

# Report of the Second Task Force on the Quality of Teaching

## To the University Community

It is apparent that the general level of teaching quality on this campus is high. There is always, however, room for improvement. The President, the Deputy Provost and I thank the Task Force for its hard work and its commitment to that improvement, and we will welcome the comments of others on this report.

—Thomas Ehrlich, Provost

## Table of Contents

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| I. Introduction   | I   |
| II. Report of the [First] Task Force on the Quality of Teaching (1981)  | I   |
| 1. The University's Dedication to Improving the Quality of Teaching   | II  |
| 2. Incentives for Improving the Quality of Teaching   | II  |
| 3. Evaluation of the Quality of Teaching  | II  |
| 4. Techniques for Improving the Quality of Teaching   | II  |
| 5. Conclusion   | II  |
| Appendix I. Teaching Awards Currently Offered at the University   | III |
| University-wide Awards  | III |
| School Awards   | III |
| Appendix II. Suggestions for Student Evaluation of Teaching   | III |
| Model Student Evaluation Form   | III |
| Appendix III. Mechanisms for In-class Peer Review   | III |
| Appendix IV. Bibliography: Advice and Research on Teaching  | III |
| III. Responses in 1985 from the Schools to the Report of the First Task Force (1981) Sections 1 to 4 and Appendix II            | IV  |
| A. Summary of Responses   | IV  |
| B. Summary of Responses to Appendix II: Suggestions for Student Evaluation of Teaching  | IV  |
| C. Detailed Responses from the President and Provost and from the Deans (and/or their Deputies) of each school. Sections 1 to 4 | IV  |
| D. Additional Comments of Respondents   | IX  |
| E. Summary of Responses to the First Task Force   | X   |
| IV. Suggested form for appraisal of conduct and/or misconduct of Instructor   | XI  |
| V. Additional Considerations by the Second Task Force   | XII |
| 1. Is there a perception that teaching has improved?  | XII |
| 2. What extra is being done and needs to be done?   | XII |
| 3. The need for a Centralized Teaching Institute  | XII |

## I. Introduction

This Second Task Force was appointed in May 1984 by Provost Ehrlich and Deputy Provost Clelland. It was charged "to review the report of the First Task Force on the Quality of Teaching. That report is identical with the preliminary version published in *Almanac* on April 14, 1981. The Task Force would then study the extent to which the recommendations of that report have been implemented and identify to the central administration any areas in which further effort is needed. The concern is that teaching in all programs at this University should be of excellent quality."

The 1981 report of the Task Force on the Quality of Teaching provided the following brief definition of excellent teaching, "Definitions of the outstanding teacher will, necessarily, be different in different fields and settings. Nonetheless, the qualities of intellectual rigor, coherence, impact, and a strong commitment to the learner and the process of learning itself seem to characterize excellent teaching in general." This Task Force finds that definition of excellent teaching to be a useful one that could continue to serve as a guide to the University's efforts. The Task Force, however, notes that in any field or setting, excellent teaching makes a significant contribution to helping students learn better how to learn.

The Task Force reviewed the extensive correspondence between Deputy Provost Clelland and the Deans during 1982-84 concerning teaching. We also interviewed the President and the Provost who asked us to consider the effect of various forms of discrimination and harassment in the teaching situation and to make recommendations. The Task Force also interviewed Ms. Barbara Hoekje of the English Program for Foreign Students, and Dr. Charles E. Dwyer and Dr. Susan L. Lytle of the Graduate School of Education. Subcommittees of the Task Force were appointed for every School and they interviewed the Deans (and/or their Deputies). This report and its appendices record the results of these reviews and interviews. It is clear that there has been significant attention to teaching in all Schools of the University and that most of these have made major efforts to implement the recommendations of the first Task Force on the Quality of Teaching. There is of course much room for improvement. We recommend that the President, Provost, Deans, and the Chairs of departments continue to stress the importance of excellent teaching and urge the continued implementation of the specific recommendations of the First and Second Task Forces on the Quality of Teaching. We recommend that this and the previous report be widely distributed.

A slightly modified version of the previous report is as follows:

## II. Report of the [First] Task Force on the Quality of Teaching(1981)

This Task Force was appointed in September 1980 by Associate Provost Benjamin S.P. Shen and charged to "take a careful look at the quality of undergraduate, graduate, and professional-school teaching at Pennsylvania and to recommend . . . concrete and realistic steps to be taken in order to improve the quality of teaching throughout the campus if it is found wanting."

To that end, we have met on numerous occasions and have twice solicited the written views of faculty and students. We have held an open forum to receive oral testimony from members of the University community, and we have interviewed or received detailed reported from the Deans (and often other administrators) of all our schools. Individual letters were sent to all Lindback winners, most of whom replied. We have also obtained information from other universities.\*

It is clear that students believe that there are many excellent teachers at this University.\*\* It is also clear that many schools care more about excellent teaching than we had expected. Nonetheless, despite these and other positive findings, there is much that remains to be done to achieve the goal, widely shared by students and faculty, of a university community thoroughly dedicated to teaching.

Definitions of the outstanding teacher will, necessarily, be different in different fields and settings. Nonetheless, the qualities of intellectual rigor, coherence, impact, and a strong commitment to the learner and the process of

universities. They are all available to members of the University community.

\*\*For example, the mean rating for instructors primarily of undergraduate courses in FAS, CGS, and Nursing, as compiled by the SCUE Course Guide for Fall 1980 was 3.1 with standard deviation (S.D.)  $\pm 0.56$ . The range was 0.5 to 4.0 where 0 was the lowest rating, 2 was defined as an average performance, and 4 was the highest possible rating. This average rating was based on 800 courses and over 13,000 responses. The mean rating for the instructors' enthusiasm and interest in teaching was 3.25 with S.D.  $\pm 0.69$ , the highest mean for all questions asked. However, the mean overall rating for recitation lab leaders was only 1.0 with S.D.  $\pm 0.31$ . Although such quantitative information is not available for all schools our perception is that the average quality of teaching is high, has improved during recent years, but still leaves much room for improvement, particularly amongst our poorer teachers.

\*The files of the Task Force on the Quality of Teaching are being kept in the Provost's Office and contain letters from the Lindback awardees and the Deans, evaluation forms from many departments and information from many other

learning itself seem to characterize excellent teaching in general. While no simple plan will guarantee an increase in the number of truly outstanding teachers, on this or any other campus, the University can and should make every effort to create an environment which more fully values and encourages teaching of the highest quality.

With this perspective in mind, the Task Force offers a set of specific recommendations:

## 1. The University's Dedication to Improving the Quality of Teaching

**1.1** The President and Provost should [continue to] make public statements reaffirming the centrality of a high level of teaching quality at the University of Pennsylvania.

**1.2** The President and Provost should [continue to] urge the Deans regularly to incorporate questions relating to teaching into the agenda of faculty meetings. In turn, Deans should encourage departments and graduate groups periodically to address issues of teaching.

**1.3** Policies, issues, and news related to teaching should be well publicized and discussed. The President and Provost should [continue to] encourage *Almanac* and other campus publications to report on successful innovative teaching efforts, so that there is an active exchange of ideas and more thought given to teaching by everyone.

## 2. Incentives for Improving the Quality of Teaching

**2.1** The President, Provost [Deans and Department Chairs] should ensure that good teaching be rewarded by merit salary increases. When put into practice this recommendation would reinforce the importance of teaching for all faculty members, especially those who already have tenure.

**2.2** The appointment and reappointment of graduate students to teaching fellowships should be based on teaching performance and dedication as well as on academic achievement.

**2.3** Because significant achievement in research is a prime consideration for both appointment and promotion within the University, in *extremely rare instances* the University can appoint the truly exceptional researcher whose teaching effectiveness is limited. Nonetheless, the President and Provost should insist that the high standards set in the 1979 Handbook for Faculty and Administration (p.34) be met:

The over-riding objective of the faculty appointment and promotion policy and procedures should be the recruitment and retention of a distinguished faculty. While the means to this end may vary, particularly in some of the professional schools, generally the objective will be met by stressing intellectual leadership as the chief criterion. Accordingly, a high degree of excellence is expected in both research and teaching. The relative weight given to research and teaching varies from case to case and should be determined by the individual faculties, but always with significant achievements in research as a prime consideration. An acceptable standard of teaching competence should be required even of those outstanding in research if they are to be assigned teaching responsibilities. An acceptable standard of competence in research should be required even of outstanding teachers, and at a research institution such as the University of Pennsylvania an acceptable standard in research is very high indeed. (Emphasis added).

**2.4** Although excellent teaching is not merely dependent upon classroom conditions, the morale of students and faculty would be enhanced if our facilities were improved. Currently, many of our classrooms are in a depressing state. The President and Provost should therefore set aside a fraction of the annual capital budget of the University for classroom improvements, a much neglected item. In addition, the University's considerable internal resources (e.g., students and faculty from the Graduate School of Fine Arts and the School of Engineering and Applied Science) should be mobilized to contribute to refurbishing the teaching environment of the campus.

