

2016-2017 ANNUAL REPORT

CENTER FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS-DALLAS



Center for Teaching and Learning
McDermott Library, MC 2.402
Office of the Provost
University of Texas-Dallas
800 W. Campbell Rd
Richardson, TX 75080
Email: ctl@utdallas.edu
Website: utdallas.edu/ctl

Table of Contents

Governance, Structure, and Personnel	3
<i>CTL Personnel</i>	3
<i>Teaching Leaders</i>	3
<i>CTL Missions</i>	3
Extant Programs and Activities	4-15
<i>Teaching Certificates</i>	4
<i>Major Workshops and Associated Events</i>	4-6
<i>Other Campus Workshops and Events</i>	6-7
<i>School Workshops and Events</i>	8-9
<i>Instructional Improvement Awards</i>	9-10
<i>Lecturer Support</i>	10
<i>Reflective Teaching Seminar</i>	10
<i>New Tenure-Track Faculty Teaching Observation Program (TOP)</i>	11
<i>Association of North Texas Teaching Centers</i>	11
<i>Teaching Awards</i>	12-13
<i>Task Force on Teaching Implications of Increased Enrollment</i>	13
<i>Reading Groups</i>	13-14
<i>Professional Presentations</i>	14
<i>Media and Communications</i>	14
<i>Other Contributions</i>	14-15
<i>International Teaching Assistant Effectiveness Course</i>	15
Upcoming Initiatives	15
<i>Task Force on Student Teaching Evaluations</i>	15
<i>Undergraduate Peer Mentors and Leaders</i>	15
New Location	15-16
Appendix A: Teaching Observation Program	17-18
Appendix B: President’s Teaching Awards	19
Appendix C: Nomination Processes for UTD Teaching Awards	20
Appendix D	21-23
<i>Documentation for Teaching Award Nominations at UTD</i>	21
<i>Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness</i>	22-23
Appendix E: Recommended Guidelines for School-Level Teaching Awards	24-25
Appendix F: Task Force on Teaching Implications of Increased Enrollment	26-32
Appendix G	33-34
<i>Guidelines for Teaching Observation in Promotion and Tenure Reviews</i>	33
<i>Guidelines for Reciprocal Formative Teaching Observations</i>	34

Governance, Structure, and Personnel

The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) at the University of Texas-Dallas (UTD) was officially launched in January 2016 and reports to the Provost's Office. The directorship is a full-time administrative position, but the present holder of that position also has a tenured faculty appointment and an endowed research professorship. Accordingly, he is expected to carry out research, instructional, and service activities in support of CTL, his academic program, UTD, and the scholarly community writ large. He is assisted by a half-time Associate Director, who currently teaches half-time for one of UTD's schools. Finally, there is a full-time Administrative Assistant II, who provides all clerical support for CTL. Funding for all salaries comes from the CTL budget.

Supplementing the core personnel are "teaching leaders," one from each of UTD's eight schools. These are selected by the individual school deans and the leaders are responsible for liaison with the Center and for organizing a minimum number of events or programs each semester within their school, assisted by the Center. The purpose is to expand the number of events and programs on campus and to direct such programming toward issues, concerns, and audiences specific to different schools and their instructional needs. An administrative supplement to each leader is provided by CTL.

CTL Personnel

Director: Dr. Paul F. Diehl, Associate Provost and Ashbel Smith Professor
Associate Director: Dr. Karen Huxtable-Jester, Senior Lecturer III
Administrative Assistant: Beverly Reed

Teaching Leaders

Prof. Shelby Hibbs, Clinical Assistant Professor (A&H)
Dr. Kristin Drogos, Assistant Professor (ATEC)
Dr. Shayla Holub, Associate Professor (BBS)
Dr. Randy Lehmann, Senior Lecturer III (ECS)
Dr. R. Paul Battaglio, Associate Professor (EPPS)
Dr. Rebekah Nix, Senior Lecturer I (IS)
Dr. McClain Watson, Clinical Associate Professor (JSOM)
Dr. John Sibert, Associate Professor (NSM)

CTL Missions

- Provide campus-wide leadership and coordination of activities aimed at supporting excellence in teaching.
- Create a campus culture in which excellent teaching is recognized, respected, and rewarded.
- Enhance student learning through effective pedagogical approaches, assessments, and technologies.
- Support innovation in instructional practices and the scholarship of teaching and learning.
- Encourage and disseminate best practices in teaching that are evidence-based.
- Introduce effective teaching practices to instructors with limited experience.
- Encourage self-reflection, assessment, and improvement by instructors.

This report covers activities from 15 July 2016 through 15 July 2017.

Extant Programs and Activities

Teaching Certificates

CTL offers the Graduate Teaching Certificate (GTC) and the Advanced Graduate Teaching Certificate (AGTC). These are programs for graduate student teaching assistants (TAs) who complete a series of requirements attesting to their training and experience in pedagogy. This is in addition to the training received by all TAs at orientations conducted by the Office of Graduate Studies and by individual schools and programs. Objectives for the GTC are to (1) improve the instructional performance of TAs while at UTD; (2) encourage the use of evidence-based best practices in instruction; (3) improve instructional performance for those pursuing a teaching career in higher education; (4) encourage reflection and innovation in pedagogy for those new to teaching; and (5) enhance employment prospects by developing professional skills and strategies related to teaching. In addition, the AGTC is designed to (1) provide a structured process for the exploration of pedagogy from a discipline-based perspective; and (2) assist TAs in developing a deeper understanding of the scholarly duties required in an academic position.

Since last year's report, 245 additional TAs have signed up for the GTC program,¹ 32 have successfully completed all requirements, 50 have completed some of the requirements, and there is evidence of 312 more having some participation in the program. With regard to the AGTC, 17 additional students have begun completing these requirements and 5 students have completed all of them during this reporting year.

In fall 2016, CTL began offering regular and advanced teaching certificates for post-doctoral research associates who have an instructional role at UTD. The requirements are similar to those for graduate teaching certificates. Twenty-two postdocs have enrolled in the program and 6 have successfully completed all requirements. One has completed the advanced version of the certificate.

Major Workshops and Associated Events

CTL is committed to sponsoring several major events involving external speakers over the course of the academic year. In September 2016, Dr. Christine Stanley, Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity at Texas A&M University, addressed issues of diversity in the classroom. In November 2016, Dr. Brent Iverson, Dean of the School of Undergraduate Studies at the University of Texas-Austin, met with faculty and staff on issues concerning new college students and how to enhance the freshman experience. For the third annual all campus workshop on teaching, Dr. Stephen Chew, Chair and Professor of Psychology, Samford University, and Carnegie Scholar, Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL), presented some of the latest research and associated recommendations on the processes of student learning. A summary of their presentations and events is given in Table 1.²

¹ 237 TAs signed up during the previous reporting year; 18 of those completed requirements during the previous reporting year and others have continued in the program during this reporting year.

² An additional speaker on educational technology was scheduled, but the visit was cancelled and could not be rescheduled.



Dr. Christine Stanley



Dr. Brent Iverson



Dr. Stephen Chew

External Speaker	Title	Audience	Audience Size
Christine Stanley	Creating our Future: Teaching and Learning for a Diverse Classroom	Campus Faculty and Graduate TAs	118
Christine Stanley	Diversity Challenges in the Classroom – Panel Discussion	Campus Faculty and Graduate TAs	36
Christine Stanley	Diversity Issues in Higher Education	President Benson and Senior Campus Leadership	10
Christine Stanley	Diversity Challenges and Strategies	Campus Diversity Committee	22
Christine Stanley	“Women Leading in Diversity” Networking Breakfast;	Campus and Community Leaders	70
Brent Iverson	A Town Hall Conversation on the First Year Experience	Campus Faculty and Graduate TAs	45
Brent Iverson	Undergraduate Services and Offices	OUE Leadership and Staff	5
Brent Iverson	Freshmen Courses	Freshmen Seminar Instructors	13
Brent Iverson	Discussion of the Needs of First Year Students	QEP Committee members	15
Stephen Chew	What We Can Do Outside the Classroom to Help Students Inside the Classroom	Post-Doctoral and Graduate TAs	58
Stephen Chew	Improving Student Performance by Addressing Student and Teacher Misconceptions About Learning	Campus Faculty and Staff	74
Stephen Chew	Teaching Psychology	BBS Administrators	4
Stephen Chew	Teaching Psychology	BBS Graduate Student Professional Development Committee	20

Table 1: Major Workshops and Associated Events, 2016-17

For the 2017-18 academic year, there are four major workshops scheduled, as listed below:

- 25 September 2017, "If We Learn Like *That*, Why Do We Teach Like *This*?" with Dr. Robert Duke, Marlene and Morton Meyerson Centennial Professor and Head of Music and Human Learning at the University of Texas at Austin as well as a member of the University of Texas System Academy of Distinguished Teachers.
- 8 November 2017, "Teaching Undergraduate Science" with Dr. Linda Hodges, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Director of the Faculty Development Center at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County and former Director of the Harold W. McGraw, Jr. Center for Teaching and Learning at Princeton University.
- 1-2 February 2018, "Leading Discussions" with Dr. Jay Howard, Professor of Sociology and Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Butler University.
- 11 April, 2018, "Teaching on the Edge of One's Expertise" with Dr. Therese Huston, Faculty Development Consultant, Center for Faculty Development at Seattle University

Other Campus Workshops and Events

CTL also offered a series of 14 specialized events and workshops for both faculty and graduate TAs; these are summarized in Table 2.

