant supported research. Members of the community anticipate cutting edge information from the results of quality research, in addition to well educated, motivated graduates who are eager to make an impact on society. While the demands for excellence in teaching are strong, student, parents, and even senior administrators and tenured faculty do not always understand the massive commitment of time that is necessary in order to be an effective teacher. "One reason legislators, trustees, and the general public often fail to understand why ten or twelve hours in the classroom each week can be a heavy load is their lack of awareness of the hard work and the serious study that under-girds good teaching" (Gaff, 1975, p. 23).

Many aspiring faculty also do not realize the magnitude of the institutional expectations of the professoriate. Rather, many of them intend to receive their doctorate from their research based institution, and then to go on to achieve tenure at another research university. To qualify for these jobs, they participate in as many scholarly research projects as they can with their mentor professors at the doctoral level. They take as many quantitative and statistics based courses as possible to help with their research analysis. They prepare vitae that represent their dedication and effort in the field. And then, they find out that the positions that they are seeking are few, far between, and in high demand:

> There are currently many doctoral students who wish to obtain a faculty position in a Research I University. They usually prepare themselves for these positions by emphasizing research, but then find that there are very few faculty positions available in the area in which they have prepared themselves. Most of the faculty

positions are not in Research I universities, and these jobs have less emphasis on research and most of them place a greater priority on other aspects of faculty work. Lacking a broader preparation, doctoral students often end up biding their time in a temporary position until something becomes available at a research university. For those who want a faculty position, an important part of their doctoral training would be to prepare themselves in ways that would enhance their chances of obtaining a faculty position (Landers, 2003, p.1).

Regardless of where new faculty begin their careers, most will be required to do a significant amount of teaching during their first years as professionals in academe. Adams (2002) wrote,

> …regardless of the type of institution, required liberal and general education courses make up some portion of the curriculum. It follows that most faculty are expected to teach in the general education curriculum that is directed at undergraduates in all disciplines and at varying levels of time to degree. This expectation often comes as a surprise to junior faculty who have just spent several years focused on a narrow niche within one discipline (p.3).

New faculty have an especially hard time with the teaching responsibilities because most have not been formally prepared to provide this level of instruction:

> Virtually all faculty received advanced training in an academic discipline or a professional field; virtually none received any pedagogical training. Nor did many come to their first full time academic appointment with prior teaching experience except perhaps for a graduate teaching assistantship that did not involve full responsibility for a course. While some groups promoted reforms, most novices still began their teaching careers armed with memories of an influential teacher and little else. I must all be learned 'on the job'(Finkelstein, 1995, p. 36).

Teaching skills for high quality instruction are rarely innate; rather, training and development opportunities need to be encouraged and accessible to everyone from graduate students to tenured professors. Boice (1991) wrote, "…there is little evidence to suggest that graduate schools, despite their purview of graduate education, normally see the preparation of professors as teaching faculty as one of their more important priorities" (p. 27). This puts new faculty at a disadvantage, as there is an enormous difference between possessing content knowledge and having the ability to effectively convey that information to students. Though an

individual may have studied a discipline for many years and is considered an expert, it can not be

assumed that the mere study of a subject qualifies an individual to provide instruction in that

area. It is illogical to expect new faculty to place priority on teaching if it was not emphasized as

they trained for the profession.

Therefore, formal training in the pedagogy of teaching is vital to the overall success of

new faculty themselves, and can have a strong impact on the course of their career. Starting a

professional position with a solid understanding of teaching practices and a supportive

institutional culture can help faculty to feel more secure in their positions and confident in their

abilities. Silverman (1997) wrote:

> If we want them (faculty) to be successful, new faculty members need to be able
> to manage all parts of their job. If they spend an inordinate amount of time
> planning for their teaching, or if they are frustrated because they feel less than
> competent, this will impact their ability to do scholarship and adjust to life as a
> faculty member. Pedagogical training may help new faculty be more successful as
> teachers --- and as scholars (p.73).

Not only are many new faculty put into a position of feeling shocked by the extent of

their responsibilities and overwhelmed by the time and skill needed to prepare their coursework,

sometimes they feel anxious about seeking help for fear that they will then be judged on their

competence. "New faculty may resist showing weaknesses to colleagues who may be involved in

retention, tenure, and promotion decision" (Boyle & Boice, 1998, p. 160). For new faculty in

particular, feeling as though assistance is not accessible can perpetuate stress and anxiety as they

discover the challenges involved in effectively conveying knowledge to their students. In

addition, this perceived lack of faculty teaching support can be an early indicator to new faculty

that their priority should be their research, and that their instruction is a secondary activity and

concern.

New faculty also have their own interests, personal goals, needs and desires for status, promotion, and stability in their careers, and unfortunately, "there is little doubt that salary, promotions, and tenure at research universities continue to depend more on research productivity than on instructional performance" (Serow, 2000, p. 451). If the institutional culture is not supportive of teaching, what incentive is there for new faculty to invest their time, resources and intellect into the scholarship of teaching? Serow (2000) interviewed a number of faculty in an attempt to understand their perspective on the 'struggle' in balancing research and teaching efforts. One reported that "the emphasis has gone from 'how good a teacher is he?' to 'how many complaints have we had against him?' (p. 453). It seems that sometimes faculty are trying to maintain minimum level standards merely in an attempt to avoid negative feedback from students, parents and administrators, and not because they view their work as teachers as a scholarly activity.

If faculty have any hope of successfully fulfilling the expectations of campus constituents while also feeling competent and prepared for their work, they must feel as though their teaching environment is collaborative, supportive, and scholarly. More importantly, new and prospective faculty, in particular, must have the tools and knowledge to assess any potential new environments in order to determine their institutional fit. This leads to the rationale for the proposed study.

1.3   RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

As obvious as the answer may seem, the question "why is teaching important" is complex and has no short response. That is why it is important to qualify that this is not the major question associated with this study, but rather an assumption that underlies the rationale for the study.

This study focuses on the importance of the "teaching culture" of an institution, not the teaching itself. Quality teaching is in a perpetual state of evolution, being shaped by the work and priorities of the instructor, the culture, expectations of his or her associated institution, and advances in pedagogical science. It is the obligation of the institution to foster an environment that encourages faculty to address both their teaching and research obligations as scholarly priorities, both of which are equally important to the potential for professorial advancement.

Much has already been mentioned about the importance of new professionals in the field finding a solid institutional fit within the culture of the school being considered for employment. The institutional teaching culture also is important to any professor who has concern for the research/teaching relationship, as well as the institutional expectations and assistance that is offered in the quest for balance. While this is an important point to keep in mind, new and prospective faculty are the primary stakeholders that will benefit from the primary outcome of this study: a set of criteria and related indicators of quality to informally assess institutional teaching priorities. New faculty need to evaluate the institutional fit between their own teaching and research priorities and those of the institution. In addition, those who enter graduate school with the ambition of one day entering the professoriate would be wise to understand the nature of their institution's teaching culture, as it will directly affect the level and amount of training that the graduate students receive as future instructors.

Most prospective and new faculty do not understand the importance of the teaching culture of an institution, nor do they know how to go about assessing that culture to determine the level and nature of support offered for teaching. An institution's commitment to teaching is challenging to assess at face level; though many, if not most institutions profess to care deeply about teaching, their actions do not always support the claim:

10

> The vast majority of colleges and universities claim to be strongly committed to effective teaching. College brochures and catalogues proclaim dedication to high quality instruction, insisting that although the faculty may be scholarly, true focus of the institution is on teaching. Many who teach in today's colleges and universities would challenge this portrayal, noting that their personal experience belies this official reference for quality teaching (Seldin, 1990, p. 3).

While Feldman and Paulson (1999) did extensive work in this area and are associated with the development of the term 'supportive teaching culture,' the product of their study can be enhanced. For one thing, the guidelines that they provide are fairly general. An outcome of this study is a detailed reference guide for new and prospective faculty to use as a resource to evaluate the teaching culture of an institution. In addition, in Feldman and Paulson's work, they do not consider the importance of graduate student education and its contribution to and reflection of an institutional culture that values the scholarship of teaching. This crucial variable will be a major factor in this dissertation.

1.4   STATEMENT OF INTENT

The purpose of this study is, through an extensive review of literature, to establish a rubric that can be used by new and prospective faculty to assess the teaching priorities of an academic institution. This information will serve as a framework for the analysis of teaching cultures, and will offer specific suggestions and recommendations regarding information that should be assessed before it can be determined to what extent teaching is valued as a form of scholarship. The final product will be evaluated by professionals in the field for its usefulness and potential.

1.5   RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In order to understand the full scope of an institutional teaching culture, it is important to analyze the expectations and support available for three faculty groups: those preparing to

become faculty (graduate students), new faculty who are in the 'induction' phase of their appointment, and seasoned and tenured faculty, who have the opportunity (and encouragement) for continued education in the form of teaching instruction. While much has already been discussed to explain why graduate student and new faculty support for teaching is reflective of the institutional teaching commitment, it may be the services and encouragement offered to tenured faculty that is the most revealing of the academic culture of the institution. New faculty obviously hope to become tenured faculty at some point; they need to know what will be expected of them in order to achieve tenure and other faculty rewards. In addition, they need to understand the responsibilities and expectations for tenured faculty regarding teaching, as well as any development opportunities that exist. The following research questions will guide the review of literature and provide a framework for the outcome of the study:

1) What programs, activities, and practices exist within research universities that indicate a culture that is supportive of teaching for *new* faculty?

2) What programs, activities, and practices exist within research universities that indicate a culture that is supportive of teaching for *prospective* faculty?

1.6   DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purposes of this study, there are a number of terms that need to be defined:

Culture: "As a sociological concept, culture refers to established patterns of shared belief and behavior. Previous applications of this concept to academic life have emphasized disciplinary and institutional cultures as forces that compete for faculty members' time and allegiance" (Serow, et.al., 2002, p. 26).

Faculty Learning Community: "A cross-disciplinary faculty and staff group of six to fifteen members who engage in an active, collaborative, yearlong program with a curriculum about enhancing teaching and learning and with frequent seminars and activities that provide learning, development, the scholarship of teaching, and community building" (Cox, 2004, p. 8).

Mentoring: "Mentoring is a process in which one person, usually of superior rank and outstanding achievement, guides the development of an entry-level individual" (Savage, et al., 2002, p. 21).

The scholarship of teaching: Knowledge that can be shared with and reviewed by a community of peers, and be built on by members of this community (Kreber, 2001, p. 79). Or , more specifically, the scholarship of teaching is the systematic and rigorous study of teaching that yields knowledge about teaching theory and practice that can be reviewed and built upon by members of the community (Kreber, 2001, p. 79).

Scholarly teaching versus the scholarship of teaching: "The purpose of scholarly teaching is to affect the activity of teaching and the resulting learning, while the scholarship of teaching results in a formal, peer-reviewed communication in appropriate media or venues, which then becomes part of the knowledge base of teaching and learning in higher education" (Richlin and Cox, 2004, p. 128).

Supportive teaching culture: In order for institutions to show true regard for teaching as a form of scholarship, it is imperative that a "supportive teaching culture" (Feldman and Paulsen, 1999) is in place. Feldman and Paulsen (1999) provide insightful research regarding "the significance of teaching cultures to faculty motivation and to excellence in teaching" (p. 71). In an ideal setting, faculty have the benefit of feedback and information to help them excel in their positions. There is almost a team-like approach to the dedication of teaching, so that faculty notice a significant level of support that hopefully will lead to feelings of confidence, empowerment, and passion toward the scholarship of teaching. Feldman and Paulsen (1999) recommend that:

> In a supportive teaching culture, informative feedback is readily available from several sources – colleagues, consultants, chairs, students, and teachers themselves –to address the needs of faculty for self-determination and excellence in teaching, to provide opportunities to learn and achieve, and to stimulate, inform, and support efforts to improve instruction (and to sustain these improvements over time) (p.74).

Teaching Portfolios: "We understand a teaching portfolio (or dossier) to be a collection of evidence of good teaching practice, where teaching is seen as everything that faculty do to help students to achieve course and program goals. This evidence is prefaced by a statement, in which portfolio-makers describe their goals with reference to their teaching philosophy and provide the reader with a guide to the body of evidence that accompanies the statement" (Wright, et al., 1999, p. 90).

Value: "Most often, when faculty speak of something being valued or not valued in academe, what they have in mind is whether it is given any weight in decisions regarding merit, tenure, and promotion---whether it is valued by the institution" (Kreber, 2001, p. 100).

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1   INTRODUCTION

Because the primary means of information gathering for this study is through a review of the literature, it stands to reason that this section will evolve significantly over the course of the study. However, in order to provide a framework for the foundation of this proposal, this section will highlight the primary relevant literature associated with a number of areas.

One important topic to address in the literature review deals with how faculty responsibilities have changed over the course of the years. Since the founding of Harvard College in 1636, the roles, expectations, and responsibilities of faculty have evolved tremendously, and a supportive teaching culture has not always been a matter of focus for American institutions. Understanding the history of these changes will set the stage for understanding why current faculty have such a variety of obligations, making it challenging to manage all of the expectations that they face; particularly in reference to the perception of a teaching/research power struggle. This knowledge is also imperative in order to fully comprehend the current situation and environment in which faculty work. Kelly Ward, author of an ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report entitled, "Faculty Service: Roles and the Scholarship of Engagement," wrote, "to understand contemporary calls for engagement and a scholarship of service more fully requires a grasp of the historical efforts of higher education to serve multiple publics and the faculty's role in providing that service" (2003, p. 17).

2.2 THE EVOLUTION OF INSTITUTIONAL AND FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES

Initially, institutions were primarily intended to prepare young men for serving the church and instructors were merely "tutors hired for their religious commitment rather than their scholarly or teaching abilities" (Ward, 2003, p. 19). In fact, college graduates were considered capable of teaching any subject offered by the school. In the mid-1700's, the "creation of professorships established specialization, and the very first seeds of the academic disciplines were planted" (Ward, 2003, p. 20). In the late 1700's, a small number of instructors adopted the title of 'professor', and became somewhat 'permanent' within the institution. Most of those with the title of professor did have some extent of training and education past that of the baccalaureate experience (Altbach & Finkelstein, 1997).

From the 1770's to the 1860's, more individuals, including those from low socioeconomic classes, had opportunities to pursue higher education due to the significant number of institutions that were originated during this time. Along with the growth in schools came an increased need for skilled faculty.

The mid-1800's was a time that many researchers refer to as the "Germanization" of education in the United States. The German philosophy opened the doors to research, publication, graduate studies, and the conferring of doctoral degrees in this country. During this time, "the external career of faculty started to shift as faculty began to exercise their expertise as educators and proponents of culture and not just of religion. Faculty and presidents were often called on to provide direction about societal affairs" (Ward, p. 24). Toward the end of the 19th century, the faculty ranking system began to develop, and a new process evolved for earning the right to be named a 'professor'. The establishment of this system is a significant historical

landmark in the academic community, and was an indicator of explosive growth in education. Rudolph (1990), wrote, "The creation of a hierarchy of professors was not so much the function of the degree as it was a function…of that ever-increasing undergraduate and graduate enrollment which in some places now called for platoons of instructors where, also, one had once sufficed" (pg. 398). Finally, professors were beginning to out-number 'tutors' on campuses around the country (Altbach & Finkelstein, 1997).

The Morrill Act of 1862, the Morrill Act of 1890 and the Hatch Act of 1887 all helped to provide greater educational opportunities to those who may not have previously had access or availability. 'Service' became an important component of the educational experience, as well as part of the mission of many institutions. The role of the faculty became increasingly important and prominent, as did the expectations that the community held for colleges and universities. Research, along with teaching, became a more significant expectation as government associations grew. Faculty were also expected to provide direction to the developments of the local and national community, in an effort to instigate change through knowledge.

The idea of a career in the professoriate was gaining appeal over the course of these years. Issues such as academic freedom and tenure started to emerge, and faculty were taking greater part in the development and 'direction' of the institution through assignments to faculty committees and the provision of input to university administration (Altbach & Finkelstein, 1977). By the end of World War II, "the components of the academic role had clearly emerged and crystallized into the highly differentiated model by which we recognize the professor today -– teaching, research, student advisement, administration, institutional and public service" (Altbach & Finkelstein, 1977, p. 29).

The G.I. Bill changed the face of the "typical" student as numerous women and servicemen began to pursue degrees. These new campus constituents required universities to consider alternative services, majors and degrees in order to meet the needs of the new students. In addition to issues related to diversity, universities were also facing situations pertaining to civil rights, particularly in the 1960's. The role of the faculty was continuing to evolve, as were the changing needs of students. Though teaching was still a significant responsibility for the faculty, it was beginning to take a back seat to other institutional expectations. Budgets were being cut, and research grants were becoming a relied upon form of monetary support.

Overall, the demand for new and energetic faculty continued to skyrocket. Altbach and Finkelstein (1997, p.21) noted that "between 1965 and 1970 alone, the ranks of the American professoriate swelled by one hundred and fifty thousand with the number of new positions exceeding the entire number of positions in 1940." Simultaneously, colleges and universities began to experience budget restrictions, which lead to even higher expectations for faculty to put extensive energy into obtaining research grants and funding. The literature suggests that universities offset their expenses by increasing tuition costs, which caused university stakeholders---particularly students and their parents---to be more concerned about how their tuition dollars are being spent. In current institutional settings, research dollars are imperative. However, expectations for high quality teaching have not diminished, and will likely continue to rise among university constituents.

In summary, the quality and level of institutional support for teaching are important issues which are under consistent scrutiny from university stakeholders. This leads to the challenge that faculty face to this day---balancing the obligations between research, to obtain

funding, prestige, and rewards, and teaching, to satisfy the needs of students and to encourage the development of productive citizens that is expected by society.

2.3   BALANCING RESEARCH AND TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS

The struggle for balance between research and teaching obligations is a long standing issue, fueled by a common perception that in many cases faculty put their research responsibilities ahead of their teaching obligations. Historically, faculty have actually been faced with consequences for not completing their research, but no tangible incentives for devoting time to teaching (Gaff, 1973). However, failure to invest time in teaching skills and strategies has multiple effects. On a basic level, substandard teaching results in frustration, disappointment and tension for both students and faculty. Conversely, high caliber teaching leads to, among other things, "improved departmental standing on campus" (Tang & Chamberlain, 2003).

Unfortunately, these factors alone are not always adequate motivation for focus on teaching because currently, teaching does not carry the same level of prestige as successful research. Wolverton (1998) wrote, "excellent teaching gets local kudos not national acclaim" (p. 11). In addition, most faculty realize that

> …typically, the more time spent teaching the lower the pay; and conversely, the more time devoted to publishing the higher the pay. Rewards for research and publications, and punishments for failure to accomplish these, are well defined and substantial; but rewards (the granting of tenure or promotion, for example) for good teaching remain limited (Wolverton, 1998, pp. 63-64).

The quest for teaching excellence in higher education is dependent on the idea that institutions provide faculty rewards that are meaningful and significant. Boyer (1990) addressed this issue in "Scholarship Reconsidered," by writing, "Today, on campuses across the nation,

19

there is a recognition that the faculty reward system does not match the full range of academic functions and that professors are often caught between competing obligations" (p. 1).

Faculty continue to be pulled in multiple directions based on their responsibilities to publish, serve and teach. While faculty are assigned the classes to be taught, they are at the same time expected to develop a research agenda and seek research funds, a process that can be extremely time consuming. A survey conducted by Gaff (1975) revealed that "more than half the faculty at research and doctorate institutions agreed that "the pressure to publish reduces the quality of teaching" (p. 55).

To make matters even more confusing, new faculty often receive mixed messages from university administrators and senior faculty regarding expectations for their work. It is not typically the case that institutions articulate their expectations about how faculty should allocate their time. Rather, in many cases, these ideals are manifested into the culture of the institution:

> The most apparent contradictory or ambiguous messages concern the relative value of the teaching and research dimensions of academic life, particularly at the Research I universities. In official discourse, administrators, department chairs, and many professors embrace teaching as well as research as central to the mission of the university; meanwhile, observed implicit messages – such as tenure decisions or other measures of esteem – often reveal a devaluing of teaching and a valorization of research (Nyquist, et al. 1999, p. 8).

It is important to report, in response to this idea, that research institutions have not been impervious to writings such as these. In fact, many have worked hard to negate what they consider to be a perpetuated stereotype. For example, Becker and Andrews (2004) authored a text dedicated to representing the efforts of research institutions to enhance teaching initiatives on their campuses. In the forward of the book, they noted that, "…this book is in part intended as a response to the assertions that both personal and institutional rewards for tenure-track and tenured faculty at research universities favor research at the expense of teaching" (pg. 1).

Through the course of the writing, the authors make references which demonstrate teaching

support on the part of research institutions, and also provide several suggestions regarding

models that may be helpful to the effort of encouraging the scholarship of teaching. The bottom

line remains, however; if the ultimate goal is for teaching and research to be viewed as

comparable forms of scholarship, both worthy of significant prestige, recognition and

advancement, the scholarship of teaching must be significantly factored into promotion and

tenure decisions. Boyer (1990) emphasized the importance of teaching being viewed as a campus

wide initiative and priority, and subsequent writings by Wessells (1994) emphasized the value of

job mobility to faculty satisfaction, and indicated that institutions should use this mechanism as a

part of their reward strategy. He suggested that "…mobility in the job market is highly prized,

and, for many faculty members, mobility depends on research credentials and reputation.

Research intensive universities have the power individually and collectively to change this

situation by making excellence in undergraduate teaching a source of job mobility" (pg. 1).

2.3.1 The Research and Teaching Connection

Many writers suggest that one way to alleviate the research/teaching struggle and to actually help

faculty become better educators is to teach them to combine the teaching and research in a way

that they complement each other, rather than compete. In fact, "universities that want to

encourage excellent teaching find ways to assist faculty in integrating their teaching and research

(Rice & Austin, 1990, p. 37). Gale and Gold (2004) suggests that this begins at the doctoral

student level:

> For those who enter graduate education with a desire to teach, examining their teaching
>
> and student learning in the same scholarly way as they pursue discovery could offer a

valuable bridge between the classroom and the lab, library and field. Early

encouragement of these future faculty members would result in a more coherent doctoral

experience; linking teaching and research as shared forms of scholarship integrates two

facets of intellectual work (p. 8).

While many institutions offer voluntary (or in some cases, mandatory), one-time teacher

preparation courses for new faculty, Johnston (1997) advises that institutions have a

responsibility to introduce graduate students to the notion that their responsibilities should not be

viewed in isolation, but rather as efforts conducted in tandem:

> Teacher preparation courses that treat teaching in isolation from other aspects of
> faculty work perpetuate the division between teaching and research, supporting
> the perspective that teaching competes with research for time and rewards.
> Programs that deal with teaching and research concurrently with other faculty
> responsibilities, such as professional service, promote the view that these
> components of faculty work are complementary rather than competing priorities
> (p.34).

By understanding that teaching and research do not have to be mutually exclusive, and

are, in fact, complementary, faculty of all levels could develop a new appreciation for education

and make exciting advances through the intersection of teaching and research. The understanding

of how research can positively affect teaching is relatively obvious; in order to be an effective

educator, the information being presented must be factual, up to date, and relevant. The best way

to ensure this is through productive and scholarly research. However, it is important to note that

good teaching can also have a positive effect on the scholarship of research. Gale and Golde

(2004) suggested that, "…involvement in the scholarship of teaching and learning makes

students better researchers in their own field; they are able to develop the habits of self-reflection

and assessment of their own practice and its impact that translates directly into work in the lab or

manuscript (p. 12).

In order to bring the importance of teaching to the forefront of the minds of university educators and administrators, it is necessary to be creative, determined, and energetic. Research will remain vital to the development and advancement of institutions, the community and the nation. However, it is not until teaching is considered to be of the same scholarly caliber that more instructors will take a vested interest in improving the quality of their instruction. "If faculty are to feel comfortable devoting the scarce resources of their time to professional development related to teaching, then they must see this commitment reflected in the way in which faculty work is validated throughout the institution" (Johnston, 1997, p. 33).

Lee Shulman, the President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, has an interesting and telling take on the teaching and research connection:

> In modern times, we regularly distinguish between two kinds of methods: the methods we use in our own research, on the one hand, and our methods of teaching, on the other. In the older traditions of the university, however, these two aspects of methods converged (or never separated). The methods of scholarship and the methods of teaching were identical; one's "methods" were those strategies used to marshal evidence in a systematic and persuasive manner for instructing one's students. Both pedagogical and scholarly arguments involved warrant (evidence) and explanation, in a persuasive rhetorical form. It is ironic that these two have not only drifted apart; they are seen as competitive (Shulman, 2000, p. 98).

The Carnegie Foundation and other interested groups will likely continue to pursue the work involved in merging the teaching and research connection. In the meantime, in addition to the time constraints of balancing teaching and research responsibilities, there are a number of other issues that contribute to the quality of institutional teaching for doctoral students who are aspiring to join the professoriate, as well as for new, seasoned, and tenured faculty.

2.4   FACTORS AFFECTING TEACHING EXCELLENCE

In an attempt to identify characteristics of quality instruction as well as to evaluate ways in which the university might recognize them, many researchers have studied faculty who have been classified as "exceptional teachers". The question of 'what makes a 'good' teacher' depends heavily upon factors such as the expectations of students, the type of course that is being taught, the particular talents and abilities of the teacher, etc. In "The Courage to Teach" (1998), Parker Palmer wrote, "Good teaching cannot be reduced to technique; good teaching comes from the identity and integrity of the teacher" (p. 10). Though student expectations of instructor performance vary, quality and teaching excellence are skills that can (and should) be developed, honed and polished throughout the course of the professoriate experience. In addition to the integration of research and teaching, there are a variety of other factors that affect the level of teaching skill and enthusiasm on the part of the faculty. The next section will highlight some of these issues.

2.4.1   Changing Roles and Technologies

As already indicated, there is an overwhelming variety of expectations placed on faculty by university stakeholders. Kemp and O'Keefe (2003) write, "…overall, we seem to want faculty who are technologically sophisticated, gifted communicators, riveting performers and, just to round out the picture, sensitive and empathetic mentors to their students" (p. 2).
It is even more challenging for faculty to uphold these expectations in the face of changing demographics of students, the growth of technology, and the growing demands from students. Most students leave the academic culture of secondary education with high expectations for their

the instruction they will receive in higher education. Feldhusen, Wood, Dixon and Larkin (1998) warned that:

> Students in freshman classes are just a few months removed from high school, where they are required to have a license and certificates showing that they have received training in methods of instruction for work with adolescents. This disparity between preparation for high school teaching and for college teaching is immense and suggests that pedagogical training for prospective college teachers should be a part of the Ph.D. curriculum (pg. 72).

Changing and developing technologies also have an enormous impact on the abilities of faculty to provide high quality instruction. "At many institutions, faculty members are encouraged to teach on-line and to participate in curricular development that draws on delivery or learning options made available through new technologies (Austin, 2002, p. 98). Faculty are expected not only to understand, but to utilize innovation in their teaching styles. In particular, advances in technology affect teaching strategies and student expectations of the ways in which knowledge and information is conveyed. "Faculty members who are inexperienced in making effective use of the new technologies and understanding the learning style(s) of the current generation of students are at a distinct disadvantage" (Kemp & O'Keefe, 2003, p. 111). These roles and expectations of faculty are yet another reason why teacher training should not be solely 'on the job'. In an ideal situation, graduate students would receive substantial preparatory work during their graduate experience. However, there is tremendous variety in the types of training actually received by pre-service faculty. "Some graduate students have no teaching experience; others have served as a teaching assistant in a couple of different courses; some have taught labs or discussion sections; others have taught a single course; and a few have independently taught several courses" (Adams, 2002, p.3). This issue will be explored at length in the following section.

2.4.2 The Preparation of Graduate Students

Some research indicates that most graduate students and new faculty have not had the benefit of instruction in the pedagogy of teaching. Boice (1991) suggested that, " …there is little evidence to suggest that graduate schools, despite their purview of graduate education, normally see the preparation of professors as teaching faculty as one of their more important priorities" (p. 27). These concerns extend to those who are in the position of hiring recent graduates: "Institutional leaders who hire new PHD graduates for faculty positions, analysts of higher education, and potential faculty members, including graduate students, raise questions about the appropriateness of graduate program preparation for the changing workplace contexts that the next generation of faculty will face" (Austin, 2002, p. 95).