**2.5** The Lindback Award is the University's principal means for recognizing excellence in teaching. The prominence of the award could be enhanced. There should be a Lindback Lecture each semester—the speaker to be a winner of the award—introduced by the President or Provost. The visibility of the award could be increased in a variety of ways: by the creation of a gallery including photographs, brief biographies, and statements on teaching by recipients; by having the President confer the awards at a formal public ceremony; by a listing of recent recipients in each edition of the various course catalogues. Other steps to increase publicity for the Lindback Awards should be developed.

**2.6** Those schools which do not have their own teaching awards for faculty should be encouraged to establish them. (Appendix I includes a list of teaching awards currently offered at the University of Pennsylvania.)

**2.7** Each year the Faculty of Arts and Sciences confers a dozen or so Dean's Awards for Distinguished Teaching by Graduate Students. Similar awards should be established in other schools in which graduate students teach.

**2.8** Financial support should be made available for faculty members who undertake the development of special innovative courses or instructional programs. This support could take the form of either sabbatical leave or a Presidential Fellowship which would provide a summer stipend.

## 3. Evaluation of the Quality of Teaching

**3.1** The President and Provost should [continue to] reaffirm the necessity of systematic and comprehensive programs of student evaluation of teaching. (Appendix II includes a set of suggestions that might govern such evaluation, along with an illustrative form.)

**3.2** In-class peer review by departmental colleagues is traditional, routine, and widely considered valuable in several of the University's schools; for example, the Medical, Dental, Veterinary, and Nursing Schools. The President and Provost should urge all Deans to consider a program of in-class peer review. (Appendix III includes a few mechanisms for in-class peer review).

## 4. Techniques for Improving the Quality of Teaching

**4.1** The President and Provost should designate and establish at least one, possibly two or three, offices as locations where professors and teaching assistants might both request that their classroom performance be videotaped and review those videotapes. Equipment already exists in many places in the University for videotaping instruction. Some of this equipment could be made generally available for this purpose. Trained professionals already exist within the University and their services should be available for analysis of the videotapes. In addition, at least one of these locations might contain a variety of supplementary materials, including files of descriptions of innovative courses, bibliographies, and a small library of books on teaching. (Appendix IV includes a bibliography.)

**4.2** Faculty should be encouraged to organize informal seminars on a variety of issues related to teaching.

**4.3** The following recommendation of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences' Committee on Graduate Education should be implemented throughout the University: "*Departments which do not now do so should be encouraged to provide training [in teaching] for their graduate teaching fellows.*" In its explanation, the Committee went on to note: "Those graduate groups whose primary mission is the preparation of college teachers . . . should systematically address preparation for college teaching."<sup>8</sup> Among the vehicles that might be used for training teaching fellows and graduate students in general to be better teachers, as well as to prepare them for their future careers, would be credit courses, non-credit workshops, and courses that incorporate experience in and advice on teaching as part of their normal operation. Some of these could be required when appropriate.

## Conclusion

When he presented our charge, Associate Provost Benjamin Shen provided his conception of what Pennsylvania ought to be: "... there is no reason why the University of Pennsylvania should not be the rare and doubly attractive research-oriented university where dedication to both teaching and research is held in high esteem . . . We owe it to our students and, in a decade full of fiscal perils, also owe it to our University to go after just such a deserving goal." In this statement, we believe Professor Shen expressed the view of the overwhelming majority of the University's faculty and students. Our proposals are submitted in the conviction that they will be a means to that end.

<sup>8</sup>Graduate Education at the University of Pennsylvania, FAS Committee on Graduate Education, 1980, p.12.

## Task Force on the Quality of Teaching

Richard C. Clelland

Peter Conn

Robert E. Davies, Chair

Mary Ellen Gallick, Chair

Subcommittee on Evaluation

Ira Harkavy

John N. Hobstetter

Bruce Johnson, Chair

Subcommittee on Incentives

Virginia Kerr

Abba M. Krieger

Joseph Masessa

James M. Larkin, Chair

Subcommittee on Technique

Alan E. Mann

Stephen Marmon

Leonard D. Miller

Nadine O'Connor

Charles Rich

Walter D. Wales

Rosalyn J. Watts

Ex-officio:

Donald C. Carroll

Robert H. Dyson, Jr.

Janis I. Somerville



## Appendices

### Appendix I. Teaching Awards Currently Offered at the University of Pennsylvania University-wide Awards

Lindback Awards are given to four faculty members each in the health and non-health areas. The awardees each receive a lump sum of \$500 and may attend the Lindback Society Dinner each year thereafter. No one may receive the award more than once.

#### School Awards

1. The Wharton School offers the Anvil Award to an outstanding junior faculty member for excellence in teaching. The winner is chosen by the students, speaks at graduation, and receives \$500. In addition a Dean's Award to non-tenured instructors carries a \$500 prize.

2. In the Dental School, the Earl Banks Hoyt Award is given for excellence in teaching to a full-time junior faculty member. The awardees receive \$1,000 and have their names placed on a plaque. In addition, the Dean sends out a certificate of Appreciation for Valued and Dedicated Teaching to other outstanding faculty members.

3. In the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the Dean's Award for Distinguished Teaching by Graduate Students carries a \$250 prize and is given to approximately ten teaching fellows. In addition, some individual departments (such as mathematics) offer their own awards.

4. The Law School offers the Harvey Levin Memorial Award for Teaching Excellence. This award gives money to the Biddle law Library for books, and the awardee's name is put on a plate on each book purchased.

5. In the Engineering School, the S. Reid Warren Award for Distinguished Teaching is chosen by alumni and undergraduate students. The award carries a \$100 prize, a certificate, and a nameplate on a plaque.

6. The Veterinary School's Norden Distinguished Teaching Award offers an honorarium of \$500 and a nameplate on a plaque.

7. The recipients of the Medical Student Government Award are decided by the graduating class on the basis of teaching excellent. The winners are then guest speakers at the Senior Dinner.

### Appendix II. Suggestions for Student Evaluation of Teaching

The suggested program of student evaluation of teaching consists of three parts:

1. Evaluation of a specific instructor and course at the end of the period in which the course is taught. This would be similar to the procedure presently used in the SCUE Course Guide and Wharton evaluations, but may vary with the conditions in each school.

2. Evaluation of instructors by each year's graduating class. This proposed mechanism would allow graduates to choose from their past instructors those for whom they would complete evaluation forms containing a few general comment-provoking questions. A copy of each evaluation would be sent to the instructor, to the instructor's department, and to his or her school office.

3. Evaluation of a specific instructor by recent graduates.

#### Model Student Evaluation Form\*

1. How clearly has the instructor indicated his or her objectives?

2. How well do the daily assignments, examinations, class or clinic activities contribute toward the accomplishment of the objectives?

3. To what extent have you attained the goals defined by the instructor?

4. How good is the feedback you have received from the instructor regarding your work?

5. To what extent has the instructor shown a willingness to help you learn aside from formal class or clinic time?

6. To what extent does the instructor concentrate on the identification of principles and issues and the solution of problems as compared to emphasizing details and memorization of factual material?

7. To what extent is the instructor intellectually stimulating? To what extent does he or she emphasize and encourage thought and the asking of questions? To what extent are you motivated to do extra work?

8. How would you rate the understandability and clarity of instruction? How well does the instructor explain concepts?

9. Regardless of the degree of difficulty of the course, to what extent is the instructor fair and respectful in his or her dealings with you?

10. To what extent is the grading of the course fair?

11. Does the instructor advise the students of regular office hours? To what extent does the instructor maintain these office hours?

12. To what extent does the instructor help you to understand your mistakes?

13. How well does the instructor show a willingness to admit to error or acknowledge his or her shortcomings?

14. Does the instructor have any personal mannerisms in speech, motion, and appearance which adversely affect teaching? If so, please identify them.

15. To what extent does the instructor show enthusiasm and interest in the subject matters?

16. How would you rate the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter?

17. To what extent were the exam questions unambiguous and relevant to the course material?

18. To what extent was the class size appropriate to the material covered?

19. To what extent was the workload appropriate to the course?

20. Please suggest ways by which the instructor might improve the course organization, handouts, exams, syllabus, and requirements.

21. Please suggest ways by which the instructor might improve his or her teaching effectiveness.

22. Please make any comments that you feel were not covered or were inadequately covered by the questions in this evaluation. The form might also contain questions for the overall rating of the course and instructor, in addition to space for the instructor's own questions. Needless to say, evaluations should not be based on small or selected samples.

### Appendix III. Mechanisms for In-Class Peer Review

Although we make no specific recommendations as to mechanisms, we do suggest that the procedure would be more effective if the instructor to be evaluated is allowed some choice in who would be sitting in his or her class.

1. In the Dental School, professors are required to attend the lectures of their colleagues in the same field. In addition, department chairpersons give advice to their faculty members. Poor teachers are teamed with good teachers for advice on how to improve their teaching techniques.