Workshop/Event	Audience	Audience Size
Effective Teaching with Teams & Groups	Campus Faculty, Post-Doctoral, and Graduate TAs	64
Developing Professionalism and Your Teaching Persona	Post-Doctoral and Graduate TAs	65
Rubrics for the Ph.D. Oral Defense	Campus Faculty	26
Diversity in the Classroom	Campus Faculty, Post-Doctoral, and Graduate TAs	74
Motivation is Not Enough	Campus Faculty, Post-Doctoral, and Graduate TAs	35
Making the Most of Large Classes	Campus Faculty, Post-Doctoral, and Graduate TAs	33
Effective Use of Clickers	Campus Faculty, Post-Doctoral, and Graduate TAs	51
They Get Younger Every Year! The Challenges of Teaching and Reaching Millennials	Campus Faculty, Post-Doctoral, and Graduate TAs	54
Power Pointless: Taming Technology to Improve Teaching	Campus Faculty, Post-Doctoral, and Graduate TAs	45
Watch Out for Curves and Detours: Grading Scales, Extra Credit, and Other Concerns in Measuring Student Learning	Campus Faculty, Post-Doctoral, and Graduate TAs	55
Effective Strategies for Supervising Undergraduate Researchers (co-sponsor with Office of Undergraduate Education)	Campus Faculty, Post-Doctoral, and Graduate TAs	48

Metacognition Follow Up	Campus Faculty, Post-Doctoral, and Graduate TAs	33
Ethical Dilemmas in Teaching: Analysis of Case Examples	Campus Faculty, Post-Doctoral, and Graduate TAs	37
Strategies for Promoting a Sense of Belonging for International Students	Campus Faculty, Staff, Post-Doctoral, and Graduate TAs	84

Table 2: Other Campus Workshops and Events, 2016-2017

For the 2017-18 academic year, CTL will sponsor at least 12 regular workshops for faculty, post-doctoral associates, and TAs, including, among others, those on the following topics:

- Simulations in Teaching
- Case Study Approaches
- Teaching at a Community College (Graduate Professionalization Week)
- Accessibility Issues and Learning
- Evaluating Instruction Broadly
- Documenting Teaching Effectiveness
- Breakfast series, “Best of Times, Worst of Times”

In addition, CTL will co-sponsor specialized workshops and events in association with other campus units:

- 4 workshops for new assistant professors in conjunction with the Provost’s Office and the Committee on Faculty Mentoring.
- 6 workshops on assessment in conjunction with the Office of Assessment
- Multiple workshops for undergraduate student mentors in conjunction with the Office of Student Success and the Office of Undergraduate Education



School Workshops and Events

Teaching Leaders in each of the eight schools organized events geared to the particular interests and concerns of the faculty and graduate student TAs in those schools. These events are listed in Table 3 below.

Workshop/Event	School	Audience Size
TA Teacher Training	ECS	75
Communications Workshop, Part I	ECS	34
Communications Workshop, Part II	ECS	34
Communications Workshop for Scientist & Engineers	ECS	120
Communications Workshop for Scientist & Engineers	ECS	50
TA Teacher Training	ECS	3
TA Appreciation and Feedback Lunch	JSOM	50
Lunch and Learn	JSOM	10
JSOM Teaching Book Club – 3 Meetings, Spring, 2017	JSOM	8
Spring Faculty Meetings – Special Presentations	IS	60
Chandler’s Reading Classes – Special Presentations	IS	45
Education Applications of the MOHO Knowledge Discovery Platform	IS	25
Character Day 2017	IS	67
Translating What You’re Already Doing in the Classroom to Assessment Reporting	A&H	10
Assessment Design Charrette	A&H	8
Book Club on Specifications Grading by Linda B. Nilson	A&H	16
Students on the Spectrum	A&H	22
Round Robin: Engagement in the Classroom	A&H	11
ATEC Pedagogy Workshop	ATEC	25
Effective Teaching in ATEC	ATEC	
Session 1		25
Session 1		25
Session 2		25
Session 3		25
Session 4		20
Session 5		20
Session 6		20
Session 7		20
The Successful Grad Student: Insights and Tips on How to Make Your Time at UT Dallas Work for You	BBS	25
Advice from the Career Center	BBS	30
TA Orientation – Dos and Don’ts for TA and Panel Discussion	BBS	27
Ways to Improve Student Learning: A Discussion of Stephen Chew’s CTL Workshops	BBS	30
Supporting LGBT+ Students in the Classroom	BBS	30
Teaching Different Types of Classes- Panel Discussion,	EPPS	12
Public Speaking for an Academic and Lay Audience	EPPS	22
Peer-Led Team Learning (PLTL) Weekly Meetings	NSM	N/A
Instructors of Freshman Chemistry Courses Weekly Meetings	NSM	4

For the 2016-17 academic year, the roles of the teaching leaders have been expanded, and each school will sponsor at least 6 events or activities related to specific instructional concerns of the unit.

With CTL encouragement and some financial subsidies, several schools and units have undertaken programs to provide specialized training for new TAs. ATEC has a fully developed program that is closely integrated with the GTC certificate program. ECS and NSM as a whole have a full day training session for TAs. EPPS has a nascent program. A&H is developing a full program and Math will implement a new classroom protocol and associated training sessions for TAs in its instruction in introductory calculus courses. CTL hopes that such efforts will spread to all schools and relevant programs. The CTL Associate Director gave presentations “Learning to Teach and Teaching to Learn” at the TA training sessions for both the ATEC and NSM programs. The CTL Director gave presentations “The First Day of Class” at the TA training session for the ATEC program.

Instructional Improvement Awards

CTL conducted a competition for Instructional Improvement Awards (IIAs) now in its second year and awarded to faculty with the goals to (1) support the continuous improvement of instructors on campus, (2) support the implementation of teaching innovations and enhancements (not including equipment), (3) encourage the development of multiple, discipline-appropriate assessment alternatives and the dissemination of successful models to other units for use in support of teaching improvement, and (4) increase visibility of teaching excellence, enhancement, and innovation across and beyond the campus community.

IIAs enable recipients to design, implement, and assess instructional innovation projects that enhance teaching and learning at UTD. Projects and activities that may be supported by IIA grants include, but are not limited to (1) projects that improve existing courses, with the expectation that viable improvements include the incorporation of innovative educational technologies or the development of community-engagement opportunities, and (2) research that examines the effectiveness of some aspect of instructional practice or that develops methods to measure instructional effectiveness.

CTL received 18 proposals from faculty and 9 were selected for funding at an average level of approximately \$4,700 per project; 8 of these are summarized in Table 4 (one declined the award due to external constraints). In addition, projects that were not funded and involved online instruction components were referred to eLearning, whose director agreed to provide some support without cost to the principal investigators.