This idea is alarming, primarily because it stands to reason that the graduate preparation program is the natural starting point for faculty to begin to learn how to provide effective and high-quality instruction. However, this often is not the case. For example, a study of TA training at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor by Bartlett (2003), found that some TA's received almost no formal training what-so-ever (¶8). Earlier research by Monaghan (1989) provided specific information regarding the extreme lack of training for teaching assistants,

> …survey data discussed here provided some sobering statistics on the lack of training for teaching assistants: - Only 25 per cent of institutions that use teaching assistants have campus-wide training programs, and only about half of those institutions require participation. - Only half of all academic departments provide training to teaching assistants. Of those, most offer little, and few follow up with procedures to improve teaching. -By their second year on the job, about two-thirds of teaching assistants have sole responsibility for classes. - Vast numbers of institutions simply assume teaching assistants can teach, and many faculty handbooks do not even mention that teaching assistants should have an aptitude for or interest in teaching.

A more recent study by Austin (2002) indicates that even now, over 15 years later, the status of training for teaching assistants is still concerning, "The literature suggests that this is not an uncommon trend: "Although teaching and research responsibilities surely can provide training opportunities for the future faculty, these assistantship roles sometimes are structured more to serve institutional or faculty needs than to ensure a high quality learning experience for graduate students" (p.95).

Many doctoral students feel threatened by the idea of spending too much time on teaching. In fact, some graduate students have the impression that showing too strong of an interest in the development of their teaching skills will lead to the perception that their interest (and skill) in research is not significant. Through Ernest Boyer's research (1990), he interviewed a TA who said, "…teaching is considered secondary at best, with the implication being that those who aspire to teach or who enjoy it are not good scholars or intellects. The department gives double messages about teaching. It does not want to shortchange the undergrads, but it is suspicious of those of us who care deeply about teaching" (p. 71).

The idea that graduate student preparation for the professoriate is significantly lacking is not a new concern. In the 1930's the dean of the University of Chicago's graduate school wrote:

> What are we doing in the way of equipping them [the graduate students] for their chosen work? Have the departments of the various graduate schools kept the teaching career sufficiently in mind in the organization of their program(s) of studies? Or have they arranged their courses with an eye to the production of research workers only, thinking of the teacher's duties merely as a means of livelihood… (Nyquist, J; Manning, L.; Wulff, D.; Austin, A.; Sprague, J.; Fraser, P.; Calcagno, C.; & Woodford, B. 1999, p.14).

Unfortunately, many years after this writing, many doctoral students who aspire toward careers in the professoriate are still not learning the skills associated with the pedagogy of teaching until their first professional position. Adams (2002) wrote,

…although the roles and responsibilities in colleges and universities have significantly changed over the last two decades, graduate faculty and administrators have yet to embrace the reality that the present job market demands skills and experiences of new Ph.D.s that were not required twenty years ago. Graduate faculty need to be aware that to succeed, the next generation of faculty needs more than research skills and an in-depth knowledge about a narrow specialty in their field (p.12).

Sending graduates of doctoral programs into the academic work force with minimal to no direct experience in teaching pedagogy is a disservice to the students, the institution, and the new faculty themselves. When students are dissatisfied with their coursework, departments receive complaints about instructors, and new teachers are faced with overburdened schedules and a lack of student connection. Frustration for all parties is imminent. Silverman (2003), wrote, "Helping students learn is part of what we do as faculty members. Helping our students learn to help their students learn will give each new faculty member some of the skills that are needed to be successful (pg.79).

The doctoral program is the ideal place to begin to instill in prospective faculty the importance of teaching as a form of academic scholarship. Gale and Golde (2004) recommend that

. …it is graduate school that prepares future faculty for the challenges of undergraduate teaching and learning. And the reality is that despite the fact that arts and science doctoral students most often cite "enjoyment of teaching" as their reason for their interest in faculty positions, many report feeling inadequately prepared for their chosen careers (p.1). …early exposure to the scholarship of teaching and learning is a vital first step and could appropriately be included in all doctoral programs (p.9).

Recommendations have been made by current professors regarding what they think is needed for doctoral students to become effective in the profession in both teaching and research. Silverman (2003) advised a three pronged plan to prepare future faculty while still at the graduate level. The three aspects of the plan involve actual coursework in teaching strategies,

opportunities to teach while still in graduate school, and finally, the prospect of having a strong

and thoughtful mentor to help lead the student along the path of teaching and learning (pp.72-

75). Silverman also emphasized that there is not a tried and true model of teaching pedagogy

that is effective for all students. Rather, a successful approach depends entirely on the student's

experience, goals, aspirations and strengths (p. 79).

The TA role is also important to consider, as it is an excellent opportunity for training in

the pedagogy and scholarship of teaching to begin. In addition, the TA experience, if mentored

and conducted appropriately, can help future faculty understand the comprehensive role of the

faculty. Many programs now are beginning to address their TA training programs in this way

(Chism,1998, p.1). This level of detail in doctoral programs is still evolving; historically, faculty

preparation through the TA experience has not been as formalized or useful as it could be. Chism

(1998) provides some historical perspective regarding this history, and divides it into four

sections:

- *Nothing to Say: Until about 1960.* Very little information to determine when graduate students first took on teaching roles, and "even less seems to be known about how early graduate student teachers were prepared for their teaching responsibilities. This time period goes along with the notion that "there is nothing to teaching; that teachers are born, not made; that teaching is telling."

- *Private Conversations: 1960-1980.* Universities began to employ more and more TAs in increasingly independent teaching roles, student criticism of the quality of education escalated, and institutions began to respond. During this time, formal efforts to prepare graduate students to teach began, largely at the department level and largely in the departments with many TAs (p.3). The term 'Private Conversations' is descriptive of this era because dialogue was, by and large, within individual departments or programs; public sharing about these efforts was mostly in disciplinary journals, when shared at all. A major exception to the trend during this period was the work of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to promote the Doctor of Arts degree.

- *Can We Talk?* In 1986, with the first national conference on TA issues at The Ohio State University, and in the five years that followed, came this phase. During this phase, large institutions came together to publicly talk about a situation that they had previously treated cautiously: the fact that TAs were carrying a large part of the undergraduate load and that efforts to prepare these graduate students to teach were in their infancy. Much of the dialogue at first dealt with policy issues. There was an interest in how TAs are selected and assigned, concern with "time to degree," and a discussion of stipends, workloads, and unionization.

- *Extending the Conversation: Early 1990's*. One group of constituents that became quite influential during this time included legislators and other public officials, investigative reporters and citizens who focused on attempting to regulate the language proficiency of ITAs and curtailing the widespread employment of teaching assistants (p. 2-5).

Even for graduate students who do not aspire to spend the majority of their time as faculty, the teaching preparation is invaluable. Better teaching skills will prepare them for a variety of jobs, rather than the limited number of research positions, and will also ease their anxiety and tension regarding the time consuming task of preparing their teaching load. Nyquist, et al (1999) wrote, "The issue goes beyond altruistic concern for the lives of graduate students, as important as we believe that concern should be. We also are considering the future of the academy and whether we are adequately preparing the kind of innovative, committed, and thoughtful faculty members needed to become the next generation of the professoriate" (p.17). This quote is meaningful because being under-prepared as a graduate student leads to only one thing: being under-prepared as a new member of the faculty. The next section will address the experience of new faculty, as they are faced with the responsibilities associated with teaching.

2.4.3 New Faculty: Sink or Swim

The ability to provide outstanding instruction rarely, if ever, is innate. Faculty who begin the profession without significant training, experience, support and feedback at the doctoral level are working at a strong disadvantage during their first professional position. As previously mentioned, new faculty cannot dedicate all of their time to developing their teaching skills, even if it is their desire to do so. Rather, they are pulled in multiple directions, having to do research and various obligations of service, such as advising, committee work and community obligations. It stands to reason, therefore, that new many faculty cannot articulate how they came to learn the skills associated with teaching, or to develop their teaching style. Unfortunately, little has changed since Gaff's (1975) report almost thirty years ago, which reported that "in their more candid moments, most faculty members readily confess that they learned to teach by being thrown into the classroom and either swimming or sinking; almost all will testify to doing considerable thrashing about before discovering how to swim. And even yet some go under" (pg. 3).

   This paper already has documented research that indicates that faculty are not learning to teach during the doctoral experience. The question therefore remains: if faculty are not, for the most part, acquiring their teaching skills in their graduate programs, how do they learn how to teach? The well documented reality is that researchers actually know very little about how faculty gain pedagogical skills in teaching. Boice (1991) wrote, "…in the midst of growing concerns for college teaching, we produce more and more useful advice about ways to improve instruction. Yet, we know almost nothing about how (and how quickly) professors establish their teaching styles (Boice, 1991, pg. 150).

Because research is such an important form of scholarship in academic circles, it can be perceived that time spent away from its pursuit is a sign of disinterest or lack of talent. Many new faculty are greatly concerned with their reputations on campus, and realize that because tenure decisions are strongly influenced by successful research, they should demonstrate their commitment and ability from the beginning of their career. New faculty realize that while research tends to take the priority, teaching is still an expectation with a great deal of visibility. Many new faculty resist seeking assistance or support when it comes to their teaching, as they want to show that they can handle their entire workload. Being mentored by a senior faculty member is typically an extremely helpful strategy to acclimate to the institution, and to receive some guidance in juggling the multiple responsibilities associated with the faculty position. However, many new faculty choose not to be mentored, because "novice teachers fear that mentoring may be used for evaluative purposes. New faculty may resist showing weaknesses to colleagues who may be involved in retention, tenure, and promotion decision" (Boyle & Boice, 1998, p. 160).

Recent research by Kreber (2002) reaffirms the idea that new faculty are better served by dedicating the majority of their energy to their research efforts, as it is not good teaching that yields the most significant rewards:

> … effective teaching is generally considered good enough. It would follow that expertise in teaching, going beyond what is necessary, or "becoming even more effective," is not something that is externally rewarded. It matters little whether you receive a teaching award once, or twice, or ten times; but it matters a lot whether you publish one article or two or ten, and it matters a lot whether you receive one external research grant or two or ten. (Kreber, 2002, p. 14).

The unfortunate reality is that most new faculty learn to teach through their own motivation and volition. Kreber (2002) suggested that "typically, it is a trial and error approach whereby strategies that work well are kept and those that do not work well are dismissed" (p.

13). Many new faculty go on to become excellent instructors. Others are satisfied by fulfilling

their teaching obligations but use the majority of their time and talent on their other

responsibilities. The bottom line is, even senior faculty and administrators are beginning to

realize that the "sink or swim" approach to junior faculty is detrimental to the institution"

(Bensimon, et al, 2000, p. xvii). This realization is an important step in addressing the issue.

2.4.4 Senior Faculty: Priorities and Development

Though the specifics of senior faculty experiences and development will not be addressed in this

study, they are important to mention as they contribute significantly to the teaching culture of the

institution. They serve as role models, and carry with them a wonderful resource in the history

and knowledge associated with the department, college, and university.

Like new faculty, senior and tenured faculty have responsibilities, as well as priorities.

The pressure and desire to publish does not stop with the tenure award. Tenured faculty provide

a significant source of funding for their departments, due to their research efforts. They are

called to serve as role models for and mentors for new faculty. They oversee the research and

dissertation efforts of new faculty, and serve on a variety of department, school and university

committees. Though their teaching load may decrease somewhat, it does not disappear.

Senior faculty are not unlike new faculty in that they need information and development

throughout their careers regarding effective and innovative teaching strategies. Faculty

development programs allow instructors to be engaged as learners. Consistently revisiting this

role not only provides faculty with the opportunity to improve their teaching skills; it also allows

faculty to identify with their students in a manner that is a form of professional development in

itself. Musil (1997) suggested that "…when faculty themselves are suddenly students again

tackling unsettling new material, they reconnect in new ways to their own students' experiences.

Engaging a faculty member in new scholarship and pedagogy changes more than a single course;

it potentially alters all the courses a faculty member might teach" (¶ 7).

Although opportunities exist and are provided by universities to affect the development

and teaching abilities of faculty, some faculty do not want to admit that they would need or value

new information regarding teaching skills and strategies:

> …typically, faculty have a cautious, skeptical, or critical initial reaction which stems from several sources. For one thing, there is the implied criticism inherent in the terms that are used. Professors often react defensively to the term "faculty development" and ask, "What's wrong with me the way I am?" Another common initial reaction is for faculty to perceive that the center may be setting up a remedial program for bad teachers. Sometimes faculty conceive of instructional-improvement programs as akin to a "methods course" offered by the school of education, and that image elicits negative educationist stereotypes" (Gaff, 1975, p. 120).

Another important idea in the quest for effective faculty development is that faculty need

to be active participants in their own learning. When faculty are involved in the process; whether

it is the direction of the university or the establishment of their professional development

programs, the results will be more meaningful and effective. Chopp, Frost and Jean (2001) agree

that "…meaningful and lasting faculty development programs are more likely to take hold when

the impetus for change emerges directly from faculty at the grassroots level. Success depends on

the faculty's ability to shape for themselves the kind of scholarly experience that best unleashes

their desires, talents, and skills (p. 48).

A valuable goal would be to provide faculty with leadership opportunities in their

professional development programs, as they would benefit from the learning experiences and

opportunities for growth. However, the faculty development programs that exist currently do not

always offer support on a consistent basis, after evaluating the individual needs of the faculty:

> Our casual approach to developing and sustaining our colleagues --- and renewing and upgrading the skills of the senior faculty--- must be directly responsible for much of the low-quality student experience portrayed by research and the low-quality educational results many of our societal stakeholders decry. We need to move beyond one-shot, flash-in-the-pan workshops on this or that toward systemic and systematic professional development (Gardiner, 1994, p. 141).

Effective faculty development requires a thorough assessment of faculty needs, an appreciation and understanding of differences and diversity among the faculty, and the time, resources and knowledge that are necessary to address these issues. In addition, consistent and reliable feedback is a priority. Feldman and Paulsen (1999) recommend that, "in a supportive teaching culture, informative feedback is readily available from several sources – colleagues, consultants, chairs, students, and teachers themselves – to address the needs of faculty for self-determination and excellence in teaching, to provide opportunities to learn and achieve, and to stimulate, inform, and support efforts to improve instruction (and to sustain these improvements over time)" (p.74).

It needs to be understood that senior faculty, even those with tenure, still have responsibilities, priorities and opportunities. In a culture that is supportive of teaching, senior administration and faculty acknowledge that development opportunities are valuable and necessary, rather than a sign of weakness or disinterest in research:

> For some faculty members and administrators, the chance to broaden the range of activities considered scholarly represents an opportunity, for others, it is a threat. There is particular concern among faculty members who themselves are quite comfortable with the research-based approach to scholarship and who see any attempt to broaden the scope of activities considered scholarly as having the potential for diminishing their power and resources---a "zero-sum game" perspective. Some administrators and faculty members also see any effort to increase the importance of applied research, teaching, and service as having the potential for reducing the prestige of their institution or their programs, and for some, image is the primary concern" (Diamond, 2002, p. 76).

The bottom line is that even tenured faculty, like graduate students, need to be committed to the prospect of lifelong learning in order to be effective, and in order to do this, they need the help and support of their institution. Peter Seldin (1995), in the preface of his book "Improving College Teaching," wrote, "…just as students deserve guidance as learners, professors are entitled to helpful direction in their teaching" (p. ix).

2.5   DEVELOPING SUPPORTIVE TEACHING CULTURES ON CAMPUS

2.5.1   Introduction

Though Feldman and Paulsen (1999) were the strong and initial proponents of a "supportive teaching culture," there is other research that supports the idea that faculty need, deserve and respond to an environment that acknowledges the pressures and stress factors experienced by new faculty. Zahorsky (2002) referred to the need for the academic environment to actually be 'nurturing':

> Many benefits derive from creating a nurturing and supportive climate for scholarship. Most obvious, of course, is a higher level of scholarly productivity. But there are other benefits as well, many of them not as tangible as increased productivity but in their own way fully as significant. First of all, in the synergistic model previously described, an office of faculty development becomes a more potent institutional force because of the additional clout and visibility gained from the alliances forged with other institutional units. In brief, faculty development components powerful in themselves become even more potent transforming agents when collaborating harmoniously with other institutional programs and offices. Second, through the intrainstitutional liaisons and partnerships characteristic of the synergistic approach, stronger bridges are built between faculty development and other institutional entities. Enhanced collaboration means enhanced communication, ultimately resulting in a revitalized spirit of collegiality and community. Third, through a synergistic approach, the importance of other professional growth agents and agencies outside the office of faculty development is accentuated. The awareness that professional growth is everyone's business can lead to much positive change on any campus (pg. 36).

The potential for this positive change is dependent on a number of factors, one of the primary and most important being institutional engagement and encouragement of teaching as a scholarly activity. The following section addresses this notion in detail.

2.5.2   Acknowledging Teaching as a Form of Scholarship

Over the past few decades, there has been an emphasis placed on the idea that scholarship needs to be associated with more than just the traditional responsibilities of research and publication. Ernest Boyer was a proponent of this idea, and in his work for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1990) he argued that the concept of scholarship must be expanded to include other types of intellectual work carried out by faculty members in addition to basic research. Teaching is particularly emphasized in his work as a faculty responsibility that should be revered as a form of scholarship.

It should be noted that the "quality" of teaching in and of itself does not define the scholarship of teaching. Some researchers indicate that in order for teaching to be considered "scholarly," it must, like academic research, undergo a process of peer review. Kreber (2002), suggested this in her work, and wrote, "…scholars of teaching are excellent teachers as well as expert teachers; but they differ from either one in that scholars of teaching share their knowledge and advance the knowledge of teaching and learning in the discipline in a way that can be peer-reviewed" (Kreber, 2002, p.5). Gale and Golde (2004) offered a view on the scholarship of teaching that refers more to the pedagogy of teaching and learning. They wrote, "…the scholarship of teaching and learning is a rigorous investigation into classroom practice, how a teacher teaches, and how (and what) students learn. The scholarship of teaching and learning

begins with the observation of student learning and the realization that there is something happening in the classroom that we do not understand" (p.2).

It was Ernest Boyer (1990) who detailed the specifics of the meaning of the scholarship of teaching. He delineated the idea of what it means to be a scholar, suggesting that it is "a recognition that knowledge is acquired through research, through synthesis, through practice and through teaching. We acknowledge that these four categories---the scholarship of discovery, of integration, of application, and of teaching---divide intellectual functions that are tied inseparably to each other" (pp. 24-25). In summary, the scholarship of teaching is the systematic and rigorous study of teaching that yields knowledge about teaching theory and practice that can be peer reviewed and built upon by members of the community.

This document has argued based on related research that for teaching excellence and quality instruction to be standard on the college campus, teaching itself would ideally be considered a form of scholarship in its own right; as important to the success of the institution as the scholarly research conducted on campus. The issue of teaching is larger than just working to be more effective as educators. Rather, teaching needs to become a form of scholarship that faculty strive to perfect and graduate students come to respect. Stanley (2001) says:

> Good teaching means that faculty, as scholars, are also learners. Teaching, at its best, means not only transmitting knowledge, but transforming and extending it as well. What we urgently need today is a more inclusive view of what it means to be a scholar --- a recognition that knowledge is acquired through research, through synthesis, through practice, and through teaching (p. 24).

In order to perpetuate teaching as a scholarly activity, it is important to clarify how faculty, themselves view the meaning of the 'scholarship of teaching.' Trigwell, et. al., (2000) sought to do this very thing. In an effort to gain more specific information, and importantly, the

views of faculty on this topic, this research team conducted a study to learn more about how faculty would define this term. Their findings were categorized into five descriptors:

a. The scholarship of teaching is about knowing the literature on teaching by collecting and reading that literature;

b. Scholarship of teaching is about improving teaching by collecting and reading the literature on teaching;

c. Scholarship of teaching is about improving student learning by investigating the learning of one's own students and one's own teaching;

d. Scholarship of teaching is about improving one's own students' learning by knowing and relating the literature on teaching and learning to discipline-specific literature and knowledge;

e. The scholarship of teaching is about improving student learning within the discipline generally, by collecting and communicating results of one's own work on teaching and learning within the discipline. (Trigwell, et al, 2000, p. 159)

Researchers also are concerned that institutions recognize that the scholarship of teaching is not the same as quality teaching. Kreber (2003) wrote, "the distinction between being an excellent teacher and practicing the scholarship of teaching doesn't make sense to the majority of faculty because such a view is seen to generate some form of 'caste system' of teachers: the good and the better (p. 30).

The book "Scholarship Assessed" (1997) was a follow up to Boyer's work, "Scholarship Reconsidered" (1990), and provided specific indicators that must be met in place in order for teaching to be considered scholarly. "The work must be characterized by clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique" (Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, 1997, p. 36). However, the scholarship of teaching will continue to be challenging to implement as long as its definition is not well known and valued by

institutions, departments, and faculty themselves. Fortunately, researchers in the field seem to have reached a consensus regarding the ideas that:

> 1. Excellence in teaching is valuable in its own right and should be rewarded, but the rewards for it should be different from the rewards for the scholarship of teaching because teaching excellence and the scholarship of teaching are not the same.
>
> 2. The concept of the scholarship of teaching, versus excellence in teaching, has been described and defined in the literature.
>
> 3. Professional advancement at a university is based on scholarship, be this in the area of teaching the discipline, in the content of the discipline itself, in the area of synthesis and integration of knowledge, or in the area of application of knowledge to real-world problems.
>
> 4. Those who would like to make teaching the focus of their scholarship but are uncertain about what this entails may wish to consult the relevant literature for suggestions for mentoring in the scholarship of teaching and seek other assistance such as consultation with peers and faculty developers.
>
> 5. Both scholarly teaching and practicing the scholarship of teaching involve being cognizant of the existing research-based or theory-based knowledge about teaching and using this knowledge to explain practice, as well as sharing one's insights in the form of the wisdom of practice in a way that can be peer reviewed. (Kreber, 2001, p. 101-102).

Faculty, administration and campus constituents must agree on the value and meaning that this concept will have for their institution.

2.5.3   Limitations of Feldman and Paulsen

Though much has been written about the notion of the academic environment having significant influence over the motivation and teaching innovation of faculty, Feldman and Paulson (1999) are credited with coining the phrase "supportive teaching culture" and initiating the subsequent research. They have synthesized the existing literature, and based on their findings, recommend a

number of characteristics which should be present in order for instructors to experience

meaningful teaching support from the institution. These include:

- High-level administrative commitment and support;

- Faculty involvement, shared values, and a sense of ownership;

- A broader definition of scholarship;

- A teaching demonstration or pedagogical colloquium as part of the hiring process;

- Frequent interaction, collaboration and community among faculty;

- A faculty development program or campus teaching center;

- Supportive and effective department chairs

- Connecting rigorous evaluation of teaching to tenure and promotion decisions.

(Feldman and Paulsen, 1999, p.72)

While this compilation of literature is relatively recent, it is not comprehensive, nor does

it provide enough specificity to offer true assistance to new and prospective faculty trying to

assess the academic culture of an institution. Clarification and examples need to be provided.

Even more importantly, however, is the notion that none of the parameters suggested by Feldman

and Paulsen address the doctoral student experience. Much has already been reported in this

document regarding the importance of graduate students having experience and mentoring in the

pedagogy of teaching. This is also the time when the value of considering teaching to be a

scholarly activity can be instilled, through the demonstration of the faculty working with the

doctoral students, and the overall messages about teaching (i.e. through reward structures,

administrative commitment, etc.) from senior faculty and administrators. Rice and Austin (2000),

like Feldman and Paulson, paid particular attention to the notion of the supportive teaching

culture, and what kinds of attributes are necessary to have an environment of this nature in place.

Through their studies, they made a number of recommendations to university administrators and senior faculty to help them improve the caliber of teaching on their campuses:

- unambiguous commitment to and support of teaching and its improvement from senior administrators;

- shared values about the importance of teaching between administrators and faculty, with widespread involvement of faculty in planning and implementing activities and programs to improve teaching, thus creating a sense of faculty "ownership" of these activities and programs;

- the presence of effective department chairs who are supportive of teaching and its improvement;

- frequent interaction and collaboration among faculty and a sense of community among faculty regarding teaching related issues;

- a faculty development program or campus teaching center;

- a broad, expanded view of scholarship and scholarly activities;

- decisions about tenure and promotion connected to rigorous evaluations of teaching; and

- a requirement that some demonstration of effective teaching be part of interviewing and hiring new faculty.

These recommendations are similar to those made by Feldman and Paulsen, with a bit of expansion. Interestingly enough, however, the development and education of graduate students is not a part of Rice and Austin's recommendations. In addition, like Feldman and Paulsen's findings, it would be helpful to see more detailed ideas regarding the meaning behind each one.

In addition to the departments and central administrators, teaching and learning centers on campus play a large role in helping new faculty and graduate students understand the role of teaching in their careers, and helping them to enhance their pedagogical knowledge and skills. It is essential to the development of new and future faculty that the campus teaching and learning center initiates appropriate activities and programs, and also consistently provides support for

individual faculty, the departments, and the institution as a whole. The next section will delineate some of the roles and responsibilities of the teaching and learning centers.

2.5.4   The Role of the University Teaching Center

Over the past few decades, many institutions have demonstrated an understanding for the importance of treating teaching as a scholarly activity by developing support and encouragement mechanisms for faculty. Many of these initiatives have become fairly standard on college campuses, and are necessary for a truly supportive teaching culture to be in place. One of the ways that institutions can show support for teaching as well as encouragement and development for all faculty and doctoral students is through teaching and learning centers.

There are many obvious reasons why faculty are encouraged to participate in professional development opportunities, but one of the greatest benefits is that faculty development programs allow instructors to be engaged as learners. Consistently revisiting this role not only provides faculty with the opportunity to improve their teaching skills; it also allows faculty to identify with their students in a manner that is a form of professional development in itself. Musil (1997) suggested that "when faculty themselves are suddenly students again tackling unsettling new material, they reconnect in new ways to their own students' experiences. Engaging a faculty member in new scholarship and pedagogy changes more than a single course; it potentially alters all the courses a faculty member might teach" (¶ 7).

In most higher education institutions across the nation, teaching and learning centers take the lead in providing faculty development opportunities, as well as encouraging departments to take initiatives in this area. The existence of teaching and learning centers has grown rapidly across the nation over the past few decades; in fact, "…we can celebrate about a three-hundred-

fold increase in the past thirty years" (Singer, 2002, p.59). The University of Michigan in Ann Arbor was the first to develop a center of this kind in the early 1960's, and by 1969, a study revealed that of 1000 schools surveyed, **"**…503 of them reported the existence of a formal in-service program for faculty, though the majority of these programs were relatively unstructured, casually implemented, rarely the responsibility of one designated person, and even less frequently supported by an item in the instructional budget of the institution" (Gaff, 1975, p. 12).

The goals of Teaching and Learning Centers were rather primitive during the early years, and were primarily charged with orienting new faculty to the institution. Eventually, they took on greater responsibility and made attempts to address faculty needs through various means. Eventually, professionals in the field determined that "offering faculty a series of workshops on teaching effectiveness or placing books about teaching on library shelves may not be sufficient to enhance their actual teaching practices behind classroom doors" (Eleser and Chauvin, 1998, p. 181).

Rather, the university was expected to ensure the provision of consistent and strategically planned opportunities for enhancing quality instruction, learning opportunities, and professional development. To many instructors who are content experts but know little about teaching pedagogy, connecting with students in an effort to enhance their learning experience is extraordinarily challenging. In situations such as this, teaching and learning centers have a crucial obligation to provide assistance, guidance, and service to the faculty. They need to provide reassurance that "it is possible for everyone to become a good teacher who exerts the effort" (Kreber, 2000, pg. 9).

In 1995, "Improving College Teaching" was written by a variety of professionals in the field. One chapter was dedicated to the development of teaching and learning centers. The author

of this chapter was Dr. Susan Ambrose, who founded the Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence at Carnegie Mellon University in 1982. Upon its foundation, the specific goal of the Eberly Center was to improve the quality of instruction for the university; a progressive idea for the early 1980's. In the chapter, Dr. Ambrose lists a number of "tenets" that she found to be "vital components necessary for the success of any faculty development program" (p. 79). One of these tenets refers to the notion of institutional "support" of teaching excellence, which Ambrose indicated must include more than budgetary incentives. For example, in June of 1993, the University Teaching Center at Carnegie Mellon "…moved into a new suite of very nice offices in a prime location on campus. This move symbolized to the campus community the ever-increasing importance of teaching at Carnegie Mellon" (Ambrose, 1995, p. 88).