2. At the School of Social Work, newly hired faculty members are assigned to faculty mentors who will provide assistance to the new instructors in all aspects of their roles in the School.

3. The Law School at present encourages instructors who are interested in receiving guidance to select mentors from others at their own experiential level, or from the School's older, more experienced faculty members.

4. The Graduate School of Education recommends that:

4.1 The instructor select a colleague to serve as the reviewer

4.2 Around the middle or third quarter of a course the reviewer takes over the last half hour of a class for the purposes of interviewing the students regarding their opinions and evaluation of the course and the instruction

4.3 The reviewer then personally reports his or her findings to the instructor of the course

4.4 Finally, the course instructor submit a summary report of the review to the Dean's Office.

### Appendix IV. Bibliography: Advice and Research on Teaching

- Atkinson, R.C. Ingredients for a theory of instruction. *American Psychologist*, 1972, 27, 921-931.
- Cole, M., Cay, J., Glick, J., & Sharp, D.W. *The cultural context of learning and thinking*. New York: Basic Books, 1971.
- Costin, F. Lecturing versus other methods of teaching: A review of research. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 1972, 3, 4-31.
- Eble, K.E. *The craft of teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.
- Feldman, K.A. The superior college teacher from the students' view. *Research in Higher Education*, 1976, 5, 243-288.
- Freire, Paulo. *The pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1973.
- Greenwood, G.E. & Ramagli, H.J. Alternatives to student ratings of college teaching. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1980, 51, 673-684.
- Highet, G. *Man's unconquerable mind*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954.
- Highet, G. *The immortal profession*. New York: Vintage, 1978.
- Inbar, M. & Stoll, C. *Stimulation and gaming in social science*. New York: Free Press, 1972.
- Kulick, J.A. & McKeachie, W.J. The evaluation of teachers in higher education. In Kerlinger, F.N. (Ed.), *Review of research in education*, vol. 3. Itasca, Ill.: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1975.
- McKeachie, W.J. *Research on college teaching: A review*. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1970.
- McKeachie, W.J. *Teaching tips: A guidebook for the beginning college teacher* (7th Edition). Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company, 1978.
- McKeachie, W.J. Student ratings of faculty: A reprise. *Academe*, 1979, 65, 384-397.
- Oakeshott, M. Learning and teaching. In Peters, R.S. (Ed.), *The concept of education*. New York: The Humanities Press, 1967, 156-176.
- Rovin, S. & Packer, M.W. Evaluation of teaching and teachers at the University of Kentucky College of Dentistry. *Journal of Dental Education*, 1971, 35, 496-502.
- Ryle, G. Teaching and training. In Peters, R.S. (Ed.), *The concept of education*. New York: The Humanities Press, 1967, 105-119.
- Scriven, M. *The evaluation of college training*. National Council of States on Inservice Education, June 1980.
- Stanford, G. & Roark, A.E. *Human interaction in education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1974.
- Ware, J.E. & Williams, R.G. The Dr. Fox effect: A study of lecture effectiveness and ratings of instruction. *Journal of Medical Education*, 1975, 50, 149-156.

\*Adapted from Rovin, S. & Packer, M.W. Evaluation of teaching and teachers at the University of Kentucky College of Dentistry. *Journal of Dental Education*, 1971, 35, 496-502.

*Part III of this Report (Summaries of Responses, Detailed Responses, and Additional Comments of Respondents) are based on our interviews with the President, the Provost and the Deans (and/or their Deputies). The various sections of the Report of the First Task Force (1981) are repeated in italics in Detailed Responses to make it easier to understand these responses.*

### III. Responses in 1985 From the Schools To the Report of the First Task Force (1981)

#### A. Summary of Responses\*

**1.2:** Most Schools from time to time incorporate questions relating to teaching into the agenda of faculty meetings. The other Schools have addressed these questions at the departmental level or in tutorials.

**2.1:** Whereas the Deans of the Schools state that they have not received direct instructions to ensure that good teaching be rewarded by merit salary increases, most of them do this. Some Schools give poor teachers lower than normal increases in salary.

**2.2:** Many Schools do not use graduate students as teaching fellows. Those that have teaching fellows state that reappointment is based on teaching performance and dedication as well as on academic achievement.

**2.6:** All but three Schools have their own teaching awards. One of these Schools has approved the creation of award(s) and is working on selection procedures. There is a great diversity in the visibility given to the awards by different Schools. Less than half of the Schools displayed plaques or made efforts to increase the visibility of teaching awards.

**2.7:** Only the Wharton School has established an award for excellence in teaching by graduate students similar to those of the School of Arts and Sciences. The Medical School has established an award developed by the Student Government to reward outstanding teaching by house-staff.

**2.8:** Sabbatical leaves have been available in most Schools for activities that have led to the development of special innovative courses or instructional programs. Whereas most sabbatical leaves have been given explicitly for research, they frequently had significant impact on teaching.

**3.1:** All but two Schools use systematic programs of student evaluation of teaching. The comprehensiveness varies from school to school. Some evaluate all teachers in every course; some, only when questions of promotion and tenure are raised. The effort put into this by several Schools varies with time. Intensive, comprehensive evaluations are not always done on an annual basis.

**3.2:** In-class peer review is still not implemented outside of the Dental, Medical, Veterinary, and Nursing Schools. It happens occasionally and informally in some departments in the Schools of Arts and Sciences, Education, and Social Work. However, in most Schools the faculty learn of their colleagues' performances in seminars, etc. In most Schools, prospective faculty members must give a public lecture, at which time the candidate's ability to communicate is assessed.

**4.2:** In all but two Schools efforts have been made to discuss issues related to teaching. These have varied from informal seminars and courses to extensive retreats including faculty members from every course given in the School.

**4.3:** Training and teaching for graduate students occurs in several departments in the School of Arts and Sciences and is available at the School of Social Work and at the Wharton School, with help by the School of Education. Other Schools have no such formal teaching for their graduate students and fellows. The Medical School has formal seminars to improve teaching by residents and has instituted one-day

retreats to teach graduating medical students how to be better clinical instructors.

#### B. Summary of Responses to Appendix II: Suggestions for Student Evaluation of Teaching

1. See 3.1.

2. This is done extensively only by the Medical School but some of the Schools do get the views of the members of the graduating class on the faculty members being considered for tenure or promotion.

3. This procedure is not done routinely in any School by all recent graduates but is used occasionally to obtain letters of recommendation for tenure or promotion.

#### C. Detailed Responses from the President and Provost and from the Deans (and/or their Deputies) of each School\*

*1. The University's Dedication to Improving the Quality of Teaching*

**1.1** *The President and Provost should make public statements reaffirming the centrality of a high level of teaching quality at the University of Pennsylvania.*

**President and Provost:** This has been done many times.

**1.2** *The President and Provost should urge the Deans regularly to incorporate questions relating to teaching into the agenda of faculty meetings. In turn, Deans should encourage departments and graduate groups periodically to address issues of teaching.*

**President and Provost:** A formal statement will be given to the Council of Deans.

**Annenberg:** Questions relating to teaching are regularly incorporated into faculty meetings, but there are no meetings specifically for this purpose.

**Arts and Sciences:** SAS has not discussed at its faculty meetings questions relating to teaching. It is felt such issues are better discussed within departmental meetings—and some departments have done just exactly that. The current and past Associate Deans for Undergraduate Studies have discussed teaching with the undergraduate chairs of departments.

**Dental:** Issues related to student evaluation of faculty performance in teaching were discussed at Faculty Senate Meetings during the fall 1984 term. An instrument was designed specifically for student evaluation of teaching performance.

**Education:** This is not done at faculty meetings but is dealt with at the departmental level.

**Engineering:** Such questions are regularly discussed by the faculty.

**Fine Arts:** Questions related to teaching are usually not incorporated into the agenda of faculty meetings, but departments do discuss teaching and each program is encouraged to develop methods appropriate to it for evaluating teaching.

**Law:** Teaching is on the agenda of faculty meetings. In addition teaching quality is always discussed in the Committee on Appointments and in the Council of Student Representatives. Furthermore a "town meeting" was held with all law students in which teaching evaluations were discussed.

\*For a summary of responses in tabular form, please see page X.



**Medical:** Questions relating to teaching are regularly incorporated into the agenda of faculty meetings. Various departments periodically address issues of teaching. The Chairs annually review the courses given in their department, and discuss their views with the course instructor.

**Nursing:** Issues related to teaching are periodically discussed at faculty meetings. The evaluative aspects of teaching were discussed at the December 1984 meeting of faculty.

**Social Work:** There are periodic discussions in faculty meetings concerning the quality of teaching, the form used for student evaluations and the process of student evaluations. Specific discussions of teaching effectiveness are done at the sequence and/or course level by sequence chairpersons or the Associate Dean.