Principal Investigator(s)	Unit	Project Title
James Florence and Diana Cogan	NSM- Electrical Engineering	Hybridization & Lab Update for EE/CE 1202-Introduction to Electrical Engineering II
Mieczyslaw Dabkowski and John Zweck	NSM-Mathematical Sciences	TA Training for More Active Learning
Roger Malina and Kathryn Evans	ATEC – Arts & Technology, NSM – Physics and A&H - Music	An Art-Sci-Humanities Cloud Curriculum
Rebecca Nix	IS -Teacher Development	The Digital Integrity Lab @ UTD
Carie S. Tucker King and Christopher Ryan	A&H - Professional Communication	Proposal to Design, Implement, & Assess a Hybrid Version of “RHET 1302-Rhetoric”

Catherine Parsonneault and Shelby-Allison Hibbs	A&H - Art and Performance	Interdisciplinary Signature Assignments: Providing Space & Support for Collaboration among Faculty
Andrew Wheeler	EPPS - Criminology	Flipping Communities & Crime into a Blended Learning Course
Robert J. Stern	NSM - Geosciences	Hardware & Software for Improving an Undergraduate Course in Geosciences

Table 4: Instructional Improvement Awards, 2017

Lecturer Support

Based on last year's CTL task force report on assisting new lecturers (full and part-time), CTL created and distributed a handbook for new part-time faculty that contains orientation materials concerning UTD procedures and instructional resources.

During the next academic year, CTL will conduct a survey of all lecturers, with a focus on part-time instructors, to determine pedagogical needs and preferences for future programs directed at this group.

Reflective Teaching Seminar

CTL offered the Reflective Teaching Seminar (RTS) for the first time during this academic year. The program sought to (1) create an environment for junior faculty in which self-reflection about teaching is fostered, and innovation in their instruction is encouraged, (2) promote interdisciplinary dialogue on teaching-related issues, (3) expose junior faculty to educational research that might be used to facilitate excellent teaching, and (4) offer direct assistance in improving the teaching of individual faculty members. This is NOT a program exclusively or even primarily for those having classroom difficulties.

Seventeen faculty members from 7 different UTD schools participated in the seminar, which involved 15 meetings over the course of the academic year. The CTL Director and Associate Director served as seminar facilitators and participating faculty discussed issues such as setting course objectives and addressing challenging student behaviors. Participants also observed a lower-level course in a discipline far outside their own expertise to simulate the freshmen experience, and then discussed their own experiences.

During the coming academic year, RTS participants will reconvene in the fall for a series of four follow-up meetings including peer observation of each other's classes. The RTS will be repeated with new participants during the 2018-19 academic year.

During the 2017-18 academic year, CTL will launch the Senior Reflective Teaching Seminar (SRTS). Modeled somewhat after the RTS, this seminar will focus on cutting edge approaches to pedagogy and will include tenured faculty members and senior lecturers with more than five years of teaching experience. Self-nominations were solicited from the faculty as a whole, and 16 faculty members from 7 UTD schools have agreed to participate.

New Tenure-Track Faculty Teaching Observation Program (TOP)

At the initiative of the Provost, CTL created a pilot program for new junior faculty on the tenure track in which an award-winning teacher from a different school visits the new faculty member's class. The pair meets to share confidential feedback about teaching effectiveness, methods, and the like. The junior faculty member also visits the senior member's class.

All 14 new tenure-track assistant professors were invited in September 2016 to participate. Eight new faculty members accepted the invitation and these were joined by one extant assistant professor who heard about the program and requested to participate. Some of those who declined cited limited and/or graduate only teaching during their first year. All past ROTA winners were invited to serve as observers; 13 accepted and 9 were matched with the junior faculty members noted above.

CTL requested feedback from observers and observes about the program. Generally, most did the minimum requested but nothing more, and these reported a positive experience. One pairing resulted in a broader, ongoing mentoring relationship. Three pairings never produced class visits even as initial meetings took place; two of these apparently stemmed from disinterest by the junior faculty member, one was a result of scheduling issues.

During the next academic year, the TOPs program will be continued but significantly revised. First, the program will include interactions between senior and junior faculty members during both the fall and spring semesters, rather than only one; see Appendix A for a description. Second, a broader set of teaching award winners, beyond ROTA winners, will be solicited for participation as senior faculty observers. Third, CTL will conduct 4 of the workshops in the seminar series for new tenure-track faculty offered by the Committee on Faculty Mentoring and the Provost's Office.



Association of North Texas Teaching Centers

CTL initiated a coordinating mechanism among centers for teaching in colleges and universities in geographic proximity to UTD. The purpose is to exchange ideas, encourage reciprocal visits for each other's programming, and possibly share resources for visiting speakers. An inaugural meeting for center directors was held on the UTD campus in September 2016. This has been followed by two meetings at other locations during the reporting period.



Teaching Awards

CTL assumed responsibility for the nomination and selection processes of all campus teaching awards and the nomination process for state and UT system awards. These included President's Awards at the campus level as well as the Regents' Outstanding Teaching Awards (ROTA), Academy of Distinguished Teachers, and Piper Professorships³ above the campus level.

CTL began by designing and securing approval for two new President's Awards, those dedicated to excellence in instruction for graduate/professional and online/blended learning respectively; these were in addition to extant awards for undergraduate teaching by tenure-track faculty, lecturers, and teaching assistants respectively. See Appendix B for descriptions.

CTL changed the nomination process for each of the awards, opening up the process to multiple stakeholders. See Appendix C for details. The number of nominations for ROTA and the President's Awards more than doubled from previous years. Each nominee was invited to submit a designated set of materials for consideration, representing a broader and multidimensional view of instructional excellence relative to prior competitions. In conjunction with the Committee on Effective Teaching (CET), CTL facilitated the creation of multiple selection committees for these awards with representation from CET, past winners, and students. Committee members read full files, discussed nominees, and selected campus nominations and award winners as appropriate. See Appendix D for details.

³ The UTD nominee for a Piper professorship was already selected by another process by the time that CTL assumed responsibility for the award and CTL only assisted the candidate in the preparation of application materials. In the coming academic year, CTL will have full responsibility for the nomination process for that award.

UTD was successful in UT system competitions, with a UTD faculty member as one of the four selections to the Academy of Distinguished Teachers. UTD was also recognized with three faculty members winning ROTA awards, the maximum number that the campus could receive.

CTL also contacted all school deans and associate deans to encourage the creation and/or revision of school and program awards for excellence in teaching. The purpose is not only to recognize more excellent instructors, but also to create a vertically integrated process that provides qualified nominees for future campus and system level competitions. CTL provided each school with a set of guidelines representing best practices and ways to avoid sources of invalidity – see Appendix E. Several schools are in the process of or have completed revising their award processes and it is hoped that all eight schools will have an array of awards, selected through valid processes, in the next academic year.

In April 2017, CTL sponsored the first of what will be an annual reception celebrating excellence in instruction. Winners of system, campus, and school teaching awards, as well as RTS participants and GTC recipients, were recognized following opening remarks by President Benson. The reception was attended by 110 people from around campus.

Task Force on Teaching Implications of Increased Enrollment

The President and Provost authorized the creation the “Task Force on Teaching Implications of Increased Enrollment” to examine the upward trend in enrollment and what it may mean for instruction at UT Dallas. CTL organized the task force and it was chaired by its Director with participation from all schools and many units across campus. The task force was asked to consider this question and specifically to consider:

- How are class sizes likely to be impacted by such increases?
- What implication does this have for current classroom space and future classroom design?
- How might instructional strategies be altered?
- How might instructional technology be improved?
- How might assessment approaches be changed?
- How would class scheduling be impacted?
- How might increased enrollment affect the use of part-time faculty and PhD candidates as instructors of record?
- How might increased enrollment influence the adoption of online, hybrid, “flipped classrooms,” and other pedagogical approaches?
- What additional resources would be required?

The task force issued a report in December 2016 that contained analysis and recommendations on multiple subjects including managing enrollment, increasing class size, staffing, online/blended learning, scheduling, student services, and space considerations. That report has become part of UTD’s strategic planning process in 2017. See Appendix F for a copy of the report.

Reading Groups

CTL co-sponsored a reading group organized by the Office of Assessment in which participants read and discussed James Lang’s *Small Teaching* (2016). Ten people participated.

CTL also sponsored 2 reading groups that read and discussed Jonathan Cole’s *Toward a More Perfect University* (2016); 13 people participated across the two groups.

In the coming academic year, CTL will sponsor four such groups. Three will be centered on books authored by external speakers that will visit campus. A fourth will deal with issues surrounding graduate student mentoring.