To many instructors who are content experts but know little about teaching pedagogy, connecting with students in an effort to enhance their learning experience is extraordinarily challenging. In situations such as this, teaching and learning centers have a crucial obligation to provide assistance, guidance, and service to the faculty. They need to provide reassurance that "it is possible for everyone to become a good teacher who exerts the effort" (Kreber, 2000, pg. 9). This is another reason why institutional commitment is crucial. Other ways that the university can show support for teaching and learning centers is for senior administrators to be involved in programs and events for faculty, and to personally encourage faculty to attend. Overall, a supportive teaching culture (Feldman & Paulsen, 1999) must exist on campus in order for teaching and learning centers ---as well as other means of faculty and instructional support---to be effective. Alternately, a teaching and learning center must be present on campus in order for the teaching culture to be considered "supportive".

2.5.5   Obstacles and Challenges

As important as a supportive teaching culture is to the success of the faculty as well as the institution, there are a number of obstacles that make it challenging for universities to fully consider teaching to be a form of scholarship. These issues have already been mentioned throughout this document, but will be synthesized in this section.

The greatest challenge that remains in promoting the scholarship of teaching on campus is the notion that promotion and tenure decisions are still based primarily on research. In some aspects, this is rational, since research can easily be evaluated through publications, findings, and peer review, while teaching is more subjective and difficult to quantify. In Boyer's (1990) report to The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, he recommended the following:

> To bring teaching and research into better balance, we urge the nation's ranking universities to extend special status and salary incentives to those professors who devote most of their time to teaching and are particularly effective in the classroom. Such recognition will signify that the campus regards teaching excellence as a hallmark of professional success (p. 58).

One of the primary ways that institutions honor quality teaching is through the use of teaching awards, which are often associated with monetary prizes. However, as much as an award and financial recognition are significant, they are not as coveted as tenure. In addition, it should be noted that, in some cases, the use of teaching awards can actually backfire. Teaching awards typically honor only a small number of individuals each year, providing no recognition for the other individuals on campus who also are considered excellent instructors.

In 1992, faculty at the University of California at Berkeley made recommendations regarding their teaching award system in an attempt to make it more prestigious on their campus. Their recommendations were specific to their own institution, but could easily be applied to other colleges and universities. The faculty recommended that the award be geared toward young

and new professionals in the field, and that winners of the award should automatically receive an increase in their compensation. Others on the committee rallied to abolish the award in its entirety, claiming that an award of this nature alienates those who to not receive the award but still initiate best teaching practices in their classroom. Overall, the committee agreed that more feedback to faculty, on a consistent basis and throughout the course of their careers, was imperative to improve the overall teaching on campus (Schwartz, 1992, p.2).

This is not to say that teaching awards should be abolished or that they do not carry honor and prestige with their delivery. Institutional decision makers should just be mindful that there are various other ways, besides the use of teaching awards, to honor effective instruction. The ultimate goal is for teaching and research to be viewed as comparable and compatible forms of scholarship, both worthy of significant prestige, recognition and advancement. Ideally, the scholarship of teaching will also be more significantly factored into promotion and tenure decisions. Diamond (1999) wrote, "Unless the criteria by which faculty are recognized and rewarded are modified, what faculty do will remain constant. Administrators must encourage and facilitate this change process, and they must understand the key role they play in establishing a receptive climate for change in the priorities of their institutions" (p. 14).

Finally, another major challenge of institutions making efforts to foster quality teaching is the notion that there are very few faculty who would admit that they are poor instructors. Many do not feel comfortable taking advantage of teaching and development opportunities on campus, as participation in such activities may be considered a sign of weakness. Typically, faculty have a cautious, skeptical, or critical initial reaction which stems from several sources. These obstacles will be explored further during the dissertation study.

2.6   SUMMARY

This review was designed to describe the ideas and relate to the notion of a supportive

teaching culture on campus, including factors that affect teaching excellence, and specific issues

pertaining to teaching as a form of scholarship. The information presented here is intended to

provide background and support for the study, which itself includes a more complete synthesis of

the literature.

3.0   RESEARCH METHODS

3.1   INTRODUCTION

This study was based on an extensive meta-analysis of research that spans the course of approximately 35 years. The purpose of this review was to develop a set of criteria with corresponding indicators for new and prospective faculty to use to assess the level of teaching support and the overall teaching culture of their institutions. The previous chapter documents much of the literature about supportive teaching cultures, primarily by the valuable findings and contributions of Feldman and Paulson (1999). This study built upon prior research and filled in 'gaps' of the previous research, and offered a framework that is a usable tool for doctoral students and new faculty to informally assess their academic 'fit' with a given institution.

The primary mode of discovery for this study was through an extensive review of existing literature pertaining to the activities, programs and initiatives that are most likely to create an environment that is supportive and conducive to the scholarship of teaching for graduate students and new faculty. These were analyzed and translated into a set of criteria and indicators for use in assessing an institution's teaching culture. These were then reviewed by researchers and practitioners in the field who have extensive knowledge of the factors being considered. Through their feedback and guidance, the criteria were revised and improved for accuracy, relevance and usefulness to new and prospective faculty.

3.2   AREAS OF FOCUS

Two primary academic groups were the focus of this study: those in the 'preparation phase' (doctoral students who plan to pursue careers in academe), those in the 'induction phase' (new

faculty) at research institutions. Each was studied individually, in relation to a number of factors that institutions offer in the effort to support the scholarship of teaching.

3.3   PROCEDURES

This meta-analysis of research and the compilation of the guidelines emerged from the criteria and indicators of quality for the scholarship of teaching. In order to accomplish this, the literature review begins by synthesizing the literature regarding a variety of topics, such as new faculty and graduate student teaching preparation, development and assessment. Recommendations pertaining to important themes, practices and programs in institutions with supportive teaching cultures were made. The literature also provides a framework of indictors with accompanying support. Finally, the established criteria and supporting indicators were evaluated by researchers in the field.

3.4   SYNTHESIS OF FINDINGS

The literature for each factor has been compiled, organized and synthesized, and findings will be detailed. An attachment to the criteria includes a list of indicators of supportive teaching for new and prospective faculty (graduate students) based on the review of research. This serves as a simple reference for anyone reviewing the criteria who want more information in any particular category.

3.5   FINAL PRODUCT: CRITERIA

The final product of this study is a set of criteria and indicators to determine the extent of a supportive teaching culture on campus. This is supported by a meta-analysis of relevant

literature, and will serve as a reference for new and prospective faculty to informally assess the teaching environment of a research institution.

3.6   EVALUATION AND REVIEW OF THE STUDY

In order to help identify the limitations and benefits of the final product of this study, it was important to receive feedback from individuals in the field who have worked extensively in the areas of scholarly teaching and institutional cultures. Five individuals (four nationally renowned researcher and one university administrator) were contacted with a request to review the criteria and related indicators identified by this document. They were also asked to comment on the indicators provided for new and prospective faculty to determine the extent to which each guideline should be addressed on campus. Their feedback and the revised criteria and indicators comprise the final chapter of this dissertation, along with recommendations for future study.

3.7   LIMITATIONS

There are a couple of limitations to this study that are worth mentioning. These criteria will serve as a starting point, but it should be noted that the onus of responsibility will still rest with the doctoral student/new faculty member to find the answers to each question in reference to their institution of interest. A good bit of research will be necessary in order for these criteria and indicators to be useful, but they serve as an outline of institutional initiatives that are typically present in the case of a supportive teaching culture on campus.

It should also be mentioned that it is not necessary for all of the factors indicated in the criteria to be present in order for an institution to have what is considered a supportive teaching culture. It is up to each individual candidate to assess for him or herself the aspects that are most

valuable and important to them, based on their own needs, expectations, and hopes for their employment. Though there are some variables that are expected to be available on most campuses (i.e. Teaching and Learning Centers, teaching opportunities for graduate students, mentoring, etc.), there are a number of new and innovative support systems that are just beginning to break ground on campuses across the nation. Faculty need to gauge for themselves the factors that they feel are most vital to their success.

Finally, there are varying opinions by researchers on what attributes need to be in place in order for a campus culture to be considered "supportive" of teaching. The research is vast, and this researcher had to make some decisions regarding the validity and usefulness of information, specifically whether each attribute should be included in the criteria. Similarly, while these criteria will be useful to faculty for the next few years, they will need to be updated often. As teaching on campus assumes greater priority, new and innovative techniques for encouraging teaching as a scholarly activity will be developed and implemented. The criteria and indicators will need to be frequently updated in order to be valuable over time.

3.8   DE-LIMITATIONS

There are various types of institutions of higher education, as well as responsibilities associated with faculty positions. For example, community colleges do not have the same needs as liberal arts colleges, and liberal arts colleges do not have the same needs as research universities. Faculty positions at each of these organizations also have different priorities and expectations. It would be challenging, if not impossible, to create a set of evaluative teaching culture criteria and indicators of quality that would be meaningful and appropriate for each of these types of

institutions. Therefore, this study focused specifically on the needs and goals of research

universities.

IV.   DEVELOPING AND DEFINING THE CRITERA

4.1   INTRODUCTION

The analysis of literature points to a variety of factors that need to be considered in order for an institution to demonstrate dedication and commitment to an environment that is supportive of teaching. In order to fully understand supportive teaching cultures on campus, it is important to evaluate, when applicable, how each condition affects both graduate students and new faculty.

New and prospective faculty need to assess the teaching culture of an institution for a number of reasons. For one thing, it is important that they understand the extent to which the university's teaching priorities, goals and expectations match their own needs and aspirations for teaching. New faculty who anticipate support and encouragement for teaching need to ensure that the schools they are considering are able to offer that support. It is important to understand what the institutional expectations are for scholarly work, so that upon accepting the position new faculty understand the expected roles and responsibilities.

Determining institutional fit is just one reason why new and prospective faculty should have the resources and ability to evaluate the teaching culture of a university. In addition, the very experience of becoming a new faculty member can be a significant source of stress as individuals "unravel the organizational structures and values, expectations for performance and advancement, and the history and traditions of their new campus setting. The ability of new faculty to navigate these early years is critical to their success in and satisfaction with an academic career" (Sorcinelli, 1994, p. 474). New faculty can make efforts to address and ease

this stress through an understanding of the support they will receive, or not receive, at the school they are considering for employment.

An extensive analysis of literature indicates that new and prospective faculty should examine a variety of factors as they determine their institutional fit with the teaching culture of an institution. It is important to remember that whether it is a graduate student or a newly graduated prospective faculty member who is trying to assess an academic environment, they must review the circumstances and opportunities for both the graduate students and the new faculty at the institution in order to fully understand the scope of the environment. Only by looking at the institution's perspective on both issues is it possible to fully determine the extent of support for the scholarship of teaching.

As demonstrated in this writing, the literature pertaining to optimal conditions for engagement in scholarly teaching is vast and varied. There is much written regarding what types of programs, initiatives and services for new and prospective faculty help to create an institutional culture that is supportive of teaching. Earlier in this paper, Feldman and Paulsen's (1999) work was reviewed and served as a framework for the development of this study. Feldman and Paulsen's work is an excellent point of reference and provided crucial information for the development of the guidelines created in this study. Their recommendations for the development of a supportive teaching culture were identified as:

- High-level administrative commitment and support;

- Faculty involvement, shared values, and a sense of ownership;

- A broader definition of scholarship;

- A teaching demonstration or pedagogical colloquium as part of the hiring process;

- Frequent interaction, collaboration and community among faculty;

55

- A faculty development program or campus teaching center;

- Supportive and effective department chairs

- Connecting rigorous evaluation of teaching to tenure and promotion decisions. (Feldman and Paulsen, 1999, p.72)

The primary criticisms mentioned regarding these standards are that they do not provide new and prospective faculty with specific criteria to assess an academic environment, and also that the graduate student experience is overlooked, yet essential, in order to gain a complete perspective of the teaching priorities of the institution. In addition, this set of standards does not make mention of the differences and importance of initiatives being taken at both the department and university levels.

Based on an analysis of research in areas relevant to scholarly teaching and supportive teaching cultures, the following is a list of components that new and prospective faculty should investigate as they assess the level of teaching support in their academic environment.

1. *Demonstrated consideration of teaching as a scholarly activity;*

2. *Senior level support for teaching;*

3. *Prestige associated with teaching responsibilities;*

4. *Hiring procedures for new faculty that address teaching skills and expectations;*

5. *Doctoral programs that ready students for careers in the professoriate;*

6. *Mandatory, on-going and inclusive training for Teaching Assistants;*

7. *Comprehensive and on-going orientation programs for graduate students and new faculty;*

8. *Continued opportunities for personal and professional development;*

9. *Rewards and recognition for teaching; and*

10. A strong sense of faculty community.

It should be noted that there is some overlap in the supporting evidence that documents each

recommendation. In other words, in several cases there are existing initiatives that support more

than one of the recommendations listed above, which actually reinforces the validity and

necessity of each initiative. In addition, the lists of supporting criteria are not comprehensive;

rather, they are intended to serve as examples of initiatives that indicate a supportive teaching

culture. The following sections will show the supporting research for each of these components,

as well as specific examples of ways to identify whether or not each aspect is in place.

The goal of this document is to provide new and prospective faculty with the tools to

assess the culture of teaching on a university campus. At the conclusion of this chapter, there will

be a figure associated with each of the recommendations listed previously. Each figure will

highlight one suggestion from the list, as well as a series of questions/factors to assess the extent

to which each suggestion exists on campus.

4.2 DEMONSTRATED CONSIDERATION OF TEACHING AS A SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

History has shown that the words 'scholar' and 'scholarly work' are typically associated with

university research activities. Encouraging institutional leaders to regard teaching as a scholarly

activity has been a slow and up-hill battle. According to Shulman (2000), institutions have an

important responsibility to foster the scholarship of teaching on their campuses. Without

institutional commitment and support, the teaching culture will be significantly lacking:

> I believe that in the long run advances in the scholarship of teaching cannot be
> sustained by the efforts of the isolated scholars working alone or in loose
> networks. Institutions in which these scholars work must develop more formal

structures that merge the institution's commitments to both teaching and inquiry. These institutions can then serve as platforms for the work of scholars of teaching, as sanctuaries for their efforts, and as forums for their scholarly exchanges (Shulman, 2000, p. 99).

Richlin and Cox (2004) encourage institutions to continue this quest, as "…both scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching are vital to the life of the academy. The purpose of scholarly teaching is to affect the activity of teaching and the resulting learning, while the scholarship of teaching results in a formal, peer-reviewed communication in appropriate media or venues, which then becomes part of the knowledge base of teaching and learning in higher education" (p. 127 &128).

Some researchers have pondered the question of what the promotion of the scholarship of teaching actually means. This is challenging to articulate, but the literature does point to a number of qualities and initiatives that reflect an institution's dedication to the scholarship of teaching. One of the most obvious indicators would be for scholarly teaching to be a significant factor in tenure, promotion and salary decisions. Other ways would be through consistent and visible documentation of teaching as a scholarly priority, in departmental and university mission statements, faculty handbooks, newsletters, web pages, etc. Smith, (2004) wrote, " …some campuses have already indicated changes in the descriptions of what counts for tenure. Scholarly products related to teaching and learning are very direct indicators of the use of the scholarship of teaching and learning" (p. 147).

Carolyn Kreber has dedicated much of her research to the area of the scholarship of teaching. Her work is extensive and provides insight into not only the importance of institutional support for teaching as a scholarly activity, but also through specific recommendations for how universities can increase teaching prestige. These recommendations include:

58

1) Introduce department wide collaborative action research programs in which professors and faculty developers explore teaching and learning in the discipline. Action research on teaching and learning involves an investigation of a particular teaching-related problem with the goal of finding solutions to make teaching and learning more effective.

2) Allow faculty to contract for and focus on the scholarship of teaching for a given number of years, and allow for sabbaticals to be dedicated to the scholarship of teaching. I would recommend allowing faculty to practice the scholarship of teaching for a specified time without being reprimanded for not contributing to discover research in the discipline. Clearly, this would entail that universities know how to assess the scholarship of teaching just as they know how to assess the scholarship of discovery. Institutions could grant sabbaticals, for example, for developing new courses or reviewing existing courses, with the goal of using existing educational research and the wisdom of practice to inform such endeavors.

3) Base workshops and seminars on educational theory and research. Not only do findings from educational research provide a solid foundation for faculty development initiatives, but workshops and seminars based on theory and research may also have greater credibility in the eyes of academics who value scholarship. Also, through such faculty development practices, faculty become introduced to the existing knowledge base on teaching and learning, which will assist them in making better sense of the processes they observe in their own classrooms.

4) Establish department reading circles on teaching and learning in the discipline, and encourage team teaching. A faculty development professional who could point discipline specialists to relevant academic journals and books could initiate reading circles. As faculty discuss the literature among themselves and with a faculty developer, they might gain a greater appreciation of existing knowledge on teaching and learning and how to relate this to each professor's specific teaching context.

5) Base courses on postsecondary teaching and learning on a model of the scholarship of teaching. Many universities now offer courses on teaching and learning in higher education with the goal of promoting the scholarship of teaching (Kreber, 2001, p. 81-82).

Theall and Centra (2001) wrote that in order to effectively enhance the academic culture

of an institution, both the department and the university must encourage and demonstrate the

value of the scholarship of teaching. Their writing proposed specific recommendations for each

group to consider in the effort to promote scholarly teaching:

> *Departmental Initiatives*: Does the department: have a system for peer review of teaching? Encourage discussion of teaching and course content topics at department meetings? Encourage or require members to prepare a teaching portfolio or self report that describes instructional objectives and vision, teaching methods, learning outcomes, and other aspects of teaching? Have a mentoring system for junior faculty that includes teaching as well as research performance? Encourage classroom visits and other means of fostering informal discussions of teaching? Make public department-level student evaluations of teaching? Support faculty attendance at conferences or workshops on teaching and learning?

> *Institutional Initiatives*: Does the institution: support an active faculty development or teaching and learning program? Have a public policy that encourages the use of student and colleague evaluations? Support a mentoring program for junior teacher? Support a training program for teaching assistants? Weight teaching performance heavily in personnel selection and promotion? Sponsor seminars or workshops on teaching and learning? Encourage or require faculty to construct a teaching portfolio or a detailed report on teaching? Have a policy of periodic review of teaching for tenured and nontenured faculty? Publish results of learning outcomes and teaching environment surveys (p. 38)?

Others assert that certain programs or activities, such as required or expected faculty

teaching portfolios, demonstrates scholarly initiative on the part of the university. "As a vehicle

for documenting teaching, portfolios can help bring greater recognition and reward to teaching as

a form of scholarly, professional work (Hutchings, 1998, p.239). Programs for Faculty Teaching

Fellows also have a strong impact on new, tenure stream faculty. "Fellows have reported that the

fellowship experience affects both how participants think about teaching as well as how they do

their teaching (Austin, 1992, p. 80). Programs of this nature will be discussed at greater length

later in this chapter.

Many suggest that in order to establish a culture that is supportive of the scholarship of

teaching, new messages, expectation and training must begin, starting with the prospective

faculty: the students in graduate school. "Central to preparation as a scholar/teacher is the

graduate teaching assistantship experience" (Nyquist, et.al., 1991, xi). Institutional leaders can demonstrate their academic commitment to doctoral students in a number of ways. New and prospective students, as well as the faculty who supervise them, need to understand that the teaching assistantships are vital to the development of the students, equal to the importance of the highly sought after research assistantships. This information and attitude should be clear not only to the students who attend the institution, but also to prospective students who are considering a particular university for their degree:

> Academic schools and departments must sincerely communicate their commitment to the scholarship of teaching when recruiting students to attend their institutions. An equal amount to seriousness, competitiveness, and luster should be given to teaching and research fellowships assistantships. That is, teaching assistants should be attracted in the same manner as the "bright" students who are channeled into research assistantships; "bright" students can also be good teachers (Ambrose, 1991, p. 158).

Researchers and practitioners in the field, like Susan Ambrose (1991) from Carnegie Mellon University, suggest that initiating scholarly teaching opportunities is as important to graduate students as it is to new faculty. She goes so far as to recommend that graduate students be required to engage in certain high-quality teaching activities to ensure that they understand and adopt certain essential skills:

> A commitment to the scholarship of teaching also needs to be reflected in the curricula of graduate programs. Courses focusing on strengthening the pedagogical talents of future faculty should also be required components of any graduate program curriculum. It is also unsafe to posit that one course on "how to teach this subject" will give graduate students the necessary skills to effectively teach undergraduates (Ambrose,1991, p.68).

Austin (2002) also offered insight into ways in which graduate students can be better prepared for the professoriate through the doctoral student experience. Doctoral students who are truly prepared for work in academe need more than just content knowledge of their discipline. They also need pedagogical knowledge, professional awareness, and extensive socialization with

faculty in order to foster these skills. Austin (2002) found, through conversations with graduate students, that their primary requests and concerns focused on the following areas:

1. Graduate students who aspire to the professoriate perceive that they do not receive systematic preparation in many aspects of the job.

2. Second, and related, aspiring professors receive little guidance about academic careers in different types of institutions.

3. Third, graduate students do not receive focused, regular feedback or mentoring. Many of the graduate students in this study were on their own to make sense of their graduate experiences.

4. Fourth, graduate students value their interactions with their peers for both its social value and the information shared. Much informal socialization occurs through those peer interactions.

5. Fifth, graduate students who aspire to the professoriate are concerned about their observations of faculty life. Especially important is the perceived difficulty in finding a balance between professional and personal commitments.

6. Sixth, the graduate student experience can adversely affect the commitment of students to the professoriate (p. 23-24).

Professionals in the field offer various other recommendations for the development of graduate students to help them to not only improve the quality of their teaching, but to encourage the scholarship of teaching. This is important because "..in general, graduate education continues to focus almost exclusively on knowledge of the discipline" (Seldin, 1990, p. 6). Gale and Golde (2004) concur that the graduate student experience is the best, and most obvious starting point for introducing prospective faculty to the notion of and commitment to the scholarship of teaching. They should have strong faculty mentors who demonstrate, through example, scholarly work regarding teaching, as well as opportunities for them to engage in scholarship themselves.

The literature also indicates that in order for the training offered to teaching assistants to be considered scholarly, it has to address three areas: "academic content knowledge, pedagogical

content knowledge, and knowledge about how students learn" (Marcincovich, 1998, p. 44-45).

Definitions of each of these is as follows:

- Academic content knowledge requires the teacher-scholar to draw together various areas of an academic discipline, explain how they relate, and place concepts in the larger context of the discipline.
- Pedagogical content knowledge refers to the interaction between learning processes and academic content, that is, expertise in designing examples, analogies, metaphors, and simulations that help students integrate new knowledge into their existing schema.
- Knowledge about how students learn refers to such topics as learning styles and preferences, student motivation, general learning principals, modes of information processing, and stages of student cognitive development (Marcincovich, 1998, p. 44-45).

One of the most important things that graduate students will learn from their institutions and from their faculty mentors is an overall attitude, or culture, toward the scholarship of teaching:

> Pre-professional attitudes and behaviors are shaped by the ways in which graduate students see the faculty in their graduate departments approach the traditional duties of teaching, research, and service. Furthermore, the experiences and formal training afforded to graduate students will undoubtedly influence the manner in which they prioritize their values as faculty scholars. However…researchers contend that graduate students are inadequately prepared for the teaching portion of their faculty careers and are often socialized to treat teaching as the stepchild of collegiate scholarship (Harper, 2001, p.61 & 62).

Messages to new faculty regarding institutional scholarly priorities are sent, directly and indirectly, as early as the interview and hiring experience. This process is an ideal opportunity for senior faculty and department chairs to articulate that values and expectations of the department and the institution regarding the teaching culture of the institution and their commitment to scholarly teaching. The hiring and orientation processes, as well as the types of development opportunities, all provide messages to prospective faculty regarding the dedication of the institution to the scholarship of teaching. While each of these will be discussed in detail

later in this chapter, it should be noted that there does seem to be some consensus regarding the idea that specifically, the implementation of Faculty Learning Communities, "provides an excellent structure to help faculty members develop scholarly teaching and create the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) in part due to the deep learning that can take place in an FLC" (Richlin & Cox, 2004, p. 128). The details of the Faculty Learning Communities will be described later in this document. They are important to the overall message of the institutional scholarship of teaching because they offer:

- support and safety provided by a community that encourages motivation and risk taking;

- a sequence of individual and group developmental steps taken by and shared with the FLC;

- the availability of forums for individual and community presentations of project results;

- mentoring of new FLC participants by graduating members;

- transdisciplinarity: multiple perspectives on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning;

- reduction of the conceptualization of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning from discovery scholarship in the disciplines;

- opportunities to repeat the FLC experience in a new FLC (Richlin & Cox, 2004, p. 133).

The rewards of the FLC to new faculty, as well as the message of scholarly commitment that they send, suggest that the existence of these communities in research universities is a strong sign of dedication to the teaching culture. More will be addressed regarding Faculty Learning Communities in the upcoming sections.

Similarly, a program for graduate students known as the "Preparing Future Faculty" program (PFF) is available on a number of campuses, and is evidence that the campus wants

their graduate students to be prepared in all ways to be true scholars as they enter the profession. Like the FLC's, PFF's will be discussed in greater detail in the section of this paper devoted to on-going personal and professional development programs. It should be noted, however, the campuses that adopt this program are providing their graduate students with an experience like no other that will prepare them for their careers:

> The "Preparing Future Faculty Program" was designed with the specific intent of providing graduate students with an opportunity to expand their understanding and associations with the word 'scholarship'. Fundamentally, PFF is based on the proposition that the doctoral experience for those interested in academic careers should a) continue to provide opportunities to develop and obtain recognition as researchers; b) include teaching experience that involves increasingly independent and varied responsibilities, support and feedback; and c) offer exposure to and experience with service to the department, campus, community, and discipline (Richlin and Essington, 2004, p. 149).

Finally, while these programs and initiatives are important and significantly contribute to an institution's demonstrated commitment to teaching as a scholarly activity, there is one essential variable that must be in place in order for a scholarly environment to truly be in place: modeling behavior from current and senior faculty. In spite of all of the programs, activities and initiatives on campus intended to indicate support for a scholarly teaching environment, these will not be effective or meaningful to new or future faculty if they find that current faculty do not view these programs as worthwhile. Senior faculty, in particular, have the capacity to set the tone for the environment of the department and the school. If, through their work, attitudes and behavior, they exemplify teaching as scholarly, new and future faculty will be more inclined to follow suit. They will see senior faculty as mentors who can provide them with guidance and direction in their own quest for scholarly teaching excellence:

> Another way in which professorial preparation may be strengthened is through the nurturing, mentoring, and modeling attitudes and behaviors of current faculty scholars. Likewise, if faculty are always discussing, demonstrating, and promoting good teaching, it is highly likely that graduate students will perceive

teaching to be as important or even more scholarly as research (Wilkening, L. 1991p. 67).

Overall, it the institutional and departmental consideration of teaching as a scholarly activity is a vital aspect of the teaching culture on campus. This is an essential element for new and prospective faculty to understand as they strive for institutional fit.

4.3 SENIOR LEVEL SUPPORT FOR TEACHING

Support from senior administrators and department chairs is of particular importance in the development of the institutional teaching culture. "A university that wants its faculty to be motivated to teach well must hold as central to the institution's mission the commitment to high quality teaching" (Rice and Austin, 1990, p. 35). It is the mission statement that 'sets the tone,' so to speak, for the university and departments regarding attitudes toward teaching. Therefore, they have significant influence over the teaching culture of the institution, as well as the perceptions that are adopted by new faculty. Austin (2002) wrote:

> Aspiring faculty members observe departmental policies (such as the absence of statements about teaching philosophies) and faculty members' behaviors, including how they allocate their time across responsibilities, their degree of willingness or reluctance to take on various tasks, and their interactions with students. The participants often mentioned "mixed messages." For example, they observed that statements made by institutional leaders about the importance of high-quality teaching do not coincide with the ways their advisors or supervising faculty spend their time, with advice offered in casual hall conversations, or with university reward structures (p. 104).

This type of scenario is unfortunate and far from what should exist in institutions with cultures that are supportive of teaching. Rather, senior faculty and administrators need to lead by example, and demonstrate the ideals of scholarly teaching through their own behaviors. Shulman (2002) said, "…scholarship entails a responsibility to "pass it on," to exchange what you have learned, what you have found, what you have invented, what you have created, with the other

members of your community, assuming that they will do the same for you. This commitment is essential because the work of the community transcends the ability of any single scholar or teacher to do it" (p. 103).

In general, there are a number of programs and initiatives that indicate senior level support for teaching that are also mentioned for other standards. These include a strong institutional understanding and communication of the difference between excellent teaching and the scholarship of teaching (Kreber, 2001), institutional support for faculty development initiatives (Ambrose, 1995; Sorcinelli, 2002), and the idea of teaching being factored into teaching and promotion decisions (Feldman & Paulsen, 1999; Diamond, 2002). In addition it is also imperative that institutional mission statements clearly reflect support for teaching (Rice and Austin, 1990). However, there are also supporting criteria that are specific to the determination of senior level support for teaching.

The Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning was developed by Lee Shulman through the American Association of Higher Education. This organization identified "Ten Ways Educational Leaders Can Support the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning" (www.carnegiefoundation.org/castl). These include "campus conversation, existing efforts, graduate education, undergraduate research, defining excellence, ongoing support, peer review, departmental criteria, annual reports and post-tenure review, and teaching awards." Sorcinelli's (2002) work is a bit more specific and focuses on the importance of helping new faculty adapt to the demands and rigor of their position, as well as providing them with the support and resources to be successful. There is a tremendous amount of stress associated with the new faculty roles and responsibilities, and Socrinelli mentions a number of ways that

institutions and departments can help alleviate, and in some cases, ward off this stress. These

include:

- Giving feedback on progress;

- enhancing collegial review processes (early career faculty members desire more ongoing discussion in the department or college of the tenure process and the values that inform it;

- creating flexible timelines for tenure;

- encouraging mentoring by senior faculty members;

- preparing the future professoriate (we need to duplicate for graduate students many of the supportive activities offered to new faculty members. The PFF project cultivates a broader conception of scholarly work;

- recognizing the department chair as career sponsor (interviews with early-career faculty members returned repeatedly to the pivotal role department chairs play in the tenure and promotion process.
(p. 43-46).

Senior faculty and administrators are particularly important because they are in the

position to assist and educate new faculty through their own knowledge and expertise. These

individuals are also instrumental in integrating scholarly teaching into other facets of the

community: a crucial endeavor for successful implementation and integration of scholarship into

the teaching culture. "…linking the effort to other institutional efforts such as diversity,

technology, program review, and research grants is more likely to embed the effort even more

deeply into institutional life" (Smith, 2004, p. 148). Lucas (1990) makes a number of

recommendations for department chairs to make efforts to improve teaching. These include:

1. Make teaching effectiveness a high priority goal of the department: Ask faculty how their classes are going. Share with them, on an individual basis, some innovations you are attempting in your courses. Ask for their advice, and listen to it.

2. Create a climate of trust and support so that visiting on another's classrooms is acceptable and nonthreatening: We can learn a great deal

about teaching from one another, yet teaching is considered to be such a private activity that we lose opportunities to learn because little formal structure exists in most departments to allow teachers to benefit from what others are doing.

3. Require all applicants for faculty positions to make a presentation to faculty and students before receiving a faculty appointment.

4. Reward good teaching: Since money is not usually available for this purpose at most institutions, the rewards referred to are recognition and positive reinforcement.

5. Talk about the many aspects of teaching at department meetings or at workshops sponsored by your department.

6. Share your course syllabus.

7. Provide feedback to department members by circulating an anonymous list of grade distributions: When faculty members have an opportunity to compare their grade distributions with others in the department, they often voluntarily make adjustments in a more realistic direction.

8. Begin a teaching committee: Deal with classroom instruction, curriculum, and peer evaluation.

9. Build a department library on teaching: such literature is becoming very rich and comprehensive!

10. Use student and colleague evaluations as feedback to celebrate good teaching.

11. Develop a mentoring system.

12. Introduce classroom research techniques for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching strategies and aiding understanding of what is going on in the classroom.

13. Send interested faculty to workshops on teaching and have them run a workshop when they return (Lucas, 1990, p. 68-71).

Zahorsky (2002), who was mentioned earlier in this report supporting an environment for faculty that is 'nurturing', also suggests the importance of leadership and dedication from senior

administrators and faculty. In addition, he offers specific and concrete examples of ways in

which institutions can implement an environment of this nature:

> Although the Office of Faculty Development naturally assumes primary
> responsibility for an institution's professional growth initiatives and programs,
> including those promoting scholarship, generating a nurturing climate institution-
> wide demands commitment, resolve, and participation from the entire academic
> community. Departments and division chairs, associate deans, and even academic
> vice presidents should also serve as professional growth agents, with the
> understanding, of course, that the evaluative dimensions of their positions
> prescribe somewhat their roles as developmental agents. Even the institution's
> mission statement should be redrafted, if necessary, to formalize a collegewide
> commitment to supporting and nurturing the scholarly lives of faculty members
> Some of the prerequisites for creating such a nurturing environment:

- o A resource center

- o A new faculty orientation and mentor program

- o A minigrant program

- o Sabbatical and released time programs

- o An annual faculty development conference

- o Topical sessions and workshops

- o A brown bag lunch discussion series

- o A faculty exchange program

- o A newsletter

- o A book discussion series

- o Regional faculty development network membership

- o Travel funding, and community service awards

- o A visiting scholars program

- o Individual counseling

o A director/coordinator with released time and a faculty development committee that monitors faculty needs and administers faculty development activities (p. 30-31).

The president, provost, and other senior administrators can show their support and expectations for scholarly teaching through the writing and communication of the mission statements of the departments, colleges, and institution. It should be noted that just incorporating the information into the writing of the mission and vision is not enough; rather, these values need to be effectively and consistently communicated to new and future faculty (Austin and Rice, 1990, p. 38). This should happen during the selection process, the hiring and acceptance phase, orientation, development opportunities, and even the day to day course of events. In other words, the institutional and departmental perspectives and expectations on the scholarship of teaching should be so imbedded in the mission and vision that it is actually an aspect of the teaching culture that is virtually tangible. "Some senior administrators make special efforts to discuss teaching issues at high-level meetings. Some take the time to attend retreats and seminars on teaching and to meet with faculty to explore concerns about teaching" (Austin and Rice, 1990, p. 38).

In addition, senior administrators need to play a central role in supporting scholarly teaching, not only by offering rewards and recognition, but also by promoting them. There needs to be campus-wide appreciation for the rigor and prestige associated with teaching, and for its associated rewards. It is the senior level faculty and administrators who can best make this happen:

> The publicity that surrounds teaching awards and programs on teaching conveys the degree to which this institutional mission is valued. Thorough and frequent campuswide coverage can be provided about teaching issues and programs, and faculty who receive teaching awards can be highlighted prominently in university publications. Institutional commitment to teaching is also expressed through the

financial allocations made to teaching-related activities. When a university allocates resources to such support services as a teaching center, instructional design consultants, faculty development programs focused on teaching, faculty travel to teaching related conferences, and speakers and seminars on teaching, the message is that teaching is high on the list of institutional priorities, and there is thus a strong incentive for faculty to commit themselves to teaching (Rice and Austin, 1990, p. 36).

Support from department chairs is particularly crucial to the overall success of new faculty, particularly in regard to teaching. "Because department chairs interact regularly with their faculty colleagues and usually have some impact on faculty assignments as well as on tenure, promotion, and salary decisions, they can play an important role in providing incentive plans for good teaching. Department chairs can convey to faculty members information about how teaching efforts are valued, how time is most profitably allocated, and on what basis rewards are determined" (Austin and Rice, 1990, p. 39).

In particular, department chairs need to pay special attention to new faculty at least until they are through their sixth year (Bensimon, et al, 2000, p. xvi). Department chairs should assign teaching mentors to all new faculty, encourage weekly meetings, and make new faculty aware of the variety of teaching services available on campus (Bensimon, et al, 2000, p. 79). One of the reasons why department chairs have so much impact on the scholarship of teaching is because they have the opportunity to influence new and prospective faculty on a variety of levels; they are involved with the recruitment, selection and orientation of graduate students, as well as the recruitment, hiring and orientation of new faculty. Bensimon (2000) views "the recruitment and selection of candidates as not an isolated act. We view the recruitment and selection phase as the first stage of a prospective colleague's initiation into the culture of the department and institution" (p. 2).

In addition, department chairs need to provide leadership to other faculty involved in the interview information processes for both new and prospective faculty, as this period of time is not only for faculty to select their candidates. Rather, it is also a time for graduate students and new faculty to assess the environment, and to see if there is an institutional fit. Therefore, the department needs to take the opportunity to communicate the teaching values and expectations of the department.

The support from department chairs should not end when faculty are hired; rather, it should continue and strengthen over the first several years of new faculty employment (as previously stated, Bensimon suggests through the first six years). Prior to the first teaching assignment, department chairs should be in frequent communication with the new faculty member. For these individuals, this is often a time of high anxiety as they struggle to organize their material for their classes. Department chairs can help new faculty with the process by providing them with information such as:

1) Sample syllabi and book lists;

2) An explanation of the student population

3) Information on course requirements and other departmental offerings

4) Contact information for other resources such as faculty who have previously taught the course (Bensimon, 2000, p. 46)

Providing information of this nature not only offers new faculty some much needed direction and guidance, it also shows that the department chairs can and should be viewed as a resource, with a priority of helping new faculty be successful.

There are other ways for department chairs to be helpful to new faculty as they prepare for their course work. Because they are already familiar with the culture and expectations of the

department, department chairs can offer suggestions to new faculty about their teaching loads, as well as effective teaching strategies based on the known needs and attitudes of students in the department:

> In helping the new professor prepare for the first teaching assignment, it is important to describe the courses to be taught in the context of the entire department, including information on 1) the role of this course in the department, 2) whether other instructors are depending upon this course to provide specific kinds of background, knowledge, or skill, 3) who the students are, and 4) what students current concerns are (e.g., self-discovery, social action, career preparation) (Bensimon et al, 2000, p. 37).

Overall, it is important for senior faculty and administrators to remember that new faculty are in a precarious position. They are beginning a new job with extraordinary expectations and often minimal background preparation, particularly in teaching pedagogy. They need all of the support, compassion and incentives that they can in order to be successful. Wheeler (1992) suggests that considering a reduction in teaching load is one way for department chairs to offer support and assistance to new faculty, particularly during their first five years of employment: "Reduce the teaching load or provide other load reduction to encourage good teaching as well as to establish a research program. Particularly for new faculty without previous teaching experience, chairs have found that over preparation for classes can result in poor teaching as well as inadequate time devoted to research and writing" (p. 94).

Strong senior level support for scholarly teaching is an imperative element of a strong and supportive teaching culture. Without this support, teaching scholarship is likely to take a back seat to the other departmental and institutional obligations of the professoriate.

4.4 PRESTIGE ASSOCIATED WITH TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES

Teaching prestige that exists and is recognized by all levels of the institution's faculty and administration contributes greatly to the teaching culture of a campus. Genuine esteem is obvious to the campus community through its underlying emphasis in the priorities of the school. This is evident in a number of ways, from the articulation of the institutional mission to the emphasis on teaching pedagogy throughout the university. "Universities in which good teaching is truly an organizational commitment find ways to bring teaching issues into prominent views" (Rice and Austin, 1990, p. 35). This is also another area where the affect of teaching on tenure decisions weighs heavily on the amount of prestige for teaching indicated by the institution (Boyer, 1990; Lieberman, 2004; Smith, 2004). This section will highlight some of the other indicators of teaching prestige that are indicated by the literature.

One of the most important, yet simplest ways to raise the element of prestige on campus is to encourage senior faculty and administrators to consistently refer to teaching as scholarly work (Boyer, 1990; Seldin, 1995). This should be done publicly, to the community, the students, the faculty, and the staff and administration, as early as the hiring process (Feldman and Paulsen, 1999 Theall and Centra, 2001). "Using a term such as scholarship, which is well understood and conceptualized by academics, in conjunction with teaching gives symbolic capital to teaching, thus raising its status and social capital for those promoting the scholarship of/in teaching as a core professional value" (Nicholls, 2004, p. 41). Consistent rewards and recognition for these efforts also adds to the prestige of the work (Boyer, 1990).

Another indicator of teaching prestige on campus is related to the ways in which university constituents perceive the role of teaching assistants. Wilkening (1991) suggested that Teaching Assistants formally be referred to as 'faculty members in training' (p. 15). This would

suggest to the faculty, campus administrators, students, and teaching assistants themselves that

the teaching role is an important opportunity to hone one of the most crucial roles associated

with the faculty position. In addition, their orientation to campus is a critical time for senior

administrators and faculty to communicate the importance and prestige associated with the

position. Marcinovich (1998) recommends that this is done through a manner of ceremony, in a

way that teaching assistants feel honored by the role:

> In reality, of course, a TA's first teaching assignment is an extraordinarily
> important step in his or her professional development. Whether or not the TA
> goes on to become a faculty member, the actual teaching that the TA does has
> tremendous value to him or her, to the students in the class, to the department, and
> to the university. It is most fitting, then, that the TA orientation for first time TAs
> should include some sort of ceremony in which the importance of the teaching
> role is acknowledged and through which the TA is officially welcomed into the
> community of teaching scholars. This should be a moment of great honor, that is
> treated with due dignity. Ideally, the president, the provost, or some combination
> of deans and distinguished faculty members should be in attendance and should
> take the lead in making the official welcome (page 125).

Teaching Assistant training is emphasized in this document as a component for new and

prospective faculty to review as they assess the teaching culture on campus. While the actual

elements of the training will be discussed in detail later in this paper, it should be mentioned that

a strong reflection of teaching prestige is demonstrated by requiring Teaching Assistants to

complete a training program (as opposed to making the program optional or strongly suggested)

and presenting the TA's with a certificate upon completion of the program. This sends a strong

message to the campus community that not "just anybody" is permitted to provide instruction to

the students on campus. It indicates that teaching on campus is a privilege, not a right, that must

be earned through training, hard work, and ultimately, certification. In their writing, Tice,

Featherstone and Johnson (1998) provide rationale and positive outcomes to this idea. These

include the following:

- to extend existing TA training efforts;

- to reconceptualize graduate education to include preparation for both the creation of knowledge (research) and the dissemination of knowledge (teaching);

- to provide a more systematic preparation of graduate students for all phases of academic careers;

- to involve faculty in the preparation of graduate students for academic positions;

- to enhance the collaboration between centralized and departmental efforts to prepare graduate students for teaching;

- to document teaching effectiveness;

- to provide a tangible award that recognizes the completion of a formal preparation for college or university teaching. (p. 263-264).

Harper (2001) advises that the teaching preparation phase of Teaching Assistants and doctoral students is a vital time to communicate the honor and prestige associated with teaching. He wrote, "graduate students should be trained to think that teaching is exciting, worthwhile and appreciated" (p. 70). This message has to be consistent and frequent, and come directly from faculty and senior level administrators.

Another sign of teaching prestige related to graduate student teaching is through the development of Teaching Fellow positions on campus. Teaching Fellows offer current graduate students the opportunity to take a leadership position in training other Teaching Assistants; similar to a promotion in status based on exceptional work and demonstrated competency. Wulff, et al (1991) suggest that institutions "use outstanding, experienced TAs as its core teaching staff with special appointments as teaching fellows. They are selected to provide peer guidance and run sessions for fellow TA's. This is a prestigious position that requires extra training" (p. 130).

The Teaching Fellow position should be regarded as an honor, and offered only to those who show the strongest potential and dedication to the scholarship of teaching.

Finally, it should be noted that without departmental and institutional prestige, teaching will likely be held in a lesser regard to research. For this reason, it is imperative that new and prospective faculty assess the level of teaching prestige on campus as they strive to assess the institutional and departmental teaching culture.

4.5 HIRING PROCEDURES FOR NEW FACULTY THAT ADDRESS TEACHING SKILLS AND EXPECTATIONS

Because teaching is such a large part of the new faculty role, the interview process for new faculty must include opportunities for the candidates to demonstrate their skills and knowledge in the pedagogy of teaching. In addition, it is important to remember that the interview process is also a time for candidates to learn about the priorities of the department and school. There are actions that can be taken during the hiring process that provide the candidate with information regarding the teaching expectations and culture of the environment.

Bensimon, et al (2000) mentions the responsibility of the department chair and other senior faculty and administrators during the "initial screening" (p. 9) of applicants. A strong message is sent to both the campus community and the applicants by the nature and amount of teaching evidence and experience that is required in the application process. To demonstrate consideration for teaching scholarship, asking applicants to submit an application letter and a dossier is not sufficient. Rather, there are a number of more significant and specific indicators should be expected. "Examples of the kinds of materials that can be requested include essays in which candidates are asked to write about their philosophy of education and teaching, samples of course syllabi, teaching evaluations, etc." (Bensimon et al, 2000, p. 9).

In addition, many institutions are requiring prospective faculty to provide a lecture to current faculty and students. Because content knowledge does not guarantee effective teaching pedagogy, this technique offers the campus community an opportunity to assess the candidate's teaching style. This process will also be helpful to the prospective faculty member, as "such an evaluation will be informative in terms of what students value" (Lucas, 1990, p. 69).

Once the new faculty member is hired, there are also a number of things the department chair can and should do to provide assistance and information to the new faculty. It is never too early to provide details of the position, and to ensure that the newly hired individual has a clear understanding of the expectations of the job. "Something that should be clarified within the department is how much time is expected of the new faculty member. How many classes should he or she expect to prepare the first year? Should he or she be encouraged or discouraged from taking on committee assignments" (Hecht, 2003, p. 3)?

In general, the hiring process for new faculty should send strong, clear messages to the candidates regarding what is valued by the institution and the department. If primarily research skills are emphasized during the interview, the candidate will be lead to believe that the teaching responsibilities are secondary, at best. By requiring candidates to prove their interest and abilities in teaching during the hiring phase, the department and institution are demonstrating that teaching is a scholarly activity on campus which is not only taken seriously, but is a strong requirement for employment, advancement, and even tenure. For these reasons, new and prospective faculty should gather information about the hiring processes of new faculty as they work to assess the teaching culture of an institution.

4.6 DOCTORAL PROGRAMS THAT READY STUDENTS FOR CAREERS IN THE PROFESSORIATE

Austin (2002) reported that "the graduate experience is the crucial point in time to determine whether or not students are exposed to the types of skills and expectations likely to confront them on the job" (p.96). Additionally, there is vast research regarding the importance of preparing future faculty for the professoriate, and the role of doctoral programs in readying graduate students for the position. Boyer (1991) stated, "…in the end, college teaching will be improved as we strengthen graduate education and focus especially on the experience of TA's" (p. 10). In other words, doctoral programs need to ready graduate students for careers in the professoriate, not just through strengthening research, but also by engaging them in scholarly teaching.

The literature supports this notion and suggests that graduate programs need to do more to prepare and orient graduate students for the entire experience of the duties of the professoriate. Minimally, doctoral programs that ready students for careers in the professoriate need to provide on-going career guidance regarding the various types of institutions and the faculty role in each one (Austin, 2002); provide students with regular interaction and feedback from their peers (Austin, 2002); and provide students with a faculty mentor to provide teaching support and guidance (Kreber, 2001; Silverman, 2003; Gale and Golde, 2004). However, even these basic standards are not always in place. Shulman (2000) wrote, "There is a growing mismatch between the responsibilities that most college and university faculty members undertake on a daily basis, and the preparation they have received as they earned their field's highest degree" (p. 101). While research and teaching are two primary priorities of the profession, new faculty have to be

prepared for a great deal more in order to be effective at their jobs as well as to decrease their

own stress levels during their first years at work. Kreber (2001) wrote:

> Although graduate programs train future faculty in the advancement of content knowledge, few concern themselves with providing the kinds of experiences necessary for future faculty to develop the knowledge and skills they require to assist their own students. In short, graduate programs, with their emphasis on educating researchers, largely neglect the advancement of pedagogical content knowledge (p. 80).

Kreber's (2001) work places special emphasis on graduate education and its relation to

the scholarship of teaching. She provides specific examples and recommendations of ways in

which doctoral programs can begin to educate students about ways to address the pedagogy of

teaching, and also engage in teaching as a scholarly activity. Her recommendations are as

follows:

> **1. Change the doctoral program curriculum to include at least two courses on pedagogy in the discipline**. In addition to their course work on content knowledge, graduate students who plan on an academic career should have the opportunity to take courses on teaching and learning in the discipline.
>
> **2. Allow dissertations to focus on pedagogy in the disciplines**. Research at the doctoral level should be original and advance the knowledge of the field, usually conceptualized as a set of field-specific constructs and their relationships, propositions, inquiry methods, and validation procedures. Yet a particular field of study is also characterized by certain ways of learning about this field. Were this metaknowledge about learning about the field recognized as part of the field's knowledge base, then dissertations on pedagogy would be not only tolerated but encouraged, as it is such research that would truly advance the discipline in an area that has received very little attention.
>
> **3. Provide opportunity for graduate students to teach and receive feedback on their teaching by those who practice the scholarship of teaching.** Teaching assistants for graduate students should be combined with a long-term mentoring program aimed at educating teaching assistants in the scholarship of teaching. Such mentoring, to be effective, will require a considerable time commitment on the part of faculty willing to take on this role. This will be attractive only if the institution considers their role as mentors as an important part of their scholarly work and recognizes it in end of year peer evaluations of their performance.

4) Base workshops and seminars, such as TA training programs, on educational theory and research. Rather than base TA training sessions largely on teaching tips for the classroom, usually drawn from the experiences of successful teachers, recognize that findings from educational research are a most significant content source for such programs.

5) **Identify professors who practice the scholarship of teaching, and have them act as mentors to graduate students.** In addition to the kind of mentoring experience discussed earlier, in which the emphasis was on teaching performance, mentors need not limit their engagement with graduate students to providing feedback on classroom teaching; they could also offer students the chance of collaborating with them on research on learning in the discipline (p. 80-81).

Much of the research by Gale and Golde focuses on graduate students, and the most effective ways to fully train them for entering the professoriate. In their 2004 work, they suggest four important initiatives that need to be addressed in order for graduate students to be prepared for their future role. These four steps, and their descriptions, are:

1. *Exposure*: Early exposure to the scholarship of teaching and learning is a vital first step and could appropriately be included in all doctoral programs. In the first year of study, many doctoral programs provide exposure to the important questions and problems of the field, often in courses devoted to exploring the span, history, and pressing problems of the discipline. What better time for a discussion of the implications of scholarship in and of teaching and learning? Another appropriate time and place for this work would be as part of the pedagogical training provided to graduate students preparing for the teaching assignments included in their departmental responsibilities

2. *Encounter:* A specific and guided encounter with the scholarship of teaching and learning, the next stage, provides graduate students with opportunities to examine and critique questions and projects. It is important for future faculty to develop a familiarity not only with the scholarship but also with how that scholarship is manifested in various forms and functions. To this end, it is important for faculty mentors to provide examples of scholarly projects, in process and completed, along with the framing observations, initial inquiries, question narrowing processes, data collection and analysis, and peer review

3. *Engagement:* Once graduate students understand what such inquiry might entail, it is vital that they be given opportunities for engagement in their own design

process; specifically, they should be mentored in the process by which investigations are conceived and implemented. This step is best accomplished in groups, with serious attention to support and critique; it is the beginning of going public and of peer review, but it is also an opportunity for development of a new way of seeing, thinking, teaching, and asking questions about student learning. Following close upon this engagement, students would need mentoring (albeit less rigorous) in more autonomous projects. Thus, engagement is a two step process moving from collective to individual inquiry.

4. *Extension:* Extension is the final stage, not necessary but important as an option for graduate students pursuing the kind of scholarship. Extension involves graduate students becoming mentors for the next cohort, extending their understanding through aid and support; they become not experts in the scholarship of teaching and learning but informed assistants in ongoing lines of inquiry. Additionally, after pursuing initial projects these graduate students would be well placed to continue this kind of inquiry in faculty positions, extending their influence to others on campus (Gale and Golde, 2004, p.9-10).

Typically, training graduate students to engage in meaningful research is a standard part of most graduate programs. "On many campuses, especially large, research universities, doctoral students are exposed to faculty who are tenured, promoted and rewarded for excellence in research" (Harper, 2001, p. 65). However, training graduate students to teach is not emphasized nearly enough. "Although a significant fraction of graduate students have teaching assignments sometime during their doctoral program, too often these are not structured experiences that prepare graduates to deal with the assessment and different types of student learning, the pedagogy of the discipline, curricular innovations, the impact of technology on education, or the variety of teaching styles that may be helpful with students from different racial, ethnic, or cultural backgrounds" (Gaff, et al., 2003).

One reason why teaching is sometimes neglected during the doctoral program experience is because it is not the case that all doctoral students intend to pursue a career in the professoriate. However, many doctoral students accept Teaching Assistant positions as a means of financial support, to add substance and experience to their resumes, or as experience to use in

case they decide to enter the faculty. Therefore, it is important for all doctoral students to be

exposed to teaching, as well as the scholarship of teaching, to some extent.

> For those who enter graduate education with a desire to teach, examining their teaching and student learning in the same scholarly way as they pursue discovery could offer a valuable bridge between the classroom and the lab, library and field. Early encouragement of these future faculty members would result in a more coherent doctoral experience; linking teaching and research as shared forms of scholarship integrates two facets of intellectual work. Even those students who do not self-identify as prospective members of the professoriate would benefit from a more scholarly approach to and awareness of teaching as a professional activity; and learning as a site of inquiry (Gale and Golde (2004) p. 8-9).

Richlin and Essington's (2004) work reiterates the idea that doctoral programs have the

responsibility to prepare their students for academic life in a number of ways. Obviously, this

includes opportunities for growth and development in the area of scholarly research, but can not

stop here, or even emphasize this area over other important points of training:

> Preparing students to become faculty means a number of things. Clearly, the ability to engage in scholarly research is a priority for all who enter the profession. However, doctoral students also have an obligation to provide students with information and practice in the pedagogy of teaching, as well as an overall understanding of the roles and expectations they will face when they enter the professoriate (p. 149).

Doctoral students and their academic institutions need to prepare themselves for the

reality that in many instances, they are ill-prepared to truly understand an academic culture,

including issues facing students, in institutions that are different from their own (Richlin &

Essington, 2004, p. 149). Preparing Future Faculty programs, which are beginning to exist on

university campuses throughout the country, provide exceptional opportunities for doctoral

students to truly prepare for a career in the professoriate, by exposing them to issues of teaching

pedagogy, campus culture, and a variety of other essential initiatives:

> Preparing Future Faculty programs include three core features: gaining teaching experience; learning about the academic triad of research, teaching and service; and mentoring. Three core concerns of future and early career faculty as lack of a

comprehensible tenure system, lack of community, and lack of integration of their academic and personal lives. Programs to prepare future faculty need to include elements that address these concerns. Foremost is developing wisdom about the academic process so that in selecting an institution, future faculty members can find the best fit for their interests and can negotiate the tenure process successfully (Essington, 2004, p. 150).

Austin (2002) provided an interesting commentary on how, specifically, a doctoral program could fully meet the needs of students and provide ample opportunities to truly develop them as prospective faculty. The proposal made in this work addresses student needs from the time they enter the academic program until the point when they are preparing to seek professional employment, and has significant merit:

> A revised doctoral program could begin with an opportunity for entering students to discuss with faculty members their intellectual and professional goals. A planning session at the time of entry could be followed by annual discussions with a faculty advisor about how the student's goals are changing and how courses, research, teaching and other experiences are contributing to progress toward the goals. Simply conceptualizing teaching assistantships according to the variety and complexity of skills required and assigning doctoral students to the most relevance teaching experiences on this basis, can help students develop a range of skills and abilities over time. Encouraging students to create portfolios that document the particular skills and abilities developed in each teaching experience as well as their research experiences and related skill development would also contribute to more systematic development of teaching and research skills. Department chairs and faculty advisors could save time and capitalize on the already present peer interaction by organizing group sessions for students (p. 117-118).

In summary, it is obvious that research and teaching have a significant reciprocal impact and training for both of them is vital to the success and future teaching effectiveness of doctoral students. However, it is also crucial that doctoral programs take the opportunity to fully train graduate students to become members of the professoriate by engaging them in all aspects of faculty responsibilities. As mentioned previously, Wilkening (1991) recommends that Teaching Assistants be treated as 'faculty in training'. Austin (2002) suggests that there is much to consider in order for this to happen:

If graduate students are truly to be considered "faculty in training" their work involves more than just learning the content of their field. The role of the faculty is extensive, and includes (but is not limited to) duties such as research, teaching, advising, course development, and community involvement. Because of this wide realm of responsibilities, it is easy for the priority of the scholarship of teaching to fall by the wayside. However, "the gradate experience is the crucial point in time to determine whether or not students are exposed to the types of skills and expectations likely to confront the job (p.96).

Research is typically an integral role of the doctoral programs, based on research assistantships, faculty shadowing, and, of course, the dissertation experience. This is not something that should change, as research capabilities are also vital to the success of new faculty. However, preparation for teaching has historically been neglected during doctoral study, and institutions must find effective ways to implement it into their programs. The real trick is helping students to not only have insight into both teaching and research, but helping them see them as activities that cannot exist without the other. Nyquist (et al., 1999) wrote,

Much is at stake. The issue goes beyond altruistic concern for the lives of graduate students, as important as we believe that concern should be. We also are considering the future of the academy and whether we are adequately preparing the kind of innovative, committed, and thoughtful faculty members needed to become the next generation of the professoriate (p.27).