**Veterinary:** There was a retreat attended by sixty-four students and faculty in October 1981. All aspects of the curriculum, including teaching, were discussed.

**Wharton:** There are no formal meetings of the faculty specifically devoted to teaching. Typically, one department chair per faculty meeting is requested to report on the research interests and teaching responsibilities of the department. There are often meetings among faculty members and teaching fellows for courses that have many sections.

**1.3 Policies, issues and news related to teaching should be well publicized and discussed. The President and Provost should encourage Almanac and other campus publications to report on successful innovative teaching efforts, so that there is an active exchange of ideas and more thought given to teaching by everyone.**

**President and Provost:** Further action will be taken on this.

## 2. Incentives for Improving the Quality of Teaching

**2.1** The President and Provost should ensure that good teaching be rewarded by merit salary increases. When put into practice, this recommendation would reinforce the importance of teaching for all faculty members, especially those who already have tenure.

**President and Provost:** It was agreed to send to the Deans a notice each year before individual salaries were determined to emphasize that good teaching should be rewarded by merit salary increases and poor teaching should be penalized.

**Annenberg:** The Dean feels that in the Annenberg School good teaching and good research are inseparable, the faculty of 12 are all highly dedicated to the students, and he would not want to quantify such qualities.

**Arts and Sciences:** The Dean tries to reward good teaching with merit salary increases and relies on the chairmen to help him in this process.

**Dental:** Issues related to excellence in teaching and associated merit increases were discussed at the Dental School Faculty Senate meeting. Financial compensation for good teaching is favored by the Dean. Faculty members varied in their opinions about merit increases. Problems related to poor teaching are discussed by the Department Chairs and the Dean. Each case is handled on an individual basis.

**Education:** The recommendation has not specifically been followed, but teachers who have had trouble in class have been counseled.

**Engineering:** In SEAS effective teaching, along with all other indices of excellence, is considered in discussions of merit salary increases for faculty. Scholarship is the most important consideration, followed closely by teaching and then by institutional service.

**Fine Arts:** The Dean takes teaching into account in determining salary increases. Good teaching is rewarded and poor teaching results in the instructor being penalized. Moreover, if a complaint is received about a given instructor's teaching or if course evaluations are negative, the chairman and often the Dean speaks to that instructor.

**Law:** Teaching is regularly considered in decisions of salary increases, along with research and institutional service. This is true for tenured and non-tenured faculty.

**Medical:** Faculty who emerge as good teachers—above and beyond the standard—are acknowledged by monetary compensation. However, poor teachers are not given salary decreases but are taken out of the teaching function. A poor teacher is not considered as negatively as a poor researcher.

**Nursing:** Emphasis is placed on excellence in teaching. Guidelines for merit increases, including a teaching component, have been distributed to all faculty.

**Social Work:** The Dean reported that, with the School's tight budget, *ALMANAC SUPPLEMENT* November 26, 1985

very little money remains for merit increases. One tenured faculty member who had been considered to be a poor teacher left the School, and two assistant professors were not retained, partly because of poor teaching.

**Veterinary:** The President's and Provost's offices have not encouraged directly the rewarding of good teaching with salary increases. The School and its departments include teaching performance as one important aspect in determining salaries; no formal mechanism is in operation. In several cases, poor teaching was the primary reason for low increases in salary.

**Wharton:** There has been no direct communication between the President's and Provost's offices, and the Deans concerning merit salary increases for excellence in teaching. The Deans have instituted a salary merit increase system. Each faculty member is evaluated by his or her department Chair on research, teaching and service. Excellence in research and teaching are required for the highest salary increases, excellent research and mediocre teaching or vice versa is not sufficient. Conversely, poor teaching and research are necessary for the lowest salary increases.

**2.2 The appointment and reappointment of graduate students to teaching fellowships should be based on teaching performance and dedication as well as on academic achievement.**

**Annenberg:** There are no graduate students teaching courses in this school; however, a very small number are teaching assistants for large undergraduate classes.

**Arts and Sciences:** SAS is making a concerted effort to base appointments of graduate students as teaching fellows on their teaching performance and dedication. In addition, SAS has instituted a pedagogical and language training program for prospective teaching fellows who are non-native English speakers. Those graduate students who do not score at a prescribed level on a standardized test of speaking proficiency must take the course and reach a required level of performance before being appointed as teaching assistants.

**Dental:** Only a few graduate students teach in the basic sciences and they are evaluated by students; Reappointments are based on teaching performance and dedication.

**Education:** The Dean said that he would implement this recommendation regarding appointment and reappointment of graduate students to teaching fellowships.

**Engineering:** The initial appointment of graduate teaching assistants is based primarily on scholastic level and perceived ability to communicate. Later appointments are based on teaching performance. It should be noted that actual classroom teaching by teaching assistants is done only in the two entry-level computer science courses. These teaching assistants are evaluated by students in the same way as are faculty.

**Fine Arts:** Very few graduate students actually teach. There are three or four graduate students in Architecture who teach and their teaching is evaluated.

**Law:** Teaching assistants instruct students in only one course, legal writing. These student teachers are always third-year students and are therefore not reappointed. Students are chosen for these positions on the basis of intellectual quality, communications skills and writing ability. They are closely supervised by the course director who is a faculty member.

**Medical:** There are very few graduate students who are teaching fellows within the Medical School. However, residents often play the role of graduate teaching fellows since they are instructors who themselves are in a formal training program. Medical residents are reappointed on the basis of their roles as clinicians and as educators. A resident who has performed inadequately as an educator faces the possibility of not being reappointed.

**Nursing:** The School of Nursing has implemented this recommendation and utilizes a limited number of graduate students who engage in a wide range of activities including classroom teaching and clinical supervision.

**Social Work:** Selected students from the doctoral program are granted teaching assistantships and they are utilized to teach undergraduate and Masters' level courses. Faculty mentors provide supervision and ensure satisfactory quality control.

**Veterinary:** No graduate students teach in this school.

**Wharton:** There are approximately 100 teaching fellows, and the contracts of teaching fellows with poor teaching performance are not renewed.

**2.3** *Because significant achievement in research is a prime consideration of both appointment and promotion within the University, in extremely rare instances the University can appoint the truly exceptional researcher whose teaching effectiveness is limited. Nonetheless, the President and Provost should insist that the high standards set in the 1974 Handbook for Faculty and Administration (p.34) be met:*

*The over-riding objective of the faculty appointment and promotion policy and procedures should be the recruitment and retention of a distinguished faculty. While the means to this end may vary, particularly in some of the professional schools, generally the objective will be met by stressing intellectual leadership as the chief criterion. Accordingly, a high degree of excellence is expected in both research and teaching. The relative weight given to research and teaching varies from case to case and should be determined by the individual faculties, but always with significant achievements in research as a prime consideration. An acceptable standard of teaching competence should be required even of those outstanding in research if they are to be assigned teaching responsibilities. An acceptable standard of competence in research should be required even of outstanding teachers, and at a research institution such as the University of Pennsylvania an acceptable standard in research is very high indeed. (Emphasis added).*

**President and Provost:** The 1983 Handbook (p.32) contains the above and also the following: "In identifying good teaching, it is essential to make use both of carefully tested forms for evaluation by current and former students and also of some type of peer evaluation. Teaching evaluation forms may differ from school to school." This has taken place and major efforts are made to ensure that the threshold qualification of good teaching is reached in all appointments to tenure.

**2.4** *Although excellent teaching is not merely dependent upon classroom conditions, the morale of students and faculty would be enhanced if our facilities were improved. Currently, many of our classrooms are in a depressing state. The President and Provost should therefore set aside a fraction of the annual capital budget of the University for classroom improvements, a much neglected item. In addition, the University's considerable internal resources (e.g., students and faculty from the Graduate School of Fine Arts and the School of Engineering and Applied Science) should be mobilized to contribute to refurbishing the teaching environment of the campus.*

**President and Provost:** Many classrooms in different schools of the University have been renovated or newly built. Plans are being developed to renovate the Penman Library in Bennett Hall, dividing it into a classroom and a faculty lounge. Much remains to be done on this continuing problem.

**2.5** *The Lindback Award is the University's principal means for recognizing excellence in teaching. The prominence of the award could be enhanced. There should be a Lindback Lecture each semester—the speaker to be a winner of the award—introduced by the President or Provost. The visibility of the award could be increased in a variety of ways: by the creation of a gallery including photographs, brief biographies, and statements on teaching by recipients; by having the President confer the awards at a formal public ceremony; by a listing of recent recipients in each edition of the various course catalogues. Other steps to increase publicity for the Lindback Awards should be developed.*

**President and Provost:** Although the University as a whole and many of the schools now give much more attention to winners of the Lindback Award, many of these recommendations remain to be implemented.

**2.6** *Those schools which do not have their own teaching awards for faculty should be encouraged to establish them.*

**Annenberg:** Teaching awards are viewed by the faculty as divisive and invidious activities. An analogy was made that it would be like giving prizes in a small family.