Professional Presentations

The CTL Associate Director made the following professional presentations:

- Interactive session, 41st Annual POD Network (The Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education) Conference -- “The Final Frontier: Space and Educational Development.”
- Concurrent session, SACSCOC Annual Meeting. -- “Motivation is Not Enough: Supporting Students in Developing the Skills for Success.” The Director of Assessment was a co-presenter. An updated version of the presentation has been accepted for the SACSCOC Annual Meeting in December 2017.
- Inaugural address, Texas Teachers of Psychology First Annual Conference. -- “Understanding Mindset and Metacognition to Promote Meaningful Learning in Psychology.”
- Teaching workshop, Parker University Annual Symposium on Teaching and Learning (“Motivation is Not Enough”) and keynote (“The Difference We Make”).

The CTL Director gave invited talks on teaching – “Turning Good Teaching on Its Head: A Thought Experiment” at the University of Oklahoma, Bradley University, and the University of Illinois respectively.

Media and Communications

A monthly newsletter from the Center is distributed directly to those on CTL listservs and indirectly to all faculty through school deans; the newsletter contains regular features including a message from the director, upcoming events, a teaching tip, a summary and citation to recent pedagogical research, and section that reports student perceptions on teaching (“What the Students Say”).

A Facebook page with weekly postings of interest from the newsletter and scholarly news and articles was launched in January 2017. The CTL website was delayed for much of the academic year and CTL has hired a graduate assistant to assist with its completion. The expected launch date is 1 September 2017. Twitter and blog accounts are planned to be attached to the website, but must wait until the website is complete.

Other Contributions

CTL created a set of guidelines for peer observation and evaluation of teaching. CTL distributed these to all school deans as well selected others, such as those involved with TOP – see Appendix G for both the evaluation and formative versions. The Provost’s Office distributed these to faculty involved with third year and tenure/promotion reviews.

CTL also created a framework and series of suggestions for documenting teaching effectiveness. This two-page set of guidelines is helpful for award nominees and other faculty in preparing materials for

review of teaching effectiveness as well as for faculty members who are involved in making award decisions or those associated with third and promotion/tenure reviews. Copies of the document were distributed to all school deans as well as all those were nominated for teaching awards under the purview of CTL; these can be found in the second part of Appendix D.

CTL also provided introductory presentations on its programs at orientations for new faculty (fall) and graduate teaching assistants (fall and spring) respectively.

International Teaching Assistant Effectiveness Course

In coordination with the Office of Graduate Studies, CTL worked with ELS Educational Services for it to design and implement a course that helps graduate TAs develop and refine the teaching skills needed to work more effectively with American undergraduate students. The course was offered to UTD graduate students in fall 2016, with six students enrolled. Although assessments were positive, UTD no longer has a contract with ELS and the course will not be repeated.

Upcoming Initiatives

Task Force on Student Teaching Evaluations

Student evaluations of instruction play important roles in yearly performance ratings, promotion and tenure decisions, and instructional awards selections. Nevertheless, two problems undermine their utility in these processes. First, low response rates and characteristics concerning how and when the evaluations are administered raise serious questions about the validity of the ratings. Second, even given valid ratings, the ways that such evaluations are used by decision makers reflect misunderstandings about their limitations in making judgments about instructional effectiveness.

Within the parameters of the University of Texas system, and relying on the empirically-based scholarship collected and synthesized by the Center for Teaching and Learning, a task force will meet and deliberate during the fall 2017 semester to (1) review the format, questions, and conditions of administration for student teaching evaluations and make recommendations for any changes therein; and (2) construct a short set of guidelines to assist decision makers in interpreting and using student teaching evaluations.

Undergraduate Peer Mentors and Leaders

Undergraduate students play critical roles as mentors, peers, group leaders, and tutors in various programs around campus. Many of them already receive excellent training, but the depth and variety of this training varies across programs and assignments. CTL will work with various programs with the goals of (1) creating workshops specifically for these undergraduates, (2) determining which existing CTL workshops might be suitable for undergraduates, and (3) developing a prototype for undergraduate versions of the teaching certificate programs.

New Location

As of 15 June, CTL has moved into permanent space located on the main floor of the McDermott Library (MC 2.402 and 2.404). This includes office space for the administrative assistant, a small meeting and reception area, and a large room suitable for larger meetings, workshops with less than 50

participants, and other CTL programs. CTL will continue to have privileged access for three days a week during select hours to the 100-seat auditorium directly across from the new office space and this will be used for events that have anticipated attendance of greater than 50 participants.

Appendix A: Teaching Observation Program (TOP)

Rationale

Educational research has shown that the first two years of a faculty member's teaching career are critical. These are the times that s/he develops a teaching style and approach compatible with personal strengths. Appropriate support and guidance can make a lasting impact in this formative stage, making the difference between fostering faculty members who are outstanding teachers versus those who find ways to muddle through their instructional responsibilities. Nevertheless, teaching observation and feedback occur sporadically, if at all, prior to the third year and promotion review processes. This might be adequate for evaluation purposes, but does not come in the formative period in the first two years. The teaching observation program is designed to address this need at a critical time in the careers of junior faculty.

Objectives

The central objective is to provide essential instructional feedback to new junior faculty members at UTD. The program is not a remedial one, but directed at all incoming faculty under the assumption that even the best instructors can benefit from feedback and assistance by a colleague. A second objective is to develop a norm or culture of reflective teaching among new faculty, and indeed the faculty as a whole. This program and the participation of distinguished senior faculty should send a message to new faculty that high quality teaching is valued by the University, and there is a significant commitment made to it. Of course, this program alone will not ensure the development or strengthening of the norm, but it can be a component of broader University efforts in this regard (e.g., CTL activities, teaching awards). Third, the program is designed to utilize the expertise held by the best teachers on campus, who will have the opportunity to share their insights and talents with others.

Program Description

The intent is to match those junior faculty members with senior faculty who have a distinguished record of teaching. Potential senior faculty members are drawn from among those who have won college, university, and state teaching awards and those recommended by CTL Teaching Leaders. The program is designed for the junior and senior faculty members to meet once informally during the fall and spring semesters and then exchange classroom visits. The first meeting, which would be arranged by CTL, is a get acquainted session. The next meetings occur when the senior faculty member visits a class taught by the junior faculty member. At a later time, the senior faculty member will share observations and suggestions with the junior faculty member. The junior faculty member is then invited to observe the teaching of the senior faculty member. Follow-up meetings are encouraged in which the senior faculty member points out the strengths of the junior faculty member's teaching as well as offering some suggestions on how the classroom performance might be improved. Suggestions on teaching strategies, style, and other areas are appropriate points for discussion. Teaching schedules permitting, this process should occur in the fall semester and then be repeated in the spring. All participants will receive invitations to other CTL events during the year. Additional meetings may occur at the discretion of the participants.

Safeguards

Any time that a colleague visits another's class there is the risk that such observation may be used in the faculty evaluation process. In order not to discourage potential junior faculty members who might fear that such information might be used against them in evaluation, promotion, and tenure decisions, there are a number of safeguards for this program. First, this is a Provost-initiated program with concern for teaching improvement and not evaluation. Second, the senior faculty member assigned to the junior faculty member must be from outside the home department (or school) of that junior faculty member. This insures that the junior faculty member is not intimidated by the presence of someone who may make personnel decisions affecting him or her in the future. Every attempt will be made to match the senior

faculty member and junior faculty member according to the similarity of the size, type, and subject matter of classes that they teach. Finally, the results of the project remain strictly confidential, as there is no written record kept or outside access to the information from the program.