The potential for future faculty to begin their instruction and understanding of these concepts is critical during the doctoral program and demonstrates why assessing doctoral programs and their commitment to scholarly teaching is a strong indicator of the institutional and departmental teaching culture.

4.7 MANDATORY, ON-GOING AND INCLUSIVE TRAINING FOR TEACHING ASSISTANTS

Central to the preparation of scholarly teaching is the graduate teaching assistantship experience. Although not all TAs will become professors, many professors have been TAs and report that, however limited it may have been, this experience was essential to their development and preparation for faculty teaching responsibilities (Nyquist, 1991, p. xi). "If the teaching assistantship is the primary means be which professors learn to be teachers, then major attention must be given to the design, sequence and supervision of the TA experience as preparation for the teaching dimension of a scholar's life" (Nyquist, et.al., 1991, p.xi).

Training programs for Teaching Assistants are imperative. These training sessions should not be optional; rather, they should be required, comprehensive, and on-going. They should train graduate students in the scholarship of teaching (Nyquist, 1991; Gale and Golde, 2004), and should thoroughly prepare these individuals for the variety of roles that they will face as new faculty (Chism, 1998). "A training program should begin to lay the foundations for the full range of teaching roles and provide the continuing resources needed to back-up the TA as he/she approaches each new charge. A mandatory program can provide all new TAs with a foundation based on a core of common knowledge while emphasizing the need for continuing learning and self evaluation" (Hiiemae, K., et.al., 1991, p. 127).

The TA experience is, or at least should be, much more than just teaching a class or two for or with a faculty member. Rather, it is a wonderful opportunity for graduate students to not only learn how to teach, but to gain expertise from the faculty, learn about the connection between teaching and research, and begin to build a framework for their own style of teaching. Receiving help, guidance and support from faculty is crucial. It is essential that TA's have supervisors for every course they teach; someone who can help them deal with issues related to

course content, student issues, and teaching pedagogy. "There should be a close apprenticeship with a faculty supervisor in every course. TAs should not be autonomous, without guidance and support. Unfortunately, this apprenticeship experience does not always happen" (Wilkening, L. 1991, p. 15).

There are two standard types of training programs for graduate students: those offered by the department and those offered by the institution. "The campus wide TA orientation is the easiest, most common, and most obvious feature of most new TA training programs" (Stout, 1998, p. 123). Institutional efforts are typically housed in the university Teaching and Learning Center, and therefore run by a professional with significant background and information regarding the pedagogy of teaching and instructional development. Because of this high level of expertise, centralized training for Teaching Assistants is often more comprehensive that those offered by the department:

> Despite the fact that in most institutions the chief responsibility for TA preparation rests with the departments, that the origin of TA preparation began in the departments, and that numerous departmental faculty may support this work in theory, many departments fail to take the initiative to start comprehensive programs. Centralized programs are designed to meet needs that often extend beyond the individual department's expertise or resources. Centralized programs often find themselves in the position of coordinating university efforts and stepping in when departmental mentoring is lacking (Mintz, 1998, p. 31-32).

Another benefit of centralized programs is that they typically include direction and feedback from senior members of the academic community, as well as fellow graduate students. This is vital in order for Teaching Centers to fully understand and be able to provide the appropriate training and information to teaching assistants. Mintz (1998) wrote,

> Most centralized programs work with a campus-wide advisory committee consisting of the crucial constituencies affected by the program's outreach. These normally include central administrators, faculty from across the discipline, and graduate students. Centralized programs need to communicate and coordinate

with all campus-wide units which provide services to teaching assistants in order to maximize the effectiveness of these services (pp. 21-22).

Mintz's (1998) work suggests a number of offerings typically provided by teaching assistant training programs that are university sponsored. This list contributed significantly to the product of this study, as it provided specific information that new and prospective graduate students can look for as they review campus environments for the nature of the teaching culture. According to Mintz, elements of centralized programs include:

- o Campus-wide orientation and teaching conference once or twice a year

- o General or special interest workshops/seminars

- o Consultation with individual TAs and faculty who teach with and prepare TAs in the departments

- o Custom-designed workshops delivered within departments

- o Microteaching

- o Videotaping

- o Classroom observation

- o Small Group Instructional Diagnosis

- o Grants to departments for programs to prepare TAs

- o Library of resources: print, audio, video

- o Awards/receptions in recognition of excellent teaching by TAs

- o Preparing TAs to work as apprentices in educational development

- o Program publications; handbook, newsletters, brochures, flyers, event- and subject-specific materials

- o A World Wide Web Page (p. 27)

Though centralized training programs for Teaching Assistants are important and extremely useful, this does not negate the validity or necessity of Teaching Assistant training programs offered by departments. On the contrary, these are quite important to the overall development of the TA, as well as helping the TA feel a sense of community and connection with the faculty in the department. Leaders of the centralized programs often encourage and help support departmental efforts, "Most centralized programs help initiate and support departmental programs for teaching assistants. In so doing, they are able to bring research, resources, experience, experts, and often grants to advance departmental efforts" (Marincovich, 1998, p. 29).

Within the department, there are two types of training for teaching assistants, those that are course specific and those that are department specific. For course specific training, faculty have an obligation to provide teaching assistants with close supervision and opportunities to ask questions and receive advice regarding their teaching experience (Marincovich, 1998, p. 42). This provides an opportunity for teaching assistants to advance their knowledge in both the content of the discipline, as well as the communication and instruction of that knowledge to the students being taught.

Within each department, there are specific guidelines, policies and expectations. With the number of departments that typically exist on each university campus, it would be impractical to try to communicate these standards at a centralized training program. Therefore, it is essential for departments to create opportunities to train their teaching assistants in the specifics of departmental protocol. Departmental training is rarely on-going; it tends to be quite brief in comparison to institutional initiatives:

> Departmental TA training refers to discipline-specific teacher training that takes place within the academic department and is designed for TAs who are assigned

to a variety of different courses. Most commonly, this type of training consists of a departmental teaching orientation that lasts from a few hours to a few days an of ongoing training activities that maybe as formal as a course or as informal as occasional seminars or workshops (Marincovich, 1998, p. 42-43).

While there is department specific information that needs to be communicated as well as discipline specific training mechanisms that are employed, departments can and should take advantage of each other as resources. By understanding how others on campus train their teaching assistants, departments can gain new ideas and strategies for training students in their own areas. Centralized training programs are often integral in helping departments share information with each other:

> Departments can benefit from knowing about one another's training programs and exchanging ideas and materials. Campus-wide programs can assist departments by gathering and distributing information about departmental TA training requirements, orientations, courses, workshops, and seminars. Such a list can provide departments with concrete ideas that they may want to incorporate into existing programs and can be of even greater help to departments creating new programs (Marcincovich, 1998, p. 44)

Some departments and institutions are requiring TA's to engage in training through the form of mandatory coursework. Marinovich (1998) indicates that those schools who have not yet moved in this direction will need to do so (p. 146). There are a variety of different types of courses for TAs that institutions tend to offer, but there are four which are highlighted in the literature.:

> The course on teaching almost always offered by an academic department, that prepares graduate students to teach a particular course or a particular type of course. A slightly more generic course on teaching, again usually offered by the department, goes beyond preparing TAs for any one particular course to exposing graduate students to instruction in the discipline. A type of course that intentionally prepares TAs for university citizenship as well as teaching is one that takes higher education as its focus and is usually offered by a school of education, a graduate division, or a teaching and learning center. Finally, there is a kind of course which may cover teaching and some aspects of higher education in addition to its concentration on a specific aspect or theme in postsecondary education (p. 148).

In addition to all of these initiatives, there is one other factor that can make or break the successfulness of a teaching assistant's training program: an involved and effective faculty supervisor. The individuals who serve as Teaching Assistant supervisors need to be aware of the holistic professional development of the TA. In other words, they need to not only be exceptional role models of the profession; they also have to understand the evolutionary process of development for teaching assistants. "Professional preparation may be strengthened through the nurturing, mentoring and modeling attitudes and behaviors of current faculty scholars (Harper, 2001, p. 68). Faculty who are working with TAs need to have a strong understanding of the issues that TA's face, as well as the developmental challenges they will encounter in regard to teaching. These faculty also should have the insight and creativity to provide opportunities for Teaching Assistants that will address the issues that they face and help them to become truly prepared for the professoriate:

> As graduate students change and develop, they will need supervisors who can model the values, behaviors, and characteristics of a professional in the field. TAs will benefit from supervisors who adapt as the TAs change, providing close supervision in the beginning but progressing to a role as consultant and colleague. For this to happen, the supervisor must incrementally and appropriately transfer responsibility for instructional decisions to the TA. In the ideal situation, the assignments for the TAs should show a similar progression from specified duties or an assisting role to assuming responsibility for class sessions or even a while course. TA preparation activities would also need to move from directed supervision to reflective practicums where approaches, results, and new ideas would be shared among colleagues. And, finally, assessment practices of TA performance should move from direct, daily/weekly assessment to providing collegial feedback helping the TA to develop personal teaching style (Nyquist & Sprague, 1998, p. 84).

Another idea mentioned in a previous section was the notion of requiring teaching assistants to become certified to teach before allowing them to do so. By making this a requirement, teaching assistants are given a message that teaching is truly important and valued

by the department and the institution. Tice, Featherstone and Johnson (1998) provide specific

ideas for ways to institute programs of this nature, which is helpful for those who are trying to

assess a campus culture for its dedication to scholarly teaching. Effective TA certificate

programs can follow a variety of formats, based on the needs of the campus community and the

goals of the individual departments. These scholars suggest the following as a framework for

campuses to consider as they establish programs to certify TA teaching:

- o Academic degree program: requires course work, perhaps as much as 32 credit hours in approved courses.

- o University wide with disciplinary variation: A second type of certificate program has university-wide standards but allows for disciplinary variations. The discipline specific component requires teaching assistant training courses or workshops and a documented faculty/teaching assistant mentoring relationship, but departments can handle these aspects of the program in a variety of ways.

- o University wide with Departmental Standards: One example is to have individual graduate programs decide whether or not their students are eligible to participate in the program, which consists of four components: university wide workshops, discipline specific activities, guided teaching, and the teaching portfolio.

- o University wide with option of student design: Allows students to design their own programs within university guidelines (pg. 267-269).

This variety of formats allows for flexibility based on the needs of the teaching assistants and the

strengths and goals of the departments and institution. Universities need to work with their

Teaching and Learning Center or other centralized experts to develop a certification plan that

best suits their needs.

Ambrose (1991) makes note of one of the most important initiatives when working with

teaching assistants and developing their training, "…one final recommendation applies to faculty

members, administrators, and policy makers in higher education---applaud, encourage, demand

and reward good teaching! Graduate students should be trained to think that teaching is exciting,

worthwhile and appreciated" (p.69). As stated several times throughout this document, it is

important to instill the values and importance of scholarly teaching during graduate programs.

This includes, as Dr. Ambrose indicated, showing appreciation and prestige associated with

quality efforts. With the appropriate encouragement and validation, graduate students will ideally

enter the professoriate with high expectations for teaching rewards, support and scholarship:

> If we are proactive, we use TAs more effectively and efficiently, and we achieve benefits for the students, the TAs and institution as a whole. By emphasizing teaching quality to TAs, we can produce graduates who are better prepared to be professors or communicators in other careers; and by having professors involved in helping mentor TAs, and by creating and active and enthusiastic TA population, we can enhance the overall interest in and quality of teaching by all instructors, faculty included (Sheridan, 1999, p. 27).

As has been demonstrated through the literature, the TA experience is often the only

formal preparation that new faculty have for their teaching roles and responsibilities on campus.

Hopefully, this will change as doctoral programs evolve to be more inclusive of teaching

pedagogy. But, until that time, new and prospective faculty need to be aware of and understand

the training and expectations for Teaching Assistants on campus. This information is reflective

of the priority that the institution places on not only the pedagogical skills of the graduate

students, but also their own development as they strive for the professoriate.

4.8 COMPRHENSIVE ORIENTATION PROGRAMS FOR NEW FACULTY

Orientation is typically a standard event for new faculty and graduate students on university

campuses, and is a prime opportunity to introduce these individuals to the culture of the

institution, an overview of the expectations, interaction with new colleagues, and information

regarding future opportunities:

New faculty desire information about their college or university as they start their appointments. An orientation program can shorten the time newcomers take to become integrated into their departments on campus. The program should include opportunities to build relationships among new and established faculty, as well as information about teaching, research and campus programs (Sorcinelli, 1994, p. 479).

However, in many, if not most cases, orientation programs fall short of what they could be: an opportunity to demonstrate the institution's commitment to the scholarship of teaching and to communicate the teaching philosophies of the school; a concept that has already been mentioned as a crucial component of the new faculty experience (Sorcinelli, 1994).

Most new faculty have numerous questions, and many of them are in reference to one important point: what needs to be done to qualify for and achieve tenure? Orientation sessions for new faculty need to address this issue, as well as many others. "Orientation sessions should familiarize newcomers with the criteria, many of which may be unspoken, that will be applied to judge whether the newcomer should be granted promotion and tenure" (Bensimon, 2000, p. 57). However, many times orientation sessions for new faculty do not meet their expectations or address their needs and questions. "Though they vary in length, content, and purpose, orientation sessions often turn into perfunctory descriptions of bureaucratic procedures with an emphasis on giving basic information about services, benefits, etc…" (Bensimon, 2000, p. 62-63). Information of this nature is important, but not what needs to be emphasized during new faculty orientations. This type of knowledge can be gained from on-going workshops, faculty handbooks, references to World Wide Web pages, etc. Rather, new faculty need to understand their responsibilities, the expectations of the department, the culture of the school, and the resources available to help them be successful. Fink (1992) wrote,

Institutions that are serious about the professional development of their faculty must at least give consideration to the value of having strong orientation programs for new faculty members at their campuses. The best and liveliest sessions are

those that have deliberately provided for active learning by participants, such as writing and small group discussions (p. 48).

Orientation for new faculty is often offered at the department and institutional level. The department, however, has critical information for new faculty as the teaching and research expectations, as well as the requirements for tenure, often vary from department to department. Departments should use orientation as an opportunity as a starting point for welcoming new faculty, and also for describing the nature of their position at the school. "Because the newcomer's success is predicated on how well he or she fits into the culture of the department and meets the expectations of academic excellence as defined by the institution, the focus on the departmental formal orientation should be on assisting new faculty to develop an understanding of the departments' and institution's culture and expectations" (Bensimon, 2000. p. 63).

It is critical that orientation, both at the university and departmental levels, are not considered one time events. This is particularly important when it comes to teaching obligations. "Their classes should be observed by colleagues or chairs, and feedback should be given so that successes can be celebrated and plans can be developed to address ineffective approaches" (Lucas, 1990, p. 78). As has been mentioned extensively in this document, many new faculty did not have many opportunities to teach (or improve their teaching) during the graduate experience. While teaching is sometimes addressed during orientation, expectations and strategies can not be covered in one session. Some feel that a separate and continuous teaching orientation for new faculty should be in place, but unfortunately, it rarely is:

> While many institutions---particularly large, research oriented universities---offer extensive teaching orientation to new graduate students, few provide the same benefits for tenure-track faculty. Since many disciplines do not allow graduate students to be fully responsible for courses, many newly minted PhD's may arrive at their first tenure-track jobs with little or no teaching experience. Orientations geared toward answering teaching questions and preparing new professors to be successful teachers can ease stress caused by inexperience and can help assure

96

that new professors know how to tackle this aspect of their chosen profession (Bensimon, 2000, p. 76-77).

Orientation is a critical time for new faculty and graduate students. While they are likely excited about their new positions, they are also apprehensive about the expectations associated with their roles, as well as a potential lack of preparation for all of the duties that will be required of them. After the hiring process, orientation is one of the first activities where departments and institutions can set the tone for welcoming the newcomers and introducing them to the teaching philosophy and services of the institution. This is a time where new faculty and graduate students need to feel welcomed into the community of scholars. Follow up to the event is critical. Overall, departmental and institutional orientation procedures are can provide new and prospective faculty with solid insight into the teaching culture of the institution.

4.9 CONTINUOUS OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Continuous opportunities for personal and professional development are important for both graduate students and new faculty. These opportunities are made possible by departmental and campus offerings, but it is also crucial that institutions offer financial support for individuals interested in pursuing other options for teaching related professional development (Lieberman, 2004). The research indicates that the impact that these programs have on new and future faculty is so significant that institutions must offer them in order for doctoral students and new faculty to truly be effective in their positions. Austin and Sorcinelli (1992) wrote:

> Although new faculty want to teach well, they do not know how to go about improving and have little time to think about and reflect on their teaching. Most have not had any guidance or advice about using more creative teaching methods. Among faculty who participate in faculty development activities, however, behaviors are different. They spend less time preparing to teach and more time doing scholarly writing, yet they feel more comfortable about their teaching. The

97

message seems clear: junior faculty need opportunities to learn about teaching (p. 97).

As with all of the dimensions mentioned here, and as stated earlier in this paper, it is important to review the opportunities for both graduate students and new faculty in order to have a full understanding of the level of support in the university teaching culture.

Mechanisms of personal and professional development for new and prospective faculty are too numerous to be all inclusive. The most effective means depend greatly on the type of institution---meaningful development opportunities at research universities are going to vary greatly from those offered at small teaching colleges. The main idea to remember, however, is just how vital it is to the success of new faculty to have department and university sponsored professional development:

> Across nearly all disciplines and sectors of higher education, early-career faculty members described a "raising of the bar" and a "ratcheting up" of requirements for tenure, especially in research. Many received little formal feedback or mentoring from senior colleagues. They were disappointed not to find a long-anticipated, supportive community of senior scholars, a department chair, and students. Early career faculty members need to know what is expected of them, and departments, schools, and colleges have adopted various practices to make this information accessible (Sorcinelli, 2002, p. 43)

There are a number of informal opportunities for professional development that are worth mentioning. For instance, simply offering structured opportunities for faculty to receive feedback and guidance in their teaching is a crucial element of faculty development (Schwartz, 1999; Feldman and Paulsen, 1999; Sorcinelli, 2002). In addition, offering new faculty assistance in their quest to find ways to integrate teaching and research is invaluable to their work and development in the profession (Gale and Golde, 2004).

While experiences such as these are imperative to the overall development of the faculty, there is consensus in the research that formal faculty development programs are essential in order

for faculty to truly be and feel supported in their teaching efforts and other professional obligations. It is important to note, however, that the content of these programs has to be intentional, and ideally developed with the help and support of faculty (Chopp, Frost & Jean, 2001). Holding programs just for the sake of doing so will likely be ineffective and counterproductive. Seldin (1990) specified a number of characteristics that are critical to the success of these programs. They should be:

- tailored to the institution's culture;

- structured along multiple-approach lines to meet individual preferences, schedules and styles;

- supported clearly and visibly by top level administrators;

- aided in their design and management by a faculty advisory group;

- started small, perhaps as a pilot project targeting specific needs or groups;

- funded by a specific percentage of an institution's general operating fund;

- publicizing their programs throughout the year;

- kept apart from the institution's promotion and tenure decision making;

- a central source for gathering, selecting and disseminating information about teaching and learning to the faculty;

- building a climate of openness, mutual respect, and interdependence;

- led by directors who offer strong leadership on campus and work effectively with institutional governing groups;

- located on campuses where outstanding teaching is recognized and rewarded; holding to the bedrock belief that faculty members merit, rather than need, help (p. 17).

Seldin indicates that faculty development programs that follow these recommendations and are on-going throughout the academic year are likely to be successful and also demonstrate, on the

part of the institution, an opportunity for the school to portray their commitment to the scholarship of teaching (1990).

Pertaining to research institutions, the related literature does mention a number of initiatives that institutions and departments can offer that show particular dedication and commitment for teaching as a scholarly activity. This section addresses development opportunities for both new faculty and doctoral students. While there are initiatives specific to each group, there is also overlap that requires explanation.

Much of the literature for new faculty emphasizes the need for them to feel, from the very beginning of their appointment, as though they are provided with the necessary means to be successful. While there are many ways to help accomplish this, a review of the literature emphasizes a few specific initiatives that demonstrate particular commitment to new faculty enrichment, in addition to the year-long orientation mentioned in a previous section. These programs and activities are each described as follows.

4.9.1   Faculty Learning Communities

Faculty Learning Communities are one of the most prominent, and highly praised mechanisms for providing support, direction and development for new faculty. They emphasize scholarly teaching and learning and provide a forum for new faculty to gain insight and receive feedback on their work. In the literature, Faculty Learning Communities are defined a variety of ways, but the following definition is fairly comprehensive:

> A *faculty learning community* (FLC) is a cross-disciplinary faculty and staff group of size 6-15 (8 to 12 is the recommended size) engaging in an active, collaborative, yearlong program with a curriculum about enhancing teaching and learning and with frequent seminars and activities that provide learning, development, interdisciplinarity, the scholarship of teaching and learning, and community building.

Milton Cox (2004) is one of the leading researchers in the area of Faculty Learning Communities, and is an expert regarding their use and importance on campus, highlighting the fact that "creating a faculty learning community program is one approach that engages community in the cause of student and faculty learning and of transforming our institutions of higher education into learning organizations" (p. 5). They offer a number of important opportunities for new faculty in a formal, well-defined format. Cox specifies the following attributes offered by Faculty Learning Communities that are most meaningful and helpful to new faculty:

- o Support and safety provided by a community that encourages innovation and risk taking

- o A sequence of individual and group developmental steps taken by and shared with the FLC

- o The availability of forums for individual and community presentations of project results

- o Mentoring of new FLC participants by graduating members

- o Transdisciplinarity: multiple perspectives on SoTL

- o Reduction of the conceptual isolation of SoTL from discovery scholarship in the disciplines

- o Opportunities to repeat the FLC experience in a new FLC (Richland and Cox, 2004, p. 133).

There are two primary types of Faculty Learning Communities: cohort based and topic based. These are defined as follows:

Cohort-based FLCs address the teaching, learning, and developmental needs of an important cohort of faculty that has been particularly affected by the isolation, fragmentation, stress, neglect, or chilly climate in the academy. The curriculum of such a community is shaped by the participants to include a broad range of

teaching and learning areas and topics of interest to them. These communities will make a positive impact on the culture of the institution over the years if given multi-year support. Four examples of cohort-based communities at Miami University are the Teaching Scholars Community for junior faculty, the Senior Faculty Community for Teaching Excellence, the Preparing Future Faculty Community for graduate students, and the Department Chairs Learning Community.

Topic-based learning communities have curricula designed to address a special campus teaching and learning need, issue, or opportunity. These communities offer membership to and provide opportunities for learning across all faculty ranks and cohorts, but with a focus on a particular theme. A particular topic-based FLC ends when the campus-wide teaching opportunity or issue of concern has been satisfactorily addressed. Examples of topics addressed by topic-based FLCs are team teaching, problem-based learning, diversity, teaching portfolio development, ethics, departmental assessment of general education, small-group learning, teaching writing-intensive courses, first-year experience, connecting the humanities and digital technology, and courses in common (Cox, 2004, p. 8).

The specific details of the offerings of Faculty Learning Communities may vary across

campuses, depending on the needs, strengths and goals of the institution. However, Cox does

indicate that the primary intentions of most FLC's are similar:

- build university wide community through teaching and learning;

- increase faculty interest in undergraduate teaching and learning;

- investigate and incorporate ways that diversity can enhance teaching and learning;

- nourish the scholarship of teaching and its application to student learning;

- broaden the evaluation of teaching and the assessment of learning;

- increase faculty collaboration across disciplines, encourage reflection about general education and the coherence of learning across disciplines;

- increase the rewards for and prestige of excellent teaching; increase financial support for teaching and learning initiatives;

- create an awareness of the complexity of teaching and learning (p. 9 and 10).

Overall, Faculty Learning Communities are helpful and desirable in research based universities because of the effect that they have on new, tenure track and senior faculty. "Faculty learning communities (FLCs) provide an excellent structure to help faculty members develop scholarly teaching and create the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), in part due to the deep learning that can take place in an FLC" (Cox, 2004, p. 128). In other words, FLCs help faculty to understand and appreciate teaching as a scholarly activity; which is why Faculty Learning Communities on campus are a strong indicator of the teaching culture on campus.

4.9.2   Teaching Fellows Program

Since the late 1970's, the Lilly Foundation has partnered with universities to provide new, tenure track faculty with a formal opportunity to gain experience and wisdom in the art of teaching. The Teaching Fellows Program's "explicit purpose is to provide a vehicle through which junior faculty members can develop their expertise as teachers as they also establish themselves as researchers and writers" (Austin, 1992, p. 73).

The way this program is constructed, it is a considered an honor to be selected as a faculty teaching fellow. The term is typically for one year and involves six to ten new faculty members. Opportunities of the group includes "regular group meetings, individual projects, release time from teaching responsibilities, senior faculty mentors, retreats and conferences (Austin, 1992, p. 74).

4.9.3   Teaching Portfolios

Teaching portfolios are an increasingly popular and extremely effective tool for faculty to use to measure, and in some ways quantify, their teaching efforts. For institutions that value teaching as

scholarly and factor it into decisions related to tenure, teaching portfolios are essential in order to demonstrate an individual's experience and development of teaching. "Teaching portfolios, compiled by faculty, enable us to bring increasingly-valued evidence about teaching quality into the tenure and promotion process" (Wright, et al., 1999, p. 90). While there are many definitions of teaching portfolios, one by Wright et al (1999) is fairly comprehensive: "We understand a teaching portfolio (or dossier) to be a collection of evidence of good teaching practice, where teaching is seen as everything that faculty do to help students to achieve course and program goals. This evidence is prefaced by a statement, in which portfolio-makers describe their goals with reference to their teaching philosophy and provide the reader with a guide to the body of evidence that accompanies the statement" (p. 90).

Departments and institutions that require faculty to maintain a portfolio of their teaching do so for a variety of reasons. The portfolio is helpful in assessing the quality of teaching when it comes to making tenure and recognition decisions. It is also a strong means of providing development to faculty. "A teaching portfolio should chronicle your development as a college teacher, highlight the very best of your teaching skills, and record the learning responses achieved by your students. Keep it organized. Keep it concise. Keep it honest" (Urbach, 1992, p. 75).

In general, the benefits of teaching portfolios are so numerous that their use should be strongly considered on campus. The literature indicates that teaching portfolios:

- o   provide a tool for reflection on teaching;

- o   improve teaching performance;

- o   provide information for teaching awards;

- o   maintain a record of teaching accomplishments;

- promote pride in the work of teaching;

- provide a context for career planning;

- are a source of information for present and prospective employers;

- can provide a model for junior faculty;

- can be shared with students to make teaching goals and processes explicit;

- support mentoring;

- encourage the establishment of effective criteria for teaching;

- encourage esteem for teaching, giving it attention and a voice; and

- provide a better basis for dialogue on teaching (Wright, Knight, Pomerleau 1999, p. 93).

Urbach (1992) recognized the challenges that faculty face in constructing a teaching portfolio. For many, it is challenging to determine what to include, what not to include, the format to use, etc. Urbach offers the following advice:

> The goal of a teaching portfolio is to describe, through documentation over an extended period of time, the full range of your abilities as a college teacher. I would like to suggest seven dimensions of teaching abilities to be documented: what you teach, how you teach, changes in your teaching and course activities, rigor in your academic standards, student impressions of your teaching, efforts at developing your teaching skills, and assessments of your teaching by colleagues. Each of the seven dimensions may be recorded through a variety of "artifacts"; your artifacts should trace the evolution of each course that you have taught (Urbach, 1992, p.71).

Teaching portfolios are also a recommended resource for graduate students in doctoral programs. Portfolios provide the opportunity for graduate students, who are often prospective faculty, to begin thinking about their teaching in a scholarly way. According to Hutchings (1998), portfolios can be helpful to graduate students in the following ways:

- One benefit of portfolios comes when TAs enter the faculty job market. Having teaching related credentials and materials to show to campuses that

place high value on good teaching is almost bound to be a boon. Moreover, the thinking that goes into the portfolio's development makes it easier for TAs to talk intelligently about their teaching in pedagogical colloquia and other occasions that campuses are increasingly using to assess teaching in the hiring process.