**Arts and Sciences:** SAS has established the Ira Abrams Award for Distinguished Teaching, to be given each year to two members of the standing or associated faculty in recognition of their contributions to teaching. The award seeks to recognize teaching that is intellectually challenging and exceptionally coherent, teaching that leads to an informed understanding of a discipline. Recipients are expected to

embody high standards of integrity and fairness, to have a strong commitment to learning, and to be open to new ideas. Winners of the Ira Abrams awards receive \$1,000 each and a certificate, and their names are inscribed on a plaque near the Dean's Office.

The Department of Mathematics has been evaluating the teaching performances of its faculty and recitation leaders each semester since 1970. For every course in which at least 10 questionnaires are received and at least 50% of the students respond, good teaching awards are given to everyone achieving 3.50 out of 4. The lists of these awards are posted around the Department.

**Dental:** The following teaching awards are given:

**Earl Banks Hoyt Award for Clinical Teaching:** Senior students select the clinician whose name is announced by the Dean at a banquet at the end of the year. The clinician receives money, an individual plaque, and a name plate on a plaque which hangs on the wall in the corridor. Full-time junior faculty members are eligible for this award, which started in 1964.

**Joseph L. Appleton Award,** which started in 1979, is presented to part-time clinical faculty.

**Robert E. DeRevere Award,** which started in 1982, is presented to junior clinical faculty members who teach on a part-time basis.

**Louis Grossman Award** is presented for clinical teaching.

**Education:** A teaching award has been given to one faculty member during each of the past three school years.

**Engineering:** *The S. Reid Warren Award for Distinguished Teaching* is given to a recipient chosen by the undergraduate students and the alumni. This prize includes a certificate and a nameplate on a plaque. In 1984 the honorarium was raised from \$100 to \$1000.

**Fine Arts:** No teaching award is given. The issue has been raised with the faculty two or three times and it does not support the establishment of awards. The Dean plans to raise the issue with graduate students. Moreover, GFSA tends not to nominate anyone for the Lindback Award.

**Law:** In the Law School, the third year students decide who should receive the *Harvey Levin Memorial Award for Teaching Excellence*. The Dean pointed out the possibility for the politicization of these awards and agrees with the decision of the Lindback committee not to make any awards to faculty being considered for tenure in the year of the award.

**Medical:** The following teaching awards are made:

**Faculty Honor Roll:** students, through open vote and discussion, choose two to three faculty members per quarter.

**Medical Student Government Award** for house staff (residents): This award was just instituted this year. Through nominations solicited from students, an "open vote" is held and one housestaff member is chosen by the MSG.

**Dripps Award:** Instituted in 1983 by the Department of Anesthesia. Awarded to a member of the Medical School faculty who is recognized as an outstanding educator of residents from a clinical teaching or administrative perspective. Nominations are solicited openly and a stipend is given.

**Berwick Award:** Instituted in 1980 by the Pathology Department for a faculty member who effectively fuses the basic sciences and clinical medicine in an outstanding fashion. The recipient is chosen by the Faculty of the School of Medicine.

**Nursing:** The School of Nursing presented the first teaching award in the Spring of 1983. A policy for the teaching award was distributed to faculty during the Fall 1984 term.

**Social Work:** An ad hoc committee on the quality of teaching recommended in May 1985 that an award for teaching excellence be given. This received faculty approval. The first award is planned for May 1986.

**Veterinary:** **Norden Award:** Awarded by the whole student body to one faculty member on a yearly basis. The award includes a \$500 stipend and plaque, and is announced at the last faculty meeting. The recipients of the award are not currently displayed in the School.

In 1985 there was instituted the *Veterinary Student Government Award for Excellence in Teaching*. Four recipients are selected annually by each of the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th year classes; awards are presented at a special reception and also announced at the School's Commencement.

**Wharton:** The following awards are made to faculty members on a yearly basis:



**Anvil Award:** Awarded by students in the MBA program to a faculty member or graduate student. The award of a plaque is made at a special luncheon and announced at commencement exercises. The winner of the award becomes the Marshal for the next year's Wharton commencement exercise. There is a plaque for Anvil award winners near the administrative offices.

**Sigma Kappa Phi,** the honor society for the Wharton evening program, awards a silver bowl to a standing faculty member. The winner is selected by members of the society and graduating seniors and is presented at a special dinner.

**2.7 Each year the Faculty of Arts and Sciences confers a dozen or so Dean's Awards for Distinguished Teaching by Graduate Students. Similar awards should be established in other schools in which graduate students teach.**

**Annenberg:** See 2.6.

**Arts and Sciences:** SAS continues to confer the Dean's Awards for Distinguished Teaching by Graduate Students. Each year approximately 12 students are honored, receiving a check for \$250 and a certificate. In the spring a reception is held in honor of both the faculty award winners and the graduate student award winners.

**Dental:** Not done. Only a small number of graduate students teach in the basic sciences and about 10-12 teach in the clinics.

**Education:** Not done. Awards for teaching to graduate students are not very practical at this school because of the small size of the divisions.

**Engineering:** There is no award given to graduate teaching assistants for distinguished teaching. The Dean believes that such an award should be considered for SEAS.

**Fine Arts:** There are too few graduate students teaching to establish awards similar to those of SAS.

**Law:** There are no awards given to teaching assistants.

**Medical:** Not done. However, the School has established an award developed by the Student Government to reward outstanding teaching by members of the house staff.

**Nursing:** Not done but is being considered.

**Social Work:** Not done.

**Veterinary:** No graduate students teach in this school.

**Wharton:** The Wharton Advisory board has an award of \$500 for excellence in teaching. Teaching fellows and young faculty members are eligible.

**2.8 Financial support should be made available for faculty members who undertake the development of special innovative courses or instructional programs. This support could take the form of either sabbatical leave or a Presidential Fellowship which would provide a summer stipend.**

**Annenberg:** This happens repeatedly. Faculty are given summer stipends and release time to follow teaching or educational pursuits. The Dean strongly emphasizes that his faculty "teach what they do."

**Arts and Sciences:** Through the Academic Development Fund in the College, SAS tries to provide support for faculty members who wish to undertake the development of special innovative courses or instructional programs. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies estimated that over 50% of sabbatical leaves results in new courses being taught. Release time is believed to be frequently given for course development.

**Dental:** Indirectly implemented. Faculty members who take a sabbatical leave will increase their knowledge base in a specific area. Enrichment of instructional content will follow from these research initiatives.

**Education:** No special innovative courses or instructional programs have been initiated.

**Engineering:** Release time from classroom teaching is made available to faculty involved in the development of new teaching materials.

**Fine Arts:** Financial support is seldom provided faculty members to undertake the development of courses, though occasionally release time is provided. Often faculty members use sabbatical time to develop new courses or update existing courses with new materials. The School has invested in the development of computer-related courses of multi-departmental interest.

**Law:** In the Law School, the development of new teaching material is considered to be a valid form of research, e.g., the development of new case books. Such case books are used during consideration for promotion.

**Medical:** Support is made available to faculty members who undertake the development of special, innovative courses or instructional skills. Money and release time from other responsibilities is provided. Sabbaticals have been granted for this purpose and three members of the medical school faculty have been given the opportunity and time to pursue a Masters in Education.

**Nursing:** Faculty who receive funding and/or other outside financial support are given release time for the development of courses and programs. Many faculty have used the sabbatical leave to engage in relevant activities to enhance course development.

**Social Work:** The sabbatical leaves have been explicitly for research, but in this area such research definitely supports teaching.

**Veterinary:** Financial support to faculty for teaching purposes is indirect through academic leaves of absence. Scholarly leaves sometimes lead to the writing of textbooks and acquiring of ideas and materials.

**Wharton:** In several cases, release time and/or summer support has been given to faculty members for course development. Grants have been given to departments from outside sources, and to faculty members from the Dean's office, for the development of courseware.

### 3. Evaluation of the Quality of Teaching

**3.1 The President and Provost should reaffirm the necessity of systematic and comprehensive programs of student evaluation of teaching. (Appendix II [of the Report of the First Task Force] includes a set of suggestions that might govern such evaluation, along with an illustrative form.)**

**President and Provost:** This has been done and is already the norm in most schools.

**Annenberg:** The faculty has recommended voluntary evaluation conducted by each faculty member.

**Arts and Sciences:** Routine, regular, comprehensive.

**Dental:** Routine, extensive, comprehensive.

**Education:** Very extensive evaluation of teaching by students has been done for several semesters using a questionnaire comprising 12 questions with Likert-style responses and 3 open-ended questions. For example, more than 900 such forms were filled out during the spring of 1984. The students do *not* write their names on the form (unless they wish to). Such student evaluation is considered *mandatory* for faculty members being considered for reappointment or tenure. The process is *voluntary* for other faculty and is used by many for their own purposes of self-improvement.