Appendix B: President's Teaching Awards

1. President's Teaching Excellence Award in Undergraduate Instruction for tenure-track faculty members: this award recognizes sustained excellence in undergraduate instruction, including innovation in approaches to teaching and the overall impact on student learning. To be eligible, faculty members must have taught on the UTD campus for a minimum of 5 years and have not won this award in the previous 10 years. (existing award)
2. President's Teaching Excellence Award in Undergraduate Instruction for non-tenure-track or contingent faculty members: this award recognizes sustained excellence in undergraduate instruction, including innovation in approaches to teaching and the overall impact on student learning. To be eligible, faculty members must have taught on the UTD campus for a minimum of 3 years and have not won this award in the previous 10 years. (existing award)
3. President's Teaching Excellence Award for Teaching Assistants: this award recognizes exceptional instructional performance by a graduate teaching assistant. To be eligible, graduate students must have served as a teaching assistant for a minimum of 2 semesters on the UTD campus. (existing award)
4. President's Teaching Excellence Award in Graduate/Professional Instruction: this award recognizes sustained excellence in graduate or professional program instruction, including innovation in approaches to teaching and the overall impact on student learning. To be eligible, faculty members must have taught on the UTD campus for a minimum of 5 years (including at least one graduate or professional course for four semesters) and have not won this award in the previous 10 years. (new award)
5. President's Teaching Excellence Award in Online/Blended Instruction: this award recognizes excellence in the design and delivery of courses in online or blended formats, including innovation in course development, effective use of technology and media, and overall positive impact on student learning. To be eligible, faculty members must have taught at least 3 courses in an online (course delivered 85-100% online) or blended (course delivered 50-84% online) format in the last 3 years and have not won this award in the previous 10 years. (new award)

Appendix C: Nomination Processes for UTD Teaching Awards

Nomination Process – Regent’s Outstanding Teaching Award (ROTA)

1. Solicitation of Nominations – simple names and school
 - a. Winners of parallel school awards from previous year automatically nominated
 - b. Deans and associate deans
 - c. Program heads
 - d. Committee on Effective Teaching members (those not on awards committee)
 - e. Teaching Leaders – Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL)
 - f. Previous ROTA winners
2. Contacting Nominees – all nominees contacted by CTL and invited to submit materials

Nomination Process – President’s Faculty Awards

1. Solicitation of Nominations – simple names and school
 - a. Winners of parallel school awards from previous year automatically nominated
 - b. ROTA pool automatically considered
 - c. Deans and associate deans
 - d. Program heads
 - e. Committee on Effective Teaching members (those not on awards committee)
 - f. Teaching Leaders – Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL)
2. Contacting Nominees – all nominees contacted by CTL and invited to submit materials

Nomination Process – President’s TA Award

1. Solicitation of Nominations – simple names and school
 - a. GTC recipients automatically contacted
 - b. Program heads who contact individual faculty members
 - c. Associate Deans for Graduate Studies contact individual faculty members
2. Contacting Nominees – all nominees contacted by CTL and invited to submit materials

Nomination Process – Piper Professorship

1. Past ROTA winners invited to apply
2. Recent President’s Award winners invited to apply

Nomination Process – UT System’s Academy of Distinguished Teachers

1. Past ROTA winners invited to apply

Appendix D:

Documentation for Teaching Award Nominations at UTD

All nominees would be requested to submit the following materials, which represent a teaching portfolio (some of which the committee could secure independently):

Regent's Outstanding Teaching Awards (ROTA) President's Faculty Awards (except online award)

1. Teaching Philosophy Statement
2. List of Courses Taught – up to the last six years
3. Student Evaluations Summary – up to the last six years.
4. Student Comments
5. Sample Syllabi, Exams, Course Assignments, and other materials
6. Listing of Other Instructional Accomplishments as per attached list “Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness”

President's TA Award

1. Letter(s) of Support from Faculty Members
2. Teaching Philosophy Statement
3. List of Courses Taught –with designated role (e.g., grader, independent instructor)
4. Student Evaluations Summary – if available
5. Student Comments – if available
6. Sample of Independent Syllabi, Exams, Course Assignments, and other materials – if appropriate

President's Online/Hybrid Award

1. All online materials/website
2. Student Evaluations Summary – if available
3. Student Comments – optional and if available

Piper Professorship

1. Materials from past ROTA and President's Award Nominations

UT System's Academy of Distinguished Teachers

1. ROTA file (required by Academy)
2. One page letter indicating interest (required by Academy)

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Regardless of the program/school in which they work, faculty members are contractually obligated to fulfill certain teaching responsibilities. These frequently fall into four broad areas: curriculum, classroom instruction, extra-classroom instruction, and teaching-related service. In addition, faculty members are increasingly making important contributions to instruction through the scholarship of teaching and learning.

The contributions of individual faculty members along these dimensions will vary according to a number of factors including departmental norms, assigned responsibilities, and rank. Few, if any, members will make all of the contributions listed.

Listed below are indicators that have been found applicable in different disciplines as evidence of teaching effectiveness. These can be used as documentation for effectiveness for awards consideration as well as for periodic faculty evaluations.

I. Curriculum: the development of course and curriculum content

Evidence/Indicators

- Syllabi with course goals and learning objectives
- Writing assignments, examinations, and other evaluation instruments
- Peer evaluations of course content from colleagues
- Comparison of course materials between sections of the same course
- Importance of instructor's courses for the departmental curriculum or disciplinary core
- Development of new courses or significant modification of existing courses
- Development of online courses and materials in traditional formats
- Revision or development of new degree programs, curriculum, and the like
- Content suitability for and student performance in follow-on courses
- Grants and Awards for course or curriculum development
- Grants related to curriculum development

II. Classroom and Online Instruction: teaching specific courses in classroom and online settings

Evidence/Indicators

- Lesson plans, PowerPoint presentations of lectures, and Websites for courses
- Online course materials (e.g., recorded lectures)
- Student course evaluations (quantitative), written student comments, letters, and other student input
- Multiple peer evaluations from colleagues
- Incorporation of technology and other non-traditional approaches into instruction
- Development of new teaching techniques, materials, or exercises (e.g., simulations, case study materials)
- Guest lectures in other courses
- Awards for instruction

III. Extra-Classroom Instruction: teaching outside of standard classroom settings

Evidence/Indicators

- Direction of independent studies (graduate and undergraduate)
- Direction of senior honors theses, master's theses, and doctoral dissertations
- Membership on graduate review, qualifying examination, prospectus, and dissertation/theses committees
- Supervision of internships
- Presentations before student organizations
- Co-authorship of papers and publications with undergraduate and graduate students
- Mentoring undergraduate students in research (e.g., McNair program)
- Serving as a mentor to another faculty member
- Grants related to instructional innovation

IV. Administration/Service Related to Teaching: at program, school, campus, profession, and community levels

Evidence/Indicators

- Student advisement and service as a faculty advisor to student organizations
- Service on instruction-related program, school, and university committees
- Service on education-related local, state, national, and international committees
- Service on an editorial board of an education journal or as a reviewer of educational grants applications and/or publications
- Leadership roles and presentations at instructional workshops at the school, campus, or beyond the campus levels
- Service as a teaching mentor for an undergraduate student, a graduate student, or another faculty member
- Supervision of large, multi-section courses

V. Contributions to and Dissemination of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Except for those faculty specifically hired for such duties, contributions in this area are not a substitute for discipline-based scholarship. Contributions in this area should therefore be rewarded under teaching and not research.

Evidence/Indicators

- Authorship of textbooks
- Adoption of one's textbooks by other institutions
- Grants related to the scholarship of teaching
- Technology and software development related to instruction
- Instruction-related publications, papers, and reports
- Participation in teaching seminars (e.g., Reflective Teaching Seminar), courses, short-courses, reading groups, and other teaching improvement programs.
- Invited talks on teaching-related topics

Appendix E: Recommended Guidelines for School-Level Teaching Awards

Developed by the Committee on Effective Teaching
Endorsed by the Center for Teaching and Learning
January 2017

Rewarding excellent teaching is an important way for schools to show that they value excellent teaching. This value is communicated not only to the award recipients, but to everyone with an interest in the university's mission: students and their families, faculty colleagues, employers, and taxpayers. In addition to having a range of awards that matches the types of outstanding teaching valued in each school, it is essential to have clear criteria for identifying teaching effectiveness and valid procedures for selecting award winners. A carefully designed system will protect the integrity of the awards and the school.

The Committee on Effective Teaching (CET) recommends that all schools develop a system for recognizing and rewarding excellent teaching. Some schools give no awards at all and others do so with a process that lacks validity. CET has compiled the following guidelines to help all schools either (a) develop a process or (b) improve the process already in place. The Center for Teaching and Learning is available to assist and for consultations in these tasks.