- Second, portfolios help graduate students develop a conception of teaching as scholarly, intellectual work. By inviting intellectually coherent, reflective documentation of one's teaching, the portfolio reconnects scholarly substance to teaching technique, and treats teaching as engaging intellectual work, worthy of the scholar's time and attention, and like other scholarly work, appropriate for collegial exchange---important lessons early in a teaching career.

- Third, portfolios foster habits of reflection and ongoing improvement. We all know the phrase "teaching load," and we know that teaching is often thought of as a sort of spin off task, dependent only on knowing the field well. Portfolios embody a different ethic (for that is what it is)—that teaching is an activity in which one is a lifelong learner, welcoming and seeking out self-assessment, examination, and improvement.

- Fourth: portfolios encourage an attitude of professional responsibilities for quality control. It is a way of saying that teachers can and should be responsible for documenting, assessing, and improving their own practice---an attitude that could usefully be part of the professional socialization of graduate students, who will otherwise, as faculty, face increasingly bureaucratic forms of accountability imposed from outside academe.

- Fifth, portfolios point the way to richer, more authentic, situated portrayals of what teachers know and can do, a significant advance on prevailing practice, which depends on student ratings (p. 239-240).

Some faculty are not supportive of the use of teaching portfolios, but usually, this is because they do not feel as though their efforts in constructing portfolios are valued. This can be demonstrated in a number of ways, such as by training faculty to construct an effective portfolio, but also through institutional and departmental commitment:

> Institutions cannot expect faculty to develop teaching portfolios unless they are going to be meaningful to the university, and be instrumental to important decisions affecting the careers of the new faculty. Teaching portfolios have an impact when they are valued, recognized and rewarded. To be valued, teachers must see that they can learn from the portfolio and benefit from the process of portfolio writing. To be recognized, the departmental and institutional cultures have to value effective teaching. To be rewarded, tenure, renewals and promotions committees must be seen to act on portfolio evidence. Increased promotion possibilities should result" (Wright, Knight, Pomerleau, 1999, p. 96).

106

4.9.4 Mentoring and Peer Coaching:

Mentoring and peer coaching are both opportunities for faculty to be involved in the process of gaining and giving each other feedback on teaching, while also offering opportunities for faculty to engage in a sense of collegiality. Mentoring for new faculty has been more prominent on university campuses since the early 1990's (Boice, 1992, p. 51). Skinner and Welch (1996) indicate the process of peer coaching can, in fact, improve the quality of teaching. They also indicate a number of recommendations to help institutions with the facilitation of peer coaching programs on their campuses:

- Clarify purposes and procedures. The goals and procedures of the process should be agreed upon by participating faculty and supporting administration. Peer coaching is designed to provide feedback on specific techniques;
- Provide formal training. Moving from the evaluative mode (I'm very impressed with your teaching ability) and toward the coaching mode (You consistently acknowledged students' questions during class today) often takes practice;
- Provide incentives for participation. We believe that faculty participating in peer coaching programs should be recognized for their efforts;
- Keep coaching reciprocal. Reciprocal coaching encourages teachers to work together and to learn from one another as peers; it is a collaborative approach where players become both learners and teachers;
- Ensure that participation is voluntary. Nothing makes a program designed to improve teaching more likely to fail than to require faculty to participate;
- Determine if peer coaching should be inter or intra-disciplinary. The literature supports both;
- Collect, analyze and report evaluation data. The purpose of peer coaching is to provide specific feedback to enhance teaching effectiveness. Thus, evaluative procedures to demonstrate the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the process should be an integral part of the program;
- Implement peer coaching as an ongoing part of an overall culture that values teaching and its improvement. To be effective, peer coaching should not be designed as an isolated occurrence. Rather, it should be ongoing and part of the culture (Skinner & Welch, 1996 pg. 155-156).

Mentoring can occur in a variety of ways, and is crucial to both doctoral student development and new faculty success. Often, new faculty are provided a research mentor when they first begin their positions. While this is important, "teaching mentors that meet weekly with the new faculty members may be even more crucial in the first few weeks than a research mentor" (Bensimon et al, 2000, p. 78). Teaching mentors are typically assigned by department chairs. Department chairs, by their very position, need to consider themselves unofficial mentors to all new faculty. By demonstrating support, encouragement, and information regarding their teaching responsibilities, department chairs can help new faculty excel in their positions.

> Once the term begins, departments should designate a specific mentor to be available to answer questions and talk to the new faculty member about his or her teaching. Depending on departmental culture, this can be an opportunity for reciprocal visits. The veteran can observe the new instructor's classes, make observations, and offer suggestions. And, the new faculty member can visit the veteran's classes to see how he or she teaches. If there is an open culture in the department, the newcomer can be invited to visit classes at will in order to acquire an understanding of different styles and become familiar with the department's overall curriculum. At some point during the term, the chair should make time to converse informally with the new faculty member to assess how the new person feels he or she is doing. Such a meeting can also provide a good setting for talking about the review procedures to which the novice will be subject (Hecht, 2003, p. 3).

Boyle and Boice (1998) have contributed greatly to the literature on mentors for new faculty in university settings, including their importance, their benefits, and the ideal qualities of individuals who assume mentorship positions. These qualities are as follows:

- Three to five years of experience on campus (or else administrators involved in the tenuring process).
- (For mentors of new GTA): Successful experiences as teaching assistant and the clear prospect of completing their doctoral degrees in five year or less;
- Quick to schedule time with protégés, often during the first meeting with their protégés;
- Likely to add structure of their own to those of the formal program (e.g., they arranged regularly scheduled meetings at interesting places around campus);
- Not given to extensive complaining and pessimism about their campus and department;

- Amenable to being prodded to stay on schedule for meetings by program directors;
- Open and generous in sharing early experiences, so that the mentor moved beyond the role of advice-giver and expert to a more personal and compassionate level of interaction (p. 176-177).

New and future faculty who are trying to assess the teaching culture of an institution should be sure to inquire as to the availability of mentors. In addition to this, it is important to understand the requirements for serving as a mentor, the selection process for mentors, and the standard expectations of mentors for involvement with the individuals being mentored. It is not enough for mentoring opportunities to exist; rather, it is the details that matter.

4.9.5   Graduate Students

Graduate students also need ongoing professional development opportunities in order to be successful in their own positions and prepared for their future in the professoriate. Harper (2001) stated that "the experiences and formal training afforded to graduate students will undoubtedly influence the manner in which they prioritize their values as faculty scholars" (p. 62). The development of graduate students takes place in a variety of ways, including a relatively recent movement for graduate students to be required to prepare and submit teaching portfolios within their department (Hutchings, 1998). While departmental and university programming and activities are of high value, many campuses are also adopting an initiative for their graduate students that is designed to help graduate students truly prepare for their future professional roles in higher education. The Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) program was established "to address the reality of doctoral students who become academics and will spend much of their career in classrooms. The ultimate goal of the program is to prepare alumni for success as assistant professors" (Richlin and Essington, 2004, p. 149 & 150). Richlin and Essington (2004).

The existence of the PFF program on campus is a strong indicator of the teaching culture of the institution. As previously mentioned, institutions that place a high priority on teaching understand that their graduated doctoral students will be pursuing a variety of opportunities, and will be employed by a variety of institutions (very few of them research based due to the high demand for those positions). Therefore, graduate students need to have a solid understanding and be able to assess the differences of expectations based on the nature of an institution. PFF programs aim to provide doctoral students with this knowledge. "Foremost is developing wisdom about the academic process so that in selecting an institution, future faculty members can find the best fit for their interests and can negotiate the tenure process successfully. Faculty learning communities provide an ideal model of what an academic career should be like" (Richlin and Essington (2004, p. 151).

Preparing Future Faculty programs are unique and important because not only do they provide graduate students with frequent opportunities for quality professional development, but they also expose students to initiatives through the department, the university, and other institutions. The existence of Preparing Future Faculty programs at research institutions is a strong sign of genuine regard for scholarly teaching, and for preparing doctoral students to assume positions in the next generation of the professoriate. For these reasons, Preparing Future Faculty programs are significant indicators of the institutional teaching climate.

4.10 REWARDS AND RECOGNITION FOR TEACHING

Rewards and recognition tend to be reflective of institutional values. Over the past decade, there has been a shift in the academic community regarding expectations for academic acknowledgement, largely due to the work of Ernest Boyer. His "leadership was pivotal in

advancing the reexamination of the faculty role and the reward structure, with special focus on the work of the scholar" (Rice, 2002, p. 9).

Therefore, when trying to assess the level of commitment to teaching on a university campus, one relatively obvious way to do so is by learning how scholarly teaching is recognized and rewarded on campus. This refers to not only 'what' is rewarded, but also 'how' things are rewarded. Greene (1990) did an excellent job of explaining the urgency of rewarding and recognizing exceptional teaching: "If teaching does not really count significantly, then it is professional suicide for a junior faculty member to concentrate on more than being an acceptable teacher. If institutions do not seriously reward good teaching in deed as well as in word, good teaching will not occur as often as it should" (p. 57 & 58).

There are few institutions that would not claim to reward teaching, so asking the question, 'does this campus reward teaching' is not sufficient. The question must be open ended, such as 'in what ways does this university recognize and reward teaching?' The means by which this is accomplished can range from simple to elaborate. For instance, for many new faculty, receiving positive feedback on their teaching from senior faculty or administrators provides strong reinforcement for their work (Lucas, 1990). In addition, many institutions reward scholarly teaching through awards. While these have merit (though some argue that they actually do not), there is a huge difference between receiving an award for scholarly work and receiving tenure for scholarly work. It also has to be recognized as a part of the faculty reward process that the faculty have a variety of roles and responsibilities:

> The faculty reward system that is in place on campuses must be modified so that it is both appropriate and fair. It must also recognize the differences among the disciplines and that faculty members have not only different strengths but, often, different roles as well. And, most important, the faculty reward system must be

sensitive to and supportive of what faculty members are required to do (Diamond, 2002, p. 79).

Tenure is typically the most sought after reward for new faculty. Promotion and salary decisions also serve as incentives for quality work. Many researchers suggest that teaching should be a component in the decisions of each of these (Boyer, 1990; Diamond, 2002; Lieberman, 2004; Smith, 2004). "When tenure and promotion reviews, as well as salary adjustments, include serious and thoughtful evaluation of the quality of teaching and significant weighting of the results of this evaluation along with consideration of research contributions, faculty receive a strong incentive to improve their teaching" (Austin and Rice, 1990, p. 37).

For some, one of the most meaningful rewards comes in the form of recognition. All too often, faculty invest enormous amounts of time and energy into their teaching efforts, which then seemingly go unnoticed by senior faculty and department chairs. "Deans and department chairs should not overlook the importance of expressing appreciation and recognition when they see faculty making an extra effort or being particularly successful in teaching" (Austin and Rice, p. 37).

Unfortunately, on many university campuses, financial rewards (which are typically the most valued besides receiving tenure) are limited due to monetary constraints. Wergin (2001) indicated that regardless, faculty can be rewarded in more important ways. He asserts that the most important and significant way to reward faculty is to recognize them. Specifically, he recommends that "autonomy, community, recognition, and efficacy" are the areas of most meaning for faculty (p. 50). Autonomy is important because for many, it was a major reason for pursuing a career in the professoriate. Faculty who are micromanaged and not provided with opportunities to follow their own direction sometimes feel as though their academic freedom is being threatened (p. 51). Providing faculty with a strong sense of autonomy is a way of providing

recognition. Wergin also mentions a number of other ways to recognize faculty, such as "hearing unsolicited compliments from students or colleagues, getting quoted in a paper, fielding requests for assistance in an area of professional expertise, etc" (p. 51).

Peter Seldin's (1990) writing reflects strong support for the notion of teaching being considered as scholarly as research in academic environments, and believes that in order for this to effectively occur, the results must be reflected in the reward and recognition programs for the faculty. Seldin recommends the following for the evolvement of a culture that is support of teaching as a form of scholarship:

1. Changing the campus environment to make it more responsive to teaching;

2. Providing the proper setting and tools to support instruction;

3. Assisting graduate students to develop their teaching skills;

4. Using appropriate rewards to improve teaching; and

5. Establishing an effective faculty development system (p. 8-16).

4.11   A STRONG SENSE OF FACULTY COMMUNITY

A strong sense of faculty community is a vital component for faculty success, and was one of the key facets of Feldman and Paulsen's (1999) original model for developing a supportive teaching culture. Wergin (2001) wrote, "The second most common reason given for choosing faculty life is the desire to join a "community of scholars," a notion that seems depressingly quaint to new faculty as they face an academic culture of isolation and competitive advantage. The desire to belong, to feel part of a nurturing community, one in which the faculty member has an important role to play, never goes away" (p. 51). Yet, a feeling of community is often overlooked or neglected for faculty who are new to a department or institution.

As has been mentioned in this document, new faculty enter the professoriate with a variety of responsibilities that can cause feelings of anxiety and stress. This stress and anxiety affects their teaching, their research, and other aspects of their professorial obligations, as they struggle to balance their time and often even over-think their projects and responsibilities. Writing by Sorcinelli (1992) suggested that there are five primary factors that are most stressful for new faculty, and one of them was a lack of collegiality (p. 31). "Researchers stress the need of new faculty for support, especially in the areas of pedagogy within a specific discipline, identification of levels of importance assigned within the departmental culture to specific professional organizations, and learning the subculture of the department" (Savage, et al., 2002, p. 22).

Similar to the other guidelines that suggest a strong institutional teaching culture, there are a number of basic approaches to developing a strong sense of faculty community. For instance, when senior level faculty and administrators attend faculty events, this provides an opportunity for new faculty to engage in conversation with them, and develop relationships (Seldin, 1995). In addition, team teaching opportunities also provide faculty with a chance to learn about the teaching style of another faculty member, while also building a connection with that individual (Kreber, 2001). Peer review is another simple, yet obvious way for faculty to feel a part of the larger faculty community. By receiving and giving teaching feedback, faculty have the opportunity to learn more about their own teaching, develop new teaching strategies, and make new connections with faculty (Theall and Centra, 2001). Finally, it should be noted that department chairs play a vital role in the assimilation of new faculty to the teaching culture of the school (Feldman and Paulsen, 1999), which helps them to develop a stronger identification with the faculty community.

New faculty are particularly anxious about the process of being reviewed for tenure. Through a feeling of collegiality with other faculty, new faculty could engage in "more ongoing discussion in the department or college of the tenure process and the values that inform it" (Sorcinelli, 2002, p. 44). If faculty feel a high comfort level with their colleagues, they are in a much better position to gain information, ask for help, and seek out opportunities that will provide them with a greater understanding of the culture and expectations of the department (and the institution).

Olsen and Sorcinelli's (1992) work addressed the need for faculty to feel a part of the academic community. While many appreciate the efforts made at the time of hiring process and orientation, the busyness and rigor of the academic year lead to a decrease in the amount of time that they have to spend with senior faculty, as well as fewer opportunities that present themselves. Olsen and Sorcinelli indicate that continuous efforts to acculturate new faculty to the university could be highly beneficial.

> Pretenure faculty reported a diminished sense of collegiality over time and expressed a critical need for more extensive, open collegial relations among faculty, especially between junior and senior faculty. While the fostering of collegiality is not a simple task, there does not appear to be a better way to socialize pretenure faculty than through the advice and guidance of more experienced colleagues. More fluid relations between junior and senior colleagues could provide more and better information about the culture of the institution, teaching and research opportunities, the tenure process, and feedback about performance and means of improvement (Olsen and Sorcinelli, 1992, p. 23).

Mentoring is another means by which to improve collegiality for new faculty. By providing someone to serve as an adviser, both professionally and through the personal transitions of the position, allows the new faculty member to have a sounding board and a personal source of guidance. Boyle and Boice (1998) wrote: "Effective mentoring begins with

institution wide programs that coach departments in ways to systematically immerse their newcomers in support programs and provide them with a sense of connectiveness" (p. 177).

Much of the literature reports that both faculty and graduate students need to experience a strong sense of community with faculty and administrators in order to be successful. Faculty learning communities can help make this happen if they:

- create connections for isolated teachers;

- establish networks for those pursuing pedagogical issues;

- meet early-career faculty expectations for community; and

- foster multidisciplinary curricula, and begin to bring community to higher education (Cox, 2004, p. 5).

Sorcinelli (1994) suggested that there are "few areas more important to academic life than the intellectual and social dimensions of collegiality" (p. 474). It is important for senior faculty and administrators to make continuous efforts to help new faculty feel a part of the environment. Support from senior faculty is imperative to the success of this initiative. Specifically, senior faculty have to be committed to helping new faculty understand and adjust to the environment and expectations of the department and the school. They have to be accessible and willing to provide feedback and guidance on teaching and research initiatives. They have to encourage new faculty to maintain a balance between their academic and personal lives. Most importantly, senior faculty and administrators have to model the components of the environment, in the hopes that the new faculty will adopt them themselves.

4.12   SUMMARY

Teaching and research are two primary obligations of the professoriate that are vital to the success of the department, school and institution. Both affect the prestige, productivity, effectiveness and notoriety of the university. However, the preparation and reward structure for new faculty emphasizes research capabilities and does not adequately address the pedagogy or scholarship associated with the teaching experience. Therefore, many new faculty are overwhelmed by the teaching expectations and obligations associated with their first formal position in the professoriate.

In order for new faculty to be truly prepared for their professional positions, they must not only understand the research function of their job, but also the mechanics of being an effective instructor. In addition, it is important that faculty are taught, as early as graduate school, that teaching is a scholarly endeavor, and not just a professorial obligation. Searching for an institution that emphasizes all of these experiences should begin as prospective faculty are investigating doctoral programs. By assessing an institution before beginning graduate school or a new professional position, new and prospective faculty can assess factors that contribute to the teaching culture and commitment of the school. New and prospective faculty can come to understand an institution's priority on teaching through the review of specific guidelines and associated criteria, such as those listed in this document.

The literature that focuses on the culture of teaching at research universities is vast and varied. However, an analysis of the literature indicates a number of researchers, as well as common themes, that emerge as central to the development of these guidelines. These studies and ideas have been incorporated into the development of the guidelines, and then reviewed by some of the prominent researchers and administrators in the field.

5.0 FEEDBACK FROM REVIEWERS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

After compiling and defining the guidelines and related criteria for this study, the next step was to gather feedback from individuals who are involved in related research and/or work in the field. The purpose of this effort was for professionals to gauge whether the findings were relevant, viable, or lacking in any way. Connecting with individuals who have knowledge of the topic and a vested interest in the information was intended to serve as the main avenue for critique and formative assessment of this work.

Approximately ten individuals were contacted, the majority of whom are referenced in the bibliography of this paper. Of those, five indicated that they would be willing to serve in the capacity of a reviewer of the work. Four of the reviewers were researchers in the field who have made substantial contributions to the literature review associated with this study; some of these individuals also have related administrative responsibilities. The fifth individual was a senior administrator for a teaching and learning center. Her work with faculty development and training issues made her an excellent resource to assess the validity of these findings.

5.2   CONTRIBUTING REVIEWERS

The following individuals served as reviewers for this study:

- Dr. Susan Ambrose: Associate Provost for Education; Director, Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence; Teaching Professor, Department of History, Carnegie Mellon University

- Dr. Milton Cox: Director for the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning, Miami University of Ohio. Dr. Cox is also the Editor in Chief of the *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*.

- Dr. Chris Golde: Senior Scholar, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Works specifically on the *Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate* project.

- Dr. Joanne M. Nicoll: Associate Director, Instructional Design and Faculty Development, Center for Instructional Development and Distance Education, The University of Pittsburgh

- Dr. Mary Dean Sorcinelli: Associate Provost for Faculty Development, Director of the Center For Teaching and associate professor in the Department of Educational Policy and Research Administration, University of Massachusetts Amherst.

5.3   INDIVIDUAL FEEDBACK AND REMARKS

The reviewers were sent an evaluation form (see Appendix C) along with the guidelines and related criteria (see Appendix A) for review. They were not given Chapter 4 to review (i.e. the literature associated with each guideline), though one reviewer did ask for this chapter, as well as the bibliography to use as a reference. On the evaluation form, they were asked to indicate for each guideline whether they accepted the guideline as it was written, if they thought changes should be made to the guideline (and what their recommendations entailed), or whether the guideline should be omitted entirely. In addition, they also had the opportunity to indicate whether or not they felt that any guidelines should be added to the list.

However, not all of the reviewers used the evaluation form as their tool for feedback Rather, some of the reviewers offered their comments through their own format, in the form of e-mail messages and additional written text added to the evaluation form. For reporting and organizational purposes, the feedback of the five reviewers has been grouped into sections based on the common themes that emerged from their input. Specific feedback from each reviewer remains anonymous, though when possible, their recommendations are written verbatim.

5.3.1 Definition of Terms

Some of the terminology used within the guidelines and related criteria was questioned by the reviewers. One of the most interesting concerns was from one individual who was not sure that the terms "guidelines" and "supporting criteria" adequately 'capture' what is being conveyed within the final product of this study. These terms were chosen and decided upon after significant thought and debate between the researcher and the dissertation committee. After much consideration, they seemed to be the most appropriate terms for these purposes, and were not changed for the final guidelines. It should also be noted that only one of the reviewers expressed concern with these terms.

Another individual stressed the importance of clarifying the difference between scholarly teaching and teaching excellence. This was an excellent point, as it is vital that there is a strong understanding on the part of new faculty (as well as senior faculty and administrators) regarding the distinct and important difference between scholarly and excellent teaching. Because the reviewers were not sent the entire document as part of their evaluation, they were unaware that this topic is covered quite specifically in Section 2.5.2: Acknowledging Teaching as a Form of Scholarship (p. 37). However, there are some related criteria that need to be further explained, or

rewritten for clarification of this issue. Under the first guideline (Demonstrated Consideration of Teaching as a Scholarly Activity), there is a related criterion that reads: 'senior faculty and administrators who commonly refer to teaching as a form of scholarship.' One reviewer noted that "the act of teaching itself is not the scholarship of teaching, but can be scholarly teaching." One way to adjust this criterion would be to add words such as "publishing or refereed presentations about…" to what is currently stated. This change was made in the final version of the guidelines.

In addition, there was some concern expressed about the use of the word "Teaching Fellow" as it relates to new faculty opportunities, which was indicated in a few of the guidelines. The main reason for this is because in many institutions, this term refers to a senior level graduate student or teaching assistant. Again, because the reviewers did not read the literature related to this concept, they may not have realized that Teaching Fellow positions also exist for new faculty. A different reviewer, however, pointed out that the Lilly Post Doctoral Teaching Fellows Program no longer exists, so it would be wise to eliminate this criterion all together. This action was taken in the final version of the guidelines.

In addition, the guideline that refers to the idea that hiring procedures for new faculty should address teaching skills and expectations was mentioned by reviewers. A criterion associated with this guideline was the notion of asking prospective faculty to hold a mock 'lecture' as a way for the hiring committee to assess the individuals teaching knowledge and ability. Two reviewers recommended that this terminology be changed to 'mock class.' While teaching ability is vital to assess, it is also important to evaluate how a prospective faculty member handles other aspects of the class time, such as interacting with students, overall

organization, class preparation, etc. This recommendation was implemented in the final version of the guidelines.

One reviewer questioned the terminology of the sixth guideline (mandatory, continuous and inclusive training for Teaching Assistants), and specifically inquired into the meaning of 'inclusive'. The question was whether this concept was meant to deal with issues of diversity. This was not the original intent of the wording; rather, the meaning referred to the idea that the opportunities within the training experience for Teaching Assistants should include a wide spectrum of the duties and responsibilities that will ultimately be expected within the professoriate. However, it is understandable that this word could require some clarification on the part of the reader. It was suggested that it might be more appropriate to rename the guideline 'Mandatory and comprehensive training for teaching assistants.' This change was made for the final guidelines.

5.3.2 Changes to the Criteria

One idea that applies to all of the criteria and should be mentioned before getting into detailed recommendations is the notion that the criteria themselves could be divided. There was a recommendation made that they be separated into two categories: one referring to criteria that are 'common', and another to criteria that are 'rare'. This might be a way to more easily understand and categorize the related criteria as they are written. One example of a case where this would be relevant is in guideline number one, where there is a related criterion regarding offering sabbaticals for the scholarship of teaching and learning. This happens very rarely, and it might be helpful in assessing the teaching culture to understand that a standard such as this, if it exists, could actually be considered exceptional, and is not to be expected. While this would be valuable

to the reader, it would also be challenging to determine, based on the literature itself, which criteria are 'common' versus 'rare'.

For the final version of the guidelines and criteria, however, there was more organization to the layout of the criteria. For each section, they were divided into categories, though some categories were not relevant for particular guidelines. The categories include: tenure and promotion, policies and procedures, senior faculty and administrative support, and training and development opportunities. By organizing the criteria according to these overriding concepts, the final copy of the guidelines and related criteria is easier to read, interpret, and apply.

Another concern that was mentioned by reviewers was the idea that there was some redundancy in the criteria; in other words, a number of the criteria 'fit' under more than one guideline. While one reviewer indicated that this can cause confusion for the reader, the duplication of criteria could also be attributed to importance. When a criterion represents the existence of more than one guideline, it can be argued that it is an even more valuable initiative or program to be included in the assessment of the teaching culture.

In addition, one reviewer pointed out that assessing issues such as 'support for the scholarship of teaching' (guideline #1) is difficult because "there is a difference often between what is espoused and what is actually done." The reviewer also suggested that it might be beneficial to include as a criterion a statement regarding what senior faculty have to say about the ways in which teaching relates to tenure decisions. And, this individual suggested that faculty being nominated for national teaching awards by a department does, in fact, demonstrate the consideration of teaching as a scholarly activity, as national awards carry significant prestige. While these are worthwhile suggestions, they were not implemented in the final copy of the guidelines due to a lack of literature support.

Another adjustment to make to guideline number one relates to 'information that is communicated to new and prospective students'. One reviewer suggested that it should be specified that it is graduate students, not undergraduate students, being referred to in this case. This same reviewer indicated that it would also be prudent to address 'course portfolios' in addition to teaching portfolios, wherever they are mentioned. The first recommendation was made to the final guidelines, but the second was not due to a lack of literature support.

Another criterion under the first guideline refers to the need for 'professional development opportunities that focus on educational theory'. In response to this, one reviewer wrote: "I suggest you replace 'focus on' with 'include' and before 'educational theory' you add 'classroom research or.' I say this because educational theory usually refers to statistical educational psychology type research, and classroom research refers to what Pat Cross suggested faculty in all disciplines could do without being experts in high-powered educational research." Since the wording for this criterion was taken direction from the literature, it was left as-is for the final copy of the guidelines.

In the second guideline (senior level support for teaching), there were several recommended changes to the related criteria. It was recommended that the criterion: 'departments that include teaching abilities in the hiring process' be made more 'concrete'. The reviewer wondered how this idea actually is portrayed and recommended ways such as 'requiring discussion of the teaching philosophy during the interview, or showing sample syllabi.' This suggestion was simple to implement into the final draft of the guidelines. Another suggestion was in reference to 'encouragement by department chairs and other senior administrators for new and prospective faculty to engage in teaching-related professional development activities, even if there is an associated expense.' One reviewer suggested adding

the recognition that there would be a dedication of time, as well as expense, in conjunction with these professional development opportunities. This was also added to the final version of the guidelines. Another criterion under this guideline reads 'senior administrators talk about teaching with their colleagues and attend faculty meetings to address teaching issues.' The suggestion here was to divide this into two separate criteria, one that refers to talking about the meetings, and another that refers to attending them. Again, this recommendation was made in the final copy of the guidelines. Finally, another criterion that was suggested to be represented as two separate ideas reads 'assistance for new faculty in finding ways to integrate teaching and research'. The reviewer wrote that this would be worth doing because "many departments now have the research release time, but few have the teaching release time." This comment misses the overall intent of this criterion, which is to actually help faculty to find ways for their teaching to affect their research and vice versa. This recommendation was not made in the final version of the guidelines.

A number of recommendations also were made in reference to the third guideline regarding prestige associated with teaching responsibilities. One reviewer commented on two of the related criteria: 'Departments that include teaching abilities in the hiring process,' and 'tenure decision that are affected by teaching excellence and scholarly teaching.' The reviewer recommended that these criteria be made more concrete. Also, the latter criterion mentioned is challenging to adequately define because what is done is often different from what is 'espoused'. These criteria were not changed in the final copy of the guidelines, as they could be expanded in a number of different ways. It is assumed that those who use these guidelines and criteria to assess and environment will understand the meaning of these two ideas.