**Engineering:** In SEAS student evaluations for teaching have been performed for many decades. When student evaluations indicate the existence of a problem, the department chairperson and/or the Dean meets with that faculty member to determine the source of the problem. In the Policy Manual for SEAS there is the following statement regarding Faculty Development:

In order to optimize the opportunities for young faculty to reach tenure, it is required that at least once annually the Department Chair meet with his or her Assistant Professors to discuss their progress carefully and give advice on what is expected of them. A report of the results of the meetings is to be submitted to the Dean.

**Fine Arts:** The majority of the departments have regular, well-established evaluations tailored to the types of instruction.

**Law:** The Law School now has a formal course review system in which students evaluate courses and the results are published in the student newspaper.

**Medical:** Routine, regular, comprehensive.

**Nursing:** Routine, regular, comprehensive.

**Social Work:** Two separate evaluation forms are used to evaluate teacher effectiveness. Students complete a form for each class at the end of the semester and return the form directly to the Dean's office.

**Veterinary:** Every course is evaluated comprehensively every four years.

**Wharton:** Routine, regular, comprehensive.

**3.2 In-class peer review by departmental colleagues is traditional, routine, and widely considered valuable in several of the University's schools, for example, the Medical, Dental, Veterinary, and Nursing Schools. The President and Provost should urge all Deans to consider a program of in-class peer review. (Appendix III [of the Report of the First Task Force] includes a few mechanisms for in-class peer review.)**

**President and Provost:** In-class peer review is becoming a little more widely used but is resisted in many places. The President and Provost continue to urge Deans to extend this review mechanism.

**Annenberg:** The Dean stated that due to the very specific and varying nature of each faculty member's work, faculty cannot really review each other. (See 4.2)

**Arts and Sciences:** In-class peer reviews are implemented in some departments by another faculty member (most often the Chair) occasionally sitting in on a colleague's class.

**Dental:** In-class peer review is traditional and routine. It is a departmental policy for faculty members in the basic sciences (e.g., anatomy-histology, biochemistry, microbiology, pathology and physiology-pharmacology) to attend all lectures.

**Education:** The class peer reviews are handled mostly on a voluntary basis, with the Educational Leadership division and the Psychology in Education division having somewhat different mechanisms for implementing the process. Several faculty members feel that this process should operate independently of the procedure for making personnel decisions.

**Engineering:** In SEAS there is no in-class peer review system because the faculty have continually opposed such a system. However, all prospective faculty members must give a public lecture at the University, at which time the candidate's ability to communicate is assessed.

**Fine Arts:** In-class peer review occurs as a matter of course in design studios, involving two or three faculty serving as a jury for a student's work. This occurs in Architecture, Urban Design, and Landscape Architecture, as well as in workshops in Planning and Fine Arts.

**Law:** In-class peer review has not been popular in the past. The Dean believes that there must be some faculty effort to evaluate teaching quality because to rely totally on student evaluations places too large a responsibility on the students. Currently the non-tenured member of the appointments committee in the Law School is talking with his non-tenured colleagues to see what can be one in this area. The Dean considers the monitoring of teaching quality to be primarily a faculty responsibility, even though the mechanism for monitoring teaching quality currently depends mostly on student evaluations. In this area he believes more faculty efforts are necessary and currently he has in-depth conferences with students about the teaching performance of faculty members. Also, he has conferences with faculty members whose teaching is judged by students to be inferior.

**Medical:** In-class peer review is very extensive, occurs regularly, and is viewed as being highly effective.

**Nursing:** In-class peer review is a routine procedure. Guidelines for evaluation have been established.

**Social Work:** A mentor system is used for peer view by colleagues; the mentor is appointed by the Dean.

**Veterinary:** Peer review is routine in the School. Many courses are co-taught and the faculty members who have responsibility for the courses typically attend all lectures.

**Wharton:** In-class peer review occurs to a limited extent in the Department of Legal Studies. Although in-class peer reviews do not occur in other departments, other methods of screening and review are practiced: a) review of student evaluations by department chairpersons; b) faculty members are encouraged to attend their colleagues' classes to improve their own teaching skills; and c) careful screening of potential faculty members. Most department chairs perceived a formal in-class review system as burdensome and perhaps detrimental in that it could lower faculty morale and stifle creativity in teaching. The only acceptable system is one which is informal and voluntary.

#### 4. Techniques for Improving the Quality of Teaching

**4.1 The President and Provost should designate and establish at least one, possibly two or three, offices as locations where professors and teaching assistants might both request that their classroom performance be videotaped and review those videotapes. Equipment already exists in many places in the University for videotaping instruction. Some of this equipment could be made generally available for this purpose. Trained professionals already exist within the University and their services should be available for analysis of the videotapes. In addition, at least one of these locations might contain a variety of**

**supplementary materials, including files of description of innovative courses, bibliographies, and a small library of books on teaching. (Appendix IV [of the Report of the First Task Force] includes a bibliography.**

**President and Provost:** Several schools have the facilities for videotaping lectures but this technique for improving the quality of teaching is not widely used. The School of Education is willing to assist other schools who request help.

**4.2 Faculty should be encouraged to organize informal seminars on a variety of issues related to teaching.**

**Annenberg:** The practice of faculty research seminars has been instituted. At these seminars, faculty members have the opportunity to discuss research and teaching.

**Arts and Sciences:** The Program for Assessing and Revitalizing the Social Sciences has dealt with and will increasingly deal with issues of teaching. This program is based on a series of formal faculty seminars. The Writing Across the Curriculum Program also deals with issues related to teaching.

**Dental:** During the 1983-84 academic year, the curriculum committee sponsored two all-day retreats to address curricular issues.

**Education:** The only formal effort to provide training in teaching to graduate teaching fellows and faculty is publicizing the availability of Dr. Susan L. Lytle, who has had experience in this regard.

**Engineering:** This is done informally.

**Fine Arts:** There are no school-wide informal courses on issues related to teaching.

**Law:** Informal seminars on issues related to teaching are not held, but there are many informal discussions on this subject in the Law School.

**Medical:** The faculty organize informal seminars on various teaching issues frequently, and numerous course modifications have resulted from this process.

**Nursing:** Throughout the academic year, the Faculty Development Committee, presents a number of enrichment seminars which focus on issues related to the teaching enterprise.

**Social Work:** Dr. Joseph Soffen teaches a doctoral seminar on curriculum and teaching effectiveness.

**Veterinary:** There was a retreat attended by sixty-four students and faculty in October 1981. All aspects of the curriculum, including teaching, were discussed.

**Wharton:** The School has several times funded a consultant to help a faculty member in cases of poor teaching performance.

**4.3 The following recommendation of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Committee on Graduate Education should be implemented throughout the University: "Departments which do not now do so should be encouraged to provide training [in teaching] for their graduate teaching fellows." In its explanation, the Committee went on to note: "Those graduate groups whose primary mission is the preparation of college teachers . . . should systematically address preparation for college teaching." Among the vehicles that might be used for training teaching fellows and graduate students in general to be better teachers, as well as to prepare them for their future careers, would be credit courses, non-credit workshops, and courses that incorporate experience in and advice on teaching as part of their normal operation. Some of these could be required when appropriate.**

**Annenberg:** Although there are no graduate teaching fellows, Research Scholars, who are graduate students on a stipend, are trained not only as good researchers, but as good teachers. They are often involved in course planning.

**Arts and Sciences:** Several SAS departments make a concerted effort to help TAs with their teaching. The Department of Romance Languages requires that all new teaching fellows take a graduate course taught by Dr. Paul M. Lloyd, Romance Languages 690 "Applied Linguistics and Language Teaching," as part of their graduate training. The Mathematics Department also offers a seminar to help its graduate students become better teachers, and the English Department has developed a seminar for graduate students who will teach freshman seminars in the same subject. The Department of Sociology has used faculty from the Graduate School of Education to provide training in teaching to TAs. The school is exploring ways to provide training to all TAs whose departments assign significant teaching tasks.



**Dental:** Not done.

**Education:** Some departments provide training in teaching.

**Engineering:** There are only approximately 10 graduate teaching assistants who actually teach in SEAS. There is a plan in SEAS to institute a seminar series for all Ph.D. candidates in which communication skills would be taught. Funding is now being sought for such a program.

**Fine Arts:** No training in teaching is currently provided for graduate teaching fellows although the Dean will look into establishing it.

**Law:** There is no such training program in the Law School.

**Medical:** Once or twice a year the Council of Chief Residents organizes a seminar for all residents on the "teaching role." The purpose of this seminar is to point out the goals or objectives of clinical instruction. In the past year, workshops were organized to help residents become better clinical instructors. Two were in the Surgery Department, one was in the Neurology Department. Presently, the Resident House Committee is developing two new programs (workshops): 1) to help residents become more competent evaluators of their students and 2) to deal with stress in the teaching environment. Last year, a workshop (one-day retreat) was offered to graduating medical students to teach them how to be better clinical instructors. This year two such retreats will be offered.