Identify Award Categories

Schools need to decide what kinds of instructional excellence should be recognized and for what categories of instructors. These will vary across schools depending on course offerings and the like, but the following are general guidelines that should apply to all:

- Consideration should be given to awards that parallel the five President's Awards given at the campus level: (1) tenured and track-track faculty for undergraduate teaching; (2) non-tenure-track faculty for undergraduate teaching; (3) graduate and professional teaching; (4) teaching assistants; and (5) online and blended learning. Winners at the school-level for such awards are automatically nominated for campus level equivalents the following year.
- Consideration should be given to creating awards that recognize categories of faculty for whom no awards exist at the campus or university system levels or for whom it is difficult to compete at such levels. Part-time faculty and tenure-track assistant professors in particular fall into these categories.
- Awards should carry monetary prizes, as well as plaques or other items that can be publicly displayed. The monetary awards need to be large enough to motivate potential award winners and to signal the value of excellent teaching to university stakeholders.

Nomination Process

The step preliminary to the selection of award winners is the identification of a qualified pool of instructors from whom winners can be chosen. The following guidelines are designed to ensure a qualified pool of potential awardees:

- Nominations should be solicited from a variety of individuals who have access to and ability to evaluate different aspects of teaching excellence. Deans, Associate Deans, faculty colleagues, graduate students, and undergraduates all might offer input regarding which faculty members demonstrate outstanding teaching.
- In no case should nominations rely exclusively or primarily on student nominations or student teaching evaluation scores.
- Nominees might be asked provide evidence of their teaching effectiveness so as to enhance the validity of the selection process described below; the Appendix to these guidelines contain suggestions for materials to be collected.

- The Teaching Leader of each school, who is affiliated with the Center for Teaching and Learning, might be assigned to coordinate this nomination process as well as the selection process described below. In no case should someone other than a faculty member be in charge of the nomination or selection processes.

Selection Process

From the pool of nominees, there needs to be a valid process in deciding on the winners. The following are good rules of thumb to follow:

- Selection committee members should have some significant teaching experience or seniority.
- Selection committee members are not eligible for awards themselves that year nor may they vote on awards in which one of their PhD students is under consideration.
- Student participation on selection committees is acceptable, even desirable in most cases.

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Selection of award winners should be based on exceptional teaching, and what this involves can vary across instructors and school or program context. Schools should adopt a broad-based view of teaching excellence and use multiple pieces of evidence and indicators to identify that excellence.

Specifically:

- Schools should consult the Appendix for a list of different dimensions of teaching effectiveness and associated indicators.
- Selection should be based on valid evidence appropriate to the award under consideration.
- In no case should awards be based exclusively or primarily on the number of student nominations or student teaching evaluation scores.
- Awards should be given for *sustained* excellence over a period of years rather than merely performance in the year in which the award is given.

Timeline

The process of soliciting nominations, asking nominees to submit evidence of teaching effectiveness, convening a committee to review these materials, committee recommendation of award winners, and Deans' final decisions regarding award winners is likely to take several months. Final decisions should be made prior to 1 April of each year to provide for recognition of winners at end of the year school events and at the yearly campus teaching awards reception held in late April.

Appendix F: Task Force on Teaching Implications of Increased Enrollment

The University of Texas-Dallas (UTD) has experienced tremendous enrollment growth going from 14,523 students a decade ago to 26,797 in fall 2016; this exceeds projections in the most recent UTD Strategic Plan⁴ and new projections anticipate over 4,500 more students by 2020.⁵ How such increases are managed has significant implications for teaching and student learning. Accordingly, in May 2016, Interim President Wildenthal and Interim Provost Musselman authorized the creation of the “Task Force on Teaching Implications of Increased Enrollment” to examine the implications of this upward trend in enrollment for instruction at UTD. The task force was asked specifically to consider:

- How are class sizes likely to be impacted by such increases?
- What implication does this have for current classroom space and future classroom design?
- How might instructional strategies be altered?
- How might instructional technology be improved?
- How might assessment approaches be changed?
- How would class scheduling be impacted?
- How might increased enrollment affect the use of part-time faculty and PhD candidates as instructors of record?
- How might increased enrollment influence the adoption of online, hybrid, “flipped classrooms,” and other pedagogical approaches?
- What additional resources would be required?

Principles

The Task Force adopted a series of principles that guided its deliberations and believes that any changes in policy or practice in light of increased enrollment should reflect those principles:

- Any changes should produce outcomes that are at least as effective and ideally more effective than the status quo in promoting student learning;
- Any changes should reflect a long-term orientation and not merely be designed to address immediate problems, although some stop-gap measures might be needed;
- All students admitted to UTD should have the courses available to graduate in “normal” time for their programs;
- Any changes should reflect best practices that enhance student learning;
- Space considerations should be regarded as constraints or facilitating conditions for instruction, rather than the primary challenges to be addressed;
- The creation of new programs or the expansion of existing ones should be accompanied by the necessary resources up front, and should be justified by market considerations (student demand and peer competition) and the assurance of high quality learning experiences for students. Continuation of extant programs should meet the same standards.
- The diversity of schools, programs, and associated instructional responsibilities – and differential impact of increased enrollment -- means that “one size doesn’t fit all,” and instructional responses to increased enrollment will need to be multifaceted and vary across multiple levels (campus, school, program, course).

⁴ http://www.utdallas.edu/strategicplan/images/icons/pdf/Strategic_Plan_March_2013.pdf

⁵ <http://www.utdallas.edu/president/speeches/state-of-the-university-2016/state-of-the-university-2016.pdf>

Enrollment increases pose a number of challenges for UTD. Past increases have already put a strain on faculty, students, services, and space allocation. Adaptations have often been *ad hoc*, slow, and inconsistent with best pedagogical practices. Future increases will exacerbate those difficulties and potentially create new ones. Such increases also jeopardize a number of university goals, including those in Chancellor McRaven's Quantum Leaps. Addressing concerns with increased enrollment will require accounting both for past enrollment growth in most cases as well as anticipated future growth.

After consulting with numerous stakeholders, analyzing selected data, looking at peer institutions, and referencing the scholarship of teaching and learning, the Task Force offers the following recommendations and considerations.

Central Recommendation

Instructional decisions are primarily made at the school and program level, and responses to increased enrollment need to be initially formulated at that level in light of specific enrollment pressures, instructional capacity, and other factors. These would be subject to review and approval at higher levels and ultimately will need to be reconciled and integrated with the plans put forward by other units (e.g., programs overseen by schools, schools overseen by campus level units).

- *Schools should be charged with developing strategic plans to meet the challenges of increased enrollment, both recent and prospective, for their programs and course offerings. Such plans should be formed after significant consultation with faculty, staff, and students in the affected units in order to garner their insights and support. Final plans submitted to the Provost should include detailed strategies and action items as well as associated resource requirements. Proposals should reflect and be justified in terms of the guiding principles noted above as well as best practices at peer institutions. Some or all of the options detailed below should be included in those plans.*
- *In order to ensure accountability, UTD should establish a strict timeline for school plans, benchmarks for implementation, and an oversight committee to monitor and assess implementation.*

Managing Enrollment

Managing enrollment would relieve some of the instructional pressures on schools and programs as well as better facilitate long-term planning to account for recent and any future increases. Enrollment limits for graduate programs are already at the discretion of individual schools and programs, but additional limits might come at the cost of foregone revenues. Enrollment limits at the undergraduate level could be established with respect to majors, and there are a number of related decisions and concerns that would need to be decided at the campus level. These include (1) whether admissions would be limited campus-wide in addition to majors; (2) how to accommodate transfers into majors for students both within and outside UTD; (3) whether adjustments need to be made to guaranteed admission standards, and (4) how the reviewed admissions process would be revised. The University of Texas-Austin and University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign have suitable models for these kinds of arrangements, although some significant institutional restructuring at UTD would be required to emulate these.

- *Schools should propose enrollment limits for particular majors as necessary in order to ensure the quality of instructional programs and reflective of instructional delivery capability.*

Increasing Class Size

The current distribution of class sizes is given in Appendix A.⁶ An obvious response to increasing enrollment is to increase the size of course enrollments, especially in high demand, core curriculum courses. Nevertheless, there are some significant space constraints and/or pedagogical costs that accompany a wholesale strategy of increasing class size. In addition, graduate courses are more effective when kept small, and a number of them are already far larger than optimal for student learning and interaction.

UTD has comparatively few courses in the 100-200 (1.4%) and >200 (0.5%) enrollment ranges, especially compared to other R1 universities. Pedagogically, increasing the size of these courses would likely have little effect, but there is presently not enough large classroom space to accommodate such an expansion in conventional course formats.