In addition, one criterion currently reads 'examples of teaching initiatives by current senior faculty that are scholarly in nature'. It was advised that junior faculty should not be left out of this expectation. While it could be listed as a separate criterion, junior faculty should also have the opportunities (and requirements) for scholarly teaching. In the final version of the guidelines, junior faculty were added to this criterion. The same reviewer made a comment regarding the criterion 'departments that include teaching abilities in the hiring process': "does 'departments' mean the department you are applying to or just that there are departments around that do this? It would be wise to specify that this should be your department, because other departments doing it does not imply that yours will." This change was not made, as it can be assumed that the department of concern is the department to which the student/prospective faculty member is applying. A few other semantic changes to some of the criteria listed for this guideline include:

- Change 'tenure decisions that are affected by teaching excellence and scholarly teaching' to 'tenure decisions that are *enhanced* by teaching excellence and scholarly teaching.' This revision was made.

- Change 'professional teaching that occurs outside of the classroom' to 'teaching that occurs outside of the classroom.' This revision was made.

- Change 'frequent articulation of the university emphasis on teaching' to '*genuine* articulation of the university emphasis on teaching.' This revision was not made.

The fourth guideline, 'hiring procedures for new faculty that address teaching skills and expectations,' had only a few suggestions for revision (besides the general expansion of ideas). It was recommended that the criterion 'department chairs, senior faculty and administrators who

are involved in the selection process' be omitted, because 'this is usually true'. However, this concept was included in the final version as this was a direct recommendation from the literature. Also, it was recommended that the presentation of a teaching portfolio be added to this section. However, this idea was not documented in the related literature.

A few issues were also raised in reference to a criterion in the fifth guideline: 'Doctoral programs that ready students for careers in the professoriate'. This criterion refers to the importance of graduate students having opportunities for informal social events. The literature is clear that a sense of community among new faculty has a major impact on their acclimation to the school and their professional expectations. Graduate students also should have this opportunity to interact informally with their peers, as well as with new and senior faculty who serve as their mentors.

In addition, it was also mentioned the idea that 'teaching is viewed as a priority' is actually quite rare, which should be noted. For instance, rather than 'a doctoral curriculum that *emphasizes* the scholarship of teaching', it might be more appropriate to say 'a doctoral curriculum that *includes* the scholarship of teaching.' This same reviewer noted that it is also rare, unfortunately, for 'graduate students to have the opportunity to engage directly and consistently with faculty in their scholarly teaching work', as well as for the availability of 'assistantships that offer pedagogical training in teaching.' In the final version of the guidelines, 'includes' was used to replace 'emphasizes,' as per the suggestion, but the other recommendation was not implemented. Even if this does not happen often, it is a component that would provide a tremendous amount of information regarding the teaching culture of the department or school.

Guideline number six reads 'mandatory, continuous and inclusive training for teaching assistants'. Revisions were suggested for two of the related criteria. It was mentioned that it

would be "extreme" to expect 'teaching assistants to have a campus teaching certification before being permitted to teach', and also that the notion of 'programs that train graduate students in the scholarship of teaching' is not a common practice. However, since this was mentioned and recommended in the literature, it will remain as-is in the criteria.

Within the eighth guideline: 'continuous opportunities for personal and professional development,' the suggestion was made that the criterion 'team teaching is encouraged' needs to be more specific, and read 'team teaching *within the department* is encouraged'. However, this was not specified in the literature; rather, it seemed to be important for the institution to acknowledge the value associated with team teaching courses, even if they were inter-departmental. Another small change in the criteria for this guideline was that teaching portfolios should be required for all faculty, rather than just those who are new. This suggestion was implemented in the final copy of the guidelines. Finally, one reviewer suggested that it would be useful to add the following related criterion: 'teaching/learning center is available for faculty support of teaching.' This is a noteworthy suggestion; however, including a criterion regarding an available teaching and learning center does not seem specific. Most, if not all research universities have teaching and learning centers that offer a wide arrange of opportunities for faculty. It would be challenging to find research that specifies this importance, because teaching and learning centers are 'a campus's visible commitment to teaching and learning.'

In the ninth guideline, (rewards and recognition for teaching), there was a question raised about the necessity of 'faculty autonomy' as one of the criteria, as the reviewer indicated that in general, faculty have a tremendous amount of autonomy. This criterion was added in reference to writing by Wergin (2001) that indicated that while faculty autonomy is the desired situation, many times faculty are micromanaged and over-supervised over the course of their work. He

128

suggests that faculty who show strong and effective teaching could be rewarded by being given more substantial autonomy in their teaching efforts. In addition, it was recommended that two of the criteria be rewritten as follows:

- Change 'tenure decisions that are affected by teaching excellence and scholarly teaching,' 'tenure decisions that are affected *positively* by teaching excellence and scholarly teaching.' The reviewer made this suggestion because "teaching is sometimes a negative at some places (you spend too much time on your teaching)." This criterion has already been revised to read 'tenure decisions are *enhanced* by teaching excellence and scholarly teaching.'

- Change 'senior faculty and administrators have personal conversations with faculty to congratulate them on their scholarly work,' to 'senior faculty and administrators have personal conversations with faculty to congratulate them on their scholarly *teaching*.' This recommendation was implemented.

Reviewers also had some ideas regarding the tenth guideline (a strong sense of faculty community) Itwas recommended that two of the criteria be rewritten as follows:

- Change 'peer review is valued and encouraged' to 'peer review *of teaching* is valued and encouraged.' This revision was made to the final guidelines.

- Change 'Faculty Learning Communities exist on campus, and faculty are encouraged to participate' to 'Faculty Learning Communities exist on campus, and *new* faculty are encouraged to participate'. This change was also made.

Finally, one reviewer recommended that it might be worthwhile to include additional programs and initiatives that impact teaching and learning, such as 'learning commons, learning

129

resource centers, academic computing, the writing program, the honors college, and the library.'
The only reservation with this idea is that the emphasis is on student teaching and learning, as
opposed to new and prospective faculty teaching and learning. Therefore, this recommendation
was not implemented in the final version of the guidelines.

5.3.3 Changes to the Guidelines

One researcher recommended that the guidelines be sorted into a continuum, where they either
demonstrate their interrelation or their building level of importance. However, since these
guidelines are based on research in the literature, it is important to note that there is not any
evidence of any of the guidelines being more important than the others. Therefore, organizing the
guidelines in this way would be subjective and inappropriate. One reviewer even suggested that
the guidelines be regrouped and renamed (and the related criteria consequently reorganized) so
that they would read: 1) Preparing Future Faculty; 2) Socializing New Faculty; 3) Ongoing
Faculty Development in Teaching; 4) Supportive Recognition and Reward Structures; and 5)
Creating a Culture of Teaching Excellence. This change was not implemented as it would require
using terminology developed by another researcher.

In addition, one reviewer commented that the second guideline (senior level support for
teaching) seems 'to narrow for the supporting criteria that were listed', and recommended that it
be changed to "support for teaching by senior colleagues and academic leaders'. This was
definitely a worthwhile suggestion that was applied to the final copy of the guidelines. It was
also recommended that a guideline be added regarding the required contents of the tenure and
promotion package. This guideline was not added, however, due to a lack of literature support.

Finally, the following feedback was offered: "The Heeding New Voices Study (Rice, et.al, 12000) by AAHE identified three worrisome themes noted by faculty who were just beginning their careers in academe: the lack of a comprehensible tenure system, the lack of community, and the separation between their academic and personal lives. The reviewer wrote: "I suggest you add the first and third (you already have the second) in some way as guidelines, or add these as criteria under an appropriate existing guideline." However, it's important to remember that it is the teaching culture that is being assessed. The tenure system as well as the distinction between academic and personal experiences is heavily focused on research and could be areas for entire studies within themselves. In other words, it is the teaching aspect of the professoriate (rather than the comprehensive faculty responsibilities) that is relevant to this study.

5.3.4 Underlying Issues and Additional Comments

Many of the reviewers pointed to a similar underlying issue: 'a campus's capacity or willingness to establish norms that support the ongoing professional development across a career.' Even more important, however, was a concern expressed about the lack of reference to the overall organizational structures that are needed to support good teaching. One reviewer articulated this well:

> I think having a set of criteria and indicators and criteria is a great idea. My only concern is that understanding an organization's culture is a complex task---Rousseau describes it as analogous to peeling an onion---the outer skins are the organization's artifacts, the middle layers are the espoused values, and the inner core represents the underlying assumptions. Often those things may not align. What is said about teaching being important is now what is really rewarded behind closed doors. I guess I'm simply saying that your criteria cluster into artifacts and values, hopefully getting to assumptions. Do you discuss organizational culture in general in the dissertation?

In general, the organizational culture was not addressed in this study. The focus was on research institutions, and it was assumed (based on support from the literature) that for the most part they have similar missions and philosophies. While this does not necessarily address the overall culture of the organization, this issue in itself is tremendously broad, and possibly the focus of another study.

Finally, an interesting perspective of one reviewer was that she wanted to read more of the original ideas of this researcher. This individual wrote:

> Your reliance on other people's ideas made me wonder whether you had particular suggestions to make? Not all good ideas have been explicitly written about. In fact, under hiring procedures I thought this list was a little thin. I understand that many departments, particularly teaching oriented ones include evidence of excellent teaching as one of their selection criterion. Without a candidate would never even make the shortlist.

This idea is intriguing, but the intent of this project was to formulate guidelines and related criteria on research initiatives and their associated findings. The analysis of literature was an appropriate means to accomplish this. Personal ideas and recommendations would not be relevant to this study.

5.3.5 Additional Literature to Consider

The only recommendations for additional literature to include in the meta-analysis were: 1) the work of Jerry Gaff and Ann Pruitt-Logan ("Building the Faculty We Need"), 2) Mary Huber's "Balancing Acts", 3) a new book on the scholarship of teaching and learning by Mary Huber and Pat Hutchings ("The Advancement of Learning"), and the dissertation findings of Laurie Richlin, which was related to doctoral programs that ready students for careers in the professoriate (guideline number 5). Each of these authors, though not these specific readings, are referenced in this study.

5.4   AREAS FOR FUTURE WORK

The changes made to the final version of the guidelines and related criteria were relatively extensive and are mentioned after each recommended change that is described in this chapter. For a variety of reasons, a number of the recommendations were not implemented. If the suggestions were not grounded in the literature, it was important not to include them in the guidelines and criteria. In addition, some of the suggestions seemed to fall outside of the boundaries of this particular study, and might be areas for future work.

For instance, it was suggested that the organizational culture of the department and institution is a significant factor in the overall teaching culture of the university. This would be an extremely interesting idea to investigate and would be an excellent topic for future study. In addition, it should be noted that the development of these guidelines and related criteria was based on the review of literature that spanned almost 35 years. Therefore, in order for them to be truly effective over the course of time, it will be important to continue to read and analyze the research in the field and make appropriate updates to both the guidelines and the criteria.

Optimally, these guidelines and criteria would be applied by new and prospective faculty to assess the teaching cultures of institutions. It is only through multiple applications, evaluations and revisions that the guidelines will become more accurate and useful. It is anticipated that both the criteria and guidelines will require regular monitoring and updating as practices change and research continues.

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
Demonstrated Consideration of Teaching as a Scholarly Activity	→Tenure decisions that are affected by teaching excellence and scholarly teaching (Boyer, 1990; Lieberman, 2004; Smith, 2004)
	→ A university mission statement that indicates the priority of scholarly teaching (Rice & Austin, 1990)
	→ A departmental mission statement that indicates teaching as a priority and is communicated to new and future faculty (Austin & Rice, 1990)
	→ Support for both the scholarship of teaching as well as excellent teaching, and a clearly articulated understanding of the difference between the two (Kreber, 2001)
	→ Teaching philosophies of the department, school and institution that are clear, accessible and common knowledge (Johnston, 1997; Rice & Austin, 2000)
	→ Examples of teaching initiatives by current senior faculty that are scholarly in nature (Greene, 2002)
	→Senior faculty and administrators who commonly refer to teaching as a form of scholarship (Boyer, 1990)
	→ Information that is communicated to new and prospective students during the recruitment and orientation processes regarding scholarly teaching (Ambrose, 1991, Nyquist, 1991)
	→ Encouraging or requiring teaching portfolios to record scholarly teaching initiatives (Hutchings, 1998)
	→ Professional development opportunities that focus on 'educational theory' (Kreber, 2001)
	→ Programs in place that provide opportunities for new and prospective faculty to engage in the scholarship of teaching (such

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
	as Faculty Learning Communities, Preparing Future Faculty Programs, and sabbaticals devoted to the scholarship of teaching (Kreber, 2001; Cox, 2004; Richlin and Essington, 2004) → The opportunity for faculty to serve as Teaching Fellows (Austin, 1992)

Guidelines	**Supporting Criteria**
Support for Teaching by Senior Colleagues and Academic Leaders	→ Departments that include teaching abilities in the hiring process (Feldman & Paulsen, 1999; Theall & Centra, 2001; Greene, 2002) → Encouragement by department chairs and other senior administrators for new and prospective faculty to engage in teaching-related professional development activities, even if there is an associated expense (Lucas, 1990) →Teaching factors into promotion and salary decisions (Greene, 1990; Feldman & Paulsen, 1999; Diamond, 2002) → Positive faculty reinforcement for exceptional teaching (Boyer, 1990; Lucas, 1990; Johnston, 1997) → Course syllabi by senior faculty that are shared and available within the department for new faculty to review (Bensimon, 2000) → Department wide committees specific to teaching (Lucas, 1990) → A departmental teaching library (Lucas, 1990) → Department chairs who assign teaching mentors to new faculty (Bensimon, 2000; Theall & Centra, 2001) → Senior administrators and faculty who reward and publicize good teaching (Boyer, 1990; Lucas, 1990; Rice & Austin, 1990)

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
	→ Information provided by department chairs to new faculty to help them prepare for their teaching obligations (i.e. the nature of the students, past syllabi for the course, class prerequisites and how it fits into the overall department, etc.) (Bensimon, 2000) → Senior faculty and administrators who commonly refer to teaching as a form of scholarship (Seldin, 1995) → Senior administrators talk about teaching with their colleagues and attend faculty meetings to address teaching issues (Austin & Rice, 1990) → Department chairs define teaching reward structures for new faculty and provide incentives (Austin & Rice, 1990) → A reduced teaching load during the early teaching years to give new faculty an opportunity to assimilate to the departmental teaching and research expectations (Wheeler, 1992) → Assistance for new faculty in finding ways to integrate teaching and research (Gale & Golde, 2004) → Support for both the scholarship of teaching as well as excellent teaching, and a clearly articulated understanding of the difference between the two (Kreber, 2001) → Institutional support (both budgetary and otherwise) for faculty development (Ambrose, 1995).

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
Prestige Associated With Teaching Responsibilities	→ A university mission statement that indicates the priority of scholarly teaching (Rice & Austin, 1990)
	→ Teaching philosophies of the department, school and institution that are clear, accessible and common knowledge (Johnston, 1997)
	→Senior faculty and administrators who commonly refer to teaching as a form of scholarship (Boyer, 1990)
	→ Departments that include teaching abilities in the hiring process (Feldman & Paulsen, 1999; Theall & Centra, 2001)
	→ Tenure decision that are affected by teaching excellence and scholarly teaching (Boyer, 1990; Lieberman, 2004; Smith, 2004)
	→ New faculty hiring, orientation and development that emphasizes teaching pedagogy (Feldman & Paulsen, 1999)
	→ Teaching Assistants who are treated like faculty-in-training (Wilkening, 1991)
	→ A ceremonial Teaching Assistant training program (Marcinovich, 1998; Harper, 2001)
	→ A requirement for Teaching Assistants to be certified to teach on campus (Featherstone & Johnson, 1998)
	→ Teaching Fellow opportunities for graduate students and Teaching Assistants (Wuff, et al, 1998)
	→ Scholarly teaching efforts that are publicly recognized and rewarded on campus (Boyer, 1990)
	→ Faculty permission to take sabbaticals for endeavors related to scholarly teaching (Kreber, 2001)
	→ Frequent articulation of the university emphasis on teaching (Seldin, 1995)

137

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
	→ The presence of senior faculty and administrators at teaching related programs (Seldin, 1995) → Senior faculty and administrators who commonly and openly refer to teaching as a form of scholarship (Nicholls, 2004)

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
Hiring Procedures for New Faculty that Address Teaching Skills and Expectations	→ Candidates are given information about the teaching expectations of the job during the hiring process (Hecht, 2003) → Department chairs, senior faculty and administrators are involved in the selection process (Bensimon, 2000) → Prospective faculty are required to prepare and present a mock lecture to the department or campus community as part of the interview process (Lucas, 1990) → Candidates are expected to produce teaching evidence and experience that is required to be a viable candidate for the job (Bensimon, 2000; Rice & Austin, 2000) →Applicants are required to submit material during the hiring process that is related to teaching, such as their teaching philosophy, past syllabi or student evaluations (Bensimon, 2000; Rice & Austin, 2000)

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
Doctoral Programs that Ready Students for Careers in the Professoriate	→ Doctoral curriculum that requires teaching pedagogy and views teaching as a priority (Ambrose, 1991; Boice, 1991; Silverman, 1997; Kreber, 2001) → Doctoral curriculum that emphasizes the scholarship of teaching (Nyquist, 1991; Kreber, 2001; Gale & Golde, 2004) → Doctoral students who are taught about the overlap and important connection between teaching and research (Johnston, 1997; Gale and Golde, 2004) → Doctoral students receive on-going career guidance and feedback regarding the various types of institutions and the faculty role in each one (Austin, 2002) → Doctoral students receive on-going guidance and feedback to prepare them for the 'entire experience' of new faculty (Richlin & Essington, 2004) → Doctoral students have regular opportunities for interaction with peers and informal social events (Austin, 2002) → Graduate students who have demonstrated exceptional work in the scholarship of teaching have the opportunity to serve as mentors for new graduate students (Gale & Golde, 2004) → Graduate students have the opportunity to engage directly and consistently with faculty in their scholarly teaching work (Austin, 2002; Gale & Golde, 2004) → Doctoral students have the opportunity to engage in Preparing Future Faculty program (Richlin & Essington, 2004) → Assistantships are available that offer pedagogical training in teaching (Austin, 2002)

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
	→ Doctoral students have a faculty mentor to provide teaching guidance and support (Kreber, 2001; Silverman, 2003; Gale & Golde, 2004)
	→ Teaching Assistants are treated like faculty-in-training (Wilkening, 1991)

Guideline	Supporting Criteria
Mandatory, Continuous and Inclusive Training for Teaching Assistants	→ Training that addresses the roles and issues faced by faculty (Chism, 1998)
	→ TA training that includes teaching, as well as being observed and apprenticed by faculty mentors (Wilkening, 1991)
	→ Campus wide TA training is available (Marincovich, 1998; Mintz, 1998; Stout, 1998)
	→ Departmental TA training is available (Marincovich, 1998; Mintz, 1998)
	→ Within the department, the availability of both department specific and course specific training (Marincovich, 1998)
	→ Teaching Assistants are required to have a campus teaching certification before being permitted to teach (Tice, Featherstone & Johnson, 1998)
	→ Programs train graduate students in the scholarship of teaching (Nyquist, 1991; Gale & Golde, 2004)
	→ TA programs incorporate training in all aspects of the faculty experience (Hiiemae, et al 1991)
	→ TA's have opportunities for formal and informal assessment and feedback (Nyquist & Sprague, 1998)

Guideline	Supporting Criteria
	→ TA's are encouraged to occasionally videotape their classes for self assessment (Mintz, 1998)
	→ TA's are rewarded and recognized for exceptional teaching efforts (Ambrose, 1991)
	→ Exceptional TA's have the opportunity to serve as mentors for then deal with concerns and training issues of new TA's (Nyquist & Sprague, 1998; Harper, 2001)

Guideline	Supporting Criteria
Comprehensive and On-Going Orientation Programs for New Faculty	→ Departmental and campus wide orientation programs exist for new faculty (Bensimon, 2000)
	→ During the orientation, new faculty are provided with specific information regarding what they need to do to be successful in their positions, and to ultimately achieve tenure (Bensimon, 2000)
	→ Information provided by department chairs to new faculty to help them prepare for their teaching obligations (i.e. the nature of the students, past syllabi for the course, class prerequisites and how it fits into the overall department, etc.) (Bensimon, 2000)
	→ Orientation for new faculty provides an opportunity for them to meet and interact with others (including senior faculty) and to build relationships (Sorcinelli, 1994)
	→During the orientation process, new faculty are helped to understand the teaching culture of the department, as well as the institution (Bensimon, 2000)
	→ The teaching philosophies of the department, school and institution clear, accessible and common knowledge (Sorcinelli, 1994)

Guideline	Supporting Criteria
	→ The orientation has follow up events throughout the course of the year (Lucas, 1990)

Guideline	Supporting Criteria
Continuous Opportunities for Personal and Professional Development	→Formal opportunities exist for faculty to receive feedback and guidance related to teaching (Schwartz, 1999; Feldman & Paulsen, 1999; Sorcinelli, 2002) → Faculty Learning Communities exist on campus, and faculty are encouraged to participate (Cox, 2004) → Team teaching is encouraged (Kreber, 2001 → Assistance is available for new faculty in finding ways to integrate teaching and research (Gale & Golde, 2004) → Senior administrators support faculty involvement in professional development activities related to teaching (Seldin, 1990) → Faculty are involved in the initiation and development of professional development programs (Feldman & Paulsen, 1999; Chopp, Frost & Jean, 2001) → There are multiple and on-going opportunities for professional development related to teaching (Seldin, 1990; Gardiner, 1994) → There is a Teaching Fellows program on campus for new faculty (Austin, 1992) → There is a Preparing Future Faculty program on campus for graduate students (Sorcinelli, 2002; Richlin & Essington, 2004) → Teaching portfolios are encouraged or required for new faculty (Urbach, 1992; Hutchings, 1998; Wright, 1999)

Guideline	Supporting Criteria
	→ Teaching portfolios are encouraged or required within the department for graduate students (Hutchings, 1998)
	→ Departmental or university funds are available for new faculty who are interested in pursuing professional development (Lieberman, 2004)
	→ Teaching mentors are assigned to each new faculty member (Boice, 1992; Skinner & Welch, 1996; Bensimon, 2000)
	→ Department chairs serve as "unofficial" mentors to new faculty (Hecht, 2003)
	→ Professional development opportunities are availalbe that focus on 'educational theory' (Kreber, 2001)

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
Rewards and Recognition for Teaching	→Tenure decisions that are affected by teaching excellence and scholarly teaching (Boyer, 1990; Lieberman, 2004; Smith, 2004)
	→Teaching factors into promotion and salary decisions (Greene, 1990; Feldman & Paulsen, 1999; Diamond, 2002)
	→Informal departmental and institutional validation for scholarly teaching (Austin & Rice, 1990; Johnston, 1997; Wergin, 2001)
	→ Senior faculty and administrators have personal conversations with faculty to congratulate them on their scholarly work (Lucas, 1990)
	→ Department chairs define teaching reward structures for new faculty and provide incentives (Austin & Rice, 1990)
	→ Exceptional teaching faculty are rewarded with autonomy in their teaching (Wergin, 2001)

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
A Strong Sense of Faculty Community	→ Senior level faculty and administrators attend departmental and campus-wide faculty functions (Seldin, 1995) → Frequent, informal opportunities for faculty get-togethers, with senior faculty often in attendance (Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992; Feldman & Paulsen, 1999) → New faculty are provided with opportunities to gather with other new faculty to address common concerns regarding tenure, stress, teaching loads, research expectations, student issues, etc. (Theall & Centra, 2001; Sorcinelli, 2002) → Teaching mentors are assigned to each new faculty member (Boyle & Boice, 1998; Theall & Centra, 2001; Sorcinelli, 2002) → Team teaching is encouraged on campus (Kreber, 2001) → Peer review is valued and encouraged (Theall & Centra, 2001) → Department chairs work to help new faculty assimilate to the teaching culture (Feldman & Paulsen, 1999) → Faculty Learning Communities exist on campus, and faculty are encouraged to participate (Cox, 2004)

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
Demonstrated Consideration of Teaching as a Scholarly Activity	***Tenure and Promotion*** →Tenure decisions that are enhanced by teaching excellence and scholarly teaching (Boyer, 1990; Lieberman, 2004; Smith, 2004) ***Policies and Procedures*** → A university mission statement that indicates the priority of scholarly teaching (Rice & Austin, 1990) → A departmental mission statement that indicates teaching as a priority and is communicated to new and future faculty (Austin & Rice, 1990) → Teaching philosophies of the department, school and institution that are clear, accessible and common knowledge (Johnston, 1997; Rice & Austin, 2000) → Encouraging or requiring teaching portfolios to record scholarly teaching initiatives (Hutchings, 1998) ***Senior Faculty and Administrative Support*** →Senior faculty and administrators who commonly refer to teaching as a form of scholarship in publishing or refereed presentations (Boyer, 1990; Seldin, 1995) ***Training and Development Opportunities*** → Information that is communicated to new and prospective graduate students during the recruitment and orientation processes regarding scholarly teaching

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
	(Ambrose, 1991, Nyquist, 1991) → Professional development opportunities that focus on 'educational theory' (Kreber, 2001) → Programs in place that provide opportunities for new and prospective faculty to engage in the scholarship of teaching (such as Faculty Learning Communities, Preparing Future Faculty Programs, and sabbaticals devoted to the scholarship of teaching (Kreber, 2001; Cox, 2004; Richlin and Essington, 2004)

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
Support for Teaching by Senior Colleagues and Academic Leaders	***Tenure and Promotion*** →Teaching factors into promotion and salary decisions (Greene, 1990; Feldman & Paulsen, 1999; Diamond, 2002) → Department chairs define teaching reward structures for new faculty and provide incentives (Austin & Rice, 1990) ***Policies and Procedures*** → Departments that include the demonstration of teaching abilities in the hiring process (Feldman & Paulsen, 1999; Theall & Centra, 2001) → A reduced teaching load during the early teaching years to give new faculty an opportunity to assimilate to the departmental teaching and research expectations (Wheeler, 1992)

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
	→ Assistance for new faculty in finding ways to integrate teaching and research (Gale & Golde, 2004)
	Senior Faculty and Administrative Support
	→ Encouragement by department chairs and other senior administrators for new and prospective faculty to engage in teaching-related professional development activities, even if there is an associated expense of time and money (Lucas, 1990)
	→ Positive faculty reinforcement for exceptional teaching (Boyer, 1990; Lucas, 1990; Johnston, 1997)
	→ Senior administrators and faculty who reward and publicize good teaching (Boyer, 1990; Lucas, 1990; Rice & Austin, 1990)
	→ Senior administrators talk about teaching with their colleagues (Austin & Rice, 1990)
	→ Senior administrators attend faculty meetings to address teaching issues (Austin & Rice, 1990)
	→Senior faculty and administrators who commonly refer to teaching as a form of scholarship in publishing or refereed presentations (Boyer, 1990; Seldin, 1995)
	→ Department chairs who assign teaching mentors to new faculty (Bensimon, 2000; Theall & Centra, 2001)
	→ Support for both the scholarship of teaching as well as excellent teaching, and a clearly articulated understanding of the difference between the two (Kreber, 2001)

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
	Training and Development Opportunities → A departmental teaching library (Lucas, 1990) → Course syllabi that are shared and available within the department (Bensimon, 2000) → Department wide committees specific to teaching (Lucas, 1990) → Institutional support (both budgetary and otherwise) for faculty development (Ambrose, 1995). → Information provided by department chairs to new faculty to help them prepare for their teaching obligations (i.e. the nature of the students, past syllabi for the course, class prerequisites and how it fits into the overall department, etc.) (Bensimon, 2000)

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
Prestige Associated With Teaching Responsibilities	**Tenure and Promotion** → Tenure decision that are enhanced by teaching excellence and scholarly teaching (Boyer, 1990; Lieberman, 2004; Smith, 2004) **Policies and Procedures** → A university mission statement that indicates the priority of scholarly teaching (Rice & Austin, 1990)

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
	→ Teaching philosophies of the department, school and institution that are clear, accessible and common knowledge (Johnston, 1997)
	→ Departments that include teaching abilities in the hiring process (Feldman & Paulsen, 1999; Theall & Centra, 2001)
	→ New faculty hiring, orientation and development that emphasizes teaching pedagogy (Feldman & Paulsen, 1999)
	→ Teaching Assistants who are treated like faculty-in-training (Wilkening, 1991)
	→ Faculty permission to take sabbaticals for endeavors related to scholarly teaching (Kreber, 2001)
	→ Genuine articulation of the university emphasis on teaching (Seldin, 1995)
	→ A requirement for Teaching Assistants to be certified to teach on campus (Featherstone & Johnson, 1998)
	Senior Faculty and Administrative Support
	→Senior faculty and administrators who commonly refer to teaching as a form of scholarship (Boyer, 1990)
	→ Scholarly teaching efforts that are publicly recognized and rewarded on campus (Boyer, 1990)
	→ The presence of senior faculty and administrators at teaching related programs (Seldin, 1995)
	→ Senior faculty and administrators who commonly and openly refer to teaching as