**Nursing:** Not done but is being considered. Many of the graduate teaching fellows have already had a considerable amount of teaching experience prior to pursuing doctoral study.

**Social Work:** Dr. Joseph Soffen teaches a doctoral seminar on curriculum and teaching effectiveness.

**Veterinary:** Not done.

**Wharton:** A non-credit teacher training program co-sponsored by the Wharton School and The Graduate School of Education (The Wharton Teacher Development Program) is available to all Ph.D. candidates. The first part entails a 6-10 week workshop on teaching methods. In the second part, a mentor is assigned to the teaching assistant to provide in-class reviews and counseling. Teaching assistants are carefully screened by the faculty and/or Department Chairperson.

Teaching assistants are monitored in a variety of ways: a) the faculty member who oversees the TA is responsible for finding and correcting teaching deficiencies; b) in-class reviews by faculty are conducted; and c) student evaluation forms of TAs are carefully read. In several situations, the school funded a consultant to help faculty members in cases of poor teaching performance.

## Appendix II. Suggestions for Student Evaluation of Teaching

*The suggested program of student evaluation of teaching consists of three parts.*

1. Evaluation of a specific instructor and course at the end of the period in which the course is taught. This would be similar to the procedure presently used in the SCUE Course Guide and Wharton evaluations, but may vary with the conditions in each school.

2. Evaluation of instructors by each year's graduating class. This proposed mechanism would allow graduates to choose from their past instructors those for whom they would complete evaluation forms containing a few general comment-provoking questions. A copy of each evaluation would be sent to the instructor, to the instructor's department, and to his or her school office.

3. Evaluation of a specific instructor by recent graduates.

1. See also 3.1, 2 and 3.

**Annenberg:** Every student must work with a particular faculty advisor for his or her thesis. The number of students who choose to work with a particular faculty member and the number of students that he or she guides to completion is a good indicator of successful teaching.

In addition, the school organizes faculty pro-seminars. This is a formal opportunity for first-year students to hear each faculty member discuss his or her research so that they might choose with whom they want to work. Visitors, who might be potential faculty members, are asked to speak in this forum and then student comments are solicited. Formal course evaluation is left to the faculty to conduct on a voluntary but recommended basis.

**Arts and Sciences:** Every five or six years or so when a department has an internal and external review, graduates are asked to evaluate their teachers. Each department chooses evaluations from current students in its own way.

**Dental:** Before receiving a grade for the course, all students are required to evaluate each course. Information taken from these evaluations that relates to teaching performance is submitted to the School of Dental Medicine Senate Committee on Promotions and Appointments along with letters of recommendation. One to five students (current enrollees and those from the previous term) are randomly selected to write a letter regarding effectiveness. All materials are then sent to the Personnel Committee. All data from the computerized form and written comments are transcribed by a typist from the Clinical Evaluation Form. All Department Chairpersons review the transcript. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs meets with each Chairperson to review the teaching performance of clinical instructors.

**Education:** (1) Course evaluations are made on a voluntary basis and are kept and only seen by each individual instructor. Formal evaluations are required when considerations of tenure and promotion occur. (2) Not done. (3) Implemented when required for tenure or promotion.

**Engineering:** (1) All classes are evaluated. (2) Graduating seniors are not currently asked for such an evaluation, but it is agreed that this is desirable. (3) The Reid Warren award is made jointly by current students, alumni, and alumnae so recent graduates are involved in the decision. Also, recent graduates provide evaluations for all promotions to tenure.

**Fine Arts:** Recent graduates as far as five years back do evaluate instructors in Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning. The chairman tends to identify the evaluators and these evaluations are part of dossiers for promotion.

**Law:** (1) All courses are evaluated. (2) The graduating class awards the teaching prize, but they do not evaluate all their courses. (3) Informal feedback occurs.

**Medical:** (1) Student evaluations are handed out for each course, are analyzed by the Educational Services Department and are made available to the department chairmen and students. (2) Presently, a retrospective course system is being instituted whereby students are being asked to assess each phase of the curriculum that they have completed at five critical points in their educational careers. At the end of the first term and the first year, in the middle of the second year and third year, and right before they graduate. (3) The Honorary Medical Student Society releases a yearly evaluation of the clinical clerkships (like the SCUE course guide).

**Nursing:** (1) Implemented. (2) Not done but is being considered. (3) Not done but is being considered. Evaluation of instructors could be incorporated as specific items, as part of the routine Alumnae and Alumni Questionnaire.

**Social Work:** Students who have graduated within a five year period are solicited concerning their opinions of the program. This includes questions on the curriculum and faculty.

**Veterinary:** A system for evaluation of instruction was implemented starting with the fall semester 1982. Several series of question sets are available from which the course Head or Department Chairs selects an appropriate subset relating to the structure of the course being evaluated. Each course is evaluated approximately once in four years. The evaluations are processed and the results are made available to the Department Chairs and Instructor(s).

**Wharton:** Evaluation of faculty are made at the end of each course. A response rate of at least 60% is required for the evaluations to be used in faculty assessment for promotion and salary raises.

## D. Additional Comments of Respondents

**Arts and Sciences:** In 18 months or so when SAS improves its computer capabilities, a major study of teaching in SAS is planned.

**Fine Arts:** The Design of the Environment major with its studio courses and intense group basis of instruction tends to represent a program that appears particularly successful in producing good undergraduate teaching.

**Medical:** The Committee on Appointments and Promotions, when considering a candidate for a promotion such as tenure, not only creates an Ad Hoc Committee on tenure, but creates a special subcommittee to evaluate the candidate on the basis of educational, and teaching skills. Student Evaluations are regularly used by this committee. Two people in the past year received tenure because they were satisfactory researchers but superb educators.

## E. Summary of Responses to the First Task Force Report

| Section   | Teaching & Merit<br>Salary Increases | Teaching Ability<br>Affecting Appts.,<br>Promotion &<br>Tenure | Individual<br>School<br>Teaching<br>Awards | Graduate<br>Student<br>Teaching<br>Awards | Student<br>Evaluation<br>of Teaching<br>at end of<br>course | In-Class<br>Peer<br>Review | Evaluation<br>by<br>Graduating<br>Class | Evaluation<br>by Recent<br>Graduates    |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|----------------------------|---|---|
|   | 2.1                                  | 2.3  | 2.5 &<br>2.6                               | 2.7                                       | 3.1 &<br>App. II-1  | 3.2                        | App.<br>II-2                            | App.<br>II-3                            |
| <b>Annenberg</b><br>11 on Faculty                         | Yes                                  | Yes  | No   | No  | Yes<br>Voluntary  | No                         | Yes                                     | No                                      |
| <b>Arts &amp; Sciences</b><br>505 on Faculty              | Yes                                  | Yes  | Yes<br>2 awards                            | Yes<br>12 awards                          | Yes   | Very<br>little             | Rarely                                  | Rarely                                  |
| <b>Dental</b><br>1984—61 on Faculty<br>1981—80 on Faculty | Yes                                  | Yes  | Yes<br>4 awards<br>(clinical)              | N/A                                       | Yes   | Yes                        | Yes                                     | Yes                                     |
| <b>Education</b><br>30 on Faculty                         | No                                   | Yes  | Yes<br>1 award                             | No  | Yes<br>voluntary  | Very<br>little             | No                                      | For tenure<br>or promotion<br>only      |
| <b>Engineering</b><br>100 on Faculty                      | Yes (X)                              | Yes  | Yes<br>1 award                             | No  | Yes   | No                         | No                                      | Yes                                     |
| <b>Fine Arts</b><br>32 on Faculty                         | Yes (X)                              | Yes  | No   | N/A                                       | No  | Yes                        | No                                      | Yes in<br>some depts.                   |
| <b>Law</b><br>30 on Faculty                               | Yes                                  | Yes  | Yes<br>1 award                             | No  | Yes   | Very<br>little             | Partial                                 | Partial through<br>informal<br>feedback |
| <b>Medical</b><br>670 on Faculty                          | Yes (X)                              | Yes  | Approx.<br>a dozen                         | Yes<br>(house staff)                      | Yes   | Yes                        | Yes                                     | Yes                                     |
| <b>Nursing</b><br>33 on Faculty                           | Yes                                  | Yes  | Yes<br>1 award                             | N/A                                       | Yes   | Yes                        | No                                      | No                                      |
| <b>Social Work</b><br>15 on Faculty                       | No (X)                               | Yes  | No, but<br>pending                         | No  | Yes   | Yes                        | No                                      | Yes                                     |
| <b>Veterinary</b><br>107 on Faculty                       | Yes (X)                              | Yes  | Yes<br>5 awards                            | N/A                                       | Yes, once<br>every<br>4 years                               | Yes                        | No                                      | Partial                                 |
| <b>Wharton</b><br>165 on Faculty                          | Yes (X)                              | Yes  | Yes<br>2 awards                            | Yes                                       | Yes   | Very<br>little             | No                                      | No                                      |

## Key

(X) indicates demerit, as well as merit uses of salary. Standing Faculty numbers as of March 1985.  
N/A (not applicable)



## IV. Suggested Appraisal Form

The Second Task Force suggests that a form of the type given below be kept in various administrative offices throughout the University, be given to students on arrival at the University and, when and if appropriate, be sent, signed, to the Office of the Ombudsman. The creation of this form is a serious matter and has the possibility of having a chilling effect on teaching and could lead to abuse. On the other hand, the Report of the Committees to Survey Harassment at the University of Penn-

sylvania (*Almanac* September 24, 1985 and subsequent correspondence), and the Report of the Subcommittee on Sexual Harassment of the Student Affairs Committee of the University Council (*Almanac* October 29, 1985), show that harassment is widespread and that new efforts must be made to stop it. This suggestion needs extensive discussion throughout the University community.