Some courses currently in the 50-70 enrollment range (currently courses in the 50-100 range constitute approximately 9% of offerings) could be expanded to the 110-125 range, and space is available to accommodate such changes. Resource requirements should be small, except perhaps for supplying graders or teaching assistants for the expanded courses. Such an expansion, however, is likely to prompt changes in instructional delivery that undermine student learning. Research indicates that students in larger classes have significantly fewer interactions with instructors and peers, and this effect was particularly acute for first-generation and minority college students. When classes get larger, there is a risk of losing the personalized interactions between students and faculty, as well as among students, about course ideas and connections between course concepts across the curriculum that are central to students' success. In addition, instructors in large classes are more likely to lecture and employ assessments that do not involve writing or advanced critical thinking (e.g., multiple choice tests); these run contrary to broader trends in higher education over past few decades toward active learning and writing across the curriculum that enhance student learning.

- *Increasing class size should be done on a limited and targeted basis and confined to contexts in which pedagogically sound practices will not be compromised.*

Use of Online and Blended Learning Formats

UTD does not have an extensive array of online courses or those that are blended. Currently, only 5.8% of courses are online (85-100% online) and only 1.7% are blended learning (i.e., 50-84% online);⁷ only 1 of the 15 largest enrollment courses is online. These percentages at UTD have not changed dramatically over the past five years. Online course offerings at selected other universities are given in Appendix B.

Studies indicate that learning outcomes are comparable for online versus conventional course formats, and those for blended learning are slightly better than either of those alternatives. Online and blended learning classes can potentially accommodate larger enrollments per course. Rather than being constrained by space, they actually free up classrooms; for example, a large class normally taught on Mondays and Wednesdays might only use a classroom on one of those days if lectures and other activities were transmitted online earlier in the week. The “Flipped Classroom” model⁸ has great instructional

⁶ These and related references are based on Fall 2015 figures.

⁷ Educational Technology Services (ETS) Annual Report 2015-2016.

http://www.utdallas.edu/elearning/documents/ETS%20Annual%20Report%202015_2016.pdf

⁸ Short video lectures are viewed by students at home before the class session, while in-class time is devoted to exercises, projects, or discussions.

promise, but some variations are more applicable to the UTD context than others. For example, large enrollment courses that pair recorded lectures with small discussion or activity sections are not a viable option at UTD in that multiple small classrooms would be needed each week per course and these are not currently available.

Existing eLearning infrastructure could accommodate an expansion of online and blended learning courses, but additional staff would be necessary for training. The eLearning team is strongly supportive of such an initiative. Furthermore, UTD already has nationally ranked online programs as examples for emulation. In addition, significant resources would be needed to facilitate course development and revision by faculty members; the Center for Teaching and Learning has a model, including revenue sharing, for such an arrangement.

- *Blended learning courses should be significantly expanded, with the highest priority given to large enrollment, core curriculum courses.*
- *Online instruction should be expanded especially in areas designed to reach non-traditional students and/or in which course delivery would provide UTD course access to meet student needs (e.g., summer term courses, second 8 week courses).*

Increased Staffing

Online/blended learning courses and increasing enrollment size of current course offerings will not address most of the increased demand for slots in courses. Beyond merely staffing courses, increased enrollment places substantial pressures on extant faculty members in terms of general advising, office hours, writing recommendations, and other forms of ongoing interactions with students. Additional instructors and support will be needed.

The challenges faced and the possible solutions vary substantially according to course, program, and school. The list below represents the menu of options available. It is likely that schools will need to adopt a mixture of different staffing strategies to meet enrollment demands. The Task Force notes that increasing staff levels also creates additional space pressures for faculty offices, laboratories, and research space – the type and magnitude depending on the type of instructor hired.

1. Hiring more temporary or part-time faculty. This is perhaps the least expensive option in terms of resources (lower salaries, no benefits), but some programs already have difficulty finding qualified instructors, and part-time faculty are not available to meet the demands of increased undergraduate research and senior design projects.
2. Hiring more senior lecturers. These generally cost more than part-time faculty (on a per class basis) but provide greater continuity and dedication to students. At the present time and in most fields, there is an oversupply of qualified PhDs available. Such faculty members, however, provide few or no benefits in terms of research reputation or grant money.
3. Hiring more tenure-track faculty. These are the most costly in terms of salary and any startup costs, offset by grant procurement. They also offer approximately half the number of courses relative to senior lecturers on a yearly basis. Priority should be given to “joint hires” or faculty who can serve the instructional needs of more than one unit, and in particular across schools.
4. Teaching Assistants as Independent Instructors. Already in use in some units, senior doctoral students (presumably ABDs) could offer undergraduate, lower level, and lower enrollment

courses. Potential barriers include (1) limited numbers available, (2) lack of training and/or English language abilities, and (3) loss of TAs who otherwise would act as graders or RAs.

5. Undergraduates as Teaching Assistants. Already in use in some units, these would assume some duties currently carried out by graduate students. Training protocols would be required. These are relatively low cost and might in some cases be superior to graduate students.

Scheduling

Working with the Office of the Registrar, programs schedule classes according to instructional needs, faculty preferences, and space availability. At present, the registrar has indicated that the average classroom is used 50 hours per week. Nevertheless, there are some open days and times in which classrooms are not fully utilized. Open times offer some alternatives for scheduling classes, especially in light of expanded class offerings to meet increased demand: (1) selected times on Fridays, much of Saturdays, and all day Sundays; (2) 8:00 AM on Mondays and Wednesdays, (3) evening lab classes that don't have a common exam, (4) Monday, Wednesday and Friday classes, and (5) evening classes or late afternoon classes, in particular for resident undergraduate students.

Scheduling new or existing courses at the above days and times are constrained by other factors even if they are not constrained by lack of space. Undergraduate students and instructors alike resist classes at these times. Resources are uncertain, but seem to be limited to additional building maintenance and security when classrooms are used.

- *Programs should consider alternative days and times for course offerings in light of student demand and preferences as well as faculty availability. Pilot offerings should be used to test the viability of alternatives.*

Other Recommendations

Student Services

Overall, enrollment pressures threaten the legal and ethical obligations that UTD has toward its students in providing an effective learning environment. Increases in student enrollment produce a proportionate increase in demand for a variety of student support services and programs. Inadequacies threaten UTD progress in recruiting, retention, and graduate rates.

Increased enrollment needs to be accompanied by commensurate opportunities and support for academic programs such as study abroad and internships. Furthermore, strains on advising at all levels are evident as well. Particularly important are programs such as Peer-Led Team Learning (PLTL) and Supplemental Instruction (SI), which are strongly associated with student success but whose services have not kept pace with increased demand. These programs and assistance are vital parts of students' academic experience and progress.

Although a variety of student services (e.g., AccessAbility, Testing Center, Judicial Affairs, Resource Connections, Academic Outreach, Counseling Center) do not directly provide instruction, they do provide critical support to students and faculty in assisting in and promoting student learning. Staffing levels for UTD support units have not necessarily kept pace with past enrollment increases and future increases will further stress some services. Some current staffing levels for units comparable to those at Texas-Austin,

Virginia Tech, and Georgia Tech (see Appendix C) indicates that UTD staffing levels are sometimes dramatically smaller than at peer institutions.

Other support elements, such as computer labs with specialized software, are sensitive to the demands of increased enrollment and the expansion of online and blended learning courses.

- *Student services staffing levels and configuration, as well as space requirements, should be reviewed and adjusted for recent and future enrollment increases. Such a review would include developing target staffing goals, based on comparisons with peer institutions and professional guidelines (e.g., mental health) as appropriate.*

Resources for new hires will be required to meet current and future enrollment; these include salaries and benefits and likely suitable office space.

New Facilities

No matter which of the above approaches are adopted, more classroom space will be essential in the long run. Classroom design is correlated with student learning outcomes, and if done properly, new or reconfigured classroom spaces can enhance existing courses as well as new offerings. Currently, UTD lacks classroom space capable of accommodating up to 500-600 students, and there is also a shortage of classrooms for classes with 10-35 student enrollment. The construction of two planned buildings on campus would ameliorate some current classroom pressures, but will not address all of them and continued increased enrollment would eliminate any progress and likely exacerbate existing problems. Models for effective classroom design include *Scale-Up* (Student Centered Active Learning Environment with Upside Down Pedagogies), developed at North Carolina State and used by a number of universities including the University of Minnesota and Virginia Tech. Whatever the approach, faculty input is essential in classroom and building design.