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
	a form of scholarship (Nicholls, 2004) ***Training and Development Opportunities*** → A ceremonial Teaching Assistant training program (Marcinovich, 1998; Harper, 2001) → Teaching Fellow opportunities for graduate students and Teaching Assistants (Wuff, et al, 1998)

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
Hiring Procedures for New Faculty that Address Teaching Skills and Expectations	***Policies and Procedures*** → Candidates are given information about the teaching expectations of the job during the hiring process (Hecht, 2003) → Teaching evidence and experience that is required to be a viable candidate for the job (Bensimon, 2000; Rice & Austin, 2000) →Requirements for applicants to submit material during the hiring process that is related to teaching, such as their teaching philosophy, past syllabi or student evaluations (Bensimon, 2000; Rice & Austin, 2000) → Requiring prospective faculty to hold a mock class for current faculty and students (Lucas, 1990)

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
Doctoral Programs that Ready Students for Careers in the Professoriate	***Policies and Procedures*** → Doctoral curriculum that requires teaching pedagogy and views teaching as a priority (Ambrose, 1991; Boice, 1991; Silverman, 1997; Kreber, 2001) → Doctoral curriculum that includes the scholarship of teaching (Nyquist, 1991; Kreber, 2001; Gale & Golde, 2004) → Doctoral students who are taught about the overlap and important connection between teaching and research (Johnston, 1997; Gale and Golde, 2004) → Teaching Assistants who are treated like faculty-in-training (Wilkening, 1991) ***Senior Faculty and Administrative Support*** → Graduate students have the opportunity to engage directly and consistently with faculty in their scholarly teaching work (Austin, 2002; Gale & Golde, 2004) → Doctoral students have a faculty mentor to provide teaching guidance and support (Kreber, 2001; Silverman, 2003; Gale & Golde, 2004) ***Training and Development Opportunities*** → Doctoral students receive on-going career guidance and feedback regarding the various types of institutions and the faculty role in each one (Austin, 2002) → Doctoral students receive on-going guidance and feedback to prepare them for the 'entire experience' of new faculty (Richlin & Essington, 2004)

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
	→ Doctoral students have regular opportunities for interaction with peers and informal social events (Austin, 2002) → Graduate students have demonstrated exceptional work in the scholarship of teaching have the opportunity to serve as mentors for new graduate students (Gale & Golde, 2004) → Doctoral students have the opportunity to engage in Preparing Future Faculty program (Richlin & Essington, 2004) → Assistantships that offer pedagogical training in teaching (Austin, 2002)

Guideline	Supporting Criteria
Mandatory and Comprehensive Training for Teaching Assistants	***Policies and Procedures*** → Teaching Assistants are required to have a campus teaching certification before being permitted to teach (Tice, Featherstone & Johnson, 1998) ***Senior Faculty and Administrative Support*** → TA's have opportunities for formal and informal assessment and feedback (Nyquist & Sprague, 1998) → TA's are rewarded and recognized for exceptional teaching efforts (Ambrose, 1991)

Guideline	Supporting Criteria
	Training and Development Opportunities
	→ Training that addresses the roles and issues faced by faculty (Chism, 1998)
	→ TA training that includes teaching, as well as being observed and apprenticed by faculty mentors (Wilkening, 1991)
	→ Campus wide TA training is available (Marincovich, 1998; Mintz, 1998; Stout, 1998)
	→ Departmental TA training is available (Marincovich, 1998; Mintz, 1998)
	→ Within the department, the availability of both department specific and course specific training (Marincovich, 1998)
	→ Programs train graduate students in the scholarship of teaching (Nyquist, 1991; Gale & Golde, 2004)
	→ TA programs incorporate training in all aspects of the faculty experience (Hiiemae, et al, 1991)
	→ TA's are encouraged to occasionally videotape their classes for self assessment (Mintz, 1998)
	→ Exceptional TA's have the opportunity to serve as mentors for then deal with concerns and training issues of new TA's (Nyquist & Sprague, 1998; Harper, 2001)

Guideline	Supporting Criteria
Comprehensive Orientation Programs for New Faculty	***Policies and Procedures*** → The teaching philosophies of the department, school and institution clear, accessible and common knowledge (Sorcinelli, 1994) → Departmental and campus wide orientation programs exist for new faculty (Bensimon, 2000) → During the orientation, new faculty are provided with specific information regarding what they need to do to be successful in their positions, and to ultimately achieve tenure (Bensimon, 2000) ***Senior Faculty and Administrative Support*** → Orientation for new faculty provides an opportunity for them to meet and interact with others (including senior faculty) and to build relationships (Sorcinelli, 1994) →During the orientation process, new faculty are helped to understand the teaching culture of the department, as well as the institution (Bensimon, 2000) ***Training and Development Opportunities*** → The orientation has follow up events throughout the course of the year (Lucas, 1990)

Guideline	Supporting Criteria
Continuous Opportunities for Personal and Professional Development	**Policies and Procedures** → Team teaching is encouraged (Kreber, 2001 → Assistance for new faculty in finding ways to integrate teaching and research (Gale & Golde, 2004) → There are multiple and on-going opportunities for professional development related to teaching (Seldin, 1990; Gardiner, 1994) → Faculty are involved in the initiation and development of professional development programs (Feldman & Paulsen, 1999; Chopp, Frost & Jean, 2001) → Teaching portfolios are encouraged or required for new faculty (Urbach, 1992; Hutchings, 1998; Wright, 1999) → Teaching portfolios are required within the department for graduate students (Hutchings, 1998) **Senior Faculty and Administrative Support** → Senior administrators support faculty involvement in professional development activities related to teaching (Seldin, 1990) → Departmental or university funds are available for new faculty who are interested in pursuing professional development (Lieberman, 2004) → Teaching mentors are assigned to each new faculty member (Boice, 1992; Skinner & Welch, 1996; Bensimon, 2000)

Guideline	Supporting Criteria
	→ Department chairs serve as "unofficial" mentors to new faculty (Hecht, 2003)
	Training and Development Opportunities
	→Formal opportunities for faculty to receive feedback and guidance related to teaching (Schwartz, 1999; Feldman & Paulsen, 1999; Sorcinelli, 2002)
	→ Faculty Learning Communities exist on campus, and faculty are encouraged to participate (Cox, 2004)
	→ There is a Preparing Future Faculty program on campus for graduate students (Sorcinelli, 2002; Richlin & Essington, 2004)
	→ Professional development opportunities are offered that focus on 'educational theory' (Kreber, 2001)

Rewards and Recognition for Teaching	**_Tenure and Promotion_**
	→Tenure decisions that are affected by teaching excellence and scholarly teaching (Boyer, 1990; Lieberman, 2004; Smith, 2004)
	→Teaching factors into promotion and salary decisions (Greene, 1990; Feldman & Paulsen, 1999; Diamond, 2002)
	→ Department chairs define teaching reward structures for new faculty and provide incentives (Austin & Rice, 1990)
	Policies and Procedures
	→ Exceptional teaching faculty are rewarded with autonomy in their teaching (Wergin, 2001)
	Senior Faculty and Administrative Support
	→Informal departmental and institutional validation for scholarly teaching (Austin & Rice, 1990; Johnston, 1997; Wergin, 2001)
	→ Senior faculty and administrators have personal conversations with faculty to congratulate them on their scholarly teaching (Lucas, 1990)

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
A Strong Sense of Faculty Community	**_Policies and Procedures_**
	→ Peer review of teaching is valued and encouraged (Theall & Centra, 2001)
	→ Department chairs work to help new faculty assimilate to the teaching culture (Feldman & Paulsen, 1999)

Guidelines	Supporting Criteria
	→ New faculty are provided with opportunities to gather with other new faculty to address common concerns regarding tenure, stress, teaching loads, research expectations, student issues, etc. (Theall & Centra, 2001; Sorcinelli, 2002) → Team teaching is encouraged on campus (Kreber, 2001) ***Senior Faculty and Administrative Support*** → Frequent, informal opportunities for faculty get-togethers, with senior faculty often in attendance (Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992; Feldman & Paulsen, 1999) → Teaching mentors are assigned to each new faculty member (Boyle & Boice, 1998; Theall & Centra, 2001; Sorcinelli, 2002) → Senior level faculty and administrators attend departmental and campus-wide faculty functions (Seldin, 1995) ***Training and Development Opportunities*** → Faculty Learning Communities exist on campus, and new faculty are encouraged to participate (Cox, 2004)

APPENDIX C

Dear _____,

Thank you so much for agreeing to take the time to review the product of my dissertation study. Rather than send you 60+ pages of the literature related to the support and development of the guidelines, I thought it would be easier to send you just the guidelines and supporting criteria that synthesizes the information. If at any time you would like additional information, such as the related chapter/literature review or the Table of Contents for the dissertation, just let me know and I will be happy to send it to you immediately.

To provide you with a frame of reference for the basis of my work, the following is the abstract for the study:

Abstract: *New and prospective faculty often enter the professoriate with less than adequate preparation for the many roles and expectations that they will face, particularly in regard to teaching requirements. In spite of the fact that teaching responsibilities consume large amounts of new faculty time, they frequently are not emphasized in the doctoral preparation experience, nor in the orientation process. Slowly, institutions are starting to move toward the realization that teaching is a scholarly endeavor, similar to skills involved in research. As a result, many campuses have initiated programs, activities and practices to help new and prospective faculty enhance their teaching abilities and, most recently, to promote teaching as a scholarly practice. It is the obligation of the institution to foster an environment that encourages faculty to address both their teaching and research obligations as scholarly priorities, equally important to the potential for professorial advancement. Most prospective and new faculty do not understand the importance of the teaching culture of an institution, nor how to go about assessing that culture to determine the level and nature of support offered for teaching. New faculty need to evaluate the institutional fit between their own teaching and research priorities and those of the institution. In addition, those who enter graduate school with the ambition of one day entering the professoriate would be wise to understand the nature of their institution's teaching culture, as it will directly affect the level and amount of training that the graduate students receive as future instructors. The product of this document will be a set of guidelines and related supporting criteria that will help new and prospective faculty assess the teaching culture of a research institution based on specific factors, as well as indicators of each factor.*

In addition to the Guidelines and Supporting Criteria, I have attached a review form for you to use as you evaluate each of the guidelines. Specifically, I am interested to know if you feel that any of the guidelines should be added or deleted, and also, for the existing guidelines, if there is any additional research that you think would add credibility.

The comments that I receive from you and the other reviewers will provide me with the information for the final chapter of my dissertation. Your comments will be kept anonymous and confidential, although I would like to acknowledge you (by name) as a reviewer of my work. If this is acceptable to you, please indicate as such on the feedback form in the space provided.

As my final defense is planned for March, it would be very helpful to me if I could receive your comments by the end of February. I can be reached at mch11@pitt.edu, or you can call me at 412-299-6845.

Again, thank you so much for your time and thoughts on this project.

Sincerely,

Mary Hoover

Reviewer's Name: _____

Position: _____

Date of Review: _____

Please review each of the indicators and for each, specify whether or not:

a) you accept the guideline as it is written
b) you think changes should be made to the guideline
c) you think the guideline should be omitted

If changes are necessary, please specify them in the space provided after each indicator.

1. Demonstrated consideration of teaching as a scholarly activity

___ *No changes needed*   ___ *Omit this guideline*   ___ *The following revisions are*

recommended:

2. Senior level support for teaching

___ *No changes needed*   ___ *Omit this guideline*   ___ *The following revisions are*

recommended:

3. Prestige associated with teaching responsibilities;

___ *No changes needed*   ___ *Omit this guideline*   ___ *The following revisions are*

recommended:

4. Hiring procedures for new faculty that address teaching skills and expectations;

___ *No changes needed*   ___ *Omit this guideline*   ___ *The following revisions are*

recommended:

5. Doctoral programs that ready students for careers in the professoriate;

___ *No changes needed*   ___ *Omit this guideline*   ___ *The following revisions are*

recommended:

6. Mandatory, continuous and inclusive training for Teaching Assistants;

___ *No changes needed*   ___ *Omit this guideline*   ___ *The following revisions are*

recommended:

7. Comprehensive and on-going orientation programs for new faculty;

___ *No changes needed*   ___ *Omit this guideline*   ___ *The following revisions are*

recommended:

8. Continued opportunities for personal and professional development;

___ *No changes needed*   ___ *Omit this guideline*   ___ *The following revisions are*

recommended:

9. Rewards and recognition for teaching;

___ No changes needed   ___ Omit this guideline   ___ The following revisions are

recommended:

10. A strong sense of faculty community.

___ No changes needed   ___ Omit this guideline   ___ The following revisions are

recommended:

Do you feel that any guidelines should be added to this list? If so, please specify.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

_____
_____
_____

While your specific comments will be kept anonymous, I would like to refer to you (by name) in the dissertation as being a reviewer of my work. If this is acceptable to you, please indicate as such by signing your name here:	
_____ _____	
Your Name **Position** **Date**	

Your comments are greatly appreciated. Please return this form to either mch11@pitt.edu or Mary Hoover, 207 Westbury Drive, Moon Township, PA 15108.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, K. (2002). What Colleges and Universities Want in New Faculty. *Publication of the Association of American Colleges & Universities*, p. 1-17.

Altbach, P. and Finkelstein, M. (1997). The *Academic Profession: The Professoriate In Crisis*. Garland Publishing, Inc. New York & London.

Ambrose, S. (1991). From graduate student to faculty member: teaching Ph.D. candidates To teaching. In Nyquist, et al., Preparing the Professoriate of Tomorrow to Teaching (157-168). Kendall/Hunt Publishing.

Ambrose, S. (1995). Fitting programs to institutional cultures: the founding and evolution of the University Teaching Center. In Seldin, P., *Improving College Teaching* (77-89). Anker Publishing Company, Inc. Boston, MA.

Amey, M. (1999). Faculty Culture and College Life: Reshaping Incentives Toward Student Outcomes. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 105, 59-69.

Austin, A. (1992). Supporting junior faculty through a teaching fellows program. *New Directions For Teaching and Learning, 50*, 73-86.

Austin, A. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *Journal of Higher Education*, 73 (1), . 94-120.

Bartlett, T. (2002, March). The unkindest cut: the struggle to save a teaching and learning center. [Electronic version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A10.

Baxter, M. & Terenzini, P. Learning and teaching in the 21st century: trends and implications for practice [Electronic version]. *Journal of College Student Development*, 2-16.

Becker and Andrews (2004). *The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education.* Indiana University Press.

Bensimon, E., Ward, K.& Sanders, K. (2000). The department chair's role in developing new faculty into teachers and scholars. Anker Publishing Company.

Boice, Robert (1991). New faculty as teachers. *Th*e *Journal of Higher Education*, 62(2), 150-173.

Boice, Robert (1992). Mentors: citation needed…

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: priorities of the professoriate*. Jossey-Bass.

Boyle, P. & Boice, B. (1998). Systematic mentoring for new faculty and graduate teaching assistants. *Innovative Higher Education*, *22*(3), 157-179.

Camblin, L. & Steger, J. (2000). Rethinking faculty development. *Higher Education*, *39*, 1-18.

Cambridge, B. (2004). Campus progress: Supporting the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. American Association of Higher Education.

Centra, J. (1978). Types of faculty development programs. *Journal of Higher Education*, *49*(2), 151-162.

Chism, N. (1998). Preparing graduate students to teach: Past, Present, and Future. In Marinovich, M. (et al), *The Professional Development of Graduate Teaching Assistants*, 1-17, Anker Publishing Company, Inc., Boston, MA.

Chopp, R; Frost, S; Jean, P. (2001). What's old is new again. *Change*, 33(6), 43-52.

Cox, M. (2004). Introduction to faculty learning communities. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 97, 5-22.

Cox, M. (n.d.). Achieving Teaching and Learning Excellence Through Faculty Learning Communities [Electronic version], Retrieved December 1, 2005 from http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/teachlearn/essays/vol_14/excellence.html

Diamond, R. (1999). *Aligning faculty rewards with institutional mission: statements policies, and guidelines*. Anker Publishing Company, Inc. Bolton, Massachusetts.

Diamond, R. (2002). Defining scholarship for the twenty-first century. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 90*, 73-79.

Eleser, C. & Chauvin, S. (1998). Professional development how to's: strategies for surveying faculty preferences [Electronic version]. *Innovative Higher Education*, *22*(3).

Feldhusen, J; Ball, D; Wood, B; Dixon, F; & Larkin, L. (1998). A university course on college teaching. *College Teaching*, *46*(2), 72-81.

Feldman, K. & Paulsen, M. (1997). *Taking teaching seriously: Meeting the challenge of instructional improvement*. ERIC Digest.

Feldman, K. & Paulsen, M. (1999). Faculty motivation: the role of a supportive teaching culture. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *78*, 71-78.

Fink, L. (1992). Orientation programs for new faculty. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 50*, 39-49.

Finkelstein, M. College Faculty as Teachers, in the *NEA 1995 Almanac of Higher Education*, National Education Association, p. 35-42.

Gaff, J.(1973). Making a difference: the impacts of faculty. *Journal of Higher Education 44*(8), 605-622.

Gaff, J. (1975). *Toward faculty renewal*. Jossey-Bass.

Gaff, J. (2002). Preparing Future Faculty and Doctoral Education. *Change*, 34 (6), p. 63-70.

Gaff, J. et al. (2003). *Preparing Future Faculty in the Humanities and Social Sciences*. Council of Graduate Schools.

Gale, R. and Golde, C. (2004). Doctoral Education and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. *Peer Review*, v6 (i3), p. 6-14.

Gardiner, L. (1994) *Redesigning higher education: producing dramatic gains in student learning*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report.

Glassick, C.E., Huber, M.T., and Maeroff, G.I. *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997.

Green, M. (1990). Why Good Teaching Needs Active Leadership. In Seldin, P., *How Administrators Can Improve Teaching, 45-62,* Jossey-Bass.

Harper, S. (2001). Preparing a teaching professoriate: Emphasizing the Scholarship of Teaching to Graduate Students. *Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association*, 61-71.

Hecht, Irene W.D., Senior Associate, American Council on Education. "Faculty Development: The Role of the Chair in Developing Tenure-eligible and Tenured Faculty." Written specifically for the ACE Department Chair Online Resource Center, 2003.

Hiiemae, K.; Lambert, L.; Hayes, D. How to establish and run a comprehensive teaching assistant training program. In Nyquist, et.al. *Preparing the Professoriate of Tomorrow to Teach*, p. 123-134, Kendall/Hunt Publishing.

Hutchings, P. (1998). Teaching portfolios as a tool for TA development. In Marinovich, M. (et al), *The Professional Development of Graduate Teaching Assistants*, 235-248, Anker Publishing Company, Inc., Boston, MA.

Hutchings, P. *Opening Lines: Approaches to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. Carnegie Publishers, 2000.

Johnston, S. (1997). Preparation for the role of teacher as part of induction into faculty life and work. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *72*, 31-39

Jones, C. (1991). Campus –wide and departmental orientations: the best of both worls. In Nyquist, et.al. *Preparing the Professoriate of Tomorrow to Teach*, p. 135-141, Kendall/Hunt Publishing.

Kemp, P. & O'Keefe, R. (2003). Improving teaching effectiveness: some examples from a program for the enhancement of teaching [Electronic version]. *College Teaching*, *51*(3).

Kreber, C. (2000). How university teaching award winners conceptualize academic work: some further thoughts on the meaning of scholarship. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *5*(1), pg. 62-78.

Kreber,. C. (2001). The scholarship of teaching and its implementation in faculty development and graduate education. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 86, pg. 79-88.

Kreber, Carolin,(2002).Teaching excellence, teaching expertise, and the scholarship of teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, 27(1), pg. 5-18.

Kreber, C. (2003). Challenging the dogma: Towards a more inclusive view of the scholarship of teaching. *Journal of Excellence in College Teaching*, 14 (2/3), 27-43.

Kreber, C. (2001). Observations, reflections and speculations: What we have learned about the scholarship of teaching and where it might lead. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 86, 99-104.

Kugel, P. (1993). How professors develop as teachers. *Studies in Higher Education*, *18*(3*),* 1-13.

Lacey, P. (1990). Let's not perpetuate our mistakes of the past as we prepare a new professorial generation [Electronic version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

Landers, D. (2003). Preparing future faculty. *Quest*, 55, 1-3

Lieberman, D. (2004). Collaborating for Change. In: Cambridge, B., *Campus Progress, 55-61, The American Association for Higher Education.*

Lucas, A (1990). The department chair as change agent. In Seldin, P., *How Administrators Can Improve Teaching*, 63-87, Jossey-Bass.

Marincovich, M. (1998). Teaching teaching: The importance of courses on teaching in TA training programs. In Marinovich, M. (et al), *The Professional Development of Graduate Teaching Assistants*, 145-162, Anker Publishing Company, Inc., Boston, MA.

Marincovich, M.; Prostko, J.; & Stout, F. (1998). *The Professional Development of Graduate Teaching Assistants*, Anker Publishing Company, Inc., Boston, MA.

McCabe, R. & Jenrette, M. (1990). Leadership in Action: A Campuswide Effort to Strengthen Teaching. In Seldin, P., *How Administrators Can Improve Teaching*, 181-198, Jossey-Bass.

Mintz, J. (1998). The role of centralized programs in preparing graduate students to teach. In Marinovich, M. (et al), *The Professional Development of Graduate Teaching Assistants*, 19-39, Anker Publishing Company, Inc., Boston, MA.

Monahan,P. (1989). Officials Deplore the Lack of Training for TAs, Ponder How to Improve It [Electronic version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Musil, C. (1997). Faculty Development: Shaking Foundations/Renewing Minds. www.diversityweb.org.

Nicholls, G. (2004). Scholarship in teaching as a core professional value: what does this mean to the academic? *Teaching in Higher Education, 9*(1), p. 29-42).

Nyquist, J.; Abbott, R.; Wulff, D; & Sprague, J. (1991). *Preparing the Professoriate of Tomorrow to Teach.* Kendall/Hunt Publishers.

Nyquist, J; Manning, L.; Wulff, D.; Austin, A.; Sprague, J.; Fraser, P.; Calcagno, C.; & Woodford, B(1999). On the road to becoming a professor: the graduate student experience. *Change, 31*(3), 1-19.

Nyquist, J; & Sprague, J. (1998). Thinking developmentally about TAs. In: Marincovich, M.; Prostko, J.; Stout, F. *The Professional Development of Graduate Teaching Assistants*, p. 61-89, Anker Publishing Company.

Olsen, D. & Sorcinelli, M. (1992). The Pretenure Years: A Longitudinal Perspective. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* 50, p. 15-25.

Palmer, P. (1998). *The Courage to Teach*. Jossey-Bass.

Paulsen, M. & Feldman, K. (1997). *Taking teaching seriously: meeting the challenge of instructional improvement.* [Electronic version] Eric Digest.

169

Rice, R. (2002). Beyond *Scholarship Reconsidered*: Toward an enlarged vision of the scholarly work of faculty members. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 90, p. 7-17.

Rice, R. & Austin, A. (1990). Organizational impacts on Faculty Morale and motivation To teach. In Seldin, P., *How Administrators Can Improve Teaching*, 23-42, Jossey Bass.

Richlin, L. (2001). Scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 86*, 57-68.

Richlin, L. & Cox, M. (2004). Developing scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning through faculty learning communities. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 97, 127-135.

Richlin, L. & Essington, A. (2004). Faculty learning communities for preparing future faculty. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 97, 149-157.

Ronkowski, S. (1998). The disciplinary/departmental context of TA training.. In Marinovich, M. (et al), *The Professional Development of Graduate Teaching Assistants*, 41-60, Anker Publishing Company, Inc., Boston, MA.

Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American College & University: A History.* The University of Georgia Press, Athens & London.

Savage, H.; Karp, R; & Logue, R. Faculty Mentorship at Colleges and Universities. *College Teaching*, 52(1), 21-24.

Schwartz, Charles. (1992). Is good teaching rewarded at Berkeley? *College Teaching, 40*(1), 1-5.

Seldin, P. (1990). *How Administrators Can Improve Teaching*. Jossey-Bass.

Seldin, P. (1995). *Improving College Teaching*. Anker Publishing Company, Inc. Boston, MA.

Seldin, P. (1997). The Teaching Portfolio: *A Practical Guide to Improved Performance and Promotion/Tenure Decisions.* Anker Publishing Company.

Serow, R. (2000). Research and teaching at a research university. *Higher Education*, *40*, 449-463.

Serow, R.; Van Dyk, P.; McComb, E.; & Harrold, A. (2002). *Innovative Higher Education, 27*(1), 25-37.

Sheridan, J. A proactive approach to graduate teaching assistants in the research university: one graduate dean's perspective. In Nyquist, et.al. *Preparing the Professoriate of Tomorrow to Teach*, p. 24-28, Kendall/Hunt Publishing.

Shulman, L. (2000). Inventing the Future. In Hutchings, P. *Opening Lines: Approaches to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning,* 95-105, Carnegie Publications.

Silverman, S. (2003). The role of teaching in the preparation of future of faculty. *Quest, 55,* 72-81.

Singer, S. (2002). Learning and teaching centers: hubs of educational reform. *New Directions for Higher Education, 119*, 59-64.

Skinner, M. & Welch, F. (1996). Peer coaching for better teaching. *College Teaching*, 44 (4), 153-160.

Smith, D. (2004). Mapping progres. In Cambridge, B., *Campus Progress: Supporting the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning,* 147-154, American Association for Higher Education.

Sorcinelli, M. (1992). New and junior faculty stress: Research and responses. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 50,* 27-37.

Sorcinelli, M. (1994). Effective approaches to new faculty development. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 72* (5), 474-480.

Sorcinelli, M. (2002). New conceptions of scholarship for a new generation of faculty members. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 90, p. 41-48.

Stanley, Christine A. (2001).The faculty development portfolio: a framework for documenting the professional development of faculty developers. *Innovative Higher Education, 26*(1), 23-26.

Stout, F. (1998). Getting started with TA training on your campus. In Marinovich, M. (et al), *The Professional Development of Graduate Teaching Assistants*, 121-143, Anker Publishing Company, Inc., Boston, MA.

Tang, L. & Chamberlain, M. (2003). Effects of rank, tenure, length of service, and institution on faculty attitudes toward research and teaching: the case of regional state universities. *Journal of Education for Business*, Nov/Dec. pp. 103-110.

Theall, M. & Centra, J. (2001). Assessing the scholarship of teaching: valid decisions from valid evidence. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 86, 31-43.

Tice, S., Featherstone, P., Johnson, H. (1998). TA certificate programs. In Marinovich, M. (et al), *The Professional Development of Graduate Teaching*

Assistants, 263-274, Anker Publishing Company, Inc., Boston, MA.

Trigwell, K., Martin, E., Benjamin, J., & Prosser, M. (2000). Scholarship of Teaching: A Model. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 19 (2), 155-168.

Urbach, F. (1992). Developing a teaching portfolio. *College Teaching*, 40 (2), 71-75.

Ward, K. (2003). Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*. *29* (5), 17-51.

Wergin, J. (2001). Beyond carrots and sticks. *Liberal Education*, 87 (1), p. 50-54.

Wessells, N. (1994). Using job mobility to reward good teaching [Electronic version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Wheeler, D. (1992). The role of the chairperson in support of junior faculty. *New Directions For Teaching and Learning, 50*, 87-96.

Wilkening, L. (1991). Teaching Assistants: Training for the Professoriate. In Nyquist, et.al. *Preparing the Professoriate of Tomorrow to Teach*, 12-16, Kendall/Hunt Publishing.

Wolverton, M. (1998). Treading the tenure-track tightrope: finding balance between research excellence and quality teaching. *Innovative Higher Education, 22* (1), 61-79.

Wright, W., Knight, P. & Pomerleau, N. (1999). Portfolio people: Teaching and learning dossiers and innovation in higher education. *Innovative Higher Education*, 24(2), 89-103.

Wulff, D., Nyquist, J., Abbott, R. (1991). Developing a TA training program that reflects the culture of the institution: TA training at the University of Washington. In Nyquist, et.al. *Preparing the Professoriate of Tomorrow to Teach*, 114-130, Kendall/Hunt Publishing.

Zahorski, K. (2002). Nurturing scholarship through holistic faculty development: a synergistic

approach. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 90, 29-37.