### University of Pennsylvania Appraisal of Conduct and/or Misconduct of Instructor

The purpose of this form is to evaluate the quality of teaching with specific emphasis on learning experiences related to sexual, racial, ethnic, sexual orientation, and religious discrimination or harassment on the part of the teacher.

#### I. Instructor's Conduct

*Directions:* Rate your perceptions of teacher-student interactions by circling the appropriate response categories in items #1 to #10.

(1 = never; 2 = once; 3 = several times; and 4 = frequently).

To what extent did the instructor exhibit the following behaviors within the context of a Penn classroom or conference situation or while you were still a student of that instructor?

- |   |               |
|---|---------------|
| 1. Unwanted <i>sex-stereotyped</i> references, depictions or jokes.         | 1   2   3   4 |
| 2. Unwanted <i>racially-stereotyped</i> references, depictions or jokes.    | 1   2   3   4 |
| 3. Unwanted <i>religiously-stereotyped</i> references, depictions or jokes. | 1   2   3   4 |
| 4. Unwanted teasing, remarks or questions of a sexual nature.               | 1   2   3   4 |
| 5. Unwanted sexually suggestive looks or gestures.                          | 1   2   3   4 |
| 6. Unwanted letters or phone calls of a sexual nature.                      | 1   2   3   4 |
| 7. Unwanted leaning over or cornering.                                      | 1   2   3   4 |
| 8. Unwanted pressure for dates.   | 1   2   3   4 |
| 9. Unwanted and deliberate touching.  | 1   2   3   4 |
| 10. Unwanted pressure for sex activity.                                     | 1   2   3   4 |

\*Complete the next section only if you were the recipient of stereotypic references.

#### II. Student's Reaction

11. To what extent were you bothered by sexual, racial, and/or religious remarks and behaviors? (Circle the specific stereotyped act).

|                     |   |   |   |   |               |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---------------|
| Not at all bothered | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Very bothered |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---------------|

12. To what extent did the experience interfere with your academic performance?

|                     |   |   |   |   |           |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| Not at all bothered | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Very much |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|-----------|

13. To what extent were you concerned about reprisals?

|                     |   |   |   |   |           |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| Not at all bothered | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Very much |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|-----------|

14. Check specific areas of concern.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Grades, recommendations, or evaluations                |  |
| The person's attitude towards you                      |  |
| The conditions within or outside the classroom setting |  |
| Other (please specify)                                 |  |

#### III. Student's Action

15. What action did you take in response to the unwanted attention?

(Check appropriate behavior).

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Confronted the instructor                    |  |
| Ignored the attention                        |  |
| Avoided contact with the instructor          |  |
| Talked to a university official (informally) |  |
| Lodged a formal complaint                    |  |
| Other  |  |

16. Regardless of whether or not you took any action, was your situation resolved?

|           |          |
|-----------|----------|
| Yes _____ | No _____ |
|-----------|----------|

*Other Comments*

## V. Additional Considerations of the Second Task Force

### 1. Is there a perception that teaching has improved?

An effort was made to try and find out if there is evidence from student responses that there has been a perception that teaching has improved since, and possibly because of, the publication of the Report of the First Task Force.

A major finding from the SAS and SCUE course evaluation forms is that, for teaching assistants, the mean overall ratings, based on over 1,000 answers, improved from 1.0, standard deviation (S.D.)  $\pm 0.31$ , in 1980 to 2.7 S.D.  $\pm 0.86$  in 1984.

For SAS faculty there has been a small overall increase, based on 29,000 answers, from 3.1 S.D.  $\pm 0.56$  to 3.2 S.D.  $\pm 0.51$  on a scale of 0 the lowest rating to 4 the highest possible rating, where 2 was defined as average.

For most other schools, comparable numerical results are not available. Moreover, interviews with many people in all schools left us with a strong impression of slow but steady overall progress and a great average improvement amongst those rated as the poorest teachers. Several of those who were particularly poor in 1980 or earlier have by now left the University because of death, resignation, retirement or failure to achieve tenure.

The Medical School faculty and administration in particular have put a major effort into monitoring and improving the quality of teaching and are convinced that it is much better now than it was several years ago.

In the last ten years, the faculty of the School of Nursing has been outstandingly successful in getting Christian R. and Mary E. Lindback Awards for Distinguished Teaching. The faculty of the School of Dental Medicine has also been well ahead of all other schools in this regard.

### 2. What extra is being done and needs to be done?

It is clear that a number of steps have been made in recent years towards improving the quality of teaching at Penn. Unfortunately, most of the University community is unaware of these activities and the kinds of options being offered which is itself a problem that must be confronted.

For several years, the School of Arts and Sciences has required that all non-native speakers applying for TA positions take a standardized test of spoken English proficiency. If they do not perform well enough on the exam, they are required to enter a training program directed by Barbara Hoekje of the English Language Program (21 Bennett Hall). During this one-month intensive course, the students acquire both language skills and cross cultural perspectives on American education and the role of the TA. Only after they have successfully completed this course are they allowed to enter the classroom. The major problem with this procedure is that many Department Chairpersons appear to be unaware of the new guidelines and/or the existence of such a program. Thus, many TAs who do not have an adequate command of the language are slipping through the system.

The Wharton School has made great strides by creating the Wharton Teacher Development Program for their Ph.D. candidates, many of whom are TAs. The first semester of this program consists of ten work-

shops focusing on general teaching methods such as lecturing, explaining and leading discussions. The second-semester mentor program includes in-class evaluations, videotaping, and teacher conferences. Now mandatory for second- or third-year Ph.D. candidates, the course will have about 25 students enrolled this fall. Unfortunately, since the program is supported by a three-year grant from Exxon, continued funding may be a problem.

Dr. Susan L. Lytle, who along with Dr. Larry M. Robbins directs the Wharton Program, also teaches a summer course, open to all Faculty members and graduate students, titled "Strategies for Teaching in Higher Education." It deals with planning, presenting and evaluating one's own course. She also does individualized consulting for various instructors and departments. Many faculty members would like to see even more of these types of options available. They feel that since an even stronger emphasis is going to be placed on excellence in teaching, significant resources must be provided to attain that level of excellence.

### 3. The need for a Centralized Teaching Institute

However, providing resources is only the first step. Distributing information on and utilization of these resources is crucial and this would occur most effectively if some kind of Centralized Teaching Institute were created within the University. As both Dr. Charles E. Dwyer and Dr. Susan L. Lytle suggest, it could be a rather modest affair. It might consist of some video equipment, tapes of effective teaching, including tapes of previous Lindback award winners, documents and bibliographies, and a University coordinator (not affiliated with any particular school) who is familiar with the various programs and opportunities presently available. The visibility of such an Institute is very important since it would indicate the strength of the University's commitment to improving the quality of teaching, and, in the end, that is what really counts. If the faculty—from the Teaching Assistants, to the Assistant Professors aspiring to get tenure to the tenured Professors, to the Department Chairs—really believe that the Deans and the central Administration are taking the issue very seriously, the quality of teaching will surely continue to improve.

#### *Second Task Force on the Quality of Teaching*

- Andrew R. Baggeley, Chair, Subcommittee on the Graduate School of Education and the School of Social Work
- Robert E. Davies, Co-Chair, member of all Subcommittees
- Scott Lawrence Gottlieb
- Ira Harkavy, Chair, Subcommittee on the School of Arts and Sciences and the Graduate School of Fine Arts
- Abba M. Krieger, Chair, Subcommittee on the School of Veterinary Medicine and the Wharton School
- Susan Miley, Chair, Subcommittee on Drafting
- David P. Pope, Chair, Subcommittee on the School of Engineering and Applied Science and the Law School
- Wendy Schick, Co-Chair; Chair, Subcommittee on the Annenberg School of Communication and the School of Medicine
- Rosalyn J. Watts, Chair, Subcommittee on the School of Dental Medicine and the School of Nursing

---

Comment on the Report of the Second Task Force on the Quality of Teaching may be sent to:

President Sheldon Hackney,  
100 College Hall/6380  
Provost Thomas Ehrlich,  
102 College Hall/6381  
Deputy Provost Richard Clelland,  
106 College Hall/6381