- *Build one or more new buildings dedicated primarily or exclusively to classrooms. These should include large lecture rooms (300-500), but might involve a multistory structure with large rooms on the lower floors and other kinds of classrooms and meeting space on the upper floors. Flexible seating arrangements and sizes, and common spaces, must facilitate student interactions as well as meet the needs of different courses and pedagogical approaches (e.g., project or team based learning).*

This will require significant resources up front and maintenance resources thereafter.

The committee examined the use of additional satellite campus locations, but did not find any clear instructional advantages. Significant drawbacks included those associated with cost, transportation, and convenience. This is not to say that the purchase of existing facilities that are geographically proximate to the central campus is undesirable. This is a potential option and one not mutually exclusive with new buildings, but the instructional impact (positive or negative) will vary according to location, actual usage, and a host of other factors.

Better Planning

Program heads and others often complain about the need for developing course schedules more than a year in advance and then engaging in last minute scrambles to add courses and find qualified instructors. Also problematic is securing space for instructional activities that support or supplement classroom instruction; such activities include review sessions, special events, guest speakers, and the like. The present system does not allow staff to identify and allocate available space easily across campus and

make reservations; various units also hoard space under their control. Enrollment pressures make a bad situation even worse.

- *Develop better enrollment and course forecasting models, and share the outputs with schools and programs with suitable advance notice.*
- *Expand the space identification and allocation system to all rooms over a capacity of 15, including those in University Housing, and allow these to be scheduled through a single office or online platform (with limited and appropriate exceptions).*

Resource requirements for these recommendations should be limited to maintenance and troubleshooting after start-up costs.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul F. Diehl (Chair)
Darren Crone (eLearning)
Kimshi Hickman (Student Success Center)
John Sibert (NSM)
Sarah Maxwell (Undergraduate Education and EPPS)
Mark Spong (ECS)
Todd Fechter (ATEC)
John Gooch (A&H)
Matthew Polze (JSOM)
Karen Huxtable-Jester (BBS and CTL)
Tonja Wissinger (IS)

In addition, the following five student leaders (three undergraduates and two graduate students) were consulted after an initial draft report was written and they provided feedback and suggestions at two subsequent stages that were incorporated into the final report:

Peter (Ohagwu) Ozoemenam
Hannah Hubbard
Aniket Patil
Akshitha Padigela
Joey Campaign

Appendix G

Guidelines for Teaching Observation in Promotion and Tenure Reviews

The informed judgment of colleagues regarding a faculty member's teaching effectiveness is an important part of personnel decisions. Sound decisions require attention to the *process* used to gather information and appreciation of the *context* in which these observations take place as well as the *content* of the evaluation. The following are good practices for conducting teaching observations and should be used in conjunction with one of the two forms approved by UT Regents, "Example A Peer Observation for Formative Assessment of Teaching" or "Example B Classroom Observation Form." Note that a separate process and evaluation form is used for online courses ("Online Course Review Rubric")

Phase 1: Pre-observation conference

Prior to the scheduled classroom observation(s), it is essential to meet with the instructor to gather information about the context of the course. You'll need:

- A copy of the syllabus
- Copies of course materials, including slides or handouts, particularly as relevant to the observed class session(s)
- Goals for the course and objectives for the class session(s) you will observe
- Instructor's plans for achieving these objectives; planned learning activities
- What have students been asked to do in preparation for this class?
- Will this be a typical class? If not, why?
- Anything the observer should be aware of prior to the observation(s)?

Phase 2: Conducting the classroom observation

During the observation, keep a narrative log describing verbal and nonverbal behavior of both the instructor and the students. At this stage, focus on gathering information rather than making evaluative judgements based on what you observe. It is helpful to record the times at which a behavior or activity occurred so that the sequence can be later understood in context and the amount of time spent on various activities can be assessed. Make note of:

- Content: How does the instructor indicate the objectives for the day's lesson? How are new ideas highlighted? Does the instructor connect new ideas to what students have learned previously?
- Organization: How does the instructor begin class and how does he or she transition from one topic or activity to the next?
- Classroom interactions: How do students respond to the instructor and each other? Make note of your observations of the classroom atmosphere.
- Effective communication: Can all students see and hear the instructor? Does the instructor communicate clearly, make eye contact, and maintain students' interest?
- Use of media and instructional materials: How does the instructor use handouts, audiovisual materials, or technology?

Phase 3: Post-observation conference

Meet with the instructor within one week of the observation to gather impressions of the class session. This will facilitate your interpretation of the narrative log as you complete the Classroom Observation Form. The following are some items to discuss:

- What things went well for this instructor and/or the class from the perspective of the instructor?
- What things did not go so well during this particular class from the perspective of the instructor?
- What changes would the instructor make to address those weaknesses?
- What questions or concerns do you have that could be addressed by the instructor?

Phase 4: Complete evaluation report

Use either of the approved forms to write a report of your observations within one week of the post-observation conference. Relate your impressions of the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness by interpreting your observations within the context of the total course and the instructor's development.

- What things did you learn in the pre- or post-observation conference that influenced your observation and feedback?
- How does this instructor compare with others in the program or school?

Guidelines for Reciprocal Formative Teaching Observations

The informed judgment of colleagues regarding a faculty member's teaching effectiveness is an important part of fostering improvement, quite apart from making personnel decisions. The information gathered for improvement is for the instructor's personal use, and therefore is private and confidential. The following are good practices for conducting teaching observations that are intended to provide richly detailed, supportive feedback. Both the instructor and the observer are expected to benefit from the process as these roles are swapped.

Phase 1: Pre-observation conference

Prior to the scheduled classroom observation(s), it is essential for the observer and instructor to meet to discuss the context of the course. What the observer will need and questions to be considered are:

- A copy of the syllabus
- Copies of course materials, including slides or handouts, particularly as relevant to the observed class session(s)
- Goals for the course and objectives for the class session(s) to be observed
- Instructor's plans for achieving these objectives; planned learning activities
- What have students been asked to do in preparation for this class?
- Will this be a typical class? If not, why?
- Anything the observer should be aware of prior to the observation(s)? For example, should the observer pay particular attention to any specific aspects of the class session that the instructor is concerned about (e.g., leading discussions or responding to specific student behaviors)?

Phase 2: Conducting the classroom observation

During the class session, the observer should keep a narrative log describing verbal and nonverbal behavior of both the instructor and the students with as many concrete details as possible. At this stage, focus on gathering descriptive information and avoid making evaluative judgments based on what you observe. It is helpful to record the times at which a behavior or activity occurred so that the sequence can be later understood in context and the amount of time spent on various activities can be assessed. If the instructor has not asked you to focus on a particular aspect of the class session, you can make note of:

- Content: How does the instructor indicate the objectives for the day's lesson? How are new ideas highlighted? Does the instructor connect new ideas to what students have learned previously?
- Organization: How does the instructor begin class and how does he or she transition from one topic or activity to the next?
- Classroom interactions: How do students respond to the instructor and each other? Make note of your observations of the classroom atmosphere.
- Effective communication: Can all students see and hear the instructor? Does the instructor communicate clearly, make eye contact, and maintain students' interest?
- Use of media and instructional materials: How does the instructor use handouts, audiovisual materials, or technology?

Phase 3: Post-observation conference

Personal feedback regarding the session is essential, and should be both candid and tactful. The observer and instructor should meet within one week of the observation to share impressions of teaching strengths and weaknesses. The goal is to generate constructive feedback that will help the instructor to develop strategies for improvement. The following are some items to discuss:

- What things went well for this instructor and/or the class from the perspective of the instructor? Of the observer?
- What things did not go so well during this particular class from the perspective of the instructor? Of the observer?
- What changes could the instructor make to address those weaknesses?
- What questions or concerns does the instructor have that could be addressed by the observer?
- What questions or concerns does the observer have that could be addressed by the instructor?

No information gathered in these meetings or via these observations may be used for evaluation of teaching performance. Other than for the instructor's or observer's personal use, no records should be kept nor information about the observation conveyed without the permission of the junior faculty member.